(In the format of *Nature Ecology and Evolution*)

# Systematic distributions of interaction strengths across tree interaction networks yield positive diversity-productivity relationships

Wentao Yu1, 2, †\*, Georg Albert1, 2, 3, †, Benjamin Rosenbaum1, 2, Florian Schnabel1, 4, Helge Bruelheide5,1, John Connolly6, Werner Härdtle7, Goddert von Oheimb8, Stefan Trogisch5,1, Nadja Rüger1,9,10, Ulrich Brose1, 2

**Authorship** UB, GA and YW conceptualised the study. YW conducted the data analysis and simulation together with GA and RB. YW led the writing of the manuscript, together with UB and GA. SF, BH, HW, vOG, TS collected the data. All authors contributed critically to the draft, and gave final approval for publication.

† authors contributed equally

1 German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

2 Institute of Biodiversity, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany.

3 Department of Forest Nature Conservation, University of Göttingen, 37077 Göttingen, Germany.

4 Systematic Botany and Functional Biodiversity, Leipzig University, 04109 Leipzig, Germany

5 Institute of Biology/Geobotany and Botanical Garden, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, 06108 Halle (Saale), Germany

6 School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland

7 Institute of Ecology, Leuphana University of Lüneburg, 21335 Lüneburg, Germany

8 Institute of General Ecology and Environmental Protection, Technische Universität Dresden, 01737 Tharandt, Germany

9 Department of Economics, Institute of Empirical Economic Research, 04109 Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany

10 Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Ancón, Panama

# Abstract

Understand the mechanisms underlying diversity-productivity relationships (DPRs) is crucial to mitigating the effects of forest biodiversity loss. Tree-tree interactions in diverse communities are fundamental in driving growth rates, potentially shaping the emergent DPRs, yet remains poorly explored. Here, using data from a large-scale forest biodiversity experiment in subtropical China, we demonstrated that changes in individual tree productivity were driven by species-specific pairwise interactions, with higher positive net pairwise interaction effects on trees in more diverse neighbourhoods. The aggregated interaction effects subsequently determined the community DPRs. We further revealed that the positive differences between inter- and intra-specific interactions were the critical determinant for the emergence of positive DPRs. Surprisingly, the condition for positive DPRs corresponded to the condition for coexistence. Our results thus provide a novel insight into how pairwise tree interactions regulate DPRs, with implications for identifying the tree mixtures with maximised productivity to guide forest restoration and reforestation efforts.

# 

# Introduction

Forests provide a wealth of ecosystem functions and services, such as biomass production, carbon sequestration, climate regulation, water filtration, and prevention of soil erosion 1,2. However, globally, forests are under siege from increasing land-use conversion to agriculture, associated fragmentation, pollution as well as climate change3. The unprecedented rate of biodiversity loss in forests4 could considerably compromise the capacity of the world’s forests to deliver essential ecosystem functions and services5,6. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the consequences of species loss on the functioning and services of forest ecosystems. To this end, manipulative experiments have been carried out in the past two decades and it has become well established that forests with diverse species are generally more productive than monocultures7–9. Nonetheless, the fundamental mechanisms that give rise to positive diversity-productivity relationships (DPRs) are still obscure.

As forests are aggregates of individual trees, interactions between tree individuals that influence the productivity of individual trees could hold the key to unlocking the mechanisms underlying positive community-level diversity-productivity relationships (hereafter: community DPRs). Interestingly, the neighbourhood diversity can enhance individual tree growth10–12. However, the effects of neighbourhood species richness on tree growth of different tree species were idiosyncratic13,14, hindering attempts to devise a mixed forest with maximum productivity15,28. This idiosyncrasy could be attributed to the inadequacy of using sheer diversity (species richness) instead of explicit pairwise interaction strengths that capture the neighbourhood effect. Eventually, the neighbourhood species composition driving the frequency and strength of competitive and facilitative interactions could thus be more important for individual tree growth than the neighbourhood diversity16,17. This suggests that observed changes in individual tree growth could be driven by divergent interactions due to the identity and relative abundance of neighbouring trees10. Consequently, varying community compositions could affect productivity via changes in tree-tree interactions at the local neighbourhood (Fig. 1a), a scale at which plant interactions emerge18,19.

The local neighbourhood is characterised by the focal tree and the pairwise tree interactions with all of its immediate neighbours, forming an intricate local interaction network. The productivity of a focal individual tree can be boosted by the dominance of positive (e.g. resource partitioning, facilitation, dilution effects of enemies and pathogens, indirect trophic interactions controlling herbivory) over negative (e.g. resource competition, increased apparent competition via herbivores) interactions in the network depending on the diversity, size, density and identity of its neighbours14,20,21. Conversely, the productivity of a focal individual tree can also be decreased by the dominance of negative over positive interactions. By extension, the interaction network composed of all the pairwise tree interactions in the community should impact productivity at the community scale unless their aggregation is a zero-sum game. As a consequence, the nature and intensity of interactions in the network could play a key role in determining community DPRs. This species-pair specificity is thus particularly pertinent to unravelling the general pattern of interactions and their role in inducing community DPRs19. Specifically, positive effects of tree diversity on community productivity require that inter-specific interaction strengths are weakly negative, or even positive, compared to intra-specific interaction strengths that govern monoculture productivity, which is similar to conditions for coexistence22 (Fig. 1b).

Despite the attempts made to explore diversity effects at the neighbourhood scale, studies focused on pairwise tree interactions are scarce (but see Sapijanskas et al 201323). This scarcity finds an explanation in the thorny issues hampering the discovery of the above-mentioned mechanisms. First of all, resolving multiple pairwise tree interactions of a focal tree demand a specific experimental design that ensures the systematic representation of all pairwise tree interactions across a diversity gradient including monocultures19. Secondly, the typically low replication of pairwise tree combinations and the simultaneous effects of multiple pairwise interactions on focal tree productivity impose serious challenges on the statistical modelling. Therefore, to make the link to productivity, we are missing systematic interaction-network approaches to investigate characteristics of the interaction network, such as the distribution of positive and negative interactions among different tree species pairs and the difference between inter- and intra-specific interactions. An in-depth knowledge of pairwise tree interactions underpinned by concomitantly operating mechanisms, i.e. competition and facilitation, with an interaction-network perspective would greatly advance our mechanistic understanding of diversity effects at the community scale.

Here, we used annual tree growth data spanning seven years from a large-scale biodiversity-ecosystem functioning (BEF) experiment. The random planting scheme of the experiment (i.e. species were randomly assigned to individual planting positions on a regular grip within plots) yielded sufficient pairwise tree interaction data. Moreover, the equal distances between all planted trees allow us to adequately assess the interactions between all immediate tree neighbours. We employed a Bayesian approach to partition individual tree growth into the intrinsic growth rate and effects of interactions with its immediate neighbours. We started with describing the allometric relationship between intrinsic growth rate of an organism and its biomass (*null model*)24–26. Interactions with neighbouring trees were described by the sum of each pairwise tree interaction between a tree and its immediate neighbours. Each unique pairwise tree interaction is characterised by a distinct species-specific interaction coefficient(*pairwise interaction model*)27, all of which constitute the tree-tree interaction network. Alternatively, if the strengths of pairwise tree interactions do not hinge on species identities, an average interaction coefficient is sufficient (*neutral model*). We applied this modelling framework to two independent datasets which had no overlap in species and were well replicated. Each spanned a diversity gradient ranging from monocultures, to 2-, 4-, and 8-species mixtures. We then set out to test the following hypotheses: (H1) species-specific pairwise tree interaction coefficients are necessary to accurately predict individual tree growth; (H2) inter-specific interaction coefficients should be systematically higher (i.e. if negative then of smaller magnitude, or if positive, then larger) than intra-specific interaction coefficients; (H3) this non-random distribution of coefficients across inter- and intra-specific interactions leads to the emergence of positive DPRs at the community level.

# Results

*Model fitting and model performance*

To assess the importance of explicitly modelling pairwise tree interactions, we compared the *pairwise interaction model* (i.e. the model assigning specific interaction parameters to all tree species pairs) with a *null model* without interactions and a *neutral model* where interaction terms are constant across species (i.e. interactions are neutral concerning species identities). In a parameter identifiability analysis, all parameters of the pairwise interaction models were accurately retrieved using simulated data with relatively low deviations between the estimated and assigned true values (Supplementary Fig. 1). All models showed good convergence with R-hat values of 1.0 for almost all estimates (Supplementary Fig. 2). Across both datasets, the *pairwise interaction model* was invariably ranked the best in terms of its predictive power (Table 1). In the *pairwise interaction model*, the estimated allometric scaling exponent of the intrinsic growth term was 0.80 and 0.81 for dataset 1 and dataset 2, respectively (Table 1). The interaction strength scaled sublinearly with the biomass of the neighbouring tree, with exponents of 0.19 and 0.14 for the two datasets (Table 1).

*The estimates of interaction coefficients*

We tested for the differences between inter- and intra-specific interaction strengths in the full interaction coefficient matrices from both datasets. The estimates of interaction coefficients in the pairwise model showed values ranging from -1.23 to 2.81 and -1.44 and 1.56 for dataset 1 and dataset 2, respectively (Fig. 2a, b, see Supplementary Fig. 3a and b for dataset 2). Note that negative and positive values imply negative and positive interactions, respectively. Out of the 64 interaction coefficients estimated, about half (dataset 1: 33; dataset 2: 32) had 90% credible intervals that did not overlap with zero, indicating that those interaction effects were significantly positive or negative (Supplementary Fig. 4 and 5). Interestingly, we noticed that the two interaction coefficients between specific tree pairs (effects of species *i* on *j* and *j* on *i*) were neither reciprocal nor inverse in magnitude (Fig. 2c), which is mirrored by the links with different thickness or/and colour between the connecting species, depicted in the network (Fig. 2b). From the two interaction networks in dataset 1 and 2, we found that the majority of the tree-tree interactions were positive, with an incidence of 67.2% [43/64] and 51.6% [33/64], respectively. When separating intra- (diagonal values in Fig. 2a) and inter-specific (off-diagonal values in Fig. 2a) coefficients, a similar trend emerged from the two independent model fittings, with the mean inter-specific interactions being consistently larger than mean intra-specific interactions (Fig. 2d, see Supplementary Fig. 3d for figures of dataset 2). Statistically, inter- and intra-specific interaction strengths can be considered to be sampled from different distributions for both datasets because the inter-specific interaction strengths were on average larger than the intra-specific interaction strengths, with a posterior probability of 100 percent and 90 percent for dataset 1 and 2, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 6). These results demonstrate two related patterns: (1) inter-specific interaction strengths were generally weaker, if negative, than intra-specific interaction strengths, and (2) inter-specific interactions even tended to be positive, whereas intra-specific interactions were on average negative.

*Effect of inter- and intra-specific interaction strengths on community DPR*

Reshuffling the whole interaction coefficient matrix gave us a wide variety of relationships between net interactions and diversity, ranging from negative to neutral and positive relationships (Fig. 3a, unconstrained, see Supplementary Fig. 7 for dataset 2). Compared to the positive relationship observed in the empirical data (Fig. 3a, green lines), the average across all the simulated communities led to a flat line of both mean community net interaction and productivity with respect to diversity (Fig. 3a, unconstrained, blue lines). This suggests that the empirical emergence of the positive relationship does not arise from a random distribution of interaction strengths across the matrix. In contrast, reshuffling the intra- and inter-specific interactions in their respective subsets greatly constrained the relationships between community mean productivity and diversity to be positive (Fig. 3a, constrained). This indicates that the pattern of inter-specific interactions being less negative than intra-specific interactions largely explains why community DPRs are positive. Likewise, when we analysed how the difference between mean inter- and intra-specific interactions from the unconstrained reshuffling related to the slopes of the DPRs, we found that positive difference between mean inter- and intra-specific interactions led to positive community DPRs (Fig. 3b). Conversely, negative differences between inter- and intra-specific interactions corresponded to negative community DPRs. Collectively, these results indicate the significance of the difference in sign as well as magnitude of the inter- and intra-specific interactions in determining the direction and strength of DPRs.

# Discussion

Employing a unique data set on the growth rates over 7 years of 3300 tree individuals and a novel modelling approach, we obtained two full interaction networks. We found that (1) pairwise interactions in our model are essential for predicting tree growth, (2) the species interaction network is dominated by positive over negative interactions, (3) the positive difference between mean inter- and intra-specific interaction strength in the community is a critical determinant of the empirically observed positive community diversity-productivity relationships (DPRs). Taken together, our results illuminate the role that the pairwise interactions play in regulating community DPRs. The knowledge of tree-tree interaction networks also has great implications for forest restoration and reforestation efforts. It opens the door to the optimal design of forest mixtures that can maximise productivity, which is an important ecosystem function and positively related to multifunctionality28.

We utilised two independent datasets to test the necessity of pairwise interactions for predicting tree growth. The consistent results strongly suggest that the identity of neighbours is an indispensable factor in shaping individual tree productivity. In a field experiment with subtropical trees, it was observed that the species identity of neighbouring samplings is an important determinant of sapling growth16. Furthermore, a population-level analysis of European forests showed that the identities of neighbouring trees drive the variation in community-level productivity28. Studies at the neighbourhood scale usually characterised the local neighbourhood by the size of neighbouring trees (e.g. the total basal area of neighbouring trees) and the richness of neighbouring species11,14,29. Their results showed that neighbourhood diversity and competition are central for regulating community productivity. Using BEF experimental data from tropical forests, Sapijanskas (2013)23 found that the inclusion of pairwise interactions through the neighbours’ litter production in addition to shading improved the prediction of individual tree growth. Our model takes a phenomenological approach, assuming that the pairwise interaction term captures the total impact of competitive and facilitative interactions between distinct species pairs. The sum of pairwise interaction effects of the focal tree then constitutes the net interaction effect, which captures the overall local neighbourhood interaction effects, allowing for scaling up to the interaction effects at the community level. This model framework thus not only permits the discernment of the pairwise interactions, but also provides a means to decipher the mechanisms through which local pairwise interactions shape the DPRs.

Surprisingly, we found that positive interaction coefficients were dominant in the interaction networks. The high frequency of positive interactions suggests abiotic facilitation30 among trees, which could be accompanied by reduced competition due to resource partitioning or biotic interaction31, so that the positive effects are not offset by competition. Our findings therefore contrast recent studies that suggest competition to be the prevalent form of plant-plant interactions32,33, with only about 25% of the recorded interactions being positive32. Generally, the ecological literature postulates that positive interactions are prevalent in stressful environments34,35 (stress gradient hypothesis). In moderately or weakly stressful environments, positive interactions are thought to be generally outweighed by the negative effects of competition which are larger in magnitude20,36. This could have repercussions on community DPRs. For instance, the positive slope of the community DPRs diminished from boreal to subtropical forests, which feature less stressful conditions compared to boreal forests37. Our results from a subtropical tree diversity experiment show that positive interactions eclipse competition in the majority of interactions, leading to the positive community DPRs. We ascribe this discrepancy primarily to the fact that prior studies with a focus on positive interactions usually used isolated species pairs33,38 and investigated how the strength of positive interactions changes from stress-free to an extremely stressful environment rather than examining the relative importance of positive interaction and competition across species in diverse communities.

Moreover, our results also point to a potential mismatch between two paradigms in the literature. On one hand, the predominance of negative inter-specific interactions, on the other hand, positive community DPRs. Based on our empirical analysis and simulations, we show that positive community DPRs8 require that inter-specific interaction strengths are on average higher (and often positive) than intra-specific interaction strengths. While a dominance of weakly negative inter-specific interactions cannot be completely ruled out, these results also suggest that the occurrence or dominance of positive inter-specific interactions, as in our study, makes the occurrence of positive DPRs much more likely. Our results thus highlight the significance of understanding the relative importance and intensity of pairwise tree interactions, which drive positive community DPRs through a predominance of positive local interactions.

Our results reveal that interaction strength scales sublinearly with the biomass of the neighbouring tree with the exponents between zero (size-independent) and one (linearly proportional to biomass), reflecting the differing capacity of plants competing for resources39,40. While there is a general agreement that competition scales with size12,41, the exact way how positive interactions scale with size is not known. For instance, plants with deep roots can make water available to plants with shallow roots through hydraulic lift42 and some plant species can shelter their direct neighbours from harsh microclimate conditions by physically mediating wind, heat, or light30. As is the case of competition, those positive interactions likely scale with the size of the neighbouring tree, with larger trees providing more readily accessible water or a more suitable microclimate43. Furthermore, negative and positive interactions could scale with the size of the neighbouring tree differentially, resulting in a non-linear scaling for the net interaction. Thus, the scaling relationship between positive interaction and the size of the neighbouring trees is worth further exploration.

Our analyses of the interaction networks showed that the difference between mean inter- and intra-specific interactions is positive, which is consistent with findings of a global synthesis study32. A field study on forests in Borneo44, which found a differential effect of conspecific versus heterospecific neighbours, with conspecific neighbours reducing the growth of the focal tree considerably more than heterospecific neighbours, also indirectly supports our results. The magnitude and direction of competitive interactions within the network can either boost or diminish the individual growth rates. Consequently, the characteristics of the competitive network among species could be central for determining the community DPRs45,46. Our results corroborate this notion and expand the competitive network to a general interaction network which incorporates the effect of often overlooked positive interactions, demonstrating that the positive difference between inter- and intra-specific interactions is a key driver for the emergence of positive community DPRs.

This finding also echoes with the general principle of coexistence theory, which predicts that intra-specific competition should be stronger than inter-specific competition for stably coexisting species22. The mechanisms underlying coexistence are frequently invoked to explain how and why mixtures outperform monocultures and there certainly is, to some extent, correspondence between coexistence and BEF studies47. Indeed, Loreau (2004)48 provided a theoretical proof that a stably coexisting mixture would inevitably overyield and create a positive net diversity effect. Hence, when inter-specific competition is on average less intense than intra-specific competition, it is indicative of the presence of complementarity. As this pattern of interaction strengths is a prerequisite for avoiding competitive exclusion and fostering species coexistence45, it may provide an explanation for the dominance of positive diversity effects in diversity-productivity studies. By establishing the connection between coexistence theory and BEF studies in an interaction network context, our research therefore offers novel insights into the preconditions for positive community DPRs.

In addition, our results show that the positive community DPRs become steeper as the difference between inter- and intra-specific interaction increases in magnitude. This finding could have practical implications for forest restoration and reforestation as it implies the possibility of selecting an optimal composition of tree species from local pools to maximise productivity28. Moreover, the interaction coefficients in our model quantitatively reflect the ecological strategies of species pairs, paving the way to relate functional traits to the interaction coefficients. Functional traits linking essential biological processes to biotic interactions can act as common currency49,50. Substituting species identities with functional traits in our model would allow us to unravel universal relationships between functional traits and biotic interactions. As a result, this approach not only permits the selection of forest mixtures with optimal performance across geographic regions, but also improves our predictive power of the effect of the loss of tree diversity on forest ecosystem functioning worldwide.

In our *pairwise interaction model*, the interaction strength scales with the biomass of the neighbouring tree, reflecting an intensified interaction strength over time as the biomass of the neighbouring tree increased over the years51. With data spanning a longer period becoming available, it could be profitable to explicitly examine the temporal variation in pairwise interactions. We accounted for environmental heterogeneity by using plots and years as random factors and allowing interactions between them and species identity. Given the large number of plots with randomly assigned species and species compositions, it is not likely that the interactions were confounded with the variations in the abiotic environment52. This interpretation is supported by Kröber (2015)53 and Fichtner (2018)29, whose findings demonstrated that environmental heterogeneity explained only 4% variation of crown width growth rate and 2.5% variation of aboveground wood production in the BEF-China experiment, respectively. Nonetheless, environmental conditions likely modify interactions when they are not accounted for through experimental designs. Previous studies showed that plant interactions exhibited differential responses across environmental gradients, in which the combination of specific species pairs and the stress type could play major roles54. Thus, further research should consider identifying environmental factors that influence plant interactions.

# Materials and Methods

*General overview*

To test for the necessity of pairwise interactions in determining individual tree productivity, we formulated three models, 1) a *null model* without interactions, 2) a *neutral model* that assumes interactions are independent of the species involved, and 3) a *pairwise interaction model* that incorporates species identity26. We then fitted these models to field data from a large-scale BEF experiment55 whose specific experimental design enabled us to examine interactions between various tree species over a 7-year time series with sufficient replicates, both of which are central for our model fitting. Lastly, we carried out simulation experiments based on the empirical interaction coefficient matrices to unravel the specific characteristics in the distribution of interaction coefficients in shaping the positive diversity-productivity relationship.

*Experimental design*

In this study, we used data from site A (29.125°N, 117.908°E) of the BEF-China tree diversity experiment55. The experimental site is located in southeast subtropical China (29.08°–29.11° N, 117.90°–117.93° E) between 105 and 275 m above sea level with an average slope of 27.5°. The major forest type is subtropical evergreen broad-leaved forest with Cambisols, Regosols and Colluvisols being the predominant soil types in the area56. The mean annual temperature is 16.7 °C whereas the mean precipitation is 1821 mm per year57.

In total, we used data from 155 study plots (25.8 × 25.8 m2) to analyse two independent datasets. The two datasets had no overlap in species (see Supplementary S7 for included tree species) and were well replicated. Each spanned a diversity gradient ranging from monocultures to 2-, 4-, and 8-species mixtures. Species of the mixtures were randomly assigned to plots following a “broken-stick” design. Within a plot, species were planted randomly. All species were equally represented along the diversity gradient. In March 2009, each plot was planted with 400 1- to 2-year-old tree saplings (20 × 20 individuals) with equal distance of 1.29 m in horizontal projection. All saplings that died during the first growing season were replanted in November 2009 (deciduous species) and March 2010 (evergreen species). Weeding was carried out twice a year from 2009 to 2011, and later once a year during the growing season (May–October). More detailed description of the experimental design is provided by Bruelheide et al. (2014)55.

*Tree data*

To avoid edge effects, we focused our analyses on core areas of 6x6 trees for monocultures and 2-species mixtures and 12x12 trees for 4- and 8-species mixtures. For all trees within these core areas of the plots, species identity, stem diameter and tree height were recorded once per year over the 7-year study period (2010–2016). Within a plot, trees that were located in the core area were considered as focal trees. For each focal tree, the location and identity of its eight neighbouring trees were also recorded. One sample consists of one focal tree and its immediate neighbouring trees in a given year. Above-ground biomass of each tree was calculated as the product of its above-ground volume and its species-specific wood densities, which were collected from a comparative study plot near the BEF-China experimental site that covers all the species used in BEF-China58. Above-ground wood volume of each tree was calculated by multiplying tree basal area by tree height with a form factor of 0.5 to account for the discrepancy between actual tree volume and the volume of a cylinder59,60. In the case of missing biomass data of one or more neighbouring trees in a certain year, the sample was removed from the dataset. Annual biomass growth rates were calculated as the biomass difference between two consecutive years. Trees that exhibited negative growth rates in certain consecutive years, most likely due to measurement errors, were excluded to avoid problems with statistical convergence. In the end, 1948 and 1352 focal trees from dataset 1 and 2 from 74 and 81 plots respectively, were included in this study, with a total number of data points of 7700 and 4585 over the 7-year study period.

*Pairwise interaction model*

We decomposed the observed individual growth rate into its intrinsic growth rate and interactions with its immediate neighbouring trees, assuming the effects of higher order interactions are negligible61. Metabolic theory predicts the relationship between intrinsic growth rate and body mass can be described by a three-quarter power allometric scaling. It is predicated on the assumption that the metabolic rate of an organism is constrained by the rates of resources uptake across surfaces and rates of nutrient distribution through branching networks of vessels within the organism23–25.

Here, we employed this allometric relationship between biomass and intrinsic growth rate while retaining the flexibility of the exponent to test the validity of three-quarter scaling in metabolic theory, which formed our *null model* described by:

(1)

where and denote the biomass of tree i in year t and t+1, respectively. Following metabolic theory, is a species-specific coefficient, whereas is a general exponent for allometric scaling. We accounted for plot effects and annual environmental changes by incorporating them as random effects (while allowing them to have species-specific effects ( as tree species may respond differentially to similar environmental conditions.

Then, the interaction effect between the focal tree and its neighbouring tree was factored in, which was defined by the product of the interaction coefficient and the biomass of the neighbouring tree with a scaling exponent. This assumes that the interaction strength scales with body size since larger trees seize disproportionally more resources relative to their size40. Additionally, the exponent of the biomass of the neighbouring tree allowed us to test whether the scaling relationship is linear (exponent = 1) or nonlinear. If the species identities of interacting trees have no bearings on the interaction strength, an average interaction coefficient (which is identical across species) would suffice, resulting in the *neutral model* which is described as follows:

(2)

Where the represents an average interaction coefficient and denotes the biomass of neighbouring tree j in year t with a scaling exponent *b*. denotes the set of neighbouring trees, which could be smaller than eight trees due to mortality.

Contrary to equation (2), if the identity of the neighbouring trees is necessary for accurately characterising individual tree productivity, then a *pairwise interaction model* is needed, which can be expressed by:

(3)

where the interaction coefficient encapsulates the effects of species of tree j on species s(i) of tree i. When , stands for the intra-specific interaction coefficient, whilst when , represents the inter-specific interaction coefficient. We tested different formulations of the random effect structure and found that the formulation in which only intrinsic growth rates were affected generally fitted best (see Supplementary S8 for model formulation with other random effect structure). Distances between focal tree and neighbouring trees were not considered in our study, because in plots where the spacing is well controlled, additional spatial information may not improve the performance of the model to characterise tree-tree interactions62.

To ensure that it is theoretically possible to estimate unique parameters given the data and our model structure, we performed a parameter identifiability analysis63(see Supplementary S1 for details). We then fitted the *null, neutral,* and *pairwise interaction* models to the two independent empirical datasets using the Rstan package64 in R version 4.265. Each model was fitted using three Markov chains and 4000 iterations with 2000 as warm-up. To ensure that the HMC sampler effectively explored the parameter space and the model convergence, we graphically checked the trace plots of Markov chains and the R-hat metric66. We used posterior predictive checks to inspect the goodness-of-fit for each model via visually comparing the predictions from the model to the observed data. Bayesian leave-one-out cross-validation (LOO-CV) was chosen to evaluate the model performance based on its out-of-sample predictive ability67,68. The set of models fitted with two independent datasets allowed us to robustly evaluate the model performances.

*Reshuffling the interaction coefficient matrix*

To uncover the specific characteristics in the tree-tree interaction network that are responsible for positive diversity-net interaction relationships, we performed randomization experiments on the interaction coefficient matrix obtained from the pairwise interaction model. We defined the second term in equation (3) as the net interaction effect, which can directly boost or diminish the growth of individual trees. We first reshuffled the whole interaction coefficient matrix to test whether the estimated interaction coefficient matrix could have emerged by chance. We then investigated how the difference between inter- (off-diagonal elements in the interaction matrix) and intra-specific (diagonal elements) interaction coefficients shaped the DPRs by constraining the reshuffling to the off-diagonal and diagonal elements, respectively. For each scenario, we sampled 100 times. With the generated interaction coefficient matrices under each scenario, we computed the net interaction effects and productivity for each focal tree. We then scaled up the individual-based effects to the community level (by summing up equation (3) for multiple individuals *i* of the community) and examined the diversity-net interaction and community DPRs using the last year growth, thereby establishing the link between the diversity effect at the local level and the diversity effect at the community level (see Supplementary S9 for details). We hypothesised that the inter-specific interaction strengths should be weaker, if negative, or positive than the intra-specific interactions for a positive DPR to emerge. To test this hypothesis, we calculated the mean difference of inter- and intra-specific interaction for each of the randomly reshuffled matrices and tested for the relationship between the difference in inter- and intra-specific interactions and the slopes of the emerging DPRs.

# Code availability:

The R code used to create the data and perform analyses is available at https://github.com/wentaoyu211/Pairwise-tree-tree-interactions

# Acknowledgements:

WY and GA were supported by the International Research Training Group TreeDì funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG; GRK 2324/2 (P9) - 319936945). WY, GA and UB gratefully acknowledge the support of iDiv funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG– FZT 118, 202548816).

# References:

1. Quijas, S. *et al.* Plant diversity and generation of ecosystem services at the landscape scale: Expert knowledge assessment. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **49**, 929–940 (2012).

2. Pan, Y., Birdsey, R. A., Phillips, O. L. & Jackson, R. B. The structure, distribution, and biomass of the world’s forests. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **44**, 593–622 (2013).

3. Rome. *the World’ S Forests*. (2020).

4. Naeem, S., Duffy, J. E. & Zavaleta, E. The functions of biological diversity in an age of extinction. *Science* **336**, 1401–1406 (2012).

5. Cardinale, B. J. *et al.* Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*. **486**, 59–67 (2012).

6. Isbell, F., Tilman, D., Polasky, S. & Loreau, M. The biodiversity-dependent ecosystem service debt. *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 119–134 (2015).

7. Chisholm, R. A. *et al.* Scale-dependent relationships between tree species richness and ecosystem function in forests. *J. Ecol.* **101**, 1214–1224 (2013).

8. Huang, Y. *et al*. Impacts of species richness on productivity in a large-scale subtropical forest experiment. Science 362, 80–83. *Science* **363**, 80–83 (2019).

9. Paquette, A. *et al.* A million and more trees for science. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 763–766 (2018).

10. Potvin, C. and & Dutilleul, P. Neighbourhood effects and size-asymmetric competition in a tree plantation varying in diversity. *Ecology*. **90**, 321–327 (2009).

11. Pretzsch, H. & Schütze, G. Transgressive overyielding in mixed compared with pure stands of Norway spruce and European beech in Central Europe: Evidence on stand level and explanation on individual tree level. *Eur. J. For. Res.* **128**, 183–204 (2009).

12. Fichtner, A. *et al.* From competition to facilitation: how tree species respond to neighbourhood diversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **20**, 892–900 (2017).

13. von Oheimb, G. *et al.* Individual-tree radial growth in a subtropical broad-leaved forest: The role of local neighbourhood competition. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **261**, 499–507 (2011).

14. Schnabel, F. *et al.* Drivers of productivity and its temporal stability in a tropical tree diversity experiment. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **25**, 4257–4272 (2019).

15. Forrester, D. I. & Bauhus, J. A Review of Processes Behind Diversity—Productivity Relationships in Forests. *Curr. For. Reports* **2**, 45–61 (2016).

16. Lang, A.C., Härdtle, W., Baruffol, M., Böhnke, M., Bruelheide, H., Schmid, B., von Wehrden, H. and von Oheimb, G. Mechanisms promoting tree species co-existence: Experimental evidence with saplings of subtropical forest ecosystems of China. J Veg Sci, 23: 837-846 (2012).

17. Ratcliffe, S., Holzwarth, F., Nadrowski, K., Levick, S. & Wirth, C. Tree neighbourhood matters - tree species composition drives diversity-productivity patterns in a near-natural beech forest. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **335**, 225–234 (2015).

18. Stoll, P. & Weiner, J. A Neighborhood View of Interactions among Individual Plants. *Geom. Ecol. Interact.* 11–27 (2010) doi:10.1017/cbo9780511525537.003.

19. Trogisch, S. *et al.* The significance of tree-tree interactions for forest ecosystem functioning. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **00**, 1–20 (2021).

20. Callaway, R. M. & Walker, L. R. Competition and facilitation: A synthetic approach to interactions in plant communities. *Ecology.* **78**, 1958–1965 (1997).

21. Callaway, R. M. *et al.* Positive interactions among alpine plants increase with stress. *Nature.* **417**, 844–848 (2002).

22. Chesson, P. Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **31**, 343–66 (2000).

23. Sapijanskas, J., Potvin, C. & Loreau, M. Beyond shading: Litter production by neighbors contributes to overyielding in tropical trees. *Ecology* **94**, 941–952 (2013).

24. West, G. B., Brown, J. H. & Enquist, B. J. A general model for the origin of allometric scaling laws in biology. *Science.* **276**, 122–126 (1997).

25. West, G. B., Brown, J. H. & Enquist, B. J. A general model for the structure and allometry of plant vascular systems. *Nature.* **400**, 664–667 (1999).

26. Enquist, B. J., West, G. B., Charnov, E. L. & Brown, J. H. Allometric scaling of production and life-history variation in vascular plants. *Nature.* **401**, 907–911 (1999).

27. Kirwan, L. *et al.* Diversity-interaction modeling: Estimating contributions of species identities and interactions to ecosystem function. *Ecology* **90**, 2032–2038 (2009).

28. Baeten, L. *et al.* Identifying the tree species compositions that maximize ecosystem functioning in European forests. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **56**, 733–744 (2019).

29. Fichtner, A. *et al.* Neighbourhood interactions drive overyielding in mixed-species tree communities. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, (2018).

30. Wright, A. J., Wardle, D. A., Callaway, R. & Gaxiola, A. The Overlooked Role of Facilitation in Biodiversity Experiments. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 383–390 (2017).

31. Barry, K. E. *et al.* The Future of Complementarity: Disentangling Causes from Consequences. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**, 167–180 (2019).

32. Adler, P. B. *et al.* Competition and coexistence in plant communities: intraspecific competition is stronger than interspecific competition. *Ecol. Lett.* **21**, 1319–1329 (2018).

33. Yang, X. *et al.* Net plant interactions are highly variable and weakly dependent on climate at the global scale. *Ecol. Lett.* 1580–1593 (2022) doi:10.1111/ele.14010.

34. Brooker, R. W. Plant-plant interactions and environmental change. *New. Phytol.* **171**, 271–284 (2006).

35. Callaway, R. M. *Positive interactions and interdependence in plant communities. Positive Interactions and Interdependence in Plant Communities* (2007).

36. Brooker, R. W., & Callaghan, T. V. The balance between positive and negative plant interactions and its relationship to environmental gradients: a model. *Oikos*, 196-207 (1998).

37. Wu, X. *et al.* The relationship between species richness and biomass changes from boreal to subtropical forests in China. *Ecography.* **38**, 602–613 (2015).

38. Brooker, R. W. *et al.* Facilitation in plant communities: The past, the present, and the future. *J. Ecol.* **96**, 18–34 (2008).

39. Weiner, J., Stoll, P., Muller-Landau, H., & Jasentuliyana, A. The effects of density, spatial pattern, and competitive symmetry on size variation in simulated plant populations. *Am. Nat.* 158(4), 438-450 (2001).

40. Freckleton, R. P. & Watkinson, A. R. Asymmetric competition between plant species. *Funct. Ecol.* **15**, 615–623 (2001).

41. Coomes, D. A. & Allen, R. B. Effects of size, competition and altitude on tree growth. *J. Ecol.* **95**, 1084–1097 (2007).

42. Emerman, S. H. & Dawson, T. E. Hydraulic lift and its influence on the water content of the rhizosphere: an example from sugar maple, Acer saccharum. 273–278 (1996).

43. Gillerot, L. *et al.* Forest structure and composition alleviate human thermal stress. *Glob Chang Biol.* **28**(24), 7340–7352 (2022).

44. Stoll, P. & Newbery, D. M. Evidence of species-specific neighbourhood effects in the Dipterocarpaceae of a Bornean rain forest. *Ecology*. **86**, 3048–3062 (2005).

45. Huston, M. A. *et al.* No Consistent Effect of Plant Diversity on Productivity. *Science*. **289**, (2000).

46. Hooper, D. U. *et al.* Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecol. Monogr.***75**, 3–35 (2005).

47. Turnbull, L. A., Levine, J. M., Loreau, M. & Hector, A. Coexistence, niches and biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 116–127 (2013).

48. Loreau, M. Does functional redundancy exist? Oikos 104, 606–611 (2004).

49. Westoby, M. & Wright, I. J. Land-plant ecology on the basis of functional traits. *TRENDS Ecol. Evol.* **21**, (2006).

50. Kunstler, G. *et al.* Plant functional traits have globally consistent effects on competition. *Nature* **529**, 204–207 (2016).

51. Reich, P. B. *et al.* Impacts of biodiversity loss escalate through time as redundancy fades. *Science.* **336**, 589–592 (2012).

52. Healy, C., Gotelli, N. J. & Potvin, C. Partitioning the effects of biodiversity and environmental heterogeneity for productivity and mortality in a tropical tree plantation. *J. Ecol.* **96**, 903–913 (2008).

53. Kröber, W. *et al.* Early subtropical forest growth is driven by community mean trait values and functional diversity rather than the abiotic environment. *Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 3541–3556 (2015).

54. Soliveres, S., Smit, C. & Maestre, F. T. Moving forward on facilitation research: response to changing environments and effects on the diversity, functioning and evolution of plant communities. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **90**, 297–313 (2015).

55. Bruelheide, H. *et al.* Designing forest biodiversity experiments: General considerations illustrated by a new large experiment in subtropical China. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 74–89 (2014).

56. Scholten, T. *et al.* On the combined effect of soil fertility and topography on tree growth in subtropical forest ecosystems study from SE China. *J. Plant Ecol.* **10**, 111–127 (2017).

57. Yang, X. *et al.* Establishment success in a forest biodiversity and ecosystem functioning experiment in subtropical China (BEF-China). *Eur. J. For. Res.* 593–606 (2013).

58. Kröber, W., Zhang, S., Ehmig, M. & Bruelheide, H. Linking Xylem Hydraulic Conductivity and Vulnerability to the Leaf Economics Spectrum — A Cross-species study of 39 evergreen and deciduous broadleaved Subtropical Tree Species. *PLoS One* 1–24 (2014).

59. Pretzsch, H. & Forest. *Forest Dynamics, Growth and Yield*. (Springer, 2009).

60. Fichtner, A. *et al.* Neighbourhood diversity mitigates drought impacts on tree growth. *J. Ecol.* **108**, 865–875 (2020).

61. Simberloff, D. The status of competition theory in ecology. *Ann. Zool. Fennici* **19**, 241–253 (1982).

62. Gregory S. Biging, M. D. Evaluation of Competition Indices in Individual Tree Growth Models. *For. Sci.* **41**, 360–377 (1995).

63. Guillaume, J. H. A. *et al.* Introductory overview of identifiability analysis: A guide to evaluating whether you have the right type of data for your modelling purpose. *Environ. Model. Softw.* **119**, 418–432 (2019).


64. Team, S. D. RStan: the R interface to Stan. (2022).

65. Team, R. C. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. (2022).

66. Gelman, A. *et al.* *Bayesian Data Analysis 3rd edition*. (2013).

67. Watanabe, S. Asymptotic equivalence of Bayes cross validation and widely applicable information criterion in singular learning theory. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **11**, 3571–3594 (2010).


68. Vehtari, A., Simpson, D., Gelman, A., Yao, Y. & Gabry, J. Pareto Smoothed Importance Sampling. (2015).





**Fig. 1** Conceptual illustration of mechanisms through which local neighbourhoods can affect (a) individual tree productivity and (b) diversity-productivity relationships (DPRs). Red and blue colour denote negative and positive interaction strength, respectively, with the degree of shading indicating the magnitude of interactions. (a) The same species richness in the neighbourhood but different species compositions can either diminish or promote the productivity of individual trees through the combined net interaction effects determined by pairwise interactions. (b) demonstrates the hypothesised link between conditions for species coexistence and DPRs. The mean difference between inter- and intra-specific interactions in a diverse community could be negative, neutral, and positive, corresponding to negative, neutral, and positive DPRs.

**Table 1** Comparison of the *null* (equ. 1), *neutral* (equ. 2) and *pairwise interaction model* (equ. 3) and their predictions of the allometric exponent, , intrinsic biomass growth, and the scaling exponent, *b*, for the effect of the neighbouring tree’s biomass. Model fit is evaluated by elpd\_diff (expected log pointwise predictive density difference), with lower values indicating poorer fit, se\_diff is its standard deviation and quantifies uncertainty, and scaling exponents are characterised by their mean and 95% credible interval.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model | elpd\_diff | se\_diff | Allometric exponent | Exponent of neighbouring tree’s biomass *b* |
| Dataset 1 | pairwise | 0 | 0 | 0.80 (0.78, 0.81) | 0.19 (0.14, 0.25) |
| null | -63.80 | 46.89 | 0.77 (0.76, 0.78) | / |
| neutral | -64.37 | 45.35 | 0.78 (0.77, 0. 80) | 0.13 (0.09, 0.36) |
|  | | | | | |
| Dataset 2 | pairwise | 0 | 0 | 0.81 (0.79, 0.83) | 0.14 (0.09, 0.19) |
| null | -47.77 | 41.40 | 0.82 (0.80, 0.83) | / |
| neutral | -55.15 | 41.05 | 0.81 (0.80, 0.83) | 0.21 (0.02, 0.55) |



  **Fig. 2** Inter- and intra-specific interaction coefficients. **(a)** shows interaction coefficient matrices for dataset 1, i.e. row a1 and column a4 denotes the interaction coefficient , representing the effect that species 4 has on species 1. **(b)** depicts the interaction network for dataset 1 with blue and red colour denoting positive and negative interaction coefficients, respectively. The thickness and colour saturation correspond to the absolute magnitude and direction of interaction coefficients, respectively. The arrows point to the species which is affected by the connecting species. **(c)** demonstrates that there is no pattern between the two interaction coefficients of a specific tree pair. **(d)** depicts the posterior distribution of the average of intra- (pink) and inter-specific (green) interaction strengths for dataset 1 with the solid lines denoting the mean values, respectively.



**Fig. 3** Results of the simulation studies on pairwise interaction coefficients (a) illustrates the simulated diversity-net interaction (top) and diversity-productivity (bottom) relationships at the community level for dataset 1 under two different scenarios: completely random reshuffling of interaction matrix (unconstrained) and reshuffling within inter- and intra-specific interactions (constrained). Grey lines show community mean effects for each reshuffled interaction matrix, with thick blue lines showing their average. Green lines show values based on empirical interactions. (b) shows the relationship between the difference between inter- and intra-specific interactions and the slopes of the simulated diversity-net interaction and diversity-productivity relationships (slopes of the grey lines in subfigure (a), unconstrained scenario). The slopes based on empirical data are shown as green squares.