

Tree nursery environments and their effect on early trait variation

Annika Perry ^{1,*}, Joan K. Beaton², Jenni A. Stockan², Glenn R. Iason², Joan E. Cottrell³, Stephen Cavers ¹

¹Biodiversity & Land Use, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (UKCEH), Bush Estate, Midlothian EH26 0QB, United Kingdom

²Ecological Sciences, James Hutton Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen AB15 8QH, United Kingdom

³Northern Research Station, Forest Research, Roslin EH25 9SY, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author. UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (UKCEH), Bush Estate, Midlothian EH26 0QB, United Kingdom. E-mail: annt@ceh.ac.uk

Abstract

Despite the major role of nurseries in raising young plants and trees prior to transplantation, not enough is known about how the nursery climate impacts the growth and development of plants from germination through to maturity. It is important for forestry practitioners to understand the effect that different nursery environments may have on early stage growth as these may exceed differences due to genetic variation and can confound the use of early stage traits for selection. Here, a replicated progeny-provenance experiment of the economically and ecologically important species Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) was established in three environmentally distinct nurseries in Scotland and traits including survival, growth, form, and phenology were measured. Temperature variation and photoperiod were the only uncontrolled environmental variables during this period, and their effect on measured traits was found to be significant among nurseries from the first growing season onwards. Trait interactions were not consistent between nurseries, indicating that the effectiveness of using proxy traits to select for desirable characteristics may depend on the environment in which the trees are grown. This study is the first in a series that will examine trait variation in Scots pine from seedlings to mature trees and highlights the importance of carefully considering and accounting for the nursery environment when growing trees for subsequent transplantation.

Keywords: forest; trait variation; environment; Scots pine; tree nursery

Introduction

Globally, forests function as the major terrestrial carbon sink (Pan et al. 2011) and increasing the area of forest cover is vital to achieving net zero targets (Westaway et al. 2023). In addition, increased forest cover would help tackle biodiversity loss, increase filtering of pollutants, provide natural management of flood risk, and contribute to soil stabilization and water purification (Holl and Brancalion 2020). Ongoing afforestation efforts create an increased need for planting stock, which is most commonly supplied as nursery-grown saplings (Brancalion and Holl 2020), and this places the forest nursery in a pivotal and crucially important position. In Great Britain alone, forest nurseries produced ~173 million saplings for the year 2022–2023 (Forestry Commission 2023).

In their role as the primary location for raising young trees, choices made by nurseries have been shown to profoundly influence size and development of young trees, effects that may be observable long after transplantation. For example, the choice of fertilizer (Gruffman et al. 2012), growing medium (Heiskanen and Rikala 2000), container type, root management, watering regime (Villar-Salvador et al. 1999), and timing of operational activities (such as transplantation, Luoranen 2018) during early life stages can affect root growth, seedling morphology, and susceptibility to pests and pathogens (Selander and Immonen 1992). Whilst soil, water, and nutrients can be controlled quite precisely by

nursery managers, the geographic location of a nursery and any protection measures used, such as glasshouse cover, determine other critical components of the nursery environment. As variables like temperature and photoperiod can strongly affect the growth, development, and biochemistry of seedlings (Downs and Borthwick 1956; Vapaavuori et al. 1992; Nerg et al. 1994; Domisch et al. 2001) with effects lasting well beyond transplantation (Dhar et al. 2015), the nursery environment can be hugely influential.

The use of locally sourced seed is an explicit requirement when planting native species in the UK (Herbert et al. 1999), but the location of the nursery in which the resulting plants are raised is rarely specified. For example, the contemporary guiding document for UK forestry—The UK Forestry Standard (Forest Research 2023)—does not comment on nursery management, nor does it connect nursery practice to its recommendations on seed sourcing. Previous publications, such as the Forestry Nursery Practice (Aldhous and Mason 1994), do consider site selection factors, but largely from the point of view of maximizing plant performance, minimizing risk, and logistical considerations. In practice, choice of nursery is generally governed by what the market offers and by economics. Consequently, the nursery site may be environmentally distant from both the site of seed origin and planting site of raised seedlings. If the effect of the nursery environment on plant phenotype is large, then the effect of local seed sourcing may be minimal in comparison. A quantitative evaluation of the impact of the nursery environment on trait

Handling editor: Dr. Fabian Fasnacht

Special Issue: Forestry Treescapes

Received 20 August 2024; revised 10 February 2025; accepted 14 February 2025

© The Author(s) 2025. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Institute of Chartered Foresters.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

with average daily temperature data derived from the nearest weather stations to the nurseries (information provided by the National Meteorological Library and Archive, Met Office, UK) for the period July 2007 to December 2010. Weather stations were Poolewe (0.7 mi from NW), Craibstone (4.3 mi from NE and NG), and Glensaugh No 2 (0.1 mi from NG when moved outdoors to Glensaugh). Where weather station data were missing (only relevant for Poolewe over this period), they were replaced with measurements from the next closest weather station: Aultbea No 2 (4.2 mi from NW). Due to the differences in the location between the weather stations and the nurseries and the different methods of recording temperature, data from weather stations were adjusted prior to inclusion in the 'nursery temperatures' dataset by comparing daily temperatures across the whole period. Missing logger temperatures were directly replaced, where possible, by checking the weather station temperature at the missing time point and calculating the mean logger temperature recorded at all other instances that the same weather station temperature was recorded. In the few instances where there were no direct replacements, replacement logger values were obtained by taking the mean value for the three logger records either side of the missing logger data point in a dataset which was ordered by the weather station temperatures. For missing data in NG (prior to May 2010), replacement temperatures derived from NE were used instead of weather station data. Where there were days with missing hourly data for one of more of the nurseries, temperature variance could not be estimated and so these days were excluded from analyses for all nurseries to avoid skewing results.

The growing season length in each year at each nursery was estimated as the period bounded by a daily mean temperature $>5^{\circ}\text{C}$ for >5 consecutive days and daily mean temperature $<5^{\circ}\text{C}$ for >5 consecutive days (after 1 July). During the defined growing season period, trees were assumed to be 'growing', whereas outwith the defined growing season trees were assumed to be 'not growing'. The previously described temperature variances were compared between these two different periods. The growing degrees were estimated for each day in the period July 2007 to December 2010 as the number of degrees above 5°C . The cumulative growing degree days (GDD) were estimated by summing the growing degrees for each period leading up to phenology assessments at each nursery from 1 January in 2008. Chilling days were defined as the days in which the average maximum temperature did not exceed 5°C .

Phenotype assessments

Seedling phenotypes were assessed for all individuals for a range of traits reflecting different life history characteristics: growth, form, phenology, and survival.

i. Growth traits

Growth traits were assessed annually from 2007 to 2010. Annual increments in height (HI, mm) and basal stem diameter (DI, mm) were measured as the increase from the end of one growing season to the end of the next (for comparisons of height increment across multiple years, height in the first year of growth in 2007 is considered as the height increment for this year), whilst absolute height (HA, mm) and absolute basal stem diameter (measured at the root collar: DA, mm) were measured at the end of each growing season. Relative growth rate (HR) was estimated as the percentage increase in HI relative to HA in the previous year and was recorded for 2008 to 2010.

ii. Form traits

Form was measured annually from 2007 to 2009. Needle length (NL, mm) was measured for three randomly selected needles per

tree, and a mean value was obtained. The total number of buds (Bu) on each seedling was counted in 2008 and 2009. Slenderness (HD, the ratio of HA to DA) was recorded in 2010 as a measure of the impact of multiple years of growth on tree form.

iii. Phenology traits

Phenology was assessed weekly during the spring and autumn of 2008. Budburst timing (BB) was defined as the number of days from 31 March 2008 to the time when newly emerged green needles were observed. The estimated proportion of trees which had burst bud in each nursery was calculated at each assessment. To compare budburst progression across the three sites, the point at which an estimated 50% of trees had undergone budburst (BB_{50}) was calculated as detailed in equation 1:

$$BB_{50} = (50 - B_{i<50}) - \frac{B_{i>50} - B_{i<50}}{A_{i>50} - A_{i<50}} + A_{i<50} \quad (1)$$

where $i < 50$ is the i th assessment performed at each nursery where $<50\%$ of trees had undergone budburst ($i < 50$: NE = 2; NG = 3; NW = 2), $i > 50$ is the i th assessment where $>50\%$ of trees had undergone budburst ($i > 50$: NE = 3; NG = 4; NW = 3), A is the variable associated with each assessment performed at each nursery (A : number of days after 31 March; or cumulative growing degree days since 1 January), and B is the percentage of trees observed with budburst at each nursery at each assessment.

Growth cessation (GC) was defined as the number of days from 10 September 2008 to the date when no further height growth was observed by eye. To compare the growing season length at each nursery with the duration of growth observed in the seedlings, 'growth duration' (GD) was calculated for each seedling as the number of days between budburst and growth cessation.

iv. Survival traits

Mortality (number of trees which died by the end of a given growing season as a percentage of the total number of trees alive at the end of the previous growing season) was recorded each year from 2007 to 2010. Survival was recorded as the percentage of surviving trees in each nursery by 2010.

Statistical analysis

Paired t tests were performed using R (R Core Team 2024) to compare nursery means for annual climatic variables (mean daily temperature, daily variance, growing degree days) and climatic variables measured within and outside the growing season (day temperature variance and night temperature variance). Where there were days with missing hourly data for one of more of the nurseries, temperature variance could not be estimated and so these days were excluded from analyses for all nurseries to avoid skewing results.

Coefficient of variation, calculated as standard deviation divided by the mean, was estimated for each trait in each nursery (Fig. S1). Where traits were measured in multiple years, only the most recent year was used.

To evaluate relationships among traits, Pearson's correlation coefficients and significance values were estimated for trees growing in each nursery using the 'Hmisc' package (Harrell Jr 2024) in R (R Core Team 2024). Absolute height, absolute basal stem diameter, and slenderness were only included for the final assessment year (2010).

Nested analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed in Minitab version 21 (Minitab 2024) for all trees with nursery as a fixed effect and block nested within nursery as a random effect. Nested ANOVA was also used to analyse the distribution of variance among these traits. In order to account for variance




Figure 1. Climatic variation at the three nurseries for the period July 2007 to December 2010 when seedlings were growing in individual pots at the nursery sites. Lines indicate smoothed monthly means for each year. Boxplots indicate values for the entire year. Solid grey lines indicate the median value; the bottom and top of the boxes indicate the first and third quartiles; and the upper and lower whiskers extend to the highest and lowest values within 1.5 times for interquartile range (no outliers are shown for ease of visualization). No data are included for daily temperature variance in 2007 due to the extent of missing hourly data for this year. Significant differences among nurseries within each year are indicated with asterisks (* $P = .01-.05$; ** $P = .001-.01$; *** $P = .0001-.001$; **** $P < .0001$; ns: not significant). Units: mean temperature, °C; daily temperature variance, °C²; growing degree days, number of degrees above 5°C for each day.

due to relatedness and/or phenotypic plasticity which would otherwise fall within the residual variance, additional terms (provenance; family nested within provenance; a nursery and provenance interaction term) were included but were not considered separately, given that the focus of this study is on the impact of environment on trait variation. Tukey's *post hoc* tests were performed to determine whether mean values among nurseries were significantly different from one another for all traits and for mean temperature, temperature variance (daily, day, and night), and growing degree days for each year. ANOVAs were repeated with all terms included as random effects to identify their contribution to the total variance.

Results

Climatic variation among nurseries

Trees growing at each of the three nurseries experienced broadly similar mean daily temperatures for each year between 2007

and 2010 which were not significantly different among nurseries (Fig. 1) with the exception of NE and NG in both 2008 and 2009, where mean daily temperature at NG was significantly warmer than at NE in both years and warmer in NG than NW in 2009. Trees at NG also experienced the fewest chilling days (total 119 between 2007 and 2010, compared with NE = 157 and NW = 123) and had higher daily GDD throughout the majority of the year (Fig. 1) compared to the other two nurseries. In contrast, the daily temperature variance that trees were exposed to was consistently and significantly lower for trees growing at NW than for trees growing at either NG or NE (Fig. 1). The daily temperature variance that trees experienced in NG and NE was also significantly different, although the magnitude of the difference was less than when comparing NW with either NE or NG (Fig. 1).

Differences in temperature variance were most pronounced among nurseries and consistent among years during the daytime within the growing season period (Fig. S2). During this period, daytime variance was significantly higher at NG than at NE or

Table 1. Traits measured in individual seedlings, grouped into the following categories: 'growth', 'form', 'phenology' and 'survival'

Trait/year code*	Unit	NE	NG	NW
<i>Growth</i>				
DA08	mm	3.58 ^A ± 0.02 (1465)	2.87 ^C ± 0.02 (1348)	2.96 ^B ± 0.03 (1121)
DA09	mm	5.74 ^A ± 0.02 (1438)	4.80 ^B ± 0.02 (1248)	4.69 ^C ± 0.04 (1050)
DA10	mm	6.77 ^C ± 0.04 (1419)	8.81 ^A ± 0.04 (1247)	7.19 ^B ± 0.07 (1029)
DI09	mm	2.14 ^A ± 0.02 (1438)	1.90 ^B ± 0.02 (1247)	1.71 ^C ± 0.03 (1048)
DI10	mm	1.08 ^C ± 0.02 (1416)	4.01 ^A ± 0.04 (1246)	2.48 ^B ± 0.04 (1029)
HA08	mm	81.12 ^C ± 0.5 (1192)	100.36 ^A ± 0.83 (1319)	88.32 ^B ± 0.82 (1014)
HA09	mm	237.76 ^A ± 1.33 (1440)	241.14 ^A ± 1.9 (1246)	216.9 ^B ± 2.51 (1036)
HA10	mm	322.80 ^C ± 1.69 (1416)	382.73 ^A ± 2.03 (1245)	334.87 ^B ± 4.13 (775)
HI07	mm	59.98 ^A ± 0.3 (1611)	57.30 ^B ± 0.32 (1498)	47.92 ^C ± 0.29 (1492)
HI08	mm	21.59 ^C ± 0.46 (1192)	42.93 ^A ± 0.73 (1319)	40.14 ^B ± 0.80 (1014)
HI09	mm	164.83 ^A ± 1.23 (1180)	142.54 ^B ± 1.46 (1218)	138.72 ^B ± 2.03 (952)
HI10	mm	84.20 ^C ± 0.75 (1415)	141.48 ^A ± 1.24 (1238)	125.84 ^B ± 1.85 (767)
HR08	%	40.11 ^C ± 1.08 (1192)	77.85 ^B ± 1.50 (1319)	90.59 ^A ± 2.15 (1014)
HR09	%	212.06 ^A ± 2.05 (1180)	150.43 ^C ± 1.87 (1218)	162.66 ^B ± 2.45 (952)
HR10	%	36.55 ^B ± 0.41 (1415)	65.81 ^A ± 1.07 (1237)	65.33 ^A ± 1.11 (767)
<i>Form</i>				
Bu08	Count	7.14 ^A ± 0.07 (1462)	5.79 ^B ± 0.09 (1339)	4.55 ^C ± 0.09 (1118)
HD08	Ratio	22.56 ^C ± 0.16 (1192)	35.46 ^A ± 0.27 (1317)	29.74 ^B ± 0.28 (1014)
HD09	Ratio	41.67 ^C ± 0.21 (1438)	50.24 ^A ± 0.35 (1242)	45.56 ^B ± 0.35 (1036)
HD10	Ratio	48.50 ^A ± 0.25 (1414)	44.21 ^B ± 0.26 (1245)	47.76 ^A ± 0.36 (774)
NL07	mm	25.55 ^B ± 0.12 (1611)	26.22 ^A ± 0.12 (1495)	22.84 ^C ± 0.13 (1492)
NL08	mm	100.42 ^C ± 0.36 (1453)	115.96 ^A ± 0.56 (1294)	104.92 ^B ± 0.62 (1113)
NL09	mm	31.21 ^C ± 0.22 (1440)	54.67 ^A ± 0.39 (1248)	49.56 ^B ± 0.37 (1050)
<i>Phenology</i>				
BB08	Days since 31/03/08	41.99 ^B ± 0.11 (1491)	19.14 ^C ± 0.19 (1454)	42.58 ^A ± 0.16 (1145)
GC08	Days since 10/09/08	44.61 ^B ± 0.53 (1450)	44.75 ^B ± 0.56 (1393)	57.61 ^A ± 0.35 (1067)
GD08	Days	165.71 ^C ± 0.53 (1440)	188.76 ^A ± 0.57 (1390)	178.32 ^B ± 0.37 (1055)
<i>Survival</i>				
Su10	%	84.88	74.23	61.31
M07	%	4.11	10.83	10.83
M08	%	9.06	9.88	25.03
M09	%	1.64	6.44	6.41
M10	%	1.04	1.27	2.00

Overall means and associated standard errors are provided for each nursery (NE, NG, and NW) separately. Tukey pairwise comparisons are reported as a superscript letter (A, B, C) after the mean value: nurseries that do not share a letter (within traits for each year) have significantly different means. Number of observations for each nursery are in parentheses. *Trait/year code: Letter(s) denote trait, number denotes year of measurement; traits—DA, absolute basal stem diameter; DI, basal stem diameter increment; HA, absolute height; HI, height increment; HR, relative growth rate; Bu, number of buds; HD, slenderness; NL, needle length; BB, budburst timing; GC, growth cessation; GD, growth duration; Su, survival; M, mortality; years—07, 2007; 08, 2008; 09, 2009; 10, 2010.

NW, and higher at NE than at NW in all years. In contrast, variance during the night time was lowest at NG compared to the outdoor nurseries in all years outside the growing season (mean night temperature variance 2008–2010: NE = 2.40°C²; NG = 1.35°C²; NW = 2.17°C²).

Trait variation among nurseries

Trees growing in NG had higher mean values for traits relating to growth than those growing outdoors in NE and NW by 2010 (Table 1): they had thicker stems and grew taller and faster, on average. They also had larger increments for both height and basal stem diameter in 2010. Trees grown in NE were the smallest and thinnest with the slowest growth rate and lowest increments on average in 2010. Mean values for traits relating to form and survival were lower, and budburst timing was earlier, for trees growing in NG than those growing in one or both outdoor nurseries (Table 1) with the exception of needle length.

Trait means were significantly different among the three nurseries for each trait and each year with the exception of height increment in 2009 and relative growth rate in 2010, both among NG and NW, and growth cessation among NE and NG (Table 1). The length of needles was considerably longer in all nurseries in 2008 than in either 2007 or 2009 (Fig. S3, Table 1). Needles

which grew in 2008 were, on average, 3.93 (NE) to 4.59 (NW) times longer than those which grew in 2007 and 2.11 (NW) to 3.21 (NE) times longer than needles which grew in 2009. Overall survival was lower for trees in NW compared to the other two nurseries (Table 1), although this was due to a spike in mortality in 2008 which was thought to be largely due to biotic factors such as sand fleas, snails, and fungal infection (although cause of mortality in each case was not recorded). Mortality was highest/joint-highest at NW in three of the four assessment years and was also high in the other year. Mortality at the other outdoor site (NE) was the lowest of all nurseries across all four years. By 2010, there were significant differences among nurseries in seedling survival. Mortality was highest in 2008 at NW (25.03% annual mortality) which accounted for over half of the seedling deaths across the period for this nursery. By 2010, mortality was low for all nurseries.

Trees that died were those which tended, in the previous year, to be shorter and thinner, formed fewer buds and shorter needles, burst bud, and stopped growing later than trees which remained alive (Fig. 2). Exceptions to this were found in only 6 out of 57 comparisons (Fig. 2): growth cessation in 2008 for trees growing in NG, some growth traits (absolute and increment height and relative growth rate) for trees growing in NW in 2008, and needle length in 2009 for trees growing in NW and NE.




Figure 2. Mean trait values for trees that were either alive or dead by the end of the year after the trait was measured, relative to one another. Where trait means were identical for each group, relative means are each 0.5 (indicated by dashed line). Where means are higher for trees which were alive in the following year, the bar exceeds the 0.5 threshold. Numbers of trees in each group are indicated within the respective section of each bar. Trait codes are given in Table 1.

The relative difference in trait values between trees that were alive and those that died increased as trees got older (Fig. 2), although differences over more than one year cannot be compared for traits relating to phenology. The numbers of trees in the 'dead' group also reduced over this period, from an average of 221 trees in 2007 to 64 trees in 2008 and 10 trees in 2009 compared to those in the 'alive' group (average numbers of trees counted for each trait: 1313 in 2007; 1198 in 2008; 1191 in 2009).

Associations between nursery climate and trait variation

Timing of phenological traits measured in 2008 was significantly different among nurseries (Table 1): budburst was, on average, 23 days earlier at NG than at either NE or NW; BB_{50} was 38.7 and 38.8 days in NE and NW, respectively, but only 16 days in NG (Fig. 3). Over the same period, the difference in GDD among nurseries was much lower (Fig. 3, NE: 207.3; NG: 237.7; NW: 238.1). Trees at NE required fewer cumulative GDD, and those at NW and NG required more cumulative GDD to complete budburst throughout the assessment period but only by ~30 degree days. Trees at NW were exposed to two chilling days during the budburst period (5 and 6 April 2008), but the temperature environments were otherwise similar at the two outdoor nurseries (NE and NW, Fig. 1).

Despite significantly earlier initiation of budburst in NG, trees ceased growing at around the same time as those in NE (Table 1) which was on average ~13 days earlier than in NW. The duration of growth (period between budburst and growth cessation) therefore varied on average between 166 and 189 days (NE and NG, respectively) with trees in NW actively growing for an average of 178 days each year. Mean growth duration was highly significantly positively associated with growing season length (Fig. 4a), although the amount of variation in this trait at each site was substantial.

There was also a significant positive relationship between mean relative growth rate and the mean growing season length at each site between 2008 and 2010 (Fig. 4b). In-season performance in individual years may be strongly associated with the length of growing season in both the current and the previous year, due to provisioning of the bud during the growing season, but these comparisons will be more powerful using field rather

than nursery data, due to the comparatively small number of datapoints available for the latter.

Relationships within and among traits

Age-age phenotypic correlations were performed for measurements of a given trait obtained in pairs of years for all trees in each nursery site separately (Fig. 5). The majority of age-age phenotypic correlations were significant across each pair of years in each of the nurseries, with the exception of needle length (between years 2007 and 2008 in NG; between years 2008 and 2009 in NE), basal stem diameter increment (between years 2009 and 2010 in NG), and height increment (between years 2007 and 2009, and 2007 and 2010 both in NG). Traits were consistently either positively or negatively correlated among years, with the exception of height increment and needle length. Phenotypic correlations among height increments in different years for individuals in NG were negative when 2010 is included (in contrast to the same years in other nurseries for this trait)—this is the year during which the pots were moved outdoors from the glasshouse. The patterns of pairwise comparisons among the sites were more similar for the outdoor sites (NE and NW) than NG. Correlations generally increased in significance as the age of the trees increased and as the number of years between comparisons decreased (Fig. 5).

For simplicity, the number of traits measured across multiple years that were consistently significantly associated (in the same direction) among years were reduced prior to subsequent analyses, either to a single (most recent) assessment year (for traits for which successive measurements were not independent: DA, HA) or to a mean value among years (HR, DI). Traits which were not consistent among years (HI, NL) were considered separately for each year.

Pairwise comparisons among growth, form, and phenology traits both within and among years (Fig. 6) show that pairs of traits were more highly significantly correlated in NW than in either NG or NE, particularly among growth traits and among budburst and other traits. Relationships were often inconsistent among sites: of the 105 pairwise comparisons among traits, 21 were not consistent (i.e. not always either positive or negative, possibly due to the confounding effects of genotype × environment interactions) among nurseries. Of the inconsistent correlations, nearly all ($N=17$) involved needle length or height increment (Fig. 6).




Figure 3. Cumulative percentage of trees reaching budburst, expressed as days since 31 March 2008 (left) and cumulative GDD since 1 January 2008 (right). Circles indicate assessment days. The dotted line indicates the day when 50% of trees had burst bud (BB_{50}).




Figure 4. Linear regressions between growing season length (the period in days bounded by a daily mean temperature $>5^{\circ}\text{C}$ for >5 consecutive days and daily mean temperature $<5^{\circ}\text{C}$ for >5 consecutive days, after 1 July) and (a) growth duration in 2008; and (b) relative growth rate 2008 to 2010. Regressions were performed on all data points. Individual seedling trait values are jittered for clarity. Trait means and associated error bars (one standard deviation either side of the mean) are provided for each nursery. Mean growth duration: number of days between budburst and growth cessation. Mean relative growth rate: mm per year as a proportion of its size at the end of the previous growing season.




Figure 5. Correlation coefficient (r) and associated significance values (P) for a given trait among years at each nursery (NE, NG, NW). On the x-axis, year is shortened, whereby a pairwise comparison of a trait between years 2007 and 2010 is presented as '07-10'. Trait codes are detailed in Table 1. Height measured in the first year (HI_{07}) has been included in both absolute height (HA) and height increment (HI) comparisons.

Significantly associated growth traits were always positive, with the exception of height increment in 2007 in NE and NW and in all years at NG (Fig. 6). Phenology traits were highly significantly positively correlated with one another and were generally negatively correlated with traits related to form (with the exception of slenderness and needle length in 2009). Considering only traits that were measured in the same year (i.e. 2008 for phenology traits), days to budburst were negatively correlated with height increment in NW, positively correlated in NE, and not associated in NG. Days to budburst were highly significantly negatively correlated with all growth traits at NW, whereas correlations were either not significant or positively significant for growth traits in NG and NE. In contrast, days to cessation of growth were highly positively correlated with most growth traits in NG (with the exception of height increment in 2007), but associations were much weaker and/or negatively correlated in the other nurseries. Thus, in general, a long growing season between budburst and growth cessation resulted in larger plants (Fig. 6).

For further analyses, traits within groups which were consistently highly significantly positively correlated with one another were reduced to a single representative trait (height increment 2008 to 2010, relative growth rate, and absolute and increment basal stem diameter were all represented by absolute height in 2010; needle length in 2007 and 2008 were represented by number of buds; growth cessation was represented by budburst).

Partitioning trait variance

There were highly significant differences among nurseries (i.e. environmental variation over a large scale) as well among blocks within nurseries (environmental variation over a small scale) for every trait (Table S1). Environmental variation (block and nursery) accounted for more than half the total variance for budburst and needle length, close to half for absolute height and around one quarter for the remaining traits (slenderness, number of buds, and height increment). Nursery accounted for a greater proportion of variation than block for needle length, number of buds, height increment, and budburst (Fig. 7), whereas the contribution of block to the total variance was greater than nursery for slenderness and absolute height.

Discussion

This study highlights the profound impact that nursery environment can have on trait variation in tree seedlings. The nurseries were exposed to the same nutrient, pot, and watering regimes, came from the same genetic background, and experienced similar average temperatures and monthly growing degree days. Differences in recorded temperature among the nurseries occurred during the daytime within the growing season, when daily temperature variance was much higher for trees growing in the nursery in the east of Scotland compared to the nursery in the west. Seedlings in the glasshouse nursery, in contrast, experienced high daily temperature variance (which was also higher than in the neighbouring outdoor nursery), but temperatures were also higher overall. The importance of the effect of warmer mean temperatures (Morison and Morecroft 2006) and extremes of temperature (Niu et al. 2014) on plant traits is increasingly well recognized, especially in the light of an anticipated increase in extreme weather events due to climate change (Herring et al. 2022). However, the contrasting effects of temperature variance




Figure 6. Pairwise correlations and associated Pearson correlation coefficient values for traits for Scots pine trees growing in each nursery (NE, NG, NW). Significance values: * $P = .01-.05$; ** $P = .001-.01$; *** $P < .001$.




Figure 7. Proportion of variance in growth, form, and phenology traits explained by mixed model factors: environmental factors are coloured in shades of green (nursery and block) and genetic/residual factors are coloured in shades of grey (nursery \times provenance, provenance, family, residual).

and mean temperatures and their comparative impact on the growth and development of plants and trees are less well understood.

In our study, all traits were strongly and significantly affected by the nursery environment: both at a large spatial scale (i.e. among nurseries) but also (and sometimes to a greater extent) at much finer spatial scales (i.e. among blocks within nurseries). The large spatial effect was particularly pronounced between the glasshouse and neighbouring outdoor nursery, highlighting the major impact that nursery type (glasshouse vs outdoor nursery) has on growing plants. Whilst the main environmental difference among the nurseries adjacent (but of different types) to one another was mean temperature, we cannot exclude the possibility that other abiotic (e.g. wind speed, humidity) and/or biotic (e.g. symbionts, pests, pathogens) factors also played a part in the differences we observed.

Growing the seedlings under high temperature variance (resulting in more days at the extreme ends of the temperature range) but with the same mean temperature may lead to lower rates of growth. Chiang et al. (2020) reported significantly taller seedlings when grown in fixed or sinusoidal temperature regimes compared to the same species grown in pots outdoors with a naturally fluctuating and high temperature variance, but only in spring. When grown in the summer, the same seedlings grown in a fixed environment were reported to be significantly shorter than those grown in the outdoor environment, possibly because the lower temperatures that seedlings were exposed to in the outdoor environment in the spring did not occur during summer. The extent of the difference between daytime and nighttime temperatures is also known to directly influence key plant traits relating to growth and form, such as internode length and height (Myster and Moe 1995). Similarly, the allocation of resources to traits relating to tree form in this study appeared to be more important in the nursery with both high variance and low

mean temperatures, indicating that a more conservative growth strategy was potentially balanced by investment in traits relating to tree form (Climent et al. 2024), such as number of buds.

The role of mean temperature on plant growth is better understood, with higher mean temperatures generally positively associated with higher rates of growth measured as specific leaf area (Poorter et al. 2010). Our study supported this finding, with seedlings grown in a nursery with warmer mean temperatures showing higher rates of growth. Although the temperatures of our nurseries were not controlled, and only a few nursery environments were studied, the environments are analogous to those used in the forestry industry (i.e. outdoor nurseries and glasshouses). We only recorded air temperature, but soil temperature may also have been an important factor for the growth and development of the seedlings. The latter is unlikely to have been consistent among the glasshouse and outdoor environments: it has been reported that soil temperature inside pots tracks but lags behind the air temperature until solar radiation falls directly onto pots, when the temperature of the soil within the pots can rise to more than 20°C higher than the air temperature (Poorter et al. 2016) and that increased soil temperature is associated with increased growth rate (Weih and Karlsson 1999) in saplings.

Growing Scots pine seedlings in nursery environments with different temperature means, variances, and photoperiods also had strong effects on phenological variation. Budburst timing was strongly associated with growing degree days at all sites but was not fully explained by differences in this environmental variable among sites. This suggests a complex relationship between warm temperatures (i.e. growing degree days) and cold temperatures (often referred to as the chilling requirement), although the number of nurseries/years assessed in this study is insufficient to enable firm conclusions to be reached on how these two variables interact to result in the observed phenotype. Plant species

generally cease growing in response to decreasing photoperiod (Nitsch 1957; Singh et al. 2017), although some may respond to decreasing temperature instead (Heide and Prestrud 2005). In our study, trees growing in neighbouring nurseries, outside or within a glasshouse, experienced the same photoperiod (although the light intensity through the glass may have been different) but different mean temperatures. Whereas budburst occurred much earlier in the glasshouse than in the neighbouring outdoor nursery (reflecting the different cumulative growing degree days over the preceding period), growth cessation occurred on average at a similar time which suggests photoperiod to be the main driver.

The accuracy of using young seedlings to predict economic traits at harvest is of major interest and importance in the genetic testing of progeny for forestry (Lee 2002; Hong et al. 2015), but detailed early and late assessments of the same tree seedlings are rarely available. Within these experimental trials, which have since been transplanted to field sites in 2012, the same traits will continue to be measured into maturity enabling age–age correlations from seedling to mature trees to be estimated with high resolution (many traits will be measured annually). Although the assessments presented here were confined to the early years of growth, this study nevertheless highlights the relative consistency of age–age correlations among the different nursery environments, with the exception of height increment in NG in the years before and after trees were moved outside. The latter showed that plants experienced a shock as a result of the move outdoors which impacted their subsequent growth. The well-documented phenomenon of ‘transplantation shock’ is known to induce changes to growth and development (Close et al. 2005) whereby growth is impaired for a period following transfer. The accuracy of age–age correlations should also, therefore, be reviewed in the context of the general environment in which the trees are measured and the specific environment the trees have been exposed to in the recent past.

The interactions among different traits were also affected by the nursery that plants were grown in. For example, whilst timing (i.e. lateness) of growth cessation was positively correlated with most growth traits in the protected glasshouse environment, these relationships were weaker in outdoor environments, possibly because these traits were not responding to a single climatic variable but to a combination of many. Similarly, traits relating to form were inconsistent in their relationship with growth traits among nurseries, with more positive associations observed in the nurseries with higher temperature variance compared to the one with low temperature variance.

Given the crucially important role of nurseries in the supply chain for forestry and tree planting, the success of global tree planting efforts depends strongly on the quality of plants they produce. Here, we have shown the vital importance of properly understanding the strength and persistence of nursery environment effects on tree seedling growth and development. This knowledge has implications both for genetic testing of material and also for operational tree production. For example, if analyses do not also incorporate data relating to the early environment of the tested trees, an important component of variation might be omitted and may lead to over- or under-estimation of breeding values. Indeed, environmental variation over both small (within sites, measured using blocks) and large (among sites) scales can have significant effects on trait variation and should be carefully recorded and used as covariates in subsequent analyses. For production forestry, although best practice may be to target specific nurseries for the growth of particular species and/or for planting in particular environments (Jaenicke 1999), economic and practical constraints often render practitioner choice of nursery

environment relatively limited. In this case, improved knowledge of the potential outcomes associated with nursery environment could help practitioners to better understand field traits as an outcome of the environment their trees experienced in the nursery. To this end, we recommend routinely monitoring and making available nursery environmental data alongside plant provenance data on shipment from the nursery. The significant effect of nursery environment on all aspects of phenotype reported in this study highlights the cumulative and divergent effect that the early growing environment can have, an effect that may have particularly profound and persistent effects on long-lived species like trees. These findings will be investigated and tested further for the subset of trees that were transplanted to field locations in 2012, using measurements made over many subsequent years.

Conclusion

Despite the relatively low levels of environmental variation recorded among the three nurseries, there were significant effects on seedling mortality, variation in traits relating to growth, form, and phenology, and on interactions among traits. These findings have implications for the choice of nursery in which plants are raised given that effects may persist and affect subsequent performance in the field. Growers may wish to assess whether plants should be preferably raised in less benign nursery environments in order to minimize the shock they receive when transplanted. In any case, we are confident of the importance of measuring and collecting data at an early stage in order to compare trait variation throughout the lifetime of trees, from seedling through to maturity: an approach which would be of benefit for plants grown for both research and for operational purposes. The trees in this study have now been transplanted to three field environments (Beaton et al. 2022), and subsequent analysis explores the persistence of early environment carryover effects following transplantation (Perry et al. 2024b). Regular measurements on the trees since transplantation will also enable ontogenetic effects on intraspecific genetic variation to be characterized for a wide range of phenotypic traits and for age–age correlations from seedling to maturity to be estimated.

Acknowledgements

We thank Stewart Mackie and staff at Forest and Land Scotland (Selkirk Office), the Forestry Commission, National Trust for Scotland, and Donald Barrie (Glensaugh) for their help in locating, establishing, and securing access to sites. We also thank two anonymous reviewers and the Editor who greatly improved the manuscript.

Author contributions

Annika Perry (Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing), Joan Beaton (Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing—review & editing), Jenni A. Stockan (Investigation, Project administration, Writing—review & editing), Glenn Iason (Conceptualization, Data curation, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing—review & editing), Joan Cottrell (Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing—review & editing), and Stephen Cavers (Conceptualization,

Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing—review & editing).

Supplementary data

Supplementary data is available at *Forestry Journal* online.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Funding

This work was supported by the newLEAF project [grant number NE/V019813/1] under the UK's 'Future of UK Treescapes' programme, which was led by the UK Research Institute's (UKRI) Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), with joint funding from the UKRI's Arts and Humanities Research Council and UKRI's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), and contributions from the UK Government's Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) and the Welsh and Scottish Governments. This work was also part of PROTREE [grant number BB/L012243/1] funded jointly by UKRI's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, NERC, & ESRC and Defra, the Forestry Commission and the Scottish Government, under the Tree Health and Plant Biosecurity Initiative. The James Hutton Institute contribution to this work was supported by Scottish Government's Rural & Environment Science & Analytical Services Division, through their Strategic Research Programmes (2006–2011, 2011–2016, and 2016–2022).

Data availability

The data underlying this article are available from the Environmental Information Data Centre (EIDC, <https://eidc.ac.uk>), at <https://doi.org/10.5285/29ced467-8e03-4132-83b9-dc2aa50537cd>. Temperature and temperature variances at each nursery are available at <https://doi.org/10.5285/81841d93-41e2-47a7-b15a-92d1e1cf07f7>.

References

- Aldhous JR, Mason WL. *Forest Nursery Practice*, Vol. 296. Farnham: Forest Research, 1994.
- Beaton J, Perry A, Cottrell J. et al. Phenotypic trait variation in a long-term multisite common garden experiment of scots pine in Scotland. *Sci Data* 2022;**9**:671. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01791-8>.
- Benavides R, Carvalho B, Matesanz S. et al. Phenotypes of *Pinus sylvestris* are more coordinated under local harsher conditions across Europe. *J Ecol* 2021;**109**:2580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13668>.
- Brancalion PHS, Holl KD. Guidance for successful tree planting initiatives. *J Appl Ecol* 2020;**57**:2349–61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13725>.
- Burdon RD, Bannister MH, Low CB. Genetic survey of *Pinus radiata*. 5: Between-trait and age-age correlations for growth rate, morphology, and disease resistance. *N Z J For Sci* 1992;**22**:211–27.
- Chiang C, Bånkestad D, Hoch G. Reaching natural growth: the significance of light and temperature fluctuations in plant performance in indoor growth facilities. *Plan Theory* 2020;**9**:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9101312>.
- Close DC, Beadle CL, Brown PH. The physiological basis of containerised tree seedling 'transplant shock': a review. *Aust For* 2005;**68**:112–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049158.2005.10674954>.
- Climont J, Alía R, Karkkainen K. et al. Trade-offs and trait integration in tree phenotypes: consequences for the sustainable use of genetic resources. *Curr For Rep* 2024;**10**:196–222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-024-00217-5>.
- Dhar A, Balliet N, Hawkins CD. et al. Bud flush phenology and nursery carryover effect of paper birch provenances. *iForest* 2015;**8**:809–17. <https://doi.org/10.3832/ifor1367-008>.
- Domisch T, Finér L, Lehto T. Effects of soil temperature on biomass and carbohydrate allocation in scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) seedlings at the beginning of the growing season. *Tree Physiol* 2001;**21**:465–72. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/21.7.465>.
- Dong M, Fan Y, Wu Z. et al. Age-age correlations and early selection for growth traits in 40 half-sib families of *Larix principis-rupprechtii*. *J For Res* 2018;**30**:2111–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11676-018-0706-6>.
- Donnelly K, Cavers S, Cottrell JE. et al. Cryptic genetic variation and adaptation to waterlogging in Caledonian scots pine, *Pinus sylvestris* L. *Ecol Evol* 2018;**8**:8665–75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4389>.
- Downs RJ, Borthwick HA. Effects of photoperiod on growth of trees. *Bot Gaz* 1956;**117**:310–26. <https://doi.org/10.1086/335918>.
- Forestry Commission. *Tree Supply Report*. UK Government, 2023. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/treesupply-report>.
- Forest Research. *The UK Forestry Standard*, Vol. 139. Farnham: Forest Research, 2023.
- Fukatsu E, Tamura A, Takahashi M. et al. Efficiency of the indirect selection and the evaluation of the genotype by environment interaction using Pilodyn for the genetic improvement of wood density in *Cryptomeria japonica*. *J For Res* 2011;**16**:128–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10310-010-0217-6>.
- Gruffman L, Ishida T, Nordin A. et al. Cultivation of Norway spruce and Scots pine on organic nitrogen improves seedling morphology and field performance. *For Ecol Manage* 2012;**276**:118–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.03.030>.
- Harrell Jr. F. Hmisc: Harrell Miscellaneous. R package version 5.2-3, 2025. <https://github.com/harrelfe/hmisc>.
- Heide OM, Prestrud AK. Low temperature, but not photoperiod, controls growth cessation and dormancy induction and release in apple and pear. *Tree Physiol* 2005;**25**:109–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/25.1.109>.
- Heiskanen J, Rikala R. Effect of peat-based container media on establishment of Scots pine, Norway spruce and silver birch seedlings after transplanting in contrasting water conditions. *Scand J For Res* 2000;**15**:49–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02827580050160466>.
- Herbert R, Samuel S, Patterson G. *Using Native Stock for Planting Native Trees and Shrubs*. UKFS Practice Note, Forestry Commission. Edinburgh, UK, 1999.
- Herring SC, Christidis N, Hoell A. et al. Explaining extreme events of 2020 from a climate perspective. *Bull Amer Meteor Soc* 2022;**103**:S1–129. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-ExplainingExtremeEvents2020.1>.
- Holl KD, Brancalion PHS. Tree planting is not a simple solution. *Science* 2020;**368**:580–1. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba8232>.
- Hong Z, Fries A, Wu HX. Age trend of heritability, genetic correlation, and efficiency of early selection for wood quality traits in scots pine. *Can J For Res* 2015;**45**:817–25. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2014-0465>.
- Jaenicke H. *Good Tree Nursery Practices: Practical Guidelines for Research Nurseries*. World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi, Kenya, 1999.

- Lee SJ. Selection of parents for the Scots pine breeding population in Britain. *Forestry* 2002;**75**:293–303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/75.3.293>.
- Luoranen J. Autumn versus spring planting: the initiation of root growth and subsequent field performance of Scots pine and Norway spruce seedlings. *Silva Fenn* 2018;**52**. <https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.7813>.
- Marron N, Dillen SY, Ceulemans R. Evaluation of leaf traits for indirect selection of high yielding poplar hybrids. *Environ Exp Bot* 2007;**61**:103–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2007.04.002>.
- Mason WL, Alía R. Current and future status of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) forests in Europe. *For Syst* 2000;**9**:317–35. <https://doi.org/10.5424/690>.
- Minitab. *Minitab Statistical Software*. Minitab, 2024. Inc (www.minitab.com).
- Morison JIL, Morecroft MD, (eds.). *Plant Growth and Climate Change*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Myster J, Moe R. Effect of diurnal temperature alternations on plant morphology in some greenhouse crops—a mini review. *Sci Hortic* 1995;**62**:205–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4238\(95\)00783-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4238(95)00783-P).
- Nerg A, Kainulainen P, Vuorinen M. et al. Seasonal and geographical variation of terpenes, resin acids and total phenolics in nursery grown seedlings of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.). *New Phytol* 1994;**128**:703–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1994.tb04034.x>.
- Nitsch JP. Growth response of woody plants to photoperiodic stimuli. *Proc Am Soc Hort Sci* 1957;**10**:512–25.
- Niu S, Luo Y, Li D. et al. Plant growth and mortality under climatic extremes: an overview. *Environ Exp Bot* 2014;**98**:13–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2013.10.004>.
- Osorio LF, White TL, Huber DA. Age-age and trait-trait correlations for *Eucalyptus grandis* Hill ex Maiden and their implications for optimal selection age and design of clonal trials. *Theor Appl Genet* 2003;**106**:735–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-002-1124-9>.
- Pan Y, Birdsey RA, Fang J. et al. A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests. *Science* 2011;**333**:988–93. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1201609>.
- Perry A, Brown AV, Cavers S. et al. Has Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) co-evolved with *Dothistroma septosporum* in Scotland? Evidence for spatial heterogeneity in the susceptibility of native provenances. *Evol Appl* 2016;**9**:982–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12395>.
- Perry A, Beaton JK, Stockan JA. et al. Long-term multisite Scots pine trial, Scotland: temperatures and temperature variances for tree nurseries, 2007–2012. NERC EDS Environmental Information Data Centre. 2024a. <https://doi.org/10.5285/81841d93-41e2-47a7-b15a-92d1e1cf07f7>.
- Perry A, Beaton JK, Stockan JA. et al. Significant and persistent carryover effects in Scots pine. *bioRxiv* 2024b. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.23.609343>.
- Poorter H, Fiorani F, Pieruschka R. et al. Pampered inside, pestered outside? Differences and similarities between plants growing in controlled conditions and in the field. *New Phytol* 2016;**212**:838–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14243>.
- Poorter H, Niinemets U, Walter A. et al. A method to construct dose-response curves for a wide range of environmental factors and plant traits by means of a meta-analysis of phenotypic data. *J Exp Bot* 2010;**61**:2043–55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp358>.
- R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2024.
- Ramírez-Valiente JA, Solé-Medina A, Pyhäjärvi T. et al. Selection patterns on early-life phenotypic traits in *Pinus sylvestris* are associated with precipitation and temperature along a climatic gradient in Europe. *New Phytol* 2021;**229**:3009–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17029>.
- Salmela MJ, Cavers S, Cottrell JE. et al. Seasonal patterns of photochemical capacity and spring phenology reveal genetic differentiation among native scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) populations in Scotland. *For Ecol Manage* 2011;**262**:1020–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.05.037>.
- Selander J, Immonen A. Effect of fertilization and watering of Scots pine seedlings on the feeding preference of the pine weevil (*Hyllobius abietis* L.). *Silva Fenn* 1992;**26**:75–84. <https://doi.org/10.14214/sf.a15637>.
- Singh RK, Svystun T, AlDahmash B. et al. Photoperiod- and temperature-mediated control of phenology in trees - a molecular perspective. *New Phytol* 2017;**213**:511–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14346>.
- Vapaavuori EM, Rikala R, Ryyppö A. Effects of root temperature on growth and photosynthesis in conifer seedlings during shoot elongation. *Tree Physiol* 1992;**10**:217–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/10.3.217>.
- Villar-Salvador P, Ocaña L, Peñuelas J. et al. Effect of water stress conditioning on the water relations, root growth capacity, and the nitrogen and non-structural carbohydrate concentration of *Pinus halepensis* Mill. *Ann For Sci* 1999;**56**:459–65. <https://doi.org/10.1051/forest:19990602>.
- Weih M, Karlsson PS. The nitrogen economy of mountain birch seedlings: implications for winter survival. *J Ecol* 1999;**87**:211–9. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2745.1999.00340.x>.
- Westaway S, Grange I, Smith J. et al. Meeting tree planting targets on the UK's path to net-zero: a review of lessons learnt from 100 years of land use policies. *Land Use Policy* 2023;**125**:106502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106502>.
- Williams CG. Accelerated short-term genetic testing for loblolly pine families. *Can J For Res* 1988;**18**:1085–9. <https://doi.org/10.1139/x88-165>.
- Wu HX, Yeh FC, Dhir NK. et al. Genotype by environment interaction and genetic correlation of greenhouse and field performance in *Pinus contorta* ssp. *latifolia*. *Silvae Genet* 1997;**46**:170–75.
- Zobel BJ, Talbert JT. *Applied Tree Improvement*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.