

1 **Tree water relations can trigger monoterpene emissions** 2 **from Scots pine stem during spring recovery**

3

4 **A. Vanhatalo¹, T. Chan¹, J. Aalto^{1,2}, J. F. Korhonen¹, P. Kolari³, T. Hölttä¹, E.**
5 **Nikinmaa¹ and J. Bäck¹**

6 [1]{Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland}

7 [2]{SMEAR II station, University of Helsinki, Finland}

8 [3]{Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Finland}

9 Correspondence to: A. Vanhatalo (anni.vanhatalo@helsinki.fi)

10

11 **Abstract**

12 Tree canopies are known to emit large amounts of VOCs (volatile organic compounds) such
13 as monoterpenes to the surrounding air. High VOC emission rates from boreal forests have
14 been observed during transition from winter to summer activity. The most important sources
15 for these are considered to be the green foliage, understory vegetation and soil organisms, but
16 emissions from the living stand woody compartments have so far not been quantified. We
17 analyzed if the non-foliar components could partially explain the springtime high emission
18 rates. We measured the monoterpene emissions from Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) stem and
19 shoots during the dehardening phase of trees in field conditions in two consecutive springs.
20 We observed a large, transient monoterpene burst from the stem, while the shoot monoterpene
21 emissions remained low. The burst lasted about 12 hours. Simultaneously, an unusual night-
22 time sap flow and a non-systematic diurnal pattern of tree diameter were detected. Hence, we
23 suggest that the monoterpene burst was a consequence of the recovery of the stem from
24 winter-time, and likely related to the refilling of embolized tracheids and/or phenological
25 changes in the living cells of the stem. This indicates that the dominant processes and
26 environmental drivers triggering the monoterpene emissions are different between the stem
27 and the foliage.

28

1 **1 Introduction**

2 The stems of mature coniferous trees contain significant quantities of oleoresin. 20–50% per
3 weight of the conifer oleoresin consists of monoterpenes (Langenheim, 2003), and the
4 monoterpene content of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) wood is about 0.5% (from dry weight)
5 (Strömvall and Petersson, 2000). In addition to the volatile monoterpenes, oleoresin is
6 composed of volatile sesquiterpenes and non-volatile diterpene acids. The composition and
7 quantity of wood oleoresin depends on e.g. tree species, age, provenance, health status, and
8 environmental conditions (Back and Ekman, 2000, Erbilgin and Colgan, 2012), and is likely
9 linked to protection against stem-damaging herbivores (Lewinsohn et al., 1991; Philips and
10 Croteau, 1999; Trapp and Croteau, 2001). Oleoresin flows out from a mechanically damaged
11 site to protect the tree by sealing the wound. Once in contact with air, the volatile parts of
12 oleoresin evaporate, and the residual compounds harden to make a solid protective seal over
13 damaged tissues. Yet, a fraction of volatile part may react already on the oleoresin and form
14 large polymers of low volatility.

15 It is well known that also the foliage of conifers contains several volatile isoprenoids
16 (isoprene, monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes), as well as small oxygenated carbonyls, e.g.
17 methanol, acetone and acetaldehyde, which are emitted at very variable rates (e.g. Isidorov et
18 al., 1985; Christensen et al., 2000; Grabmer et al., 2004). Temperature is the main controlling
19 factor for monoterpene emission, influencing their volatility in an exponential manner
20 (Tingey et al., 1980), although recently light-dependent emissions from shoots have also been
21 reported (Loreto et al., 1996; Staudt and Bertin, 1998; Shao et al., 2001; Tarvainen et al.,
22 2005; Ghirardo et al., 2010), indicating a close dependence with carbon assimilation.
23 Emissions of monoterpenes from tree canopies have a typical seasonal pattern, normally
24 peaking in summer (e.g. Hakola et al., 2006).

25 Surprisingly, despite abundant knowledge on emissions of volatile isoprenoids from foliage,
26 very little is known about their emissions from woody plant tissue. From the viewpoint of the
27 timber and paper industry, isoprenoid emissions from harvested and further-processed timber
28 have been previously reported (Strömvall and Petersson, 1991; 1993; Granström, 2007), but
29 living woody tree parts have gained only little attention. As the oleoresin storage pools in
30 stems are large, emissions occur constitutively without any damage to the tree itself, but their
31 seasonal patterns or driving factors have not been studied in detail.

1 Resin duct network and water transport system are both pressurized systems: resin is under
2 positive pressure caused by cells surrounding the ducts and xylem water under negative
3 pressure caused by the transpiration created tension linking the pressure to many
4 physiological processes of a tree. Apart from transpiration the water status in stem is linked to
5 repeated freezing and thawing cycles in winter. These can cause embolism in water
6 conducting tracheids (Sperry, 1993) potentially hindering the stem water transport as
7 transpiration commences at spring recovery of the canopy. Thus one requirement for trees
8 living in cold environments is that the xylem conduits are refilled and the water transport
9 capacity recovers in the spring (e.g. Améglio et al., 2002). The water pressure changes in
10 xylem and phloem can be reflected to the radial changes of inner-bark and xylem (e.g.
11 Mencuccini et al., 2013)

12 Interestingly, emissions from intact Scots pine branches can be very high in early spring, in
13 many cases much higher than those later in the growing season (e.g. Tarvainen et al., 2005;
14 Hakola et al., 2006). This implies that other factors, related to the tree physiological processes
15 in spring may also influence inherent emission rates, beyond the simple physical factors
16 related to volatilization of VOCs or the factors related to biotic or abiotic damage.

17 To analyze the dynamics of stem monoterpene emissions and their possible relationship to the
18 stem physiology in spring, we measured the emissions from a Scots pine stem during two
19 springs in field conditions in a boreal pine forest. In addition, we measured sap flow, stem
20 radial variation and foliage gas exchange (including emissions of monoterpenes) from the
21 same tree. Our hypothesis was that the emissions from the stem are driven by several factors:
22 one is related to incident changes in temperature (affecting volatilization), and the second one
23 represents the dynamic emission driven by tree physiological processes. The latter one was
24 expected to be linked to tree water relations, and thus the onset of monoterpene emissions
25 from the stem in spring could be related to the recovery of tree water transport capacity.

26

27 **2 Materials and methods**

28 Measurements were done at the SMEAR II (Station for Measuring Forest Ecosystem–
29 Atmosphere Relations, 61°51'N, 24°17'E) stand (Hari and Kulmala, 2005) in 2012 and 2013.
30 The growing season ranges, on average, from the end of April to mid-October (Table 1).
31 Thermal spring, defined as a period when daily mean temperature stays between 0 and 10 °C,
32 starts typically during the first half of April (Table 1). The growing season starts when snow

1 has melted on open sites and mean daily air temperature rises above 5 °C, this takes place
2 around the turn from April to May. The ambient air temperature, snow depth and soil water
3 content during the measurement periods in April–May 2012 and 2013 are shown in Figure 1.

4 The measurement site is situated at the boreal vegetation zone in southern Finland. The stand
5 is dominated by Scots pine with some Norway spruce (*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.), European
6 aspen (*Populus tremula* L.), and birches (*Betula* spp.) as a mixture. The ground is covered
7 with dwarf shrubs (*Vaccinium myrtillus* L., *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* L.) and mosses (*Pleurozium*
8 *schreberi* (Brid.) Mitt., *Dicranum* spp.). Soil is haplic podzol formed from glacial till and its
9 thickness on bedrock is quite low, on average only 0.5–0.7 m.

10 The tree-scale parameters were measured from a visibly healthy, representative Scots pine ca.
11 50-yr old individual belonging to the dominating canopy layer. This tree was 18.6 m tall and
12 had a diameter of 20 cm at breast height (in 2012), and has been measured for diameter
13 change and sap flow since 2005. The lowest living branches grew at a height of 10 m. The
14 shoots and stem were inspected visually, and no injuries or other abnormalities could be seen
15 before or after the installation of measurement device.

16 The gas exchange of the stem was measured with a transparent enclosure (see below). The
17 flux calculation of stem enclosure data was done according to Kolari et al. (2009). The top-
18 canopy shoot gas exchange was measured at the height of about 17 m with a dynamic
19 enclosure (including 2–3 most recent needle year classes) as presented by Aalto et al. (2014).
20 The shoot gas exchange was calculated as in Kolari et al. (2012) with a transpiration
21 correction as in Altimir et al. (2006). Until the end of April 2013 the H₂O and CO₂ exchange
22 was measured with URAS 4 infrared light absorption gas analysers (Hartman and Braun,
23 Frankfurt am Main, Germany), and from May 2013 onwards with a Li-840A analyser (Li-
24 Cor, Lincoln, NE, USA). The replacement of the gas analysers did not cause any irregularity
25 in the H₂O and CO₂ exchange data because the calculation of gas exchange is primarily
26 dependent on concentration difference instead of absolute concentration, and besides of that
27 both analysers were also calibrated for CO₂ using comparable calibration method and
28 standard gases containing ca. ambient concentration of CO₂. For more details on CO₂ and
29 H₂O calibration protocol used at SMEAR II, see Keronen et al. (2014). The stem CO₂ efflux
30 was temperature-normalised using the air temperatures measured inside the enclosure to study
31 linkages with other stem processes by fitting an exponential curve to measurements at above
32 zero temperatures in April. Simple exponential models derived from the described plot (Eqs

1 1, 2) were then used to estimate CO₂ efflux anomalies. The exponential models for respiration
2 (*R*) as a function of ambient temperature (*T*) were

$$3 \quad R = 4.5784 * \exp(0.0925 * T) \quad (\text{Eq 1})$$

4 and

$$5 \quad R = 0.9874 * \exp(0.207 * T) \quad (\text{Eq 2})$$

6 for April 2012 and April 2013, respectively. The VOC emissions were measured online with a
7 proton transfer reaction-quadrupole mass spectrometer (PTR-Q-MS, Ionicon, Innsbruck,
8 Austria; Hansel et al., 1995) modified from the system described in Ruuskanen et al. (2005).
9 The description and accuracy of the VOC measurement system has been reported in Kolari et
10 al. (2012). Altogether, ten protonated mass ions (amu+1) were monitored, but for this study
11 we use data only on the *m/z* 137, which corresponds in Scots pine emissions mainly to
12 monoterpenes. The other masses show so low signal-to-noise ratios and dependence on air
13 humidity that their fluxes are insufficiently quantified. Calibrations of the PTR-Q-MS were
14 carried out 2–3 times a month according to the method described in Taipale et al. (2008). A
15 mixture of several VOCs (e.g. α -pinene as a representative of monoterpenes) in nitrogen was
16 used as a gas standard. The mixture was further diluted with volatile-free air from a zero air
17 generator to attain concentrations below 20 parts per billion by volume, i.e. around the
18 ambient atmospheric concentrations. The gaps in the data originate from the momentary
19 maintenance and malfunction of the measuring system. As the temperature variation in
20 springtime is wide, the measured emissions were normalized to enable better comparison by
21 applying the temperature normalization equation according to Guenther (1997) using an
22 empirical beta-coefficient of 0.09 °K⁻¹ and a standard temperature of 303.15 K according to
23 Eq (3).

$$24 \quad E_0 = E * \exp(\beta * [T_s - T]) \quad (3)$$

25 where *E*₀ = normalized emission rate (ng m⁻² s⁻¹), *E* = observed emission (ng m⁻² s⁻¹), β = 0.09
26 (°K⁻¹), *T*_s = standard temperature (K), and *T* = temperature in chamber (K).

27 The stem enclosure (Figure 2) was designed specifically for measuring reactive gases with
28 materials chemically inert to many VOCs to avoid detrimental signal losses. The enclosure
29 covered 396 cm² of the pine stem at the height of 12 m from the ground, which is close to the
30 lowest living branches. The enclosure consists of a transparent and UV-permeable FEP foil

1 (0.05 mm thick, Fluorplast, Maalahti, Finland) wrapped around the stem 2–3 times and
2 tightened with binds on both ends. The vertical seal of the foil was made with FEP tape.
3 Within the enclosure, a spiral of polyethylene-coated aluminium tube (Synflex, Eaton, USA)
4 was wrapped around the stem to maintain an air space between the foil and the bark, and a
5 FEP tape-covered aluminium brace for inlet and outlet connectors was placed between the
6 spiral and the foil. Inside the enclosure, temperature was recorded with a copper-constantan
7 thermocouple on the south-facing side of the stem. Rain water flow along the stem was
8 blocked with a rain cover above the enclosure. Mounting of the enclosure was done well
9 before the first measurements and without damaging the bark to avoid possible induced
10 emissions. The bark at this height was rather smooth, so no levelling with a knife was needed.
11 The measurements were done in steady state when the flow rate through the enclosure was
12 about 1 l min^{-1} . The sampling time for emissions was 2 min 45 s, and samples were taken 24
13 times per day. To avoid accumulation of gases inside the enclosure, the enclosure was flushed
14 between the samplings with above-canopy air at a rate of about 0.4 l min^{-1} . All the
15 monoterpene emissions from the stem are expressed per m^2 of bark area and the emissions
16 from the shoot per m^2 of all-sided needle area. The stem area was defined as a smooth
17 cylinder surface ignoring the cracks of the bark.

18 Changes in stem radius were measured with two linear variable displacement transducers
19 (point-dendrometers) (LVDT; model AX/5.0/S, Solartron Inc. West Sussex, U.K.), at a height
20 of 15 m from the base of the sample tree. The point-dendrometers were installed to a
21 rectangular stainless steel frame and were affixed onto the stem using two attachment plates.
22 A detailed description of the dendrometers is provided by Sevanto et al. (2005). The head of
23 the first dendrometer rested against a screw that was placed 10 mm through the bark surface,
24 measuring xylem radial thickness (d_x). The head of the second dendrometer rested against the
25 inner-bark, which was exposed by incising the outer-bark 3–4 mm deep with a scalpel. This
26 dendrometer measured whole stem radial thickness (d_{ws}). As whole stem thickness also
27 includes xylem thickness, the difference between these measurements is the inner-bark radial
28 thickness (d_b). Inner-bark thickness, hence, includes the cambium and the phloem tissue
29 towards the outside of the cambium. Dendrometer measurements (accuracy $1 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$) at 30
30 minute intervals were used for the study and were offset to zero on April 1 of each year.

31 We used the radial measurements to calculate a dimensionless ratio, β , which is the ratio of
32 the change in d_x to the change in d_b (Eq 4):

1
$$\beta = \frac{d_{b\text{MAX}} - d_{b\text{MIN}}}{d_{x\text{MAX}} - d_{x\text{MIN}}} \quad (4)$$

2 where $d_{b\text{MAX}}$ and $d_{b\text{MIN}}$ correspond to the maximum and minimum daily inner-bark diameter,
3 respectively, and $d_{x\text{MAX}}$ and $d_{x\text{MIN}}$ corresponded to the maximum and minimum daily xylem
4 diameter, respectively. This ratio is proportional to the ratio of the elasticity of the inner-bark
5 tissues to xylem tissues. Note that an assumption is made here that the xylem and inner-bark
6 tend towards water potential equilibrium with each other at the minimum and maximum
7 diameters. As the elasticity of the xylem tissue is dependent mainly on the elastic properties
8 of the dead xylem tracheids (Irvine and Grace, 1997; Perämäki et al., 2001) and the xylem
9 and inner-bark (Sevanto et al., 2011) tend to approximately follow water potential equilibrium
10 on a daily scale, the changes in β represent mainly the changes in the elasticity of the phloem.

11 Sap flow rate was measured with the Granier-type heat dissipation method at a height of
12 about 13 m. Two probes, of 50 mm in length, were inserted in 2 mm wide brass cylinders into
13 the sapwood approximately 10 cm apart. The upper probe (with 30 ohms resistance) was
14 heated with constant power (approximately 0.2 W) and the sap flux density was calculated
15 from the temperature difference between the two probes with a standard protocol (see e.g.
16 Granier, 1987).

17 Air temperature was measured at 8 m height (Pt-100 sensor) and in soil A-horizon (5–10 cm
18 depth with Philips thermistors). Precipitation was measured (Vector ARG-100 tipping bucket
19 rain gauge and Vaisala FD12P Weather sensor) in an open site at 30-min intervals. Snow
20 depth was measured once a week at seven locations below canopies at the study site and
21 averaged for the forest stand.

22

23 **3 Results**

24 Weather patterns in both springs were rather normal (Table 1). Mean temperatures in April
25 were somewhat below the long-time average, but May temperatures were slightly higher. The
26 onset of the growing period was typical for the site. The maximum depth of snow was in both
27 years higher than average, but snow was melting slightly earlier than normal.

28 The emission measurements show that very early in spring, already in early April, significant
29 monoterpene emissions from pine stem and shoot could be detected (Figure 3). The emissions
30 exhibited a clear diurnal cycle, with a maximum at midday and a minimum at midnight

1 (Figure 3a, b). Interestingly, a single, extremely high burst of monoterpene emission was
2 observed from the stem on both years in April. At highest, the monoterpene burst was 13 ng
3 $\text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ in 2012 and 50 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ in 2013. The corresponding normalized (30°C) emissions in
4 the bursts were 77 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and 500 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, respectively. In 2012, the peak occurred on
5 11 April, when the mean air temperature was 3.6 °C, and in 2013 on 19 April when the mean
6 air temperature was 3.4 °C. The average, temperature normalized emission rate from the stem
7 was 29 $\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ after the burst in April–May 2012. In 2013, the normalized emission rates
8 were 79 $\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ before the burst in April and 47 $\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ after the burst in April–
9 May, respectively. In 2013, the mean measured monoterpene emission from the stem in April
10 before the burst was 0.7 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (standard deviation 0.6 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) and after the burst in
11 April–May 1.3 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (standard deviation 1.5 $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$).

12 The transient extremely high monoterpene emissions occurred after the freeze-thaw cycles,
13 but their timing was different from the pre- and post-peak periods and varied slightly between
14 years: in 2012, the highest values were measured in the afternoon, around 15:00, whereas in
15 2013 the highest values occurred in late evening, around 21:00 (Fig 4a, b). In 2012, the high
16 emissions were recorded for 12 hours, after which, emissions returned to their normal, low
17 levels. In 2013, the emission measurements were unfortunately interrupted due to a
18 communication error between the PTR-MS and the laptop controlling it during the peak
19 emission. Before the break, the high emissions had continued for nine hours.

20 The stem monoterpene emission peaks in April were not coinciding with the highest emission
21 periods from shoots (Figure 3). The stem and shoot monoterpene emissions were momentarily
22 at about the same level during the stem monoterpene burst in 2012, but in 2013, the stem
23 monoterpene emissions clearly exceeded those from the shoots.

24 The observed inner-bark radial thickness (d_b) dynamics were very different before, during and
25 after the observed emission burst. Thus, we separated them into three consecutive phases. The
26 first phase began in early April, when large and reversible stem swelling and shrinkage was
27 observed, which was associated with repeated freeze-thaw cycles (Figures 4 and 5). These
28 freeze-thaw cycles were observed over the first nine days of both Aprils, coinciding with
29 daily minimum temperatures below -5°C .

30 The second phase began once monoterpene emission started. Immediately after the stem
31 monoterpene emission burst ceased, a period lasting roughly one week was seen in d_b (Figure
32 5a, b). Recovery of the d_b from the first period's freeze thaw cycles was detected, which

1 occurred roughly three days after the burst in 2012 and almost immediately in 2013. On the
2 11–23 April 2012 and 19–25 April 2013, d_b and d_x were swelling and shrinking with no time
3 lag, or even d_b swelling occurring before d_x . We considered the end of the second phase to
4 take place once the d_x and d_b changes got more regular. Thus, the stem and its water transport
5 got acclimated to external factors such as rising air temperature.

6 In the third phase, a regular swelling and shrinking of stem radius was observed: d_b followed
7 d_x with a time lag. This kind of pattern is typical for the active growing period and is
8 commonly observed in summertime at the study site. Moreover, irreversible d_b increment (i.e.
9 radial growth) began shortly after the second phase.

10 Sap flow decreased and minimum occurred about 10 days after the peaks in monoterpene
11 emissions, and then began to increase steadily to summertime levels following similar pattern
12 in temperature (Figure 6). Nighttime sap flow occurred concurrently with the stem
13 monoterpene emission peaks (Figure 4), which does not typically occur at any other time of
14 the year at this site. In addition, shoot transpiration was very low during 2012 emission peak,
15 although VPD was high, indicating closed stomata (data not shown).

16 β , reflecting the changes of inner-bark to xylem maximum daily amplitude showed large daily
17 variations prior to the emission burst followed by a decline shortly after (Figure 7). During the
18 second phase, β exhibited noticeably smaller but abrupt changes lasting 2–3 days. After this
19 response period, β reached a steady summer state.

20 The stem CO₂ efflux anomalies, i.e. the part of respiration value that is not explained by the
21 regular response to temperature (Figure 8), reveal that prior to the high monoterpene emission
22 peak of both years, the stem CO₂ efflux anomaly increased relative to period before, or
23 immediately after in 2012 (2013 measurements were missing at that period due to system
24 problems). This suggests that in addition to regular maintenance respiration, CO₂ was released
25 from some storage or there were some CO₂-producing processes occurring. This high CO₂
26 efflux during the monoterpene peak is not associated with growth since radial growth was
27 observed with the point dendrometers approximately one month later.

28

29 **4 Discussion**

30 We showed that in a boreal forest, monoterpenes are emitted from Scots pine stems
31 continuously at a low rate in spring, with a systematic daily pattern – maxima in the afternoon

1 and minima during night-time. The stem monoterpene emissions differ from those measured
2 from shoots in both magnitude and dynamics at the same time. The monoterpene emission
3 from Scots pine shoots show clear seasonal pattern with several high transient emission
4 periods in the beginning of the growing season (Aalto et al., 2014). The average level of the
5 monoterpene emissions from the stem in springtime is in general lower than from the shoots
6 (per area unit), which is likely due to lower oleoresin content and lower biological activity in
7 stem than in shoot (Rockwood, 1973; Back and Ekman, 2000). The monoterpene emissions
8 from the shoot were generally lower in 2013 than in 2012 (Figure 3), but this is likely due to
9 the aging of needles as the same shoot was enclosed in the measurement chamber in both
10 years (Aalto et al., 2014). Moreover, the dynamics of the monoterpene emissions from the
11 stem and shoots seem to be driven by different factors.

12 We compared the fluxes measured with chambers to those monitored with ecosystem scale
13 flux measurements (data not shown), but no clear correlations could be seen. Since the
14 ecosystem scale measurements upscale the emissions of the whole heterogenic stand, such
15 transient physiological features related to emission changes in individual trees may not be
16 observable at that scale. As the environmental factors vary within a forest stand and the tree
17 individuals exhibit naturally somewhat different responses to these factors, there is variance
18 in timing of the physiological processes within a stand.

19 In addition to the continuous low monoterpene emissions from the stem, we observed a rapid
20 but large emission burst, lasting for several hours, after which the emissions decreased to the
21 pre-burst levels, with a gradual emission increase towards summer concurrently with
22 increasing ambient temperatures. The monoterpene emission burst coincided well with the
23 recovery of stem radius from winter conditions. In both years studied, the burst occurred
24 shortly after the last freezing period (Figure 5). Around the time of the burst, stem radius
25 fluctuations showed irregular behaviour in comparison to the regular pattern observed during
26 summer condition, more noticeably in 2012. This behaviour included inner-bark fluctuations
27 occurring before xylem fluctuations, both inner-bark and xylem changes occurring
28 concomitantly and large daily fluctuations unlike summer-time behaviour. In both years, the
29 inner-bark radius had a depression relative to xylem around the emission burst, but extremely
30 so during 2012. This behaviour also coincided well with the changes in relative bark-xylem
31 daily amplitude, β , where the largest changes were seen shortly before the burst (Figure 7) and
32 also more prominent in the year 2012 when the bark shrinking was more pronounced. Also

1 the dynamics of sap flow behaved in similar manner relative to the burst event on both years
2 (Figure 6). This irregular behaviour relative to timing and amplitudes of xylem and inner-bark
3 indicates that other driving forces than transpiration, the main driver of diameter change
4 variation during summer (Perämäki et al., 2001; 2005), drives the pattern of diameter change
5 variation. .

6 It is commonly known that freeze/thaw cycles experienced during winter cause winter
7 embolism in trees ((Sperry, 1993; Sperry and Robson, 2001; Pittermann and Sperry, 2006)):
8 frozen gases (mostly air and CO₂) dissolve in xylem sap forming bubbles, which then expand
9 during thawing and embolize the water conducting tracheids. In spring, xylem conduits are
10 refilled with water by metabolic processes which are not yet fully understood, but most likely
11 involve the interaction of living cells and radial interaction between xylem and phloem
12 (Zwieniecki and Holbrook, 2009; Nardini et al., 2011), resulting in the recovery of xylem
13 transport capacity along with transpiration-driven tension propagation in stems. Cochard et al.
14 (2001) demonstrated that an active mechanism for the recovery of shoot hydraulic
15 conductivity via embolism refilling occurred early in the growing season, before cambial
16 reactivation (i.e., before ring development). Also aquaporin activity, which changes the
17 permeability of the cell membranes, is known to be associated with embolism refilling (e.g.
18 Sakr et al., 2003; Brodersen and McElrone, 2013).

19 Studies have shown that the inner-bark (i.e. phloem), plays a contributory role by providing
20 the mechanism to drive radial water flow, ultimately aiding osmotic flow into embolized
21 conduits (Salleo et al., 1996; Zwieniecki et al., 2000; Salleo et al., 2004). Also our results
22 show that soon after the cessation of freeze-thaw events there occur changes, such as
23 temporary shrinking of inner-bark relative to xylem and high inner-bark vs. xylem amplitude
24 changes, which could suggest an active role of phloem in xylem recovery. Also the stem CO₂
25 flux anomalies might be related to this phloem activity during embolism refilling as embolism
26 refilling is known to require input of energy (Zwieniecki and Holbrook, 2009). After this
27 period, changes in stem radius achieved a general summer-time steady state, where changes in
28 inner-bark follow xylem changes with a 30–45 min time lag (Sevanto et al., 2002).

29 The simultaneous dynamic changes in stem radius and deviation of xylem sap flow from
30 normal conditions indicate that the changes in stem water relations are at least coinciding if
31 not causing the emission bursts in April. In addition to water transport, the shrinking and
32 swelling of phloem could indicate the onset of growth: xylem microcore samples have

1 indicated that xylem cells start forming at our measurement site after mid-May (Jyske et al.,
2 2014) and phloem cells have been reported to start to form about 10 to 20 days before xylem
3 cells in Scots pine (Antonova and Stasova, 2006). Thus, the timing of tree growth does not
4 explain the observed bursts which were seen to occur prior to growth onset, and we need to
5 search for explanations from other physical and physiological processes.

6 The most plausible causes for these transient monoterpene bursts from pine stem are
7 volatilization from storages due to temperature increase (e.g. Lerdau et al., 1997); changes in
8 the non-specific storage of monoterpenes (e.g. Niinemets and Reichstein, 2002); or a rapid
9 pressure-induced mobilization of volatiles from resin ducts .

10 As volatile cues are important for many herbivores in finding their host trees, the springtime
11 monoterpene emission dynamics may also be linked to tree-herbivore relations.

12 **4.1 Direct effect of temperature**

13 Monoterpene volatilization is a temperature-driven process (Guenther et al., 1993; Guenther,
14 1997; Lerdau et al., 1997; Tarvainen et al., 2005) and thus the seasonality of monoterpene
15 emissions from vegetation is often linked to changes in ambient temperatures. Temperature-
16 dependent emissions are especially important in species with large storage pools, such as
17 conifers (e.g. Lewinsohn et al., 1991; Lerdau et al., 1997). The accumulation of monoterpenes
18 in stem storage pools over winter and their release due to higher temperatures in spring could
19 possibly lead to high emission rates. However, we could not identify any extraordinary
20 weather conditions which could have caused such high emission peak. The emission burst had
21 on both years almost similar timing compared to the growing season: the burst took place on
22 11 April in 2012 and on 19 April in 2013 (onset of growing season 12 April and 16 April,
23 respectively). Also the daily mean temperatures of the peak emissions days were almost
24 identical in both years.

25 The bark surface temperature follows ambient air temperature with a short time lag, but may
26 occasionally rise well above ambient temperature due to direct irradiation on the bark surface.
27 However, inside and especially below the canopy this happens only occasionally and only on
28 one side of the stem at a time, and especially deeper inside the stem the response to changes
29 in ambient temperatures is very slow. Measurements on a 60 cm thick Monterey pine have
30 shown that diurnal temperature range inside the stem is only about one third of the range in
31 ambient air (Neher, 1993). Thus, the oleoresin-rich heartwood (Strömvall and Petersson,

1 2000) stays in more stable conditions than the sapwood with lower oleoresin content. On the
2 other hand, sapwood includes the living cells of the xylem and thus its temperature changes
3 might be more significant for monoterpene emissions, especially in the case of de novo
4 emissions. Our stem enclosure was situated inside the living canopy, so there apparently was
5 only living sapwood and no heartwood enclosed.

6 It is also possible that the monoterpenes get reallocated from roots to upper tree parts through
7 sap flow. However, as oleoresin is still rather viscous at that the prevailing temperatures in
8 spring, and the monoterpenes do not easily dissolve to water, this may not provide a good
9 explanation for the observed peak emissions.

10 **4.2 Changes in non-specific storage of monoterpenes due to changes in** 11 **membrane permeability during spring**

12 The spring dehardening involves many biochemical changes affecting membrane transport
13 properties and changing membrane permeability (Pukacki and Kaminska-Rozek, 2013; Martz
14 et al., 2006), which likely also influence the water relations in stem and xylem refilling.
15 Changes in membrane properties (e.g. elasticity and permeability) were likely seen as changes
16 in stem radius measured with point dendrometers. The change in permeability is reflected in
17 the water status of the living cells of the stem, affecting sap flow rate as well.

18 A dynamic, non-specific monoterpene storage pool exists in cellular membranes (Niinemets
19 and Reichstein, 2002; 2003; Ormeño et al., 2011). This pool may either influence or be
20 affected by membrane permeability changes. At high concentrations monoterpenes may alter
21 the properties of membrane proteins (Wink, 2003) and thus also affect the permeability and
22 other bioactive features of the membrane. Monoterpenes may affect membrane permeability
23 and cause leakage of intracellular materials of pathogenic microbes, which could explain their
24 antimicrobial activity (Trombetta et al., 2005; Cristani et al., 2007). Since the properties of
25 cell membranes change dramatically during dehardening, this may lead to a release of
26 membrane-accumulated monoterpenes – however it is unlikely that the release would be seen
27 as such a short and transient emission peak, but rather as a gradually increasing emission rate
28 as the dehardening proceeds.

1 **4.3 A rapid mobilization of volatiles from resin ducts**

2 A rather plausible explanation for the monoterpene emission peaks is a pressure-induced
3 release of volatiles from resin duct cavities. Resin ducts are located both horizontally and
4 vertically in the stem, and thus they are in contact with both heartwood and sapwood. It is
5 likely that the rapid changes in water transport and related pressure changes in stem in spring
6 could lead to a pressure change in the xylem resin ducts and a consequent release of oleoresin.
7 Such an effect could be corresponding to a damage-induced, transient release of
8 monoterpenes from herbivory or mechanical wounding. However, after a steady diurnal water
9 transport rate is obtained (in some hours after the recovery of the xylem), the resin ducts are
10 no longer experiencing strong pressure effects and emissions go down to 'normal' diurnal
11 pattern.

12 Monoterpene emissions may also originate from the gases inside embolized tracheids. It is
13 well known that a large proportion of tracheids is embolized during the winter as gas bubbles
14 get trapped inside the frozen xylem sap during freezing and expand to embolize the tracheids
15 during thawing (e.g. Pittermann and Sperry, 2003). The air inside the embolized tracheids
16 may have a high concentration of monoterpenes, as the turnover rate of the gases is low and
17 monoterpenes can diffuse to tracheids from the neighbouring resin ducts over the winter.
18 Once the conduits refill with water in the spring, the gases, including monoterpenes, within
19 the embolized tracheids diffuse out from the stem (Yang and Tyree, 1992; Vesala et al.,
20 2003). It is unclear how large are the changes in stem gas content during the spring, and if
21 monoterpene concentrations can be high enough to sustain a burst for several hours. However,
22 substantial changes in the volume of gas inside the stem are very likely, as the volumetric
23 water content of the stem is known to vary a lot during winter months (Sparks et al., 2001)
24 and can increase by up to tens of percent's during the springtime (Wullschleger et al., 1996).
25 On the other hand, once the embolized tracheid cells fill up with water in spring, the filling
26 causes extra pressure on resin ducts and this may also cause micro-scale damages on the ducts
27 followed by a subsequent oleoresin flow and elevated monoterpene emissions.

28

29 **5 Conclusions**

30 Although emission measurements on tree shoots using branch enclosures abound, very little is
31 known on the emission patterns and their driving factors of the woody parts of the shoots.

1 This study is the first to show that monoterpene emissions from Scots pine stems are linked to
2 changes in stem water relations during the spring recovery. The stem emissions seem to be
3 less related to changes in incident changes in environment than to the physiology of the tree,
4 especially during the winter dehardening phase. The dynamic changes in stem processes
5 (irregular diurnal pattern of stem radial change, night-time sap flow, and transient
6 monoterpene burst) indicate a spring-time phase change in stem water transport capacity that
7 precedes the physiologically active summer state of the tree. After this period, the water
8 transport capacity reaches a steady summer state with stable daily patterns of stem radial
9 change and sap flow rates. While the emission dynamics in foliage follows a clear
10 temperature and light dynamics, the large oleoresin reservoirs in woody compartments seem
11 to be less directly affected by these incident factors, and rather reflecting a longer term
12 adjustment of the whole tree physiology. The large transient emission peaks from stem are
13 most likely related to the springtime refilling of embolized tracheids. Future studies on the
14 topic could address the cellular-level processes in tree stems, and their connections to
15 seasonal water transport capacity and occurrence of insect outbreaks.

16

17 **Acknowledgements**

18 This work was supported by the Finnish Center of Excellence ‘Physics, Chemistry, Biology
19 and Meteorology of Atmospheric Composition and Climate Change’ (projects 1118615 and
20 272041), Nordic Center of Excellence CRAICC and Helsinki University Centre for
21 Environment HENVI. We highly acknowledge the assistance given during the measurements
22 by the staff of the SMEAR II station.

23

24 **References**

25 Aalto, J., Kolari, P., Hari, P., Kerminen, V.-M., Schiestl-Aalto, P., Aaltonen, H., Levula, J.,
26 Siivola, E., Kulmala, M., and Bäck, J.: New foliage growth is a significant, unaccounted
27 source for volatiles in boreal evergreen forests, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 1331–1344, 2014.

28 Altimir, N., Kolari, P., Tuovinen, J. P., Vesala, T., Bäck, J., Suni, T., Kulmala, M., and Hari,
29 P.: Foliage surface ozone deposition: a role for surface moisture? *Biogeosciences*, 3, 209–228,
30 2006.

- 1 Améglio, T., Bodet, C., Lacoïnte, A., and Cochard, H.: Winter embolism, mechanisms of
2 xylem hydraulic conductivity recovery and springtime growth patterns in walnut and peach
3 trees, *Tree Physiol.*, 22, 1211–1220, 2002.
- 4 Antonova, G. F., Stasova, V. V.: Seasonal development of phloem in Scots pine stems,
5 *Ontogenez*, 37, 368–383, 2006.
- 6 Back, E. L. and Ekman, R.: The variability of wood resin, in: Pitch control, wood resin and
7 deresination, Back, E. L. and Allen, L. H. (eds.), TAPPI Press, Atlanta, pp. xii–xiv, 2000.
- 8 Brodersen, C. R. and McElrone, A. J.: Maintenance of xylem network transport capacity: a
9 review of embolism repair in vascular plants. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 4, 108, 2013.
- 10 Christensen, C. S., Hummelshøj, P., Jensen, N.O., Larsen, B., Lohse, C., Pilegaard, K., and
11 Skov, H.: Determination of terpene flux from orange species and Norway spruce by relaxed
12 eddy accumulation, *Atmospheric Environ.*, 34, 3057–3067, 2000.
- 13 Cochard, H., Lemoine, D., Améglio, T., and Granier, A.: Mechanisms of xylem recovery
14 from winter embolism in *Fagus sylvatica*, *Tree Physiol.*, 21, 27–33, 2001.
- 15 Cristani, M., D'Arrigo, M., Mandalari, G., Castelli, F., Sarpietro, M. G., Micieli, D., Venuti,
16 V., Bisignano, G., Saija, A., and Trombetta, D.: Interaction of four monoterpenes contained in
17 essential oils with model membranes: implications for their antibacterial activity, *J. Agric.*
18 *Food Chem.*, 55, 6300–6308, 2007.
- 19 Delpierre, N., Vitasse, Y., Chuine, I., Guillemot, J., Bazot, S., Rutishauser, T. and Rathgeber,
20 C. B. K.: Temperate and boreal forest tree phenology: from organ-scale processes to
21 terrestrial ecosystem models, *Ann. For. Sci.* XX, YY–YY, 2015.
- 22 Erbilgin, N. and Colgan, L. J.: Differential effects of plant ontogeny and damage type on
23 phloem and foliage monoterpenes in jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*), *Tree Physiol.*, 32, 946–957,
24 2012.
- 25 Ghirardo, A., Koch, K., Taipale, R., Zimmer, I., Schnitzler, J.-P., and Rinne, J.:
26 Determination of de novo and pool emissions of terpenes from four common boreal/alpine
27 trees by ¹³CO₂ labelling and PTR-MS analysis, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 33, 781–792, 2010.
- 28 Grabmer, W., Graus, M., Wisthaler, A., Rappenglück, B., Steinbrecher, R., and Hansel, A.:
29 Disjunct eddy covariance measurements of monoterpene fluxes from a Norway spruce forest
30 using PTR-MS, *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.*, 239, 111–115, 2004.

- 1 Granier, A.: Evaluation of transpiration in a Douglas-fir stand by means of sap flow
2 measurements, *Tree Physiol.*, 3, 309–320, 1987.
- 3 Granström, K. M.: Wood processing as a source of terpene emissions compared to natural
4 sources, *WIT Trans. Ecol. Envir.*, 101, 263–272, 2007.
- 5 Guenther, A.: Seasonal and spatial variations in natural volatile organic compound emissions,
6 *Ecol. Appl.*, 7, 34–45, 1997.
- 7 Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P., Harley, P., Monson, R., and Fall, R.: Isoprene and
8 monoterpene emission rate variability: model evaluations and sensitivity analyses, *J.*
9 *Geophys. Res.*, 98, 12609–12617, 1993.
- 10 Hansel, A., Jordan, A., Holzinger, R., Prazeller, P., Vogel, W., and Lindinger, W.: Proton
11 transfer reaction mass spectrometry: on-line trace gas analysis at ppb level, *Int. J. Mass*
12 *Spectrom.*, 149, 609–619, 1995.
- 13 Hari, P. and Kulmala M.: Station for measuring Ecosystem–Atmosphere Relations (SMEAR
14 II), *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 10, 315–322, 2005.
- 15 Irvine, J. and Grace, J.: Continuous measurements of water tensions in the xylem of trees
16 based on the elastic properties of wood, *Planta*, 202, 455–461, 1997.
- 17 Isidorov, V. A., Zenkevich, I. G., and Ioffe, B.V.: Volatile organic compounds in the
18 atmosphere of forests, *Atm. Environ.*, 19, 1–8, 1985.
- 19 Jyske, T., Mäkinen, H., Kalliokoski, T., and Nöjd, P.: Intra-annual tracheid production of
20 Norway spruce and Scots pine across a latitudinal gradient in Finland, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*,
21 194, 241–254, 2014.
- 22 Keronen, P., Reissell, A., Chevallier, F., Siivola, E., Pohja, T., Hiltunen, V., Hatakka, J.,
23 Aalto, T., Rivier, L., Ciais, P., Jordan, A., Hari, P., Viisanen, Y., and Vesala, T.: Accurate
24 measurements of CO₂ mole fraction in the atmospheric surface layer by an affordable
25 instrumentation. *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 19 (suppl. B), 35–54, 2014.
- 26 Kolari, P., Kulmala, L., Pumpanen, J., Launiainen, S., Ilvesniemi, H., Hari, P., and Nikinmaa,
27 E.: CO₂ exchange and component CO₂ fluxes of a boreal Scots pine forest, *Boreal Environ.*
28 *Res.*, 14, 761–783, 2009.

- 1 Kolari, P., Bäck, J., Taipale, R., Ruuskanen, T. M., Kajos, M. K., Rinne, J., Kulmala, M., and
2 Hari, P.: Evaluation of accuracy in measurements of VOC emissions with dynamic chamber
3 system, *Atm. Env.*, 62, 344–351, 2012.
- 4 Langenheim, J. H.: *Plant resins: chemistry, evolution, ecology, and ethnobotany*, Timber
5 Press, Portland, Cambridge, 586 pp., 2003.
- 6 Lerda, M., Litvak, M., Palmer, P., and Monson, R.: Controls over monoterpene emissions
7 from boreal forest conifers, *Tree Physiol.*, 17, 563–569, 1997.
- 8 Lewinsohn, E., Gijzen, M., and Croteau, R.: Defence mechanisms of conifers, *Plant Physiol.*,
9 96, 44–49, 1991.
- 10 Loreto, F., Ciccioli, P., Brancaleoni, E., Cecinato, A., Frattoni, M., and Sharkey, T. D.:
11 Different sources of reduced carbon contribute to form three classes of terpenoid emitted by
12 *Quercus ilex* L. leaves, *PNAS*, 93, 9966–9969, 1996.
- 13 Martz, F., Sutinen, M.-L., Kiviniemi, S., and Palta, J. P.: Changes in freezing tolerance,
14 plasma membrane H⁺-ATPase activity and fatty acid composition in *Pinus resinosa* needles
15 during cold acclimation and de-acclimation, *Tree Physiol.*, 26, 783–790, 2006.
- 16 Mencuccini, M., Hölttä, T., Sevanto, S., and Nikinmaa, E.: Concurrent measurements of
17 change in the bark and xylem diameters of trees reveal a phloem-generated turgor signal, *New*
18 *Phytol.*, 198, 1143–1154, 2013.
- 19 Nardini, A., Lo Gullo, M. A., and Salleo, S.: Refilling embolized xylem conduits: is it a
20 matter of phloem unloading? *Plant Sci.*, 180, 604–611, 2011.
- 21 Neher, H. V.: Effects of pressures inside Monterey pine trees, *Trees*, 8, 9–17, 1993.
- 22 Niinemets, Ü. and Reichstein, M.: A model analysis of the effects of nonspecific
23 monoterpene storage in leaf tissues on emission kinetics and composition in Mediterranean
24 sclerophyllous *Quercus* species, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 16, 1–26, 2002.
- 25 Niinemets, Ü. and Reichstein, M.: Controls on the emission of plant volatiles through
26 stomata: Differential sensitivity of emission rates to stomatal closure explained, *J. Geophys.*
27 *Res.*, 108, 4208, 2003a.
- 28 Niinemets, Ü. and Reichstein, M.: Controls on the emission of plant volatiles through
29 stomata: A sensitivity analysis, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 4211, 2003b.

- 1 Ormeño, E., Goldstein, A., and Niinemets, Ü.: Extracting and trapping biogenic volatile
2 organic compounds stored in plant species, *Trends Analyt. Chem.*, 30, 978–989, 2011.
- 3 Perämäki, M., Vesala, T., and Nikinmaa, E.: Analysing the applicability of the heat balance
4 method for estimating sap flow in boreal forest conditions, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 6, 29–43,
5 2001.
- 6 Perämäki, M., Vesala, T., and Nikinmaa, E.: Modeling the dynamics of pressure propagation
7 and diameter variation in tree sapwood, *Tree Physiol.*, 25, 1091–1099, 2005.
- 8 Phillips, M. A. and Croteau, R. B.: Resin-based defences in conifers, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 4,
9 184–190, 1999.
- 10 Pirinen, P., Simola, H., Aalto, J., Kaukoranta, J.-P., Karlsson, P., and Ruuhela, R.: Tilastoja
11 Suomen ilmastosta 1981–2010, Finnish Meteorological Inst. Rep. 2012/1, 1–96, 2012.
- 12 Pittermann, J. and Sperry, J.: Tracheid diameter is the key trait determining the extent of
13 freezing-induced embolism in conifers, *Tree Physiol.*, 23, 907–914, 2003.
- 14 Pittermann, J. and Sperry, J. S.: Analysis of freeze-thaw embolism in conifers. The interaction
15 between cavitation pressure and tracheid size, *Plant Physiol.*, 140, 374–382, 2006.
- 16 Pukacki, P. M. and Kaminska-Rozek, E.: Differential effects of spring reacclimation and
17 deacclimation on cell membranes of Norway spruce seedlings, *Acta Soc. Bot. Pol.*, 82, 77–84,
18 2013.
- 19 Rockwood, D. L.: Variation in the monoterpene composition of two oleoresin systems of
20 loblolly pine, *Forest Sci.*, 19, 147–153, 1973.
- 21 Ruuskanen, T. M., Kolari, P., Bäck, J., Kulmala, M., Rinne, J., Hakola, H., Taipale, R.,
22 Raivonen, M., Altimir, N., and Hari, P.: On-line field measurements of monoterpene
23 emissions from Scots pine by proton transfer reaction - mass spectrometry, *Boreal Environ.*
24 *Res.*, 10, 553–567, 2005.
- 25 Sakr, S., Alves, G., Morillon, R., Maurel, K., Decourteix, M., Guilliot, A., Fleurat-Lessard, P.,
26 Julien, J.-L., and Chrispeels, M. J.: Plasma membrane aquaporins are involved in winter
27 embolism recovery in walnut tree, *Plant Physiol.*, 133, 630–641, 2003.
- 28 Salleo, S., Lo Gullo, M. A., DePaoli, D., and Zippo, M.: Xylem recovery from cavitation-
29 induced embolism in young plants of *Laurus nobilis*: a possible mechanism, *New Phytol.*,
30 132, 47–56, 1996.

- 1 Salleo, S., Lo Gullo, M. A., Trifilo, P., and Nardini, A.: New evidence for a role of vessel-
2 associated cells and phloem in the rapid xylem refilling of cavitated stems of *Laurus nobilis*
3 L., *Plant Cell Environ.*, 27, 1065–1076, 2004.
- 4 Sevanto, S., Vesala, T., Perämäki, M., and Nikinmaa, E.: Time lags for xylem and stem
5 diameter variations in a Scots pine tree, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 25, 1071–1077, 2002.
- 6 Sevanto, S., Hölttä, T., Markkanen, T., Perämäki, M., Nikinmaa, E., and Vesala, T.:
7 Relationships between diurnal xylem diameter variation and environmental factors in Scots
8 pine, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 10, 447–458, 2005.
- 9 Sevanto, S., Hölttä, T., and Holbrook, N. M.: Effects of the hydraulic coupling between
10 xylem and phloem on diurnal phloem diameter variation, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 34, 690–703,
11 2011.
- 12 Shao, M., Czapiewski, K.V., Heiden, A. C., Kobel, K., Komenda, M., Koppmann, R., and
13 Wildt, J.: Volatile organic compound emissions from Scots pine: mechanisms and description
14 by algorithms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 20483–20491, 2001.
- 15 Sparks, J. P., Campbell, G. S., and Black, R. A.: water content, hydraulic conductivity, and
16 ice formation in winter stems of *Pinus contorta*: a TDR case study, *Oecologia*, 127, 468–475,
17 2001.
- 18 Sperry, J. S.: Winter xylem embolism and spring recovery in *Betula cordifolia*, *Fagus*
19 *grandifolia*, *Abies balsamea* and *Picea rubens*, in: *Water Transport in Plants under Climatic*
20 *Stress*, Borghetti, M., Grace, J., and Raschi, A. (eds.), Cambridge University Press,
21 Cambridge, UK, p. 86–98, 1993.
- 22 Sperry, J. S. and Robson, J. D.: Xylem cavitation and freezing in conifers, in: Bigras, F. J. and
23 Colombo, S. (eds.): *Conifer cold hardiness*, Springer, Netherlands, 121–136, 2001.
- 24 Staudt, M. and Bertin, N.: Light and temperature dependence of the emission of cyclic and
25 acyclic monoterpenes from holm oak (*Quercus ilex* L.) leaves, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 385–
26 395, 1998.
- 27 Strömvall, A.-M. and Petersson, G.: Conifer monoterpenes emitted to air by logging
28 operations, *Scand. J. For. Res.*, 6, 253–258, 1991.
- 29 Strömvall, A.-M. and Petersson, G.: Monoterpenes emitted to air from industrial barking of
30 Scandinavian conifers, *Environ. Pollut.*, 79, 215–218, 1993.

- 1 Strömvall, A.-M. and Petersson, G.: Volatile terpenes emitted to air, in: Pitch control, wood
2 resin and deresination, Back, E. L. and Allen, L. H. (eds.), TAPPI Press, Atlanta, p. 77–99.
3 2000.
- 4 Tarvainen, V., Hakola, H., Hellén, H., Bäck, J., Hari, P., and Kulmala, M.: Temperature and
5 light dependence of the VOC emissions of Scots pine, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 989–998,
6 2005.
- 7 The Finnish Meteorological Institute Open Data: en.ilmatieteelaitos.fi/open-data, last access
8 19th February 2014.
- 9 The Finnish Meteorological Institute, Climate in Finland: <http://en.ilmatieteelaitos.fi/climate>,
10 last access 12th February 2014.
- 11 Trapp, S. and Croteau, R.: Defensive resin biosynthesis in conifers, *Annu. Rev. Plant*
12 *Physiol. Plant. Mol. Biol.*, 52, 689–724, 2001.
- 13 Trombetta, D., Castelli, F., Sarpietro, M. G., Venuti, V., Cristani, M., Daniele, C., Saija, A.,
14 Mazzanti, G., and Bisignano, G.: Mechanisms of antibacterial action of three monoterpenes,
15 *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.*, 49, 2474–2478, 2005.
- 16 Vesala, T., Hölttä, T., Perämäki, M., and Nikinmaa, E.: Refilling of a hydraulically isolated
17 embolized xylem vessel: model calculations. *Ann. Bot.*, 91, 419–428, 2003.
- 18 Wink, M.: Evolution of secondary metabolites from an ecological and molecular phylogenetic
19 perspective, *Phytochemistry*, 64, 3–19, 2003.
- 20 Wullschleger, S. D., Hanson, P. J., and Todd, D. E.: Measuring stem water content in four
21 deciduous hardwoods with a time-domain reflectometer, *Tree Physiol.*, 16, 809–815, 1996.
- 22 Yang, S. and Tyree, M. T.: A theoretical model of hydraulic conductivity recovery from
23 embolism with comparison to experimental data on *Acer saccharum*, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 15,
24 633–643, 1992.
- 25 Zwieniecki, M. A., Hutyra, L., Thompson, M. V., and Holbrook, N. M.: Dynamic changes in
26 petiole specific conductivity in red maple (*Acer rubrum* L.), tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*
27 L.) and northern fox grape (*Vitis labrusca* L.), *Plant Cell Environ.*, 23, 407–414, 2000.
- 28 Zwieniecki, M. A. and Holbrook, N. M.: Confronting Maxwell's demon: biophysics of xylem
29 embolism repair, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 14, 530–534, 2009.

1

2

1 Table 1. Environmental variables at the study site during statistical period 1981–2010 and in
 2 studied years 2012 and 2013.

	1981–2010 ¹⁾	2012 ²⁾	2013 ²⁾
Annual mean air temperature, °C	3.5	3.3	4.9
Minimum air temperature, °C	–38.1	–31.7	–29.5
	(January 1987)	(4 February)	(18 January)
Maximum air temperature, °C	33.1	27.5	29.6
	(July 2010)	(29 July)	(26 June)
Annual precipitation, mm	711	907	615
Annual maximum snow depth, cm	43	76	68
Duration of snow cover, days	227	157	179
First snow ³⁾	15 October	28 November	26 October
Snow melt	15–30 May	4 May	24 April
Thermal spring start	5 April	10 April	12 April
Start of the growing season	27 April–2 May	25 April	27 April
Annual cumulative temperature sum, degreedays	1200–1300	1161	1388
April mean temperature, °C	2.3	1.5	1.7
April minimum temperature, °C	–19.7	–16.5	–14.5
April maximum temperature, °C	23.4	13.9	11.9
April precipitation, mm	37	60	42
May mean temperature, °C	8.9	9.4	12.2
May minimum temperature, °C	–7.1	–2.9	–2.7
May maximum temperature, °C	28.2	23.8	24.9
May precipitation, mm	45	56	16

3 ¹⁾ Statistical data for years 1981–2010 is collected from Pirinen et al. (2012) and from Finnish
 4 Meteorological Institute (FMI) webpages (2014). ²⁾ Data from FMI open access data. ³⁾ Date
 5 in the previous year.

6

1 **Figure legends**

2

3 Figure 1. A–B. Temperature at 8.4 m in air and in soil A horizon ($^{\circ}\text{C}$). C–D. Weekly snow
4 depth (cm) and volumetric soil water content in A horizon ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$). Left-hand panels are for
5 April–May 2012 and right-hand panels for April–May 2013.

6

7 Figure 2. The stem enclosure around a Scots pine stem at a height of 12 m (left) and a linear
8 variable displacement transducer to measure stem radius changes (right).

9

10 Figure 3. A–B. Measured monoterpene emission (m/z 137, ng m^{-2} bark area s^{-1}) from the pine
11 stem (same location on the stem in both years). C–D. Measured monoterpene emission (m/z
12 137, ng m^{-2} total needle area s^{-1}) from a pine shoot (same shoot in both years). E–F.
13 Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) in the stem enclosure. Left-hand panels for April–May 2012, right-hand
14 panels for April–May 2013.

15

16 Figure 4. A–B. Monoterpene emission from the stem (m/z 137, ng m^{-2} bark area s^{-1}) and the
17 air temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) inside the enclosure. C–D. Stem sap flow (kg h^{-1}) and inner-bark and
18 xylem radius (μm). Left-hand panels for April 2012 and right-hand panels for April 2013. The
19 grey shading refers to the periods when the stem was frozen. The timing of the monoterpene
20 burst is marked with dotted lines in the lower panels.

21

22 Figure5. A–B. Pine stem xylem and inner-bark radius changes (μm). C–D. Stem sap flow (kg
23 day^{-1}). E–F. Vapor pressure deficit (VPD, Pa). Left-hand panels for April 2012 and right-hand
24 panels for 2013. The grey shading refers to the periods when the stem was frozen. The timing
25 of the monoterpene burst is marked with dotted lines. A closer look on the burst period is
26 provided in the Figure 4. The Roman numerals refer to the three phases of inner-bark radial
27 changes discussed in the text.

28

29

1 Figure 6. The daily sum of pine stem sap flow in 2012 (red) and 2013 (black). The timings of
2 the monoterpene bursts are marked with dashed lines. The days when the stem was frozen are
3 removed from the figure.

4

5 Figure 7. β as a function of time in 2012 and 2013. Figure shows that β (see Eq. 1), i.e. the
6 daily amplitude of the phloem vs. xylem radial change, had its maximum value briefly before
7 and during the monoterpene emission burst (dashed line). Days with occurrences of rain and
8 frozen stem were removed.

9

10 Figure 8. Temperature-corrected stem CO₂ efflux anomalies for April 2012 (A) and 2013 (B).















