



Tree damage and microclimate of forest canopies along a hurricane-impact gradient in Cusuco National Park, Honduras

Journal:	<i>Journal Of Tropical Ecology</i>
Manuscript ID:	JTE-14-141.R2
Manuscript Type:	Full Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Batke, Sven; Trinity College Dublin, Botany Kelly, Daniel L; Trinity College Dublin, Botany
Keywords:	Climate, DISTURBANCE, Rainforest, vapour pressure deficit, Wind

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3
4 **TITLE:** Tree damage and microclimate of forest canopies along a hurricane-
5
6 impact gradient in Cusuco National Park, Honduras
7
8

9
10
11
12 **RUNNING TITLE:** Microclimate effects to past hurricanes
13
14

15
16
17
18 **KEY WORDS:** climate, disturbance, rain forest, wind, vapour pressure deficit
19
20

21
22
23
24 **AUTHOR:** Sven Peter Batke & Daniel Lucius Kelly
25
26

27
28
29
30 **INSTITUTION:**
31

32
33 Department of Botany & Trinity Centre for Biodiversity Research, Trinity
34
35 College, The University of Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland
36
37

38
39
40
41 **EMAIL:** batkesp@tcd.ie
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Past studies of large, infrequent wind disturbances have shown that topographical, biological and meteorological factors interact to create complex damage patterns to forest ecosystems. However, the extent to which some of these factors change the forest microclimate along a vertical forest profile is poorly known. In a previous study, we correlated tree damage with a hurricane model that estimated past hurricane impacts within Cusuco National Park, Honduras over 15-y period. Here we use the model to compare physical tree damage among different species in ten 150 ×150-m plots and to correlate modelled exposure of hurricanes to microclimate measurements along the vertical canopy over a 12-mo period. It was found that past hurricane impacts could still be detected long after the events. Different tree species showed different levels of wind damage. Most branch damage was observed on conifers (*Pinus* spp.), followed by angiosperm species. Vapour pressure deficit increased with height in the canopy and with increased disturbance level. A linear model explained 83% of the total variance in vapour pressure deficit, with 67% attributed to monthly fluctuation, 15% to altitude, 12% to historical hurricane damage and 6% to height in the canopy.

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The damage that large infrequent disturbance events, such as hurricanes and
8 cyclones, can cause to forest systems has been widely discussed (Everham &
9 Brokaw 1996). The focus has been on abiotic factors that influence patterns of
10 damage (Martin & Ogden 2006) and effects on the composition and structure of
11 forest vegetation (Zimmerman *et al.* 1994). However, little information is
12 available on the micro-environmental effects that large storm events have on
13 forest canopies (Turton 2013, Turton & Siegenthaler 2004).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The structural impact of infrequent high-energy weather events depends on the
25 properties of regional and local stands (Martin & Ogden 2006), the geographical
26 environment and the frequency, strength, duration, severity and size of the
27 disturbance event (Everham & Brokaw 1996, Sturtevant *et al.* 2014). For
28 example, topographic sheltering can reduce the local impact on forest trees,
29 while their vulnerability to wind damage can increase on exposed sites such as
30 ridge tops (Brokaw & Grear 1991). Repetitive wind damage may result in either
31 stand adaptations to wind damage (de Gouvenain & Silander 2003) or
32 increased vulnerability to additional disturbances through changing stand
33 physiognomy (Uriarte *et al.* 2004). The scale of the impact is highly variable and
34 can extend from mass uprooting of trees, to branch damage (e.g. breakage,
35 bending stress and wounds), to defoliation of the canopy.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The effects that these structural changes have on the micro-environment of the
52 forest are also closely linked to the degree of disturbance. The changes in light
53 environment along with the resulting increase in temperature maxima and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 decrease in humidity are particularly striking (Turton & Siegenthaler 2004).
5
6 Consequently, change in the forest micro-environment can have wide-reaching
7
8 implications for the forest stand and associated biota (Benzing 1990, Cach-
9
10 Pérez *et al.* 2013). Little is known about the recovery of forest micro-
11
12 environment and even less about microclimatic changes along the vertical
13
14 forest profile after disturbance (Turton & Siegenthaler 2004).
15
16

17
18 To assess how the forest micro-environment changed following long-term
19
20 exposure to hurricane winds in Cusuco National Park, Honduras, we developed
21
22 a model that allowed us to identify areas that have been least/most impacted by
23
24 hurricanes over a 15-y period (1995-2010) (Batke *et al.* 2014). The model was
25
26 verified on the ground using tree damage as a proxy for wind impact (Batke *et*
27
28 *al.* 2014). As the forest canopy will be structurally altered as a result of past
29
30 wind disturbances, it can be hypothesised that the forest microclimate will differ
31
32 along a gradient of hurricane exposure.
33
34
35

36
37 To investigate this, we tested the correlation between predicted hurricane
38
39 exposure and the local microclimate within individual trees (expressed as VPD).
40
41 It was predicted that VPD will increase in tree canopies that are found in high-
42
43 exposure sites, as they are likely to be more affected by hurricane winds. As the
44
45 response to wind damage is predicted to change among tree species, we also
46
47 expected to find differences in VPD among them.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

METHODS

Study site

Cusuco National Park (CNP) is located in the Departments of Santa Barbara and Cortés in north-west Honduras (15°32'31"N, 88°15'49"W; Figure 1). Cusuco is situated within a mountainous, high-rainfall region. Maximum altitude is 2242 m asl, with a mean monthly precipitation of 211 mm and an annual precipitation of approximately 2500 mm (Baker 1994). The wet season in CNP is between May-November and is followed by a shorter dry season between December-April (Harborne *et al.* 2001). The long-term average probability of hurricanes striking a particular point in Central America is 0.2 hurricanes y^{-1} (Pielke *et al.* 2003). Honduras falls within a hurricane belt that is estimated to have a 5%-10% chance of being hit by a hurricane each year (Pielke *et al.* 2003) (Figure 1). Between 1995 and 2010, 11 hurricanes affected CNP. However, most winds at CNP did not reach hurricane strength, as many of the storms only passed the Park at great distance (Batke *et al.* 2014).

The forest in CNP consists of a complex mosaic of forest types that is the subject of ongoing study by the Forest Botany team of Operation Wallacea, led by D.L. Kelly over the period 2004-2013 (<http://opwall.com/>). Mixed broadleaved and pine forests dominate most of the Park; *Liquidambar* (Hamamelidaceae), *Pinus* (Pinaceae) and *Quercus* (Fagaceae) being among the principal genera. The families Melastomataceae, Lauraceae, Rubiaceae and Euphorbiaceae are also well represented. At the highest elevations a well-defined elfin forest is present.

Hurricane model

A hurricane model was used to predict the high-energy weather impacts at CNP from 1995 to 2010 (Batke *et al.* 2014). The model was based on data provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and a digital elevation map (DEM) of CNP. The model predicted hurricane exposure at a high-resolution (50 × 50 m) for eight cardinal model solutions. Each model solution represents the predicted hurricane exposure from different cardinal wind-inflow directions within CNP. Each 50 × 50-m raster field on the DEM is expressed as an exposure vulnerability site score (EVSS). The scores are between 1 and 5 (low-high exposure) and represent the topographic exposure of each raster field, the hurricane frequency (i.e. number of hurricanes) and the maximum wind velocity calculated for each hurricane. The individual models were assessed following validation on the ground using tree assessment methods and by correlating the exposure scores to the observed tree damage on the ground. Damage on individual trees in CNP was explained best by the correlation of tree damage with the south and south-east model solutions (i.e. exposure to south and south-easterly winds) (Batke *et al.* 2014).

Plot and tree selection

Between June and August 2012 and 2013 a total of ten plots was sampled (four additional plots to those in Batke *et al.* 2014). The locations of the plots were standardised using the results from the hurricane model and a contour map of CNP and randomly selected as described in Batke *et al.* (2014). The size of the plots was 150 × 150 m, and minimum distance between plots was 50 m. The

1
2
3
4 plots had an altitudinal average \pm SD of 1595 ± 269 m asl. The original aim was
5
6 to sample three large *Pinus* sp. and three large angiosperm trees (*Quercus* sp.
7
8 or *Liquidambar styraciflua* L.) within each of the ten plots. However, because of
9
10 anthropogenic forest disturbance and scarcity of *Pinus* sp. and *L. styraciflua* at
11
12 higher elevations this was not always possible. As a result, other angiosperm
13
14 species that had similar architectural properties to *Quercus* sp. (i.e. a decurrent
15
16 canopy) were randomly selected and surveyed. On sites where *Pinus* spp. were
17
18 absent, additional angiosperm species were investigated. Compared to the
19
20 decurrent canopy and evergreen ecology of most angiosperms investigated, *L.*
21
22 *styraciflua* had an excurrent canopy and was deciduous.
23
24
25
26

27 Branch damage on each tree was assessed using rope climbing methods
28
29 (Batke *et al.* 2014). Trees were selected based on (1) tree diameter at breast
30
31 height (>150 cm) and (2) safe climbing-accessibility, thereby excluding all toxic
32
33 species (e.g. *Toxicodendron*) as well as ant-trees (e.g. *Cecropia*). Tree species
34
35 were identified at Kew (K), the Natural History Museum (BM), Trinity College
36
37 Dublin (TCD) and the Cyril Hardy Nelson Sutherland Herbarium (TEFH). Only
38
39 large trees were surveyed as they are more susceptible to wind damage (Foster
40
41 & Boose 1992) and they most fully represent the vertical range in microclimate
42
43 regimes (Shaw 2004).
44
45
46
47

48 To assess how observed branch damage differed among tree species and
49
50 types, individual trees were divided for the analysis into groups based on
51
52 morphological characteristics and/or genus. Group one consisted of *Quercus*
53
54 spp., *L. styraciflua*, conifers (*Pinus maximinoi* H.E. Moore and *P. tecunumanii* F.
55
56 Schwerdtf. ex Eguluz & J.P. Perry, two species of similar overall morphology)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and other angiosperm species (*Cedrela odorata* L. and *Ilex pallida* Standl.,
5
6 *Dendropanax* aff. *hondurensis* M.J. Cannon & Cannon). Group two consisted of
7
8 *L. styraciflua*, conifers and other angiosperm species, whereas group three was
9
10 simply divided into conifers and other angiosperm species.
11

12 13 14 **Climate data**

15
16
17 Data loggers (Luscar EL-USB-2) were suspended on two of the six trees within
18
19 each plot (n = 20). Loggers were placed at three levels within the tree canopy,
20
21 viz.: lower, middle and upper canopy. The height of each logger depended on
22
23 the total tree height. Each of the three data loggers was at the same horizontal
24
25 distance from the bole of the tree (i.e. the inner canopy). Some of the data
26
27 loggers were paired, in order to assess recording precision. The loggers
28
29 measured relative humidity and temperature at 10-min or hourly intervals from
30
31 June 2012 to June 2013.
32
33

34
35
36 Autocorrelation in the climate data was tested for using a Durbin-Watson test,
37
38 which confirmed a first order-autocorrelation (d = 0.598). To compensate for this
39
40 autocorrelation, we used loglinear models and treated the factor 'Month' as a
41
42 random variable and 'Plot' and canopy position ('Position') as nested random
43
44 variables. To avoid multicollinearity between variables in the models (Heikkinen
45
46 *et al.* 2006), only the variable with the highest Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)
47
48 was retained (O'Brien 2007).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Calculating VPD

Transpiration rates, amongst others, are limited externally by VPD and internally by hydraulic conductivity and water potential between the leaves and the soil (i.e. the capacity to transport available water) (Koch *et al.* 2004). Although there has been much debate on the usefulness of using VPD to explain temporal dynamics in transpiration (Bacon 2004, Streck 2003), it is believed that VPD can be a useful indicator of potential transpiration for many species, particularly when they are closely coupled to the atmosphere (Adelman *et al.* 2008). VPD is biologically more relevant to many forest organisms than relative humidity (RH) (Rambo & North 2009), because it reflects more closely differences in water stress (Donald 1936). As a result, monthly RH and temperature (T) measurements ($n = 386,469$) were converted into VPD, using the formula by Murray (1967) as adapted by Bolton (1980).

Sunrise and sunset times for the years 2012 and 2013 were calculated by averaging daily sunrise and sunset data for each month. The data were obtained from Time and Date (www.timeanddate.com). Mean time of sunrise was 05h44 (± 12 min) and 17h52 (± 14 min) for sunset. It was assumed that $VPD = 0$ when temperature was $\leq 0^{\circ}\text{C}$ (Rambo & North 2009). Bolton (1980) showed that this assumption for VPD is sufficiently accurate (0.1%) for temperatures between -30°C and 35°C . As a first step, saturation vapour pressure (e_s) was calculated as follows:

$$e_e = 6.112 \times \exp\left(\frac{17.67 \times T}{T + 243.5}\right) \quad (1)$$

Where T is the temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$). Because hourly temperature and RH measurements were available, the actual vapour pressure (e_a) and VPD were determined as follows:

$$e_a = e_s(T) \times \frac{RH}{100} \quad (2)$$

and

$$VPD = e_s - e_a \quad (3)$$

The calculated VPD was correlated to the different model solutions, altitude, tree species and data logger position within the canopy, and compared between different plots and months.

RESULTS

Branch damage

Branch damage differed significantly among different tree groups (Pearson's Chi-square; grouping 1: $X^2 = 106$, $P < 0.01$; grouping 2: $X^2 = 82.8$, $P < 0.01$; grouping 3: $X^2 = 78.4$, $P < 0.001$). Standardized residuals from loglinear models (LLM) showed that most of the difference in observed branch damage between different tree types was among conifers and angiosperms (Table 1). Branch

1
2
3
4 damage was significantly higher for *Pinus* trees than for angiosperms, and the
5
6 latter had significantly higher numbers of undamaged branches (Table 1).
7
8

9 **Vapour Pressure Deficit**

10
11
12 Linear mixed models (LMM) with random nested effects were used to identify
13
14 changes in mean VPD as a function of the eight hurricane exposure solutions,
15
16 altitude, position in the canopy and different tree species. A Shapiro-Wilks test
17
18 and visual assessment were used to test for data normality. No further
19
20 transformation was necessary ($P < 0.05$). VPD was not included as a seasonal
21
22 (i.e. dry/wet) or diurnal measurement, but merely as a monthly measurement.
23
24 This was done because 'Month' had the highest VIF. Monthly VPD was strongly
25
26 correlated with diurnal VPD (Adj. $R^2 = 0.97$, $P < 0.01$) and seasonal VPD (Adj.
27
28 $R^2 = 0.99$, $P < 0.01$). Moreover, diurnal VPD was strongly correlated to
29
30 seasonal VPD (Adj. $R^2 = 0.98$, $P < 0.01$).
31
32
33
34

35
36 As a first step, the eight different hurricane exposure solutions, which predicted
37
38 the hurricane exposure from different wind-inflow directions, were compared
39
40 using maximum likelihood (ML) ratio tests. The south solution (i.e. exposure to
41
42 south and south-easterly winds) was the model with the best fit (AIC = 582.07).
43
44 In a second step, the south solution model was remodelled using different
45
46 interaction and random-effect combinations to identify the contribution of
47
48 different nested and random effects on the overall model performance (Table
49
50 2). Note that the interaction terms (e.g. plot x position) were not included here,
51
52 as the overall variance did not significantly contribute to the total variance of the
53
54 models. The best-fit model remained model one (M1a). Here VPD was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 measured as a function of the south hurricane solution (i.e. best fit solution);
5
6 altitude as a fixed effect; and plot, canopy position and monthly fluctuation as
7
8 random nested effects. The final model was re-run using the restricted
9
10 maximum likelihood estimation (REML) (AIC = 597.3; Table 3). Due to the low
11
12 variance of each random effect (total variance = 0.7%), all random effects were
13
14 removed from the model and a linear model (LM) was used instead. The fitted
15
16 LM explained 83% of the total variance, of which 67% was attributed to monthly
17
18 fluctuation, 15% to altitude, 12% to historical hurricane damage and 6% to
19
20 canopy position (Table 4).
21
22
23

24
25 VPD was significantly different among different tree species (df = 435, $P < 0.01$)
26
27 and types (df = 435, $P < 0.01$). The main differences were observed between
28
29 conifers and angiosperms. Angiosperm trees, with the exception of *L. styraciflua*
30
31 (t = 6.6, $P < 0.01$), had significantly lower VPD compared to conifer trees (t =
32
33 5.9, $P < 0.01$). However, as the variation of VPD in the model (i.e. M1a) was not
34
35 significantly explained by different tree species (Table 2), tree species was not
36
37 analysed further as a variable.
38
39

40
41 Micro-environmental canopy conditions (i.e. VPD) differed amongst heights
42
43 within the canopy, as well as the months in which the results were recorded
44
45 (Figure 2; Table 5). Although seasonal and diurnal VPD changes were not
46
47 included in the overall model, significant differences between mean VPD in the
48
49 dry and wet seasons were detected (df = 439, $F = 15.8$, $P < 0.01$), with the dry
50
51 season having significantly higher VPD (2.8 ± 1.09 kPa) compared to the wet
52
53 season (2.4 ± 1.1 kPa). Additionally, a Tukey Honest Significant Differences
54
55 (TukeyHSD) test showed that VPD changed significantly between night and day
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (df = 1, F = 29.7, P < 0.01). This difference was consistent throughout the year
5
6 (df = 11, F = 3040, P < 0.01), with the only non-significant comparisons
7
8 between months being December/August (P > 0.05), May/February (P > 0.05)
9
10 and October/January (P > 0.05).
11

12
13 An analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni adjustment revealed that VPD
14 varied significantly between different canopy positions (df = 438, F = 17.5, P <
15
16 0.01). The lower canopy had significantly lower VPD compared to the middle (P
17
18 < 0.01) and upper canopy (P < 0.01). However, the middle canopy did not differ
19
20 statistically from the upper canopy (P > 0.05).
21
22
23

24
25 Additionally, VPD increased with hurricane EVSS (Estimate = 0.28, F = 74.2, R²
26
27 = 0.14, P < 0.01), with the exception of EVSS 4. Differences between exposure
28
29 levels were detected following pairwise comparisons among EVSSs 1, 3 and 5
30
31 (P < 0.01); 2, 3 and 5 (P < 0.01); 3 and 4 (P < 0.01) and 4 and 5 (P < 0.01).
32
33

34 Mean VPD increased with height in the canopy and increased hurricane
35
36 exposure. VPD was significantly lower in canopies that were less likely to be
37
38 impacted by hurricanes compared to canopies that were more likely to be
39
40 affected (lower: t = 5.48, P < 0.01; middle: t = 8.04, P < 0.01; upper: t = 9.51, P
41
42 < 0.01) (Figure 3).
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 DISCUSSION

50
51
52 The effects of disturbance by hurricane winds depends on the spatial
53
54 environment of the trees, their proneness to damage, the frequency of hurricane
55
56 events, and the size and intensity of prior disturbances (Boose *et al.* 2001,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Turner *et al.* 1998, Xi *et al.* 2008). For example, Foster & Boose (1992) found
5
6 that storm damage increases linearly with increasing tree height, making taller
7
8 trees more vulnerable to damage. Emergent trees seem to be particularly
9
10 vulnerable, as they are less sheltered by the surrounding vegetation and
11
12 therefore experience increased biomechanical stress (de Gouvenain & Silander
13
14 2003, Lewis & Bannar-Martin 2011). The difference of tree damage between
15
16 trees of different size was not very apparent in our study, because most of the
17
18 investigated trees were similar in height (mean \pm SD tree height = 40.4 \pm 9.9 m).
19
20

21
22 Moreover, tree species may differ in their susceptibility to storm events. *Pinus*
23
24 spp. had much higher levels of branch damage than the angiosperm canopy
25
26 species. These findings are consistent with other studies (Brokaw & Walker
27
28 1991, Foster & Boose 1992). Xi *et al.* (2008) reported that the probability of tree
29
30 damage differs between tree species in a Carolina forest. They found that
31
32 species such as *Pinus taeda* are more susceptible to hurricane damage
33
34 compared to species such as *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Quercus* spp.
35
36 (deciduous) and *Fagus grandifolia*. Although no statistical differences among *L.*
37
38 *styraciflua*, *Quercus* spp. and angiosperm division (group one) were detected in
39
40 our study, the angiosperm species investigated had significantly lower branch
41
42 damage compared to *Pinus* spp. This is probably because *L. styraciflua* and
43
44 *Quercus* spp. have a very similar damage-risk, making the detection of
45
46 differences in damage more difficult (Xi *et al.* 2008). The difference between
47
48 angiosperm and conifer trees may be due to the higher wood density observed
49
50 in many slow-growing hardwood species (Zimmerman *et al.* 1994), compared to
51
52 that of the fast-growing and shade-intolerant conifers. In contrast to Xi *et al.*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (2008), Boucher *et al.* (1990) found that rain-forest trees (i.e. angiosperm-
5
6 dominated forest) had higher overall tree damage compared to conifer stands,
7
8 but that angiosperm species had higher survival due to their resprouting
9
10 abilities. It is possible that other stand attributes such as composition and
11
12 physiognomy (e.g. canopy closure), rather than differences in wood and tree
13
14 properties such as density, elasticity and anchorage (Brokaw & Walker 1991,
15
16 McCallum *et al.* 2007, Putz *et al.* 1983) could have caused this observed
17
18 difference. Although our study did not investigate stand properties, stand
19
20 composition and tree density within each plot could have influenced the
21
22 susceptibility of individual trees to wind damage (Rambo & North 2009). For
23
24 example, if the variability of forest canopy height is increased, wind flow
25
26 turbulence is more severe, thereby enhancing damage susceptibility of the
27
28 whole stand (Martin & Ogden 2006).
29
30
31

32
33 Understanding the differences in probability of wind-damage between tree
34
35 species and forest stands is important as damage affects the vertical, seasonal
36
37 and diurnal pattern of micro-environmental condition in the canopy. The
38
39 formation of gaps and the opening of the canopy due to topping of canopies,
40
41 branch damage and severe defoliation are some mechanisms that can alter the
42
43 forest micro-environment. Our study found that VPD was affected significantly
44
45 by seasonal and diurnal cycles, height in the canopy and the modelled impact of
46
47 hurricanes. However, our model showed that tree species is not an important
48
49 factor in explaining differences in VPD between trees. The LM explained 83% of
50
51 the total variance with 67% attributed to monthly fluctuation, 15% to plot
52
53 altitude, 6% to height in the canopy and 12% to predicted hurricane damage.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The decline in VPD with elevation can be attributed to several causes. The air
5
6 has a lower water-holding capacity at higher altitude (because the temperatures
7
8 are lower); also, rainfall and cloud occurrence are higher (Richards 1996). This
9
10 was clearly observed in one of the plots at EVSS level four (Figure 3). VPD was
11
12 significantly reduced at this plot due to its higher altitude (~2020 m asl) and
13
14 possibly because of the shorter stand height observed at this plot. The low
15
16 variability in that plot can be attributed to the recording failure of the logger
17
18 equipment between November and June. Thus only data for the period between
19
20 June-August was available for these trees.
21
22
23

24
25 Studies that investigate micro-environmental gradients in forest canopies are
26
27 often limited by incomplete and periodic data records and are often restricted to
28
29 the lower canopy (Bohlman *et al.* 1995, Fetcher *et al.* 1985, Stuntz *et al.* 2002,
30
31 Turton & Siegenthaler 2004). Saldaña *et al.* (2013) investigated micro-
32
33 environmental differences in the lower part of the canopy (ca. 5-10 m above
34
35 ground level) between different forest successional stages and found that VPD
36
37 increased with height in the canopy. Our study investigated the full range of the
38
39 vertical forest profile over a 12-mo period and found that a clear climate
40
41 stratification could be observed along this gradient. VPD increased with height
42
43 in the canopy, although the upper and middle canopy did not differ statistically
44
45 in mean VPD; the lower canopy was significantly different from the middle and
46
47 upper canopy. The vertical gradient in VPD can be attributed to the differences
48
49 in solar radiation absorption through the canopy profile (Szarzynki & Anhuf
50
51 2001). The elevated heat of the air in the upper canopy produces a stable
52
53 density stratification of cooler denser air in the lower canopy and warmer, lighter
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 air in the upper canopy. The lower canopy is therefore less connected to the
5
6 atmosphere, reducing the saturation deficit in some instances to approximately
7
8 20% compared to the upper canopy (Szarzynki & Anhuf 2001).
9

10
11 The long-lasting effect of hurricanes on the forest microclimate can be
12
13 substantial and will vary spatially and temporally (Lugo *et al.* 2000). Our
14
15 hurricane exposure model for CNP was able to explain 12% of the variation in
16
17 mean VPD along a gradient of hurricane exposure. This is striking as the last
18
19 severe hurricanes that impacted Honduras and CNP were hurricane Mitch in
20
21 1998 and Wilma in 2005 (Batke *et al.* 2014, Ensor 2009). This highlights the
22
23 importance of past hurricane impacts on forest stand structure. These effects
24
25 will diminish over time (Fetcher *et al.* 1985) and there is some evidence that the
26
27 recovery rates might vary spatially along the vertical forest profile (King 1986,
28
29 Weishampel *et al.* 2007). For example, Weishampel *et al.* (2007) used LiDAR
30
31 remote-sensing technology to detect historical hurricane damage following the
32
33 1938 hurricane in New England. They reported that the degree of forest
34
35 damage varied vertically with height in the canopy and tree diversity. This is
36
37 important, as the difference in damage susceptibility and recovery rate among
38
39 different tree types and species can further complicate the picture (Bellingham
40
41 *et al.* 1992) and the implications are therefore more difficult to predict.
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 Early studies reported that the effects of site disturbance on the forest
49
50 microclimate are highly variable along an intensity gradient and with distance
51
52 from the disturbance site (Davies-Colley *et al.* 2000, Meyer *et al.* 2001). Fetcher
53
54 *et al.* (1985) compared microclimatic regimes in single tree-fall gaps and clear-
55
56 fell sites over a 2-y period and found that an increase in VPD and temperature
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 between different sites increased with canopy openness (i.e. disturbance level).
5
6 However, they also noted that these differences declined strongly after only 2 y,
7
8 due to regrowth. Our study showed that mean VPD increased on sites that were
9
10 more impacted by hurricanes at the lower, middle and upper canopy, with great
11
12 variability among the different canopy positions. Similar results were observed
13
14 by Turton & Siegenthaler (2004) in a rain forest in Australia after the passing of
15
16 cyclone 'Rona'. They found that mean VPD was significantly higher compared
17
18 to pre-disturbance measurements at a canopy height of 10 m; However, post-
19
20 hurricane VPD did not significantly differ at 20 and 30 m height in the canopy.
21
22
23

24
25 In conclusion, the effects that canopy removal (e.g. defoliation and branch
26
27 damage) and thinning (Rambo & North 2009) can have on the micro-
28
29 environment after the passing of hurricanes is of great importance to the forest's
30
31 long-term persistence. De Frenne *et al.* (2013) recently reported that forest
32
33 closure minimises the risk to understorey vegetation under climate change
34
35 scenarios, by reducing ground-layer temperatures and solar radiation and by
36
37 increasing RH. Our study revealed that cumulative hurricane impacts (i.e.
38
39 branch damage and raised VPD) can still be measured long after the passing of
40
41 hurricane storms (Brokaw & Walker 1991, Weaver 2008). Moreover, the degree
42
43 of structural damage and the resulting alteration in micro-environmental canopy
44
45 conditions varied along a hurricane exposure gradient and along the vertical
46
47 forest profile. It remains to be seen how significant these long-term alterations
48
49 are to the forest and its biota, as there is limited long-term information available
50
51 on this (baseline forest plot data for CNP go back only to 2003-2004; Cayuela *et*
52
53 *al.* 2012).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded by Trinity College, The University of Dublin, the Rufford Foundation, Operation Wallacea, British Airways and the Royal Geographic Society London (in collaboration with Dr. Merlijn Jocque). In particular, we thank Nicholas Hill (primary assistant), Waldo Etherington (Canopy Access Limited - CAL), Ian Geddes (CAL), Alex Turner (CAL) and José Omar Arteaga Mesía (local guide) for their help with the data collection. Additionally, we would like to thank Seán Ó Riordáin (Statistics Department, Trinity College Dublin) for his valuable advice on the data analysis.

LITERATURE CITED

- ADELMAN, J. D., EWERS, B. E. & MACKAY, D. S. 2008. Use of temporal patterns in vapor pressure deficit to explain spatial autocorrelation dynamics in tree transpiration. *Tree Physiology* 28:647-658.
- BACON, M. A. 2004. *Water use efficiency in plant biology*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Boca Raton. 344 pp.
- BAKER, D. S. 1994. *Evaluación ecológica rápida, Parque Nacional El Cusuco y Cordillera del Merendón, Honduras* The Nature Conservancy, Washington. 79 pp.
- BATKE, S. P., JOCQUE, M. & KELLY, D. L. 2014. Modelling hurricane exposure and wind speed on a mesoclimate scale: a case study from Cusuco NP, Honduras. *PLoS ONE* 9:e91306.

1
2
3
4 BELLINGHAM, P. J., KAPOS, V., HEALEY, J. R., TANNER, E. V. J., KELLY, D.
5
6 L., DALLING, J. W., BURNS, L. S., LEE, D. & SIDRAK, G. 1992. Hurricanes
7
8 need not cause high mortality: the effects of hurricane Gilbert on forests in
9
10 Jamaica. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 8:217-223.
11

12
13
14 BENZING, D. H. 1990. *Vascular epiphytes - general biology and related biota*.
15
16 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 376 pp.
17

18
19 BOHLMAN, S. A., MATELSON, T. J. & NADKARNI, N. M. 1995. Moisture and
20
21 temperature patterns of canopy humus and forest floor soil of a montane cloud
22
23 forest, Costa Rica. *Biotropica* 27:13-19.
24

25
26
27 BOLTON, D. 1980. The computation of equivalent potential temperature.
28
29 *Monthly Weather Review* 108:1046-1053.
30

31
32 BOOSE, E. R., CHAMBERLIN, K. E. & FOSTER, D. R. 2001. Landscape and
33
34 regional impacts of hurricanes in New England. *Ecological Monographs* 71:27-
35
36 48.
37

38
39 BOUCHER, D. H., VANDERMEER, J. H., YIH, K. & NELSON, Z. 1990.
40
41 Contrasting hurricane damage in tropical rain forest and pine forest. *Ecology*
42
43 71:2022-2024.
44

45
46
47 BROKAW, N. V. L. & GREAR, J. S. 1991. Forest structure before and after
48
49 hurricane Hugo at three elevations in the Luquillo Mountains, Puerto Rico.
50
51 *Biotropica* 23:386-392.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 BROKAW, N. V. L. & WALKER, L. R. 1991. Summary of the effects of
5
6 Caribbean hurricanes on vegetation. *Biotropica* 23:442-447.
7
8

9
10 CACH-PÉREZ, M. J., ANDRADE, J. L., CHILPA-GALVÁN, N., TAMAYO-CHIM,
11
12 M., ORELLANA, R. & REYES-GARCÍA, C. 2013. Climatic and structural factors
13
14 influencing epiphytic bromeliad community assemblage along a gradient of
15
16 water-limited environments in the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. *Tropical*
17
18 *Conservation Science* 6:283-302.
19

20
21 CAYUELA, L., GÁLVEZ-BRAVO, L., PÉREZ, R. P., DE ALBUQUERQUE, F. S.,
22
23 GOLICHER, D. J., ZAHAWI, R. A., RAMÍREZ-MARCIAL, N., GARIBALDI, C.,
24
25 FIELD, R., BENAYAS, J. M. R., GONZÁLEZ-ESPINOSA, M., BALVANERA, P.,
26
27 CASTILLO, M. Á., FIGUEROA-RANGEL, B. L., GRIFFITH, D. M., ISLEBE, G.
28
29 A., KELLY, D. L., OLVERA-VARGAS, M., SCHNITZER, S. A., VELÁZQUEZ, E.,
30
31 WILLIAMS-LINERA, G., BREWER, S. W., CAMACHO-CRUZ, A., CORONADO,
32
33 I., DE JONG, B., DEL CASTILLO, R., GRANZOW-DE LA CERDA, Í.,
34
35 FERNÁNDEZ, J., FONSECA, W., GALINDO-JAIMES, L., GILLESPIE, T. W.,
36
37 GONZÁLEZ-RIVAS, B., GORDON, J. E., HURTADO, J., LINARES, J.,
38
39 LETCHER, S. G., MANGAN, S. A., MEAVE, J. A., MÉNDEZ, E. V., MEZA, V.,
40
41 OCHOA-GAONA, S., PETERSON, C. J., RUIZ-GUTIERREZ, V., SNARR, K. A.,
42
43 DZUL, F. T., VALDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ, M., VIERGEVER, K. M., WHITE, D. A.,
44
45 WILLIAMS, J. N., BONET, F. J. & ZAMORA, R. 2012. The Tree Biodiversity
46
47 Network (BIOTREE-NET): prospects for biodiversity research and conservation
48
49 in the Neotropics. *Biodiversity & Ecology* 4:211-224.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 DAVIES-COLLEY, R. J., PAYNE, G. W. & VAN ELSWIJK, M. 2000.

5
6 Microclimate gradients across a forest edge. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology*
7
8 24:111-121.
9

10
11 DE FRENNE, P., RODRÍGUEZ-SÁNCHEZ, F., COOMES, D. A., BAETEN, L.,
12
13 VERSTRAETEN, G., VELLEND, M., BERNHARDT-RÖMERMANN, M.,
14
15 BROWN, C. D., BRUNET, J., CORNELIS, J., DECOCQ, G. M., DIERSCHKE,
16
17 H., ERIKSSON, O., GILLIAM, F. S., HÉDL, R., HEINKEN, T., HERMY, M.,
18
19 HOMMEL, P., JENKINS, M. A., KELLY, D. L., KIRBY, K. J., MITCHELL, F. J.
20
21 G., NAAF, T., NEWMAN, M., PETERKEN, G., PETŘÍK, P., SCHULTZ, J.,
22
23 SONNIER, G., VAN CALSTER, H., WALLER, D. M., WALTHER, G.-R., WHITE,
24
25 P. S., WOODS, K. D., WULF, M., GRAAE, B. J. & VERHEYEN, K. 2013.

26
27 Microclimate moderates plant responses to macroclimate warming.

28
29 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:18561–18565.
30
31

32
33 DE GOUVENAIN, R. C. & SILANDER, J. A. 2003. Do tropical storm regimes
34
35 influence the structure of tropical lowland rain forests? *Biotropica* 35:166-180.
36
37

38
39 DONALD, B. A. 1936. Relative humidity or vapor pressure deficit. *Ecology*
40
41 17:277-282.
42
43

44
45 ENSOR, M. O. 2009. *The legacy of hurricane Mitch: lessons from post-disaster*
46
47 *reconstruction in Honduras*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. 240 pp.
48
49

50
51 EVERHAM, E. M. & BROKAW, N. V. L. 1996. Forest damage and recovery
52
53 from catastrophic wind. *Botanical Review* 62:113-185.
54
55

1
2
3
4 FETCHER, N., OBERBAUER, S. F. & STRAIN, B. R. 1985. Vegetation effects
5 on microclimate in lowland tropical forest in Costa Rica. *International Journal of*
6 *Biometeorology* 29:145-155.
7
8

9
10
11 FOSTER, D. R. & BOOSE, E. R. 1992. Patterns of forest damage resulting from
12 catastrophic wind in central New England, USA. *Journal of Ecology* 80:79-98.
13
14

15
16
17 HARBORNE, A. R., AFZAL, D. C. & ANDREWS, M. J. 2001. Honduras:
18 Caribbean coast. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 42:1221-1235.
19
20

21
22 HEIKKINEN, R. K., LUOTO, M., ARAÚJO, M. B., VIRKKALA, R., THUILLER,
23 W. & SYKES, M. T. 2006. Methods and uncertainties in bioclimatic envelope
24 modelling under climate change. *Progress in Physical Geography* 30:751-777.
25
26
27

28
29
30 KING, D. A. 1986. Tree form, height growth, and susceptibility to wind damage
31 in *Acer saccharum*. *Ecology* 67:980-990.
32
33

34
35 KOCH, G. W., SILLETT, S. C., JENNINGS, G. M. & DAVIS, S. D. 2004. The
36 limits to tree height. *Nature* 428:851-854.
37
38

39
40
41 LEWIS, R. J. & BANNAR-MARTIN, K. H. 2011. The impact of cyclone Fanele
42 on a tropical dry forest in Madagascar. *Biotropica* 44:1-6.
43
44

45
46 LUGO, A. E., ROGERS, C. S. & NIXON, S. W. 2000. Hurricanes, coral reefs
47 and rainforests: resistance, ruin and recovery in the Caribbean. *AMBIO: A*
48 *Journal of the Human Environment* 29:106-114.
49
50

51
52
53
54 MARTIN, T. J. & OGDEN, J. 2006. Wind damage and response in New Zealand
55 forests: a review. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 30:295-310.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 MCCALLUM, D. J., MASON, E. G. & WHITLEY, B. 2007. Influence of exposure
5 and elevation on radiata pine branch size, log velocity, sweep, taper and value.
6
7
8 *New Zealand Journal of Forestry* 52:10-16.
9

10
11 MEYER, C. L., SISK, T. D. & COVINGTON, W. W. 2001. Microclimatic changes
12 induced by ecological restoration of ponderosa pine forests in northern Arizona.
13
14
15 *Restoration Ecology* 9:443-452.
16

17
18
19 MURRAY, F. W. 1967. On the computation of saturation vapor pressure.
20
21
22 *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 6:203-204.
23

24
25 O'BRIEN, R. 2007. A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation
26 factors *Quality and Quantity* 41:673-690.
27

28
29
30 PIELKE, R. A., RUBIERA, J., LANDSEA, C., FERNANDEZ, M. L. & KLEIN, R.
31
32 2003. Hurricane vulnerability in Latin America and the Caribbean: normalized
33 damage and loss potentials. *Natural Hazards Review* 4:101-114.
34
35

36
37
38 PUTZ, F. E., COLEY, P. D., LU, K., MONTALVO, A. & AIELLO, A. 1983.
39
40 Uprooting and snapping of trees: structural determinants and ecological
41 consequences. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 13:1011-1020.
42
43

44
45
46 RAMBO, T. R. & NORTH, M. P. 2009. Canopy microclimate response to pattern
47 and density of thinning in a Sierra Nevada forest. *Forest Ecology and*
48
49 *Management* 257:435-442.
50

51
52
53 RICHARDS, P. W. 1996. *The tropical rain forest*. (Second edition). Cambridge
54
55 University Press, Cambridge. 575 pp.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 SALDAÑA, A., PARRA, M. J., FLORES-BAVESTRELLO, A., CORCUERA, L. J.
5
6 & BRAVO, L. A. 2013. Effects of forest successional status on
7
8 microenvironmental conditions, diversity, and distribution of filmy fern species in
9
10 a temperate rainforest. *Plant Species Biology* doi: 10.1111/1442-1984.12020.
11
12

13
14 SHAW, D. C. 2004. Vertical organisation of canopy biota. Pp. 73-78. in
15
16 Lowman, M. D. & Rinker, H. B. (eds.). *Forest canopies*. Elsevier Academic
17
18 Press, London.
19
20

21
22 STRECK, N. A. 2003. Stomatal responses to water vapor pressure deficit: an
23
24 unsolved issue. *Current Agricultural Science and Technology* 9:317-322.
25
26

27
28 STUNTZ, S., SIMON, U. & ZOTZ, G. 2002. Rainforest air-conditioning: the
29
30 moderating influence of epiphytes on the microclimate in tropical tree crowns.
31
32 *International Journal of Biometeorology* 46:53-59.
33
34

35
36 STURTEVANT, B. R., MIRANDA, B. R., WOLTER, P. T., JAMES, P. M. A.,
37
38 FORTIN, M. J. & TOWNSEND, P. A. 2014. Forest recovery patterns in
39
40 response to divergent disturbance regimes in the Border Lakes region of
41
42 Minnesota (USA) and Ontario (Canada). *Forest Ecology and Management*
43
44 313:199-211.
45
46

47
48 SZARZYNKI, J. & ANHUF, D. 2001. Micrometeorological conditions and canopy
49
50 energy exchanges of a neotropical rain forest (Surumoni-Crane project,
51
52 Venezuela). *Plant Ecology* 153:231-239.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 TURNER, M. G., BAKER, W. L., PETERSON, C. J. & PEET, R. K. 1998.

5
6 Factors influencing succession: lessons from large, infrequent natural
7
8 disturbances. *Ecosystems* 6:511-523.
9

10
11 TURTON, S. 2013. Tropical cyclones and forest dynamics under a changing
12
13 climate: what are the long-term implications for tropical forest canopies in the
14
15 cyclone belt? Pp. 105-111. in Lowman, M., Devy, S. & Ganesh, T. (eds.).

16
17 *Treetops at risk*. Springer, New York
18

19
20
21 TURTON, S. M. & SIEGENTHALER, D. T. 2004. Immediate impacts of a severe
22
23 tropical cyclone on the microclimate of a rain-forest canopy in north-east

24
25 Australia. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 20:583-586.
26

27
28
29 URIARTE, M., RIVERA, L. W., ZIMMERMAN, J. K., AIDE, T. M., POWER, A. G.
30
31 & FLECKER, A. S. 2004. Effects of land use history on hurricane damage and
32
33 recovery in a neotropical forest. *Plant Ecology* 174:49-58.
34

35
36
37 WEAVER, P. L. 2008. Dwarf forest recovery after disturbances in the Luquillo
38
39 Mountains of Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Journal of Science* 44:150-163.
40

41
42 WEISHAMPEL, J. F., DRAKE, J. B., COOPER, A., BLAIR, J. B. & HOFTON, M.
43
44 2007. Forest canopy recovery from the 1938 hurricane and subsequent salvage
45
46 damage measured with airborne LiDAR. *Remote Sensing of Environment*
47
48 109:142-153.
49

50
51
52 XI, W., PEET, R. K., DECOSTER, J. K. & URBAN, D. L. 2008. Tree damage
53
54 risk factors associated with large, infrequent wind disturbances of Carolina
55
56 forests. *Forestry* 81:318-334.
57
58
59
60

ZIMMERMAN, J. K., EVERHAM, E. M., WAIDE, R. B., LODGE, D. J., TAYLOR, C. M. & BROKAW, N. V. L. 1994. Responses of tree species to hurricane winds in subtropical wet forest in Puerto Rico: implications for tropical tree life histories. *Journal of Ecology* 82:911-922.

TABLES

Table 1. A LLM pairwise residual comparison was made to compare branch damage responses following hurricane perturbation at Cusuco National Park, among different tree groups. Group one consisted of *Quercus* spp., *Liquidambar styraciflua*, conifers (*Pinus maximinoi* and *P. tecunumanii*) and other angiosperm species. Group two consisted of *L. styraciflua*, conifers and other angiosperm species. Group three consisted of conifers and angiosperm species. Comparisons were made among branches that were not damaged (none), had minor damage (minor) and were severely damaged (severe). P-values are given for each comparison. The plus and minus signs indicate the direction (positive or negative) of the comparison.

Tree group	One	One	One	Two	Two	Two	Three	Three	Three
Damage	None	Minor	Severe	None	Minor	Severe	None	Minor	Severe
Other angiosperms	(+) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(-) <0.01
<i>Liquidambar</i>	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns			
<i>Pinus</i> (conifer)	(-) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(-) <0.01	(+) <0.01	(+) <0.01
<i>Quercus</i>	ns	ns	ns						

Table 2. Assessing VPD in Cusuco National Park, Honduras. Maximum likelihood ratio tests were used to identify how VPD changed in response to altitude, monthly fluctuations, plot location, canopy position (namely lower, middle and upper canopy) and hurricane exposure (i.e. EVSS_S). The tests were run using different interaction and random effect combinations. The model with the lowest AIC and BIC (Bayesian information criterion) was retained (i.e. the best-fit model) and a Chi-squared test was used to test for significance ($Pr > \text{Chisq}$).

Model	Form	df	AIC	BIC	Pr(>Chisq)
M1a	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude + (1 Plot) + (1 Position) + (1 Month)	7	580.51	609.14	<0.01
M1b	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Position) * (1 Month) * (1 Species)	8	582.07	614.78	<0.01
M1c	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude + (1 Plot) + (1 Position) + (1 Month) + (1 Species)	8	582.07	614.78	>0.05
M1d	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S * (1 Plot) * (1 Month) * (1 Position)	6	591.94	616.47	>0.05
M1e	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Position) * (1 Month)	6	711.68	736.22	>0.05
M1f	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Month)	6	743.98	768.52	>0.05
M1g	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Month) * (1 Species)	7	745.84	774.47	<0.01
M1h	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Position)	6	1225.18	1249.72	>0.05
M1i	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Position) * (1 Species)	7	1227.18	1255.81	>0.05
M1j	VPD ~ 1 + EVSS_S + Altitude * (1 Plot) * (1 Species)	6	1256.27	1280.8	>0.05

Table 3. The best-fit model that explained most of the variation of VPD in Cusuco National Park, Honduras. The model was rerun using restricted maximum likelihood estimation (REML). The contribution to the model of each random and fixed effect is presented.

Variables	Effects	Variance	SD	Estimate	Error
Month	Random	0.8	0.9		
Plot	Random	0.2	0.4		
Canopy position	Random	0.1	0.4		
Tree species	Random	0	0		
EVSS south	Fixed		0.1	0.1	0.8
Altitude	Fixed		0.0005	-0.002	-3.8

Table 4. Summary of the variance from the LM that explained most of the variation in VPD in Cusuco National Park, Honduras. For each contributing variable (i.e. month, altitude, EVSS south and canopy position), the remaining variance (exclusion of individual variables from the model), the difference in variance and the total variance (%) are presented.

Variables	Remaining variance (Adj-R ²)	Difference (Adj-R ²)	Total variance (%)
Total variance	0.83	0.17	100
Month	0.53	0.48	67
Altitude	0.18	0.82	15
EVSS south	0.14	0.86	12
Canopy position	0.07	0.93	6

Table 5. Mean and standard deviation of changes in VPD in Cusuco National Park, Honduras. The mean, maximum and minimum VPD for each month are given for the lower, middle and upper canopy.

Month	VPD _{mean}			VPD _{max}			VPD _{min}		
	Lower	Middle	Upper	Lower	Middle	Upper	Lower	Middle	Upper
January	1.35 ± 0.53	1.75 ± 0.43	1.82 ± 0.65	6.83 ± 1.66	7.27 ± 0.93	7.38 ± 1.5	0.02 ± 0.06	0.04 ± 0.09	0.03 ± 0.08
February	2.84 ± 0.96	3.53 ± 0.68	3.67 ± 0.99	6.09 ± 1	6.68 ± 0.81	6.69 ± 0.95	0.16 ± 0.19	0.23 ± 0.31	0.27 ± 0.25
March	2.45 ± 0.49	3 ± 0.35	3.11 ± 0.41	6.49 ± 0.53	6.84 ± 0.29	6.94 ± 0.39	0.04 ± 0.09	0.13 ± 0.23	0.06 ± 0.15
April	3.5 ± 0.89	4.19 ± 0.65	4.44 ± 0.78	8.04 ± 1.01	9.11 ± 0.37	9.24 ± 0.79	0.2 ± 0.29	0.25 ± 0.33	0.32 ± 0.3
May	3.07 ± 0.99	3.71 ± 0.82	4.01 ± 0.85	8.62 ± 1.56	9.41 ± 1.61	9.99 ± 1.54	0.28 ± 0.35	0.38 ± 0.39	0.45 ± 0.41
June	2.25 ± 1.03	2.73 ± 1.06	2.88 ± 1.12	5.88 ± 1.66	6.8 ± 1.82	7.15 ± 2.01	0.29 ± 0.34	0.48 ± 0.42	0.45 ± 0.36
July	2.04 ± 0.69	2.45 ± 0.72	2.78 ± 0.83	6.22 ± 1.02	6.91 ± 1.26	7.9 ± 1.62	0.38 ± 0.36	0.55 ± 0.45	0.49 ± 0.38
August	2.23 ± 0.77	2.8 ± 0.74	3.19 ± 1.02	6.71 ± 1.29	7.2 ± 1	7.89 ± 1.37	0.55 ± 0.6	0.76 ± 0.77	0.86 ± 0.94
September	2.29 ± 0.8	2.87 ± 0.65	3.08 ± 0.73	7.29 ± 1.48	7.83 ± 0.94	8.62 ± 1.21	0.41 ± 0.35	0.72 ± 0.37	0.63 ± 0.37
October	1.29 ± 0.62	1.87 ± 0.49	2 ± 0.59	5.6 ± 1.54	7.21 ± 1.1	7.97 ± 1.71	0.09 ± 0.12	0.15 ± 0.23	0.14 ± 0.14
November	0.47 ± 0.29	0.77 ± 0.34	0.8 ± 0.43	5.39 ± 0.64	6.37 ± 0.41	6.52 ± 0.85	0 ± 0	0.03 ± 0.06	0.01 ± 0.04
December	1.92 ± 0.61	2.51 ± 0.45	2.52 ± 0.52	7.66 ± 1.22	8.36 ± 1.24	8.77 ± 0.94	0 ± 0	0.09 ± 0.2	0.02 ± 0.07


LEGENDS TO FIGURES

Figure 1. Annual likelihood of hurricane activity per country, in the Caribbean.

The north-east Bahamas and the coastal region in the Atlantic basin has the highest strike probability, followed by regions such as the Lesser Antilles through the British and U.S. Virgin Islands, southern Haiti, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, central Bahamas, the Cayman Islands and western Cuba. Moderate hurricane risk areas (~5%-10%) include countries such as Jamaica, Turks and Caicos Islands, Belize, Honduras and the Yucatan and western Gulf of Mexico. Our study site Cusuco National Park, indicated by a circle, lies within the moderate risk area. Moreover, countries south of 10°N latitude have an annual hurricane risk probability of < 1 %. Data were adapted from Pielke *et al.* (2003).

Figure 2. Boxplot of mean monthly VPD (kPa) between 2012 and 2013 at Cusuco National Park, Honduras. A linear model (LM) for each canopy position was computed and overlaid. The dashed line represents the modelled mean VPD values for the upper canopy position, the dotted line represents the middle canopy position and the solid line represents lower canopy position.


Figure 3. Violin plot of mean monthly VPD (kPa) for each canopy position and hurricane exposure site at Cusuco National Park, Honduras. The violin plot is a combination of a boxplot and a kernel density plot, which shows the spread and the probability density of the data. The hurricane exposure sites (EVSS 1 = low impact; EVSS 5 = very high impact) are indicated by the grey boxes at the top of the figure. The black dot symbolizes the median.



33 Annual likelihood of hurricane activity per country, in the Caribbean. The north-east Bahamas and the
 34 coastal region in the Atlantic basin has the highest strike probability, followed by regions such as the Lesser
 35 Antilles through the British and U.S. Virgin Islands, southern Haiti, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, central
 36 Bahamas, the Cayman Islands and western Cuba. Moderate hurricane risk areas (~5%-10%) include
 37 countries such as Jamaica, Turks and Caicos Islands, Belize, Honduras and the Yucatan and western Gulf of
 38 Mexico. Our study site Cusuco National Park, indicated by a circle, lies within the moderate risk area.
 39 Moreover, countries south of 10°N latitude have an annual hurricane risk probability of < 1 %. Data were
 40 adapted from Pielke et al. (2003).


41 581x449mm (300 x 300 DPI)

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Boxplot of mean monthly VPD (kPa) between 2012 and 2013 at Cusuco National Park, Honduras. A linear model (LM) for each canopy position was computed and overlaid. The dashed line represents the modelled mean VPD values for the upper canopy position, the dotted line represents the middle canopy position and the solid line represents lower canopy position.

361x174mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Violin plot of mean monthly VPD (kPa) for each canopy position and hurricane exposure site at Cusuco National Park, Honduras. The violin plot is a combination of a boxplot and a kernel density plot, which shows the spread and the probability density of the data. The hurricane exposure sites (EVSS 1 = low impact; EVSS 5 = very high impact) are indicated by the grey boxes at the top of the figure. The black dot symbolizes the median.

581x326mm (300 x 300 DPI)