KÜTTIM et al.

Article type: Original article

Controls of *Sphagnum* growth and the role of winter

Martin Küttim¹ | Liisa Küttim¹ | Mati Ilomets¹ | Anna M. Laine^{2,3}

1) Tallinn University, School of Natural Sciences and Health, Institute of Ecology, Uus-Sadama 5, 10120 Tallinn, Estonia.

2) University of Oulu, Department of Ecology and Genetics, P.O.Box 8000, FI-90014 Oulu, Finland.

3) University of Eastern Finland, School of Forest Sciences, P.O.Box 111, FI-80101 Joensuu, Finland.

Correspondence

Martin Küttim, Tallinn University, School of Natural Sciences and Health, Institute of Ecology, Uus-Sadama 5, 10120 Tallinn, Estonia.

Email: kyttim@tlu.ee

Funding

Centre of Excellence “Natural Sciences and Sustainable Development” at Tallinn University, Estonian Doctoral School of Earth Sciences and Ecology, Archmedes Foundation (Dora programme), Estonian Science Foundation (grant 9070), Institutional Grant “Enchanted” (IUT 18-9), Kone Foundation and the Academy of Finland (project code 287039).

ABSTRACT

Sphagnum is the major genus in northern peatlands that contributes to peat formation and carbon sequestration. *Sphagnum* growth in summer has been fairly well studied but the information about growth in autumn and winter is limited. Therefore, we studied how the growth of *Sphagnum* is seasonally distributed with a particular interest on possible winter growth. The linear increment and biomass production of three *Sphagnum* species was measured in three Northern European bogs over a year. In all sites, our results indicate the highest annual linear increment in *S. angustifolium* (28 mm), followed by *S. magellanicum* (20 mm) and *S. fuscum* (13 mm), but the biomass production was fairly even among the species (189, 192 and 215 g m⁻², respectively). Both linear increment and biomass production depended mostly on meteorological parameters rather than ecophysiological or microsite properties. The seasonal measurements revealed a significant linear increment and biomass production during the winter that accounted for ca 10 % and ca 5 % from the annual values, respectively. Moreover, the mean daily rates of linear increment in autumn often exceeded the increment in summer. Our results thus indicate the ability for year-around growth of *Sphagnum* if the conditions are favourable, including during boreal winter.

KEYWORDS: biomass production, linear increment, peatland, peat moss, seasonality

INTRODUCTION

Northern peatlands store vast quantities of carbon through the accumulation of peat, and thus play a significant role in the global carbon cycle. The accumulation of peat is a result of imbalance between the production and decay of plants. *Sphagnum* mosses play a major role in it: they cover 1.5 million km² of northern peatlands and hold over 150 Gt of carbon (Rydin & Jeglum, 2013) – more than any other terrestrial plant genus (Clymo & Hayward, 1982).

Sphagnum mosses are ecosystem engineers of the majority of ombrotrophic peatlands, successful in growth, distribution and competition with other plants. If a *Sphagnum* population has established on a peatland, it starts to rapidly increase and modify the habitat by making it wet, acid, nutrient-limited and anoxic (Van Breemen, 1995). These conditions are characteristic of ombrotrophic peatlands.

Sphagnum species cover a range of specific habitats along several environmental gradients, such as shade, nutrient status, microtopography and water table (Rydin & Jeglum, 2013; Vitt, 1990). Mean air temperature, photoperiod, precipitation and water table have generally been considered to primarily control the growth of *Sphagnum* (Gerdol, 1995; Grabovik & Nazarova, 2013). Correspondingly, temperature decreases northwards with a concomitant decrease in *Sphagnum* growth (Gunnarsson, 2005). Nevertheless, *Sphagnum* growth is positively correlated with a warmer temperature only if it is not compromised by low capitula water content (Asada, Warner & Banner, 2003; Dorrepaal, Aerts, Cornelissen, Callaghan & van Logtestijn, 2004; Grabovik & Nazarova, 2013).

The phenology of moss growth and photosynthesis differ from vascular plants (Glime, 2017). *Sphagnum* mosses have a poikilohydric water economy, and thus their active period for growth and photosynthesis is mainly restrained by the availability of water (Gaberščik & Martinčič, 1987; Robroek, Schouten, Limpens, Berendse, & Poorter, 2009). For example, Lindholm (1990) demonstrated that *S. fuscum* produces biomass when temperature exceeds

0°C. It is therefore likely that *Sphagnum* growth is not restricted to the traditional growing season of most vascular plants, and that their growth and other physiological processes do not cease in the late summer but can continue year-around (Krebs, Gaudig & Joosten, 2016). While the studies targeting winter growth are limited, evidence for its existence have been found: Asada et al. (2003) proposed that in the maritime region at the West-Coast of Canada winter growth is likely. Their estimations were based on the linear relationships between the Climate Index and growth of several *Sphagnum* species. Hulme and Blyth (1982) have given a similar estimation for Southwest Scotland. Krebs et al. (2016) have recorded winter growth (both linear increment and production) of *S. papillosum* and *S. palustre* in Georgia (Transcaucasus), affirming the possibility of continuous growth year-around if frost is absent. In addition to locations with mild oceanic climate, late-autumn and winter growth of *Sphagnum* has been measured at higher latitudes with more continental climate as well. In several types of peatlands in Southern Finland 1/4–1/3 of annual *Sphagnum* growth have been detected outside the classical growth period (from late September to May, when daily mean air temperature does not exceed 5°C) (Laine, Juurola, Hajek & Tuittila, 2011; Maanavilja, Kangas, Mehtätalo & Tuittila, 2015). Lütt (1992) has documented a late-autumn and winter growth of *Sphagnum* in Northern Germany as well. However, the focus of these papers has been elsewhere, and thus so far the winter growth of *Sphagnum* have not been studied and discussed in detail. Therefore, the mechanisms behind and seasonality of *Sphagnum* growth are not entirely understood. Given that *Sphagnum* species differ in their climatic preferences (Breeuwer, Heijmans, Robroek & Berendse, 2010), the seasonal and geographic variations in *Sphagnum* growth are likely species specific.

The majority of *Sphagnum*-dominated peatlands can be found at high latitudes (> 45° N) where the rate of climate change is expected to be above the global average, and is particularly rapid in winter (Jylhä, Tuomenvirta & Ruosteenoja, 2004; Lode, Küttim & Kiivit,

2017; Makoto et al., 2014). In addition to the warmer air temperatures in winter, precipitation will come more often as rain, and the snow cover will decrease both in thickness and duration (Templer, 2012). Consequently, it will leave ground vegetation, including mosses, exposed to the rapid changes in temperature (Bombonato & Gerdol, 2012), and alter the functions of northern terrestrial, including carbon and nutrient cycling (Makoto et al., 2014). Although the responses are species specific, climate warming is generally expected to increase *Sphagnum* productivity (Zhaojun et al., 2011). However, the possible shifts in the seasonal distribution of cumulative *Sphagnum* growth due to changing climate have not gained much attention and thus are not well known. While the increased length of autumn, higher overall temperatures and rate of precipitation could favour *Sphagnum* growth, midsummer desiccation, lack of protecting snow cover and thus lower minimum temperatures in winter could reduce the *Sphagnum* growth (Gerdol, 1996; Hajek, 2014; Küttim et al., 2017; Yazaki & Yabe, 2012).

In this study, we measured the seasonal linear increment and biomass production of three widespread *Sphagnum* species in three ombrotrophic peatlands in Northern Europe. Climatic factors, especially winter conditions, including the continuity of snow cover, differ among the sites. This climatic gradient allows us to use the plants of our southern sites as sentinels of future behaviour under a warmer climate at northern latitudes. We divide the annual growth period into three seasons, namely autumn, winter and late spring/summer. With these data we aim to 1) quantify interspecies differences in growth rate, 2) evaluate the impacts of latitudinal climatic gradient on *Sphagnum* growth, and 3) quantify the contribution of growth per season to the annual growth rate. We use seasonal meteorological parameters, microsite properties and the ecophysiological traits of *Sphagnum* in explaining the growth rates. The likely effects of a changing climate on the growth of *Sphagnum* during different seasons are discussed.

115 MATERIAL AND METHODS

116 Focal species

117 We chose three common and widespread *Sphagnum* species, typical of ombrotrophic bogs, as
118 our focal species. *S. angustifolium* (Russ.) C. Jens. (section Cuspidata) is a medium-sized
119 yellowish moss that grows most often in a loose form on the low hummocks and lawns of
120 marginal wooded edges of peatlands and paludified forests. *S. fuscum* (Schimp.) Klinggr.
121 (section Acutifolia) is a small brownish moss that forms tall compact hummocks in
122 ombrotrophic peatlands, where it is the main contributor to peat formation. *S. magellanicum*
123 Brid. (section Sphagnum) is a large red (in open habitats) or greenish (in the shade) moss.
124 This species forms low hummocks and extensive lawns in ombrotrophic and weakly
125 minerotrophic peatlands.

126

127 Study sites

128 We chose three ombrotrophic bogs along a circa 800-km latitudinal gradient as our study
129 sites: two bogs in Estonia and one in Finland (Figure 1). The southernmost of them, the
130 excentric Männikjärve bog, is located in Central Estonia, in the hemiboreal vegetation zone.
131 Pääsküla bog is situated in Northern Estonia, close to the city of Tallinn. Due to its proximity
132 to the Baltic Sea its climate is more maritime than at the other two sites. Most of this large
133 bog (946 ha) has been drained, but our sampling location is situated in the nearly pristine part
134 of the bog that accounts only for 10 ha. Likasuo bog is situated in Northwestern -Finland ~ 30
135 km to northeast from the Bothnian Bay and the city of Oulu. It belongs to a boreal vegetation
136 zone, and has a subarctic climate. Meteorological records of each study site were attained
137 from the Estonian Weather Service and from the Finnish Meteorological Institute (Table 1).
138 In general, all study sites have similar conditions: low pH (ca 4), electrical conductivity (EC <

50 $\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$) and the peat layer exceeding 2.5 m; however, the climatic conditions between the Estonian and Finnish sites clearly differ (Table 1).

At the beginning of our study in early autumn 2014 the water table at the lawn surfaces was on average similar at all sites: -19 cm in Männikjärve, -22 cm in Pääsküla and -16 cm in Likasuo. The annual fluctuation of the water table generally remains within 10 cm in open and within 20 cm in wooded parts of our bog sites, being the deepest in August and the highest in April.

In all sites, the tree cover varies from a few dozen Scots pines (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) per 100 m² in the marginal wooded bog microsite, to few scarce pines around the wet hollows (see for more from Küttim, Küttim, Puusepp & Sugita, 2016; and Lode et al., 2017). The ground vegetation in the wooded part of the bogs is dominated by species like *Ledum palustre* L., *Empetrum nigrum* L. subsp. *nigrum*, *Rubus chamaemorus* L., *Calluna vulgaris* L., *Andromeda polifolia* L. and *Eriophorum vaginatum* L. The open parts of the bogs are rather poor in vascular plant species with the dominance of *Trichophorum cespitosum* (L.) Hartm., *Rhynchospora alba* (L.) Vahl., *Ledum palustre* L., *Scheuchzeria palustris* L. and *Vaccinium oxycoccus* (L.). The moss layer is dominated by *Sphagnum angustifolium*, *S. magellanicum*, *S. fuscum* and *Pleurozium schreberii* (Brid.) Mitt. and J. Linn. in the wooded bog, and *S. magellanicum*, *S. fuscum*, *S. balticum* (Russ.) C. Jens. and *S. rubellum* Wils. in the open areas. In both of wooded and open bog, *Sphagnum* mosses have formed hummocks up to 40 cm. The hollows are inhabited by *S. cuspidatum* Ehrh. Ex Hoffm. in Estonian sites, and by *S. majus* (Russ.) C. Jens. and *S. lindbergii* Schimp. in Likasuo.

Study set-up and measurements

In each study site we established sample plots ($\varnothing = 50$ cm) into monocultures of *Sphagnum*

163 *angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* and *S. magellanicum*, 5 plots per species so that they covered the
164 microtopographic and tree cover gradients as evenly as possible. As the variation in Scots
165 pine cover was considerably higher in Männikjärve, we established 10 plots per species there.
166 Therefore, we had 60 plots in total. Microforms were distinguished according to their relative
167 height: hummock as a positive, hollow as a negative and lawn as a neutral microform. Their
168 relative height was measured from the bottom of the nearby deepest hollow. For the
169 temperatures at the moss surface (T_M), hourly recording temperature data loggers (Lascar
170 Electronics EL-1, UK; 12 loggers in total) were installed to the capitula level of the moss
171 layer of certain plots so to cover the variation in shading and microforms of the plots. T_M data
172 of the most similar logger-equipped plot in terms of shade and microform was applied to each
173 plot. Freeze-thaw cycles were counted according to these T_M data: in case of negative T_M in
174 the night and positive T_M value in the day-time, the cycle was counted to be present. The
175 shade of the vascular plants was evaluated by comparing the light intensity measured by the
176 luxmeter (Li-Cor Li-189, USA) on top of the moss layer and 1.5 m above it. Around the
177 sample plots, we measured tree height, shrub height and the distance of the sample plots from
178 the trees, and estimated canopy closure.

179 We used stainless steel cranked wires (Clymo 1970) to measure the linear increment of
180 mosses, as this is the only method enabling repeated growth measurements of the same
181 *Sphagnum* shoots. Three wires per plot were installed in late September – early October 2014
182 to each sample plot. The height increment of *Sphagnum* was measured (1) in late November
183 2014 before the first snow (autumnal growth); (2) in April 2015 after the snowmelt and
184 saturation of *Sphagnum* with melt water that indicated the recovery from the snowpack-
185 caused compaction (winter growth); and finally (3) in late September – early October 2015
186 (summer growth during the classical growing season; Supporting information 1). As some of
187 the cranked wires heated up in the summer and caused damage to the nearest mosses, the

measurements were implemented on the closest healthy looking shoots. At each visit, we took a 6 cm diameter moss sample from each plot using a plastic tube, trying to leave the surroundings of the wires intact. The sample was cut into two segments – capitulum (0-1 cm) and upper stem (1-3 cm). The shoots were counted and 30 shoots from both segments dried for 24 h at 65°C for *Sphagnum* biomass, bulk density and water content estimations.

We used about half of these dry *Sphagnum* samples (n = 31 per season, n = 93 in total) – covering all sites, species and the microtopographic variation – to analyse their nutrient (N, P, K) concentration from the two segments of *Sphagnum* shoots in a laboratory. From Pääsküla and Likasuo, three samples per species from different microforms (hummock, lawn, hollow) were analysed. In Männikjärve we had to consider higher variation in tree cover, and thus four samples of *S. angustifolium* and *S. fuscum*, and five samples of *S. magellanicum* were analysed for nutrients. N concentration was analysed according to Kjeldahl method (burning with H₂SO₄), dilution with water and measured by Kjeltec Auto 1030 analyser. P concentration was measured photometrically (720 nm) after wet ashing the samples. Ammonium lactate extractable method with flame photometry was used to determine the K concentration of *Sphagnum* capitula and upper stem.

In addition, we collected randomly approximately 10 shoots of *Sphagnum* from each sample plot for the chlorophyll concentration analyses at the end of each season. The samples were deep frozen shortly after collection. Chlorophyll concentrations from the two segments of *Sphagnum* were analysed using 80% acetone method (Porra, Thompson & Kriedemann, 1989) by measuring the absorbance at 470 nm, 647 nm, 664 nm and 750 nm by UV spectrophotometer Shimadzu UV-1800 (Japan).

Data analyses

212 Before the analyses, three estimates of the linear increment per sample plot were pooled. The
213 biomass production was calculated according to the linear increment, number of shoots per
214 unit area, and the bulk density of the upper stem. Throughout this paper, data are given as
215 mean values ± 1 standard error. Ecophysiological traits (linear increment and production,
216 concentrations of nutrients and chlorophyll-*a*) were analysed with generalised linear mixed
217 models (GLMM), with season, species and site as fixed factors. The same method was applied
218 to test the dependence of daily mean temperature on the capitula layer (T_M) on the study site,
219 tree cover, microtopography and *Sphagnum* species. Post-hoc differences were found by the
220 Tukey test.

221 To assess the effect of environmental and ecophysiological parameters on annual *Sphagnum*
222 growth in linear increment and biomass production we applied a two-step linear regression
223 models (Backeus, 1988). This approach was chosen due to a large amount of possible
224 parameters explaining the growth. Models were built separately for the linear increment and
225 biomass production of each species and season but combining all the sites. In the first
226 analysis, each environmental and ecophysiological parameter was treated separately as a
227 single predictor of *Sphagnum* growth in a simple linear regression. As a second step,
228 significant predictors at $p \leq 0.05$ level were entered to a multiple stepwise linear regression
229 with a forward selection. Separate models were performed for the linear increment and
230 biomass production of each species and season. All data analyses were performed by IBM
231 SPSS 20. The schematic map of the study sites was created by R 3.2.3 (R core team 2015),
232 using the package *maps*.

RESULTS

Microclimate of the habitats

The temperature regime of moss layer differed between sites, between microsites with contrasting tree cover, and somewhat between the *Sphagnum* species covering the ground, but not between the microforms (Figure 2). In general, mean annual moss temperature at the capitulum level (T_M) decreases along the south-north gradient (Figure 2). While the mean summer temperatures followed the same latitudinal pattern, winter temperatures fluctuated evenly around subzero temperatures at all sites. However, while the permanent snow cover maintained steady microclimate in Likasuo, numerous freeze-thaw cycles occurred at Männikjärve ($n = 91$) and Pääsküla ($n = 35$) due to intermittent snow melts. In autumn, ground temperatures at the northernmost site were significantly lower ($F_{2,147} = 24.8$; $p \leq 0.001$) than at the other sites.

Sphagnum biomass and growth

The standing biomass of all species generally increased northwards (Figure 3). *S. fuscum* had overwhelmingly the highest standing biomass – a twofold of the other species – and the highest shoot density as well. The biomass of *S. angustifolium* was of the same magnitude as *S. magellanicum*.

Considering all study sites and species, *Sphagnum* grew on average 19.5 ± 8.9 mm in length, and 200.4 ± 74.4 g m⁻² in biomass during the study period (Figure 3). Both linear increment and production varied greatly among the replicates. The inter-species differences in linear increment were significant and greater than between the site differences: *S. angustifolium* grew the most and *S. fuscum* the least at all sites ($p \leq 0.05$). The production, in contrast, showed almost no significant differences between the species and sites ($p > 0.05$) (Figure 3).

Although its linear increment was low, *S. fuscum* exhibited the greatest annual production. The linear increment and production were the greatest in summer in all cases, but considerable growth was measured also in autumn and in winter at all species and sites. Winter growth accounted for $12\pm6\%$ from the annual linear increment and $7\pm4\%$ from the production of *S. angustifolium*, $10\pm5\%$ and $4\pm3\%$ of *S. magellanicum*, and $18\pm13\%$ and $6\pm5\%$ of *S. fuscum*, respectively. The mean daily rates of linear increment in autumn often exceeded the increment in summer, depending on the site and species (Supporting information 2). The daily production, however, was always higher in summer than in autumn. Considering all species, the mean daily production in the autumn was in average 61% of the production rate in the summer.

We found species to differ in their seasonal growth rates as a response to differing site conditions: linear increment and production of *S. angustifolium* were annually the greatest in the northernmost site Likasuo, while both linear increment and production in the winter were greater at the Estonian sites (Figure 3). In contrast, both annual growth rates of *S. fuscum* were the greatest in the southernmost site Männikjärve, but the winter production was the greatest in Likasuo. The growth rates of *S. magellanicum* did not differ significantly between the sites ($p > 0.05$), being however slightly higher at the southernmost site.

Nutrient and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations

The nutrients and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations in *Sphagnum* capitula and stems were clearly species-specific ($p \leq 0.05$; Figure 4; Table 2). The average concentrations of N and P were the highest in *S. angustifolium* and the lowest in *S. fuscum*, whereas the K concentration was the highest in *S. angustifolium* and the lowest in *S. magellanicum*. The mean chlorophyll-*a* concentration, in contrast, was the highest in *S. fuscum* and the lowest in *S. angustifolium*.

Altogether, chlorophyll-*a* concentration varied greatly between species and sites ($p \leq 0.05$), but not so much between the seasons ($p \geq 0.05$; Figure 4; Table 2). The lowest nutrient concentrations in our *Sphagnum* samples were generally measured in April, and the highest in September (Figure 4). The N:P ratios were relatively large in Männikjärve (14-23) compared to those at the other sites (8-19), and exhibited a major variation (Supporting information 3). *S. fuscum* had relatively higher N:P ratios in capitula compared to other species. In the stem the inter-species differences in N:P ratios did not differ that clearly between the species and sites.

Controls of site conditions and ecophysiological properties on growth rates

Both linear increment and production of *Sphagnum* depended more on meteorological parameters than ecophysiological or microsite properties (Table 3 and 4). When considering annual growth rates, air temperature and a number of freeze-thaw cycles altered the linear increment and production of all species. Number of days with precipitation and capitula P concentration were common predictors for all linear increment models, and moss temperature, photoperiod and sum of precipitation for all production models. Capitula water content and shade were often important as well. Moreover, some factors affected *Sphagnum* growth only during certain seasons. For example, the shrub height and the depth and duration of snow, which were not significant for annual growth, became more important than temperature parameters in winter. The species differed in their response to some factors as well. For instance, while N concentration was related to the growth of *S. angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* was more dependent on K.

DISCUSSION

Annual *Sphagnum* growth

This study shows that the annual mean linear increment of *S. angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* and *S. magellanicum* was within the range of values previously measured in the Northern Europe (e.g., Ilomets, 1982; Laiho, Ojanen, Ilomets, Hajek & Tuittila, 2011; Laine et al., 2011; Lindholm & Vasander 1990) but somewhat greater than the average values (Supporting information 4). The higher linear increment compared to earlier studies is most likely related to the greater air temperatures and in the northernmost site, Likasuo, stimulated by the greater amount of precipitation in 2013/14 than in the previous years. Moreover, in our study, the annual production of *S. angustifolium* and *S. fuscum* – the species with a northern distribution (Robroek, Limpens, Breeuwer, & Schouten, 2007) – was above the global average, while the production of *S. magellanicum*, a cosmopolitan species, was below the global average (Gunnarsson 2005). Our study sites lie in the hemiboreal and boreal vegetation zones of Northern Europe, and thus were expected to be more favourable habitats for *S. angustifolium* and *S. fuscum* than for *S. magellanicum*.

Similarly to Breeuwer et al. (2010), we found the differences in growth to be species-specific so that only the growth of *S. angustifolium* increased northwards along the latitudinal climate gradient. The higher temperatures southwards may restrict the availability of water through increased evaporation (Breeuwer, Heijmans, Robroek, & Berendse, 2008), and thus might not always facilitate *Sphagnum* growth. Indeed, as the growth rates were greater in the northernmost site only in the summer, the differences between the sites can be explained by the severe desiccation of *S. angustifolium* already in mid-May at the southern sites, where the evaporation is higher and the precipitation less abundant than in Likasuo. *S. angustifolium* has much lower water holding capacity than *S. magellanicum* and especially *S. fuscum* (Elumeeva, Soudzilovskaia, During & Cornelissen, 2011; Robroek et al., 2009), making it

more prone to desiccate and consequently less stressed in the northernmost site. Also, it is possible that *S. angustifolium* took advantage on longer daylight in Likasuo, which according to Li & Glime (1991) can increase the growth speed of *Sphagnum* at the northern areas. While the longer photoperiod appeared to enhance linear increment and production of *Sphagnum* in our study, our data gives also some support to Dorrepaal et al. (2004) that the increased snow cover can facilitate the production of Sphagna. Some previous studies (eg. Genet, Oberbauer, Colby, Staudhammer & Starr, 2013) suggest that declines in winter snow cover can reduce the *Sphagnum* growth in summer, and relate it to increased number of freeze-thaw cycles and prolonged frost. Whilst the depth of snow cover increased the linear increment, and the number of snow covered days increased the biomass productivity during the winter in our study, the impact of snow was, however, not significant for the annual growth rates. Nevertheless, the number of freeze-thaw cycles decreased both annual linear increment and production in our study. Thus, the results of this study confirm our earlier conclusion (Küttim, Laine, Küttim, Ilomets & Robroek, 2019) that the negative effect of freeze-thaw cycles on moss physiology in winter and spring may cascade to the rest of the growing season. The physiological stress can be relieved by abundant precipitation (Küttim et al., 2019; Nijp et al., 2014), but if input of snowmelt water is minor due to reductions in snow cover, *Sphagnum* desiccates and its growth is likely to be suppressed.

Winter growth

During the winter the metabolic rates of plants are reduced by the cold. Some plants, such as *Fragaria vesca* L. and *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* L. continue physiological processes and development under snow, however (Åström, Metsovuori, Saarinen, Lundell & Hänninen, 2015; Crawford 2014; Halfpenny & Ozanne, 1989; Lundell, Saarinen, Åström & Hänninen, 2008;). Our study confirmed that *Sphagnum* mosses have the ability for year-around growth.

The average winter growth in our sites was ~10 % and ~5 % from the annual linear increment and production, respectively.

The conditions during the winter, which allow growth and most strongly affect it, are the occurrence of above-zero temperatures, liquid water and the availability of light adequate for photosynthesis; all these factors are linked to the existence of snow cover. Bryophytes are evolutionally regarded as shade plants (Marchall & Proctor, 2004) that are most abundant and species-rich in cold and humid environments. Accordingly, they cope well in low-light environments (Glime, 2017). The snowpack provides dark and cool, but stable and moist conditions that are suitable for the growth of *Sphagnum*. Likewise for some vascular plants (Lundell et al., 2008), the thick snow cover enables increased winter activity. Our result that the shrubs enhance the linear increment and production of nearby *Sphagnum* in the winter points to the ability of these shrubs to trap snow and increase the height of the insulating snow cover. Although we have not enough evidence to prove it, probably these mosses are able to photosynthesize under snow as well. Gabersčik & Martinčič (1987) have reported *Sphagnum* photosynthesis to last until February, when it ceased completely. Indeed, the late winter is most likely the time when the frost has penetrated the snow, and consequently *Sphagnum* activity halts.

Despite the difference in snow cover, the winter growth was apparent and rather similar at all sites. We found that the snow cover had a unimodal effect on moss layer temperature: during the winter the snow maintained steady subzero temperature at our northernmost site, but during autumn and spring, compared to the two southern sites, snow cover suppressed the moss surface warm-up. The peat layer has a high thermal capacity and accumulates energy during the warm period, while snow cover is a fine thermal isolation (Federer, 1965). Consequently, heat flow from the peat layer initiates the long-lasting slow thaw rate at the snow-soil interface (Federer 1965; Nagare, Schincariol, Quinton & Hayashi, 2012) with

ground temperatures at our northernmost site typically around the freezing point from November until late-April (but yet with some periods of frost; Figure 2).

At the two southern sites, the impersistent snow cover exposed the ground to the freeze-thaw cycles, but also enabled the ground to warm up a month earlier than in the northern site. There are indications that freeze-thaw cycles are harmful for plants (e.g., Min, Chen & Arora, 2014; Schmitt, Schramm, Pfanz, Coughlan & Heber, 1985). In the current study, the winter growth of *Sphagnum* was, however, only to some extent compromised by the regular freeze-thaw cycles. Although the linear increment and production of all species were significantly decreased by freeze-thaw cycles, the growth rates in the southern sites were similar to those measured at northern site with continuous snow cover. This is probably due to the ability of bryophytes to take advantage on the intermittent warm periods of winter, and use it for active growth after relatively rapid recovery. Although the photosynthetic capacity and chlorophyll concentration of *Sphagnum* declines due to freeze-thaw cycles (Küttim et al., 2017), the recovery seems to be faster than in case of vascular plants. Indeed, with relatively high concentrations of fatty acid derivatives and phenylpropanoids, soluble sugars and abscisic acid, bryophytes are usually more freezing tolerant than vascular plants (Glime, 2017). Moreover, bryophytes have no roots (Rydin & Jeglum, 2013) and therefore are not so dependent on the ground frost that postpones the metabolic activity of most of the vascular plants (Glime, 2017).

Environmental and ecophysiological control over *Sphagnum* growth

The present investigation has demonstrated the paramount importance of meteorological parameters on *Sphagnum* growth rather than ecophysiological or microsite properties. Our study confirms the comprehension that the precipitation and temperatures exceeding the

melting point are the prerequisites and best explanators of *Sphagnum* growth (Breeuwer, Heijmans, Gleichman, Robroek & Berendse, 2009; Grabovik & Nazarova, 2013; Krebs et al., 2016; Nijp et al., 2014), while low quantities of nutrients are tolerated by the *Sphagnum* species of ombrotrophic peatlands (Wang, Larmola, Murphy, Moore & Bubier, 2016). The impact of temperature seems to be subordinate to moisture conditions as also Dorrepaal et al. (2004) showed that higher mean air temperature will not increase *Sphagnum* growth if low capitula water content is limiting growth. Indeed, our results also point to the importance of indirect factors that alter the moisture balance of *Sphagnum*, such as shading and snow depth.

Conclusions

We detected significant linear increment and production of all our focal species in winter. The growth rate in winter was related to several factors, particularly to sum of precipitation, the presence of snow and the number of freeze-thaw cycles. While the predicted decline in snow cover in Northern Europe is likely to increase the number of freeze-thaw cycles – a major stress for mosses – the results of modelling (Jylhä et al., 2004) predict an increase in sums of precipitation – particularly in winter – that relieve the stress and facilitate *Sphagnum* performance (Krebs et al., 2016; Nijp et al., 2014). Although there is much uncertainty in precipitation predictions, its increase is likely to balance the increased evaporation, leaving the possible water level drawdown rather minor (Laine et al., 2019). Higher precipitation frequency that shifts from summer to winter (Jylhä et al., 2004) is likely to change the annual *Sphagnum* growth pattern as well (Nijp et al., 2014), thus increasing the *Sphagnum* growth and its overall share from the annual growth rates in winter.

In addition to changes in winter, climate change has prolonged the autumn, as the air temperatures have increased the most in the cold season, and the increased amounts of

precipitation come more often as rain, not snow (Jylhä et al., 2004; Lode et al., 2017). The cool, wet and cloudy weather is inherent to the autumn in Northern Europe and is at the same time favourable for *Sphagnum* mosses. Our results demonstrate the high growth rates of Northern European *Sphagnum* species during the autumn. Moreover, we observed often higher mean daily growth rates in the autumn than in the summer, indicating more suitable conditions for growth during autumn. Longer autumns induced by climate change are seen negative for carbon sequestration capacity of most ecosystems as most vascular plants cannot respond to longer autumns by increased photosynthesis (Halfpenny & Ozanne, 1989; Korrensalo, Hájek, Vesala, Mehtätalo & Tuittila, 2016; Zhaojun et al., 2011), but at the same time the warmer soil enhances the respiration rates (Dorrepaal et al., 2009; Zhaojun et al., 2011). Taken together, carbon storage would decrease under those scenarios. In *Sphagnum*-dominated peatlands the situation is somewhat different as *Sphagnum* can be active whenever conditions are suitable for them. Thus, even though *Sphagnum* production in autumn and winter may not balance soil carbon emissions, the overall active period and rate of growth are more stable than in plant communities dominated by vascular plants; therefore, the effects of climate change on the carbon sink of *Sphagnum*-dominated peatlands are likely to appear modest. Still, our assumption holds as long as hydrological conditions allow *Sphagnum* to stay the major component of the vegetation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Centre of Excellence “Natural Sciences and Sustainable Development” at Tallinn University, by the Estonian Doctoral School of Earth Sciences and Ecology, by the Archmedes Foundation (Dora programme), and by the Estonian Science Foundation (grant 9070). MK and LK were supported by the Institutional Grant “Enchanted” (IUT 18-9). Kone Foundation and the Academy of Finland (project code 287039) supported AML. The valuable comments on the manuscript by Shinya Sugita are acknowledged. A special thanks to Laimi Truus and Mikko Petäjäkangas for field assistance, to Mai Olesk (Estonian University of Life Sciences) for conducting the laboratory analyses of nutrient concentrations, and to Marju Merila (Weather Service of Estonia) for providing the environmental data.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Asada, T., Warner, B.G., & Banner, A. (2003). Growth of mosses in relation to climate factors in a hypermaritime coastal peatland in British Columbia, Canada. *The Bryologist* 106, 516–527.
- Åström, H., Metsovuori, E., Saarinen, T., Lundell, R., & Hänninen, H. (2015). Morphological characteristics and photosynthetic capacity of *Fragaria vesca* L. winter and summer leaves. *Flora* 215, 33–39. doi: 10.1016/j.flora.2015.07.001.
- Backeus, I. (1988). Weather variables as predictors of *Sphagnum* growth on a bog. *Holarctic*

467 Ecology 11, 146–150.

468 Bombonato, L. & Gerdol, R. (2012). Manipulating snow cover in an alpine bog: effects on
 469 ecosystem respiration and nutrient content in soil and microbes. *Climatic Change* 114, 261–
 470 272. doi: 10.1007/s10584-012-0405-9.

471 Breeuwer, A., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Robroek, B.J.M., & Berendse, F. (2008). The effect of
 472 temperature on growth and competition between *Sphagnum* species. *Oecologia* 156, 155–167.
 473 doi: 10.1007/s00442-008-0963-8.

474 Breeuwer, A., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Gleichman, M., Robroek, B.J.M., & Berendse, F. (2009).
 475 Response of *Sphagnum* species mixtures to increased temperature and nitrogen availability.
 476 *Plant Ecology* 204, 97–111. doi: 10.1007/s11258-009-9571-x.

477 Breeuwer, A., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Robroek, B.J.M., & Berendse, F. (2010). Field Simulation
 478 of Global Change: Transplanting Northern Bog Mesocosms Southward. *Ecosystems* 13, 712–
 479 726. doi: 10.1007/s10021-010-9349-y.

480 Clymo, R.S. (1970). The growth of *Sphagnum*: methods of measurement. *Journal of Ecology*
 481 58, 13–49. doi: 10.2307/2258168.

482 Clymo, R.S. & Hayward, P.M. (1982). The ecology of *Sphagnum*. In: Smith, A.J.E. (Ed.),
 483 *Bryophyte Ecology* (pp. 229–289). Chapman and Hall, London,

484 Crawford, R.M.M. (2014). Plant survival in cold habitats. In: Crawford, R.M.M (Ed.),
 485 *Tundra-taiga biology* (pp. 146–163). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

486 Dorrepaal, E., Aerts, R., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Callaghan, T.V., & van Logtestijn, R.S.P. (2004).
 487 Summer warming and increased winter snow cover affect *Sphagnum fuscum* growth, structure
 488 and production in a sub-arctic bog. *Global Change Biology* 10, 93–104. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
 489 2486.2003.00718.x.

490 Dorrepaal, E., Toet, S., van Logtestijn, R.S.P., Swart, E., van de Weg, M.J., Callaghan, T.V., &
491 Aerts, R. (2009). Carbon respiration from subsurface peat accelerated by climate warming in
492 the subarctic. *Nature* 460, 616–619. doi: 10.1038/nature08216.

493 Elumeeva T. G., Soudzilovskaia N. A., During H. J., & Cornelissen J. H. C. (2011). The
494 importance of colony structure versus shoot morphology for the water balance of 22 subarctic
495 bryophyte species. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 22, 152–164.

496 Federer, C.A. (1965). Sustain winter streamflow from groundmelt. USDA Forest Service
497 Research Note NE-41, 1–4.

498 Gaberščik, A. & Martinčič, A. (1987). Seasonal dynamics of net photosynthesis and
499 productivity of *Sphagnum papillosum*. *Lindbergia* 13, 105–110.

500 Genet, H., Oberbauer, S.F., Colby, S.J., Staudhammer, C.L., & Starr, G. (2013). Growth
501 responses of *Sphagnum* hollows to a growing season lengthening manipulation in Alaskan
502 Arctic tundra. *Polar Biology* 36, 41–50. doi: 10.1007/s00300-012-1236-x.

503 Gerdol, R. (1995). The growth dynamics of *Sphagnum* based on field measurements in a
504 temperate bog and on laboratory cultures. *Journal of Ecology* 83, 431–437. doi:
505 10.2307/2261596.

506 Gerdol, R. (1996). The seasonal growth pattern of *Sphagnum magellanicum* Brid. in different
507 microhabitats on a mire in the southern Alps (Italy). *Oecologia Montana* 5(1), 13–20.

508 Glime, J.M. (2017). *Bryophyte Ecology*. Ebook. IAB, Michigan.

509 Grabovik, S.I. & Nazarova, L.E. (2013). Linear increment of *Sphagnum* mosses on Karelian
510 mires (Russia). *Arctoa* 22, 23–26.

511 Gunnarsson, U. (2005). Global patterns of *Sphagnum* productivity. *Journal of Bryology* 27,
512 269–279. doi: 10.1179/174328205X70029.

513 Hajek, T. (2014). Physiological Ecology of Peatland Bryophytes. In: Hanson, D.T., & Rice,
 514 S.K. (Eds.), *Photosynthesis in Bryophytes and Early Land Plants* (pp. 233-252). Springer,
 515 Dordrecht.

516 Halfpenny, J.C. & Ozanne, R.D. (1989). Winter. An ecological handbook. Johnson Books,
 517 Boulder, Colorado.

518 Hulme, P.D. & Blyth, A.W. (1982). The annual growth period of some *Sphagnum* species on
 519 the Silver Flowe National Nature Reserve, south-west Scotland. *Lindbergia* 13, 105–110.

520 Ilomets, M. (1982). The productivity of the *Sphagnum* communities and the rate of peat
 521 accumulation in Estonian bogs. In: Masing, V. (Ed.), Estonian contributions to the
 522 international biological programme No. 9 (pp. 102-116). Valgus, Tallinn.

523 Jylhä, K., Tuomenvirta, H., & Ruosteenoja, K. (2004). Climate change projections for Finland
 524 during the 21st century. *Boreal Environment Research* 9, 127–152. Korrensalo, A., Hájek, T.,
 525 Vesala, T., Mehtätalo, L., & Tuittila, E.-S. (2016). Variation in photosynthetic properties
 526 among bog plants. *Botany* 94, 1127–1139. doi: 10.1139/cjb-2016-0117.

527 Krebs, M., Gaudig, G., & Joosten, H. 2016. Record growth of *Sphagnum papillosum* in
 528 Georgia (Transcaucasus): rain frequency, temperature and microhabitat as key drivers in
 529 natural bogs. *Mires and Peat* 18, 1-16. doi: 10.19189/MaP.2015.OMB.190.

530 Küttim, L., Küttim, M., Puusepp, L., & Sugita, S. (2016). The effects of ecotope,
 531 microtopography and environmental variables on diatom assemblages in hemiboreal bogs in
 532 Northern Europe. *Hydrobiologia* 792, 137–149. doi: 10.1007/s10750-016-3050-x.

533 Küttim, M., Hofsommer, M.L., Robroek, B.J.M., Signarbieux, C., Jassey, V.E.J., Laine, A.M.,
 534 Lamentowicz, M., Buttler, A., Ilomets, M., & Mills, R.T.E. (2017). Freeze-thaw cycles
 535 simultaneously decrease peatland photosynthetic carbon uptake and ecosystem respiration.
 536 *Boreal Environment Research* 22, 267–276.

537 Küttim, M., Laine, A.M., Küttim, L., Ilomets, M., & Robroek, B.J.M. (2019). Winter climate
 538 change increases physiological stress in calcareous fen bryophytes. *Science of the Total*
 539 *Environment* 695, 133867. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.133867.

540 Laiho, R., Ojanen, P., Ilomets, M., Hajek, T., & Tuittila, E.-S. (2011). Moss production in a
 541 boreal, forestry-drained peatland. *Boreal Environment Research* 16, 441–449.

542 Laine, A.M., Juurola, E., Hajek, T., & Tuittila, E.-S. (2011). *Sphagnum* growth and
 543 ecophysiology during mire succession. *Oecologia* 167, 1115–1125. doi: 10.1007/s00442-011-
 544 2039-4

545 Laine, A.M., Mäkiranta, P., Laiho, R., Mhtätalo, L., Penttilä, T., Korrensalo, A., Minkkinen,
 546 K., Fritze, H. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2019). Warming impacts on boreal fen CO₂ exchange under
 547 wet and dry conditions. *Global Change Biology* 1-14. doi: 10.1111/gcb.14617

548 Li, Y. & Glime, J.M. (1991). Growth response of two *Sphagnum* species to photoperiod.
 549 *Canadian Journal of Botany* 69, 2643–2646.

550 Lindholm, T. (1990). Growth dynamics of the peat moss *Sphagnum fuscum* hummocks on a
 551 raised bog in southern Finland. *Annales Botanici Fennici* 27, 67–78.

552 Lindholm, T., & Vasander, H. (1990). Production of eight species of *Spahgnum* at Suurisuo
 553 mire, southern Finland. *Annales Botanici Fennici* 27, 145-157.

554 Lode, E., Küttim, M., & Kiivit, I.-K. (2017). Indicative effects of climate change on
 555 groundwater levels in Estonian raised bogs over 50 years. *Mires and Peat* 19, 1-21. doi:
 556 10.19189/MaP.2016.OMB.255.

557 Lundell, R., Saarinen, T., Aström, H., & Hänninen, H. (2008). The boreal dwarf shrub
 558 *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* retains its capacity for photosynthesis through the winter. *Botany* 86,
 559 491–500. doi: 10.1139/B08-022.

560 Lütt, S. (1992). Produktionsbiologische Untersuchungen zur Sukzession der
 561 Torfstichvegetation in Schleswig-Holstein. Mitteilungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Geobotanik
 562 in Schleswig-Holstein und Hamburg 43. AG Floristik, Kiel. (in German).

563 Maanavilja, L., Kangas, L., Mehtätalo, L., & Tuittila, E.-S. (2015). Rewetting of drained
 564 boreal spruce swamp forests results in rapid recovery of *Sphagnum* production. Journal of
 565 Applied Ecology 52, 1355–1363. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12474.

566 Makoto, K., Kajimoto, T., Koyama, L., Kudo, G., Shibata, H., Yanai, Y., & Cornelissen, J. H.
 567 C. (2014). Winter climate change in plant–soil systems: summary of recent findings and
 568 future perspectives. Ecological Research, 29, 593–606. doi: 10.1007/s11284-013-1115-0.

569 Marschall, M., & Proctor, M.C.F. (2004). Are Bryophytes Shade Plants? Photosynthetic Light
 570 Responses and Proportions of Chlorophyll a, Chlorophyll b and Total Carotenoids. Annals of
 571 Botany 94, 593–603. doi:10.1093/aob/mch178.

572 Min, K., Chen, K., & Arora, R. (2014). Effect of short-term versus prolonged freezing on
 573 freeze–thaw injury and post-thaw recovery in spinach: importance in laboratory freeze–thaw
 574 protocols. Environmental and Experimental Botany 106, 124–131. doi:
 575 10.1016/j.envexpbot.2014.01.009.

576 Nagare, R.M., Schincariol, R.A., Quinton, W.L., & Hayashi, M. (2012). Effects of freezing on
 577 soil temperature, freezing front propagation and moisture redistribution in peat: laboratory
 578 investigations. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 16, 501–515. doi: 10.5194/hess-16-501-
 579 2012.

580 Nijp, J.J., Limpens, J., Metselaar, K., van der Zee, S.E.A.T.M., Berendse, F., & Robroek,
 581 B.J.M. (2014). Can frequent precipitation moderate the impact of drought on peatmoss carbon
 582 uptake in northern peatlands? New Phytologist 203, 70-80. doi: 10.1111/nph.1279.

583 Porra, R.J., Thompson, W.A., & Kriedemann, P.E. (1989). Determination of accurate

584 extinction coefficients and simultaneous equations for assaying chlorophylls a and b extracted
585 with four different solvents: verification of the concentration of chlorophyll standards by
586 atomic absorption spectroscopy. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 975, 384–394. doi:
587 10.1016/S0005-2728(89)80347-0.

588 R Core Team (2015) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
589 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>

590 Robroek, B.J.M., Limpens, J., Breeuwer, A., & Schouten, M.G.C. (2007). Effects of water
591 level and temperature on performance of four *Sphagnum* mosses. *Plant Ecology* 190, 97–107.
592 doi: 10.1007/s11258-006-9193-5.

593 Robroek, B.J.M., Schouten, M.G.C., Limpens, J., Berendse, F., & Poorter, H. (2009).
594 Interactive effects of water table and precipitation on net CO₂ assimilation of three co-
595 occurring *Sphagnum* mosses differing in distribution above the water table. *Global Change*
596 *Biology* 15, 680–691. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01724.x.

597 Rydin, H. & Jeglum, J.K. (2013). *The Biology of Peatlands*, 2nd edn. Oxford University
598 Press, Oxford.

599 Schmitt, J.M., Schramm, M.J., Pfanz, H., Coughlan, S., & Heber, U. (1985). Damage to
600 chloroplast membranes during dehydration and freezing. *Cryobiology* 22, 93–104. doi:
601 10.1016/0011-2240(85)90012-4.

602 Templer, P.H. (2012). Changes in winter climate: soil frost, root injury, and fungal
603 communities. *Plant and Soil* 353, 15–17. doi: 10.1007/s11104-011-1064-8.

604 Van Breemen, N. (1995). How *Sphagnum* bogs down other plants. *Trends in Ecology and*
605 *Evolution* 10, 270–275. doi: 10.1016/0169-5347(95)90007-1.

606 Vitt, D.H. (1990). Growth and production dynamics of boreal mosses over climatic, chemical
607 and topographic gradients. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 104, 35–59. doi:

608 10.1111/j.1095-8339.1990.tb02210.x.

609 Wang, M., Larmola, T., Murphy, M.T., Moore, T.R., & Bubier, J.L. (2016). Stoichiometric
610 response of shrubs and mosses to long-term nutrient (N, P and K) addition in an ombrotrophic
611 peatland. *Plant and Soil* 400, 403–416. doi: 10.1007/s11104-015-2744-6.

612 Yazaki, T., & Yabe, K. (2012). Effects of snow-load and shading by vascular plants on the
613 vertical growth of hummocks formed by *Sphagnum papillosum* in a mire of northern Japan.
614 *Plant Ecology* 213, 1055–1067. doi: 10.1007/s11258-012-0065-x.

615 Zhaojun, B., Joosten, H., Hongkai, L., Gaolin, Z., Xingxing, Z., Jinze, M., & Jing, Z. (2011).
616 The response of peatlands to climate warming: A review. *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 31, 157–162.

Table 1. The prevailing annual mean environmental conditions at the study sites during the study period (2014/15) and preceding years (2007/08 – 2013/14). Meteorological records are provided by the Estonian Weather Service and the Finnish Meteorological Institute. Daylight durations are downloaded from timeanddate.com. According to the timing of the study the annual data is from 1 October to 30 September of the following year.

	Männikjärve		Pääsküla		Likasuo	
Coordinates	N 58° 52'; E 26° 14'		N 59° 21'; E 24° 39'		N 65°07'; E 26°00'	
Elevation above the sea level (m)	78		36		60	
Area (ha)	320		10		78	
	Mean	2014/15	Mean	2014/15	Mean	2014/15
Air temperature (°C)	5.83	6.33	6.3	7.57	2.22	2.99
Winter air temperature (Dec.-Feb.; °C)	-5.24	-1.91	-3.45	-0.34	-9.33	-6.53
Sum of precipitation (mm)	736	613	734	589	571	735
Days with precipitation	194	180	182	184	151	183
Days with snow cover	121	106	109	76	170	188
Mean snow depth (cm)	28	6	15	4	33	34
Daylight time (Jun 24)	04:06 – 22:24 (18:17 h)		04:04 – 22:42 (18:39 h)		02:20 – 00:20 (22:00 h)	
Daylight time (Dec 24)	09:01 – 15:23 (06:22 h)		09:18 – 15:22 (06:03 h)		10:29 – 14:05 (03:36 h)	
Distance to the meteorological station (km)	0.8		6.5		52.8	

Table 2. The ANOVA results of the generalised linear mixed models (GLMM) on the effect of season, species and study site on the (a) *Sphagnum* growth and on the (b) N, P, K and chlorophyll-*a* concentration in the *Sphagnum* capitula (apical 0-1 cm) and stem (1-3 cm from the top)

(a) *Sphagnum* growth

Factor	df	Linear growth			Production		
		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>P-Hoc</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>P-Hoc</i>
Season	2	121.1	0.001	All differ	146.5	0.001	All differ
Species	2	31.4	0.001	All differ	0.7	0.511	None differ
Site	2	2.1	0.126	None differ	1.5	0.229	None differ
Season * Species	4	8.0	0.001		0.5	0.731	
Season * Site	4	1.6	0.290		0.4	0.775	
Species * Site	4	1.9	0.110		0.6	0.640	
Season * Species * Site	8	1.6	0.128		1.0	0.425	
R²			0.718			0.698	

(b) Nutrients and chlorophyll-*a*

b) Nutrients and chlorophyll-*a*

		N		P		K		Chlorophyll- <i>a</i>		
	Factor	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Capitula	Season	2	6.3	0.004	19.7	0.001	1.3	0.274	0.8	0.434
	Species	5	15.4	0.001	24.2	0.001	12.8	0.001	3.1	0.016
	Site	2	16.3	0.001	30.9	0.001	1.1	0.330	3.4	0.039
	Season * Species	7	1.2	0.309	4.2	0.001	2.1	0.063	1.5	0.163
	Season * Site	4	1.4	0.237	14.4	0.001	17.1	0.001	7.7	0.001
	Species * Site	5	18.2	0.001	5.0	0.001	1.7	0.149	1.1	0.373
	Season * Species * Site	10	1.9	0.061	2.1	0.045	4.3	0.001	1.0	0.477
	R²			0.798		0.885		0.830		0.594
Stem	Season	2	34.5	0.001	14.4	0.001	10.9	0.001	0.5	0.601
	Species	5	25.6	0.001	16.9	0.001	40.6	0.001	3.4	0.041
	Site	2	1.3	0.273	10.4	0.001	3.5	0.038	14.2	0.001
	Season * Species	7	13.5	0.001	1.5	0.202	1.5	0.230	2.9	0.030
	Season * Site	4	3.5	0.013	7.6	0.001	11.9	0.001	7.8	0.001
	Species * Site	5	1.2	0.315	3.6	0.002	1.7	0.166	0.2	0.938
	Season * Species * Site	10	1.4	0.196	0.9	0.554	2.7	0.015	0.5	0.855
	R²			0.816		0.832		0.804		0.590

Table 3. The results of the simple linear regression models on the environmental control over *Sphagnum* growth in length (Lin.) and biomass production (Prod.). At first, tests are carried out for full data set over the annual study period (October 2014 – September 2015). Secondly, the study period is divided into Autumn (October – November), Winter (December – April) and Summer (May–September). Thirdly, the tests are performed separately for the three species: *Sphagnum angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* and *S. magellanicum*. ↑ indicates positive and ↓ negative regression; dark grey indicates significance at 0.001 level and light grey at 0.05 level; relations with white background are not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$)

		Seasonally								Species-wise					
		All		Autumn		Winter		Summer		S.ang.		S.fusc.		S.mag.	
Factor		Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.	Lin.	Prod.
Meteorology	Air temperature (T_{Air})	↑	↑	↑	↑			↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
	Moss temperature (T_M)	↑	↑	↑	↑			↑	↑	↑	↑		↑	↑	↑
	Sum of precipitation (Psum)		↑	↑	↑	↑		↑	↑		↑	↑			↑
	Days with precipitation (Pdays)	↑		↑	↑			↑	↑	↑		↑		↑	
	Freeze-thaw cycles (FTC)	↓	↓			↓	↓			↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	Photoperiod (PP)	↑	↑			↑				↑	↑		↑	↑	↑
	Mean snow depth (MSD)					↑									
	Days with snow cover (Sdays)						↑								
Ecophysiology	Capitulum	Water content (WCc)	↑		↑	↑			↑	↑		↑			
		Standing biomass	↑	↑	↑										
		N concentration (Nc)	↑					↑		↑	↑				
		P concentration (Pc)	↑					↑		↑		↑		↑	
		K concentration (Kc)	↑	↑	↑	↑						↑	↑		
		N:P ratio	↓					↓							
		K:P ratio													
		Chlorophyll- <i>a</i> concentration										↑			
	Stem	Water content (WCs)				↑			↑			↑			
		Standing biomass		↑	↑				↑						
N concentration (Ns)															
P concentration (Ps)		↑		↑			↑								
K concentration (Ks)															
N:P ratio		↓					↓								
K:P ratio					↑	↑									
Chlorophyll- <i>a</i> concentration		↑								↑	↑				
Microsite	Shoot density	↑	↑	↑				↑	↑						
	Relative height of microform							↓							
	Shade	↑	↑	↑	↑		↓	↑						↑	
	Tree canopy closure			↑		↑									
	Tree height														
	Shrub height (SH)					↑	↑	↑							
	Distance from trees					↓									

Table 4. The results of the final multiple stepwise linear regression models on the environmental control over *Sphagnum* growth in length (Lin.) and biomass (Prod.) over the annual study period (October 2014 – September 2015). Regression models are calculated both on species-wise and seasonal basis. The abbreviations for predictors are the same as in Table 3.

Species	Growth	R ²	p	F	df	Predictors with <i>p</i> -values
<i>S.angustifolium</i>	Lin.	0.820	0.001	28.88	3,19	Pdays (0.001), PP (0.001), T _M (0.016)
	Prod.	0.823	0.001	30.97	3,20	Psum (0.001), PP (0.001), T _M (0.039)
<i>S.fuscum</i>	Lin.	0.707	0.001	15.29	3,19	WCc (0.005), T _{Air} (0.009), Pdays (0.029)
	Prod.	0.622	0.001	95.30	1,58	T _M (0.001)
<i>S.magellanicum</i>	Lin.	0.651	0.001	53.16	2,57	Pdays (0.001), PP (0.001)
	Prod.	0.718	0.001	28.06	3,56	Psum (0.004), PP (0.041), T _M (0.048)
Season						
Autumn	Lin.	0.429	0.009	6.39	2,17	Kc (0.020), Shade (0.039)
	Prod.	0.469	0.001	13.25	2,30	Shade (0.001), WCc (0.014)
Winter	Lin.	0.359	0.001	10.09	1,18	MSD (0.005)
	Prod.	0.295	0.001	8.77	2,42	Shade (0.002), SH (0.004)
Summer	Lin.	0.286	0.001	7.21	1,18	Pc (0.015)
	Prod.	0.347	0.001	9.25	1,31	WCc (0.005)
All	Lin.	0.670	0.001	31.98	4,63	Pdays (0.001), PP (0.001), Pc (0.001), FTC (0.020)
	Prod.	0.573	0.001	47.7	2,71	T _M (0.001), Shade (0.012)

Figure captions:

Fig. 1. Locations of the study sites: Männikjärve (M), Pääsküla (P) and Likasuo (L) bogs.

Fig. 2. The average daily temperatures on the capitula level of the moss layer (T_M) at the study sites during the annual study period (Oct. 2014 – Oct. 2015) by its (a) daily dynamics and (b) among its seasonal ranges. The ANOVA results of the generalised linear mixed models (GLMM) on the effect of the study site, microform, *Sphagnum* species and tree cover on the daily T_M according to the temperature loggers ($n = 12$) are added.

Fig. 3. The growth in (a) length and (b) biomass of *Sphagnum angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* and *S. magellanicum* during one year: during the autumn, winter and summer (exact periods given in Supporting information 1). (c) Standing biomass and (d) shoot density of the focal species are given for the end of the measuring period. Statistical difference between the species is indicated by asterisks, and between the sites by letters ($p < 0.05$). Different number of asterisks or different letter indicates statistical difference between the species and between the sites. Data are mean values ± 1 standard error.

Fig. 4. The concentrations of (a) nitrogen, (b) phosphorus, (c) potassium and (d) chlorophyll-*a* in the capitula and stem of *Sphagnum angustifolium*, *S. fuscum* and *S. magellanicum* in our study sites. Concentrations were measured at the end of each season. Data are mean values ± 1 standard error.

673

674

676

677

679

680

681 **Supporting information for the manuscript “Controls of *Sphagnum* growth and the role**
682 **of winter” by Martin Küttim et al.**

Supporting information 1. The dates when the *Sphagnum* growth was measured, and the length of *Sphagnum* growth periods at each site

	Männikjärve		Pääsküla		Likasuo	
	Sampling date	Period (days)	Sampling date	Period (days)	Sampling date	Period (days)
Set-up	01/10/14		02/10/14		25/09/14	
Autumn growth	21/11/14	51	23/11/14	52	13/11/14	49
Winter growth	07/04/15	137	08/04/15	136	23/04/15	161
Summer growth	18/09/15	164	17/09/15	162	04/10/15	164
Total period		352		350		374

Supporting information 2. The mean daily linear increment and production rates of *Sphagnum* during the autumn, winter and summer, with the ANOVA results of the generalised linear mixed models (GLMM) on the effect of season, species and study site on the daily values of *Sphagnum* growth. Data are mean values $\pm$ 1 standard error.

Supporting information 3. The N:P:K ratios in the capitula (apical 0-1 cm) and stem (1-3 cm from the top) of *Sphagnum angustifolium* (*S.ang.*), *S. fuscum* (*S.fusc.*) and *S. magellanicum* (*S.mag.*) at the field sites three times at the time of *Sphagnum* growth measurements: before winter (November 2014), after winter (April 2015), and at the end of the summer (September 2015). In the last columns are given the changes during the winter and during the summer in the N:P:K ratios.

			November			April			September			Winter change			Summer change			
Site	Sp.	n	N	P	K	N	P	K	N	P	K	N	P	K	N	P	K	
Capitula	Männik-järve	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	14	1	8	15	1	7	14	1	15	1	0	-1	-1	0	7
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	5	22	1	12	23	1	10	18	1	14	1	0	-2	-5	0	4
		<i>S.mag.</i>	5	15	1	7	18	1	7	16	1	6	3	0	0	-2	0	-1
	Pääs-küla	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	10	1	7	12	1	7	12	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	-1
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	3	11	1	6	15	1	7	17	1	7	4	0	1	2	0	0
		<i>S.mag.</i>	3	10	1	5	14	1	5	13	1	6	4	0	0	-1	0	1
	Likasuo	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	9	1	6	11	1	6	12	1	5	2	0	0	1	0	-1
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	3	10	1	7	15	1	10	19	1	5	5	0	3	4	0	-5
		<i>S.mag.</i>	3	8	1	5	15	1	8	19	1	6	7	0	3	4	0	-2
All		31	14	1	7	15	1	7	16	1	8	2	0	1	-1	0	0	
Stem	Männik-järve	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	14	1	10	14	1	13	15	1	22	-1	0	3	1	0	9
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	5	20	1	14	21	1	13	16	1	13	0	0	-1	-4	0	0
		<i>S.mag.</i>	5	21	1	10	22	1	10	18	1	7	1	0	0	-5	0	-3
	Pääsküla	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	8	1	7	12	1	11	12	1	7	4	0	4	0	0	-4
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	3	10	1	4	12	1	8	15	1	6	2	0	4	3	0	-2
		<i>S.mag.</i>	3	8	1	5	13	1	7	13	1	4	4	0	2	1	0	-3
	Likasuo	<i>S.ang.</i>	3	7	1	6	11	1	9	15	1	7	4	0	3	4	0	-2
		<i>S.fusc.</i>	3	11	1	9	13	1	11	17	1	5	2	0	2	4	0	-6
		<i>S.mag.</i>	3	9	1	8	13	1	8	18	1	6	4	0	0	-3	0	-2
All		31	14	1	8	15	1	10	16	1	9	2	0	3	0	0	-1	

699 **Supporting information 4.** Annual linear increment (before slash, mm year⁻¹) and production
700 (after slash; g m⁻² year⁻¹) of *Sphagnum* measured in previous studies, where at least two of our
701 focal species have been measured.

Author	Location	Year	<i>S.ang.</i>	<i>S.fusc.</i>	<i>S.mag.</i>
Camill et al. (2001)	Manitoba, Canada	1996	30/175	18/196	
		1998	31/213	15/163	
Damman (1978)	S-Sweden	1974		10/90	8/100
Forrest and Smith (1975)	England	1969	-/240-330		15/230
Grigal (1985)	Minnesota, USA	1981-83	31/520		39/320
Ilomets (1976)	Komi Republic, NW Russia	1971-72		6-10/70-100	15/120
Ilomets (1982)	SW-Estonia	1975	19/110	4/80	12/170
		1976		4/80	29/410
	C-Estonia (Männikjärve)	1975	29/410	10/220	
		1976		11/240	15/150
Kosykh et al. (2017)	W-Siberia, Russia	2013		14/260	13/110
		2014		17/221	19/124
Laiho et al. (2011)	S-Finland	2005	17/113	15/87	13/51
		2006	22/161	18/140	24/109
Lindholm and Vasander (1990)	S-Finland	1985	51/400	5/-	8/-
		1986	48/250	22/270	30/230
		1987	10/270	25/320	14/210
Moore (1989)	N-Quebec, Canada	1984	17/127	6/75'	
		1985	4/29'	7/84'	
Overbeck and Happach (1957)	N-Germany	1954-55	120-160/488-1656	30/424-1656	35-51/252-794
Pedersen (1975)	S-Norway		15/500		10/70
Rochefort et al. (1990)	NW-Ontario, Canada	1984	29/186	8/69	25/230
		1985	34/169	10/91	35/186
		1986	32/157	12/116	14/73
		1987	21/99	13/119	11/52
Tolonen et al. (1988)	Maine, USA	1981		11/142-414	11/252
This study	C-Estonia	2014	26/169	15/237	20/211
	N-Estonia	-15	22/178	12/180	20/178
	NW-Finland		34/220	12/228	19/187

REFERENCES FOR THE SUPPORTING INFORMATION 4

- Camill, P., Lynch, J.A., Clark, J.S., Adams, J.B., & Jordan, B. (2001). Changes in biomass, aboveground net primary production, and peat accumulation following permafrost thaw in the boreal peatlands of Manitoba, Canada. *Ecosystems* 4, 461–478. doi: 10.1007/s10021-001-0022-3.
- Damman, A.W.H. (1978). Distribution and movement of elements in ombrotrophic peat bogs. *Oikos* 30, 480–495. doi: 10.2307/3543344.
- Forrest, G.I. & Smith, R.A.H. (1975). The productivity of a range of blanket bog vegetation types in the northern Pennines. *J. Ecol.* 53, 371–384. doi: 10.2307/2258850.
- Grigal, D.F. (1985). *Sphagnum* production in forested bogs of northern Minnesota. *Can. J. Botany* 63, 1204–1207. doi: 10.1139/b85-166.
- Ilomets, M. (1976). Produktivnost sfagnovo pokrova na primere Gusinovo bolota. In: LI Irzhak (Ed.), *Trudy Pecoro-Ilyckovo Gosudarstvennogo Zapovednika* (pp. 40-57). Komi knizhnoje izdatelstvo, Syktyvkar. (In Russian)
- Ilomets, M. (1982). The productivity of the *Sphagnum* communities and the rate of peat accumulation in Estonian bogs. In Masing, V. (Ed.), *Estonian contributions to the international biological programme No. 9* (pp. 102-116). Valgus, Tallinn.
- Kosykh, N.P., Koronatova, N.G., Lapshina, E.D., Filippova, N.V., Vishnyakova, E.K., & Stepanova, V.A. (2017). Linear growth and production of *Sphagnum* mosses in the middle taiga zone of West Siberia. *Env. Dynam. Global Clim. Change.* 8, 3–13. doi: 10.17816/edgcc813-13.
- Laiho, R., Ojanen, P., Ilomets, M., Hajek, T., & Tuittila, E.-S. (2011). Moss production in a boreal, forestry-drained peatland. *Boreal Environ. Res.* 16, 441–449.
- Lindholm, T. & Vasander, H. (1990). Production of eight species of *Spahgnum* at Suurisuo

727 mire, southern Finland. Ann. Bot. Fenn. 27, 145-157.

728 Moore, T.R. (1989). Growth and net production of *Sphagnum* at five fen sites, subarctic
729 eastern Canada. Can. J. Botany 67, 1203–1207. doi: 10.1139/b89-156.

730 Overbeck, F. & Happach, H. (1957). Über das Wachstum und den Wasserhaushalt einiger
731 Hochmoor-Sphagnen. Flora 144, 335-402. doi: 10.1016/S0367-1615(17)31396-4.

732 Pedersen, A. (1975). Growth measurements of five *Sphagnum* species in South Norway.
733 Norw. J. Bot. 22, 277–284.

734 Rochefort, L., Vitt, D.H., & Bayley, S.E. 1990. Growth, Production, and Decomposition
735 Dynamics of *Sphagnum* under Natural and Experimentally Acidified Conditions. Ecology 71,
736 1986-2000. doi: 10.2307/1937607.

737 Tolonen, K., Davis, R.B., & Widoff, L.S. (1988). Peat accumulation in selected Maine peat
738 deposits. Maine Geol. Survey Bull. 33, 1–99.

739

740