

Can bryophyte groups increase functional resolution in tundra ecosystems?

Signe Lett^{1*}, Ingibjörg S. Jónsdóttir², Antoine Becker-Scarpitta³, Casper T. Christiansen^{1,4}, Heinjo During⁵, Flemming Ekelund¹, Gregory H. R. Henry⁶, Simone I. Lang⁷, Anders Michelsen¹, Kathrin Rousk¹, Juha M. Alatalo⁸, Katlyn R. Betway⁹, Sara Busca¹⁰, Terry Callaghan^{11,12}, Michele Carbognani¹³, Elisabeth J. Cooper¹⁴, J. Hans C. Cornelissen¹⁵, Ellen Dorrepaal¹⁶, Dagmar Egelkraut¹⁰, Tatiana G. Elumeeva¹⁷, Siri V. Haugum¹⁰, Robert D. Hollister⁹, Annika K. Jägerbrand¹⁸, Frida Keuper¹⁹, Kari Klanderud²⁰, Esther Lévesque²¹, Xin Liu²², Jeremy May²³, Pascale Michel¹⁰, Martin Mörsdorf²⁴, Alessandro Petraglia¹³, Christian Rixen²⁵, Bjorn J.M. Robroek²⁶, Agnieszka M. Rzepczynska¹, Nadejda A. Soudzilovskaia²⁷, Anne Tolvanen²⁸, Vigdis Vandvik¹⁰, Igor Volkov²⁹, Irina Volkova³⁰, Kristel van Zuijlen²⁰

¹Terrestrial Ecology Section, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

²Institute of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Iceland, Sturlugata 7, 102 Reykjavik, Iceland

³Spatial Food Web Ecology Group & Research Centre for Ecological Change, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Helsinki, PO Box 27 (Viikinkaari), 00014, Helsinki, Finland.

⁴Center for Permafrost (CENPERM), University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 10, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark

⁵Ecology & Biodiversity, Department of Biology, Utrecht University, 3584 CH Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁶Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

⁷Department of Arctic Biology, The University Centre in Svalbard (UNIS), 9171 Longyearbyen, Svalbard, Norway

⁸Environmental Science Center, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar

⁹Biology Department, Grand Valley State University, 1 Campus Dr., Allendale, MI 49401 USA

¹⁰Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bergen, PO Box 7801, N-5020 Bergen, Norway

¹¹Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield UK

¹²Department of Botany, Tomsk State University, Russia

¹³Department of Chemistry, Life Sciences and Environmental Sustainability, University of Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze 11/A, I-43124, Parma, Italy

¹⁴Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, Biosciences Fisheries and Economics, UiT-The Arctic University of Norway, N-9037 Tromsø, Norway

¹⁵Department of Ecological Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

¹⁶Climate Impacts Research Centre, Department of Ecology and Environmental Science, Umeå University, Sweden

¹⁷Department of Ecology and Plant Geography, Biological Faculty, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory, 1/12, 119234 Moscow, Russia

¹⁸Ecology and Environmental Science, RLAS, Halmstad University, Halmstad, Sweden

¹⁹BioEcoAgro Joint Research Unit, INRAE, F-02000 Barenton-Bugny, France

²⁰Faculty of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resource Management, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, P.O. Box 5003, 1432, Ås, Norway

²¹Département des Sciences de l'environnement et Centre d'études nordiques, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Qc, Canada, G8Z 4M3

²²Chinese Academy of Sciences Key Laboratory of Mountain Ecological Restoration and Bioresource Utilization & Ecological Restoration and Biodiversity Conservation Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province, Chengdu Institute of Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chengdu 610041, China

²³Department of Biology, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th Street, Miami, Florida USA

²⁴Department of Geobotany, University of Freiburg, Schänzlestrasse 1, 79104 Freiburg, Germany

²⁵WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF, Flüelastr. 11, 7260 Davos Dorf

²⁶Aquatic Ecology & Environmental Biology, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, AJ 6525 Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

²⁷Centre for environmental Sciences, Hasselt University, Martelarenlaan42, 3500 Hasselt, Belgium

²⁸Natural Resources Institute Finland, B.O. Box 413, 90014 Oulu, Finland

²⁹Laboratory of Biodiversity and Ecology, Tomsk State University, Lenin pr., 36, 634050 Tomsk, Russia

³⁰Department of Botany and Laboratory of Ecosystem and Climate Change Studies, Tomsk State University, Lenin pr., 36, 634050 Tomsk, Russia

*Corresponding author: signe.lett@bio.ku.dk

Abstract

The relative contribution of bryophytes to plant diversity, primary productivity, and ecosystem functioning increases towards colder climates. Bryophytes respond to environmental changes at the species level, but because bryophyte species are relatively difficult to identify, they are often lumped into one functional group. Consequently, bryophyte function remains poorly resolved. Here, we explore how higher resolution of bryophyte functional diversity can be encouraged and implemented in tundra ecological studies.

We briefly review previous bryophyte functional classifications and the roles of bryophytes in tundra ecosystems and their susceptibility to environmental change. Based on shoot morphology and colony organization, we then propose twelve easily distinguishable bryophyte functional groups. To illustrate how bryophyte functional groups can help elucidate variation in bryophyte effects and responses, we compiled existing data on water holding capacity, a key bryophyte trait. Although plant functional groups, can mask potentially high inter- and intraspecific variability, we found better separation of bryophyte functional group means compared to previous grouping systems regarding water holding capacity. This suggests that our bryophyte functional groups truly represent variation in the functional roles of bryophytes in tundra ecosystems. Lastly, we provide recommendations to improve monitoring of bryophyte community changes in tundra study sites.

Keywords:

Mosses, Arctic-Alpine, environmental change, functional traits, water holding capacity

1 Introduction

In the Arctic, bryophytes represent 30% of all plant species (Walker and Raynolds 2011). Unlike the general trend for vascular plants, regional bryophyte species richness does not decline when moving from the equator towards the poles (Geffert et al. 2013; Mateo et al. 2016). In many tundra ecosystem types, bryophytes contribute significantly (>50 %) to primary production and standing biomass (Wielgolaski 1971; Huemrich et al. 2010) and play important roles for soil moisture, biogeochemical cycling, surface energy balance, and species diversity (e.g. Lindo and Gonzalez 2010; Turetsky et al. 2012). Tundra ecosystems are facing dramatic shifts in structure and function due to environmental change, which affects the abundance of bryophytes (Elmendorf et al. 2012a, 2012b; Lang et al. 2012; Olofsson et al. 2014; Cooper et al. 2019). However, although both functionality of bryophytes and their responses to environmental change differ considerably among species (Cornelissen et al. 2007; Hudson and Henry 2010; Lang et al. 2012) very few field studies include bryophytes at the species or other subgroup level. Therefore, studies are largely inconclusive and speculative in predicting responses of tundra bryophyte communities to environmental changes (Elmendorf et al. 2012a, 2012b) and the potential consequences of these changes for ecosystem functioning.

The resolution of the bryophyte component in tundra vegetation and ecosystem studies could be increased considerably by applying relevant bryophyte functional groups. Traditionally, functional classification has been used in the opposite manner as an effort to reduce complexity in e.g. vascular plant ecology using 'plant functional types'. Such *a priori* functional grouping has been challenged because effect and response traits do not necessarily match. Therefore, a good starting point for establishing fine-resolution linkages between bryophyte abundance, environmental changes, and ecosystem functioning could be to assign bryophyte species to functional groups through post hoc trait-based aggregation. This is done increasingly for other primary producer groups (Thomas et al.

2019; Mauffrey et al. 2020), because it directly provides ecologically meaningful functional groups. Such groups translate and aggregate species responses to more general functional responses and allow cross-site comparisons of responses regardless of species (Lavorel et al. 1997). However, for bryophytes the challenge is not limited to translating species into function.

Bryophyte species identification as such is challenging, especially in the field. It is time-consuming and requires identification skills that few ecologists possess (Grace 1995). In practice, this causes most field ecologists to lump bryophytes into one group (e.g., bryophytes or even as ‘non-vascular plants’, with lichens as ‘cryptogams’), or two or more bryophyte groups (e.g., ‘*Sphagnum*’ and ‘other bryophyte species’). Consequently, important ecological information is lost, comparison between different studies is not straightforward and opportunities for addressing functional responses of bryophytes across sites and at larger scales are hampered. Therefore, for bryophytes, using *a priori* defined functional groups, based on coarse morphological characteristics that can be identified in the field, may be a more promising approach. Previous work on bryophyte classifications that has been based on life history traits (During 1979), position of sexual reproductive organs (La Farge-England 1996) and bryophyte colony structure (Mägdefrau 1982) offer useful insights about bryophyte ecology, but none of them focus primarily on functional diversity.

Here we propose *a priori* defined, field-identifiable ‘bryophyte functional groups’ (BFGs) as a cost- and time-efficient, and meaningful way to increase bryophyte data resolution, allow measurement of change in bryophyte communities in response to environmental change, obtain comparable bryophyte data across tundra habitats and sites, and enhance understanding of bryophyte ecosystem effects and responses. To this end, we 1) provide an overview of the role of bryophytes in tundra ecosystems and their susceptibility to environmental change; 2) review previous efforts to group bryophytes and 3) build on these efforts to propose twelve field identifiable BFGs. 4) We evaluate the relevance of these BFGs in relation to water holding capacity (WHC), a functionally

important and commonly measured bryophyte trait, in a case-study where we re-analyze existing data. As such, if BFGs separate into more than one cluster based on water holding capacity, the groups improve the functional resolution compared to the commonly used single 'bryophytes' group for ecosystem function governed by this trait. Finally, we discuss how BFGs may differ in regard to other key bryophyte functions and provide recommendations on how to apply BFGs in tundra ecological studies.

2. Bryophytes in tundra ecosystems

2.1 Ecosystem functions and functional diversity of tundra bryophytes

An important feature of tundra bryophytes is that they often grow in dense carpets or colonies in many habitats. It is in the colony form that bryophytes most strongly affect the environment through their physical presence, as well as biogeochemically and biotically through interactions with other organisms in the ecosystem (Fig 1). The physical properties of a dense and deep bryophyte layer may significantly control the soil environment by buffering substrate moisture and insulate soil from diurnal and annual air temperature variation with consequences for biogeochemical processes (Gornall et al. 2007; Soudzilovskaia et al. 2013; Jaroszynska 2019), active layer development and permafrost ice content (Jorgenson et al. 2010). Through their effects on water balance bryophytes affect energy partitioning and decrease ecosystem ground heat flux (Blok et al. 2011) and affect surface albedo (May et al. 2018). Biogeochemically, bryophytes are important as they contribute to the ecosystem carbon (C) balance through their great abundance, high C use efficiency and because they are active beyond the short vascular plant growing season (Douma et al. 2007; Woodin et al. 2009; Street et al. 2012, 2013). Bryophytes control the input of nitrogen (N) to the ecosystem through associations with N_2 fixing bacteria and by efficiently immobilizing N from deposition within the bryophyte layer (Jónsdóttir et al. 1995). Both C and N fixation rates are highly dependent on moisture

conditions within the bryophyte tissue (Solheim and Zielke 2003; Turetsky 2003; Gavazov et al. 2010; Lett and Michelsen 2014; Rousk et al. 2015, 2017). Last, their recalcitrant litter and effects on pH are an important feature, which slows the release of C and N cycling in the ecosystem (Russell 1990; Lang et al. 2009; Soudzilovskaia et al. 2010).

Through a combination of these physical and biochemical effects, bryophytes interact with the biotic environment. As such, they affect vascular plant growth and establishment through competition and facilitation (Gornall et al. 2011; Soudzilovskaia et al. 2011; Keuper et al. 2011; Lett et al. 2017, 2018, 2020). For instance, bryophytes can grow in places where vascular plants cannot root, such as rocks and glacial forelands, where they over time form an organic substrate which can later be colonized by plants (Jones and Henry 2003; Gavini et al. 2019). Their colonies comprise a matrix for unique food webs of microfauna and microbes (Lindo and Gonzalez 2010; Glime 2012; Jonsson et al. 2015). Although their dietary value is low (Prop and Vulink 1992; Hübner 2007), bryophytes are also consumed by vertebrate herbivores such as rodents, geese, reindeer/caribou, and muskox, (Glime 2006; Ihl and Barboza 2007; Bjørkvoll et al. 2009; Soininen et al. 2013).

Bryophyte ecosystem functional trait data are still scarce in comparison to such data for vascular plants (St. Martin and Mallik 2017). Morphological shoot traits, and colony traits such as moss layer depth, colony density and surface texture and color, are important for determining the physical effects of bryophytes on tundra ecosystems. For instance, decomposition rates can vary more than 10-fold between the extremely recalcitrant *Sphagnum* mosses and more nitrogen rich species such as *Ptilidium ciliare* and *Pleurozium schreberi* (Lang et al. 2009; van Zuijlen et al. 2020) and water holding capacity may vary five-fold (Elumeeva et al. 2011). Such information is obtained by systematically screening species for important effect traits.

2.2 Responses in bryophyte cover to environmental change in tundra ecosystems

As for any tundra plant, climate warming is likely to promote bryophyte growth if water and nutrients are not limiting (Douma et al. 2007). Wetter and warmer climates, which are now occurring and expected in much of the tundra biome (Bintanja and Andry 2017; Thomas et al. 2018), should, in theory, promote bryophyte growth and thus abundance. Data on bryophyte abundance responses to climate change are scarce compared to those on vascular plants, but available data from the North American and European Arctic show an overall decline in bryophyte abundance in responses to climate warming across tundra ecosystems (Elmendorf et al. 2012a, 2012b). This decline seems more pronounced in moister sites and has been attributed to indirect effects of warming through competition from vascular plants (shading). However, bryophyte responses to warming vary substantially across species and sites, and habitats within sites. For example, no effect of experimental warming on bryophyte covers was observed in a sub-Arctic *Racomitrium lanuginosum* heath (Jónsdóttir et al. 2005), positive effects of warming were observed for common boreal bryophyte species in Arctic and subarctic alpine tundra plant communities (Lang et al. 2012) and for bryophytes in various habitats within a high Arctic tundra site (Hudson and Henry 2010; Edwards and Henry 2016).

Changes in water availability under warming, or susceptibility to other global change drivers may also contribute to the observed general negative trends. Unlike vascular plants, most bryophytes are poikilohydric and cannot actively control their water balance. They have no or only thin leaf cuticles and do not have leaf stomates. Most species do not have efficient vascular systems (but see Brodribb et al. 2020) nor true roots, and access water and nutrients passively through their leaves. Bryophytes can, to varying degrees, tolerate desiccation during dry periods after which they return to normal physiological activity (Proctor and Tuba 2002; Proctor et al. 2007). Increased herbivore pressure may disturb the bryophyte layer in the tundra, as for example through spring grubbing by the increasing goose populations in the Arctic (Kotanen and Jefferies 1997; Wal et al. 2007).

Exclusion of lemmings and reindeer (Olofsson et al. 2014) and sheep (Jónsdóttir 1991) in subarctic alpine heath tundra increases bryophyte cover and colony depth through promotion of tall stature bryophytes. Furthermore, goose and sheep grazing can increase small scale bryophyte diversity at the species level (Jónsdóttir 1984; Jasmin et al. 2008). Increased snow depth may promote bryophyte biomass production and cover (Dorrepaal et al. 2004; Paradis et al. 2016; Cooper et al. 2019). Importantly, bryophytes show species-specific responses to multiple environmental factors operating at different spatial scales, with variable consequences for both community composition and total bryophyte cover across alpine and Arctic tundra regions.

2.3 Functional trait responses to the environment and intraspecific variation

By combining data for total bryophyte cover and species composition with data for bryophyte functional traits we can understand how environmental changes affect ecosystem functionality (Díaz and Cabido 2001). Some functional traits of bryophytes may, however, themselves be responsive to environmental change causing considerable intraspecific trait variation in addition to interspecific trait variation that is caused by species turnover. For example, bryophyte tissue P content and shoot water holding capacity and growth showed high variation within species, while traits like pH, N content and litter decomposability showed less intra- than interspecific variation in alpine ecosystems (Jägerbrand et al. 2014; Roos et al. 2019; van Zuijlen et al. 2020). However, Roos et al. (2019) concluded that bryophyte species turnover rather than intraspecific variation drove changes in community abundance-weighted means of all six measured traits (N and P concentration and ratio, pH, specific leaf area and water holding capacity) across an elevational gradient. This supports the possibility to assign bryophyte species to groups, which could represent certain ecosystem functions.

3. Grouping of bryophytes

3. 1 Previous grouping of bryophytes

During (1979, 1992) identified life history types to classify bryophytes according to life strategies (e.g., life span and reproductive strategy, -age and -effort). Life history types may depend on the environment and life history traits are likely a key to understanding bryophyte population dynamics (Austrheim et al. 2005); however, they do not provide full insights into bryophyte functional roles in the ecosystem. Currently, the majority of trait data for bryophytes occurring in the TRY database are on *life history traits* (Kattge et al. 2020).

The growth form classification has often been used in combination with life form and/or perichaetial position in the literature. La Farge-England (1996) distinguishes growth form, life form and perichaetial position and indicates which are environmentally modified versus genetically fixed. This provided a comprehensive and unambiguous way to assess the structure of moss (Bryophyta) individuals. They refer to growth form as the structure of individual shoots, including direction of growth and branch form. Here, growth form (modified by the environment) is differentiated from the perichaetial position (La Farge-England 1996). Perichaetial position, which classifies acrocarpy, cladocarpy, and pleurocarpy, is analyzed and reviewed with an evolutionary perspective within major Bryophyta lineages. Huttunen et al. (2018) mapped “carpy” phylogenetically across the lineages in an extensive review on bryophyte functional traits. They show that perichaetial position alone does not determine the ecosystem function of bryophytes or how populations respond to environmental change. Growth form, on the other hand, seems to influence how shoots are organised in colonies, which is thought to be important for ecosystem functioning (Bates 1998).

The *life form* classification of bryophytes was developed by Gimingham and Robertson (1950) and later refined and modified by Gimingham & Birse (1957), Mägdefrau (1982), Longton (1988), Grace (1995), Bates (1998), Hill et al. (2007) and Vanderpoorten and Goffinet (2009). The classification is based on the organization of the colony (group of shoots) although exact groups differ

between authors. The life form classification integrates shoot morphology, such as branching pattern, growth direction and colony structure. Grace (1995) showed that life forms are easily identifiable in the field across different levels of bryophyte identification skill. Importantly, it is convenient and meaningful to view bryophytes in terms of colonies rather than individuals in order to understand their effects on ecosystems (Bates 1998; Huttunen et al. 2018). Some physical colony properties, such as density and thickness, are directly related to ecosystem function, e.g., insulation capacity and water holding capacity (Gornall et al. 2007; Elumeeva et al. 2011; Soudzilovskaia et al. 2013), whereas it is unknown whether chemical properties such as N content are linked to colony structure. Through their colony features bryophytes also affect the biotic environment, e.g., by hosting specific micro- and mesofauna communities and through competition with or facilitation of other plants. Colonies in tundra ecosystems may be a mixture of several species (see below), which is a limitation to the life form classification. In conclusion, with their identifiability and ecological relevance, life forms integrate many of the desired features for *a priori* defined bryophyte functional groups.

3.2 Modified 'life form' as bryophyte functional groups

Our primary aim is to improve the representation of functionally different bryophytes in studies of tundra ecosystems by (1) focusing on the specific context of their responses to environmental changes and their effects on key ecosystem functions, and to encourage this by (2) proposing field-identifiable bryophyte functional groups as an alternative to determination at either the highest level, 'species', and often not feasible level or the lowest level, 'bryophyte', of resolution, which is too coarse to be useful. Therefore, our bryophyte functional groups (BFGs) are chosen to be as morphologically distinct as possible to aid field identification. The BFGs are organized as a key (Fig 2). The first steps follow the British Field Flora for Mosses and Liverworts (Atherton et al. 2010) and rely on morphological differences in macro-characteristics of the shoots and thalli, including branching

pattern, and later steps divide groups based on colony structure, i.e. *life forms* (Fig 2). By combining the growth form and life form concept, we optimize the possibility to have functionally and morphological distinct groups, which are also taxonomically distinct.

The first split divides bryophytes into those with thallus and those with leaves (Fig 2a). The 'Thalloid' group contains liverworts and hornworts (Marchantiophyta and Anthocerotophyta, Fig A1). Leafy bryophytes are divided based on the characteristics and placement of the leaves (Fig 2b). Leaves can be arranged either in 2-3 ranks, mostly rounded or 2-lobed, and always without nerves, 'Leafy liverworts', or have leaves which are arranged in a spiral and often with a nerve and acute tip, mosses (Bryophyta). Mosses are further divided into those with a capitulum, i.e. '*Sphagnum*' and those without capitulum, i.e. Non-*Sphagnum* (Fig 2c). The group and genus *Sphagnum* is easily recognized in the field as no other bryophytes have a capitulum. Non-*Sphagnum* mosses are divided into those with branched shoots and those with shoots not or infrequently branching (Fig 2d) roughly corresponding to pleurocarps and acrocarps; cladocarps fall into both groups.

Colonies with shoots not or- infrequently branching are divided into those with thick, non-transparent leaves and those with thin, more transparent leaves (Fig 2e). Non-transparent leaves are a feature of 'Polytrichales' (Fig A1) and are caused by lamellae on the surface of the leaves. These lamellae are usually visible with a hand lens but common for this group is that stem and leaves tend to be sturdier than in individuals in the contrasting group. The contrasting group, mosses with thin, more transparent leaves, form a large group, which is divided into 'Cushions' and 'Unbranched turfs' (Fig 2f). 'Unbranched turfs' correspond to Bates' turfs (Bates 1998), except our group includes only *acrocarps*. All shoots grow vertically from the substrate and, depending on the length of the shoots, 'Unbranched turfs' are divided into 'Short unbranched turfs' (<5 cm) and 'Tall unbranched turfs' (>5 cm, Fig 2g). The 'Cushions' have dome shaped colonies (as in 'cushion plants' such as *Silene acaulis*).

‘Cushions’ are divided into ‘Small cushions’ and ‘Large cushions’. Small cushions have shoots emerging from a shared, central origin so that shoots grow centrifugally and are less than 5 cm deep, Fig 2h), e.g., genus *Grimmia* and *Andreaea*. ‘Large cushions’ are more than 5 cm deep and may or may not have shoots growing from a central point. Species of this group also appear in other BFGs e.g., *Racomitrium lanuginosum* in branched turf (see below) or *Leucobryum glaucum*, *Dicranum elongatum* and *Anoetangium aestivum*, in tall unbranched turfs.

Colonies with branched shoots are divided into ‘Dendroid’, ‘Weft’, ‘Mat’ and ‘Branched turf’ (Fig 2i). The dendroid classification is technically a growth form. Dendroids have shoots that extend from horizontal stem and have branches placed towards the tip of the shoot making them resemble miniature trees. This is a small group and the most common species in tundra ecosystems is *Climacium dendroides*, but also e.g. *Thamnobryum alopecurum* and *Isothecium alopecuroides* are found in subarctic areas. Wefts also have strongly branched shoots, but branches are distributed throughout the entire stem giving rise to the colloquial name, feather moss. Colonies appear loose and chaotic with large heavily branched shoots growing both vertically and horizontally. The emblematic boreal species *Pleurozium schreberi* and *Hylocomium splendens* belong to this group. Shoots of the Mat group grow horizontal to the substrate. Tips of shoots can become erect, giving the mat a rougher surface as described in Bates (1998), but generally the branched shoots lie flat on the surface and therefore have a rather compact appearance. Mats are often found on solid substrates like logs or stones. Branched turf forms a new group containing pleuro- and cladocarp forming turfs. Like the unbranched turf, they have erect shoots but differ in that their shoots are branched, although usually not as branched as the Wefts. The abundant tundra species *Tomentypnum nitens* and species from the *Racomitrium* genus belong to this group.

The 12 BFGs (Fig 2) do not encompass all tundra bryophyte species but focus on the perennial bryophytes, which constitute the vast majority of species (in the British bryophyte flora, 90

% of species are perennial, Hill et al. 2007). Most species can be ascribed to only one BFG but some variable species will have a primary and a secondary life form, as recognized in Hill et al. (2007). For example, the cladocarpous *Racomitrium lanuginosum* is often quite branched and can form continuous and often deep layers, which would place it in the 'branched turf' group. In more exposed sites with less vegetation cover, it can form dense cushions and would therefore be better placed within the 'Large cushion' group. Furthermore, although species within each BFG do not necessarily share all characteristics (Dormann and Woodin 2002; Dorrepaal 2007) we argue that our bryophyte functional groups will increase resolution in tundra ecosystem studies compared to the frequent lumping of all bryophytes into one or very few functional groups.

3.3 Ecosystem functions of the BFGs

We assessed whether our choice of field-identifiable bryophyte functional groups can lead to a more meaningful representation of tundra bryophytes in the study of their ecosystem function by investigating how the groups separate for one key trait that is frequently measured, the water holding capacity (WHC). As such, if BFGs separate into more than one cluster, we can conclude that the resolution for that trait is improved compared to the commonly used 'bryophytes'. Currently bryophyte trait data are poorly represented in global and regional trait databases such as the TRY (Kattge et al. 2020) and the tundra plant specific Tundra Trait Team database (Bjorkman et al. 2018), which limits the possibility to fully test the BFGs. However, a wide set of ecosystem functions are ultimately linked to bryophyte water balance. Water content, in turn, depends on habitat, seasonal climate and the species-specific ability of bryophytes to retain and hold water. The trait WHC is determined by a set of other traits, such as colony density and leaf and shoot morphology (Elumeeva et al. 2011). Water content is important for key bryophyte traits such as insulation capacity, albedo,

flammability, growth and association with N₂-fixing bacteria (Cornelissen et al. 2007; May et al. 2018).

To assess if our groups indeed perform better than those previously identified, we also compared our groups to three previous grouping systems. We chose the life form classification by Grace (1995) as this has been tested on non-expert people and found to be user-friendly, and it is most similar to our groups with *Sphagnum* defined as a separate group, ‘whorled branched turf’. We included the primary life forms as defined by Bernhardt-Römermann et al. (2018), because these are the most recent of the life form classifications. As a third grouping system, we included perichaetial position (La Farge-England 1996), with the only adaptation that we included liverworts as a separate group).

3.3.1 Water holding capacity data collection and analysis

We collated existing data on water holding capacity (WHC) defined as maximum water held per gram of dry mass of bryophyte shoots or monospecific bryophyte colonies. The full dataset included 1360 observations of 59 species from both published and unpublished studies. All data were from tundra ecosystems, except one Norwegian coastal heathland study (Rui, Vandvik, Haugum *unpubl.*). Although the method across studies did not follow any standardized protocol the studies could be grouped into three methods of measuring WHC: as “internally” (shoot_{int}) and “internal and externally” (shoot_{int+ext}) held water in shoots and for whole bryophyte colonies (see Appendix Table A1 for the descriptions of methods for the individual studies). While colonies represent the most realistic field situation, measurements at the shoot level are less destructive and therefore possible to conduct in long-term experimental plots and often data will therefore exist in this form. Internally held water is likely what directly links to physiological processes taking place inside bryophyte cells but is likely ultimately dependent on colony WHC. Water holding capacity shoot_{int} data included 36

species representing 7 BFGs (Elumeeva et al. 2011; Michel et al. 2012; Roos et al. 2019; van Zuijlen et al. 2021). WHC Shoot_{int+ext} data included 28 species representing 8 BFGs (Busca, Vandvik, Haugum, *unpubl.*; Elumeeva et al. 2011; Rzepczynska, Lett, Michelsen *unpubl.*) and WHC colony data included 33 species representing 7 BFGs (Elumeeva et al. 2011; Jónsdóttir, *unpubl.*; Lett et al. 2017, Liu and Rousk *unpubl.*; May et al. 2018; Michel et al. 2012; Rzepczynska, Lett, Michelsen, *unpubl.*).

Correlation analyses with averaged species WHC values showed that WHC of whole colonies and WHC of shoots_{int+ext} were well correlated (Fig A2a) whereas WHC shoot_{int} did not correlate with other ways of measuring WHC (Fig A2, b, c). Data for WHC shoot_{int} was therefore excluded from further analyses. The remaining dataset included 963 observations of 37 bryophyte species, which we assigned to eight different BFGs (Fig 3, Fig A3) and to existing grouping schemes, namely 'perichaetial position' (Liverworts grouped separately) (La Farge-England 1996), life form according to Grace (1995) and life form according to the BryForTrait database (Bernhardt-Römermann et al. 2018). Differences in WHC between groups within the different grouping schemes were analyzed with a mixed-effect model followed by Tukey's HSD test (see Appendix). All data were handled and analyzed in R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team 2020).

3.3.2 Tundra bryophyte functional groups in relation to water holding capacity

Three clusters with distinct WHC (shoots_{int+ext} and colony) materialized from our analysis (Fig 3). '*Sphagnum*' had the highest WHC, with an average of 17 g water per g dw for colonies and shoots_{int+ext}. The high WHC of *Sphagnum* species is primarily attributed to their specialized hyaline cells, which greatly increase their water holding capacity. With 2 g/g, 'Polytrichales' had the lowest WHC and there was little variation between species within the group. Polytrichales are unique in several ways as they have relatively well-developed water conducting tissue and root-like structures,

rhizoids and waxy leaves, a feature that reduces water evaporation rather than increasing water storage. The four groups, 'Weft', 'Mats', 'Tall and Short unbranched turf' and 'Branched turf' had intermediate WHC and did not differ from each other. Large variation between species within those groups (Fig A3) shows that not all our groups distinguish themselves from each other in terms of WHC. Particularly the groups 'Short unbranched turf' and 'Tall unbranched turf' displayed almost as much variation between species within groups as the entire spectrum of the dataset. A better separation between those groups might have been achieved by use of standardized protocols or a larger number of species representing each group. However, the groups possibly differ in other functional traits and thus represent functionally distinct species clusters, and this should be tested in future work.

Four of our groups were not represented in the analyses. Of these, 'Thalloid' is, with its absence of leaves, the morphologically most distinct. From this group *Marchantia foliacea* and *Monoclea forsteri* from New Zealand forests had WHC of 20 and 10 g/g, respectively (Green and Snelgar 1982), which is within the upper end the spectrum covered in our study. 'Cushions', large and small, were also not represented by our data. Cushion growth is considered an adaptation to water conservation and low temperatures (Rice and Schneider 2004; Sand-Jensen and Hammer 2012). The WHC of 'Dendroid' bryophytes has not been studied but the dendroid life form is associated with habitats of relatively high moisture or humidity (Atherton et al. 2010). Dendroids grow in loose patches, often intermingled with other species, and with limited branches at the lower stem, which could suggest that their WHC is not improved by colony structure.

3.3.3 Tundra bryophyte functional groups and other functional traits

Data at the species level for more than one functional trait are required to fully understand the functional roles of each BFG. Water holding capacity is only one of many important traits which

relate bryophytes to key ecosystem functions (Cornelissen et al. 2007) and the BFGs are likely to cluster in unique ways for different functional traits. Here we discuss how additional functional traits, which are presumed to be of importance for ecosystem functioning, likely differ between the BFGs i.e., colony density, bryophyte layer depth, relative growth rate, decomposability and nutrient content and identify the need for further research (Fig 4).

Colony density together with bryophyte layer depth affect soil insulation efficiency, which in turn affects soil temperature, organic matter decomposition, nutrient cycling, active layer depth and permafrost (Gornall et al. 2007; Soudzilovskaia et al. 2013). Colony density is relatively low in 'Sphagnum', 'Weft' and 'Tall unbranched turf' whereas 'Branched turf' and 'Polytrichales' are BFGs that often have relatively higher density values (Fig 4). Bryophyte layer depth or mat thickness is here defined as the distance from bryophyte layer surface to the point where bryophyte shoots or thalli begin to disintegrate. Mat thickness differs between some BFGs partly because size is an explicit character defining some groups ('Unbranched turf' and 'Cushion'). Along with 'Sphagnum', 'Tall unbranched turf' and 'Large cushion' create relatively deep bryophyte layers (Fig 4). 'Thalloid' bryophytes and 'Mats' are never deep as they grow in close contact with the substrate.

The contribution of bryophytes to ecosystem C balance is manifested by the bryophyte layer depth as the balance between their net primary production and litter decomposability leads to variation in accumulation of bryophyte-derived organic matter. Both growth rate and decomposability show high variation between species and potentially between the BFGs. Studies comparing growth rates between multiple bryophyte species are relatively sparse and likely very sensitive to the method used. In growth chambers, length increment of 'Sphagnum' was high compared to intermediate 'Weft' and 'Branched-' and 'Unbranched turfs' and slow growing 'Leafy liverworts' (Fig 4, Rzepzynska, Lett, Michelsen *unpubl.*), whereas maximum biomass gain under highly standardized conditions was the highest in 'Short unbranched turf' and 'Leafy liverworts' (Furness and Grime

1982a). While both length and biomass gain may be relevant performance indicators, they are two different functional traits (Furness and Grime 1982b). This highlights the need for standardized bryophyte trait protocols. Bryophyte functional groups seem to have a relatively high variability in decomposability as '*Sphagnum*' had the lowest decomposition rates, followed by 'Thalloid' bryophytes and 'Branched turfs' (Fig 4, Lang et al. 2009). 'Unbranched turf', 'Weft' and 'Polytrichales' had intermediate, and 'Leafy liverworts' had the highest decomposition rates. The rates of these two processes are likely influenced mostly by the contents of C-rich recalcitrant compounds, but also by tissue nutrient contents. Both bryophyte growth and decomposability are likely to be strongly affected by tissue nutrient content (Lang et al. 2009), and N content can be regarded as a separate functional trait.

Although there are indications from previous studies that BFGs are likely to differ in important functional traits (Fig 4), there are big gaps in available data and the BFGs are not evenly represented. 'Dendroids', 'Mats', 'Small and large cushion' and 'Thalloids' are heavily understudied and focused efforts to include species representing these groups is crucial. In addition, there is a range of other important functional bryophyte traits which are less studied. For example, flammability has large impacts on ecosystem C and N balance and could become more important under future warmer and drier climate conditions. As water content greatly influences bryophyte flammability (Blauw et al. 2015), flammability could be linked to WHC and thus predicted by the BFGs. Bryophytes constitute an important substrate in many tundra ecosystems for N₂ fixing bacteria with substantial inter species variation (Gavazov et al. 2010; Stuart et al. 2020). The mechanisms controlling N₂ fixation in bryophytes are poorly understood but traits like WHC and perhaps specific leaf area are potential important predictors of species differences (Rousk et al 2018; Liu and Rousk *unpubl.*). In conclusion, the BFGs are likely to have unique combinations of trait values for a range of functional traits and the application of BFG could improve functional resolution in ecosystem studies.

While BFGs may differ in one or many functional traits, many traits are plastic and may cause substantial intraspecific (or intra-BFG) variation. This variation needs to be further explored and it is possible that for some traits, the extent of the intraspecific variation may be predicted by the BFGs. For example, the trait ‘bryophyte albedo’ is highly plastic for some species e.g. within the genera of *Sphagnum* and *Racomitrium*, which turn whiteish upon drought (May et al. 2018). In addition, trait plasticity could be important for understanding changes in bryophyte community composition in relation to environmental change as species or BFGs with higher trait plasticity may be less susceptible to environmental changes (Henn et al. 2018; Roos et al. 2019).

4 Using BFGs in vegetation surveys

The inclusion of bryophyte functional groups in vegetation assessments using standard methods such as the point-intercept method, a standard within the ITEX network (Molau and Mølgaard 1996), and visual cover estimates could improve vegetation analyses in tundra ecosystems by providing greater resolution of the bryophyte component in plant communities. The BFGs are partly defined by the type of colony they appear in, but bryophytes do not always grow in mono-specific patches. Often, they grow in complex assemblages of multiple species, which may or may not belong to the same functional group. If species growing in the same colony do not belong to the same BFG, how should a BFG then be determined based on colony type? For the point intercept method, this is partly solved in our classification system which combines shoot and colony characteristics. The hierarchical organization (Fig 2) of the BFGs allows group determination at a ‘lower’ level in cases where colony type cannot be determined (Broad functional groups, Fig 2). For visual cover estimates of bryophyte colonies, the BFG that the dominating species belongs to may be recorded. In relation to these issues, functional properties of mixed and single species bryophyte colonies can differ beyond the additive effect of the combination of species (Mulder et al. 2001; Rixen and Mulder 2005; Michel et al. 2012).

In this way, the function of a given colony may not be the weighted mean of the species present in the colony. This is especially an issue when assessing bryophyte community function based on the species present in the ecosystem. Functional groups, like the ones suggested here, do not eliminate this issue. Despite these unresolved situations, we believe that the benefits of using BFGs will exceed the drawbacks.

In practice, we suggest using the proposed bryophyte functional group classification as a complement to the species approach. Thus, when a species cannot be determined due to issues such as time or skill limitation, hits are assigned to the group. It may also be advisable for field researchers to learn the two to three most common species in their plots and go to species level here. Importantly, the BFGs could also be used the “other way around” as a means to combine species allowing comparison of bryophyte-cover data across experiments and field sites. This type of aggregation is essential for enabling comparison when sites do not have the same species and has been done successfully for vascular plants within the ITEX network (Walker et al. 2006; Elmendorf et al. 2012a, 2012b). This would provide important insights into the responses of bryophyte communities to climate and environmental change and their ecosystem impacts and consequences.

5 Directions for future research

The BFGs suggested here are a first step to facilitate inclusion of bryophytes in vegetation surveys at a higher functional resolution than simply 'bryophytes', while still accessible to non-experts and a means to lump bryophytes into meaningful groups that share important functional traits. However, the suggested BFGs need to be further evaluated for their usefulness by statistical testing for additional traits measured at the species level. With the WHC data, we provide an example of how this evaluation can be done and show that for WHC bryophyte functional resolution is increased from one to three by using the BFGs rather than the generic ‘bryophytes’ and that the BFGs explain WHC

better than previous grouping systems. The outcome might either support the grouping suggested here or require adjustments.

Further testing of the BFGs requires accessible functional trait data, which is currently limited. To allow robust analyses, these traits must be gathered using standardized protocols building on previous efforts (Jónsdóttir et al. 1999; Cornelissen et al. 2007; Hill et al. 2007). In order to improve or include bryophyte representation in current trait databases such as TRY and Tundra Trait Team (Kattge et al. 2020; Björkman et al. 2018) bryophyte functional trait data need to be geographically and taxonomically diverse for good representation of species. Unlike vascular plants, bryophyte functional traits are rarely recorded in field experiments, as this requires skills in species identification. For instance, in the database TRY, moss shoot length only has 716 entries and none of the observations are georeferenced, whereas vascular plant height has 249,551 observations (Kattge et al. 2020) and Arctic plant traits are generally highly under-represented (Bjorkman et al. 2018). Future challenges therefore lie in identifying and measuring bryophyte traits that underpin key ecological functions and to add these to existing trait databases. Importantly, species level identification cannot be circumvented for these trait studies.

Bryophyte species identification will likely remain a struggle for many ecologists. This is further challenged by the lack of a comprehensive flora covering the Arctic region and poor representation of bryophytes in plant-identification mobile phone applications such as SEEK-iNaturalist or PictureMe (*pers. obs., the authors*). To date, there is not a comprehensive bryophyte flora that covers Greenland and North America. Fennoscandia and the Russian Arctic are covered by several regional floras (Table A2). As the Arctic biome consists of many countries, language can be another obstacle for identification. Comprehensive floras are needed to facilitate further focus on tundra ecosystem functioning where bryophytes are a major component both in terms of biomass, primary production and diversity. In the longer term, novel field-based genetic profiling technology

(Parker et al. 2017) and plant identification applications may develop to become powerful tools for aiding field identification. Until then, our contribution seeks to minimize the loss of data in the long-term monitoring of the Arctic vegetation and elucidate the functional role and importance of bryophytes in tundra ecosystems. This may in turn stimulate further focus on species identification as well as facilitate openings for innovative research projects.

6 Final remarks

Today, bryophytes constitute a missing functional and evolutionary dimension in most tundra ecosystem studies, hindering our ability to understand ecosystem functionality and responses to environmental change. Using BFGs could be a means to include functional diversity of bryophytes in ecological studies while bypassing difficulties with species identification. Our example with bryophyte WHC shows some of the potentials and challenges of using BFGs and the groups can likely be improved through further studies at the species level. If proven robust, the groups could likely be expanded to include the boreal zone, another region where bryophytes play a major role (Turetsky et al. 2012). The hierarchical organization of the BFGs allows functional resolution to be adjusted to the scientific question in mind. Importantly, our suggestion to use the BFGs in ecological studies is not a suggestion to abandon studies of bryophyte functionality and responses at the species level. Rather it should be seen as an encouragement to include bryophytes at a higher functional resolution than simply 'bryophyte' in more studies.

7 Acknowledgements

This study was supported by a grant to SL from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie, Grant No. 797446 and by the Independent Research Fund Denmark, Grant no. 0135-00140B. Funding from the Academy of Finland (grant

322266), National Science Foundation (1504224, 1836839, PLR-1504381 and PLR-1836898), Independent Research Fund Denmark (9040-00314B), Moscow State University, (project № 121032500089-1), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Arctic Net, Polar Continental Shelf Program, Northern Science Training Program, Polar Knowledge Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Tomsk State University competitiveness improvement program and the Russian Science Foundation (grant № 20-67-46018) is gratefully acknowledged. Matthias Ahrens provided valuable insights on the cushion growth form, and we are most thankful. We thank Gaius Shaver and two anonymous reviewers for providing valuable critique and input to earlier versions of this manuscript.

Author contributions

SL and ISJ conceived the original idea for the paper, which was developed with input from ABS, CTC, HD, FE, GHRH, SIL, AM, KR. ISJ, SB, SL, TGE, XL, JM, AMR, KvZ contributed data. SL analyzed the data and led the writing of the paper. All authors contributed to writing and editing of the manuscript.

Literature

- Atherton, I., Bosanquet, S.D.S., and Lawey, M. 2010. Mosses and liverworts of Britain and Ireland: a field guide. British Bryological Society.
- Austrheim, G., Hassel, K., and Mysterud, A. 2005. The role of life history traits for bryophyte community patterns in two contrasting alpine regions. *The Bryologist* **108**: 259–271. doi:10.1639/0007-2745(2005)108[0259:TROLHT]2.0.CO;2.
- Bates, J.W. 1998. Is “Life-Form” a useful concept in bryophyte ecology? *Oikos* **82**: 223–237. doi:10.2307/3546962.
- Bernhardt-Römermann, M., Poschod, P., and Hentschel, J. 2018. BryForTrait – A life-history trait database of forest bryophytes. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **29**: 798–800. doi:10.1111/jvs.12646.
- Bintanja, R., and Andry, O. 2017. Towards a rain-dominated Arctic. *Nature Clim. Change* **7**: 263–267. doi:10.1038/nclimate3240.
- Bjorkman, A.D., Myers-Smith, I.H., Elmendorf, S.C., Normand, S., Thomas, H.J.D., Alatalo, J.M., Alexander, H., Anadon-Rosell, A., Angers-Blondin, S., Bai, Y., Baruah, G., Beest, M. te, Berner, L., Björk, R.G., Blok, D., Bruelheide, H., Buchwal, A., Buras, A., Carbognani, M., Christie, K., Collier, L.S., Cooper, E.J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Dickinson, K.J.M., Dullinger, S., Elberling, B., Eskelinen, A., Forbes, B.C., Frei, E.R., Iturrate-Garcia, M., Good, M.K., Grau, O., Green, P., Greve, M., Grogan, P., Haider, S., Hájek, T., Hallinger, M., Happonen, K., Harper, K.A., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Henry, G.H.R., Hermanutz, L., Hewitt, R.E., Hollister, R.D., Hudson, J., Hülber, K., Iversen, C.M., Jaroszynska, F., Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Johnstone, J., Jorgensen, R.H., Kaarlejärvi, E., Klady, R., Klimešová, J., Korsten, A., Kuleza, S., Kulonen, A., Lamarque, L.J., Lantz, T., Laval, A., Lembrechts, J.J., Lévesque, E., Little, C.J., Luoto, M., Macek, P., Mack, M.C., Mathakutha, R., Michelsen, A., Milbau, A., Molau, U., Morgan, J.W., Mörsdorf, M.A., Nabe-Nielsen, J., Nielsen, S.S., Ninot, J.M., Oberbauer, S.F., Olofsson, J., Onipchenko, V.G., Petraglia, A., Pickering, C., Prevéy, J.S., Rixen, C., Rumpf, S.B., Schaepman-Strub, G., Semenchuk, P., Shetti, R., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Spasojevic, M.J., Speed, J.D.M., Street, L.E., Suding, K., Tape, K.D., Tomaselli, M., Trant, A., Treier, U.A., Tremblay, J.-P., Tremblay, M., Venn, S., Virkkala, A.-M., Vowles, T., Weijers, S., Wilking, M., Wipf, S., and Zamin, T. 2018. Tundra Trait Team: A database of plant traits spanning the tundra biome. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **27**: 1402–1411. doi:10.1111/geb.12821.
- Bjørkvoll, E., Pedersen, B., Hytteborn, H., Jónsdóttir, I.S., and Langvatn, R. 2009. Seasonal and interannual dietary variation during winter in female Svalbard reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus platyrhynchus*). *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research* **41**: 88–96. doi:10.1657/1523-0430-41.1.88.
- Blauw, L.G., Wensink, N., Bakker, L., Logtestijn, R.S.P. van, Aerts, R., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2015. Fuel moisture content enhances nonadditive effects of plant mixtures on flammability and fire behavior. *Ecology and Evolution* **5**: 3830–3841. doi:10.1002/ece3.1628.
- Blok, D., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Schaepman-Strub, G., van Ruijven, J., Parmentier, F.J.W., Maximov, T.C., and Berendse, F. 2011. The cooling capacity of mosses: Controls on water and energy fluxes in a Siberian tundra site. *Ecosystems* **14**: 1055–1065. doi:10.1007/s10021-011-9463-5.

- Brodribb, T.J., Carriquí, M., Delzon, S., McAdam, S. a. M., and Holbrook, N.M. 2020. Advanced vascular function discovered in a widespread moss. *Nat. Plants* **6**: 273–279. doi:10.1038/s41477-020-0602-x.
- Cooper, E.J., Little, C.J., Pilsbacher, A.K., and Mörsdorf, M.A. 2019. Disappearing green: Shrubs decline and bryophytes increase with nine years of increased snow accumulation in the High Arctic. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **30**: 857–867. doi:10.1111/jvs.12793.
- Cornelissen, J.H.C., Lang, S.I., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., and During, H.J. 2007. Comparative cryptogam ecology: A review of bryophyte and lichen traits that drive biogeochemistry. *Annals of Botany* **99**: 987–1001. doi:10.1093/aob/mcm030.
- Díaz, S., and Cabido, M.R. 2001. Vive la différence: Plant functional diversity matters to ecosystem processes. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02283-2.
- Dormann, C.F., and Woodin, S.J. 2002. Climate change in the Arctic: using plant functional types in a meta-analysis of field experiments. *Functional Ecology* **16**: 4–17. doi:10.1046/j.0269-8463.2001.00596.x.
- Dorrepaal, E. 2007. Are plant growth-form-based classifications useful in predicting northern ecosystem carbon cycling feedbacks to climate change? *Journal of Ecology* **95**: 1167–1180. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2007.01294.x.
- Dorrepaal, E., Aerts, R., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Callaghan, T.V., and Logtestijn, R.S.P.V. 2004. Summer warming and increased winter snow cover affect *Sphagnum fuscum* growth, structure and production in a sub-arctic bog. *Global Change Biology* **10**: 93–104. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2003.00718.x.
- Douma, J.C., Van Wijk, M.T., Lang, S.I., and Shaver, G.R. 2007. The contribution of mosses to the carbon and water exchange of arctic ecosystems: quantification and relationships with system properties. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **30**: 1205–1215. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2007.01697.x.
- During, H.J. 1979. Life strategies of bryophytes: A preliminary review. *Lindbergia* **5**: 2–18.
- During, H.J. 1992. Ecological classification of bryophytes and lichens. Page in J.W. Bates and A.M. Farmer, eds. *Bryophytes and lichens in a changing environment*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK.
- Edwards, M., and Henry, G.H.R. 2016. The effects of long-term experimental warming on the structure of three High Arctic plant communities. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **27**: 904–913. doi:10.1111/jvs.12417.
- Elmendorf, S.C., Henry, G.H.R., Hollister, R.D., Björk, R.G., Bjorkman, A.D., Callaghan, T.V., Collier, L.S., Cooper, E.J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Day, T.A., Fosaa, A.M., Gould, W.A., Grétarsdóttir, J., Harte, J., Hermanutz, L., Hik, D.S., Hofgaard, A., Jarrad, F., Jónsdóttir, I.S., Keuper, F., Klanderud, K., Klein, J.A., Koh, S., Kudo, G., Lang, S.I., Loewen, V., May, J.L., Mercado, J., Michelsen, A., Molau, U., Myers-Smith, I.H., Oberbauer, S.F., Pieper, S., Post, E., Rixen, C., Robinson, C.H., Schmidt, N.M., Shaver, G.R., Stenström, A., Tolvanen, A., Totland, Ø., Troxler, T., Wahren, C., Webber, P.J., Welker, J.M., and Wookey, P.A. 2012a. Global assessment of experimental climate warming on tundra vegetation: heterogeneity over space and time. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**: 164–175.
- Elmendorf, S.C., Henry, G.H.R., Hollister, R.D., Björk, R.G., Boulanger-Lapointe, N., Cooper, E.J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Day, T.A., Dorrepaal, E., Elumeeva, T.G., Gill, M., Gould, W.A., Harte, J., Hik, D.S., Hofgaard, A., Johnson, D.R., Johnstone, J.F., Jónsdóttir, I.S., Jorgenson, J.C., Klanderud, K., Klein, J.A., Koh, S., Kudo, G., Lara, M., Lévesque, E., Magnússon, B., May, J.L.,

- Mercado-Díaz, J.A., Michelsen, A., Molau, U., Myers-Smith, I.H., Oberbauer, S.F., Onipchenko, V.G., Rixen, C., Martin Schmidt, N., Shaver, G.R., Spasojevic, M.J., Þórhallsdóttir, Þ.E., Tolvanen, A., Troxler, T., Tweedie, C.E., Villareal, S., Wahren, C.-H., Walker, X., Webber, P.J., Welker, J.M., and Wipf, S. 2012b. Plot-scale evidence of tundra vegetation change and links to recent summer warming. *Nature Clim. Change* **2**: 453–457. doi:10.1038/nclimate1465.
- Elumeeva, T.G., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., During, H.J., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2011. The importance of colony structure versus shoot morphology for the water balance of 22 subarctic bryophyte species. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **22**: 152–164. doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2010.01237.x.
- Furness, S.B., and Grime, J.P. 1982a. Growth Rate and Temperature Responses in Bryophytes: II. A Comparative Study of Species of Contrasted Ecology. *Journal of Ecology* **70**: 525–536. [Wiley, British Ecological Society]. doi:10.2307/2259920.
- Furness, S.B., and Grime, J.P. 1982b. Growth Rate and Temperature Responses in Bryophytes: I. An Investigation of *Brachythecium Rutabulum*. *Journal of Ecology* **70**: 513–523. [Wiley, British Ecological Society]. doi:10.2307/2259919.
- Gavazov, K., Soudzilovskaia, N., van Logtestijn, R., Braster, M., and Cornelissen, J. 2010. Isotopic analysis of cyanobacterial nitrogen fixation associated with subarctic lichen and bryophyte species. *Plant Soil* **333**: 507–517.
- Gavini, S.S., Suárez, G.M., Ezcurra, C., and Aizen, M.A. 2019. Facilitation of vascular plants by cushion mosses in high-Andean communities. *Alp Botany* **129**: 137–148. doi:10.1007/s00035-019-00222-6.
- Geffert, J.L., Frahm, J.-P., Barthlott, W., and Mutke, J. 2013. Global moss diversity: spatial and taxonomic patterns of species richness. *Journal of Bryology* **35**: 1–11. doi:10.1179/1743282012Y.0000000038.
- Gimingham, C.H., and Birse, E.M. 1957. Ecological studies on growth-form in bryophytes: I. Correlations between growth-form and habitat. *Journal of Ecology* **45**: 533–545. doi:10.2307/2256934.
- Gimingham, C.H., and Robertson, E.T. 1950. Preliminary Investigations on the Structure of Bryophytic Communities. *Transactions of the British Bryological Society* **1**: 330–344. doi:10.1179/006813850804878734.
- Glime, J.M. 2006. Bryophytes and herbivory. *Cryptogamie. Bryologie* **27**: 191–203.
- Glime, J.M. 2012. Chapter 1 - The Fauna: A place to call home. Page *in* *Bryophyte Ecology*, 1st edition. Ebook sponsored by Michigan Technological University and the International Association of Bryologists.
- Gornall, J.L., Jónsdóttir, I.S., Woodin, S.J., and Wal, R. van der 2007. Arctic mosses govern below-ground environment and ecosystem processes. *Oecologia* **153**: 931–941. doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0785-0.
- Gornall, J.L., Woodin, S.J., Jónsdóttir, I.S., and Wal, R. van der 2011. Balancing positive and negative plant interactions: how mosses structure vascular plant communities. *Oecologia* **166**: 769–782. doi:10.1007/s00442-011-1911-6.
- Grace, M. 1995. A key to the growthforms of mosses and liverworts and guide to their educational value. *Journal of Biological Education* **29**: 272–278.
- Green, T.G.A., and Snelgar, W.P. 1982. A comparison of photosynthesis in two thalloid liverworts. *Oecologia* **54**: 275–280. doi:10.1007/BF00378404.

- Henn, J.J., Buzzard, V., Enquist, B.J., Halbritter, A.H., Klanderud, K., Maitner, B.S., Michaletz, S.T., Pötsch, C., Seltzer, L., Telford, R.J., Yang, Y., Zhang, L., and Vandvik, V. 2018. Intraspecific Trait Variation and Phenotypic Plasticity Mediate Alpine Plant Species Response to Climate Change. *Front. Plant Sci.* **9**. doi:10.3389/fpls.2018.01548.
- Hill, M.O., Preston, C.D., Bosanquet, S.D.S., and Roy, D.B. 2007. BRYOATT - Attributes of British and Irish mosses, liverworts and hornworts. Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, UK.
- Hübner, C.E. 2007. Spring stopover in the Arctic: implications for migrating geese and their food plants. University Centre in Svalbard, Norway.
- Hudson, J.M.G., and Henry, G.H.R. 2010. High Arctic plant community resists 15 years of experimental warming. *Journal of Ecology* **98**: 1035–1041. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01690.x.
- Huemmerich, K.F., Gamon, J.A., Tweedie, C.E., Oberbauer, S.F., Kinoshita, G., Houston, S., Kuchy, A., Hollister, R.D., Kwon, H., Mano, M., Harazono, Y., Webber, P.J., and Oechel, W.C. 2010. Remote sensing of tundra gross ecosystem productivity and light use efficiency under varying temperature and moisture conditions. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **114**: 481–489. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2009.10.003.
- Huttunen, S., Bell, N., and Hedenäs, L. 2018. The Evolutionary Diversity of Mosses – Taxonomic Heterogeneity and its Ecological Drivers. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* **37**: 128–174. Taylor & Francis. doi:10.1080/07352689.2018.1482434.
- Ihl, C., and Barboza, P.S. 2007. Nutritional value of moss for Arctic ruminants: a test with muskoxen. *wild* **71**: 752–758. doi:10.2193/2005-745.
- Jägerbrand, A.K., Alatalo, J.M., and Kudo, G. 2014. Variation in responses to temperature treatments ex situ of the moss *Pleurozium schreberi* (Willd. ex Brid.) Mitt. originating from eight altitude sites in Hokkaido, Japan. *Journal of Bryology* **36**: 209–216. doi:10.1179/1743282014Y.0000000095.
- Jaroszynska, F. 2019. Climate and biotic interactions - drivers of plant community structure and ecosystem functioning in alpine grasslands. University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- Jasmin, J.-N., Rochefort, L., and Gauthier, G. 2008. Goose grazing influences the fine-scale structure of a bryophyte community in arctic wetlands. *Polar Biol* **31**: 1043–1049. doi:10.1007/s00300-008-0443-y.
- Jones, G.A., and Henry, G.H.R. 2003. Primary plant succession on recently deglaciated terrain in the Canadian High Arctic. *Journal of Biogeography* **30**: 277–296. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2699.2003.00818.x.
- Jónsdóttir, I.S. 1984. Áhrif beitar á gróður Auðkúluheiðar. *Náttúrufræðingurinn* **53**: 19–40.
- Jónsdóttir, I.S. 1991. Effects of Grazing on Tiller Size and Population Dynamics in a Clonal Sedge (*Carex bigelowii*). *Oikos* **62**: 177–188. [Nordic Society Oikos, Wiley]. doi:10.2307/3545263.
- Jónsdóttir, I.S., Callaghan, T.V., and Lee, J.A. 1995. Fate of added nitrogen in a moss-sedge Arctic community and effects of increased nitrogen deposition. *Science of The Total Environment* **160–161**: 677–685. doi:10.1016/0048-9697(95)04402-M.
- Jónsdóttir, I.S., Crittenden, P.D., and Jägerbrand, A.K. 1999. Measuring growth rate in bryophytes and lichens. Pages 91–95 in R.D. Hollister, ed. *Proceedings from the 9th ITEX Meeting January 5-9 1999*. Michigan State University, East Lansing.

- Jónsdóttir, I.S., Magnússon, B., Gudmundsson, J., Elmarsdóttir, Á., and Hjartarson, H. 2005. Variable sensitivity of plant communities in Iceland to experimental warming. *Global Change Biology* **11**: 553–563. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00928.x>.
- Jonsson, M., Kardol, P., Gundale, M.J., Bansal, S., Nilsson, M.-C., Metcalfe, D.B., and Wardle, D.A. 2015. Direct and indirect drivers of moss community structure, function, and associated microfauna across a successional gradient. *Ecosystems* **18**: 154–169. doi:10.1007/s10021-014-9819-8.
- Jorgenson, M.T.J.T., Romanovsky, V.R., Harden, J.H., Shur, Y.S., O'Donnell, J.O., Schuur, E.A.G.S.A.G., Kanevskiy, M.K., and Marchenko, S.M. 2010. Resilience and vulnerability of permafrost to climate change This article is one of a selection of papers from The Dynamics of Change in Alaska's Boreal Forests: Resilience and Vulnerability in Response to Climate Warming. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. doi:10.1139/X10-060.
- Kattge, J., Bönisch, G., Díaz, S., Lavorel, S., Prentice, I.C., Leadley, P., Tautenhahn, S., Werner, G.D.A., Aakala, T., Abedi, M., Acosta, A.T.R., Adamidis, G.C., Adamson, K., Aiba, M., Albert, C.H., Alcántara, J.M., C, C.A., Aleixo, I., Ali, H., Amiaud, B., Ammer, C., Amoroso, M.M., Anand, M., Anderson, C., Anten, N., Antos, J., Apgaua, D.M.G., Ashman, T.-L., Asmara, D.H., Asner, G.P., Aspinwall, M., Atkin, O., Aubin, I., Baastrup-Spohr, L., Bahalkeh, K., Bahn, M., Baker, T., Baker, W.J., Bakker, J.P., Baldocchi, D., Baltzer, J., Banerjee, A., Baranger, A., Barlow, J., Barneche, D.R., Baruch, Z., Bastianelli, D., Battles, J., Bauerle, W., Bauters, M., Bazzato, E., Beckmann, M., Beeckman, H., Beierkuhnlein, C., Bekker, R., Belfry, G., Belluau, M., Beloiu, M., Benavides, R., Benomar, L., Berdugo-Lattke, M.L., Berenguer, E., Bergamin, R., Bergmann, J., Carlucci, M.B., Berner, L., Bernhardt-Römermann, M., Bigler, C., Bjorkman, A.D., Blackman, C., Blanco, C., Blonder, B., Blumenthal, D., Bocanegra-González, K.T., Boeckx, P., Bohlman, S., Böhning-Gaese, K., Boisvert-Marsh, L., Bond, W., Bond-Lamberty, B., Boom, A., Boonman, C.C.F., Bordin, K., Boughton, E.H., Boukili, V., Bowman, D.M.J.S., Bravo, S., Brendel, M.R., Broadley, M.R., Brown, K.A., Bruelheide, H., Brumlich, F., Bruun, H.H., Bruy, D., Buchanan, S.W., Bucher, S.F., Buchmann, N., Buitenwerf, R., Bunker, D.E., Bürger, J., Burrascano, S., Burslem, D.F.R.P., Butterfield, B.J., Byun, C., Marques, M., Scalon, M.C., Caccianiga, M., Cadotte, M., Cailleret, M., Camac, J., Camarero, J.J., Company, C., Campetella, G., Campos, J.A., Cano-Arboleda, L., Canullo, R., Carbognani, M., Carvalho, F., Casanoves, F., Castagnyrol, B., Catford, J.A., Cavender-Bares, J., Cerabolini, B.E.L., Cervellini, M., Chacón-Madrigal, E., Chapin, K., Chapin, F.S., Chelli, S., Chen, S.-C., Chen, A., Cherubini, P., Chianucci, F., Choat, B., Chung, K.-S., Chytrý, M., Ciccarelli, D., Coll, L., Collins, C.G., Conti, L., Coomes, D., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Cornwell, W.K., Corona, P., Coyea, M., Craine, J., Craven, D., Cromsigt, J.P.G.M., Csecerits, A., Cufar, K., Cuntz, M., Silva, A.C. da, Dahlin, K.M., Dainese, M., Dalke, I., Fratte, M.D., Dang-Le, A.T., Danihelka, J., Dannoura, M., Dawson, S., Beer, A.J. de, Frutos, A.D., Long, J.R.D., Dechant, B., Delagrangé, S., Delpierre, N., Derroire, G., Dias, A.S., Diaz-Toribio, M.H., Dimitrakopoulos, P.G., Dobrowolski, M., Doktor, D., Dřevojan, P., Dong, N., Dransfield, J., Dressler, S., Duarte, L., Ducouret, E., Dullinger, S., Durka, W., Duursma, R., Dymova, O., E-Vojtkó, A., Eckstein, R.L., Ejtehadi, H., Elser, J., Emilio, T., Engemann, K., Erfanian, M.B., Erfmeier, A., Esquivel-Muelbert, A., Esser, G., Estiarte, M., Domingues, T.F., Fagan, W.F., Fagúndez, J., Falster, D.S., Fan, Y., Fang, J., Farris, E., Fazlioglu, F., Feng, Y., Fernandez-Mendez, F., Ferrara, C., Ferreira, J., Fidelis, A., Finegan, B., Firn, J., Flowers, T.J., Flynn, D.F.B., Fontana, V., Forey, E., Forgiarini, C., François, L., Frangipani, M., Frank, D.,

Frenette-Dussault, C., Freschet, G.T., Fry, E.L., Fyllas, N.M., Mazzochini, G.G., Gachet, S., Gallagher, R., Ganade, G., Ganga, F., García-Palacios, P., Gargaglione, V., Garnier, E., Garrido, J.L., Gasper, A.L. de, Gea-Izquierdo, G., Gibson, D., Gillison, A.N., Giroldo, A., Glasenhardt, M.-C., Gleason, S., Gliesch, M., Goldberg, E., Gödel, B., Gonzalez-Akre, E., Gonzalez-Andujar, J.L., González-Melo, A., González-Robles, A., Graae, B.J., Granda, E., Graves, S., Green, W.A., Gregor, T., Gross, N., Guerin, G.R., Günther, A., Gutiérrez, A.G., Haddock, L., Haines, A., Hall, J., Hambuckers, A., Han, W., Harrison, S.P., Hattingh, W., Hawes, J.E., He, T., He, P., Heberling, J.M., Helm, A., Hempel, S., Hentschel, J., Hérault, B., Hereş, A.-M., Herz, K., Heuertz, M., Hickler, T., Hietz, P., Higuchi, P., Hipp, A.L., Hirons, A., Hock, M., Hogan, J.A., Holl, K., Honnay, O., Hornstein, D., Hou, E., Hough-Snee, N., Hovstad, K.A., Ichie, T., Igić, B., Illa, E., Isaac, M., Ishihara, M., Ivanov, L., Ivanova, L., Iversen, C.M., Izquierdo, J., Jackson, R.B., Jackson, B., Jactel, H., Jagodzinski, A.M., Jandt, U., Jansen, S., Jenkins, T., Jentsch, A., Jespersen, J.R.P., Jiang, G.-F., Johansen, J.L., Johnson, D., Jokela, E.J., Joly, C.A., Jordan, G.J., Joseph, G.S., Junaedi, D., Junker, R.R., Justes, E., Kabzems, R., Kane, J., Kaplan, Z., Kattenborn, T., Kavelenova, L., Kearsley, E., Kempel, A., Kenzo, T., Kerkhoff, A., Khalil, M.I., Kinlock, N.L., Kissling, W.D., Kitajima, K., Kitzberger, T., Kjøller, R., Klein, T., Kleyer, M., Klimešová, J., Klipel, J., Kloepfel, B., Klotz, S., Knops, J.M.H., Kohyama, T., Koike, F., Kollmann, J., Komac, B., Komatsu, K., König, C., Kraft, N.J.B., Kramer, K., Kreft, H., Kühn, I., Kumarathunge, D., Kuppler, J., Kurokawa, H., Kurosawa, Y., Kuyah, S., Laclau, J.-P., Lafleur, B., Lallai, E., Lamb, E., Lamprecht, A., Larkin, D.J., Laughlin, D., Bagousse-Pinguet, Y.L., Maire, G. le, Roux, P.C. le, Roux, E. le, Lee, T., Lens, F., Lewis, S.L., Lhotsky, B., Li, Y., Li, X., Lichstein, J.W., Liebergesell, M., Lim, J.Y., Lin, Y.-S., Linares, J.C., Liu, C., Liu, D., Liu, U., Livingstone, S., Llusà, J., Lohbeck, M., López-García, Á., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Lososová, Z., Louault, F., Lukács, B.A., Lukeš, P., Luo, Y., Lussu, M., Ma, S., Pereira, C.M.R., Mack, M., Maire, V., Mäkelä, A., Mäkinen, H., Malhado, A.C.M., Mallik, A., Manning, P., Manzoni, S., Marchetti, Z., Marchino, L., Marcilio-Silva, V., Marcon, E., Marignani, M., Markesteyn, L., Martin, A., Martínez-Garza, C., Martínez-Vilalta, J., Mašková, T., Mason, K., Mason, N., Massad, T.J., Masse, J., Mayrose, I., McCarthy, J., McCormack, M.L., McCulloh, K., McFadden, I.R., McGill, B.J., McPartland, M.Y., Medeiros, J.S., Medlyn, B., Meerts, P., Mehrabi, Z., Meir, P., Melo, F.P.L., Mencuccini, M., Meredieu, C., Messier, J., Mészáros, I., Metsaranta, J., Michaletz, S.T., Michelaki, C., Migalina, S., Milla, R., Miller, J.E.D., Minden, V., Ming, R., Mokany, K., Moles, A.T., Molnár, A., Molofsky, J., Molz, M., Montgomery, R.A., Monty, A., Moravcová, L., Moreno-Martínez, A., Moretti, M., Mori, A.S., Mori, S., Morris, D., Morrison, J., Mucina, L., Mueller, S., Muir, C.D., Müller, S.C., Munoz, F., Myers-Smith, I.H., Myster, R.W., Nagano, M., Naidu, S., Narayanan, A., Natesan, B., Negoita, L., Nelson, A.S., Neuschulz, E.L., Ni, J., Niedrist, G., Nieto, J., Niinemets, Ü., Nolan, R., Nottebrock, H., Nouvellon, Y., Novakovskiy, A., Nystuen, K.O., O'Grady, A., O'Hara, K., O'Reilly-Nugent, A., Oakley, S., Oberhuber, W., Ohtsuka, T., Oliveira, R., Öllerer, K., Olson, M.E., Onipchenko, V., Onoda, Y., Onstein, R.E., Ordonez, J.C., Osada, N., Ostonen, I., Ottaviani, G., Otto, S., Overbeck, G.E., Ozinga, W.A., Pahl, A.T., Paine, C.E.T., Pakeman, R.J., Papageorgiou, A.C., Parfionova, E., Pärtel, M., Patacca, M., Paula, S., Paule, J., Pauli, H., Pausas, J.G., Peco, B., Penuelas, J., Perea, A., Peri, P.L., Petisco-Souza, A.C., Petraglia, A., Petritan, A.M., Phillips, O.L., Pierce, S., Pillar, V.D., Pisek, J., Pomogaybin, A., Poorter, H., Portsmouth, A., Poschlod, P., Potvin, C., Pounds, D., Powell, A.S., Power, S.A., Prinzing, A., Puglielli, G., Pyšek, P., Raavel, V., Rammig, A., Ransijn, J., Ray, C.A., Reich, P.B., Reichstein, M., Reid, D.E.B.,

Réjou-Méchain, M., Dios, V.R. de, Ribeiro, S., Richardson, S., Riibak, K., Rillig, M.C., Riviera, F., Robert, E.M.R., Roberts, S., Robroek, B., Roddy, A., Rodrigues, A.V., Rogers, A., Rollinson, E., Rolo, V., Römermann, C., Ronzhina, D., Roscher, C., Rosell, J.A., Rosenfield, M.F., Rossi, C., Roy, D.B., Royer-Tardif, S., Rüger, N., Ruiz-Peinado, R., Rumpf, S.B., Rusch, G.M., Ryo, M., Sack, L., Saldaña, A., Salgado-Negret, B., Salguero-Gomez, R., Santa-Regina, I., Santacruz-García, A.C., Santos, J., Sardans, J., Schamp, B., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Schleuning, M., Schmid, B., Schmidt, M., Schmitt, S., Schneider, J.V., Schowanek, S.D., Schrader, J., Schrod, F., Schuldt, B., Schurr, F., Garvizu, G.S., Semchenko, M., Seymour, C., Sfair, J.C., Sharpe, J.M., Sheppard, C.S., Sheremetiev, S., Shiodera, S., Shipley, B., Shovon, T.A., Siebenkäs, A., Sierra, C., Silva, V., Silva, M., Sitzia, T., Sjöman, H., Slot, M., Smith, N.G., Sodhi, D., Soltis, P., Soltis, D., Somers, B., Sonnier, G., Sørensen, M.V., Sosinski, E.E., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Souza, A.F., Spasojevic, M., Sperandii, M.G., Stan, A.B., Stegen, J., Steinbauer, K., Stephan, J.G., Sterck, F., Stojanovic, D.B., Strydom, T., Suarez, M.L., Svenning, J.-C., Svitková, I., Svitok, M., Svoboda, M., Swaine, E., Swenson, N., Tabarelli, M., Takagi, K., Tappeiner, U., Tarifa, R., Tauugourdeau, S., Tavsanoğlu, C., Beest, M. te, Tedersoo, L., Thiffault, N., Thom, D., Thomas, E., Thompson, K., Thornton, P.E., Thuiller, W., Tichý, L., Tissue, D., Tjoelker, M.G., Tng, D.Y.P., Tobias, J., Török, P., Tarin, T., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Tóthmérész, B., Treurnicht, M., Trivellone, V., Trolliet, F., Trotsiuk, V., Tsakalos, J.L., Tsiripidis, I., Tysklind, N., Umehara, T., Usoltsev, V., Vadeboncoeur, M., Vaezi, J., Valladares, F., Vamosi, J., Bodegom, P.M. van, Breugel, M. van, Cleemput, E.V., Weg, M. van de, Merwe, S. van der, Plas, F. van der, Sande, M.T. van der, Kleunen, M. van, Meerbeek, K.V., Vanderwel, M., Vanselow, K.A., Vårhammar, A., Varone, L., Valderrama, M.Y.V., Vassilev, K., Vellend, M., Veneklaas, E.J., Verbeek, H., Verheyen, K., Vibrans, A., Vieira, I., Villacís, J., Violle, C., Vivek, P., Wagner, K., Waldram, M., Waldron, A., Walker, A.P., Waller, M., Walther, G., Wang, H., Wang, F., Wang, W., Watkins, H., Watkins, J., Weber, U., Weedon, J.T., Wei, L., Weigelt, P., Weiher, E., Wells, A.W., Wellstein, C., Wenk, E., Westoby, M., Westwood, A., White, P.J., Whitten, M., Williams, M., Winkler, D.E., Winter, K., Womack, C., Wright, I.J., Wright, S.J., Wright, J., Pinho, B.X., Ximenes, F., Yamada, T., Yamaji, K., Yanai, R., Yankov, N., Yguel, B., Zanini, K.J., Zanne, A.E., Zelený, D., Zhao, Y.-P., Zheng, J., Zheng, J., Ziemińska, K., Zirbel, C.R., Zizka, G., Zo-Bi, I.C., Zotz, G., and Wirth, C. 2020. TRY plant trait database – enhanced coverage and open access. *Global Change Biology* **26**: 119–188. doi:10.1111/gcb.14904.

Keuper, F., Dorrepaal, E., Van Bodegom, P.M., Aerts, R., Van Logtestijn, R.S.P., Callaghan, T.V., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2011. A race for space? How *Sphagnum fuscum* stabilizes vegetation composition during long-term climate manipulations. *Global Change Biology* **17**: 2162–2171. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02377.x.

Kotanen, P.M., and Jefferies, R.L. 1997. Long-term destruction of sub-arctic wetland vegetation by lesser snow geese. *Écoscience* **4**: 179–182. doi:10.1080/11956860.1997.11682393.

La Farge-England, C. 1996. Growth form, branching pattern, and perichaetial position in mosses: Cladocarp and pleurocarp redefined. *The Bryologist* **99**: 170–186. doi:10.2307/3244546.

Lang, S.I., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Klahn, T., Van Logtestijn, R.S.P., Broekman, R., Schweikert, W., and Aerts, R. 2009. An experimental comparison of chemical traits and litter decomposition rates in a diverse range of subarctic bryophyte, lichen and vascular plant species. *Journal of Ecology* **97**: 886–900. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01538.x.

- Lang, S.I., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Shaver, G.R., Ahrens, M., Callaghan, T.V., Molau, U., Ter Braak, C.J.F., Hölzer, A., and Aerts, R. 2012. Arctic warming on two continents has consistent negative effects on lichen diversity and mixed effects on bryophyte diversity. *Glob Change Biol* **18**: 1096–1107. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02570.x.
- Lavorel, S., McIntyre, S., Landsberg, J., and Forbes, T.D.A. 1997. Plant functional classifications: from general groups to specific groups based on response to disturbance. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **12**: 474–478. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(97)01219-6.
- Lett, S., and Michelsen, A. 2014. Seasonal variation in nitrogen fixation and effects of climate change in a subarctic heath. *Plant Soil* **379**: 193–204. doi:10.1007/s11104-014-2031-y.
- Lett, S., Nilsson, M.-C., Wardle, D.A., and Dorrepaal, E. 2017. Bryophyte traits explain climate-warming effects on tree seedling establishment. *J Ecol* **105**: 496–506. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12688.
- Lett, S., Teuber, L.M., Krab, E.J., Michelsen, A., Olofsson, J., Nilsson, M.-C., Wardle, D.A., and Dorrepaal, E. 2020. Mosses modify effects of warmer and wetter conditions on tree seedlings at the alpine treeline. *Global Change Biology* **26**: 5754–5766. doi:10.1111/gcb.15256.
- Lett, S., Wardle, D.A., Nilsson, M., Teuber, L.M., and Dorrepaal, E. 2018. The role of bryophytes for tree seedling responses to winter climate change: Implications for the stress gradient hypothesis. *Journal of Ecology* **106**: 1142–1155. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12898.
- Lindo, Z., and Gonzalez, A. 2010. The bryosphere: An integral and influential component of the Earth's biosphere. *Ecosystems* **13**: 612–627. doi:10.1007/s10021-010-9336-3.
- Longton, R.E. 1988. The cryptogamic vegetation. Pages 32–65 in *Biology of polar bryophytes and lichens*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Mägdefrau, K. 1982. Life-forms of Bryophytes. Pages 45–58 in A.J.E. Smith, ed. *Bryophyte Ecology*, 1st edition. Capman and Hall, NY, USA.
- Mateo, R.G., Broennimann, O., Normand, S., Petitpierre, B., Araújo, M.B., Svenning, J.-C., Baselga, A., Fernández-González, F., Gómez-Rubio, V., Muñoz, J., Suarez, G.M., Luoto, M., Guisan, A., and Vanderpoorten, A. 2016. The mossy north: an inverse latitudinal diversity gradient in European bryophytes. *Scientific Reports* **6**: 25546. doi:10.1038/srep25546.
- Mauffrey, A.R.L., Cappelatti, L., and Griffin, J.N. 2020. Seaweed functional diversity revisited: Confronting traditional groups with quantitative traits. *Journal of Ecology* **108**: 2390–2405. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.13460.
- May, J.L., Parker, T., Unger, S., and Oberbauer, S.F. 2018. Short term changes in moisture content drive strong changes in Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and gross primary productivity in four Arctic moss communities. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **212**: 114–120. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2018.04.041.
- Michel, P., Lee, W.G., During, H.J., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2012. Species traits and their non-additive interactions control the water economy of bryophyte cushions. *Journal of Ecology* **100**: 222–231. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2011.01898.x.
- Molau, U., and Mølgaard, P. 1996. *International Tundra Experiment (ITEX) Manual*. Danish Polar Center, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Mulder, C.P.H., Uliassi, D.D., and Doak, D.F. 2001. Physical stress and diversity-productivity relationships: The role of positive interactions. *PNAS* **98**: 6704–6708. doi:10.1073/pnas.111055298.

- Olofsson, J., Oksanen, L., Oksanen, T., Tuomi, M., Hoset, K.S., Virtanen, R., and Kyrö, K. 2014. Long-term experiments reveal strong interactions between lemmings and plants in the Fennoscandian highland tundra. *Ecosystems* **17**: 606–615. doi:10.1007/s10021-013-9740-6.
- Paradis, M., Lévesque, E., and Boudreau, S. 2016. Greater effect of increasing shrub height on winter versus summer soil temperature. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11**: 085005. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/8/085005.
- Parker, J., Helmstetter, A.J., Devey, D., Wilkinson, T., and Papadopoulos, A.S.T. 2017. Field-based species identification of closely-related plants using real-time nanopore sequencing. *Scientific Reports* **7**: 8345. Nature Publishing Group. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08461-5.
- Prop, J., and Vulink, T. 1992. Digestion by Barnacle Geese in the Annual Cycle: The Interplay Between Retention Time and Food Quality. *Functional Ecology* **6**: 180–189. doi:10.2307/2389753.
- R Core Team 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Vienna, Austria. [Online] Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rice, S.K., and Schneider, N. 2004. Cushion size, surface roughness, and the control of water balance and carbon flux in the cushion moss *Leucobryum glaucum* (Leucobryaceae). *American Journal of Botany* **91**: 1164–1172. doi:10.3732/ajb.91.8.1164.
- Rixen, C., and Mulder, C.P.H. 2005. Improved water retention links high species richness with increased productivity in arctic tundra moss communities. *Oecologia* **146**: 287–299. doi:10.1007/s00442-005-0196-z.
- Roos, R.E., Zuijlen, K. van, Birkemoe, T., Klanderud, K., Lang, S.I., Bokhorst, S., Wardle, D.A., and Asplund, J. 2019. Contrasting drivers of community-level trait variation for vascular plants, lichens and bryophytes across an elevational gradient. *Functional Ecology* **33**: 2430–2446. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.13454.
- Rousk, K., Sorensen, P.L., Lett, S., and Michelsen, A. 2015. Across-habitat comparison of diazotroph activity in the subarctic. *Microb Ecol* **69**: 778–787. doi:10.1007/s00248-014-0534-y.
- Rousk, K., Sorensen, P.L., and Michelsen, A. 2017. Nitrogen fixation in the High Arctic: a source of 'new' nitrogen? *Biogeochemistry* **136**: 213–222. doi:10.1007/s10533-017-0393-y.
- Russell, S. 1990. Bryophyte production and decomposition in tundra ecosystems. *Bot J Linn Soc* **104**: 3–22. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8339.1990.tb02208.x.
- Sand-Jensen, K., and Hammer, K.J. 2012. Moss cushions facilitate water and nutrient supply for plant species on bare limestone pavements. *Oecologia* **170**: 305–312. doi:10.1007/s00442-012-2314-z.
- Soininen, E.M., Zinger, L., Gielly, L., Bellemain, E., Bråthen, K.A., Brochmann, C., Epp, L.S., Gussarova, G., Hassel, K., Henden, J.-A., Killengreen, S.T., Rämä, T., Stenøien, H.K., Yoccoz, N.G., and Ims, R.A. 2013. Shedding new light on the diet of Norwegian lemmings: DNA metabarcoding of stomach content. *Polar Biol* **36**: 1069–1076. doi:10.1007/s00300-013-1328-2.
- Solheim, B., and Zielke, M. 2003. Associations between cyanobacteria and mosses. *Cyanobacteria in symbiosis*: 137–152.
- Soudzilovskaia, N.A., van Bodegom, P.M., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2013. Dominant bryophyte control over high-latitude soil temperature fluctuations predicted by heat transfer traits, field moisture regime and laws of thermal insulation. *Funct Ecol* **27**: 1442–1454. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12127.

- Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Cornelissen, J.H.C., During, H.J., Logtestijn, R.S.P. van, Lang, S.I., and Aerts, R. 2010. Similar cation exchange capacities among bryophyte species refute a presumed mechanism of peatland acidification. *Ecology* **91**: 2716–2726. doi:10.1890/09-2095.1.
- Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Graae, B.J., Douma, J.C., Grau, O., Milbau, A., Shevtsova, A., Wolters, L., and Cornelissen, J.H.C. 2011. How do bryophytes govern generative recruitment of vascular plants? *New Phytol.* **190**: 1019–1031. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03644.x.
- St. Martin, P., and Mallik, A.U. 2017. The status of non-vascular plants in trait-based ecosystem function studies. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* **27**: 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.ppees.2017.04.002.
- Street, L.E., Jens-Arne, S., Martin, S., Victoria, S., Helene, D., Gareth K., P., and Mathew, W. 2013. The role of mosses in carbon uptake and partitioning in arctic vegetation. *New Phytologist* **199**: 163–175. doi:10.1111/nph.12285.
- Street, L.E., Stoy, P.C., Sommerkorn, M., Fletcher, B.J., Sloan, V.L., Hill, T.C., and Williams, M. 2012. Seasonal bryophyte productivity in the sub-Arctic: a comparison with vascular plants. *Functional Ecology* **26**: 365–378. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2011.01954.x.
- Stuart, J.E.M., Holland-Moritz, H., Lewis, L.R., Jean, M., Miller, S.N., McDaniel, S.F., Fierer, N., Ponciano, J.M., and Mack, M.C. 2020. Host identity as a driver of moss-associated N₂ fixation rates in Alaska. *Ecosystems*. doi:10.1007/s10021-020-00534-3.
- Thomas, E.K., Castañeda, I.S., McKay, N.P., Briner, J.P., Salacup, J.M., Nguyen, K.Q., and Schweinsberg, A.D. 2018. A Wetter Arctic Coincident With Hemispheric Warming 8,000 Years Ago. *Geophysical Research Letters* **45**: 10,637–10,647. doi:10.1029/2018GL079517.
- Thomas, H.J.D., Myers-Smith, I.H., Bjorkman, A.D., Elmendorf, S.C., Blok, D., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Forbes, B.C., Hollister, R.D., Normand, S., Prevéy, J.S., Rixen, C., Schaepman-Strub, G., Wilmking, M., Wipf, S., Cornwell, W.K., Kattge, J., Goetz, S.J., Guay, K.C., Alatalo, J.M., Anadon-Rosell, A., Angers-Blondin, S., Berner, L.T., Björk, R.G., Buchwal, A., Buras, A., Carbognani, M., Christie, K., Collier, L.S., Cooper, E.J., Eskelinen, A., Frei, E.R., Grau, O., Grogan, P., Hallinger, M., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Hermanutz, L., Hudson, J.M.G., Hülber, K., Iturrate-Garcia, M., Iversen, C.M., Jaroszynska, F., Johnstone, J.F., Kaarlejärvi, E., Kulonen, A., Lamarque, L.J., Lévesque, E., Little, C.J., Michelsen, A., Milbau, A., Nabe-Nielsen, J., Nielsen, S.S., Ninot, J.M., Oberbauer, S.F., Olofsson, J., Onipchenko, V.G., Petraglia, A., Rumpf, S.B., Semenchuk, P.R., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Spasojevic, M.J., Speed, J.D.M., Tape, K.D., Beest, M. te, Tomaselli, M., Trant, A., Treier, U.A., Venn, S., Vowles, T., Weijers, S., Zamin, T., Atkin, O.K., Bahn, M., Blonder, B., Campetella, G., Cerabolini, B.E.L., Iii, F.S.C., Dainese, M., Vries, F.T. de, Díaz, S., Green, W., Jackson, R.B., Manning, P., Niinemets, Ü., Ozinga, W.A., Peñuelas, J., Reich, P.B., Schamp, B., Sheremetev, S., and Bodegom, P.M. van 2019. Traditional plant functional groups explain variation in economic but not size-related traits across the tundra biome. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **28**: 78–95. doi:10.1111/geb.12783.
- Turetsky, M.R. 2003. The role of bryophytes in carbon and nitrogen cycling. *The Bryologist* **106**: 395–409.
- Turetsky, M.R., Bond-Lamberty, B., Euskirchen, E., Talbot, J., Frohling, S., McGuire, A.D., and Tuittila, E.-S. 2012. The resilience and functional role of moss in boreal and arctic ecosystems. *New Phytol.* **196**: 49–67. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04254.x.
- Vanderpoorten, A., and Goffinet, B. 2009. Ecology. Pages 153–184 in *Introduction to bryophytes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Wal, R.V.D., Sjögersten, S., Woodin, S.J., Cooper, E.J., Jónsdóttir, I.S., Kuijper, D., Fox, T. a. D., and Huiskes, A.D. 2007. Spring feeding by pink-footed geese reduces carbon stocks and sink strength in tundra ecosystems. *Global Change Biology* **13**: 539–545. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01310.x.
- Walker, D.A., and Raynolds, M.K. 2011. An International Arctic Vegetation Database: a foundation for panarctic biodiversity studies. Concept Paper. CAFF International Secretariat.
- Walker, M.D., Wahren, C.H., Hollister, R.D., Henry, G.H.R., Ahlquist, L.E., Alatalo, J.M., Bret-Harte, M.S., Calef, M.P., Callaghan, T.V., Carroll, A.B., Epstein, H.E., Jónsdóttir, I.S., Klein, J.A., Magnússon, B., Molau, U., Oberbauer, S.F., Rewa, S.P., Robinson, C.H., Shaver, G.R., Suding, K.N., Thompson, C.C., Tolvanen, A., Totland, Ø., Turner, P.L., Tweedie, C.E., Webber, P.J., and Wookey, P.A. 2006. Plant community responses to experimental warming across the tundra biome. *PNAS* **103**: 1342–1346. doi:10.1073/pnas.0503198103.
- Wielgolaski, F.E. 1971. Vegetation types and primary production in tundra. Pages 9–34 in F.E. Wiel and T. Roswall, eds. *Proceedings IV International Meeting on the Biological Productivity of Tundra*. the Tundra Steering Committee, Leningrad USSR.
- Woodin, S.J., van der Wal, R., Sommerkorn, M., and Gornall, J.L. 2009. Differential allocation of carbon in mosses and grasses governs ecosystem sequestration: a ¹³C tracer study in the high Arctic. *New Phytol.* **184**: 944–949. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.03022.x.
- van Zuijlen, K., Klanderud, K., Knutsen, M.S., Dahle, O.S., Hasvik, Å., Sundsbø, S., Olsen, S.L., and Asplund, J. 2021. Community-level functional traits of alpine vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens after 19 years of experimental warming. *Arctic Science*.
- van Zuijlen, K., Roos, R.E., Klanderud, K., Lang, S.I., Wardle, D.A., and Asplund, J. 2020. Decomposability of lichens and bryophytes from across an elevational gradient under standardized conditions. *Oikos* **129**: 1358–1368. doi:10.1111/oik.07257.

Figure 1 Schematic overview of some of the structural and functional roles of the bryophyte layer (Bryosphere) in tundra ecosystems. The bryosphere (green) does not substantially penetrate the soil but creates a zone between the active layer (brown) belowground and the atmosphere (light blue) aboveground. Blue-framed boxes are physical properties (solid) and conditions (dashed), yellow-framed boxes are biogeochemical pools (solid) and processes (dashed) and pink-framed boxes are the biota. Dashed arrow indicates an uncertain connection between boxes. The diagram does not include all environmental factors acting on bryophyte functioning.


Figure 2 Bryophyte functional groups (BFGs) building on shoot morphology and *Life forms* (Mägdefrau 1982). The left diagram functions as a key, which splits bryophytes into 12 BFGs listed in the right panel with their abbreviations (Abb.), short descriptions and examples of species. The key starts at the grey bubble and dichotomies leading from each step are indicated with a number and same color arrow. The 12 BFGs are placed at the periphery. Red crossed circles mark “not *Sphagnum*” or “not Polytrichales”. Groups originating from orange bubbles can be collated to form broader functional groups. Note, in nature bryophytes often occur as a mixture of species, usually individuals occupy the same BFG, but if they do not, the most abundant BFG should be recorded.

Figure 3 Water holding capacity (WHC, g water per g dry mass bryophyte, g/g) analyzed across each of four grouping schemes. Black dots are species means and grey diamonds are group means. The dataset includes 963 observations of 37 species. Each species was assigned a bryophyte functional groups (BFGs), perichaetial position (La Farge-England 1996) and life form according to Bernhardt-Römermann (2018) and life form following Grace (1995). Bryophytes functional groups are represented in the dataset by Po, Polytrichales; BT, Branched turf; LL, Leafy liverworts; We, Weft; SU, Short unbranched turf; TU, Tall unbranched turf; Ma, Mat; Sp, *Sphagnum*). BryForTrait Life form following Bernhardt-Römermann et al (2018) are represented by Weft, Mat, Turf, cushion and species not assigned to groups (NA). Life form following Grace (1995) are represented by Large (L) cushion, Smooth mat, Tall (T) turf, Short (S) turf, Weft, Rough (R) mat, Whorled branch (WB) turf.

Groups with different lower-case letters are significantly different, N.S. indicate where groups that are not different (Tukey's test, $p < 0.05$). Full variation within species for each BFG can be seen in the Appendix Fig A3.

Figure 4 Selection of six bryophyte traits important for ecosystem functioning and their estimated relative value across the 12 bryophyte functional groups (BFGs). Three shades of green, light to dark indicate relative trait values (low, intermediate, high) assessed from the referenced sources. Diagonally split cells reflect that for a given BFG trait values range across the full spectrum. Striped cells are not covered by the given reference but are hypothesized based on authors' expert knowledge, no propositions are made for white cells; question marks indicate lack of data. Traits are water holding capacity (WHC), colony density, bryophyte colony layer depth/ shoot length, growth rate, tissue decomposability and nitrogen (N) content. References for a given trait do not necessarily use common protocols or units. No study covers all traits or all BFGs. Bryophyte functional groups are Sp, *Sphagnum*; De, Dendroid; We, Weft; Ma, Mat; BT, Branched turf; SC, Small cushion; LC, Large cushion; SU, Short unbranched turf; TU, Tall unbranched turf; Po, Polytrichales; LL, Leafy liverworts; Th, Thalloid.

Arctic Science Downloaded from cdnsciencepub.com by UNIVERSITY OF OSLO on 01/27/22
For personal use only. This Just-IN manuscript is the accepted manuscript prior to copy editing and page composition. It may differ from the final official version of record.



Arctic Science Downloaded from cdsciencepub.com by UNIVERSITY OF OSLO on 01/27/22
 Only. This Just-IN manuscript is the accepted manuscript prior to copy editing and page composition. It may differ from the final official version.





Abb	BFG	Short description	Examples of common/ typical species	
Th	Thallose liverwort and hornwort	Have undifferentiated vegetative tissue (no stems and shoots).	<i>Marchantia foliacea</i> , <i>Aneura pinguis</i>	
LL	Leafy liverwort	Shoots with leaves in 2-3 ranks, mostly rounded or 2-lobed and always without veins.	<i>Ptilidium ciliare</i> , <i>Lophozia floerkii</i>	
Sp	Sphagnum	Have capitulum. All Sphagnum species.	<i>Sphagnum fuscum</i> , <i>S. girgensohnii</i> , <i>S. warnstorffii</i>	
Po	Polytrichales	Unbranched shoots. Lanceolate leaves appear thick due to lamellae parallel to the vein (visible with hand lens). All Polytrichales	<i>Polytrichastrum alpinum</i> , <i>Polytrichum commune</i>	
SC	Small cushion	Dome-shaped colonies < 5 cm deep. Shoots grow from a central point with limited growth.	<i>Andreaea rupestris</i> , <i>Schistidium apocarpum</i> , <i>Grimmia spp.</i>	Shoots not or sparsely branched
LC	Large cushion	Dome-shaped colonies > 5 cm deep. Colonies may reach a radius of several decimeters.	<i>Racomitrium lanuginosum</i> , <i>Anoetangium aestivum</i> , <i>Dicranum elongatum</i>	
SU	Short unbranched turf	Colonies of unbranched (or sparsely branched) erect shoots. Shoots < 5 cm.	<i>Aulacomnium turgidum</i> , <i>Dicranum acutifolium</i> , <i>Cinclidium stygium</i>	
TU	Tall unbranched turf	Colonies of unbranched (or sparsely branched) erect shoots. Shoots > 5 cm.	<i>Dicranum majus</i> , <i>D. scoparium</i> , <i>Plagiomnium ellipticum</i> , <i>Paludella squarrosa</i>	
De	Dendroids	Main stem creeping and becomes erect. Branching stems from apex of main stem.	<i>Climacium dendroides</i> , <i>Thamnobryum alopecurum</i>	Shoots branched
We	Weft	Shoots grow erect and horizontally. Multiple branching stems distributed throughout the main stem. Sometimes appearance of a feather.	<i>Hylocomium splendens</i> , <i>Pleurozium schreberi</i>	
Ma	Mat	Branched shoots grow horizontal to substrate. Sometimes shoots possess erect lateral branches.	<i>Hypnum cupressiforme</i> , <i>Plagiothecium denticulatum</i>	
BT	Branched turf	Colonies of erect shoots with some branching.	<i>Tomentypnum nitens</i> , <i>Racomitrium spp.</i> , <i>Drepanocladus revolvens</i>	



207x166mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Bryophyte functional groups - BFGs

Trait	Sp	De	We	Ma	BT	SC	LC	SU	TU	Po	LL	Th	Reference
WHC		?				?	?					?	This study
Colony density		?		?	/	?						?	Soudzilovkaia et al 2013, Lett et al 2017, Elumeeva et al. 2011
Depth/shoot length		?		*								?	Soudzilovkaia et al 2013
Growth rate						?	?					?	Furness 1982, Rzepczynska, Lett, Michelsen <i>unpubl.</i>
Decomposability		?		?		?	?						Lang et al 2009
N content		?		?	/	?	?					?	Roos et al 2019, Rzepczynska, Lett, Michelsen <i>unpubl.</i>

* Mats will always be relatively shallow while their shoots may grow to an extensive length along the substrate
 ? No data

Appendix for 'Can bryophyte groups increase functional resolution in tundra ecosystems?'

Methodology on water holding capacity:

Water holding capacity (WHC) in all studies was measured as maximum held water per gram dry weight bryophyte. No recognized standardized protocol exists for measuring WHC and methodology therefore differed between studies (Table A2). However, across the WHC studies examined, three different general approaches were followed: WHC for shoot_{int+ext}, WHC for shoot_{ext} and WHC for colonies. Shoot_{int+ext} WHC was the weight difference of shoots at full water saturation and after complete drying. Shoot_{int} WHC was measured in a similar manner except external water was removed before weighing by blotting shoots dry on a paper towel (Elumeeva et al. 2011). Bryophyte colony WHC was measured by weighing colonies at fully saturated conditions and after complete drying. For bryophyte colonies, volume varied between 20 and 3200 cm³ between studies, though one study had volumes down to 2.5 cm³ for some small statured bryophytes *Neorthocaulis floerkii*, and *Dicranum elongatum* (Rzeczczynska, Michelsen, Lett *unpubl.*).

To test if WHC measurements of the three approaches were correlated, we averaged species values and where species were represented for at least two approaches, these were fitted using linear models (Fig A1). Colony WHC and shoot_{int+ext} WHC were significantly correlated ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.70$), whereas shoot_{int} WHC did not correlate with colony or shoot_{ext} WHC (Figure A1). This suggests that WHC can be measured on single shoots (WHC of shoots_{int+ext}) in permanent plots where destructive measurement must be kept to a minimum and still represent colony WHC reasonably well. Water holding capacity of shoot_{int} on the other hand should perhaps be considered an entirely separate trait.

Because WHC of shoot_{int+ext} and colony were well-correlated (Fig A2), differences between tundra bryophyte functional groups (BFGs) were analysed for WHC of shoot_{int+ext} and colony together with a mixed effects model followed by Tukey's HSD test. To take into account potential structural biases across studies, study ID was included as a random factor. Species was nested inside study ID to take into account the expected smaller variation within- compared to between bryophyte species.

Table A1 Methods of individual water holding capacity (WHC) studies. Full references for published studies can be found in the reference list for the main text. Water holding capacity was measured either for whole colonies, for shoots with internally and externally held water (WHC shoot_{int+ext}) and for shoot only with internally held water (WHC shoot_{int}). See above for overall description of methodology.

Study	Description	Dimensions
WHC colony		
Elumeeva et al. 2011	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Shoots of non-target species removed to <1%. Colonies remoistened and surplus water drainage allowed. Samples weighed and full moisture and after oven-drying at 90°C until constant mass.	N: 5, area: 7.5 x 7.5 cm ² , Depth: similar height as in field, green and basal parts included
Jónsdóttir, unpubl.	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Shoots of non-target species removed to <1% (usually not needed). Colonies sprayed with water until saturated and allowed to drain surplus water. Weighed at full saturation and after drying at 70°C.	N: 10, area 19.6 cm ² (circle, 5 cm in diameter), trimmed to 5 cm depth
Lett et al. 2017	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Shoots of non-target species removed to <1%. Colonies sprayed with water until field saturation and allowed to drain surplus water. Weighed at full water and after oven-drying at 85°C until constant mass	N: 4, area: 11 x 11 cm ² , depth: 2.8 - 7.3 cm depending on species, green and basal parts included
Liu and Rousk unpubl.	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Shoots of non-target species removed to <1%. Placed in a tray of distilled water for 12 h to saturate and allowed to drain surplus water. Weighed at full water and after oven-drying at 65°C until constant mass.	N: 3, area: 10.75 cm ² (circle, 3.7 cm Ø), depth: 2.1-7.8 cm depending on species, green and basal parts included
May et al. 2018	Vertical faces of colonies wrapped in cellophane and placed in trays. Colonies had vascular plants and soil removed and contained 95% target species moss. Placed in a tray of distilled water (3 cm depth) to hydrate. Soaked for 2 h until full saturation, then drained for 1 h. Colonies weighed after draining and at 0% water content after dried at 50°C.	N: 4, Area: 20 x 20 cm ² , depth: fixed depth, 8cm
Michel et al. 2012	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Shoots of non-target species removed to <1%. Colonies sprayed with water until field saturation and allowed to drain surplus water. Weighed at full water and after oven-drying at 60°C until constant mass.	N: 6 for each colony, 16 colonies, area 19.6 cm ² (circle 5 cm in diameter), fixed depth, 5cm depth
Rzeczynska, Lett, Michelsen, unpubl	Colonies kept in plastic containers. Non-target species removed (~95%). Sprayed with distilled water until full saturation, allowing the excess water to drain. Samples were weighed and then dried at 85°C for 48h.	N: 20; dimensions varied between species (vol. 3 to 248 cm ³)
WHC shoot_{int+ext}		
Busca, Vandvik, Haugum, unpubl.	Soil removed. Soaked in water for 30 min. Suspended in sealed container with water at the bottom for 24 hours at 22 to allow excess of water drops and prevent evaporation. Then, weighed, oven-dried for 72h at 70°C and weighed again	N: 30, Sample size: 1g dw
Elumeeva et al. 2011	Separate shoots remoistened in deionized water for min 12 h before weighing at full turgor. Less than 30 s before initial weighing every shoot was taken out of the water, shaken and lightly blotted to remove the extra external water not well connected with the shoot structures. Shoots dried at 90°C until constant mass and weighed again.	N:10, Sample size: 1 shoot
Rzeczynska, Lett, Michelsen unpubl.	Shoots collected from each sample placed in a glass vial and sprayed with distilled water until full turgor. Vials sealed with perforated parafilm for 24h, shoots then weighed before and after drying at 50°C for 48h.	N: 20, number of shoots differed between species, always covering area of 1 cm ²
WHC shoot_{int}		
Roos et al 2019	Shoots submersed in demineralized water for 30 min. Placed on moistened filter paper in sealed Petri dishes for ~ 24 hr. Shoots blotted dry and weighed, air-dried and weighed again. For each batch of samples, one replicate was oven-dried at 40°C for 6 hr and weighed to provide a conversion factor between air- and oven-dry mass.	N: 10, Sample size :1 shoot, (i.e. the top part of the shoot with green leaves)
van Zuijlen et al. 2021	Same as Roos et al. 2019, except one replicate per batch was oven-dried at 70 °C for 24 hours (to provide a conversion factor between air- and oven-dry mass.	Same as Roos et al. 2019
Elumeeva et al. 2011	Shoots moistened in deionized water and shaken to remove water against gravity, then blotted to remove as much external water as possible and weighed. Shoots oven-dried at 90°C.	N: 12, Sample size: 1 shoot.
Michel et al. 2012	Shoots moistened in deionized water and shaken to remove water, then blotted to remove as much external water as possible and weighed. Shoots oven-dried at 60°C for 48h.	N: 6 shoots for each species, 16 colonies, 8 species




Figure A1 The twelve bryophyte functional groups (BFGs) and their abbreviations illustrated with photos of characteristic species A–L. A: *Sphagnum fuscum*, B: *Climacium dendroides*, C: *Hylocomium splendens*, D: *Hypnum cupressiforme*, E: *Tomentypnum nitens*, F: *Grimmia pulvinata*, G: *Racomitrium lanuginosum*, H: *Aulacomnium turgidum*, I: *Dicranum flexicaule*, J: *Polytrichum commune*, K: *Ptilidium ciliare* and L: *Marchantia foliacea*. White bars indicate approximate scale. Photos by Signe Lett and through Creative commons




Figure A2 Relationships between water holding capacity (WHC) in bryophyte colonies, shoots external and internal and in shoots only internal. Dots represent species means and are colored according to tundra bryophyte functional groups (TBFGs, We, Weft; Ma, Mat; BT, Branched turf; SU, Short unbranched turf; TU, Tall unbranched turf; Po, Polytrichales; Sp, *Sphagnum*, LL, Leafy liverworts). Colony WHC and shoot_{int+ext} WHC were significantly correlated, whereas shoot_{int} WHC did not correlate to colony or shoot_{ext} WHC (b,c).




Table A2 List of recommended bryophyte floras and species lists (*) covering Arctic areas. The list is not comprehensive. Where available, number of species is given.

Arctic region	Flora/species list*	Language	Authors (ref)	Year	Comment
North America					
	Flora of North America, Vol. 27 and 28	English	Flora of North America Committee (1)	2007, 2014	Mosses. Available as e-book, 621 + 698 species
USA	The mosses of Arctic Alaska*	English	W. C. Steere (2)	1978	Mosses. 415 species Out of print
	A Bryophyte Species List for Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska, with Comments on Several New and Noteworthy Records*	English	S. E. Stehn, J. K. Walton, C. A. Roland (3)	2013	Bryophytes, Covers Denali National Park, 499 species
Canada	Flore des bryophytes du Québec et du Labrador, Vol. 1-3	French	J. Faubert (4)	2012	Bryophytes, 892 species
	A key and annotated synopsis of the mosses of the northern lowlands of Devon Island, N.W.T., Canada	English	V. D. Vitt (5)	1975	Mosses. Covers Devon Island. 131 species
	The Mosses of Northern Ellesmere Island, Arctic Canada. II. Annotated List of the Taxa*	English	G. R. Brassard (6)	1971	Mosses. Covers N Ellesmere Island. 151 species
Greenland					
	Illustrated Moss Flora of Arctic North America and Greenland vol. 1-3	English	D. Long, H. Crum, B. Murray, G. Mogensen, <i>ed.</i> (7–9)	1985	1. Polytrichaceae, 2. Sphagnaceae, 3. Andreaobryaceae – Tetrarhizaceae. Out of print
	Liverworts of Greenland	English	K. Damsholt (10)	2013	Liverworts, 178 species
	Mosses (Bryophyta) and liverworts (Marchantiophyta) of the Zackenberg valley, northeast Greenland*	English	K. Hassel, H. Zechmeister, T. Prestø (11)	2014	Mosses and liverworts, 212 species
Fennoscandia					
	Illustrated Moss Flora of Fennoscandia. II. Musci. Vol. 1-6	English	E. Nyholm (12)	1954-1969	Bryophytes. Out of print
	Illustrated flora of Nordic Mosses, Vol. 1-4	English	E. Nyholm (13–16)	1987-1998	Mosses; vol 4 out of print
	Illustrated moss flora of Nordic liverworts and hornworts	English	K Damsholt (17)	2009	Liverworts and hornworts. Out of print
Iceland	Íslenskir mosar	Icelandic	B. Jóhannsson (18)	1989-2003	Bryophytes. Available as reports. 604 species, detailed descriptions and distribution maps for Iceland
	Mosar á Íslandi	Icelandic	Á. H. Bjarnsson (19)	2018	Bryophytes. Key to all species in Iceland
Norway	Norges torvmoser	Norwegian	K.I. Flatberg (20)	2014	Sphagnaceae. 55 species
	Bryophytes of the Longyearbyen area*	English	T. Prestø, M. Lüth, K. Hassel (21)	2014	Bryophytes

	Bryophytes, Lichens and cyanoprocaroyotes in surrounding of pyramiden (Svalbard): A consise handbook	English	M. Dodd, I. Tatarenko, N. Koroleva (22)	2015	Bryophytes, subset of Svalbard species, 87 species
Sweden	National Nyckeln, 4 volumes	Swedish + English	T. Hallingbäck, N. Lönnel, H. Weibull, L. Hedenäs (23–26)	2005-2019	All mosses, 852 species
	Mossor	Swedish	T. Hallingbäck (27)		All bryophytes
	Bryophytes of the Tornetraesk area, northern Swedish Lapland*	English	O. Mårtensson (28–30)	1956	Bryophytes
Russia					
	Moss Flora of Russia, Vol. 2, 4 and 5	Russian, English	M.S. Ignatov et al. (31–33)	2017, 2018, 2020	Oedipodiales - Grimmiales; Bartramiales - Aulacomniales; Hypopterygiales - Hypnales (Plagiotheciaceae - Brachytheciaceae)
Other useful resources					
Britain and Ireland	Mosses and Liverworts of Britain and Ireland – a field guide	English	I. Atherton, S. Bosanquet, M. Lawley (34)	2010	Mosses, Liverworts and Hornworts.

Reference list for Table A2

1. Committee F of NAE, editor. Flora of North America: Volume 27: Bryophytes: Mosses, Part 1: North of Mexico. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2007. 734 p.
2. Steere WC. The mosses of Arctic Alaska. Vaduz: J. Cramer; 1978.
3. Stehn SE, Walton JK, Roland CA. A Bryophyte Species List for Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska, with Comments on Several New and Noteworthy Records. *Evansia*. 2013 Mar;30(1):31–45.
4. Faubert J. Flore des Bryophytes du Quebec-Labrador. Vols. 1–3. Société Québécoise de Bryologie; 2012.
5. Vitt DH. A key and annotated synopsis of the mosses of the northern lowlands of Devon Island, N.W.T., Canada. *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 1975;53(19):2158–97.
6. Brassard GR. The Mosses of Northern Ellesmere Island, Arctic Canada. II. Annotated List of the Taxa. *The Bryologist*. 1971;74(3):282–311.
7. Long DG. Illustrated Moss Flora of Arctic North America and Greenland. Mogensen GS, editor. Museum Tusulanum Press; 1985. 64 p. (Monographs on Greenland; vol. 1. Polytrichaceae).
8. Crum HA. Illustrated moss flora of Arctic North America and Greenlans. Mogensen GS, editor. Museum Tusulanum Press; 1986. (Monographs on Greenland; vol. 2. Sphagnaceae).
9. Murray BM. Illustrated Moss Flora of Arctic North America and Greenland. Mogensen GS, editor. Museum Tusulanum Press; 1987. 40 p. (Monographs on Greenland; vol. 3. Andreaobryaceae-Tetraphidaceae).
10. Damsholt K. Liverworts of Greenland. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 2013.
11. Hassel K, Zechmeister H, Prestø T. Mosses (Bryophyta) and liverworts (Marchantiophyta) of the Zackenberg valley, northeast Greenland. *lnbg*. 2014 Jan;37(2):66–84.

12. Nyholm E. Illustrated Moss Flora of Fennoscandia. II. Musci. Vols. 1–6. Lund, Sweden: Swedish Natural Science Research Council; 1954.
13. Nyholm E. Illustrated Flora of Nordic Mosses. Vol. 1. Fissidentaceae-Seligeriaceae. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 1987.
14. Nyholm E. Illustrated flora of Nordic Mosses. Vol. 2. Pottiaceae-Schistostegaceae. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 1990.
15. Nyholm E. Illustrated flora of Nordic Mosses. Vol. 3. Bryaceae-Plagiomniaceae. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 1993.
16. Nyholm E. Illustrated flora of Nordic Mosses. Vol. 4. Aulacomniaceae-Orthotrichaceae. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 1998.
17. Damsholt K. Illustrated moss flora of Nordic liverworts and hornworts. Lund, Sweden: Oikos editorial office; 2009.
18. Jóhansson B. Íslenskir mosar (Icelandic bryophytes). Iceland: Fjölrit Náttúrufræðistofnunar; 1989 2003. Report No.: 12, 13, 15, 16, 19–22, 24, 26, 29, 30, 33, 36, 38 and 41–44.
19. Bjarnason ÁH. Mosar á Íslandi. Forlagid; 2018.
20. Flatberg KI. Norges Torvmoser. Norway: Akademiska Forlag; 2014.
21. Prestø T, Lüth M, Hassel K. Bryophytes of the Longyearbyen area. Trondheim: NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet, Sektion for naturhistorie; 2014 p. 1–68. (NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet naturhistorisk notat).
22. Dodd M, Tatarenko I, Koroleva N. Bryophytes, lichens and cyanoprocaroytes in surroundings of Pyramiden (Svalbard): a concise guide-book. Dodd M, Tatarenko I, Koroleva N, editors. Apatity, Murmansk: Polar-Alpine Botanical Garden-Institute; 2015. 253 p.
23. Hallingbäck T, Lönnell N, Weibull H, Hedenäs L. Bladmossor: Sköldmossor - blåmossor: Bryophyta: Buxbaumia - Leucobryum klot. SLU Artdatabanken; 2005. 416 p.
24. Hallingbäck T, Lönnell N, Weibull H. Bladmossor : kompaktmossor - kapmossor. Bryophyta : anoetangium - orthodontium. Vol. AJ 24-36. SLU Artdatabanken; 2008.
25. Hedenäs L, Hallingbäck T. Bladmossor : skirmossor - baronmossor. Bryophyta : hookeria - anomodon. Vol. AJ 37-57. SLU Artdatabanken; 2014.
26. Lönnell N, Hallingbäck T. Bladmossor: Vitmossor – knappålsmossor: Bryophyta: Sphagnum–Tetradontium. Vol. AJ 1-5. SLU Artdatabanken; 2019.
27. Hallingbäck T. Mossor: En fältguide. Naturcentrum; 2016.
28. Mårtensson O. Bryophytes of the Torneträsk Area, Northern Swedish Lappland I - Hepaticae. Kungl. Sv. Vetensk. Akad. avhandlingar i naturskyddsärenden 12; 1955.
29. Mårtensson O. Bryophytes of the Torneträsk Area, Northern Swedish Lappland II - Musci. Kungl. Sv. Vetensk. Akad. avhandlingar i naturskyddsärenden 14; 1956.
30. Mårtensson O. Bryophytes of the Torneträsk Area, Northern Swedish Lappland III - General part. Sv. Vetensk. Akad. avhandlingar i naturskyddsärenden 15; 1956.
31. Ignatov MS, Ignatova EA, Fedosov VE. Moss Flora of Russia. Vol. 2. Oedipodiales-Grimmiales. Moscow, Russia: KMK; 2017.

32. Ignatov MS, Ignatova EA, Fedosov VE. Moss Flora of Russia. Vol. 4. Bartramiales-Aulacomniales. Moscow, Russia: KMK; 2018.
33. Ignatov MS, Ignatova EA, Fedosov VE. Moss Flora of Russia. Vol. 5. Hypopterygiales-Hypnales (Plagiotheciaceae-Brachytheciaceae). Moscow, Russia: KMK; 2020.
34. Atherton I, Bosanquet SDS, Lawey M. Mosses and liverworts of Britain and Ireland: a field guide. British Bryological Society; 2010.