To which side are the scales swinging? Growth stability of Siberian larch under permanent moisture deficit with periodic droughts

- 3 Dina F. Zhirnova^{*a*}, Elena A. Babushkina^{*a*}, Liliana V. Belokopytova^{*a*}^{*}, Eugene A. Vaganov^{*b c d*}
- 4 ^a Khakass Technical Institute, Siberian Federal University, 27 Shchetinkina, 655017, Abakan, Russia
- 5 ^b Siberian Federal University, 79 Svobodny, 660041, Krasnoyarsk, Russia
- 6 ^c Sukachev Institute of Forest, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 50/28 Akademgorodok,
- 7 660036, Krasnoyarsk, Russia
- 8 ^d Center for Forest Ecology and Productivity, Russian Academy of Sciences, 84/32 bldg. 14 Profsoyuznaya st.,
- 9 117997, Moscow, Russia
- 10 * Corresponding author: white_lili@mail.ru
- 11

1

2

12 Abstract

In moisture-limited regions in which droughts leave a significant "footprint", 13 monitoring of quantitative climatic parameters and of forest adaptation and acclimation to 14 these parameters is of utmost importance due to the ambiguity of spatial patterns in 15 reaction of tree growth to drought and the variety of drought resistance strategies exhibited 16 by trees at the genetic, morphological and physiological levels. This is a case study of the 17 radial growth of Siberian larch (Larix sibirica Ledeb.) along the forest-steppe transect in 18 the foothills of the Bateni Ridge (Kuznetsk Alatau, Southern Siberia, Russia) and of its 19 climatic response and stability under the influence of droughts and contributing factors. In 20 this region, a permanent mild moisture deficit is gradually increasing due to warming of 21 the vegetative season by 0.14–0.19°C per decade; droughts occurred in 1951, 1963-65, 22 1974-76, and 1999. The forests in the region are represented by pure larch stands in the 23 west and mixed stands of larch with Scots pine and silver birch in the eastern portion of 24 the ridge. The forest-steppe ecotone comprises a significant part of the ridge area, mainly 25 on the southern and southeastern slopes. At 5 sampling sites, dependence of larch growth 26 on precipitation (P) and standardized precipitation-evapotranspiration index (SPEI) during 27 April–July of the current year and June–September of the previous year and on maximum 28 temperature (Tmax) during May–July of the current year and July–September of the 29 previous year was observed. We propose the use of a linear regression model based on the 30 SPEI of these seasons as an individualized indicator of climate aridity, which is 31 biologically significant for larch in the study area. An analysis of pointer years showed 32 that precipitation in November (formation of snow cover) also contributes to larch growth. 33 The larch in the study area tolerates moisture deficit, rebounding after the end of stress 34

exposure. The spatiotemporal patterns of the stability indices revealed that despite the 35 decrease in growth resistance and resilience with drought severity, these characteristics are 36 higher at more arid sites due to trees' acclimation to permanent climate aridity. The 37 findings contribute to a better understanding of the capability of larch to further 38 acclimatize and provide a basis for planning measures for conservation and/or restoration 39 of the region's forests under climate warming; however, to clarify the contributions of 40 factors at the individual and local scales, further investigation of the stability of larch 41 growth at the level of individual trees may be required. 42

43

Keywords: radial growth; *Larix sibirica;* Kuznetsk Alatau; forest-steppe; climate–
 growth relationships; pointer years; drought stress

46

47 **1 Introduction**

Climate forecasts predict an increase in the length and intensity of droughts in many 48 regions (Seager et al., 2007; Dai, 2013). Drought is aggravated by warming, which leads 49 to an increase in potential evapotranspiration and, as a result, water stress in vegetation 50 (Allen et al., 2010, 2015; Williams et al., 2013; Serra-Maluquer et al., 2018). Therefore, 51 spatiotemporal analysis and constant monitoring of quantitative climatic parameters and of 52 plants' (including trees) reaction to them become extremely important for regions 53 experiencing moisture deficit, since the "footprints" of droughts in semiarid regions are 54 often more severe than the effects of other dangerous phenomena (Wilhite, 1993; Yatagai, 55 Yasunari, 1995; Dai et al., 1998; Velisevich and Khutornoy, 2009; Dulamsuren et al., 56 2013). To facilitate this monitoring, a variety of drought indices that take into account 57 climatic, hydrological, and other characteristics of a territory or ecosystem are often used 58 (WMO and GWP, 2016). 59

Data on the patterns of woody plants' reaction to droughts under various conditions are quite contradictory. For example, growth reduction trends can be more pronounced in populations growing in more xeric (Pasho et al., 2011; Camarero et al., 2013) or more humid areas (Martínez-Vilalta et al., 2012), and the absence of growth stability dependence on local conditions is also observed (Serra-Maluquer et al., 2018). Trees from regions in which there is permanent moisture deficit may be less susceptible to extreme droughts due to their genetic adaptation to low water availability (Chen et al., 2010;

Anderegg et al. 2015). On the other hand, droughts can have significant long-term effects 67 on plants via ecophysiological memory and morphological changes (Peñuelas et al., 2000; 68 Galiano et al., 2011); this is supported by the delayed tree mortality observed in the most 69 extreme cases (Bigler et al., 2006; McDowell et al., 2010; Anderegg et al., 2013; Cailleret 70 et al. 2017). This effect also determines some intra-specific spatial gradients in the drought 71 response (Martínez-Vilalta et al. 2008; Dorman et al. 2013, 2015; Levesque et al. 2014): in 72 drier habitats, structural and physiological acclimation to a permanent moisture deficit is 73 observed, e.g., a lower ratio of the area of leaves and/or fine roots to sapwood or higher 74 stomata control (Delucia et al. 2000; Martinez-Vilalta et al. 2009). Morphological and 75 physiological differences between species also provide different strategies for coping with 76 drought (Maherali et al., 2004; Engelbrecht et al., 2007; McDowell et al. 2008; Lyu et al., 77 2017). In general, it is difficult to unambiguously answer the question of how forests will 78 resist and recover from drought stress since their reaction can be influenced by many 79 factors (McDowell et al., 2008; Anderegg and HilleRisLambers, 2016; Clark et al., 2016). 80 However, we can with a high degree of certainty assess the point at which effect of stress, 81 including drought, becomes irreversible and leads to forest dieback. 82

In mountain forests, the lower forest boundary is most severely affected by moisture 83 deficit. The vulnerability of these ecosystems due to their mosaic topography and 84 microclimate (Barber et al. 2000; Kulagin et al. 2006; Lange et al. 2016; Monnier et al. 85 2012) may lead to a reduction in forest area under conditions of climate warming and 86 increased drought frequency and intensity. In low mountain systems that have a relatively 87 small range of altitudes and natural zones, the forest-steppe ecotone may occupy a 88 substantial portion of the total forest area. A striking example of such a region is the 89 Bateni ridge, the eastern spur of the Kuznetsk Alatau (Russia, Southern Siberia), which we 90 selected as a study area. The Bateni ridge is surrounded on three sides by arid steppes of 91 the Khakass-Minusinsk depression. The purpose of this case study was to conduct a 92 spatiotemporal analysis of the growth response of Siberian larch (Larix sibirica Ledeb.), 93 one of the main tree species in the region, to moisture deficit, including droughts. We 94 assume that the drought tolerance of larch has allowed this species to successfully adapt to 95 the conditions on the ridge, participate in the formation of the lower forest boundary there 96 (cf. Bocharov, Savchuk 2015), and successfully acclimatize to the current rapid regional 97 warming. 98

99

2 Materials and Methods

100 2.1 Study area and sampling sites

The study was conducted in the foothills of the Bateni Ridge, the eastern spur of the 101 Kuznetsk Alatau (Fig. 1a). This ridge is characterized by less variation in elevation (500-102 1200 m a.s.l.) than occurs in the main part of the Kuznetsk Alatau (up to 2000 m a.s.l.). 103 Most of the ridge area is covered by mixed forest consisting of Siberian larch, Scots pine 104 (Pinus sylvestris L.) and silver birch (Betula pendula Roth.). On the drier southern and 105 southeastern slopes of the ridge, open-stand forests and free-standing trees are interspersed 106 with steppes. The study area belongs to the state forest fund and consists of territories 107 belonging to the Tuim, Bograd, Ust-Byur and Abakan forestries. The archives of the State 108 Forest Committee of the Republic of Khakassia were used in this work as a source of 109 additional data on forest disturbances over the last three decades. 110

The regional climate is sharply continental (Alisov 1956; Fig. 1b), showing large 111 seasonal and daily temperature variation $(mean(Tmax - Tmin) = 9.5 - 14^{\circ}C$ depending on 112 the month; the temperature difference between July and January is \sim 38°C), hot summer, 113 and frosty winter lasting from November to March with little snow. The average annual 114 temperature ranges from -1.5 to $+0.5^{\circ}$ C, and the annual precipitation is 470-560 mm, of 115 which approximately 80% falls during the season of positive temperatures, with a 116 maximum in July. The frost-free period (positive minimum daily temperatures) lasts on 117 average from May to September, the same interval during which the mean daily 118 temperatures exceed +5°C. During this season, significant negative correlations of 119 monthly temperature series with precipitation are observed, as is typical for the region 120 (Bazhenova and Tyumentseva, 2010); the correlation ranges from -0.25 to -0.43 for the 121 mean temperature and from -0.35 to -0.61 for the maximum temperature, whereas the 122 minimum temperature does not correlate with precipitation. As a result, the climate of the 123 vegetative season fluctuates between hot-dry and cool-wet modes, i.e., between extreme 124 conditions and conditions favorable for tree growth. 125

126



Fig. 1. Study region. (a) Satellite map of the area 53.5-54.5°N 89.5-91.5°E prepared using the ArcGIS online map tool (https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html),showing the geographic grid (yellow solid lines), the approximate boundary of the Bateni Ridge (dashed line), the location of the Shira weather station (diamond) and the sampling sites (circles with a gradient of color along the transect in the foothills). (b) Monthly climatic diagram averaged from CRU TS 4.02 for the area shown on the map

133

To analyze the radial growth of Siberian larch, five sampling sites in 30-50 km from each other in the forest-steppe zone along the foothills of the Bateni Ridge were chosen (Fig. 1a, Table 1, Fig. S1). The selected sites were on sunlit slopes oriented southwest to southeast. Larch prevails on the western part of the ridge, presenting as standalone trees on the background of steppe vegetation at the TUIM site and dominating in the mixed larchbirch forest stands at the KAM and SON sites. At the eastern tip of the ridge at the BOGR and BID sites, there are mixed forest stands consisting of all three species.

Characteristics	TUIM	SON	BOGR	BID	KAM	BAT
Sampling site						
latitude (N)	54°24'20"	54°21'55"	54°15'58"	54°00'20"	53°55'52"	_
longitude (E)	89°57'27"	90°22'04"	90°41'30"	90°58'52"	90°37'30"	_
elevation, m a.s.l.	550-600	530-600	550-620	640-670	700-770	-
Sample						
number of trees	84	55	44	68	61	312
length, years	301	168	175	316	310	316
cover period, years	1719-2019	1851-2018	1845-2019	1704-2019	1710-2019	1704-2019
average TRW	1.265	1.174	0.935	1.228	0.924	1.127
Residual TRW chronol	ogy					
standard deviation	0.399	0.383	0.314	0.283	0.357	0.288
mean inter-series correlation	0.496	0.569	0.500	0.469	0.451	0.372
mean sensitivity	0.462	0.427	0.353	0.330	0.380	0.329
EPS>0.85 from calendar year	1744	1889	1882	1815	1759	1758

142 **Table 1.** Characteristics of sampling sites and tree-ring width (TRW) chronologies

143

144 2.2 Climatic data

The spatially distributed field Climate Research Unit Time-Series (CRU TS 4.02, 145 Harris et al., 2014), which includes monthly series of minimum, mean, and maximum 146 temperature (*Tmin*, *Tmean*, *Tmax*) and precipitation (*P*), and the fields of monthly drought 147 indices SPEI (Beguería et al., 2014) and PDSI (Osborn et al., 2018) were used as the main 148 sources of climatic data in this study. In 1936, the methodology used in meteorological 149 observations in Russia was changed, and the number of reference weather stations 150 increased sharply (NCDC, 2005); we thus limited analysis of climatic series to the period 151 1936-2019, the period for which the observations are of maximum reliability. The spatial 152 climatic gradients in the study area were determined from the initial field at a resolution of 153 $0.5 \times 0.5^{\circ}$ on the geographical grid, and we used series averaged for the entire Bateni Ridge 154 territory (53.5-54.5°N 89.5-91.5°E) to perform dendroclimatic analysis and identification 155 of the regional climatic trends. During the analysis, monthly climatic series were 156 generalized (averaged or, in case of precipitation, summed) to determine the impact of 157 seasonal climatic conditions on larch growth. In addition, daily temperature and 158 precipitation data from the Shira weather station (54°30'N 89°56'E, north of the study 159 area) were used to examine the climatic regimes of certain years in detail. 160

161 2.3 Dendrochronological data

Wood samples (cores) of adult living larch trees were collected at breast height (~1.3 m), one core per tree, and processed using standard dendrochronology techniques

(Cook and Kairiukstis, 1990). Individual series of tree-ring width (TRW) were measured 164 at the LINTAB station using the TSAP program (Rinn, 2003) and cross-dated; the cross-165 dating was verified using the COFECHA program (Holmes, 1983). Then, in the ARSTAN 166 program (Cook and Krusic, 2005), the age trends were fitted by a cubic smoothing spline 167 with a frequency response of 0.50 at 67% of the individual series length, than the age 168 trends and autocorrelations were removed from the raw series, making it possible to isolate 169 high-frequency fluctuations (including the climatic signal) to obtain residual indexed 170 series. The individual series were averaged based on bi-weighted means to obtain 171 generalized chronologies for each site separately. The regional chronology for the entire 172 transect along the Bateni Ridge foothills (BAT) was obtained by averaging the individual 173 series from all sites. 174

175 *2.4 Statistical analysis*

The following statistics of TRW chronologies were used in the study: standard deviation (*SD*), mean sensitivity (Fritts, 1976), mean inter-serial correlation coefficient (Cook, 1985), and expressed population signal (*EPS*, Wigley et al., 1984). Despite recent discussion of the applicability of mean sensitivity in dendrochronological research from a statistical point of view (e.g., Bunn et al., 2013), this characteristic has ecological value, for example, in regard to the risk of tree mortality under conditions of severe stress (Gillner et al., 2013; Macalady and Bugmann, 2014).

To identify the relationships between TRW chronologies and climatic factors, paired correlation coefficients and a multifactor linear regression model were used. The threshold values of *mean*±*SD* and *mean*±1.5*SD* (Schweingruber et al., 1990; cf. Neuwirth et al., 2007) were used to identify extremes in larch growth (pointer years) and climatic variables (droughts and the most favorable conditions).

To analyze the stability of larch growth under drought stress, the indices proposed by Lloret et al. (2011) were used: resistance ($Rt = G_d/G_{prev}$), recovery ($Rc = G_{post}/G_d$) and resilience ($Rs = G_{post}/G_{prev}$), where G_{prev} is the average growth during the 3 years prior to the drought, G_d is the average growth during the drought, and G_{post} is the average growth during the 3 years following the drought (see comparison of 2-, 3-, and 4-year periods in Gazol et al., 2017). The average values of TRW at the site calculated from the generalized raw chronologies were used as an indicator of larch growth (cf. Merlin et al., 2015; Gazol et al., 2017), since many cores had rotted pith or pith offset, making it difficult to calculate
the basal increment area as in Lloret et al. (2011).

197 **3 Results**

198 *3.1 Radial growth chronologies of larch and their statistics*

The obtained site chronologies of larch TRW have lengths of 168–316 years. Trees 199 older than 200 years are mainly observed at the TUIM and KAM sites (Table 1, Fig. S2); 200 the forest stands in the northeastern part of the ridge (the SON, BOGR, BID sites) are 201 younger. The average radial growth varies moderately among the sites, amounting to 0.9– 202 1.3 mm per year. The statistical characteristics of the residual chronologies indicate a 203 rather high general (standard deviation 0.28–0.40) and year-to-year variability (mean 204 205 sensitivity 0.33–0.46) in combination with a substantial common signal (inter-serial correlations 0.45-0.57, EPS > 0.85 for the entire period of climatic observations). 206

All site chronologies are closely correlated with each other (0.62–0.80, Table 2); this made it possible to build a regional chronology BAT for the Bateni Ridge foothills. The variability and the common signal characteristics of the regional chronology are lower than those of the site chronologies; however, they remain sufficient for use in dendroclimatic analysis.

212

Table 2. Correlations between residual TRW chronologies for 1936-2019

Site	TUIM	SON	BOGR	BID	KAM
SON	0.80				
BOGR	0.71	0.77			
BID	0.63	0.62	0.67		
KAM	0.72	0.76	0.72	0.75	
BAT	0.80	0.90	0.86	0.82	0.89

All correlation coefficients are significant at p < 0.00001.

215

216 *3.2 Climate-growth relationships*

Correlation dendroclimatic analysis of site TRW chronologies with monthly climatic series showed that among the temperature variables during the previous and current vegetative seasons, the limitation of larch growth was most pronounced for the *Tmax* series (Table S1). A significant response to the temperature from July to September of the previous season and to the temperature in May and July of the current season was observed (Fig. 2). At the same time, precipitation, *SPEI* and other moisture-related climatic variables from June to September of the previous season and, to a lesser extent,
from April to July of the current season stimulated larch growth. A positive reaction to
precipitation during the previous November was also observed.



229

226

Fig 2. Correlations of site TRW chronologies with monthly maximum temperature, precipitation, and SPEI. On the horizontal axis, asterisks mark the months of the previous year (i.e., the year preceding tree ring formation)

233

After generalizing the climatic factors for the second half of the previous vegetative season and the first half of the current vegetative season, maximum correlations of the TRW chronologies with temperature were obtained for the previous July–September and the current May–July; in both cases, the most pronounced response to precipitation and *SPEI* started earlier: June–September and April–July (Table S2).

Since seasonal series of SPEI have significant correlations with larch growth but not 239 with each other, they can be used as non-collinear predictors in a multifactor linear 240 regression model of larch growth (Table 3). The obtained models are of high statistical 241 significance; they account for 24–34% of the larch growth variability at a site scale and for 242 38% of the larch growth variability at the regional scale. The fitness of these models at all 243 sites is higher than that of models that employ separate seasonal series of precipitation and 244 maximum temperature (not presented). The regional model of climate-driven component 245 in larch TRW variability, $BAT = f(SPEI_{prev}, SPEI_{curr})$, can be used as an indicator of 246 climate aridity during the vegetative season in the study area (see Williams et al., 2013). 247

248

Table 3. Multifactor regressions between TRW chronologies and seasonal series of *SPEI* for the second
part of the previous vegetative season (*prev*) and the first part of the current vegetative season (*curr*)

Site	Equation <i>f</i> (<i>SPEI</i>)	R^2	R^{2}_{adj}	F	р
TUIM SON	$0.939+0.294 \cdot SPEI_{prev}+0.295 \cdot SPEI_{curr}$ 0.947+0.397 · SPEI +0.181 · SPEI	0.333	0.315	18.4	<0.00001
BOGR	$0.953+0.262 \cdot SPEI_{prev}+0.136 \cdot SPEI_{curr}$	0.258	0.237	12.8	0.00002
BID Kam	$0.956+0.230 \cdot SPEI_{prev}+0.214 \cdot SPEI_{curr}$	0.357	0.340	20.5	<0.00001
BAT	0.949+0.298 SPEI _{prev} +0.100 SI El _{curr} 0.949+0.298 SPEI _{prev} +0.218 SPEI _{curr}	0.317 0.400	0.298 0.384	24.7	<0.00001 <0.00001

251

252

3.3 Spatiotemporal patterns of vegetative season climatic variability

For the seasonal climatic series that were found to most significantly affect larch 253 growth, a spatial distribution field was obtained from the corresponding monthly data for 254 the geographical grid at a resolution of 0.5° over the study area (Fig. 3a). The spatial 255 climatic patterns in the first and second halves of the vegetative season are similar. An 256 increase in temperature and a decrease in precipitation, i.e., an increase in climate aridity, 257 were observed from the TUIM to the BID sites, whereas opposite pattern was observed 258 from the BID to the KAM sites. Because SPEI does not allow comparison of sites, the 259 climate aridity at each site was estimated as the average value of *P/Tmax* for the *prev* and 260 *curr* seasons: 261

262 $\operatorname{mean}(P / Tmax) = \operatorname{mean}(P_{\operatorname{Jun}^*-\operatorname{Sep}^*} / Tmax_{\operatorname{Jul}^*-\operatorname{Sep}^*}; P_{\operatorname{Apr}-\operatorname{Jul}} / Tmax_{\operatorname{May}-\operatorname{Jul}}).$

In this equation, P / Tmax were calculated from their average values for 1937-2018 interpolated by geographical coordinates. Obtained mean(P / Tmax) values are following: 13.39 mm/°C in TUIM, 12.88 mm/°C in SON, 12.53 mm/°C in BOGR, 11.44 mm/°C in BID, and 12.36 mm/°C in KAM. However, the variability of the microclimate depending

on the local landscape and the elevation at the sampling sites should also be taken into 267 account. Note that this spatial gradient is followed by a higher variability of larch radial 268 growth (Table 1), both in general (SD of residual chronologies) and in regard to its year-269 to-year component (mean sensitivity). During the cover period of reliable climatic data, 270 precipitation during the vegetative season in the study area was stable; no significant long-271 term trends were observed (Fig. 3b). At the same time, the increase in the maximum 272 temperature during the vegetative season was approximately 0.14-0.20°C per decade. As a 273 result, the overall climate aridity also increased. 274





Fig. 3. Spatiotemporal patterns of the regional seasonal series of maximum temperature and precipitation, generalized over intervals of their maximal impact on tree growth (Table S2). (a) Spatial gradients of average values over the period 1936-2019 for the cells of a $0.5^{\circ} \times 0.5^{\circ}$ geographic grid. The connected dots represent a transect of the sampling sites along the Bateni Ridge foothills. (b) Interannual dynamics during the period 1936-2019



Fig. 4. Dynamics of larch growth and droughts in the study area. (a) Pointer years and climatic extremes for the period 1936-2019, differentiated by weak 285 (small markers; deviation from the mean value is 1-1.5 standard deviations) and strong (large markers; deviation from the mean value is >1.5 standard 286 287 deviations), positive (empty markers) and negative (filled markers). Note that the sign is reversed for maximum temperatures to take into account their negative impact on tree growth, i.e., hot weather is considered a negative extreme, and cool weather is considered a positive extreme. The time intervals of the seasonal 288 climatic series (*prev* and *curr*) are the same as those in Table S2. The shaded areas in the top part of the plot represent pointer years of the regional scale, i.e., 289 observed at >50% of the sites. The shaded areas in the bottom part of the plot represent years of droughts considered in this study and the three-year periods 290 prior to and following the droughts. (b) Larch radial growth duringdroughts and during the 3 years prior to, and following the droughts. The shaded areas 291 represent drought years. The thin and thick solid lines represent the bi-weighted mean of TRW (i.e., raw chronologies) for the sampling sites and for the region, 292 respectively. The dashed lines represent the f(SPEI) regression model (Table 3, last line) used as a regional drought index individualized for larch 293

3.4 Dynamics of extreme events: pointer years in larch growth and droughts

During the period under consideration, 11 positive and 12 negative pointer years 295 (defined as the years of the formation of extremely wide and extremely narrow rings, 296 respectively) were observed for larch growth on a regional scale, i.e., covering more than 297 half of the sampling sites along the transect (Fig. 4a). As can be seen, most of these pointer 298 years (with the exception of 1940, 1987, 1991, 1994, and 2005) coincide with extreme 299 deviations in the corresponding direction in seasonal series of precipitation, maximum 300 temperatures and/or SPEI. The climatic differences between positive and negative pointer 301 years are also more substantial for months during prev and curr seasons than for other 302 months (Fig. S3). 303

304 Data on other stress factors are available for pointer years 1990, 1994, and 2000-2005 (Fig. 4). According to the daily temperature and precipitation data recorded at the 305 Shira weather station, extreme frosts (-20–25°C) were observed in November 1993 before 306 the formation of snow cover; in contrast, a warm autumn and a mild snowy winter were 307 recorded in 1990. A significant difference in the amount of precipitation during November 308 was also observed when positive and negative pointer years were compared (Fig. S3). In 309 addition, according to the State Forest Committee, in 2000-2005 large areas were affected 310 by an outbreak of gypsy moth (Lymantria dispar L.) on the Bateni Ridge (Fig. S4). 311 Unfortunately, no observations on the insect population dynamics in earlier years are 312 available. 313

314 *3.5 Stability of larch growth*

294

Among the climatic extremes that significantly suppressed larch growth on the 315 regional scale, several droughts (1951, 1963-65, 1974-76 and 1999, Fig. 4a) that occurred 316 at intervals of more than 6 years were selected. Six-year interval was chosen to avoid 317 overlapping of the three-year periods before and after drought. Despite the fact that during 318 each of the periods 1963-65 and 1974-76 only one pointer year was observed, in both 319 cases, both the radial growth of larch and SPEI remained substantially lower than the 320 mean values during all three years (Fig. 4b); therefore, these periods were considered as 321 three-year droughts. A comparison of larch growth dynamics and SPEI after droughts 322 shows that recovery of growth after a drought event occurs in accordance with climatic 323 dynamics in the cases of relatively weak drought. However, an increase in the duration of 324 adverse conditions (1963–65 and 1974–76) is accompanied by a slight divergence between 325

the f(P/Tmax) series and larch growth after the first year of drought. During the three years following the severe drought that occurred in 1999, growth did not recover despite relatively favorable conditions.

For each drought, three indicators characterizing the growth stability under stress, 329 resistance Rt, recovery Rc, and resilience Rs, were calculated. Comparison between sites 330 shows that *Rt* increases significantly with local climatic aridity; also, there are tendencies 331 for *Rs* to increase and for *Rc* to decrease, both close to the significance threshold (Fig. 5a). 332 The dependence of growth stability on the severity of drought stress is more pronounced: 333 both Rt and Rs are closely correlated with f(SPEI) calculated on the local scale (Fig. 5b). 334 Comparison of growth stability with climatic conditions during the 3-year periods before 335 (for all three indices) and after drought (for Rc and Rs) did not reveal any significant 336 relationships (p=0.22-0.85). Determination of the relationship of the stability indices to 337 tree age, preliminarily estimated as mean cambial age for all individual series at the sites 338 during each drought (Table S3), revealed correlations close to zero for Rt and Rc, but there 339 was a decrease in Rs with age close to the significance threshold (r=0.34, p=0.14). 340

> 2.5 (a) (b) 0 0 increase of climate aridity 0 0 + Rt 2 O Rc **Growth stability indices** r = 0.37, 00 🔺 Rs 0 p=0.11 0 r = 0.09, 1.5 С 0 0 0 n=0.69 00 8 8 C \cap 0 8 1 é 0 r = 0.76 0 r = -0.34, p=0.00010 ----p=0.14 0.5 r = -0.48, r = 0.61p=0.03 * + 4 p=0.004 + 0 11 11.5 12 12.5 13 13.5 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 Mean P/Tmax (mm/°C) f(SPEI) during drought TUIM KAM BOGR BD SON increase of drought severity

342

341

Fig. 5. Patterns in growth stability indices: *Rt*: resistance (pluses, dotted lines); *Rc*: recovery (circles, solid lines; *Rs*: resilience (triangles, dashed lines). Coefficients of determination written in bold indicate statistical significance (p<0.05) of linear relationships. (a) Relationship between growth stability indices and climate aridity at sampling sites estimated as mean *P*/*Tmax* ratio. The sites are labeled below the horizontal axis. (b) Relationships between growth stability indices and drought severity estimated at the local scale as values of regression functions *TRW=f*(*SPEI*) (Table 3) during the drought year or averaged for 3 years of drought.

350

351 **4 Discussion**

Despite the substantial territory of the study area (the maximum distance between 352 the sampling sites is more than 150 km), the presence of common signals in the dynamics 353 of larch growth allow us to consider the entire forest-steppe ecotone of the Bateni Ridge as 354 a single geographical object characterized by a unity of fluctuations in environmental 355 conditions and a common response of vegetation to these fluctuations. At the same time, 356 tree-ring width chronologies are a promising indicator of the long-term dynamics of this 357 ecosystem state, and this dynamics is relevant to regional forest management in the 358 context of the ongoing climate change. 359

Siberian larch, on one hand, is sufficiently drought-tolerant to permit it to grow on 360 the lower forest boundary in the study area; on the other hand, it is highly sensitive to 361 climatic conditions in terms of climate-driven growth variation (sf. Dulamsuren et al., 362 2009). The plasticity of larch growth is ensured by the species' ecophysiological features. 363 Its shorter duration of xylogenesis compared to that of evergreen conifers (Gower and 364 Richards, 1990; Rossi et al., 2006; Velisevich and Khutornoy, 2009; Kraus et al., 2016) 365 and its high intensity of metabolism, even under conditions of moisture deficit, due to its 366 anisohydric strategy (McDowell et al. 2008; Martínez-Vilalta et al., 2014), lead to the 367 maintenance of a high rate of photosynthesis during short-term droughts. During longer 368 period of water stress, partial abscission of needles and fine roots (Chenlemuge et al., 369 2015; Khansaritoreh et al., 2018) protects the body of the tree from damage without lasting 370 effects on growth, unlike evergreen species. In addition, larch has a relatively narrow 371 sapwood (1–2 cm or 10–15 rings, Bergstedt and Lyck, 2007), a trait that accelerates the 372 acclimation of the stem hydraulic architecture to long-term climatic trends. 373

The negative reaction of radial growth to temperature and the positive reaction to 374 precipitation during the warm season, revealed by correlation dendroclimatic analysis and 375 comparison of climatic conditions during the pointer years, is typical for trees growing in 376 moisture-limited regions (Stahle et al., 2011; Touchan et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2013; Cook 377 et al., 2016; Kurz-Besson et al., 2016; Shestakova et al., 2016 and others), but climatic 378 response obviously has species- and region-specific seasonality and intensity. The more 379 pronounced and stable response of chronologies to the maximum temperature during the 380 vegetative season can be explained by the fact that the water stress that suppresses tree 381 growth reaches its maximal levels in the daytime, when higher air temperatures (including 382

the daily maximum) are combined with solar radiation, and additional substantial heating 383 of the soil and foliage occurs (Jackson et al., 1981; Wieser, 2007; Ermida et al., 2014). A 384 similar dependence of tree growth on maximal temperature and precipitation in other 385 regions has been described quantitatively (e.g., Williams et al., 2013). The predominance 386 of the response to conditions of the previous vegetative season is probably due to the large 387 input of accumulated non-structural assimilates in the growth of larch, a deciduous species 388 with an intensive growth strategy (Kozlowski 1992; Hoch et al., 2003; Pallardy 2007; 389 Piper, Fajardo, 2014). Despite the low winter precipitation, the positive effect of 390 November precipitation on growth can be substantial, probably due to thermal insulation 391 by the snow cover formed during that months; this is supported by climatic observations 392 393 for the pointer years 1990 and 1993.

There are no obvious spatial gradients in the climatic response of larch. This can be 394 explained by the complex interaction between the gradients of climatic variables, local 395 landscape conditions (e.g., microclimate modifiers), forest stand density, differences 396 between pure and mixed stands, etc. (Martínez-Vilalta et al., 2012; Lebourgeois et al., 397 2012 2013; Pretzsch et al., 2015; Thurm et al., 2016). Nevertheless, moisture availability 398 should be relatively similar at all sampling sites because all sites are located near the 399 forest-steppe boundary, the position of which (e.g., elevation at slopes of different 400 orientation) is mostly defined by moisture limitation of tree growth. Unfortunately, the 401 limited cover period of direct observations on forest disturbances and their drivers does 402 not allow us to determine the causes of growth depression during some pointer years. 403 However, the identified depression of larch growth during the massive gypsy moth 404 outbreak in 2000-2005 is a striking example of the fact that, in addition to direct exposure, 405 drought can have a long-term indirect effect through the demographic regulation of insects 406 and the increased vulnerability of trees (McDowell et al., 2008 and references therein). 407 However, our observation that larch growth was relatively rapid in wetter and cooler years 408 during this outbreak (Fig. S4) supports the high resilience of deciduous larch to defoliation 409 (Hoch et al., 2003; Piper, Fajardo, 2014; Foster, 2017). It should also be taken into account 410 that larch has a competitive advantage in mixed stands containing evergreen pine for 411 several years after defoliation, since the gypsy moth feeds on both species. 412

The correspondence between the spatial gradients in climate aridity and the resistance/resilience of larch growth can be associated with genetic adaptation and with

morphological acclimation of trees to permanent moisture deficit through formation of 415 appropriate hydraulic architecture and alterations in the proportion of foliage, fine roots 416 and sapwood areas, changes that reduce the trees' sensitivity to increased water stress 417 (Martínez-Vilalta et al. 2008, 2012; Anderegg et al. 2013, 2015). This assumption is 418 supported by the corresponding gradients in the standard deviation and especially in mean 419 sensitivity of the TRW chronologies, since these characteristics are associated with greater 420 risk of mortality under drought stress (Gillner et al., 2013; Macalady and Bugmann, 2014). 421 Resilience decreases more rapidly and has a stronger relationship to severity of drought 422 than resistance; thus severe droughts have more long-term effects on larch growth. 423

Despite the fact that radial growth decreases with age (Table S3, also compare plots 424 from left to right in Fig. 4b), in this study it was found that the sensitivity of larch to 425 droughts depends primarily on drought intensity, although the possibility of increasing tree 426 vulnerability to drought with age and size should also be taken into account (cf. Lloret et 427 al., 2011; Serra-Maluquer et al., 2018). This was reflected on the local scale as a nearly 428 significant decrease in resilience. However, local chronologies are averaged from the 429 radial growth series of trees of various ages, that are growing under various micro-430 conditions of habitat, occupy different social position in the forest stand, and have 431 different growth rates, genotypes and other individual characteristics; therefore, the 432 analysis of generalized chronologies does not allow us to judge the contribution of these 433 factors with any accuracy. Growth stability under the influence of drought can depend 434 significantly on all these factors (Velisevich and Khutornoy, 2009; Kuznetsova and 435 Kozlov, 2011; Bennett et al., 2015; Merlin et al., 2015; Serra - Maluguer et al., 2018); for 436 example, drought resistance may increase and recovery may decrease with soil moisture 437 and slope (Gazol et al., 2017). In this regard, it would be interesting to continue the study 438 of larch growth stability in more detail, taking into account the scale of individual trees. A 439 large sample size (number of trees, Table 1) at several sampling sites will make it possible 440 to use mixed linear models to identify the contributions of factors on the individual to 441 regional scales to larch growth stability in the study area. Investigation of the responses of 442 individual trees to periodic stresses caused by droughts and/or biotic agents is of particular 443 interest for understanding forest acclimation and adaptation to a changing environment. 444 The results of such a study can be used for forest management in the study area and in 445

446 particular for planning measures for forest conservation and/or reforestation considering447 further regional climate warming.

448

449 Acknowledgments

The study was supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project no. 19-14-00120, additional sampling and dendrochronological analysis; project no. 19-77-30015, spatial analysis).

453

454 **References**

Alisov, B.P., 1956. Climate of the USSR. Moscow State University, Moscow (InRussian).

Allen, C.D., Macalady, A.K., Chenchouni, H., Bachelet, D., McDowell, N.,
Vennetier, M., Kitzberger, T., Rigling, A., Breshears, D.D., Hogg, E.H., Gonzalez, P.,
Fensham, R., Zhang, Z., Castro, J., Demidova, N., Lim, J.H., Allard, G., Running, S.W.,
Semerci, A., Cobb, N., 2010. A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree
mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. For. Ecol. Manag. 259 (4),
660–684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.09.001.

Allen, C.D., Breshears, D.D., McDowell, N.G., 2015. On underestimation of global
vulnerability to tree mortality and forest die-off from hotter drought in the Anthropocene.
Ecosphere 6 (8), 129. https://doi.org/10.1890/es15-00203.1.

Anderegg, W.R.L., Plavcová, L., Anderegg, L.D.L., Hacke, U., Berry, J.A., Field,
C.B., 2013. Drought's legacy: multiyear hydraulic deterioration underlies widespread
aspen forest die-off and portends increased future risk. Glob. Change Biol. 19 (4), 1188–
1196. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12100.

470 Anderegg, W.R.L., Schwalm, C., Biondi, F., Camarero, J.J., Koch, G., Litvak, M.,

471 Ogle, K., Shaw, J.D., Shevliakova, E., Williams, A.P., Wolf, A., Ziaco, E., Pacala, S.,

2015. Pervasive drought legacies in forest ecosystems and their implications for carbon
cycle models. Science 349 (6247), 528–532. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab1833.

Anderegg, L.D.L., HilleRisLambers, J., 2016. Drought stress limits the geographic
ranges of two tree species via different physiological mechanisms. Glob. Change Biol. 22
(3), 1029–1045. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13148.

Barber, V.A., Juday, G.P., Finney, B.P., 2000. Reduced growth of Alaskan white spruce in the twentieth century from temperature-induced drought stress. Nature 405 (6787), 668–673. https://doi.org/10.1038/35015049.

Bazhenova, O.I., Tyumentseva, E.M., 2010. The structure of contemporary
denudation in the steppes of the Minusinskaya depression. Geogr. Nat. Resour. 31 (4),
362–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gnr.2010.11.010.

Beguería, S., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., Reig, F., Latorre, B., 2014. Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) revisited: parameter fitting, evapotranspiration models, kernel weighting, tools, datasets and drought monitoring. Int. J. Clim. 34, 3001–3023. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3887.

Bennett, A.C., McDowell, N.G., Allen, C.D., Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., 2015. Larger
trees suffer most during drought in forests worldwide. Nature Plants 1, 15139.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2015.139.

Bergstedt, A., Lyck, C. (Eds.), (2007). Larch Wood – a Literature Review. Forest &
Landscape Denmark, Copenhagen.

Bigler, C., Bräker, O.U., Bugmann, H., Dobbertin, M., Rigling, A., 2006. Drought
as an inciting mortality factor in Scots pine stands of the Valais, Switzerland. Ecosyst. 9
(3), 330–343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-005-0126-2.

Bocharov, A.Y., Savchuk, D.A. (2015). Structure of forests and climatic response of
trees in "forest-steppe" contact zone, the Altai Mountains. J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Biol. 8 (4),
426–440. https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1389-2015-8-4-426-440. (In Russian).

Bunn, A.G., Jansma, E., Korpela, M., Westfall, R D., Baldwin, J., 2013. Using simulations and data to evaluate mean sensitivity (ζ) as a useful statistic in dendrochronology. Dendrochronologia 31(3), 250-254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dendro.2013.01.004.

Cailleret, M., Jansen, S., Robert, E.M.R., Desoto, L., Aakala, T., Antos, J.A.,
Beikircher, B., Bigler, C., Bugmann, H., Caccianiga, M., Cada, V., Camarero, J.J.,
Cherubini, P., Cochard, H., Coyea, M.R., Cufar, K., Das, A.J., Davi, H., Delzon, S.,
Dorman, M., Gea-Izquierdo, G., Gillner, S., Haavik, L.J., Hartmann, H., Heres, A.M.,
Hultine, K.R., Janda, P., Kane, J.M., Kharuk, V.I., Kitzberger, T., Klein, T., Kramer, K.,
Lens, F., Levanic, T., Linares Calderon, J.C., Lloret, F., Lobo-Do-Vale, R., Lombardi, F.,

López Rodriguez, R., Mäkinen, H., Mayr, S., Mészáros, I., Metsaranta, J.M., Minunno, F.,

Oberhuber, W., Papadopoulus, A., Peltoniemi, M., Petritan, A.M., Rohner, B., SangüesaBarreda, G., Sarris, D., Smith, J.M., Stan, A.B., Sterck, F., Stojanovic, D.B., Suarez, M.L.,
Svoboda, M., Tognetti, R., Torres-Ruiz, J.M., Trotsiuk, V., Villalba, R., Vodde, F.,
Westwood, A.R., Wyckoff, P.H., Zafirov, N., Martínez-Vilalta, J., 2017. A synthesis of
radial growth patterns preceding tree mortality. Glob. Change Biol. 23 (4), 1675–1690.
https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13535.

Camarero, J.J., Manzanedo, R.D., Sanchez-Salguero, R., Navarro-Cerrillo, R.M., 515 2013. Growth response to climate and drought change along an aridity gradient in the 516 southernmost Pinus nigra relict forests. Ann. For. Sci. 70 (8), 769-780. 517 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-013-0321-9. 518

Chen, P.Y., Welsh, C., Hamann, A., 2010. Geographic variation in growth response
of Douglas-fir to interannual climate variability and projected climate change. Glob.
Change Biol. 16 (12), 3374–3385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02166.x.

522 Chenlemuge, T., Schuldt, B., Dulamsuren, C., Hertel, D., Leuschner, C., Hauck, M., 523 2015. Stem increment and hydraulic architecture of a boreal conifer (*Larix sibirica*) under 524 contrasting macroclimates. Trees 29 (3), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-014-525 1131-x.

Clark, J.S., Iverson, L., Woodall, C.W., Allen, C.D., Bell, D.M., Bragg, D.C.,
D'Amato, A.W., Davis, F.W., Hersh, M.H., Ibanez, I., Jackson, S.T., Matthews, S.,
Pederson, N. Peters, M., Schwartz, M.W., Waring, K.M., Zimmermann, N.E., 2016. The
impacts of increasing drought on forest dynamics, structure, and biodiversity in the United
States. Glob. Change Biol. 22 (7), 2329–2352. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13160.

Cook, E.R., 1985. A Time Series Analysis Approach to Tree-Ring Standardization.
PhD thesis. Univ. of Arizona, Tucson.

Cook, E.R., Kairiukstis, L.A., 1990. Methods of Dendrochronology: Applications in
the Environmental Sciences. Springer, Dordrecht. htpps://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-0157879-0.

Cook, E.R., Krusic, P.J., 2005. Program ARSTAN: a Tree-Ring Standardization
Program Based on Detrending and Autoregressive Time Series Modeling, with Interactive
Graphics. Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades.

- Cook, B.I., Anchukaitis, K.J., Touchan, R., Meko, D.M., Cook, E.R., 2016.
 Spatiotemporal drought variability in the Mediterranean over the last 900 years. J.
 Geophys. Res. Atmos. 121 (5), 2060–2074. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023929.
- 542 Dai, A., Trenberth, K.E., Karl, T.R., 1998. Global variations in droughts and wet 543 spells: 1900–1995. Geophys. Res. Lett. 25 (17), 3367–3370. 544 https://doi.org/10.1029/98GL52511.
- Dai, A., 2013. Increasing drought under global warming in observations and models. Nature Clim. Change 3, 52–58. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1633.
- Delucia, E.H., Maherali, H., Carey, E.V., 2000. Climate-driven changes in biomass
 allocation in pines. Glob. Change Biol. 6, 587–593. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.13652486.2000.00338.x.
- Dorman, M., Svoray, T., Perevolotsky, A., Sarris, D., 2013. Forest performance 550 during two consecutive drought periods: diverging long-term trends and short-term 551 climatic gradient. responses along a For. Ecol. Manag. 310, 1–9. 552 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.08.009. 553
- 554 Dorman, M., Perevolotsky, A., Sarris, D., Sarris, D., 2015. The effect of rainfall and 555 competition intensity on forest response to drought: lessons learned from a dry extreme. 556 Oecol. 177 (4), 1025–1038. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-015-3229-2.
- 557 Dulamsuren C., Hauck M., Bader M., Osokhjargal D., Oyungerel S., Nyambayar S., 558 Runge M., Leuschner C., 2009. Water relations and photosynthetic performance in *Larix* 559 *sibirica* growing in the forest-steppe ecotone of northern Mongolia. Tree Physiol. 29 (1), 560 99–110. https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpn008.
- 561 Dulamsuren, C., Khishigjargal, M., Leuschner, C., Hauck, M., 2013. Response of 562 tree-ring width to climate warming and selective logging in larch forests of the Mongolian 563 Altai. J. Plant Ecol. 7 (1), 24–38. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpe/rtt019.
- Engelbrecht, B.M.J., Comita, L.S., Condit, R., Kursar, T.A., Tyree, M.T., Turner,
 B.L., Hubbell, S.P., 2007. Drought sensitivity shapes species distribution patterns in
 tropical forests. Nature 447, 80–82. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05747.
- Ermida, S.L., Trigo, I.F., DaCamara, C.C., Göttsche, F.M., Olesen, F.S., Hulley, G.,
 2014. Validation of remotely sensed surface temperature over an oak woodland landscape
 The problem of viewing and illumination geometries. Remote Sens. Environ. 148,
 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.03.016.

571 Fritts, H.C., 1976. Tree Rings and Climate. Academic Press, London.

572 Foster, J.R., 2017. Xylem traits, leaf longevity and growth phenology predict growth

and mortality response to defoliation in northern temperate forests. Tree Physiol. 37 (9),

574 1151–1165. https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpx043.

Galiano, L., Martínez-Vilalta, J., Lloret, F., 2011. Carbon reserves and canopy defoliation determine the recovery of Scots pine 4 yr after a drought episode. New Phytol. 190 (3), 750–759. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03628.x.

- Gazol, A., Camarero, J.J., Anderegg, W.R.L., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., 2017. Impacts
 of droughts on the growth resilience of Northern Hemisphere forests. Glob. Ecol.
 Biogeogr. 26 (2), 166–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12526.
- Gillner, S., Rüger, N., Roloff, A., Berger, U., 2013. Low relative growth rates
 predict future mortality of common beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). For. Ecol. Manag. 302,
 372-378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.03.032.
- Gower, S.T., Richards, J.H., 1990. Larches: deciduous conifers in an evergreen
 world. BioSci. 40 (11), 818–826. https://doi.org/10.2307/1311484.
- Harris, I., Jones, P.D., Osborn, T.J., Lister, D.H., 2014. Updated high-resolution
 grids of monthly climatic observations the CRU TS3.10 Dataset. Int. J. Climatol. 34 (3),
 623–642. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3711.
- Hoch, G., Richter, A., Körner, C., 2003. Non-structural carbon compounds in temperate forest trees. Plant Cell Environ. 26 (7), 1067–1081. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0016-8025.2003.01032.x.
- Holmes, R.L., 1983. Computer-assisted quality control in tree-ring dating and measurement. Tree-Ring Bull. 43, 69–78.
- Jackson, R.D., Idso, S.B., Reginato, R.J., Pinter Jr., P.J., 1981. Canopy temperature as a crop water stress indicator. Water Resour. Res. 17 (4), 1133–1138. https://doi.org/10.1029/WR017i004p01133.
- 597 Khansaritoreh, E., Schuldt, B., Dulamsuren, C., 2018. Hydraulic traits and tree-ring 598 width in *Larix sibirica* Ledeb. as affected by summer drought and forest fragmentation in 599 the Mongolian forest steppe. Ann. For. Sci. 75, 30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-018-600 0701-2.
- Kozlowski, T.T., 1992. Carbohydrate sources and sinks in woody plants. Bot. Rev.
 58 (2), 107–222. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02858600.

Kraus, C., Zang, C., Menzel, A., 2016. Elevational response in leaf and xylem
phenology reveals different prolongation of growing period of common beech and Norway
spruce under warming conditions in the Bavarian Alps. Eur. J. For. Res. 135 (6), 1011–
1023. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-016-0990-7.

Kulagin, A.Y., Davydychev, A.N., Zaitsev, G.A. (2006) Specific features of the 607 growth of Siberian spruce (Picea obovata Ledeb.) at early stages of ontogeny in broadleaf-608 conifer forests of the Ufa plateau. Russ. J. Ecol. 37 (1), 66–69. 609 https://doi.org/10.1134/S1067413606010115. 610

Kurz-Besson, C.B., Lousada, J.L., Gaspar, M.J., Correia, I.E., David, T.S., Soares,
P.M.M., Cardoso, R.M., Russo, A., Varino, F., Mériaux, C., Trigo, R.M., Gouveia, C.M.,
2016. Effects of recent minimum temperature and water deficit increases on *Pinus pinaster* radial growth and wood density in southern Portugal. Front. Plant Sci. 7, 1170.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01170.

Kuznetsova, E.P., Kozlov, D.N., 2011. Tree-ring variability of larch (Larix Sibirica
Ledeb.) in different landscape positions of the Terekhol depression, Tuva, Russia in the
20th Century. J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Biol. 4 (4), 325–337 (In Russian).

Lange, J., Cruz-García, R., Gurskava, M., Jalkanen, R., Seo, J.-W., & Wilmking, 619 M., 2016. Can microsite effects explain divergent growth in treeline Scots pine? In: Hevia, 620 A., Sánchez-Salguero, R., Linares, J.C., Olano, J.M., Camarero, J.J., Gutiérrez, E., Helle, 621 G., Gärtner, H. (Eds.), Proceedings of the DENDROSYMPOSIUM 2015: May 20th -622 23rd, 2015 in Sevilla, Spain, (Scientific Technical Report; 16/04), 14th TRACE 623 conference (Tree Rings in Archaeology, Climatology and Ecology) (Sevilla, Spain 2015). 624 GFZ Centre for Geosciences, Potsdam, German Research 93–101. pp. 625 http://doi.org/10.2312/GFZ.b103-16042. 626

Lebourgeois, F., Gomez, N., Pinto, P., Mérian, P., 2013. Mixed stands reduce *Abies alba* tree-ring sensitivity to summer drought in the Vosges mountains, western Europe. For. Ecol. Manag. 303, 61–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.04.003.

Lei, Y., Liu, Y., Song, H., Sun, B., 2014. A wetness index derived from tree-rings in
the Mt. Yishan area of China since 1755 AD and its agricultural implications. Chin. Sci.
Bull. 59 (27), 3449–3456. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11434-014-0410-7.

Levesque, M., Rigling, A., Bugmann, H., Weber, P., Brang, P., 2014. Growth response of five co-occurring conifers to drought across a wide climatic gradient in
 635
 Central
 Europe.
 Agric.
 For.
 Meteorol.
 197,
 1–12.

 636
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.06.001.
 197,
 1–12.

Lloret, F., Keeling, E. G., Sala, A., 2011. Components of tree resilience: effects of
successive low-growth episodes in old ponderosa pine forests. Oikos 120 (12), 1909–1920.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19372.x.

Lyu, S., Wang, X., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., 2017. Different responses of Korean pine (*Pinus koraiensis*) and Mongolia oak (*Quercus mongolica*) growth to recent climate warming in northeast China. Dendrochronologia 45, 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dendro.2017.08.002.

Macalady, A.K., Bugmann, H., 2014. Growth-mortality relationships in piñon pine (*Pinus edulis*) during severe droughts of the past century: shifting processes in space and time. PLoS One 9(5), e92770. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092770.

Maherali, H., Pockman, W.T., Jackson, R.B., 2004. Adaptive variation in the vulnerability of woody plants to xylem cavitation. Ecol. 85 (8), 2184–2199. https://doi.org/10.1890/02-0538.

Martínez-Vilalta, J., Lopez, B.C., Adell, N., Badiella, L., Ninyerola, M., 2008. Twentieth century increase of Scots pine radial growth in NE Spain shows strong climate interactions. Glob. Change Biol. 14, 2868–2881. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01685.x.

Martinez-Vilalta, J., Cochard, H., Mencuccini, M., Streck, F., Herrero, A.,
Korhonen, J.F.J., Llorens, P., Nikinmaa, E., Nolè, A., Poyatos, R., Ripullone, F., SassKlaassen, U., Zweifel R., 2009. Hydraulic adjustment of Scots pine across Europe. New
Phytol. 184 (2), 353–364. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.02954.x.

Martínez-Vilalta, J., López, B.C., Loepfe, L., Lloret, F., 2012. Stand- and tree-level
determinants of the drought response of Scots pine radial growth. Oecol. 168 (3), 877–
888. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-011-2132-8.

Martínez-Vilalta, J., Poyatos, R., Aguadé, D., Retana, J., Mencuccini, M., 2014. A new look at water transport regulation in plants. New Phytol. 204 (1), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12912.

McDowell, N., Pockman, W.T., Allen, C.D., Breshears, D.D., Cobb, N., Kolb, T., Plaut, J., Sperry, J., West, A., Williams, D.G., Yepez, E.A., 2008. Mechanisms of plant survival and mortality during drought: why do some plants survive while others succumb 667 to drought? New Phytol. 178 (4), 719–739. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-668 8137.2008.02436.x.

McDowell, N.G., Allen, C.D., Marshall, L., 2010. Growth, carbon-isotope discrimination, and drought-associated mortality across a *Pinus ponderosa* elevational transect. Glob. Change Biol. 16 (1), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01994.x.

Merlin, M., Perot, T., Perret, S., Korboulewsky, N., Vallet, P., 2015. Effects of stand composition and tree size on resistance and resilience to drought in sessile oak and Scots pine. For. Ecol. Manag. 339, 22–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.11.032.

Monnier, Y., Prévosto, B., Ripert, C., Corbani, A.C., Fernandez, C., 2012. Forest microhabitats differentially influence seedling phenology of two co-existing Mediterranean oak species. J. Veg. Sci. 23 (2), 260–270. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2011.01358.x.

National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), 2005. Data Documentation for Dataset 680 9290c, Global Synoptic Climatology Network. C. The former USSR, Version 1.0. 681 Climatic (Available National Data Center, Asheville. at 682 https://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/documentlibrary/tddoc/td9290c.pdf; accessed 04 683 October 2019). 684

Neuwirth, B., Schweingruber, F.H., Winiger, M., 2007. Spatial patterns of central
European pointer years from 1901 to 1971. Dendrochronologia 24 (2–3), 79–89.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dendro.2006.05.004.

Osborn, T.J., Barichivich, J., Harris, I., van der Schrier, G., Jones, P.D., 2018.
Drought [in "State of the Climate in 2017"]. Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc. 99, S36–S37.
https://doi.org/10.1175/2018BAMSStateoftheClimate.1.

Pallardy, S.G., 2007. Physiology of Woody Plants. Academic Press, San Diego,.

Pasho, E., Camarero, J.J., de Luis, M., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., 2011. Impacts of
drought at different time scales on forest growth across a wide climatic gradient in northeastern Spain. Agric. For. Meteorol. 151 (12), 1800–1811.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.07.018.

Peñuelas, J., Filella, I., Lloret, F., Piñol, J. Siscart, D., 2000. Effects of a severe
drought on water and nitrogen use by *Quercus ilex* and *Phyllyrea latifolia*. Biol. Plant. 43
(1), 47–53. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026546828466.

Piper, F.I., Fajardo, A., 2014. Foliar habit, tolerance to defoliation and their link to
carbon and nitrogen storage. J. Ecol. 102 (5), 1101–1111. https://doi.org/10.1111/13652745.12284.

Pretzsch, H., del Río, M., Ammer, Ch., Avdagic, A., Barbeito, I., Bielak, K., 702 Brazaitis, G., Coll, L., Dirnberger, G., Drössler, L., Fabrika, M., Forrester, D.I., Godvod, 703 K., Heym, M., Hurt, V., Kurylyak, V., Löf, M., Lombardi, F., Matović, B., Mohren, F., 704 Motta, R., den Ouden, J., Pach, M., Ponette, Q., Schütze, G., Schweig, J., Skrzyszewski, 705 J., Sramek, V., Sterba, H., Stojanović, D., Svoboda, M., Vanhellemont, M., Verheyen, K., 706 Wellhausen, K., Zlatanov, T., Bravo-Oviedo, A., 2015. Growth and yield of mixed versus 707 pure stands of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) and European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.) 708 analysed along a productivity gradient through Europe. Eur. J. For. Res. 134 (5), 927–947. 709 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-015-0900-4. 710

Rinn, F., 2003. TSAP-Win: Time Series Analysis and Presentation for
Dendrochronology and Related Applications: User reference. RINNTECH, Heidelberg.

Rossi, S., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Deslauriers, A., 2009. Comparing needle and shoot
phenology with xylem development on three conifer species in Italy. Ann. For. Sci. 66 (2),
206. https://doi.org/10.1051/forest/2008088.

Schweingruber, F.H., Eckstein, D., Serre-Bachet, F., Braker, O.U., 1990.
Identification, presentation and interpretation of event years and pointer years in
dendrochronology. Dendrochronologia 8, 9–38.

Shestakova, T.A., Gutiérrez E., Kirdyanov, A.V., Camarero, J.J., Génova, M.,
Knorre, A.A., Linares, J.C., de Dios, V.R., Sánchez-Salguero, R., Voltas, J., 2016. Forests
synchronize their growth in contrasting Eurasian regions in response to climate warming.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 113 (3), 662–667. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514717113.

- Seager, R., Ting, M., Held, I., Kushnir, Y., Lu, J., Vecchi, G., Huang, H.-P., Harnik,
 N., Leetmaa, A., Lau, N.-C., Li, C., Velez, J., Naik, N., 2007. Model projections of an
 imminent transition to a more arid climate in southwestern North America. Sci. 316
 (5828), 1181–1184. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1139601.
- Selyaninov, G.T., 1928. About climate agricultural estimation. Proc. Agric.
 Meteorol. 20, 165–177 (In Russian).
- Serra-Maluquer, X., Mencuccini, M., Martínez-Vilalta, J., 2018. Changes in tree
 resistance, recovery and resilience across three successive extreme droughts in the

northeast Iberian Peninsula. Oecol. 187 (1), 343–354. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-0184118-2.

Stahle, D.W., Diaz, J.V., Burnette, D.J., Paredes, J.C., Heim Jr., R.R., Fye, F.K.,
Acuna Soto, R., Therrell, M.D., Cleaveland, M.K., Stahle, D.K., 2011. Major
Mesoamerican droughts of the past millennium. Geophys. Res. Lett. 38 (5), L05703.
https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046472.

Touchan, R., Woodhouse, C.A., Meko, D.M., Allen, C., 2011. Millennial
precipitation reconstruction for the Jemez Mountains, New Mexico, reveals changing
drought signal. Int. J. Climatol. 31 (6), 896–906. https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2117.

Thurm, E.A., Uhl, E., Pretzsch, H., 2016. Mixture reduces climate sensitivity of
Douglas-fir stem growth. For. Ecol. Manag. 376, 205–220.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.06.020.

Velisevich, S.N., Khutornoy, O.V., 2009. Effects of climatic factors on radial growth of Siberian stone pine and Siberian larch in sites with different soil humidity in the south of Western Siberia. J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Biol. 2(1), 117–132 (In Russian).

Wieser, G., 2007. Climate at the upper timberline. In: Wieser, G., Tausz, M. (Eds.).
Trees at Their Upper Limit: Treelife Limitation at the Alpine Timberline. Springer,
Dordrecht. pp. 19–36.

Wilhite, D.A., 1993. Drought Assessment, Management and Planning: Theory andCase Studies. Kluwer, Boston, MA.

Williams, A.P., Allen, C.D., Macalady, A.K., Griffin D., Woodhouse, C.A.,
Meko, D.M., Swetnam, T.W., Rauscher, S.A., Seager, R., Grissino-Mayer, H.D., Dean,
J.S., Cook, E.R., Gangodagamage, C., Cai, M., McDowell, N.G., 2013. Temperature as a
potent driver of regional forest drought stress and tree mortality. Nat. Clim. Change 3,
292–297. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1693.

Wigley, T.M.L., Briffa, K.R., Jones, P.D., 1984. On the average value of correlated
time series, with applications in dendroclimatology and hydrometeorology. J. Appl.
Meteorol. Climatol. 23 (2), 201–213. https://doi.org/10.1175/15200450(1984)023<0201:OTAVOC>2.0.CO;2.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and Global Water Partnership (GWP),
2016: Handbook of Drought Indicators and Indices (Eds. M. Svoboda and B.A. Fuchs).

⁷⁶² Integrated Drought Management Programme (IDMP), Integrated Drought Management

Tools and Guidelines Series 2. Geneva.

- Wu, X., Liu, H., Wang, Y., Deng, M., 2013. Prolonged limitation of tree growth due
 to warmer spring in semi-arid mountain forests of Tianshan, northwest China. Environ.
 Res. Lett. 8 (2), 024016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/2/024016.
- Yatagai, A, Yasunari, T., 1995. Interannual variations of summer precipitation in the 767 arid/semi-arid regions in China and Mongolia: Their regionality and relation to the Asian 768 J. Meteorol. Ser. II, 909–923. Soc. summer monsoon. Jpn. 73 (5),769 htpps://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj1965.73.5_909. 770

771

To which side are the scales swinging? Growth stability of Siberian larch under
 permanent moisture deficit with periodic droughts

Dina F. Zhirnova, Elena A. Babushkina, Liliana V. Belokopytova, Eugene A. Vaganov

Supplementary Materials





776

774

775

777

778



Fig. S2. Site residual TRW chronologies (lines) and respective sample depths (shades). The vertical
dashed lines mark the beginning of the period with EPS>0.85. The recent decrease in sample size was
caused by repeated sampling (first sampling in 2012-2013 or 1989 and second sampling in 2017-2019) to
extend the cover period



790

789

Fig. S3. Climatic patterns for pointer years of the regional scale (marked in Fig. 4). The indexed anomalies of climatic variables (maximum temperature or precipitation) was calculated by subtraction of the series mean value, division by the standard deviation, and then averaging separately values for positive and negative pointer years. Shaded areas mark months and seasons when differences between groups of positive and negative pointer years are significant at p<0.05





797

798 Fig. S4. Area damaged by gypsy moth (Lymantria dispar L.) after the severe drought of 1999 in forestries located on the territory of the Bateni Ridge. Bars represent damaged area in each forestry; lines represent 799 seasonal series of precipitation to maximum temperature ratio P_{prev}/T_{prev} (dashed) and P_{curr}/T_{solid} (dashed) 800 with marked extremes (see Fig. 4a); thin horizontal lines represent their respective mean values; shades 801 represent positive (lighter green) and negative (darker red) pointer years in larch growth. Note that during 802 period of gypsy moth outbreak, the years when larch growth is relatively rapid are associated with high 803 P/T ratio values during the current vegetative season (2000), the previous vegetative season (2004), or 804 both (2003). 805

Chronology	Character Month														
Chronology	Jun [*]	Jul*	Aug*	Sep*	Oct [*]	Nov*	Dec [*]	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
							Tmin								
TUIM	-0.19	0.03	-0.14	-0.19	0.09	0.12	-0.01	-0.05	0.10	0.07	-0.02	-0.21	0.03	-0.10	-0.10
SON	-0.14	-0.08	-0.15	-0.21	0.14	0.05	-0.13	-0.14	0.09	0.04	0.02	-0.17	0.01	-0.12	-0.16
BOGR	-0.02	0.03	-0.17	-0.20	0.17	0.00	-0.14	-0.16	-0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.23	0.06	-0.05	-0.15
BID	-0.07	-0.10	-0.08	-0.12	0.19	0.10	-0.22	-0.03	-0.01	-0.08	-0.13	-0.09	0.04	-0.10	-0.17
KAM	-0.06	-0.14	-0.10	-0.16	0.25	0.11	-0.10	-0.07	0.01	-0.03	-0.17	-0.24	0.00	-0.14	-0.10
BAT	-0.12	-0.07	-0.15	-0.20	0.18	0.10	-0.12	-0.09	0.05	0.02	-0.07	-0.21	0.02	-0.13	-0.16
	0.112	0.07	0.120	0.20	0.10	0.10	Tmean	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.21	0.02	0.120	0.10
TUIM	-0.18	-0.03	-0.26	-0.27	0.07	0.12	0.00	-0.04	0.07	0.07	-0.05	-0.25	0.00	-0.18	-0.08
SON	-0.12	-0.17	-0.27	-0.32	0.15	0.06	-0.11	-0.13	0.06	0.04	0.01	-0.20	-0.03	-0.16	-0.10
BOGR	0.02	-0.03	-0.26	-0.26	0.13	0.00	-0.13	-0.14	-0.05	0.02	0.00	-0.26	0.04	-0.09	-0.09
BID	-0.03	-0.16	-0.20	-0.20	0.17	0.01	-0.22	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.15	-0.15	-0.01	-0.16	-0.09
KAM	-0.02	-0.23	-0.26	-0.24	0.21	0.10	-0.10	-0.06	-0.02	-0.04	-0.17	-0.31	-0.04	-0.20	0.00
BAT	-0.09	-0.15	-0.20	-0.32	0.18	0.10	-0.11	-0.08	0.02	0.04	-0.09	-0.31	-0.02	-0.20	-0.09
DAI	-0.07	-0.15	-0.20	-0.52	0.10	0.10	Tmax	-0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.07	-0.27	-0.02	-0.20	-0.07
TUIM	-0.17	-0.06	-0.30	-0.28	0.04	0.11	0.01	-0.03	0.04	0.07	-0.07	-0.26	-0.02	-0.23	-0.05
SON	-0.10	-0.22	-0.32	-0.34	0.14	0.08	-0.09	-0.13	0.04	0.04	0.00	-0.20	-0.02	-0.19	-0.05
BOCR	0.05	-0.07	-0.32	-0.26	0.14	0.03	-0.11	-0.13	-0.07	0.04	-0.02	-0.22	0.03	-0.12	-0.05
BID	-0.01	-0.19	-0.30	-0.20	0.15	0.05	-0.22	0.03	-0.05	-0.05	-0.16	-0.18	-0.04	-0.12	-0.03
KAM	0.01	-0.19	-0.34	-0.30	0.21	0.11	-0.00	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.17	-0.10	-0.04	-0.23	0.05
RAM	0.01	0.10	0.34	0.30	0.21	0.11	-0.09	-0.03	-0.03	-0.05	-0.17	0.34	-0.07	0.23	0.00
DAI	-0.07	-0.19	-0.34	-0.34	0.10		-0.10	-0.07	-0.01	0.01	-0.10	-0.29	-0.05	-0.23	-0.05
TUM	0.22	0.15	0.22	0.16	0.10	г 0.26		0.19	0.15	0.19	0.12	0.14	0.22	0.21	0.10
SON	0.23	0.15	0.34	0.10	0.10	0.20	-0.04	-0.16	0.15	-0.10	0.15	0.14	0.25	0.21	-0.19
BOCD	0.24	0.33	0.31	0.20	0.02	0.19	-0.03	-0.10	0.21	-0.10	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.00	-0.22
DUUK	0.20	0.22	0.34	0.05	0.02	0.22	0.07	-0.15	0.15	-0.14	0.12	0.21	0.14	0.10	-0.12
BID	0.14	0.20	0.38	0.18	-0.05	0.27	-0.00	0.05	0.07	-0.11	0.11	0.10	0.19	0.20	-0.11
KAM	0.11	0.30	0.49	0.12	0.05	0.25	0.03	-0.12	0.12	-0.12	0.06	0.15	0.18	0.18	-0.23
BAT 0.21 0.27 0.41 0.17 0.05 0.27 -0.01 -0.13 0.16 -0.14 0.11 0.17 0.22 0.19 -0.21															
BAT	0.21	0.27	0.41	0.17	0.05	0.27	-0.01	-0.13	0.16	-0.14	0.11	0.17	0.22	0.19	-0.21
	0.21	0.27	0.41	0.17	0.05	0.27	-0.01 SPEI	-0.13	0.16	-0.14	0.11	0.17	0.22	0.19	-0.21
TUIM	0.21 0.23	0.27 0.19	0.41 0.29	0.17	0.05	0.27 0.22	-0.01 SPEI 0.00	-0.13 -0.15	0.16 0.16	-0.14 -0.22	0.11	0.17	0.22	0.19	-0.21 -0.22
TUIM SON	0.21 0.23 0.23	0.27 0.19 0.34	0.41 0.29 0.30	0.17 0.16 0.19	0.05 0.09 0.03	0.27 0.22 0.14	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15	0.16 0.16 0.14	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19	0.11 0.16 0.12	0.17 0.20 0.11	0.22 0.33 0.24	0.19 0.20 0.10	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32
TUIM SON BOGR	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20
TUIM SON BOGR BID	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11	-0.01 <i>SPEI</i> 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32
TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20	-0.01 <i>SPEI</i> 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 DDSI	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29
TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20	-0.01 <i>SPEI</i> 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 <i>PDSI</i> 0.30	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29
TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.30	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.40	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.42	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.24	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.26	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.28	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.27	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.20	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.31	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.20	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.25	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.45	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.21	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.40	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.35 0.38 0.29	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.37 0.38 0.30	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.34 0.34	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.36 0.45	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.48	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.37 0.5	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.11	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.11 0.25	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.31 0.44 0.44	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.22 0.28
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.24	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.40 0.39	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.42	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.47	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.41	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.40	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.46	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.42 0.42	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.4	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.20	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.45 0.44 0.43 H	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 0.44 ydrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coei	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 inov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 <i>TC</i>)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.12	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.27 0.36
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.25	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 HY 0.24	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 ydrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coer	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.27 0.36 -0.16 0.14
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGD	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.23	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 H 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 ydrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coer	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 inov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.14	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.21	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 0.04
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.15	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.22	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.32	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 HY 0.24 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coer	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyan	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 inov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.14 0.21	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.11 0.12	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.04	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 0.22
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.14	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.20 0.31 0.22	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.32	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 H 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22 0.22	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyan	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.14 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.12	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.01 0.25	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.04	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.05 -0.05 -
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.29 0.20	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.34 0.51	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 H 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22 0.22 0.22	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar	0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.21 0.21	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.20 0.20	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.02 -0.02
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 H 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22 0.22 0.24	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.19 0.23	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.32 -0.32 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.02 -0.16 -0.18
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.30	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 H 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22 0.22 0.24	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient of messinde	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.19 0.23	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.14 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.02 -0.16 -0.18
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22 0.27	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.20	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.33 0.35 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.51 0.42 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.23	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 Hy 0.24 0.28 0.11 0.22 0.22 0.24	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe: Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient c	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyan x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 minov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.19 0.23 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.20 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.25 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.55	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.17 0.17 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.04 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.04 -0.16 -0.18 -0.06 -0.06
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22 0.27 0.22	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.36 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.29 0.36 0.29 0.36 0.29 0.20 0.20 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.25 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.23 0.25	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.39 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.29 0	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 Hy 0.24 0.24 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.24 0.27 0.33 0.21	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.30 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coel Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient c	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyan x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.19 0.23 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.20 0.20 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.55	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21 0.18 0.88 0.22	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.04 -0.02 -0.16 -0.18 -0.06 -0.07 0.22
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22 0.27 0.22 0.04	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.20 0.30	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.29 0.30 0.43	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 HY 0.24 0.24 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.40 0.43 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe: Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient c	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.18 0.14 0.29 0.21 0.19 0.23 0.19 0.17 0.19	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20 0.10 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.04 -0.18 -0.04 -0.18 -0.06 -0.07 0.22
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22 0.27 0.22 0.04 0.11	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.20 0.30 0.36 0.20 0.30 0.35 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.22 0.21 0.25 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.25 0.25 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.22 0.23 0.22 0.23 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.21 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.28 0.20	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.29 0.36 0.36 0.36	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 Hy 0.24 0.24 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.24 0.27 0.33 0.21 0.25	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.12 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.40 0.43 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe: Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient c	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyar x (WI) x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.18 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.12 0.12 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.12 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.25	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.13 0.07 0.20 0.10 0.07 -0.03 0.10 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.17 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.18 0.08 0.09 0.18	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.27 0.27 0.27 0.27 0.27 0.20 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.04 -0.16 -0.18 -0.06 -0.07 0.02 0.03 0.02 -0.00 -0
BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM BAT TUIM SON BOGR BID KAM	0.21 0.23 0.23 0.14 0.10 0.07 0.18 0.10 0.11 0.00 0.14 0.07 0.09 0.30 0.26 0.15 0.18 0.14 0.22 0.27 0.22 0.04 0.11 0.11 0.11 0.11	0.27 0.19 0.34 0.26 0.23 0.35 0.30 0.15 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.28 0.20 0.30 0.30 0.30 0.30 0.31 0.22 0.20 0.31 0.22 0.29 0.36 0.36 0.23 0.31 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.25 0.25 0.11 0.24 0.22 0.21 0.25 0.21 0.25 0.21 0.25 0.21 0.25 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.25 0.23 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.21 0.22 0.23 0.25	0.41 0.29 0.30 0.31 0.42 0.51 0.41 0.30 0.38 0.25 0.40 0.43 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.23 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.29 0.30 0.43 0.29 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.32 0.34 0.30 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.51 0.45 0.45 0.40 0.45 0.45 0.45 0.40 0.43 0.45 0.45 0.45 0.45 0.40 0.43 0.45 0.55	0.17 0.16 0.19 0.07 0.20 0.09 0.16 0.34 0.41 0.27 0.45 0.44 0.43 Hy 0.24 0.24 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.22 0.24 0.27 0.33 0.21 0.25 0.27	0.05 0.09 0.03 0.13 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.36 0.41 0.27 0.46 0.44 0.44 vdrother	0.27 0.22 0.14 0.14 0.22 0.11 0.20 0.40 0.43 0.40 0.43 0.49 0.46 0.47 mal coe: Weth	-0.01 SPEI 0.00 0.06 0.12 -0.01 0.08 0.05 PDSI 0.39 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.46 0.47 fficient c	-0.13 -0.15 -0.15 -0.13 0.00 -0.14 -0.13 0.35 0.38 0.29 0.47 0.42 0.43 of Selyan x (WI) x (WI)	0.16 0.16 0.14 0.15 0.09 0.10 0.15 0.37 0.38 0.30 0.45 0.42 0.44 ninov (H	-0.14 -0.22 -0.19 -0.20 -0.17 -0.14 -0.21 0.33 0.34 0.26 0.41 0.38 0.40 TC)	0.11 0.16 0.12 0.19 0.21 0.10 0.39 0.36 0.30 0.45 0.40 0.44	0.17 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.19 0.12 0.19 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.38 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.44 0.49 0.42 0.49 0.43 0.43 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.43 0.48 0.44 0.49 0.12 0.19 0.17 0.17 0.19 0.17 0.19 0.17 0.28 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.19 0.27 0.28 0.19 0.27 0.28 0.19 0.27 0.27 0.28 0.19 0.27 0.27 0.27 0.28 0.19 0.27 0	0.22 0.33 0.24 0.20 0.26 0.25 0.31 0.47 0.40 0.39 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.45 0.52 0.13 0.07 0.01 0.10 0.07 -0.03 0.11 0.10 0.20	0.19 0.20 0.10 0.12 0.17 0.18 0.48 0.37 0.39 0.56 0.44 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.04 0.52 0.17 0.20 0.14 0.07 0.20 0.14 0.21 0.18 0.08 0.09 0.21 0.19 0.21 0.19 0.21 0.19 0.21 0.19 0.21 0.19 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.21 0.21 0.22	-0.21 -0.22 -0.32 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.32 -0.29 0.36 0.21 0.28 0.21 0.28 0.21 0.28 0.21 0.28 0.42 0.27 0.36 -0.16 -0.14 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.18 -0.06 -0.07 0.02 0.03 -0.07 0.02 -0.05 -0.07 -0.05 -0.

Table S1. Correlations of site TRW chronologies with monthly climatic variables

807 Correlation coefficients written in bold are significant at p < 0.05.

808 * Months of the previous year.

810 $WI=10 \cdot \log(\sum P) / \sum Tmean$, Lei et al., 2014).

811

⁸⁰⁹ *HTC* and *WI* were calculated from *Tmean* and precipitation (*HTC* = $10 \cdot \sum P / \sum Tmean$, Selyaninov, 1928;

812 Table S2. Maximum correlations of site TRW chronologies with seasonal climatic variables in the 813 previous (*prev*) and current (*curr*) vegetative seasons

Chronology	Tmin	Tmean	Tmax	Р	SPEI	PDSI	HTC	WI
prev	Jul*-Sep*			Jun*-Sep*		Sep*	Jul*-Sep*	
TUIM	-0.15	-0.29	-0.36	0.42	0.43	0.34	0.40	0.40
SON	-0.23	-0.40	-0.48	0.53	0.53	0.41	0.52	0.49
BOGR	-0.17	-0.29	-0.35	0.40	0.38	0.27	0.35	0.35
BID	-0.15	-0.32	-0.40	0.44	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.40
KAM	-0.21	-0.40	-0.49	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.52	0.46
BAT	-0.21	-0.39	-0.47	0.52	0.52	0.43	0.51	0.48
curr		May-Jul		Apr-Jul		May-Jul		-
TUIM	-0.14	-0.21	-0.24	0.37	0.44	0.49	0.32	0.28
SON	-0.13	-0.19	-0.22	0.20	0.28	0.41	0.21	0.22
BOGR	-0.11	-0.15	-0.18	0.28	0.37	0.41	0.28	0.26
BID	-0.07	-0.15	-0.19	0.36	0.42	0.55	0.31	0.23
KAM	-0.18	-0.27	-0.32	0.29	0.31	0.47	0.31	0.32
BAT	-0.15	-0.24	-0.26	0.34	0.43	0.54	0.34	0.31
Correlation between prev and curr seasonal climatic series	0.31	0.39	0.40	0.11	0.14	0.65	0.24	0.33

814 Correlation coefficients written in bold are significant at p < 0.05.

815 * Months of the previous year.

Note that *SPEI* is the only drought index for which here is no significant correlation between the previous and the current season series; in contrast, the *PDSI* series display very high correlation between the previous and the current season. Therefore, despite the fact that *PDSI* is better correlated with larch chronologies, *SPEI* was used as an indicator of drought in this study.

820

Table S3. Preliminary estimation of mean cambial ages during droughts (calculated automatically in
 ARSTAN without pith offset evaluation and addition, i.e., biased to the minimum values)

	Mean cambial age at the site, years								
Drought years	TUIM	SON	BOGR	BID	KAM				
1951	93	33	50	61	90				
1963-65	98	43	59	66	98				
1974-76	102	51	70	66	104				
1999	109	74	76	85	125				

823

824 **References**

- Lei, Y., Liu, Y., Song, H., Sun, B., 2014. A wetness index derived from tree-rings in the Mt. Yishan area of China since 1755 AD and its agricultural implications. Chin. Sci. Bull. 59 (27), 3449–3456. doi:10.1007/s11434-014-0410-7.
- Selyaninov G.T., About climate agricultural estimation Proc. Agric. Meteorol. 1928.
 165-177.