

Biogeosciences Discussions is the access reviewed discussion forum of *Biogeosciences*

Spatial trends in leaf size of Amazonian rainforest trees

A. C. M. Malhado^{1,*}, Y. Malhi^{1,**}, R. J. Whittaker^{1,**}, R. J. Ladle^{1,**},
H. ter Steege^{2,**,***}, L. E. O. C. Aragão^{1,***}, C. A. Quesada^{3,***},
A. Araujo-Murakami^{4,***}, O. L. Phillips^{3,**,***}, J. Peacock^{3,***},
G. Lopez-Gonzalez^{3,***}, T. R. Baker^{3,***}, N. Butt^{1,**}, L. O. Anderson^{1,**},
L. Arroyo^{4,***}, S. Almeida^{5,***}, N. Higuchi^{6,***}, T. J. Killeen^{7,***}, A. Monteagudo^{8,***},
D. Neill^{9,***}, N. Pitman^{10,***}, A. Prieto^{11,***}, R. P. Salomão^{5,***}, N. Silva^{12,***},
R. Vásquez-Martínez^{8,***}, and W. F. Laurance^{6,***}

¹School of Geography and the Environment, Oxford University, UK

²Dept. of Plant Ecology and Biodiversity, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

³Earth and Biosphere Institute, School of Geography, University of Leeds, UK

⁴Museo Noel Kempff Mercado, Santa Cruz, Bolivia

⁵Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Belem, Brazil

⁶Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Amazônicas, Manaus, Brazil

⁷Center for Applied Biodiversity Science, Conservation International, Washington, DC, USA

⁸Herbario Vargas, Universidad Nacional San Antonio Abad del Cusco, Cusco, Perú

⁹Herbario Nacional del Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador

2125

¹⁰Center for Tropical Conservation, Duke University, Durham, USA

¹¹Inst. de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt, Bogotá D.C, Colombia

¹²CIFOR, Tapajos, Brazil

*Conceived the study, collected leaf data, undertook the analysis.

**Worked on the manuscript.

***Contributed data.

Received: 17 December 2008 – Accepted: 26 January 2009 – Published: 23 February 2009

Correspondence to: A. C. M. Malhado (ana.malhado@ouce.ox.ac.uk)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Abstract

Leaf size influences many aspects of tree function such as rates of transpiration and photosynthesis and, consequently, often varies in a predictable way in response to environmental gradients. The recent development of pan-Amazonian databases based on permanent botanical plots (e.g. RAINFOR, ATDN) has now made it possible to assess trends in leaf size across environmental gradients in Amazonia. Previous plot-based studies have shown that the community structure of Amazonian trees breaks down into at least two major ecological gradients corresponding with variations in soil fertility (decreasing south to northeast) and length of the dry season (increasing from northwest to south and east). Here we describe the results of the geographic distribution of leaf size categories based on 121 plots distributed across eight South American countries. We find that, as predicted, the Amazon forest is predominantly populated by tree species and individuals in the mesophyll size class (20.25–182.25 cm²). The geographic distribution of species and individuals with large leaves (>20.25 cm²) is complex but is generally characterized by a higher proportion of such trees in the north-west of the region. Spatially corrected regressions reveal weak correlations between the proportion of large-leaved species and metrics of water availability. We also find a significant negative relationship between leaf size and wood density.

1 Introduction

Leaf size is one of the most plastic traits of a tree and it is not uncommon to see great variability within genera, species, individuals within a species, and even between the same individual at different stages of development (e.g. sapling, canopy tree) or on different parts of the same tree (e.g. sun versus shade leaves). Despite this very large variation it is often possible to detect significant associations between a range of environmental variables and leaf size. For example, Givnish (1987) reviewed comparative studies of leaf form and concluded that effective leaf size – the width of a leaf or its

2127

lobes or leaflets – increases along gradients of increasing rainfall, humidity and/or soil fertility, and decreases with increasing irradiance. Leaf size also tends to decrease with elevation on mountains in regions receiving high rainfall at low elevation, and to increase and then decrease with elevation in more arid regions. Givnish (1987) also observed that older plants often possess smaller leaves than younger ones of the same species.

The existence of broad-scale (macrogeographic) environment-leaf size correlations probably reflect the evolutionary response of this trait to its environment (Givnish, 1987; Westoby et al., 2002). The size of leaves on a tree can therefore be productively considered as a “solution” to the complex environmental “problems” of, most notably, light capture for photosynthesis (Falster and Westoby, 2003), economics of gas and water vapour exchange (Givnish and Vermeij, 1976; Givnish, 1984), avoidance of heat stress from intense sunlight, mechanical stability (Westoby et al., 2002), and defence against herbivores (Moles and Westoby, 2000). Certainly the size of a leaf is by no means ecologically trivial since, as Givnish (1987) points out, leaf size variation will have a direct effect on whole-plant growth rate, mainly through size-related changes in the conductance of the boundary layer, which affects heat exchange, uptake of carbon dioxide and loss of water vapour.

Leaf size theory predicts that the costs and benefits of a “large leaf” or a “small leaf” strategy should vary in a predictable way with environmental parameters such as humidity, water availability, and soil fertility (Parkhurst and Loucks, 1972; Givnish and Vermeij, 1976; Givnish, 1978, 1979, 1984; Westoby et al., 2002). Larger leaves have a thicker boundary layer of slow-moving, non-turbulent air and slower convective heat loss and therefore tend to be hotter than ambient air temperature when exposed to net incoming radiation. This can be disadvantageous, especially in areas where water is limiting, because it may lead to higher rates of respiration and decreased rates of photosynthesis (Lloyd and Farquhar, 2008) through the following mechanism: higher leaf temperatures cause a higher water vapour deficit that, in turn, leads to increased transpiration/water loss. The plant adaptively responds to this by closing stomata, which

2128

has the net effect of reducing CO₂ uptake and reducing the rate of photosynthesis. Increased water acquisition costs would therefore be expected to favour smaller leaves (Givnish, 1987). With respect to soil fertility, trees growing in oligotrophic (low nutrient) soils will be more limited in their rate of construction of photosynthetic enzymes and therefore benefit less from temperature-related increases in photosynthetic metabolism – once again favouring the evolution and development of smaller leaves (Givnish, 1984, 1987).

The complex nature of the relationship between environment and leaf size is further reflected by the considerable variation in leaf size that can be observed within areas with similar macroclimatic conditions (Cornelissen, 1999). In other words, many different leaf size strategies frequently co-exist in physically similar environments. It is likely that within-site (or plot) variation in leaf size arises because the ecological opportunities for each species are also strongly dependent on the other species present in the community (Westoby et al., 2002). Thus, the ability of a species to establish successfully in a habitat may be dependent upon which other species are present and may be influenced by other traits apart from leaf form and size. These complex trade-offs and the multiple selective pressures on leaf size have generated considerable diversity in this trait, even between ecologically similar species (Ackerly, 1996).

Care should be taken not to interpret everything purely in terms of optimisation of a single trait (leaf size) since developmental and physiological constraints and trade-offs (cf. Dawkins, 1982) may also play a role in determining leaf size. This is clearly illustrated by the associations between leaf size and canopy architecture and branching morphology (Midgley and Bond, 1989; Ackerly and Donoghue, 1998). Furthermore, these latter traits may, in turn, influence leaf size evolution independent of ecophysiological function (Ackerly and Reich, 1999). An example of the importance of such trade-offs could be the commonly observed negative relationship between wood density and leaf size (reviewed in Wright et al., 2007). The explanation for this relationship is still uncertain but may relate to the higher hydraulic conductivity of trees with low-density wood that allows them to deploy a larger total leaf area per stem (Wright et

2129

al., 2007). Alternatively, this relationship is perhaps related to the “pioneer-climax” tree gradient or may be due to co-varying factors that do not directly affect each other and are therefore difficult to identify. However, the fact that there is still considerable variation in leaf size between species with similar wood densities suggests that this is by no means the whole story.

Despite the fact that ecologists have had a long-standing interest in explaining variations in leaf size between, and within, species and habitats it is still a subject that appears far from resolution. For instance, Westoby et al. (2002) consider the leaf size–twig size spectrum of ecological variation as being fundamental to our understanding of the texture and function of forest canopies, but acknowledge that the costs and benefits of large versus small leaf and twig size are still poorly understood. Ackerly and Reich (1999) also feel obliged to admit that, “variation [in leaf size] among species within habitats is still poorly explained”.

Givnish (1987), in his agenda-setting review of comparative studies in leaf form, suggests two methodological approaches that may lead towards a better understanding of leaf size. Firstly, in-depth physiological studies may be able to tease apart the various constraints and trade-offs that affect leaf size (e.g. Parkhurst and Loucks’ (1972) general eco-physiological model of leaf size). Secondly, broader comparative studies are required, since the more intensive physiologically-based approaches will necessarily be subject to biases stemming from a range of genetic influences such as linkage, epistasis and pleiotropy that are peculiar to the study population, in addition to any influence of natural selection.

In this paper we adopt the broader comparative approach advocated by Givnish (1987). With the recent creation of very large databases of Amazonian trees based on permanent plots scattered throughout the Amazon region it has now become possible to conduct a comprehensive study of broad scale patterns of leaf size variation within the largest block of rainforest in the world. Here, we use the RAINFOR database of 121 permanent plots to: 1) describe the spatial distribution of leaf size categories across the Amazon Basin and Guyana Shield, and; 2) investigate the envi-

2130

ronmental factors driving regional scale patterns in leaf size. We do this to gain further insights into the ecological significance of leaf size and improve our understanding of the functioning of the Amazonian rainforest.

Specifically, we seek answers to the following questions:

- 5 – Which leaf size categories predominate in the canopy of the Amazon rainforest?
- Are there spatial patterns in leaf size distribution in the Amazon?
- Are the frequencies of different leaf size categories associated with environmental variables that reflect their adaptive function (e.g. rainfall, soil fertility, and length of dry season)?
- 10 – Are leaf size categories associated with the growth strategy of trees?
- Are leaf size and wood density negatively correlated?

More specifically, we will be testing the following key hypotheses about leaf size in Amazonia: a) small leaves are an adaptation to relatively drier conditions and will show a macrogeographic pattern that reflects this; b) small leaves are favoured on
15 oligotrophic soils; and c) there is a negative relationship between leaf size and wood density.

2 Methods

2.1 Database construction

Our main source of data and research tool for exploring spatial variation in leaf size
20 categories across the Amazon basin was the RAINFOR database (Peacock et al., 2007¹) and 26 data plots from Guyanas and Suriname compiled by the ATDN network (ter Steege et al., 2003). The database has been constructed using information

¹<http://www.rainfor.org>

from 141 permanent plots distributed across eight South American countries (Malhi et al., 2002). However, not all data were available for all plots, so plots lacking relevant environmental data were removed from certain analyses. Furthermore, 20 plots were excluded from the study because they had >30% of species that were either unident-
5 fied at species level (475 species from entire database) or for which herbarium/flora data were not available (61 species). As a consequence, numbers of plots included in the analyses varied from 51 to 121. The database at the time of extraction for this study (August 2006) contained 111 123 individual trees (>100 mm DBH) from 3324 species.

The plots used in this study span local and regional environmental gradients that nat-
10 urally occur in Amazonia, including mature forests that are seasonally flooded, water-logged, and non-flooded lowland terra firme (88% of plots) forests on both clay-rich and white-sand substrates. All sites consisted of an apparently mature old-growth forest with natural gap-phase dynamics and a canopy dominated by non-pioneer species. None of the plots is believed to have experienced any recent human-caused distur-
15 bance. The individual plots range in size from 0.25 to 9 ha (1.17 ha±1.04=mean±SD) and in total encompass 141.5 ha of forest. The density of stems per plot (including undetermined stems) ranged from 265 to 1307 per ha (672±167 per ha=mean±SD).

To this existing database, information was added on leaf size for each (2788) species using images from floras and herbaria (Table 1). Leaf-size was determined from the
20 herbarium or flora specimen using the geometric leaf-size classification of Raunkiaer (1934) as modified by Webb (1959). Raunkiaer (1934) defined six leaf-size classes: leptophyll (leaves up to 0.25 cm² in area), nanophyll (0.25–2.25 cm²), microphyll (2.25–20.25 cm²), mesophyll (20.25–182.25 cm²), macrophyll (182.25–1640.25 cm²), and megaphyll (>1640.25 cm²). Webb (1959) divided the mesophyll size class into two
25 further size classes (see Table 2): notophyll (20.25–45.0 cm²) and mesophyll (45.0–182.25 cm²).

2.2 Leaf size metrics

The spatial patterns of variation in leaf size were assessed through the use of several simple metrics, which then acted as dependent variables within OLS (Ordinary Least Squares) regressions. Following Dolph and Dilcher (1980), our main metrics for describing the geographic distribution of leaf sizes are the proportion of *species* or *individuals* that possess large leaves (category 5, mesophyll; category 6, macrophyll; and category 7, megaphyll). Where appropriate for analysis or illustration we also collapse categories 6 and 7 into a combined “very-large” leaves category (Table 2). Furthermore, palm trees were placed in a separate palm-leaf category and were only used to report abundance.

2.3 Geographic trends in leaf size

Recent studies (e.g. Baker et al., 2004; Malhi et al., 2004; ter Steege et al., 2006) have demonstrated consistent ecological differences in tree characteristics (including a variety of leaf traits – Malhado, 2008) across different regions of the Amazon. Here, to aid direct comparisons with these studies, we follow the practice of splitting the Amazon into four main regions: Region 1, North Amazonia, containing plots from Guyana, Suriname and Venezuela; Region 2, North-West Amazonia, containing plots from Ecuador, Colombia, and North Peru; Region 3, Central and East Amazonia, all Brazilian plots (states of Amazonas and Pará only); Region 4, South-West Amazonia, containing plots from Bolivia and South Peru.

Leaf size could be associated with the size of the tree if tall or short species tend to have leaves of characteristic sizes. To control for this potential association, trees were separated into three different height ranges that were analysed separately using DBH (diameter at breast height) as a proxy for height: small trees (≤ 200 mm DBH), medium trees (> 200 mm to < 400 mm DBH), and large trees (≥ 400 mm DBH). The regional distribution of leaf size might also be affected by the distribution of the largest family, the Fabaceae, so analyses were repeated both with the Fabaceae removed dataset and

2133

within the Fabaceae dataset.

To better detect and visualize regional patterns in leaf size categories, taking into account tree diameters, we also quantified the relative contribution (proportion) of each leaf size (categories 1 to 6) across eight tree trunk diameter (DBH) classes (100–190 mm, >190–280 mm, >280–370 mm, >370–480 mm, >480–550 mm, >550–640 mm, >640–730 mm, >730 mm) for each region. The relative abundance was quantified through a two-stage process: first, the proportion of trees within each DBH category within a region was calculated; second, relative proportion of each size class across the four regions was calculated (proportion of trees in DBH category, and region, / sum of proportions in category for all regions).

2.4 Life history metrics

In this paper, we define the growth strategy of each species through a simple index (henceforth referred to as the pioneer index) based on expert judgment. This index reflects the degree of consensus among botanists familiar with the taxa, in this case Oliver Phillips, Rodolfo Vásquez-Martínez, and Abel Monteagudo, and was cross-referenced with herbarium material collector’s labels. To calculate the index each taxon was judged independently by each botanist and given a value between zero (“non-pioneer”) and one (“pioneer”). The pioneer index was then calculated as the average score for each species. Wood density for each species was calculated using information available in the RAINFOR database (Baker and Lopez-Gonzalez, 2006) and derived from published sources (Baker et al., 2004; Peacock et al., 2007).

2.5 Environmental variables

The choices of independent (predictor) variables for our spatially controlled regression models were based on both observation and theory. Since one of the main hypotheses is that small leaves in tropical forests are an adaptation to relatively drier conditions (Givnish, 1984, 1987), we used a series of metrics of precipitation retrieved from the

2134

monthly TRMM (Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission -TRMM 3B43-V6, 0.25° spatial resolution). This product combines multiple data sources including satellite information on rainfall with ground precipitation gauge adjustment (Huffman and Bolvin, 2007). These data have recently been shown to represent the rainfall patterns over the Amazonian region (Aragão et al., 2007). For each month we calculate the average mean from 1998 to 2005. The monthly mean surfaces (one for each month of the year, combining twelve geo-referenced surfaces) were then used to estimate for each pixel: (1) the annual rainfall (mm year^{-1}), based on the sum of the monthly values; (2) the standard deviation (SD) of rainfall within the year, as a measure of seasonality; (3) the maximum climatological water deficit (MWD; mm), calculated by assuming that the evapotranspiration rate is approximately $100 \text{ mm month}^{-1}$ in tropical forests and a cumulative deficit is thus incurred if the rainfall is less than this value (Aragão et al., 2007); and (4) the length of the dry season, as the number of months with rainfall $< 100 \text{ mm}$ (Fig. 1). Although crude, the MWD is thought to be a useful indicator of meteorologically-induced water stress without taking into account local soil conditions and plant adaptations, which are poorly understood in Amazonia (Aragão et al., 2007).

Small leaves may also be favoured on oligotrophic soils even under wet conditions (Givnish, 1987) and we therefore used data on soil fertility (sum of bases), where available (51 plots, Quesada 2008). Soil sampling for the sites was carried out in accordance with a standard protocol developed for the RAINFOR project². Soil pits were situated at representative locations for the dominant soil and topographic positions, usually located a few metres outside the permanent sample plots in order to reduce potential disturbances. All the soil samples (Quesada, 2008) were analysed and exchangeable Ca, Mg, K, Na and Al were determined by the silver thiourea method (Pleysier and Juo, 1980) as described in detail in ISRI (1995). The sum of bases (SB) was calculated as: $[\text{SB}] = [\text{Ca}] + [\text{Mg}] + [\text{K}] + [\text{Na}]$ (Units: mmol kg^{-1}). Soil analyses ranged from regional to global scales and used individual leaf size categories (leaf categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) and clustered categories (small, large, “very-large”) for par-

²<http://www.geog.leeds.ac.uk/projects/rainfor/projdocs.html>

tial datasets (all trees, Fabaceae removed, only Fabaceae) while controlling for tree diameter (small DBH, median DBH, large DBH).

2.6 Statistical analysis

Leaf size characteristics varied considerably within taxonomic groups in the study suggesting that it is unnecessary to control formally for phylogeny. However, RAINFOR plots do show a degree of spatial clustering and ecological and physical variables may therefore be more similar (or dissimilar) because of spatial proximity and it is therefore appropriate to account statistically for spatial autocorrelation (Legendre, 1993). With multiple variables it is a common strategy to perform Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions of response variables (in this case metrics of leaf size) on the raw environmental factors and use Moran's I correlograms to check for the presence of spatial autocorrelation in the residuals (Rangel et al., 2006). When correlograms showed evidence of spatial autocorrelation we used a spatial filtering approach to control for the influence of spatial position on the relationship between explanatory and response variables. Furthermore, we tested for an association between the sum of bases (plot soil fertility data) and proportion of leaf size categories adjusting for the number of degrees of freedom using Dutilleul's (1993) method. All spatial analyses were performed using the software Spatial Analysis in Macroecology (SAM v2) (Rangel et al., 2006).

Trends in the distribution of the various leaf size metrics (see Materials and Methods) in relation to the four Amazonian regions (regional analyses) were assessed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). We also used ANOVA to assess relationship between leaf size categories and pioneer index/wood density. These analyses were performed using SPSS 14.0. Significance level were set at 5% (0.05) for all inferential statistics.

3 Results

3.1 Abundance of leaf size categories

Based on our analysis of herbaria specimens, among the 2788 studied *species* 50% fell into the mesophyll category (category 5), 1.2% leptophyll, 1.3% nanophyll, 7.6% microphyll, 23.6% notophyll, 13.7% macrophyll, and 0.1% megaphyll (Fig. 2). The final 2% were palms, which were excluded from further analysis. The proportion of *individual* trees that fall into different leaf size categories closely mirrored the observed proportion of *species*: 52.4% of 84 554 individual trees fell into mesophyll category, 1.3% were leptophyll, 0.6% nanophyll, 4.1% microphyll, 18.5% notophyll, 11.9% macrophyll, and 0.6% megaphyll (Figure 2). Palms account for 10.5% of the total number of individual trees across the studied plots.

Leaf size classes are broadly distributed within and between families. This is clearly illustrated by the proportion of families that contain species in two leaf size categories (24.7%), three leaf size categories (29.6%) or four leaf size categories (30.9%). Only 13.6% of the families were characterized by all their species belonging to a single leaf size category – although it is important to note that the vast majority of these families contained only 1 or 2 species. The species rich Fabaceae family are the group with the largest distribution of leaf size categories and are characterised by species that are represented in 6 (out of the 7) leaf classes.

The leaf size distribution of the largest families (those with >60 species) follows a humped distribution with a distinct peak in the mesophyll leaf category (Fig. 3). Further analyses on families where all species possess simple leaves and on families displaying at least one species with compound leaves (leaflets), also followed a humped distribution. Two families deviate from the general form: the Fabaceae and Myrtaceae, both of which are characterized by a flatter distribution (lower kurtosis) of leaf size categories (Fig. 3).

2137

3.2 Spatial trends in leaf size

There is a significant difference in the mean proportion of *species* with large leaves (categories 5 to 7) among the four Amazonian regions ($n=121$, $df=3$, $F=14.455$, $p<0.001$), with plots from northwest Amazonia (Region 2) possessing a greater proportion of larger-leaved *species* on average than plots from the other regions (Fig. 4). It is interesting to note that Region 4 appears to consist of two quantitatively distinct clusters of plots (Fig. 4), a northwestern set and a southeastern set. The northwestern cluster (nearest to Region 2) features forests with a similar proportion of large-leaved trees to those found in plots in Region 2. When the analysis is repeated using the two largest leaf size categories (categories 6 and 7), a significant difference is found between the mean proportion of species with leaves in these classes between all 4 regions. In this case, northwest Amazonia (Region 2) once again has the greatest proportion of species with the largest leaves, followed by southwest Amazonia (Region 4), central and eastern Amazonia (Region 3), and finally, north Amazonia (Region 1).

Very similar geographical patterns are observed when we consider relative abundance of *individual* trees with large leaves (categories 5 to 7), or 'very-large' leaves (categories 6 and 7) and these regional differences remain when we control for the diameter of a tree (using DBH). The mean proportion of *individual* trees with DBH smaller or equal to 200 mm with large leaves (categories 5 to 7) is significantly different among the four regions ($n=92$, $df=3$, $F=4.669$, $p=0.004$). In this case, Tukey's post-hoc test reveals that the difference is being driven by Region 1 (north Amazonia), which is characterized by a lower mean proportion of large leaves than the other regions. The regional gradient found is similar to the one described above: northwest Amazonia (Region 2) having the greatest mean proportion of large leaves, followed by southwest Amazonia (Region 4), then central and eastern Amazonia (Region 3), and finally north Amazonia (Region 1), which had the lowest mean proportion of large-leaved trees. We found an identical pattern of significant regional differences ($n=92$, $df=3$, $F=5.969$, $p=0.001$) for medium-sized trees (>200 mm to <400 mm DBH) with large leaves. In-

2138

terestingly, there are no significant regional differences in the mean proportion of large trees ($DBH \geq 400$ mm) with large leaves ($n=92$, $df=3$, $F=0.808$, $p=0.493$).

There is still a significant difference among the four regions in terms of the mean proportion of trees with large leaves (and “very-large” leaves) when we control for the possible influence of the numerically abundant Fabaceae family. Specifically, when all the Fabaceae trees are removed from the analysis there was a significant difference observed for *individual* trees with large leaves among the regions ($n=118$, $df=3$, $F=13.068$, $p<0.001$). Tukey’s post-hoc test reveals two distinct clusters: 1) north and southwest Amazonia (Regions 1 and 4) that display a lower mean proportion of trees with large leaves, and 2) northwest Amazonia and central-eastern Amazonia (regions 2 and 3) that display a higher mean proportion of trees with large leaves. An identical geographical pattern and level of significance was observed when the proportion of trees with “very-large” leaves (classes 6 and 7) was used as the dependent variable ($n=118$, $df=3$, $F=7.464$, $p<0.001$).

When the analysis was repeated within the Fabaceae we found a weakly significant difference among the regions in the mean proportion of trees with large leaves ($n=118$, $df=3$, $F=2.715$, $p=0.048$). In this case northwest Amazonia (Region 2) still contains the largest mean proportion of Fabaceae trees with large leaves although Tukey’s post hoc test revealed that none of the means (regional mean) are statistically different from each other. However, when the same test is performed using the mean proportion of Fabaceae trees with “very-large” leaves a strongly significant result is gained ($n=118$, $df=3$, $F=4.639$, $p=0.004$), once again following the “typical” geographic pattern outlined above: trees with “very-large” leaves being relatively less abundant in north and southwest Amazonia and relatively more abundant in northwest Amazonia and central-eastern Amazonia.

The mean frequency of different leaf size categories shows a consistent pattern across the four Amazonian regions and is characterized by the dominance of individual trees in the mesophyll category (Fig. 5a). Region 1 (North Amazonia) has a slightly larger frequency of smaller-leaved individuals (Fig. 5a). An almost identical pattern of

2139

mesophyll dominance is repeated when the most numerically abundant and species rich family, the Fabaceae, are removed from the dataset with Region 1 conforming most closely to the “typical” pattern (Fig. 5b). When the size distribution of individuals within the Fabaceae is plotted each region appears to have its own singular distribution (Fig. 5c) testifying to the unique and unusual ecology of this remarkable family.

We also looked at the relative proportion of individual trees in each leaf size category in relation to regions and DBH classes (Fig. 6). The distribution of trees in leaf size categories 1 and 2 is in concordance with the distribution of Fabaceae across the regions and DBH size classes. Relative proportions of trees in leaf size categories 3 and 4 are relatively even among our regions, although it is possible to detect a slight increase in relative proportion for region 4 for trees in the higher DBH ranks (Fig. 6). The relative proportions of trees in leaf size classes 5 and 6 are very consistent in smaller DBH categories but show a trend of increasing regional separation in the higher DBH categories (Fig. 6). Regional analysis of small (classes 1 to 4 combined) and large leaves (classes 5 to 7 combined) reveals a singular pattern in Region 4 (southwest Amazonia), which is distinguished by a higher proportion of large DBH trees that possess either smaller leaves or larger leaves (Fig. 7). Region 1 shows a trend of a relatively lower proportion of large leaved trees in larger DBH categories (Fig. 7).

3.3 Leaf size and tree characteristics

Species with small leaves show significantly lower “pioneer” scores than *species* with large leaves ($n=1358$, $df=1$, $F=7.822$, $p=0.005$). A more detailed analysis using leaf categories one to six also shows a significant difference in identified growth strategy among the classes ($n=1358$, $df=5$, $F=3.978$, $p=0.001$). Tukey’s post-hoc test reveals that the significance is being primarily driven by the growth strategy of *species* with large leaves (category 6)³, which are characterized by almost 40% higher mean

³Species in the largest leaf size category (7) were not significant in this test, possibly because they account for a very small proportion (0.1%) of the total number of species.

2140

scores than *species* with smaller leaf sizes (categories 3, 4 and 5). Unsurprisingly, when *species* in the two largest leaf size categories (6 and 7) are compared against all the other smaller categories (1 to 5), significantly higher index values are observed in *species* with large leaves ($n=1358$, $df=1$, $F=12.927$, $P<0.001$).

5 *Species* with large leaves (categories 5 to 7) have lower wood density (approximately 10% less) when compared with *species* with small leaves (categories 1 to 4) ($n=967$, $df=1$, $F=26.097$, $p<0.001$; mean wood density large leaves: 0.62; small leaves: 0.68). This pattern repeats itself when we looked at the largest leaves (categories 6 to 7) against smaller leaves (categories 1 to 5) ($n=967$, $df=1$, $F=33.905$, $p<0.001$). *Individual* trees with small leaves tend to have larger diameters (DBH), while larger leaves present smaller diameters although, interestingly, it is also possible to find *individual* trees with large DBH possessing large leaves.

3.4 Environmental correlates of leaf size

15 The proportion of *species* per site with large leaves was significantly correlated with three precipitation metrics used in the study: length of the dry season (months <100 mm rainfall), maximum water deficit, and a metric of the variation in water availability based on the standard deviation of total rainfall (full results given in Table 3). However, no significant relationships were seen at the *individual* level or for *species* or *individuals* when the leaf size metric was the proportion of trees per plot with “very-large” leaves (categories 6 and 7).

20 When we controlled for diameter of the *individual* trees, we found only one significant association: between the proportion of medium-sized *individual* trees (DBH>200 and <400 mm) with large leaves (categories 5 to 7) and MWD. No other associations were observed between the data subsets – i) trees with small diameter (DBH<200 mm), and ii) large trees (DBH>400 mm) – and the precipitation metrics (TRMM variables) for either large or “very-large” (categories 6 and 7) leaves (Table 3).

Analyses of the large leaf subsets of data controlling for the influence of the Fabaceae – with Fabaceae trees removed and with only Fabaceae trees included

2141

– also resulted in a small number of significant correlations (Table 3). When the Fabaceae were removed, the proportion of trees with large leaves and “very-large” leaves did not correlate with any variables. However, when the Fabaceae were analysed separately significant correlations were found between the proportion of trees with large leaves and length of the dry season. The proportion of Fabaceae individuals with “very-large” leaves only correlated with the coefficient of variation (SD) of rainfall (Table 3).

5 The relationship between soil fertility and leaf size was complex and revealed no strong patterns or consistent associations. From the global dataset (individual and clustered leaf categories of proportion of *individual* trees and *species*) only one correlation was significant – between the proportion of *individual* trees with leaf size 1 and soil fertility (Table 4). There was no correlation between small DBH trees and soil fertility, median DBH trees are only correlated with leaf size category 1 (Table 4) and large DBH trees were correlated with category 6, category 7, and the “very-large” leaf size category (Table 4). No correlations were found when we removed the Fabaceae, while only categories 6 and “very-large” leaves were correlated within the Fabaceae trees subset (Table 4).

15 Analyses within region 2 did not reveal any significant correlation with soil fertility and leaf size, while analyses within Region 3 (Central-East Amazonia) produced only one significant (positive) correlation between *individual* trees and leaf size category 1. An interesting contrast is found in Region 4 (Southwest Amazonia) with 18 significant results supporting an inverse correlation between the proportions of *individual* trees with large leaves and soil fertility (Table 4) – the opposite trend to that observed by previous authors (Wright et al., 2007).

25 4 Discussion

Richards (1952), in his pioneering study on tropical rainforests, noted that plants of different families in a tropical forest tended towards similar morphologies far more than

2142

species, even of the same genera, in temperate forests. This is very apparent for traits such as leaf size, where species within tropical forests can be remarkably homogenous in the leaf size properties that they possess. In lowland rainforests the predominant leaf size category is mesophyll (*sensu* Raunkiaer, 1934) – Grubb and his colleagues describe 64% of species in Ecuador, 84% of their sample in Brazil, and 98% of their sample in Australia as belonging to the mesophyll category (Grubb et al., 1963). Turner (2001) proposes that trees in this category normally constitute approximately three-quarters of all species in lowland tropical rainforests across the globe. The current study supports these findings, with 73.6% of species identified belonging to this size category. This result also supports the observation that the mesophyll category dominates in Neotropical rainforests (Grubb et al., 1963; Thompson et al., 1992; Kelly et al., 1994). Another characteristic feature of tropical rainforests is to have a small proportion of (non-palm) species with very large leaves. Once again this was further supported by this study in that we observed 0.01% of species with leaves in the megaphyll size category.

4.1 Spatial trends in leaf size

Our study demonstrates complex patterns of variation in leaf size characteristics across the Amazon rainforest. At the crudest level of analysis there is a trend of larger proportions of individuals and species in large leaf size categories in the western plots. The relatively lower proportion of trees with large leaves in the Guiana Shield region may be due to the high proportion of Fabaceae in this area, many of which are characterized by the possession small leaves.

These spatial trends in leaf size can be interpreted in relation to previous macrogeographic studies in the Amazon. Most significantly, ter Steege et al. (2006) recently used inventory data to identify two major gradients in tree composition and function across Amazonia. The first gradient stretches from the Guiana Shield to southwestern Amazonia and is primarily characterized by changes in the abundance of several common species of legumes in the Guyanas. This observed gradient in tree composition

2143

is paralleled by declines in functional traits such as wood density and seed mass. The main ecological driver of this gradient is hypothesized to be a gradient of increasingly poorer soils as one approaches the northeastern corner of Amazonia. The second gradient stretches from Colombia to southeastern Amazonia and is characterized by the increasing presence of more drought-adapted species in the forests on the southeastern edge of Amazonia, which is postulated to be driven by a parallel gradient of dry season length (ter Steege et al., 2006).

In the present study the relative predominance of larger-leaved species in west and southwest Amazonia closely aligns with the scores for the second axis of ter Steege's DCA analysis of genus level community composition (ter Steege et al., 2006) and indicates a possible influence of length of the dry season on leaf size. This interpretation is further supported, although weakly, by the spatially-corrected OLS regressions, which identified three metrics of water availability (see materials and methods) as being significantly associated with the proportion of tree species with large leaves. However, the data do not generate a clear signal when individual trees are split into DBH classes, when the Fabaceae are excluded from the dataset, or when the Fabaceae are analysed independently. In summary, the data presented here do not provide any clear support for the work of Webb (1959) and Dolph and Dilcher (1980), who suggested that leaf size in rainforests is positively correlated with annual rainfall.

4.2 Leaf size and tree characteristics

The postulated functional association between water availability and leaf size may also underlie the observed negative relationship between leaf size and wood density. Wright et al. (2007) argue that trees with lower wood density have larger-diameter stem vessels and can therefore transport more water and have a greater total leaf area per stem. As interspecific variation in leaf area per stem is driven more by leaf size than number of leaves (e.g. Ackerly, 2004), all other things being equal, species with low density wood tend to have larger leaves. Wood density might therefore contribute to the observed relationship between the water availability metrics and leaf size if the enhanced

2144

water transport abilities of large-leaved, low wood density species is a disadvantage in sites with lower water availability.

It should be noted, however, that wood density itself has a complex relationship with precipitation. Thus, while Wiemann and Williamson (2002) found a positive correlation between wood density and mean annual precipitation in their comparison of North American and South American tree communities, ter Steege and Hammond (2001) found that the variation in mean wood density within the Guyanas was not correlated with precipitation. On the other hand, Barajas-Morales (1987) found that mean wood density was negatively related to precipitation in two tropical forests in Mexico. Wood density has also been observed to vary between Amazonian regions and with altitude. A recent study in the Amazon described a complex spatial pattern of significant decreases in wood density with increasing altitude and significant differences among low-altitude Amazonian regions: the forests of western Amazonia have significantly lower mean wood density than those of eastern and central Amazonia (Chave et al., 2006). In conclusion, wood density should be considered as one potentially important factor driving spatial trends in leaf size in Amazonia but further manipulative and comparative work is clearly desirable in order to better understand the complex trade-offs and selective pressures on these two traits.

5 Conclusions

This study set out to address three key hypotheses. First, that small leaves are an adaptation to relatively drier conditions and will show a macrogeographic pattern that reflects this. The regional distribution of leaf size categories is broadly consistent with this hypothesis, although the spatially corrected regressions failed to provide strong evidence for quantitative relationships between leaf size and precipitation metrics. Second, that small leaves are favoured on oligotrophic soils. No evidence was found in support of this hypothesis, possibly because of the numerous trade-offs with other ecological and physiological factors, or the limitations of the soil data used in the analysis.

2145

Finally, that there is a negative relationship between leaf size and wood density. Like many other studies we found strong support in favour of this hypothesis, suggesting that this relationship is one of the constraints on leaf size evolution.

Although the regional trends in leaf size described here fit well with our current understanding of the macroecology of the Amazon, other factors not easily be picked up at this resolution of analysis may also be influencing observed patterns. Regional trends in leaf size might also be influenced by allometry, development and phylogeny in constraining the expression of this trait in different ways in different habitats (Cornelissen, 1999). It is even possible that other factors, such as herbivory, may also influence the geographic distribution of leaf size since small leaves are often thicker and more resistant to herbivores. Moles and Westoby (2000) have argued that species with smaller leaves may suffer less herbivory during leaf expansion because the leaf expands for a shorter period. Finally, it should also be noted that while single plot-based attributes such as proportion of trees in a given leaf size category may produce useful correlates with biophysical variables at large spatial scales, these may break down under varying spatial, temporal and environmental scales (Gillison and Carpenter, 1997), thus limiting their utility. However, despite these difficulties in inferring causal relationships, macrogeographic studies of functional traits, such as leaf size, clearly provide important tools to help describe the still poorly-understood functional ecology of Amazonia (ter Steege et al., 2006).

Acknowledgements. We thank Ingolf Kühn for advice about spatial analyses; Mike Ladle for comments and copy-editing; and the whole RAINFOR network. Corine Vriesendorp, Finn Borchsenius, Barbara M. Thiers, and Luc Willemse have provided herbaria data. Ana Malhado's PhD was funded by Oxford University's Clarendon and ORS scholarships.

2146

References

- Ackerly, D. D.: Canopy structure and dynamics: integration of growth processes in tropical pioneer trees, in: *Tropical Forest Plant Ecophysiology*, Chapman and Hall, NY, US, 619–658, 1996.
- 5 Ackerly, D. D. and Donoghue, M. J.: Leaf size, sapling allometry, and Corner's rules: phylogeny and correlated evolution in maples (*Acer*), *Am. Nat.*, 152, 767–791, 1998.
- Ackerly, D. D. and Reich, P. B.: Convergence and correlations among leaf size and function in seed plants: a comparative test using independent contrasts, *Am. J. Bot.* 9, 1272–1281, 1999.
- 10 Ackerly, D. D.: Functional strategies of chaparral shrubs in relation to seasonal water deficit and disturbance, *Ecol. Monogr.*, 74, 25–44, 2004.
- Aragão, L. E. O. C., Malhi, Y., Roman-Cuesta, R. M., Saatchi, S., Anderson, L. O., and Shimabukuro, Y. E.: Spatial patterns and fire response of recent Amazonian droughts, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L07701, doi:10.1029/2006GL028946, 2007.
- 15 Baker, T. R., Phillips, O. L., Malhi, Y., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Di Fiore, A., Erwin, T., Killeen, T., Laurance, S. G., Laurance, W. F., Lewis, S. L., Lloyd, J., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D. A., Patiño, S., Pitman, N. C., Silva, J. N. M., and Vásquez-Martínez, R.: Variation in wood density determines spatial patterns in Amazonian forest biomass, *Global Change Biol.*, 10, 1–18, 2004.
- 20 Baker, T. R. and Lopez-Gonzalez, G.: Wood density, in: *RAINFOR: Functional Traits Database*, Date of extraction: August 2006.
- Barajas-Morales, J.: Wood specific gravity in species from two tropical forests in Mexico, *IAWA Journal*, 8, 143–148, 1987.
- Cain, S. A., Oliveira Castro, G. M., Pires, J. M., and da Silva, N. T.: Application of some phytosociological techniques to Brazilian rain forest, *Am. J. Bot.*, 43, 911–941, 1956.
- 25 Chave, J., Muller-Landau, H. C., Baker, T. R., Easdale, T. A., ter Steege, H., and Webb, C. O.: Regional and phylogenetic variation in wood density among 2456 Neotropical tree species, *Ecol. Appl.*, 16, 2356–2367, 2006.
- Cornelissen, J. H. C.: A triangular relationship between leaf size and seed size among woody species: allometry, ontogeny, ecology and taxonomy, *Oecologia*, 118, 248–255, 1999.
- 30 Dawkins, R.: *The Extended Phenotype*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1982.
- Dolph, G. E. and Dilcher, D. L.: Variation in leaf size with respect to climate in the tropics of the Western Hemisphere, *B. Torrey. Bot. Club.*, 107, 154–162, 1980.
- Dutilleul, P.: Modifying the t-test for assessing the correlation between 2 spatial processes, *Biometrics*, 49, 305–314, 1993.
- Falster, D. S. and Westoby, M.: Leaf size and angle vary widely across species: what consequences for light interception?, *New. Phytol.*, 158, 509–525, 2003.
- 5 Gillison, A. N. and Carpenter, G.: A generic plant functional attribute set and grammar for dynamic vegetation description and analysis, *Funct. Ecol.*, 11, 775–783, 1997.
- Givnish, T. J.: On the adaptive significance of compound leaves, with particular reference to tropical trees, in: *Tropical Trees as Living Systems*, Cambridge University Press, New York, USA, 351–380, 1978.
- 10 Givnish, T. J.: On the adaptive significance of leaf form, in: *Topics in Plant Population Biology*, Columbia University Press, New York, USA, 375–407, 1979.
- Givnish, T. J.: Leaf and canopy adaptations in tropical forests, in: *Physiological ecology of plants in the wet tropics*, Junk, The Hague, Netherlands, 51–58, 1984.
- 15 Givnish, T. J.: Comparative studies of leaf form – assessing the relative roles of selective pressures and phylogenetic constraints, *New. Phytol.* 106, 131–160, 1987.
- Givnish, T. J. and Vermeij, G. J.: Sizes and shapes of liana leaves, *Am. Nat.* 110, 743–778, 1976.
- Grubb, P. J., Lloyd, J. R., Pennington, T. D., and Whitmore, T. C.: A comparison of montane and lowland rain forest in Ecuador I. The forest structure, physiognomy, and floristics, *J. Ecol.*, 51, 567–601, 1963.
- Huffman, G. J. and Bolvin, D. T.: *TRMM and Other Data Precipitation Data Set Documentation*, Laboratory for Atmospheres, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center and Science Systems and Applications, Inc., 2007.
- 25 Kelly, D. L., Tanner, E. V. J., Nic Lughadha, E. M., and Kapos, V.: Floristics and biogeography of a rain forest in the Venezuelan Andes, *J. Biogeogr.*, 21, 421–440, 1994.
- Legendre, P.: Spatial autocorrelation: trouble or new paradigm?, *Ecology*, 74, 1659–1673, 1993.
- Lloyd, J. and Farquhar, G. D.: Effects of rising temperatures and [CO₂] on the physiology of tropical forest trees, *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B*, 363, 1811–1817, 2008.
- 30 Malhado, A. C. M.: *The Functional Biogeography of Leaves of the Amazonian Rainforest*, Ph.D. Thesis, Oxford University Centre for the Environment, Oxford University, UK, 2008.
- Malhi, Y., Phillips, O. L., Lloyd, J., Baker, T., Wright, J., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Frederiksen, T.,

- Grace, J., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T., Laurance, W. F., Leão, C., Lewis, S., Meir, P., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D., Núñez Vargas, P., Panfil, S. N., Patiño, S., Pitman, N., Quesada, A., Rudas, A., Salomão, R., Saleska, S., Silva, N., Silveira, M., Sombroek, W. G., Valencia, R., Vásquez-Martínez, R., Vieira, I. C. G., and Vinceti, B.: An international network to understand the biomass and dynamics of Amazonian forests (RAINFOR), *J. Veg. Sci.*, 13, 439-450, 2002.
- 5 Malhi, Y., Baker, T. R., Phillips, O. L., Almeida, S., Alvarez, E., Arroyo, L., Chave, J., Czimczik, C. I., Di Fiore, A., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T. J., Laurance, S. G., Laurance, W. F., Lewis, S. L., Mercado, L. M., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D. A., Núñez Vargas, P., Patiño, S., Pitman, N. C. A., Quesada, C. A., Silva, N., Torres Lezama, A., Vásquez-Martínez, R., Terborgh, J., Vinceti, B., and Lloyd, J.: The above-ground coarse woody productivity of 104 Neotropical forest plots, *Global Change Biol.*, 10, 563–591, 2004
- 10 Midgley, J. J. and Bond, W. J.: Leaf size and inflorescence size may be allometrically related traits, *Oecologia*, 78, 427–429, 1989.
- Moles, A. T. and Westoby, M.: Do small leaves expand faster than large leaves, and do shorter expansion times reduce herbivore damage?, *Oikos*, 90, 517–524, 2000.
- 15 Parkhurst, F. and Loucks, L.: Optimal leaf size in relation to environment, *J. Ecol.*, 60, 505–537, 1972.
- Peacock, J., Baker, T. R., Lewis, S. L., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., and Phillips, O. L.: The RAINFOR database: monitoring forest biomass and dynamics, *J. Veg. Sci.*, 18, 535–542, 2007.
- 20 Pleysier, J. L. and Juo, A. S. R.: A single-extraction method using silver-thiourea for measuring exchangeable cations and effective CEC in soils with variable charges, *Soil Sci.*, 129, 205–211, 1980.
- Quesada, C. A.: Soil Vegetation Interactions across Amazonia, Unpublished PhD, Leeds University, UK & RAINFOR, 2008.
- 25 Rangel, T. F. L. V. B., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., and Bini, L. M.: Towards an integrated computational tool for spatial analysis in macroecology and biogeography, *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 15, 321–327, 2006.
- Raunkiaer, C.: *The Life Forms of Plants and Statistical Plant Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 632 pp., 1934.
- 30 Richards, P. W.: *The Tropical Rain Forest: an Ecological Study*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1952.
- ter Steege, H. and Hammond, D. S.: Character convergence, diversity, and disturbance in tropical rain forest in Guyana, *Ecology*, 82, 3197–3212, 2001.

2149

- ter Steege, H., Pitman, N., Sabatier, D., Castellanos, H., Van der Hout, P., Daly, D. C., Silveira, M., Phillips, O., Vásquez-Martínez, R., Van Andel, T., Duivenvoorden, J., de Oliveira, A. A., Ek, R., Lilwah, R., Thomas, R., Van Essen, J., Baider, C., Maas, P., Mori, S., Terborgh, J., Vargas, P. N., Mogollón, H., Morawetz, W.: A spatial model of tree alpha-diversity and tree density for the Amazon, *Biodiv. Conser.*, 12, 2255–2277, 2003.
- 5 ter Steege, H., Pitman, N. C. A., Phillips, O. L., Chave, J., Sabatier, D., Duque, A., Molino, J. F., Prevost, M. F., Spichiger, R., Castellanos, H., von Hildebrand, P., and Vásquez-Martínez, R.: Continental-scale patterns of canopy tree composition and function across Amazonia, *Nature*, 443, 444–447, 2006.
- 10 Thompson, J., Proctor, J., Viana, V., Milliken, W., Ratter, J. A., and Scott, D. A.: Ecological studies on a lowland evergreen rain forest on Maraca Island, Roraima, Brazil. I. Physical environment, forest structure and leaf chemistry, *J. Ecol.*, 80, 689–703, 1992.
- Turner, I. M.: *The Ecology of Trees in the Tropical Rainforest*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- 15 Vásquez-Martínez, R.: *Flórmula de las Reservas Biológicas de Iquitos, Perú*, Missouri Botanical Garden Press, St. Louis, 1997.
- Webb, L. J.: A physiognomic classification of Australian rain forests, *J. Ecol.*, 47, 551–570, 1959.
- Westoby, M., Falster, D. S., Moles, A. T., Vesk, P. A., and Wright, I. J.: Plant ecological strategies: some leading dimensions of variation between species, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 33, 125–159, 2002.
- Wiemann, M. C. and Williamson, G. B.: Geographic variation in wood specific gravity: effects of latitude, temperature, and precipitation, *Wood. Fiber. Sci.*, 34, 96–107, 2002.
- 25 Wright, I. J., Ackerly, D. D., Bongers, F., Harms, K. E., Ibarra-Manriquez, G., Martinez-Ramos, M., Mazer, S. J., Muller-Landau, H. C., Paz, H., Pitman, N. C. A., Poorter, L., Silman, M. R., Vriesendorp, C. F., Webb, C. O., Westoby, M., and Wright, S. J.: Relationships among ecologically important dimensions of plant trait variation in seven Neotropical forests, *Ann. Bot.*, 99, 1003–1015, 2007

2150

Table 1. List of floras and herbaria used as information sources and number of species retrieved from each source.

Source	Total Species
1. Neotropical Herbarium Specimens – The Field Museum	1918
2. New York Botanical Garden	160
3. The Nationaal Herbarium Nederland (NHN)	159
4. Flórmula de las Reservas Biológicas de Iquitos, Perú Vásquez-Martínez (1997)	154
5. Mobot – Missouri Botanical Gardens Herbarium	140
6. Centre IRD de Cayenne, French Guiana	99
7. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia Herbarium, INPA, Brazil	55
8. Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum, Berlin, Germany	18
9. Cain et al. (1954)	18
10. Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi Herbarium, Brazil	16
11. Oxford University – Plant Science Herbarium, UK	13
12. The Herbarium of the University of Aarhus, AAU, Denmark	9
13. HerbW – Virtual Herbaria Austria	4
14. http://images.nbii.gov/	2
15. Others	23

2151

Table 2. Derivation and correspondence of leaf size categories used in study. Collapsed categories are used as dependent variables in analyses.

Category	Dimensions	Raunkiaer (1931)	Webb (1959)	Collapsed Categories
1	<0.25 cm ²		Leptophyll	
2	0.25–2.25 cm ²		Nanophyll	
3	2.25–20.25 cm ²		Microphyll	Small Leaves
4	20.25–45.0 cm ²		Notophyll	
5	20.25–182.25 cm ²	Mesophyll	Mesophyll	
6	182.25–1640.25 cm ²		Macrophyll	Large leaves
7	>1640.25 cm ²		Megaphyll	“Very-large” leaves

2152

Table 3. OLS regression analysis of large leaves of species and individual trees (and variation of sub-datasets: small DBH, median DBH, large DBH, only Fabaceae trees, Fabaceae trees removed) in relation to climatic variables controlled for spatial autocorrelation. Spatial structure was accounted for in all regressions by adding eigenvector filters produced with the PCNM. Filters were omitted and only plots with measurements for all variables were used in the regressions. CV = coefficient of variation in water availability (see methods). MWD = maximum water deficit.

	Species with large leaves			Species with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	0.273 (<0.001)	1.249	0.214	0.152 (<0.001)	0.598	0.551
CV	-0.441 (-0.004)	-2.541	0.012*	0.067 (<0.001)	0.319	0.75
Length dry	1.385(0.089)	4.511	<0.001*	0.354 (0.024)	1.022	0.309
MWD	0.808 (<0.001)	4.354	<0.001*	0.052 (<0.001)	0.249	0.804
	Individuals with large leaves			Individuals with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	0.266 (<0.001)	1.355	0.178	-0.106 (<0.001)	-0.433	0.666
CV	0.089 (-0.003)	-0.594	0.554	-0.086 (-0.001)	-0.458	0.648
Length dry	0.336 (0.07)	1.289	0.2	-0.049 (-0.006)	-0.151	0.881
MWD	-0.051 (<0.001)	-0.311	0.756	0.071(<0.001)	0.303	0.762
	Small individuals (DBH<200 mm) with large leaves			Small individuals (DBH<200 mm) with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	-0.312 (<0.001)	-0.835	0.406	-0.135 (<0.001)	-0.412	0.681
CV	0.086 (0.001)	0.327	0.744	0.157 (0.002)	-0.622	0.536
Length dry	-0.035 (-0.004)	-0.08	0.937	0.093 (0.009)	-0.213	0.832
MWD	0.496 (<0.001)	1.618	0.109	0.476 (<0.001)	1.417	0.16
	Medium individuals (DBH>200 and <400 mm) with large leaves			Medium individuals (DBH>200 and <400 mm) with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	-0.494 (0.001)	-1.457	0.149	-0.346 (<0.001)	1.111	0.27
CV	0.127 (0.001)	0.545	0.588	0.121 (0.001)	0.521	0.604
Length dry	0.246 (0.023)	0.576	0.566	-0.581 (-0.059)	-1.428	0.157
MWD	0.791 (0.001)	2.778	0.007*	-0.25 (<0.001)	-0.904	0.368

2153

Table 3. Continued.

	Large individuals (DBH>400 mm) with large leaves			Large individuals (DBH>400 mm) with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	0.084 (<0.001)	0.237	0.813	-0.248 (<0.001)	-0.77	0.444
CV	-0.29 (-0.005)	-1.101	0.274	-0.128 (-0.002)	-0.529	0.598
Length dry	0.658 (0.097)	1.548	0.125	-0.13 (-0.013)	-0.306	0.761
MWD	0.38 (<0.001)	1.357	0.178	-0.09 (<0.001)	-0.315	0.754
	Individuals (not Fabaceae) with large leaves			Individuals (not Fabaceae) with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	0.412 (<0.001)	1.296	0.198	0.168 (<0.001)	0.547	0.585
CV	-0.26 (-0.003)	-1.061	0.291	-0.199 (-0.003)	-0.801	0.425
Length dry	0.65 (0.052)	1.524	0.13	0.304 (0.031)	0.7	0.486
MWD	0.066 (<0.001)	0.334	0.739	0.057 (<0.001)	0.215	0.83
	Individuals (only Fabaceae) with large leaves			Individuals (only Fabaceae) with "very-large" leaves		
	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Std. Coeff./Coeff.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Rainfall	0.488 (<0.001)	1.487	0.14	0.059 (<0.001)	0.261	0.795
CV	-0.518 (-0.0012)	-1.966	0.052	-0.453 (-0.003)	-2.505	0.014*
Length dry	1.065 (0.196)	2.364	0.02*	0.492 (0.015)	1.539	0.127
MWD	0.068 (<0.001)	0.319	0.751	0.148 (<0.001)	0.779	0.438

2154

Table 4. Correlations analyses of leaf size categories and soil fertility (sum of bases). Blank cells represent no correlation. “-” and “+” indicate the direction of the correlation. A capitalized letter represents a significant spatially corrected correlation (details below table). S, L, VL = collapsed categories: small leaves, large leaves, and “very-large” leaves.

LEAF size categories		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	S	L	VL
Global	Proportion of individual trees within a plot	+ ^A									
	Proportion of species within a plot										
	Proportion of individual trees (small DBH)										
	Proportion of individual trees (median DBH)	+ ^B									
	Proportion of individual trees (large DBH)						+ ^C	+ ^D			+ ^E
	Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae removed)										
Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae only)							+ ^F				+ ^G
North-West Amazonia	Proportion of individual trees within a plot		-	-							+
	Proportion of species within a plot		-	-	+	+			-	+	+
	Proportion of individual trees (small DBH)		-	-							+
	Proportion of individual trees (median DBH)										+
	Proportion of individual trees (large DBH)										+
	Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae removed)		-	-					-		
Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae only)		-					+		-	+	+
Central and East Amazonia	Proportion of individual trees within a plot	+ ^H									
	Proportion of species within a plot										
	Proportion of individual trees (small DBH)		+								-
	Proportion of individual trees (median DBH)										
	Proportion of individual trees (large DBH)										
	Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae removed)										
Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae only)											
South West Amazonia	Proportion of individual trees within a plot					+ ^I	- ^J		+ ^K	- ^L	-
	Proportion of species within a plot					+ ^M	- ^N		+ ^O	- ^P	- ^Q
	Proportion of individual trees (small DBH)	+ ^R				+ ^S			+ ^T	- ^U	-
	Proportion of individual trees (median DBH)								+ ^V	- ^W	
	Proportion of individual trees (large DBH)										
	Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae removed)					+ ^X		- ^Y		+ ^Z	
Proportion of individual trees (Fabaceae only)											

Correlation results (*n*, Pearson's $F_{corrected}$, $DF_{corrected}$, $p_{corrected}$). **A)** $n=51$, Pearson's $F_{corrected}=4.953$, $DF_{corrected}=43.9$, $p_{corrected}=0.031$; **B)** 51, 5.834, 45.7, 0.025; **C)** 51, 0.231, 5.569, 98, 0.02; **D)** 51, 0.298, 4.151, 42, 0.048; **E)** 51, 0.253, 3.435, 97, 0.011; **F and G)** 51, 0.468, 14.018, 28, 0.008; **H)** 15, 0.599, 7.137, 12.765, 0.019; **I)** 16, 0.579, 5.818, 11, 0.034; **J)** 16, -0.503, 5.094, 16, 0.031; **K)** 16, 0.585, 6.944, 13, 0.02; **L)** 16, -0.585, 6.944, 13, 0.02; **M)** 16, 0.307, 9.153, 87, 0.003; **N)** 16, -0.493, 5.391, 16, 0.03; **O)** 16, 0.379, 7.081, 42, 0.011; **P)** 16, -0.379, 7.081, 42, 0.011; **Q)** 16, -0.516, 4.989, 13.7, 0.043; **R)** 16, 0.592, 7.093, 13.113, 0.019; **S)** 16, 0.617, 5.684, 9.259, 0.04; **T)** 16, 0.615, 6.841, 11.277, 0.023; **U)** 16, -0.615, 6.841, 11.277, 0.023; **V)** 16, 0.493, 7.99, 24.853, 0.009; **W)** 16, -0.493, 7.99, 24.853, 0.009; **X)** 16, 0.482, 7.62, 25.22, 0.011; **Y)** 16, -0.544, 4.991, 11.878, 0.045; **Z)** 16, 0.471, 5.66, 19.85, 0.027

2155




Fig. 1. The spatial distribution of four water availability variables across Amazonia: total annual rainfall, maximum water deficit (MWD), length of the dry season, and standard deviation of total annual rainfall. These data were derived from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM – from 1998 to 2005).

2156




Fig. 2. Mean percentage of species and individual trees in different leaf size categories in 121 Amazonian plots. Error bars = 1 standard error of the mean.

2157




Fig. 3. Leaf size distributions of the largest (most species rich) families (>60 species) in the RAINFOR dataset: (a) all large families; (b) excluding families that have any species with compound leaves; (c) families that have one or more species displaying compound leaves.

2158




Fig. 4. Map of the incidence of species with large leaf size category (categories 5 to 7) in each plot organized by proportion categories and regions (region 1, North Amazonia; region 2, North-West Amazonia; Region 3, Central and East Amazonia; Region 4, South-West Amazonia). For the purposes of clear visualisation the positions of some plots within clusters have been adjusted, and may not correspond to exact geographic location.

2159




Fig. 5. The mean frequency (0 to 1) of different leaf size categories across the four Amazonian regions (region 1, north; region 2, north-west; region 3, central and east; region 4, south-west Amazonia). (a) represents all individual trees; (b) illustrates all individual trees with the exception of members of the Fabaceae; (c) shows only trees that are from the Fabaceae taxa.

2160




Fig. 6. Relative abundance (percentage) of trees in each diameter (DBH) class for each individual leaf size category. The relative abundance is calculated following two steps: firstly, relative abundance within the region; second, relative abundance among regions to allow comparison. DBH1=100–190 mm; DBH2=>190–280 mm; DBH3=>280–370 mm; DBH4=>370–460 mm; DBH5=>460–550 mm; DBH6=>550–640 mm; DBH7=>640–730 mm; DBH8=>730. The regions are: region 1, north Amazonia; region 2, north-west Amazonia; region 3, central and east Amazonia; region 4, south-west Amazonia.

2161




Fig. 7. Relative abundance of trees in each diameter (DBH) class for clustered (small and large) leaf size category. The relative abundance is calculated following two steps: firstly, relative abundance within the region; second, relative abundance among regions to allow comparison. DBH1=100–190 mm; DBH2=>190–280 mm; DBH3=>280–370 mm; DBH4=>370–460 mm; DBH5=>460–550 mm; DBH6=>550–640 mm; DBH7=>640–730 mm; DBH8=>730. The regions are: region 1, North Amazonia; region 2, North-West Amazonia; Region 3, Central and East Amazonia; Region 4, South-West Amazonia. **(a)** Trees with small leaves (size categories 1 to 4). **(b)** Trees with large leaves (size categories 5 and 6).

2162