Differential drivers of chemical defenses in three widespread pine species along a 1500-m elevational gradient: a test of the elevational gradient in plant defense hypothesis

Scott Ferrenberg^{1,2*}, Joseph M. Langenhan², Steven A. Loskot², Leonardo M. Rozal², Jeffry B. Mitton¹

¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA ²Department of Chemistry, Seattle University, Seattle, WA, USA

*Corresponding author: <u>scott.ferrenberg@colorado.edu</u>

1 Summary

The elevational gradient in plant defense (EGPD) hypothesis posits that natural enemy
 pressures increase positively alongside temperature across elevational climatic gradients,
 thereby selecting for enhanced defenses at lower elevations while leaving plants less defended
 at higher elevations. Phylogenetically constrained tests of this hypothesis in tree populations
 are exceedingly rare. Nevertheless, the presumed presence of poorly-defended trees has been
 invoked as an important driver of recent pest outbreaks at higher elevations than historically
 common.

2. Tree age, growth rate, and size have all been correlated with levels of tree defenses. Thus, we
sought to disentangle the interacting influences of these properties from possible elevational
climatic effects on monoterpene composition, concentrations, and diversity of constitutive
resin within three widespread pines (*Pinus contorta, Pinus ponderosa*, and *Pinus flexilis*)
across a 1532 m elevational transect in the Rocky Mountains, Colorado, USA.

- Collectively, elevation and tree properties were relatively weak predictors of defenses in *P. ponderosa* and *P. flexilis*, but explained ~ 75% of variation in monoterpene concentration and ~ 50% of diversity in *P. contorta*.
- 4. Increasing tree age had the greatest positive influence on monoterpene concentration and diversity in *P. contorta*, while increasing tree size had a negative influence suggesting a potential lifelong tradeoff between tree growth and defense. Elevation had a significant, negative influence on monoterpene concentration but little to no effect on monoterpene diversity in *P. contorta*.
- 5. Overall, we found some support for the EGPD hypothesis within *P. contorta*, but no support
 within *P. ponderosa* or *P. flexilis*. Our results suggest the presence of divergent conifer defense
 allocation strategies and drivers even among congeners growing in shared environments. An
 improved understanding of the controls on tree defenses, particularly possible influences of
 climate-based drivers, is necessary for predicting forest pest dynamics under global change
 scenarios.
- 28

Key words: chemical ecology, climate, conifer, elevational gradient, monoterpenes, *Pinus*, plant
defenses, resin

2

31 Introduction

32 Coniferous trees possess defense and resistance mechanisms that enable some individuals to avoid or withstand pest attack (Trapp & Croteau 2001; Franceschi et al. 2005; Mumm & Hilker 33 34 2006). Tree defense phenotypes, while influenced by contemporary environmental conditions, are genetically controlled and have been shaped by abiotic and biotic selection pressures occurring at 35 local and regional scales (Rosner & Hannrup 2004; Holeski, Kearsley & Whitham 2011; Sampedro 36 et al. 2011; Moreira et al. 2015; Westbrook et al. 2015; Zinkgraf et al. 2015; Harper et al. 2016), 37 as well as continental scales (Pearse & Hipp 2012; Moreira et al. 2014; Carrillo-Gavilán et al. 38 39 2015; Wang et al. 2016). As a result, tree defense phenotypes can vary substantially within and among populations (Moreira et al. 2014; Ferrenberg, Kane & Langenhan 2015; Vogan & Schoettle 40 2015; Zinkgraf et al. 2015; Harper et al. 2016). This spatial variation in tree defenses, particularly 41 as it relates to landscape features, has important implications for pest outbreaks (Holdenrieder et 42 al. 2004; Ferrenberg 2016). 43

Spatial variation in tree defense phenotypes can result from many dynamic, interacting 44 mechanisms. At the scale of individual trees, defenses can increase or decrease across stages of 45 ontogeny and phenology (Boege & Marquis 2005; Barton & Koricheva 2010). For example, in 46 lodgepole pines (Pinus contorta Dougl. ex Loud.), older stem material has been reported to be less 47 chemically defended than younger materials (Goodman et al. 2013). In contrast, chemical defenses 48 of white spruce (*Picea glauca* Moench) needles increase with age (Quiring 1992). With respect to 49 phenology, variations in tree size and growth rate over time have been linked to changes in 50 defenses and risk of mortality (Ireland et al. 2014; Bigler 2016). For example, larger diameter 51 52 limber pines (Pinus flexilis James) suffered higher densities of bark beetle attacks (beetle attacks/m² bark surface) than smaller trees (Ferrenberg & Mitton 2014) and larger diameter 53 lodgepole pines (Pinus contorta) were attacked at higher frequencies than smaller trees in some 54 55 locations (Björklund & Lindgren 2009). At the same time, slower growth rates correlate with 56 reduced production of resin ducts (specialized cells where resins are produced and stored) in the

57 stems of numerous pine species, which increases susceptibility to bark beetle attack and mortality 58 (Kane & Kolb 2010; Gaylord et al. 2013; Ferrenberg, Kane & Mitton 2014; Moreira et al. 2015; 59 Hood et al. 2015; Bentz et al. 2016). Importantly, Moreira et al. (2016) found that resin defenses 60 of 17 pine species clustered into two divergent defensive-syndromes with slow-growing species (e.g., *Pinus contorta* and *Pinus ponderosa* Lawson) investing more heavily in constitutive defenses 61 while fast growing species have greater inducible defenses regardless of phylogenetic relatedness. 62 This finding suggests a hierarchy of influences on pine defenses, whereby an individual tree's 63 defenses are influenced by age, size, and growth rate within the context of species-level adaptive 64 65 strategies.

Beyond these influences, tree defenses are also hypothesized to have evolved in response 66 to contemporary and historical climatic gradients (Moles et al. 2011a). For example, climatic 67 suitability gradients for insects and pathogens are thought to influence the intensity of selection 68 pressure placed upon plant defenses, shaping defenses as a function of time and biogeography 69 70 (Schemske et al. 2009; Salazar & Marquis 2012; Anstett et al. 2016). This longstanding idea is encapsulated in the longstanding latitudinal gradient in plant defenses (LGPD) hypothesis (Moles 71 et al. 2011a) and the related *elevational gradient in plant defenses* (EGPD) hypothesis (Rasmann 72 73 et al. 2014). These hypotheses posit that trees from lower latitudes and elevations (warmer regions) 74 experience more consistent pest pressures than trees at higher latitudes and elevations (colder regions). Thus, in forest ecosystems, these selection gradients should result in greater defenses as 75 76 a function of warmer temperatures (Moles et al. 2011a; Mitton & Ferrenberg 2012; Pearse & Hipp 2012; Pellissier et al. 2012; Moreira et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2016). In general, the LGPD and 77 EGPD hypotheses have received mixed support across a range of plants. This may be due in part 78 to experimental designs that fail to control for phylogeny, variation in defense traits across tree 79 species, and variable feeding strategies of different natural enemies (Anstett et al. 2016). The 80 81 recent spread of pests from lower to higher elevation forests has rapidly increased interest in the 82 EGPD hypothesis. In particular, this model might prove particularly applicable to coniferous tree

species that often occur along relatively large elevational climatic gradients (Mitton & Ferrenberg
2012; Rasmann et al. 2014). Unfortunately, whether for conspecifics or congeners, comparisons
of conifer defenses that examine a substantial elevational gradient are exceedingly rare (Hengxiao
et al. 1999; Smith 2000). To our knowledge, there are no previous phylogenetically constrained
studies of defenses across elevation that further parse the influences of elevation, tree age, and
growth rate on defense patterns.

The possible interacting influences of tree growth rate, size, age, and climatic gradients 89 inspired us to examine conifer defenses along a 1532 m elevational transect in the Rocky 90 91 Mountains, Colorado, USA. We characterized the defenses of three widespread and ecologically important pine species of western North America: Pinus ponderosa var. scopulorum (Engelm), 92 Pinus contorta var. latifolia (Engelm), and Pinus flexilis (James). Like all conifers, these species 93 use resin as a primary defense against pests (Franceschi et al. 2005; Mumm & Hilker 2006), 94 investing significantly in constitutive resin defenses, particularly in stem material targeted by 95 96 specialized bark and wood-boring insects that can cause substantial pine mortality rates during outbreaks and droughts (Ferrenberg et al. 2014). Pine resin consists of a suite of secondary 97 metabolites, primarily diterpene acids dissolved in sesquiterpenes and monoterpenes. Variation in 98 99 tree monoterpene phenotypes strongly influences host selection and reproductive success of insect 100 pests, as well as tree survival during pest outbreaks (Seybold et al. 2006; Raffa, Powell & 101 Townsend 2013; Taft, Najir & Erbilgin 2015; Taft et al. 2015). Thus, in this study, we focused on 102 the monoterpene components of constitutive stem resin. We hypothesized that monoterpene concentrations and diversity would be positively related to tree growth rates, and would decline 103 104 with increasing tree age, size (stem diameter), and elevation. Our *a priori* prediction was that 105 relatively faster-growing, younger trees at lower elevations would be the most defended within our sampling region, while slower-growing and older trees at higher elevations would be the least 106 107 defended. However, given potential tradeoffs among tree defenses and growth (or other 108 physiological processes) under optimal resource conditions, we considered an alternate hypothesis

that higher growth rates would lead to decreased concentration of defenses as predicted by severalplant defense theories (Stamp et al. 2003).

111

112 Materials and Methods

We tested our hypothesis regarding the influence of tree age, size, and growth on tree 113 defenses along climatic gradients by sampling monoterpene chemistry of the constitutive resin of 114 P. ponderosa, P. contorta, and P. flexilis across an elevational transect covering a total range of 115 1532 meters from the lowest to highest sampling sites. The highest sampling site was located at 116 117 3330 m above sea level (asl) (40.0375, -105.5739; -0.3°C mean annual air temperature) and the lowest sampling site at 1795 m asl (40.1113, -105.3076; 11.1°C mean annual air temperature). The 118 119 highest, western-most site (located within the Niwot Ridge LTER, Boulder County, Colorado, USA) and the lowest, eastern-most site (located on private property near the city of Boulder, 120 Colorado, USA) were separated by approximately 20 km of planar distance. The majority of 121 122 sampling sites for intermediate elevations were located within a 10 km wide transect (North to South) lying between the high and low points of the East to West transect. Sampling sites were 123 restricted to low and moderately sloping ridge-tops and benches with a south-southeast aspect in 124 125 locations where access was permitted by private landowners, the Niwot Ridge LTER, the University of Colorado's Mountain Research Station, the U.S Forest Service, and Boulder County 126 Parks and Open Space. Previous studies along or near this elevation gradient have revealed a 127 128 decreasing stand disturbance frequency as elevation increases (Schuster et al. 1995) leading to a higher proportion of trees >100 years for all three species in higher elevation stands. However, 129 selective harvesting in the late 19th and early 20th century has led to a more homogenous age 130 distribution in *P. contorta* compared to other conifers (Knowles & Grant 1983). 131

The species used here have large, often overlapping geographic ranges, yet have elevation ranges partitioned by climate. For instance, while all three species can be found growing together between 2579 m asl and 2870 m asl, *P. ponderosa* dominates at lower elevations while *P. contorta*

135 and P. flexilis are more common at higher elevations. We attempted to sample each pine species 136 across the majority of their elevational distributions, with *P. ponderosa* sampled from 1795 to 2854 m asl, P. contorta sampled from 2347 to 3330 m asl, and P. flexilis sampled from 2579 to 137 138 3330 m asl. Trees of each species were sampled between 2011 and 2014 from five or more locations along the elevational transect, with a diverse range of tree sizes included from along 139 140 randomly oriented transects within each sampling site. The goal was to collect data on defenses from across a range of tree ages and growth rates while also effectively assessing 141 elevational/climatic influences. In addition to characterizations of constitutive monoterpene 142 143 chemistry, we measured tree diameter at breast height (DBH, 1.4 m above the ground surface) and collected an increment core from the majority of sampled trees with a 12 mm diameter borer 144 (several trees of each species were lost after resin sampling but before physical measurements were 145 taken due to wildfires or harvest). Increment cores were used to estimate tree age at breast height 146 from annual ring counts and annual radial growth $(mm \cdot yr^{-1})$ of the most recent 5 years which were 147 148 measured from high resolution scans (9600 dpi) in *Image J*. Radial growth rates were then used to calculate each tree's basal area increment (BAI) growth for the 5 year xylem ring interval. BAI in 149 this study was calculated as the percentage of a tree's total cross-sectional area (mm²) comprised 150 151 by of the most recent five years of xylem growth.

152

153 *Resin chemistry*

154 Constitutive monoterpene types and concentrations were measured from resin collected in 155 glass scintillation vials placed into a 65 mm diameter bore hole drilled at an upward 45° angle and 156 approximately 25 mm deep into each tree's xylem. Vials were tightly inserted to reduce contact 157 between resin and the atmosphere, left in place for 48 hours, and then capped and stored at -30° C 158 until analysis. For laboratory analysis, resin samples were allowed to warm to room temperature 159 before an aliquot of each sample was transferred to a 3 dram glass vial which was promptly capped 160 and weighed. Each sample was then dissolved into methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE, C₅H₁₂O)

containing either 5 mM isobutylbenzene (C10H14) or 5 mM cyclohexylbenzene (C12H16) as an 161 162 internal standard. A Hewlett-Packard HP6890 Series GC/MS equipped with a Restek Rtx-5Sil MS column was used to quantify monoterpene amounts. After split injection (2 µL, 34:1 ratio, 220 163 164 °C), the oven temperature increased from an initial value of 40 °C at 10 °C/min until 200 °C was reached (5 min hold). During this time, helium flow rate was maintained at 1.6 mL/min. 165 166 Identification of peaks was accomplished by comparing retention times to those of authentic standards. Calibration curves for quantification for the following monoterpenes were generated 167 using authentic (standard) α-pinene (Fluka), β-pinene (Fluka), α-phellandrene (TCI), β-168 169 phellandrene (supplied by Dr. Ken Keefover-Ring, University of Wisconsin), Δ^3 -carene (Aldrich), limonene (Fluka), myrcene (Acros), sabinene (Indofine), and terpinolene (TCI). 170

171

172 *Statistical analyses*

Relationships among tree age and size (DBH) were examined for each tree species with 173 174 linear regression. DBH for each species was log-transformed to meet the assumptions of normality prior to regression analysis. Monoterpene concentration (mg monoterpenes / mg resin) and 175 diversity (α -diversity) calculated as the Shannon diversity index (H') based on the composition 176 177 and abundance of monoterpenes in each sample were compared among the three species using Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric tests followed by Steel-Dwass comparisons (a nonparametric 178 179 multiple means comparison with sequential correction). Differences in the mean pair-wise 180 dissimilarity of monoterpene diversity (β -diversity) calculated as the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index of each species were compared to mean differences obtained by calculating all possible 181 182 values of the test statistic under rearrangements of the labels on the observed data points, otherwise 183 known as a permutation resample test. This approach determines whether observed differences in mean monoterpene dissimilarity among species differs from random differences; we used this 184 185 approach to avoid violating assumptions of sample independence associated with other possible tests. In addition to simple assessments of monoterpene concentration and diversity, we treated 186

187 monoterpene composition and abundances in each tree's resin sample as 'communities' which 188 were compared via multi-response permutation procedure (MRPP, a non-parametric method for 189 comparing the hypothesis of no difference among groups/communities). We also used a stepwise 190 logistic regression model to determine what proportion of resin samples could be correctly 191 categorize to their species of derivation via monoterpene measures, with the best-fit logistic 192 regression model determined via the Bayesian information criterion (BIC).

We examined hypothesized relationships of total monoterpene concentration, diversity, 193 dissimilarity, and individual monoterpene concentrations with elevation, tree age, size, growth rate 194 195 (entered into each model as radial growth and BAI of the most recent five years from tree increment cores) via generalized regression models. Generalized regressions were completed in 196 JMP Pro 12.0.1 (2015) using the adaptive lasso estimation method, an approach that computes 197 parameter estimates by penalizing a weighted sum of the absolute values of the regression 198 coefficients (Zou 2006). Best-fit models were validated using the Corrected Akaike Information 199 200 Criterion (AIC_c). Concentration, diversity, and dissimilarity data had variable distributions across the three species. Thus, P. contorta monoterpene concentration (untransformed) and diversity 201 (cube-root transformed) were modeled as normal distributions, while monoterpene dissimilarity 202 203 was modeled as a gamma distribution. For *P. ponderosa* and *P. flexilis* diversity and dissimilarity 204 were modeled as a gamma distribution and monoterpene concentrations were modelled as a Cauchy-Lorentz distribution due to the larger number of outliers observed. 205

We used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM; Grace 2006) to parameterize and evaluate the fit of hypothetical, causal models linking the monoterpene concentration and monoterpene diversity of constitutive resin to factors found to be significant in generalized regressions (i.e., tree age, size, growth rate, and elevation). Similar to generalized regressions, monoterpene measures were only weakly explained at best by tree properties and elevation for *P. ponderosa* and *P. flexilis* resulting in poorly supported SEMs for these species, leading us to discard models for these species. SEMs were performed in R version 3.1.2 (R Core Development Team 2014) with the

213 *lavaan* package (Rosseel 2012). With the exception of monoterpene concentration (normally 214 distributed without transformation in P. contorta) most variables used in the model were not normally distributed so we used maximum likelihood parameter estimates (MLM) and a mean 215 adjusted Satorra-Bentler χ^2 (Satorra & Bentler 1988) to fit and test model fit, respectively. Because 216 data used in the model were comprised of measures with various units (i.e., monoterpene 217 concentration per mg of resin, tree age in years, tree size/growth in mm, and meters above sea 218 level) we calculated standardized coefficients as indicators of the magnitudes of the various paths 219 in our SEM. 220

221

222 **Results**

We attempted to collect samples of constitutive resin from 106 individual trees of P. 223 224 contorta, 118 individuals of P. ponderosa, and 106 individuals of P. flexilis across the elevational gradient. Of these trees, 60 P. contorta (57%), 105 P. ponderosa (89%), and 106 P. flexilis (100%) 225 226 yielded a sufficient quantity of resin for further analysis. For trees yielding samples, the mean age of P. contorta was 104 years with a range of 23 to 186, P. ponderosa mean age was 135 years with 227 a range of 21 to 424, and *P. flexilis* mean age was 118 with a range of 29 to 375. Mean tree size, 228 229 measured as diameter at breast height (DBH) in P. contorta was 20 cm with a range of 11.3 to 36.1, in *P. ponderosa* mean DBH was 20.2 with a range of 10.1 to 43.8, and in *P. flexilis* mean 230 DBH was 16.5 with a range of 3.7 to 39.2. Tree size was negatively related to tree age for P. 231 contorta ($R^2 = 0.14$, P = 0.009), but positively related to tree age in P. ponderosa ($R^2 = 0.14$, P =232 0.0004) and P. flexilis ($R^2 = 0.22$, P < 0.0001) (Fig. S1). 233

Regardless of tree properties (age, growth rate, or size) or sample elevation, monoterpene concentration within constitutive resin (mg monoterpene / mg resin) was significantly greater in *P. contorta* and *P. ponderosa* than in *P. flexilis* (H = 58.8, d.f. = 2, P < 0.0001; Fig. 1a). Total monoterpene 'communities' of constitutive resin significantly differed among all three species (MRPP T = -142.5, A = 0.38, P < 0.0001; Fig. 2). Logistic regression with a subset of six

monoterpene concentrations (in order of their log worth for categorizing the pine species: β phellandrene, limonene, sabinene, β -pinene, Δ^3 -carene, and terpinolene) correctly categorized 98.2 % of resin samples by their tree species or origin (Generalized $R^2 = 0.99$, $X^2 = 557.5$, P = 0.0001; Fig. 3) with an area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve ≥ 0.99 for all three species (a value of 1.0 indicates a perfect grouping test, a value of 0.5 indicates a poor test that performs no better than random assignment).

The diversity of resin monoterpenes (calculated as Shannon's H', a measure of within 245 sample diversity or α -diversity) significantly differed among all three species (Kruskal-Wallis H 246 = 101.3, d.f. = 2, P < 0.0001; Fig. 1b), with the highest diversity found in P. flexilis (1.57 \pm 0.03), 247 248 followed by *P. ponderosa* (1.31 ± 0.03) and *P. contorta* (1.09 ± 0.04) . Mean pair-wise dissimilarity 249 in monoterpene diversity (a measure of average differences in monoterpene composition among 250 samples or β -diversity) was also significantly different among the three species (P < 0.0001; Fig. 251 1c), with the lowest level of monoterpene dissimilarity found in *P. ponderosa* (0.48 \pm 0.007), 252 followed by *P. flexilis* (0.51 \pm 0.009), and *P. contorta* (0.63 \pm 0.010).

253 Generalized regressions using the adaptive lasso estimation method revealed that the combination of elevation and tree properties (age, size, and growth rates) were strong determinants 254 of monoterpene concentration ($R^2 = 0.76$) and diversity ($R^2 = 0.50$) in *P. contorta* (Table 1). 255 However, these factors are very weak influences on monoterpene concentration and diversity in 256 *P. ponderosa* ($R^2 = 0.08$ and $R^2 < 0.01$, respectively) and moderate to weak influences on 257 concentration and diversity in *P. flexilis* ($R^2 = 0.17$ and $R^2 = 0.11$, respectively) (Table 1). 258 Monoterpene dissimilarity among trees was not influenced by tree properties or elevation for P. 259 contorta ($R^2 = 0.01$) but was weakly influenced by tree properties (primarily age) in P. ponderosa 260 $(R^2 = 0.12)$, and by tree age and elevation in *P. flexilis* $(R^2 = 0.10)$. 261

Generalized regressions were also used to test the relationships of concentrations of individual monoterpenes (as opposed to total monoterpene concentration described above) with elevation and tree properties. Overall, generalized regressions suggested that variation in the

265 concentrations of 7 of the 10 identified monoterpenes were significantly linked to one or more tree properties in P. contorta, with a significant influence of elevation apparent for only two 266 monoterpenes (P < 0.05; Table S1). Importantly, tree age was the most influential factor in the 267 268 variation of three of the four most abundant monoterpenes on average found in *P. contorta* (Table S1). Full generalized regression models (i.e., age plus all other factors retained by adaptive lasso 269 estimation) resulted in an $R^2 = 0.71$ for β -phellendrene (the most abundant monoterpene of P. 270 contorta), $R^2 = 0.14$ for β -pinene (the third most abundant monoterpene in *P. contorta*), and $R^2 =$ 271 272 0.58 for α -pinene (the fourth most abundant monoterpene in *P. contorta*); with fits ranging from $R^2 = 0.69$ to 0.10 for the remaining less abundant monoterpenes in *P. contorta* (Fig. 2, Table S1). 273 274 For P. ponderosa, tree properties and elevation were poor predictors of concentrations for any of the individual monoterpenes; the model explaining the most variation in any monoterpene yielded 275 an $R^2 = 0.08$ (camphene), while models for the four most abundant monoterpenes of *P. ponderosa* 276 (δ³-carene, β-pinene, α-pinene, and terpinolene) all had an $R^2 \le 0.03$ (Fig. 2, Table S1). Finally, 277 278 for P. flexilis, tree basal area increment growth, tree age, and elevation were significant factors (P < 0.05) which combined to explain a moderate amount of variation ($R^2 = 0.17$) in the second most 279 abundant monoterpene (limonene); while tree growth rates and elevation were significantly linked 280 (P < 0.05) to models explaining a modest amount of variation in terpinolene $(R^2 = 0.10)$ and 281 myrcene ($R^2 = 0.21$) both of which were moderately abundant in *P. flexilis* (Fig. 2, Table S1) 282

The strong relationship of monoterpene concentration and diversity in P. contorta to tree 283 properties and elevation in generalized regression models led us to propose and test a hypothetical 284 casual model (i.e., a structural equation model, SEM) of the interactive effects of tree age, size, 285 286 growth rate, and elevation on P. contorta monoterpene concentration and diversity. Unlike generalized regressions where collinear predictors can lead to inflated model fit values, SEMs 287 allow for predictor terms to interact via multiple paths (hence the alternate name 'path models'). 288 289 In our case, both SEMs were considered to be well fit to the observed data with both models having a Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2 = 0.043$, d.f. = 1, and P = 0.836 (a small χ^2 and a large P-value indicate an 290

SEM that is well fit to observed data). The SEMs for *P. contorta* explained 75 % ($R^2 = 0.752$) of 291 the variation in monoterpene concentration (Fig. 4a) and 49% ($R^2 = 0.493$) of the variation in 292 monoterpene diversity (Fig. 4b). The SEM for monoterpene concentration in P. contorta resin 293 294 revealed: 1) elevation has the strongest, negative direct-effect on monoterpene concentration, 2) tree age has a strong, positive direct-effect on total monoterpene concentration, as well as two 295 296 paths of indirect influence via tree size and growth rate (basal area increment represented by the most recent five years of annual growth), and 3) increasing tree growth rates and sizes have 297 conflicting direct-effects on monoterpene concentrations, with faster growing trees having greater 298 299 concentrations and larger trees having lower concentrations (Fig. 4a). The SEM for monoterpene diversity was similar to that for monoterpene concentrations with regard to the effects of tree age, 300 301 but differed in finding no significant links of diversity and elevation. Increasing tree size appeared to have the strongest, negative direct-effect on monoterpene diversity (Fig. 4b). Taken together, 302 the SEMs would suggest that smaller, older *P. contorta* trees with larger growth rates have the 303 304 greatest levels of constitutive monoterpene defenses. At the same time, trees with these properties would also be more defended (in terms of total monoterpene concentration) at lower elevations. 305

306

307 Discussion

308 Pests rank among the leading causes of tree mortality and forest disturbance, with their impacts expected to increase due to global change pressures (Dietze & Matthes 2014; Haynes, 309 310 Allstadt & Klimetzek 2014; Kozlov et al. 2014; Anderegg et al. 2015; Jules et al. 2016). Spatiotemporal patterns in tree defenses are an important feature of the landscape that affects forest 311 pest dynamics (Ferrenberg 2016). Indeed, range expansion by insects has been linked to greater 312 susceptibility of host plants within novel versus historical ranges (Desurmont et al. 2011). Also, 313 studies ranging in focus from herbaceous plants to coniferous trees suggest that a diverse set of 314 315 secondary chemicals is important for resisting natural enemies (Keefover-Ring & Linhart 2010; 316 Iason et al. 2011; Roach et al. 2014; Richards et al. 2015). Previous work has suggested potentially

317 strong influences of tree properties on risk of pest attack and mortality (Iason et al. 2014). Resource 318 and climatic gradients have also been shown to influence tree defenses in some species (O'Neill 319 et al. 2002; Moreira et al. 2015; Ferrenberg 2016). At the same time, warming temperatures can 320 interact with conifer defense chemistry to affect the relative risk of forest insect pest outbreaks (Kollberg et al. 2015). A greater understanding of the underlying drivers of spatiotemporal patterns 321 322 in tree defenses is necessary to improve predictions of forest pest dynamics in relation to global change pressures (Holdenrieder et al. 2004; Ferrenberg 2016). We employed a study design that 323 characterized resin defenses of three congeners occurring within shared environments across a 324 325 1500 m elevational gradient. The design supported our goal of disentangling potentially interacting influences of age, growth, size, and climate on defenses of P. ponderosa, P. contorta, and P. 326 flexilis. 327

We found that the combined influences of tree properties and elevation explained a 328 substantial amount of the variation in monoterpene concentration and diversity within P. contorta 329 330 (Tables 1 and S1, Fig. 4), but explained a relatively modest to small amount of the variation for both P. ponderosa and P. flexilis (Tables 1 and S1). Specifically, for P. contorta, tree properties 331 and elevation collectively explained roughly 75% of the variation in monoterpene concentrations 332 and 50% of the variation in monoterpene diversity depending on the modeling approach utilized 333 (i.e., generalized regression vs. SEM) (Fig. 4, Tables 1 & S1). The same set of factors were 334 relatively weak predictors of variation in these measures for *P. flexilis* and *P. ponderosa* (Tables 335 1 & S1) leading us to reject SEMs for these species due to poor model fit. Similarly, monoterpene 336 dissimilarity was poorly explained by elevation or tree properties for all three species (i.e., $R^2 \leq$ 337 338 0.12 for all). These results suggest that resin defense chemistry is determined by divergent 339 mechanisms among these pine species, with climate and tree properties varying greatly in their overall influence at both the individual and species level. This result presents challenges for 340 341 predicting spatiotemporal patterns in tree secondary chemistry across coniferous species.

342 In general, support for hypothesized climatic gradients in plant defenses, where plants are

predicted to have greater defenses in warm regions, is mixed and a majority of studies refute their 343 344 existence (Moles et al. 2011a, 2011b). However, phylogenetically constrained experiments—i.e., those performed within the same species or genus—lend stronger support for the LGPD, including 345 346 support from studies completed on defenses of coniferous trees (O'Neill et al. 2002; Pearse & Hipp 2012; Moreira et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2016; Zadworny et al. 2016). Support for the EGPD 347 hypothesis is also mixed, with support available from both community-level studies (Pellissier et 348 al. 2014; Rasmann et al. 2014b; Descombes et al. 2017) and from phylogenetically constrained 349 studies suggesting a general decline in plant defenses with elevation (Hengxiao et al. 1999; Smith 350 351 2000; O'Neill et al. 2002; Anderson et al. 2015). However, phylogenetically constrained studies of tree defenses completed across substantial elevational gradients in field settings are exceedingly 352 rare, possibly limited to our present study and those by Hengxiao et al. (1999) and Smith (2000). 353 Importantly, these previous studied diverge in their findings as Hengxiao et al. (1999) found 354 support for the EGPD, while Smith (2000) found no change in the average monoterpene 355 356 composition and concentrations in *P. ponderosa* (var. ponderosa Lawson) sampled across a 1430 m elevation transect of California's Sierra Nevada. Additionally, phylogenetically constrained 357 studies of insect damage on conifers, while also rare, suggest strong influences of soil properties 358 359 on pest impacts (Kosunen et al. 2016). Conflicting results in cross-gradient studies, combined with 360 evidence of alternative drivers of defenses, highlights the need for additional research to justify broad claims—such as those of Raffa et al. (2014) whose study did not include an elevation 361 362 gradient—that climatic conditions have led to trees primarily found at high elevation being poorly defended against pests compared to low elevation trees. 363

A strong influence of tree age on the number of pests attacking trees and in the amount of damage they cause has been reported in numerous studies (Boege, Barton & Dirzo 2011). A metaanalysis by Barton & Koricheva (2010) found that mammalian herbivores consumed more tissue from older trees than younger ones, but there was no clear preference across studies for phytophagous insects possibly due to variation in plant defense strategies in relation to diverse

369 insect feeding types. We found that tree age was consistently a significant factor in best-fit models of monoterpene diversity, dissimilarity, and total concentration for all three species (Table 1), as 370 371 well as in models for the concentrations of seven individual monoterpenes within P. contorta and 372 three monoterpenes within P. flexilis (Table S1). For P. contorta, where models explained a substantial portion of variation in defenses, we found monoterpene concentration and diversity 373 significantly increased with tree age-i.e., older trees have higher monoterpene concentrations 374 than younger trees (Table 1, Fig. 4). Previous studies have also found that chemical defenses-375 particularly terpenoid compounds in conifer needles-increased with age in various conifer 376 377 species (Barton & Koricheva 2010; Boege et al. 2011). However, Goodman et al. (2013) found that monoterpene concentrations were greater in younger xylem tissues than in older tissues of 378 individual *P. contorta* trees—i.e., lower stem material was less defended than upper stem material. 379 380 In addition to variation in tree ages and local environmental pressures across study sites, a plausible explanation for these seemingly contradictory results of our study with that of Goodman et al. 381 382 (2013) likely stems from their focus on phloem defenses versus our focus on xylem defenses. Indeed, dramatic variation in levels and types of defenses across plant structures is a common 383 feature of nearly all natural plant populations (Moore et al. 2014; Hahn & Maron 2016). At the 384 385 same time, we found a significant negative effect of P. contorta tree size on monoterpene 386 concentration and diversity, which initially seems to be in conflict with an age-related increase in defenses since older trees are generally expected to be larger than younger trees within a given 387 388 population. Surprisingly, we found that the relationship among tree age and size was negative for P. contorta trees in our study, while the relationship of tree age and size were positive for P. 389 390 ponderosa and P. flexilis (Fig. S1). This negative relationship among tree age and size for P. contorta is likely the result of late 19th and early 20th century mass harvests that targeted P. contorta 391 over other species for building material (Knowles & Grant 1983). This negative relationship 392 393 among age and growth in *P. contorta* in our study location might further explain the increase in 394 monoterpene concentration and diversity with age, since slow growing conifers tend to produce

higher concentrations of constitutive chemical defenses (Moreira et al. 2016). Also, evidence
indicates that conifers exhibiting slower growth rates in early years of their lifespans tend
ultimately to be smaller in size but live longer (Black, Colbert & Pederson 2008; Rötheli, Heiri &
Bigler 2012; Bigler 2016) and suffer less pest damage later in life than trees with rapid early growth
rates (Ruel & Whitham 2002).

Similar to results from previous comparisons of monoterpene defenses in these species 400 (Smith 2000; West et al. 2016), we found that overall, monoterpene 'communities' of these pine 401 species had little overlap (Figs 2 and 3), with interspecific variation exceeding intraspecific 402 403 variation regardless of elevational position or tree properties. The large differences among species was illustrated by the ability of logistic regression (based on monoterpene compositions and 404 405 concentrations) to be more than 98% accurate for grouping resin samples within the proper species. Additionally, we found that monoterpene concentration and diversity were highest on average in 406 P. contorta (Fig. 1). Specifically, monoterpene concentration was significantly lower in P. flexilis 407 408 than in the other two species, while *P. contorta* had a significantly greater level of monoterpene diversity than both P. flexilis and P. ponderosa. Increasing levels of both of these measures have 409 been linked to greater resistance to natural enemies (Keefover-Ring & Linhart 2010; Raffa 2014). 410 Thus, our results suggest that *P. contorta* has greater levels of defense against natural enemies 411 relative to *P. ponderosa* and especially to *P. flexilis*. Our finding that *P. flexilis* (subgenus *Strobus*) 412 appears to be less defended against natural enemies than co-occurring congeners of the subgenus 413 414 Pinus joins a result by Bentz et al. (2016) who found P. flexilis to be less defended than cooccurring Great Basin bristlecone pines (Pinus longaeva) and foxtail pines (Pinus balfouriana) 415 416 despite these three species being members of the same subgenus. However, we found that 43% of P. contorta, compared to 11% of P. ponderosa and 0% of P. flexilis, failed to produce a sufficient 417 quantity of resin for monoterpene extraction upon wounding in our experiment. Smith (2000) 418 419 reported similarly low levels of resin yield in several populations of *P. contorta* suggesting weak 420 responses to mechanical wounding in the absence of pathogens. Whether the failure to 'pitch' resin

upon mechanical wounding indicates susceptibility to natural enemies is not entirely clear based
on conflicting outcomes across tree and pest species. For example, while low resin flow could
indicate poor production, trees can also over-produce defensive resins and chemicals in response
to relatively minor pest damage, thereby inducing their own mortality (Hulcr & Dunn 2011).

While interspecific variation in monoterpene concentrations and diversity were far greater, 425 intraspecific variation in monoterpene chemistry was still substantial over the relatively small 426 spatial scale of our study. Specifically, monoterpene dissimilarity-measured as the mean pairwise 427 difference in monoterpene 'communities' among each tree of a species-was roughly two-fold 428 429 greater in P. contorta than in P. ponderosa and P. flexilis (Fig. 1c). In other words, P. ponderosa and *P. flexilis* display less variation in defense from tree to tree than did *P. contorta*. Previous work 430 has unveiled similar levels of intraspecific variation in resin chemistry of the species studied here, 431 but the majority of this work was completed over larger spatial scales than present in our study 432 (Forrest 1980; Smith 2000; Pollack & Dancik 1985; Lindström et al. 1989; Zavarin, Cool & 433 434 Snajberk 1993; Pureswaran, Gries & Borden 2004; Clark et al. 2010). However, substantial variation in secondary resin chemistry in *P. ponderosa* was previously shown to occur in trees near 435 the lower end of the same elevational gradient used in the current study (Latta et al. 2003). 436

Given that congeners occurring in the same environment must deal with similar abiotic and 437 biotic pressures, large interspecific variation in resin chemistry suggests continued influences of 438 deep evolutionary pressures alongside contemporary pressures on tree secondary chemistry. 439 440 Elucidating the relationship between compositions and concentrations of constitutive and induced secondary chemicals is challenged by conflicting selection pressures at large and fine scales 441 (Talluto & Benkman 2014). Local adaptations and low gene-flow have been previously 442 443 demonstrated for both *P. ponderosa* and *P. flexilis* populations along the same elevational transect used in our study (Schuster & Mitton 2000). Such local adaptation is likely driven by numerous 444 445 factors. Evidence indicates that pressure by different natural enemies or abiotic factors can select 446 for diverse monoterpene profiles (Iason et al. 2011) but also lead to divergent plant defense

strategies (Carmona & Fornoni 2012; Moreira et al. 2016). Meta-analytical results also indicate 447 that secondary chemicals can have both detrimental and beneficial effects on insect pests of woody 448 plants leading to conflicting adaptive influences over spatiotemporal scales (Smilanich, Fincher & 449 450 Dyer 2016). Additionally, profiles of monoterpenes and other chemicals in various coniferous tree species have been associated with a range of interactions with mammalian herbivores and seed 451 dispersers, insect pollinators, and resistance to fungal pathogens (Snyder 1993; Langeheim 1994; 452 Latta & Mitton 1997; Litvak & Monson 1998; Witzell & Martín 2008). Similarly, the presence of 453 'poorly defended' pine species (e.g., P. flexilis) at higher elevations could be linked to 454 physiological responses in response to low atmospheric pressure, high UV irradiance, and other 455 factors unrelated to pest-selection pressures (Bentz et al. 2016). Finally, a focus on temperature in 456 the absence of consideration for precipitation regime is potentially at the heart of incongruence 457 results among studies testing the LGPD and EGPD hypotheses in coniferous trees. Work by 458 O'Neill et al. (2002) found both constitutive and inducible defenses of spruce trees (*Picea spp.*) 459 460 decreased with elevation and latitude in western Canada, but increased with aridity. Understanding the drivers of interspecific and intraspecific variation in defense chemistry of the species studied 461 here and others will require additional experimental and observational efforts to disentangle 462 influences of multiple, interacting pressures on conifer defense expression. 463

464

465 Authors' Contributions

SF conceived and designed the study; SF, JL, and JM implemented the study and collected samples
and data; SF, JL, SL and LR implemented laboratory procedures to quantify monoterpene
concentrations; SF analyzed the data and led the writing of the manuscript; JL and JM edited drafts.
All authors gave final approval for publication.

470

471 Acknowledgements

We thank Boulder County Parks and Open Space, the Indian Peaks Wilderness Alliance, the John
Marr Ecology Fund, the University of Colorado's Department of Ecology and Evolutionary
Biology for support.

475

476 **Data Accessibility**

477 Data from this study will be made publicly available from FigShare pending acceptance.

478

479 **References**

- 480 Anderegg, W. R., Hicke, J. A., Fisher, R. A., Allen, C. D., Aukema, J., Bentz, B., ... & Pan, Y.
- 481 (2015) Tree mortality from drought, insects, and their interactions in a changing climate. New
- 482 Phytologist, 208(3), 674-683.
- 483 Anderson, J. T., Perera, N., Chowdhury, B., & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2015) Microgeographic
- 484 patterns of genetic divergence and adaptation across environmental gradients in *Boechera stricta*
- 485 (Brassicaceae)*. The American Naturalist, 186(S1), S60-S73.
- 486 Anstett, D. N., Nunes, K. A., Baskett, C., & Kotanen, P. M. (2016). Sources of Controversy
- 487 Surrounding Latitudinal Patterns in Herbivory and Defense. Trends in Ecology & Evolution,
- 488 31(10), 789-802.
- 489 Barton, K. E., & Koricheva, J. (2010) The ontogeny of plant defense and herbivory:
- 490 Characterizing general patterns using meta-analysis. The American Naturalist, 175(4), 481-493.
- 491 Bentz, B. J., Hood, S. M., Hansen, E. M., Vandygriff, J. C., & Mock, K. E. (2017) Defense traits
- in the long-lived Great Basin bristlecone pine and resistance to the native herbivore mountain
- 493 pine beetle. New Phytologist, 213(2), 611-624.
- Bigler, C. (2016) Trade-offs between growth rate, tree size and lifespan of mountain pine (*Pinus montana*) in the Swiss National Park. PloS one, 11(3), e0150402.
- 496 Björklund, N., & Lindgren, B. S. (2009) Diameter of lodgepole pine and mortality caused by the
- 497 mountain pine beetle: factors that influence their relationship and applicability for susceptibility
- 498 rating. Canadian journal of forest research, 39(5), 908-916.
- Boege, K., & Marquis, R.J. (2005) Facing herbivory as you grow up: the ontogeny of resistance
 in plants. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 20, 441–448.
- 501 Boege, K., Barton, K. E., & Dirzo, R. (2011) Influence of tree ontogeny on plant-herbivore
- interactions. In Size-and age-related changes in tree structure and function (pp. 193-214).
- 503 Springer Netherlands.
- 504 Black, B. A., Colbert, J. J., & Pederson, N. (2008) Relationships between radial growth rates and
- 505 lifespan within North American tree species. Ecoscience, 15(3), 349-357.

- Carmona, D., & Fornoni, J. (2013) Herbivores can select for mixed defensive strategies in plants.
 New Phytologist, 197(2), 576-585.
- 508 Carrillo-Gavilán, A., Moreira, X., Zas, R., Gonzalez-Voyer, A., Vilà, M., & Sampedro, L. (2015)
- 509 Phylogenetic and biogeographical patterns in defensive strategies and quantitative allocation to
- 510 chemical defences in Palaearctic and Nearctic pine trees. Journal of Biogeography, 42(4), 684-
- 511 693.
- 512 Clark, E. L., Carroll, A. L., & Huber, D. P. W. (2010) Differences in the constitutive terpene
- 513 profile of lodgepole pine across a geographical range in British Columbia, and correlation with
- 514 historical attack by mountain pine beetle. Canadian Entomologist, 142, 1-17.
- 515 Descombes, P., Marchon, J., Pradervand, J. N., Bilat, J., Guisan, A., Rasmann, S., & Pellissier,
- 516 L. (2017) Community-level plant palatability increases with elevation as insect herbivore
- abundance declines. Journal of Ecology, 105(1), 142-151.
- 518 Desurmont, G. A., Donoghue, M. J., Clement, W. L., & Agrawal, A. A. (2011) Evolutionary
- history predicts plant defense against an invasive pest. Proceedings of the National Academy of
 Sciences, 108(17), 7070-7074.
- - 521 Dietze, M. C., & Matthes, J. H. (2014) A general ecophysiological framework for modelling the
 - impact of pests and pathogens on forest ecosystems. Ecology letters, 17(11), 1418-1426.
 - 523 Ferrenberg, S., and J. B. Mitton. 2014. Smooth bark surfaces can defend trees against insect
 - attack: resurrecting a 'slippery' hypothesis. Functional Ecology, 28, 837–845.
 - 525 Ferrenberg, S., Kane, J. M., & Mitton, J. B. (2014). Resin duct characteristics associated with
 - tree resistance to bark beetles across lodgepole and limber pines. Oecologia, 174(4), 1283-1292.
 - 527 Ferrenberg, S., Kane, J. M., & Langenhan, J. M. (2015) To grow or defend? Pine seedlings grow
 - less but induce more defences when a key resource is limited. Tree physiology, 35(2), 107-111.
 - 529 Ferrenberg, S. (2016) Landscape features and processes influencing forest pest dynamics.
 - 530 Current Landscape Ecology Reports, 1, 19.
 - 531 Forrest, G. I. (1980). Geographical variation in the monoterpenes of Pinus contorta oleoresin.
 - 532 Biochemical Systematics and Ecology, 8(4), 343-359.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

- 533 Franceschi, V. R., Krokene, P., Christiansen, E., & Krekling, T. (2005). Anatomical and
- chemical defenses of conifer bark against bark beetles and other pests. New Phytologist, 167(2),353-376.
- Grace, J. B. (2006) Structural equation modeling and natural systems. Cambridge UniversityPress.
- 538 Gaylord, M. L., Kolb, T. E., Pockman, W. T., Plaut, J. A., Yepez, E. A., Macalady, A. K., ... &
- McDowell, N. G. (2013). Drought predisposes piñon–juniper woodlands to insect attacks and
 mortality. New Phytologist, 198(2), 567-578.
- Goodsman, D. W., Lusebrink, I., Landhäusser, S. M., Erbilgin, N., & Lieffers, V. J. (2013)
- 542 Variation in carbon availability, defense chemistry and susceptibility to fungal invasion along the 543 stems of mature trees. New Phytologist, 197(2), 586-594.
- 544 Harper, A. L., McKinney, L. V., Nielsen, L. R., Havlickova, L., Li, Y., Trick, M., ... & Janacek,
- 545 S. H. (2016) Molecular markers for tolerance of European ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) to dieback
- 546 disease identified using Associative Transcriptomics. Scientific reports, 6.
- Hahn, P. G., & Maron, J. L. (2016) A Framework for Predicting Intraspecific Variation in Plant
 Defense. Trends in Ecology & Evolution.
- 549 Haynes, K. J., Allstadt, A. J., & Klimetzek, D. (2014) Forest defoliator outbreaks under climate
- 550 change: effects on the frequency and severity of outbreaks of five pine insect pests. Global
- change biology, 20(6), 2004-2018.
- Hengxiao, G., McMillin, J. D., Wagner, M. R., Zhou, J., Zhou, Z., & Xu, X. (1999) Altitudinal
- variation in foliar chemistry and anatomy of yunnan pine, *Pinus yunnanensis*, and pine sawfly
- (Hym., Diprionidae) performance. Journal of Applied Entomology, 123(8), 465-471.
- Holdenrieder, O., Pautasso, M., Weisberg, P. J., & Lonsdale, D. (2004) Tree diseases and
- landscape processes: the challenge of landscape pathology. Trends in Ecology & Evolution,
 19(8), 446-452.
- Holeski, L. M., Kearsley, M. J., & Whitham, T. G. (2009) Separating ontogenetic and
- environmental determination of resistance to herbivory in cottonwood. Ecology, 90(11), 2969-2973.

561	Hood, S., Sala, A., Heyerdahl, E. K., & Boutin, M. (2015) Low-severity fire increases tree
562	defense against bark beetle attacks. Ecology, 96(7), 1846-1855.
563	Hulcr, J., & Dunn, R. R. (2011) The sudden emergence of pathogenicity in insect-fungus
564	symbioses threatens naive forest ecosystems. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:
565	Biological Sciences, 278(1720), 2866-2873.
566	Iason, G. R., O'Reilly-Wapstra, J. M., Brewer, M. J., Summers, R. W., & Moore, B. D. (2011)
567	Do multiple herbivores maintain chemical diversity of Scots pine monoterpenes?. Philosophical
568	Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 366(1569), 1337-1345.
569	Ireland, K. B., Moore, M. M., Fulé, P. Z., Zegler, T. J., & Keane, R. E. (2014) Slow lifelong
570	growth predisposes Populus tremuloides trees to mortality. Oecologia, 175(3), 847-859.
571	Jules, E. S., Jackson, J. I., van Mantgem, P. J., Beck, J. S., Murray, M. P., & Sahara, E. A. (2016)
572	The relative contributions of disease and insects in the decline of a long-lived tree: a stochastic
573	demographic model of whitebark pine (Pinus albicaulis). Forest Ecology and Management, 381,
574	144-156.
575	Kane, J. M., Kolb, T. E. (2010) Importance of resin ducts in reducing ponderosa pine mortality
576	from bark beetle attacks. Oecologia 164: 601–609.
577	Keefover-Ring, K., & Linhart, Y. B. (2010) Variable chemistry and herbivory of ponderosa pine
578	cones. International Journal of Plant Sciences, 171(3), 293-302.
579	Knowles, P., & Grant, M. C. (1983) Age and size structure analyses of Engelmann spruce,
580	ponderosa pine, lodgepole pine, and limber pine in Colorado. Ecology, 64(1), 1-9.
581	Kollberg, I., Bylund, H., Jonsson, T., Schmidt, A., Gershenzon, J., & Björkman, C. (2015)
582	Temperature affects insect outbreak risk through tritrophic interactions mediated by plant
583	secondary compounds. Ecosphere, 6(6), 1-17.
584	Kosunen, M., Kantola, T., Starr, M., Blomqvist, M., Talvitie, M., & Lyytikäinen-Saarenmaa, P.
585	(2016) Influence of soil and topography on defoliation intensity during an extended outbreak of
586	the common pine sawfly (Diprion pini L.). iForest-Biogeosciences and Forestry, 1151.

- 587 Kozlov, M. V., Stekolshchikov, A. V., Söderman, G., Labina, E. S., Zverev, V., & Zvereva, E. L.
- 588 (2015) Sap-feeding insects on forest trees along latitudinal gradients in northern Europe: a
- climate-driven patterns. Global change biology, 21(1), 106-116.
- 590 Langenheim, J. H. (1994) Higher plant terpenoids: A phytocentric overview of their ecological
- roles. Journal of Chemical Ecology 20: 1223–1279
- Latta, R. G., & Mitton, J. B. (1997) A comparison of population differentiation across four
- classes of gene marker in limber pine (*Pinus flexilis* James). Genetics, 146(3), 1153-1163.
- Latta, R. G., Linhart, Y. B., Snyder, M. A., & Lundquist, L. (2003) Patterns of variation and
- 595 correlation in the monoterpene composition of xylem oleoresin within populations of ponderosa
- pine. Biochemical systematics and ecology, 31(5), 451-465.
- Lindström, M., Norin, T., Birgersson, G., Schlyter, F. (1989) Variation of enantiomeric
- 598 composition of α -pinene in Norway spruce, *Picea abies*, and its influence on production of
- verbenol isomers by *Ips typographus* in the field. Journal of Chemical Ecology 15:541-548.
- 600 Litvak, M. E., & Monson, R. K. (1998) Patterns of induced and constitutive monoterpene
- production of conifer needles in relation to insect herbivory. Oecologia 114: 531–540.
- Mitton, J. B., & Ferrenberg, S. M. (2012) Mountain pine beetle develops an unprecedented
 summer generation in response to climate warming. The American Naturalist, 179(5), E163E171.
- Moles, A. T., Bonser, S. P., Poore, A. G. B., Wallis, I. R., Foley, W. J. (2011a) Assessing the
 evidence for latitudinal gradients in plant defence and herbivory. Functional Ecology 25: 380388.
- Moles, A. T., Wallis, I. R., Foley, W. J., Warton, D. I., Stegen, J. C., Bisigato, A. J., ... &
- 609 Edwards, W. (2011). Putting plant resistance traits on the map: a test of the idea that plants are
- 610 better defended at lower latitudes. New Phytologist, 191(3), 777-788.
- Moore, B. D., Andrew, R. L., Külheim, C., & Foley, W. J. (2014) Explaining intraspecific
- diversity in plant secondary metabolites in an ecological context. New Phytologist, 201(3), 733-
- **613** 750.

- 614 Moreira, X., Mooney, K. A., Rasmann, S., Petry, W. K., Carrillo-Gavilán, A., Zas, R., &
- 615 Sampedro, L. (2014). Trade-offs between constitutive and induced defences drive geographical
- and climatic clines in pine chemical defences. Ecology letters, 17(5), 537-546.
- Moreira, X., Zas, R., Solla, A., & Sampedro, L. (2015) Differentiation of persistent anatomical
- defensive structures is costly and determined by nutrient availability and genetic growth-defence
- constraints. Tree physiology, 35(2), 112-123.
- 620 Moreira, X., Sampedro, L., Zas, R., & Pearse, I. S. (2016) Defensive traits in young pine trees
- 621 cluster into two divergent syndromes related to early growth rate. PloS one, 11(3), e0152537.
- Mumm, R., & Hilker, M. (2006). Direct and indirect chemical defence of pine against folivorous
- 623 insects. Trends in plant science, 11(7), 351-358.
- 624 O'Neill, G. A., Aitken, S. N., King, J. N., & Alfaro, R. I. (2002) Geographic variation in resin
- 625 canal defenses in seedlings from the Sitka spruce× white spruce introgression zone. Canadian
- Journal of Forest Research, 32(3), 390-400.
- Pearse, I. S., & Hipp, A. L. (2012) Global patterns of leaf defenses in oak species. Evolution,
 66(7), 2272-2286.
- 629 Pellissier, L., Fiedler, K., Ndribe, C., Dubuis, A., Pradervand, J. N., Guisan, A., & Rasmann, S.
- 630 (2012) Shifts in species richness, herbivore specialization, and plant resistance along elevation
- 631 gradients. Ecology and Evolution, 2(8), 1818-1825.
- 632 Pollack, J. C., & Dancik, B. P. (1985). Monoterpene and morphological variation and
- hybridization of Pinus contorta and P. banksiana in Alberta. Canadian journal of botany, 63(2),201-210.
- Pureswaran, D. S., Gries, R., & Borden, J. H. (2004). Quantitative variation in monoterpenes in
 four species of conifers. Biochemical systematics and ecology, 32(12), 1109-1136.
- 637 Quiring, D. T. (1992) Rapid change in suitability of white spruce for a specialist herbivore,
- 638 Zeiraphera canadensis, as a function of leaf age. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 70(11), 2132-
- **639** 2138.

- 640 Raffa, K. F., Powell, E. N., & Townsend, P. A. (2013). Temperature-driven range expansion of
- 641 an irruptive insect heightened by weakly coevolved plant defenses. Proceedings of the National
- 642 Academy of Sciences, 110(6), 2193-2198.
- Raffa, K. F. (2014) Terpenes tell different tales at different scales: glimpses into the chemical
- ecology of conifer-bark beetle-microbial interactions. Journal of chemical ecology, 40(1), 1-20.
- Rasmann, S., Pellissier, L., Defossez, E., Jactel, H., & Kunstler, G. (2014) Climate-driven
- change in plant–insect interactions along elevation gradients. Functional Ecology, 28(1), 46-54.
- 647 Richards, L. A., Dyer, L. A., Forister, M. L., Smilanich, A. M., Dodson, C. D., Leonard, M. D.,
- 648 & Jeffrey, C. S. (2015) Phytochemical diversity drives plant–insect community diversity.
- 649 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(35), 10973-10978.
- 650 Roach, C. R., Hall, D. E., Zerbe, P., & Bohlmann, J. (2014) Plasticity and evolution of (+)-3-
- 651 carene synthase and (–)-sabinene synthase functions of a Sitka spruce monoterpene synthase
- gene family associated with weevil resistance. Journal of Biological Chemistry, 289(34), 23859-23869.
- Rosner, S., & Hannrup, B. (2004) Resin canal traits relevant for constitutive resistance of
- Norway spruce against bark beetles: environmental and genetic variability. Forest Ecology and
- 656 Management, 200(1), 77-87.
- Rosseel, Y. (2012) lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. Journal of Statistical
 Software, 48(2), 1-36.
- Rötheli, E., Heiri, C., & Bigler, C. (2012) Effects of growth rates, tree morphology and site
- 660 conditions on longevity of Norway spruce in the northern Swiss Alps. European Journal of
- 661 Forest Research, 131(4), 1117-1125.
- Ruel, J., & Whitham, T. G. (2002) Fast-growing juvenile pinyons suffer greater herbivory when
 mature. Ecology, 83(10), 2691-2699.
- 664 Salazar, D., & Marquis, R. J. (2012) Herbivore pressure increases toward the equator.
- 665 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

- Sampedro, L., Moreira, X., Llusia, J., Peñuelas, J., & Zas, R. (2010) Genetics, phosphorus
 availability, and herbivore-derived induction as sources of phenotypic variation of leaf volatile
 terpenes in a pine species. Journal of experimental botany, 61(15), 4437-4447. (31), 1261612620.
- 670 Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (1988) Scaling corrections for statistics in covariance structure
- analysis (UCLA Statistics Series 2). Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles,
- 672 Department of Psychology.
- 673 Schemske, D. W., Mittelbach, G. G., Cornell, H. V., Sobel, J. M., & Roy, K. (2009) Is there a
- latitudinal gradient in the importance of biotic interactions?. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 40,245-269.
- 676 Schuster, W. S., Mitton, J. B., Yamaguchi, D. K., & Woodhouse, C. A. (1995) A comparison of
- 677 limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*) ages at lower and upper treeline sites east of the Continental Divide in
- 678 Colorado. American Midland Naturalist, 101-111.
- Schuster, W. S., & Mitton, J. B. (2000) Paternity and gene dispersal in limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*James). Heredity, 84(3), 348-361.
- 681 Seybold, S. J., Huber, D. P., Lee, J. C., Graves, A. D., & Bohlmann, J. (2006) Pine monoterpenes
- and pine bark beetles: a marriage of convenience for defense and chemical communication.
- 683 Phytochemistry Reviews, 5(1), 143-178.
- 684 Smilanich, A. M., Fincher, R. M., & Dyer, L. A. (2016) Does plant apparency matter? Thirty
- years of data provide limited support but reveal clear patterns of the effects of plant chemistry onherbivores. New Phytologist, 210(3), 1044-1057.
- 687 Smith, R. (2000) Xylem monoterpenes of pines: distribution, variation, genetics, function.
- USDA FS Gen Tech Rept, PSW-GTR 177:89.
- Snyder, M. A. (1993). Interactions between Abert's squirrel and ponderosa pine: the relationship
 between selective herbivory and host plant fitness. American Naturalist, 866-879.
- 691 Stamp, N. (2003). Out of the quagmire of plant defense hypotheses. The Quarterly Review of
- 692 Biology, 78(1), 23-55.

- 693Taft, S., Najar, A., & Erbilgin, N. (2015a). Pheromone production by an invasive bark beetle
- varies with monoterpene composition of its naïve host. Journal of chemical ecology, 41(6), 540-549.
- Taft, S., Najar, A., Godbout, J., Bousquet, J., & Erbilgin, N. (2015b). Variations in foliar
- 697 monoterpenes across the range of jack pine reveal three widespread chemotypes: implications to
- 698 host expansion of invasive mountain pine beetle. Frontiers in plant science, 6.
- Talluto, M. V., & Benkman, C. W. (2014). Conflicting selection from fire and seed predation
- 700 drives fine-scaled phenotypic variation in a widespread North American conifer. Proceedings of
- the National Academy of Sciences, 111(26), 9543-9548.
- Trapp, S., & Croteau, R. (2001) Defensive resin biosynthesis in conifers. Annual review of plant
 biology, 52(1), 689-724.
- Vogan, P. J., & Schoettle, A. W. (2015) Selection for resistance to white pine blister rust affects
 the abiotic stress tolerances of limber pine. Forest Ecology and Management, 344, 110-119.
- 706 Wang, X. F., Liu, J. F., Gao, W. Q., Deng, Y. P., Ni, Y. Y., Xiao, Y. H., ... & Jiang, Z. P. (2016)
- 707 Defense pattern of Chinese cork oak across latitudinal gradients: influences of ontogeny,
- herbivory, climate and soil nutrients. Scientific reports, 6, 27269.
- 709 West, D. R., Bernklau, E. J., Bjostad, L. B., & Jacobi, W. R. (2016) host defense mechanisms
- against bark beetle attack differ between ponderosa and lodgepole pines. Forests, 7(10), 248.
- 711 Westbrook, J. W., Walker, A. R., Neves, L. G., Munoz, P., Resende, M. F., Neale, D. B., ... &
- Peter, G. F. (2015). Discovering candidate genes that regulate resin canal number in Pinus taeda
- stems by integrating genetic analysis across environments, ages, and populations. New
- 714 Phytologist, 205(2), 627-641.
- 715 Witzell, J., & Martín, J. A. (2008) Phenolic metabolites in the resistance of northern forest trees
- to pathogens-past experiences and future prospects. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 38(11),
 2711-2727.
- 718 Zadworny, M., McCormack, M. L., Żytkowiak, R., Karolewski, P., Mucha, J., & Oleksyn, J.
- 719 (2016) Patterns of structural and defense investments in fine roots of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*
- L.) across a strong temperature and latitudinal gradient in Europe. Global Change Biology.

- 721 Zavarin, E., Cool, L. G., & Snajberk, K. (1993) Geographic variability of *Pinus flexilis* xylem
- monoterpenes. Biochemical systematics and ecology, 21(3), 381-387.
- 723 Zinkgraf, M. S., Meneses, N., Whitham, T. G., & Allan, G. J. (2015) Genetic variation in NIN1
- and C/VIF1 genes is significantly associated with *Populus angustifolia* resistance to a galling
- herbivore, *Pemphigus betae*. Journal of insect physiology.
- Zou, H., (2006) The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 101, 1418–
- 727 1429.

Table 1. Generalized regression models* of monoterpene concentration (mg monoterpenes / mg resin), diversity (Shannon H'), and dissimilarity (Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) relationships to tree age, size (DBH), growth rate, and elevation in *Pinus contorta* (lodgepole pine). *Pinus ponderosa* (ponderosa pine), and *Pinus flexilis* (limber pine)

Monoterpene	Factor	P. contorta				P. ponderosa			P. flexilis		
measure		W	ald χ^2	Р	R^2	Wald χ^2	Р	R^2	Wald χ^2	Р	R^2
concentration	age		30	<0.001	0.76		removed	0.08	0.5	> 0.1	0.17
	size	1	18.8	<0.001			removed		1.0	> 0.1	
	basal growth			removed			removed		2.1	> 0.1	
	radial growth		6.2	0.013			removed		2.4	> 0.1	
	elevation		27.2	< 0.001		4.1	0.044		4.0	0.044	
diversity	age		30.0	<0.001	0.50		removed	0.00		removed	0.11
	size		15.8	<0.001			removed			removed	
	basal growth			removed		0.08	> 0.1		1.2	> 0.1	
	radial growth			removed			removed			removed	
	elevation			removed			removed		6.7	0.010	
dissimilarity	age		0.01	> 0.1	0.01	5.0	0.026	0.12	2.8	0.095	0.10
	size			removed		2.6	> 0.1			removed	
	basal growth			removed		3.4	0.065			removed	
	radial growth			removed		3.3	0.069			removed	
	elevation			removed			removed		4.7	0.030	

**R*² are for full generalized regression models including all factors not listed as "removed". Factors retained in each model were determined with the adaptive lasso estimation method and best-fit models were validated by AICc scores.

728

729	Figure Legends
730	Figure 1: Monoterpene measures from constitutive stem resin of <i>P. contorta</i> (PICO), <i>P.</i>
731	ponderosa (PIPO), and P. flexilis (PIFL): (a) Monoterpene concentration (mg of monoterpenes
732	per mg of resin), (b) monoterpene diversity (H'), and (c) monoterpene dissimilarity (pairwise
733	Bray-Curtis distance among each tree; i.e., higher dissimilarity values indicates larger differences
734	in chemistry among trees). Box plots show the median (center line) and the 1 st and 3 rd quartiles,
735	and whiskers represent 1.5 inter-quartile range (IQR). The P-value is from a Kruskal-Wallis test;
736	boxes with different lettering are significantly different ($P < 0.05$) via Steel-Dwass
737	nonparametric pairwise comparison.
738	
739	Figure 2: Mean relative abundance of 10 identified monoterpenes and unidentified (other)
740	monoterpenes in the constitutive resin of lodgepole pines (P. contorta; P. CONTORTA),
741	ponderosa pines (P. ponderosa, PIPO), and limber pines (P. flexilis, PIFL). Monoterpene relative
742	abundances significantly differ among all three species (χ^2 =203.7, <i>P</i> < 0.0001).
743	
744	Figure 4: Canonical correlation plot illustrating the differences in monoterpene chemistry
745	among lodgepole pine (P. contorta; red triangles), ponderosa pine (P. ponderosa; grey circles),
746	and limber pine (P. flexilis; blue squares) trees. For each species, the larger open concentric
747	circle shows the 50% contour (the region in ordination space that contains \sim 50% of
748	observations), while the smaller open concentric circle indicates the 95% confidence ellipses.
749	Vectors indicate the strength and influence of specific monoterpenes on point locations relative
750	to canonical axis 1 and axis 2.
751	
752	Figure 5: Structural equation models relating resin monoterpene concentration (a) and diversity
753	(b) to tree properties and elevation. Values are standardized coefficient estimates, lines widths
754	are scaled to represent effects sizes with solid lines indicating significant paths ($P < 0.05$) and

dashed lines nonsignificant paths. Measures of tree age, tree growth increment (basal area

- increment, BAI, represented by the most recent five years of annual growth), tree size (diameter
- at breast height, DBH), and monoterpene content of constitutive resin (mg monoterpenes/mg
- resins) were determined from samples (increment cores and liquid resin) collected 1.4 meters
- above the ground surface.



760







Figure 2



764 765

35

NOT PEER-REVIEWED





768 Supporting Materials

769

Table S1. Generalized regression models* of monoterpene relationships to tree age, size (DBH), growth rate, and elevation across *Pinus contorta* (lodgepole pine), *Pinus ponderosa* (ponderosa pine), and *Pinus flexilis* (limber pine)

Mail (2) P R ² Wald χ ² P R ² Wald χ ² P R ² α-pinene age 36.5 < 0.0001 0.58 removed 0.03 1.7 0.1960 0.03 g-pinene age 36.5 < 0.001 0.58 removed 0.0668 2.2 0.1355 radial growth removed removed removed removed removed removed removed 0.07 β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.07 5.6 0.017 a-phellendrene age 4.0 <0.0001 removed r	Monoternene	Factor	P. contorta			P. ponderosa			P. flexilis			
α-pinene size 10.8 removed nemoved ne	measure		Wald χ^2	P	R ²	Wald χ^2	P	R ²	Wald χ^2	P	R ²	
size 10.8 0.0010 removed removed removed removed removed β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.068 2.2 0.1355 β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.03 removed 0.077 size removed removed removed 0.03 removed 0.078 acphellendrene age 6.0 0.0147 removed 0.00 removed 0.007 acphellendrene age 40.0 <0.001	α-pinene	age	36.5	< 0.0001	0.58		removed	0.03	1.7	0.1960	0.03	
basal growth removed 3.4 0.0666 2.2 0.1355 radial growth removed removed removed removed removed 0.07 β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.03 removed 0.07 izig removed removed removed removed removed removed 0.07 acyhellendrene age 40.0 <0.0001		size	10.8	0.0010			removed			removed		
radial growth removed removed removed removed removed removed removed 0.07 β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.03 removed 0.07 size removed removed 2.4 0.1245 5.6 0.0178 adal growth removed removed removed 0.00 removed 0.00 7.63 adal growth removed removed 0.00 removed 0.00 7.63 0.00 acphellendrene age 2.2.8 <0.0001		basal growth		removed		3.4	0.0668		2.2	0.1355		
elevation removed removed removed 0.03 removed 0.07 β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.14 removed 0.03 removed 0.07 ac-phellendrene age 40.0 <0.0001		radial growth		removed			removed			removed		
β-pinene age 6.0 0.0147 0.114 removed 1.3 0.2630 α-phellendrene age 40.0 <0.0001		elevation		removed			removed			removed		
size removed	β-pinene	age	6.0	0.0147	0.14		removed	0.03		removed	0.07	
basal growth radial growth elevation removed removed 2.4 0.1245 5.6 0.0178 removed a-phellendrene age age 40.0 <0.001		size		removed			removed			removed		
radial growth removed removed removed removed removed 1.3 0.2630 α-phellendrene age 40.0 <0.001		basal growth		removed		2.4	0.1245		5.6	0.0178		
elevation removed removed 1.3 0.2630 α-phellendrene age 40.0 <0.001		radial growth		removed			removed			removed		
α-phellendrene age 40.0 <0.0001 removed 0.00 removed 0.00 size 11.6 <0.0001		elevation		removed			removed		1.3	0.2630		
size 11.6 <0.0001 removed remo	α-phellendrene	age	40.0	<0.0001	0.69		removed	0.00		removed	0.00	
$\besit growth in the term of term of$		size	11.6	<0.0001			removed			removed		
radial growth 17.9 <0.0001 removed 0.0235 0.043 0.0235 0.043 0.0235 0.0435 0.0235 0.043 removed remov		basal growth		removed			removed			removed		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		radial growth	17.9	<0.0001			removed			removed		
β-phellendrene age 27.5 < 0.0001 0.71 removed 0.07 5.1 0.0235 0.04 size 11.3 0.0008 removed 0.032 removed 0.04 removed 0.04 removed 0.03 0.04 removed 0.04 removed 0.04 removed 0.03 0.04 removed 0.04 removed 0.04		elevation	22.8	<0.0001			removed			removed		
size11.30.0008removedremovedremovedbasal growth4.50.0342removedremoved1.70.1930campheneageremoved0.17removed0.08removed0.04size12.80.00032.40.1239removed0.04basal growth5.00.0260removed0.30.6038removedradial growth5.00.0260removed0.60.4330removedradial growth5.00.0260removed0.60.4330removedradial growth5.00.0250removed0.06removed0.03size2.50.1125removedremoved0.01removed δ^3 -careneage3.60.05870.23removedremoved1.70.1915basal growthremoved0.110.7446removedremoved1.70.1915limoneneage3.80.0512removed1.70.1915removedsizeremoved1.90.1721removedremoved2.00210.021myrceneageremoved0.105.10.0230.02removed1.30.0003size9.60.0020removedremoved1.300.0003removed1.300.0003size9.10.025removedremoved1.400.066removed1.990.001myrceneageremov	β-phellendrene	age	27.5	<0.0001	0.71		removed	0.07	5.1	0.0235	0.04	
		size	11.3	0.0008			removed			removed		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		basal growth	4.5	0.0342			removed			removed		
elevation16.5<0.001<		radial growth	5.2	0.0224			removed		1.7	0.1930		
camphene age removed 0.17 removed 0.08 removed 0.04 size 12.8 0.0003 2.4 0.1239 removed 0.3 0.6038 basal growth 5.0 0.0260 removed 0.3 0.6038 removed 0.6 0.4330 δ^3 -carene age 3.6 0.0587 0.23 removed 0.00 removed 0.03 size 2.5 0.1125 removed 0.01 removed removed removed removed 0.03 size 2.5 0.1125 removed 0.01 removed removed 1.7 0.1915 limonene age 3.8 0.0512 removed 1.9 0.1721 removed removed 1.7 0.1915 limonene age .8 0.0522 0.22 removed 1.0 4.00014 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.0021 removed		elevation	16.5	<0.0001		4.1	0.0439			removed		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	camphene	age		removed	0.17		removed	0.08		removed	0.04	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		size	12.8	0.0003		2.4	0.1239			removed		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		basal growth	5.0	0.0260			removed		0.3	0.6038		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		radial growth		removed			removed		0.6	0.4330		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		elevation		removed		3.3	0.0677			removed		
size2.5 0.1125 removed <thr< th="">removed<thr< th="">removedr</thr<></thr<>	δ ³ -carene	age	3.6	0.0587	0.23		removed	0.00		removed	0.03	
basal growth radial growth adial growthremoved0.110.7446removedremovedelevation3.80.0512removedremoved1.70.1915limoneneage3.80.05220.22removed0.049.50.00210.17sizeremoved1.90.1721removedremovedremoved1.70.1915basal growth3.70.05472.70.102010.180.00141.7radial growth3.30.0682removedremoved5.40.0201myrceneageremoved0.105.10.02340.02removed0.21size9.60.0020removed13.00.0024removed0.21size9.60.0020removed13.00.0024removed1.9size9.60.0020removed13.00.00031.0saal growth3.30.0676removed19.9<0.0001		size	2.5	0.1125			removed			removed		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		basal growth		removed		0.11	0.7446			removed		
elevation 3.8 0.0512 removed 1.7 0.1915 limonene age 3.8 0.0522 0.22 removed 0.04 9.5 0.0021 0.17 size removed 1.9 0.1721 removed removed 1.9 0.1721 removed 0.0021 0.17 basal growth 3.7 0.0547 2.7 0.1020 10.18 0.0014 7 0.0014 7 7 0.012 10.18 0.0014 7 0.021 7 7 0.021 7 7 0.021 7 7 0.021 7 7 0.0023 7 7 0.0023 7 7 0.0023 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7 0.0024 7 7		radial growth		removed			removed			removed		
limonene age 3.8 0.0522 0.22 removed 0.04 9.5 0.0021 0.17 size removed 1.9 0.1721 removed removed 1.9 0.1721 removed removed 1.9 0.1721 removed removed removed removed 1.0 1.018 0.0014 1.0		elevation	3.8	0.0512			removed		1.7	0.1915		
size removed 1.9 0.1721 removed basal growth 3.7 0.0547 2.7 0.1020 10.18 0.0014 radial growth 3.3 0.0682 removed removed 5.4 0.0201 myrcene age removed 0.10 5.1 0.0234 0.02 removed 0.21 size 9.6 0.0020 removed 0.02 removed 0.003 removed 0.003 removed 0.004 0.0003 0.0003 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004 0.004	limonene	age	3.8	0.0522	0.22		removed	0.04	9.5	0.0021	0.17	
basal growth 3.7 0.0547 2.7 0.1020 10.18 0.0014 radial growth 3.3 0.0682 removed removed 5.4 0.0201 myrcene age removed 0.10 5.1 0.0234 0.02 removed 0.21 size 9.6 0.0020 removed 13.0 0.0003 removed 0.001 10.18 0.001 10.18 0.001 0.021 size 9.6 0.0020 removed removed 9.2 0.0024 0.0003 0.0003 0.0003 10.18 0.001 10.18 0.001 10.18 0.01 10.18 0.021 0.021 10.18 0.21 10.18 0.021 10.18 0.021 10.18 0.021 10.18 0.021 10.18 0.21 10.18 0.21 10.18 0.21 10.18 0.21 10.11 10.0023 10.11 10.0025 removed 10.18 0.04 10.18 0.04 10.11 10.12		size		removed		1.9	0.1721			removed		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		basal growth	3.7	0.0547		2.7	0.1020		10.18	0.0014		
elevation 2.1 0.1432 removed 5.4 0.0201 myrcene age removed 0.10 5.1 0.0234 0.02 removed 0.21 size 9.6 0.0020 removed 13.0 0.0003 removed 13.0 0.0003 radial growth 3.3 0.0676 removed 9.2 0.0024 elevation removed 9.2 0.0024 sabinene age removed 0.17 removed 19.9 <0.001		radial growth	3.3	0.0682			removed			removed		
myrcene age removed 0.10 5.1 0.0234 0.02 removed 0.21 size 9.6 0.0020 removed removed removed removed 0.003 basal growth 3.3 0.0676 removed 9.2 0.0003 0.0003 radial growth removed removed removed 9.2 0.0024 elevation removed removed removed 9.2 0.0024 sabinene age removed 0.17 removed 0.06 removed 0.04 size 9.1 0.0025 removed 0.06 removed 0.0672 radial growth 1.4 0.2353 1.6 0.2041 removed removed terpinolene age 1.8 0.1749 0.12 removed 0.00 removed 0.1 size 0.5 0.4610 removed removed removed removed 0.0041 1 basal growth <		elevation	2.1	0.1432			removed		5.4	0.0201		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	myrcene	age		removed	0.10	5.1	0.0234	0.02		removed	0.21	
basal growth 3.3 0.0676 removed 13.0 0.0003 radial growth removed removed removed 9.2 0.0024 elevation removed removed 19.9 <0.0001		size	9.6	0.0020			removed			removed		
radial growth elevationremovedremovedremoved9.20.0024sabineneage sizeremoved0.17removed19.9<0.0001		basal growth	3.3	0.0676			removed		13.0	0.0003		
elevationremovedremoved19.9<0.0001sabineneageremoved0.17removed0.06removed0.04size9.10.0025removedremovedremovedremoved0.06basal growthremovedremovedremoved3.40.0672removedradial growth1.40.23531.60.2041removedremovedelevationremovedremovedremovedremoved0.00removed0.1terpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00removed0.1size0.50.4610removedremoved8.20.00411basal growthremovedremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327		radial growth		removed			removed		9.2	0.0024		
sabineneageremoved0.17removed0.06removed0.04size9.10.0025removedremovedremoved3.40.0672basal growthremovedremovedremovedremovedremovedremoved1.4radial growth1.40.23531.60.2041removedremovedelevationremovedremovedremovedremoved0.00removed0.1terpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00removed0.1size0.50.4610removedremovedremoved8.20.0041basal growthremovedremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327		elevation		removed			removed		19.9	<0.0001		
size9.10.0025removedremovedbasal growthremovedremoved3.40.0672radial growth1.40.23531.60.2041removedelevationremovedremovedremovedremovedterpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00size0.50.4610removedremoved0.00basal growthremovedremovedremoved8.20.0041radial growthremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327	sabinene	age		removed	0.17		removed	0.06		removed	0.04	
basal growth radial growth elevationremovedremoved3.40.0672 removedterpinoleneage1.40.23531.60.2041removedterpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00removed0.1size0.50.4610removedremoved8.20.00410.0041basal growth radial growth elevationremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327		size	9.1	0.0025			removed			removed		
radial growth elevation1.40.23531.60.2041removedterpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00removed0.1size0.50.4610removedremovedremoved0.10.12removed0.1basal growth radial growth elevationremoved0.090.76946.40.01170.0327		basal growth		removed			removed		3.4	0.0672		
elevationremovedremovedremovedterpinoleneage1.80.17490.12removed0.00removed0.1size0.50.4610removedremovedremovedremoved0.001basal growthremovedremovedremoved8.20.00411radial growthremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327		radial growth	1.4	0.2353		1.6	0.2041			removed		
terpinolene age 1.8 0.1749 0.12 removed 0.00 removed 0.1 size 0.5 0.4610 removed removed removed 0.00 removed 0.1 basal growth removed removed removed 8.2 0.0041 radial growth removed 0.09 0.7694 6.4 0.0117 elevation 3.4 0.0662 removed 4.6 0.0327		elevation		removed			removed			removed		
size0.50.4610removedremovedbasal growthremovedremoved8.20.0041radial growthremoved0.090.76946.40.0117elevation3.40.0662removed4.60.0327	terpinolene	age	1.8	0.1749	0.12		removed	0.00		removed	0.1	
basal growth removed removed 8.2 0.0041 radial growth removed 0.09 0.7694 6.4 0.0117 elevation 3.4 0.0662 removed 4.6 0.0327	-	size	0.5	0.4610			removed			removed		
radial growth removed 0.09 0.7694 6.4 0.0117 elevation 3.4 0.0662 removed 4.6 0.0327		basal growth		removed			removed		8.2	0.0041		
elevation 3.4 0.0662 removed 4.6 0.0327		radial growth		removed		0.09	0.7694		6.4	0.0117		
		elevation	3.4	0.0662			removed		4.6	0.0327		

770

*R² are for full generalized regression models with all factors not listed as "removed". Best-fit models were validated by AICc scores.



771

772 Figure S1

- 773 Relationship of tree size (diameter at breast height, DBH) to tree age (# annual xylem rings at
- 774 DBH) in Pinus contorta (a), Pinus ponderosa (b), and Pinus flexilis (c). DBH was log-
- transformed for all three species to meet linear model assumptions of normality.

776 777	R script for SEM
778 779 780	## Structural Equation Model(SEM) code for pine resin monoterpene concentration and diversity in relation to tree age, size, growth rate, and elevation. ## scott.ferrenberg@colorado.edu
781	
782	###########
783 784	# Set your working directory (in this example a folder named SEM on the C drive) setwd("C:/SEM")
785	
786	#Load library
787	library(lavaan)
788	ind a y (la vaari)
789	#Load data
790	ResChem <- read csv("ResinChemistryPICO csv")
791	
792	#Examine contents of data file
703	names(ResChem)
707	hancs(Resonem)
795	nead(nesonem)
796	
797	##Monoterpene Concentration
798	
799	mod1<-'Mt_conc ~ Age + DBH + BAI5 + Elev
800	$DBH \sim Age + BAI5$
801	BAI5 ~ Age + Elev'
802	Brite riget Liev
803	#Note that this model was fit with EmI, but, due to multivariate non-normality
804	#we scaled the test of fit and the standard errors
805	#monoterpene concentrations were normally distributed
806	
807	mod1Fit <- sem(mod1, data=ResChem, estimator="MLM")
808	summary(mod1Fit)
809	
810	varTable(ResChem)
811	
812	#standardized coefficients are in Fig. 5 of the model
813	3
814	standardizedSolution(mod1Fit)
815	modindices(mod1Fit)
816	
817	#variation explained
818	inspect(mod1Fit, "r2")
819	
820	#model fit BIC
821	fitMeasures(mod1Fit, "bic")
822	
823	#######################################
824	
825	##Model 2
826	##Monoterpene Diversity

827	
828	mod2<-'Mt_div ~ Age + DBH + BAI5 + Elev
829	DBH ~ Age + BAI5
830	BAI5 ~ Age + Elev'
831	
832	#Note that this model was fit with Fml, but, due to multivariate non-normality
833	#we scaled the test of fit and the standard errors
834	#monoterpene diversity was cube-root transformed to better meet the assumption of normality
835	
836	mod2Fit <- sem(mod2, data=ResUnem, estimator="MILM")
83/	summary(mod2Fit)
020	varTable(PacCham)
840 840	val rable(resolient)
840 8/1	#standardized coefficients are in Fig. 5 of the model
842	
843	standardizedSolution(mod2Fit)
844	modindices(mod2Fit)
845	
846	#variation explained
847	inspect(mod2Fit, "r2")
848	
849	#model fit BIC
850	fitMeasures(mod2Fit, "bic")