

HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Genet dynamics and its variation among genets of a clonal plant Convallaria keiskei	
Author(s)	Araki, Kiwako S.; Shimatani, Ichiro K.; Ohara, Masashi	
Citation	Oikos, 2023(4), e09367 https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.09367	
Issue Date	2023-04	
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/91589	
Rights	This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Araki, K. S., Shimatani, I. K., Ohara, M. Genet dynamics and its variation among genets of a clonal plant Convallaria keiskei, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.09367. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley 's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited.	
Туре	article (author version)	
Additional Information	There are other files related to this item in HUSCAP. Check the above URL.	
File Information	Manuscript_Fig.1-4.pdf	



1 Title: Genet dynamics and its variation among genets of a clonal plant *Convallaria*

2 keiskei

3 Abstract

4 In clonal plant populations, a number of genetically identical ramets form a genet. While 5 coexisting ramets potentially perform independently, their behaviours not only depend on 6 ages and sizes but are also constrained by genetic background. In this study, genet dynamics 7 and its variability among neighbouring genets were investigated based on the ramet 8 demography of each genet in Convallaria keiskei. Genet dynamics were first formulated as 9 a matrix model with the two components of clonal growth (clonal reproduction) and 10 survival-transitions between ramet size classes. Then, a statistical estimation of the matrix 11 elements was established using three datasets: aboveground demographic censuses, 12 belowground directional rhizome connections and genetic identification of ramets. Finally, 13 genet growth rates reflecting both the changes of clonal growth and ramet size growth were 14 estimated and compared for fundamental demographic elements among genets. Over three 15 years of aboveground annual censuses of a 28×2 m plot, 2021 ramets were identified as 16 belonging to 28 genotypes. Belowground excavation detected 515 clonal fragments. Genet 17 growth rate of three dominant genets varied with medians of 1.13, 1.02 and 1.05; 95% 18 credible intervals of the posterior distributions did not overlap between the genet with the largest median and the others. The variation was caused primarily by differences in clonal 19 20 growth rather than survival-transitions between size classes. Clonal growth by branching 21 was rarer than at the tips but contributed to the maintenance of the genet. Therefore, both 22 clonal growth frequencies and connecting patterns of ramets caused the variation of genet 23 dynamics and established genets persist for a long time through the positive growth rates, 24 which would contribute to maintain a population. We also conclude that fundamental 25 demographic elements relating to clonal growth traits (the features of individual genets) 26 strongly impact genet dynamics.

1

27 Introduction

28 Plants with the ability to produce offspring via clonal organs, such as rhizomes, stolons 29 and tubers, are called clonal plants (Klimeš et al. 1997, Whigham 2004, Silvertown 2008). 30 A remarkable characteristic of clonal plants is horizontal expansion and multiplication by 31 developing clonal organs (Klimeš et al. 1997, Herben and Klimešová 2020). This ability 32 generates interesting and complex life-histories with two life cycles - seedling 33 recruitment and clonally recruited offspring (Jackson et al. 1985, van Groenendael and 34 de Kroon 1990). A number of genetically identical sub-units (ramets) exist simultaneously 35 and have the potential to perform independently from each other; these constitute a genetic individual called a genet (Abrahamson 1980, Tuomi and Vuorisalo 1989, Eriksson 36 37 1993, Tanner 2001). A clonal plant thus possesses a hierarchical structure of ramets, 38 genets and populations.

39 Demographic analysis is an effective approach to understanding the population 40 dynamics and life-history of organisms (Abrahamson 1980, Silvertown et al. 1993, 41 Franklin et al. 2021). A basic approach is to determine three fundamental demographic 42 elements of individuals in a population: reproduction, survival and growth. Many 43 mathematical modelling approaches set the individual as the basic unit (e.g. Caswell 2001 44 and references therein). In the case of clonal plants, both ramets and genets can be treated 45 as individuals; the formation of clonal ramets is sometimes treated as reproduction of 46 ramets (clonal reproduction) and sometimes as growth of a genet (clonal growth) 47 (Hartnett and Bazzaz 1985, Fair et al. 1999, Eriksson and Bremer 1993). Many studies 48 have mainly analysed ramet demography by using ramet-based data, and have offered 49 useful predictions for changes in dynamics such as biomass, ground cover and population expansion (e.g. Cain and Damman 1997, Ehrlén and Lehtilä 2002, Decruyenaere and Holt 50

51 2005). Genet-based studies, on the other hand, treat genet recruitment as reproduction by 52 seeds, and genet growth as the incrementation of the ramet number and/or occupied area 53 (e.g. Fair et al. 1999, Suzuki et al. 2006, Kouassi et al. 2014). However, the origin of 54 clonal offspring ramets has so far not been considered in studies. If demographic 55 characteristics differ from one genet to another, considering the variations among genets 56 may improve understanding of population dynamics of clonal plants (Barsoum et al. 2004, 57 Franklin et al. 2021). In addition, the demographic variation among ramet ages and sizes 58 may differently impact on the dynamics of each genet. Thus, determining the fundamental 59 demographic elements for ramets with considering clonal growth as well as growth, 60 survival and transition of each ramet per genet and comparing them among genets, would 61 shed light on understanding the life-history strategy of clonal plants.

62 It is sometimes hard to determine demographic traits such as reproduction (seed 63 and clonal growth), growth and survival of ramets per genet because of ecological and 64 genetic features of clonal plants. First, in order to deal with genets, we have to know 65 which genet each ramet belongs to. Although genet distribution can be distinguished by the clumping structure for plants forming genet patches (Kouassi et al. 2014, Kawai and 66 67 Kudo 2018), it is impossible to identify genets at a glance for plants spreading via 68 structures that intermingle with each other. DNA analysis is an alternative tool now 69 available for identifying genetic relations between ramets (e.g. Reusch 2006, Suzuki et al. 70 2006, Matsuo et al. 2018). Second, in order to explore features of ramets producing 71 offspring, it is necessary to detect which ramets perform clonal growth and produce 72 offspring ramets. Clonal growth can be treated as reproduction by the mother ramet and 73 largely depends on the situation of the mother ramet and the reproductive ability of the 74 genets in such plants as the stoloniferous herb Rubus (Lambrecht-McDowell and 75 Radosevich 2005) and the pseudo-annual herb Uvularia perfoliata (Huber et al. 2004). 76 However, the mother ramet of newly emerged offspring may not be identifiable from 77 aboveground plant structures, especially in clonal plant species that use underground 78 organs for clonal growth and have long life spans. Ease and required approach of 79 observation largely depend on the architecture of the clonal organs and on expansion 80 frequency (Franklin et al. 2021). If the directional connection of mother to daughter is 81 directly observable, exact information about mother-daughter pairs can be obtained and 82 variability in clonal recruitment from mother ramets may be analysed in addition to such 83 demographic traits as survival and growth (e.g. leaf area incrementation and stem height 84 expansion) of mother ramets.

85 Convallaria keiskei is a perennial clonal herb species that can expand widely on 86 the forest floor (Ohara et al. 2006, Araki et al. 2007). It has stoloniform rhizomes, i.e. 87 underground stems (Bell 2008), elongating during the growing season. The distal end of 88 the rhizome containing the apical meristem becomes erect and grows vertically forming 89 a new ramet, while rhizomes gradually die from the basal end (Supporting information). 90 The resulting linear structure is thus oriented from an older to the youngest end in a 91 rhizome fragment (Araki and Ohara 2008, Logofet 2016). Since most rhizomes are 92 maintained for several years and older ones often persist as more fragmented pieces in 93 soil, destructive excavation provides not only a snap-shot of belowground connections 94 but also a record of growth history; that is, the directional connections of the belowground 95 rhizome may be used as a source of information for reconstructing the expanding state of 96 a genet over the previous few years. On the other hand, ramets usually live for years and 97 produce new ramets repeatedly even if they are disconnected from each other (Supporting 98 information; Araki and Ohara 2008). However, as identifying all ramet members of an

99 expanding and fragmented genet is impossible because of vigorous clonal expansion,100 statistical estimation from sampled data is inevitable.

101 In this study, we aimed to reveal the life-history strategy of herbaceous clonal 102 plants having stoloniform rhizomes by investigating the variation of genet dynamics in a 103 population, based on the ramet demography of clonal recruitment and survival-transition. 104 We addressed the following questions: 1) do genet growth rates, composed of clonal 105 growth and ramet size growth, vary among genets?; 2) what demographic traits of ramets 106 cause any variation?; 3) do less frequent clonal growth patterns such as branching 107 contribute to the genet dynamics, and if so, to which degree compared with frequent 108 expansion at a clonal fragment tip?

109 To this end, we first formulated genet dynamics as a matrix model. After 110 establishing a statistical estimation of the elements of the matrix using three datasets (aboveground behaviour, belowground directional rhizome connection and genetic 111 112 identification of ramets), we quantitatively estimated genet growth rates and compared 113 these between genets for a C. keiskei population. In particular, we estimated the 114 consecutive clonal growth probability over years, which also indicates how long it takes 115 for a C. keiskei genet to expand over a given distance. Finally, we discuss the belowground 116 ecology of this plant, an aspect that has repeatedly been highlighted in the population 117 ecology of clonal plants (Janovský et al. 2017, Klimešová et al. 2021).

118

119 Methods

120 Study species

121 *Convallaria keiskei* (Asparagaceae) is a perennial herb, distributed across Japan
122 (Hokkaido, Honshu and Kyushu), Sakhalin Island, Korea, China and eastern Siberia

123 (Utech and Kawano 1976). An aerial shoot of sheath leaves is elongated aboveground and 124 develops one or two leaves in late April to May. An inflorescence also develops and 125 flowering takes place in late May to June (Ohara et al. 2006). The aerial shoots die down 126 during September and October, leaving only belowground organs over winter (Supporting 127 information). In the following season the aerial shoots grow again from the basal organs 128 that persist for years, thus ramets of C. keiskei emerge at almost the same position 129 (Supporting information). Convallaria keiskei propagates clonally by growing 130 stoloniform rhizomes belowground. A rhizome starts to elongate in spring and forms a 131 new ramet that expands a shoot at the tip next season in autumn. Rhizomes gradually 132 decay and are usually maintained for several years in the soil. Therefore, ramets are 133 separated physically every year, resulting in an average of 1.86 ramets connected in a 134 clonal fragment. This indicates that the rhizomes primarily function to produce new 135 ramets rather than provide physiological integration to transport resources. This 136 configuration has been described as 'developmentally-programmed division of labour' 137 (sensu Alpert and Stuefer 1997) or 'division of labour in time' (Jonsdottir and Watson 138 1997), based on the type and degree of functional specialization.

139

140 Study site

The study was carried out in a windbreak forest (143° 10' N, 42° 40' E) in Nakasatsunai, eastern Hokkaido, Japan. The forest is several kilometres long and fragmented by roads and agricultural fields. Planted *Larix leptolepis* is the most dominant tree, followed by naturally established *Quercus dentata* and *Betula platyphylla*. In 2001, a study plot (100 \times 90 m) with grid points plotted every 5 m (total 21× 19 = 399 points) and characterized by *x* and *y* coordinates, was established on the forest floor. Genotypes of the ramets 147 nearest to each grid point were identified using allozyme analysis over the whole plot 148 (Araki et al. 2007). In 2005, a new, long rectangular plot (28×2 m) was established for 149 the present study within the original plot (coordinates x = 20-48, y = 50-52). Fifty-six 1 150 \times 1 m subplots were also laid out in the plot.

151

152 Aboveground demographic census

153 Aboveground demographic censuses were performed in June and July from 2005 to 2007. 154 In the first year, all aerial shoots observed in the 28×2 m plot were carefully marked and 155 mapped. For each shoot, the number of leaves was counted and the length of the longest 156 leaf (leaf size) was measured. The fate of leaves and successive changes in leaf number 157 and size at marked shoots were recorded and re-measured until 2007. Newly emerged 158 shoots (NEW) within the plots were additionally marked and measured. Marked shoots 159 that did not emerge aboveground in following years might be either 1) dead or 2) living; 160 in the latter case they were recorded as 'unemerged (UEM)' for that year (Araki et al. 161 2009).

162

163 Genetic identification

Leaf tissues of all ramets appearing in 2005 and newly emerging in 2006 and 2007 within the 28×2 m plot were collected after they were measured. Collected leaves were frozen until analysis. To minimize the damage to plants, we collected only ~1 cm² of tissue from each leaf. DNA was extracted using CTAB methods, and 5 ng of the extracted DNA was then amplified using a set of six labelled primer pairs targeting highly polymorphic DNA microsatellite loci according to previously reported protocols (GeneBank accession numbers AB251398, AB251399, AB251400 and AB251401; Araki et al. 2006). Size 171 separation of the PCR products was carried out using capillary electrophoresis on an ABI 172 3100 genetic analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher Scientific). Size scoring of 173 banding patterns and genotyping were performed using a semi-automated method and the 174 program GENESCAN (Applied Biosystems). Identical genotypes were classified as 175 members of the same clone if the probability of a particular multilocus genotype occurring 176 by free recombination was very small. The error likelihood of falsely ascribing genotypes 177 to the same genet, P_{gen} , was calculated according to Parks and Werth (1993). Since the 178 chance of obtaining the same multilocus genotypes by recombination was smaller than 179 1%, the results (all $P_{\text{gen}} < 0.001$) overall affirmed that the used primers were highly 180 polymorphic microsatellite markers and that all identical genotypes could be considered 181 members of the same clone.

182

183 **Belowground rhizome connection**

184 In order to explore rhizome connections between ramets in the soil, all subterranean 185 organs in fourteen of the 1×1 m subplots (coordinates x = 30-42, y = 50-52) within the 186 28×2 m plot were completely dug up in September 2007. Only the area where ramets 187 and underground organs could be stably excavated was used in this experiment. All plant 188 organs of elongating or senescent rhizomes with established aboveground shoots, new 189 apical buds and remaining old tissues were carefully taken out, so as to maintain rhizome 190 connections between ramets for direct observation. When a rhizome extended beyond the 191 plot, the subterranean organs were excavated as far as possible towards the end of the rhizome connections. Some rhizomes ended or started with decayed or interrupted tips 192 193 and were classified as 'interrupted rhizomes'.

194

We defined a set of connected subterranean organs and shoots as a 'fragment'

195 unit. Observing rhizome connections in a fragment enabled us to identify pairwise 196 connections and the direction of rhizomes elongating from mother to daughter ramets 197 (Araki and Ohara 2008). These observations were first sketched and then digitized in the 198 form of a table in which each row corresponded to one pairwise connection from a mother 199 to a daughter ramet.

In *C. keiskei*, rhizome elongation takes place during the spring to autumn growing season and daughter ramets emerge in the subsequent year. Thus, new buds found in September 2007 indicate clonal growth in 2007 and newly emerged shoots in June 2007 reflect the clonal growth in 2006. A further eight of the 1×1 m subplots in 2008 and three in 2009 were similarly excavated. The remaining areas in the plot proved impractical to dig up because of heavy grass cover and typhoon damage.

206

207 Modelling genet dynamics

208 In order to examine the genet dynamics of C. keiskei, we applied a matrix model which 209 has been widely applied in population dynamics studies of perennial plant species 210 (Caswell 2001, Salguero-Gómez et al. 2015). In this model, individuals are categorized into 'growth stages'. Let i and j denote the stages (i, j = 1, ..., I where I indicates the 211 212 number of stages). The model consists of a diagonal matrix of survival, $\mathbf{S} = (S_i)$, a 213 transition matrix, $\mathbf{T} = (T_{ij})$ and a reproductive matrix, $\mathbf{R} = (R_{ij})$. The diagonal element S_i 214 indicates the survival probability per year of an individual that belongs to stage j. T_{ii} 215 indicates the transition probability that an individual in stage i is transmitted to stage i216 conditionally for survival at stage j. R_{ij} indicates the expected number of offspring in stage 217 *i* produced by an individual of stage *j*. The population matrix **A** is then defined as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{TS}$ 218 + **R**

Supposing that in year t - 1, there are n_j individuals in stage j. Denoting them by vector $\mathbf{n}_{t-1} = (n_1, ..., n_l)^T (^T$ indicating transposition), the expected number of individuals in year t can be written as:

222 $\mathbf{n}_t = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{n}_{t-1} = (\mathbf{T}\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{R}) \mathbf{n}_{t-1}.$

223 Applying this population dynamics modelling framework, we developed a genet 224 dynamics model in which the population was replaced by a genet, individuals by ramets 225 in the genet, and reproduction was obtained from clonal growth. When a matrix model is 226 applied in population ecology under the stationary assumption (i.e. matrix **A** is invariant 227 across years), the largest real eigenvalue of **TS** + **R**, which is often denoted by λ , is 228 generally interpreted as the intrinsic growth rate of the population. Thus, in the case of 229 genet dynamics, it expresses the genet growth rate.

230 The partial derivative of λ with respect to each matrix element is called 231 sensitivity and has been commonly applied in population ecology in order to examine 232 effects of a small change in each matrix element on the largest eigenvalue λ . There is a 233 convenient formula (Caswell 2001);

234
$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{a_{ij}} = \frac{v_i u_j}{\sum_k v_k u_k}$$

235 in which **u** and **v** respectively indicate the right and left eigenvector of the largest 236 eigenvalue λ .

237

238 Growth stage

A new rhizome regularly extends from the internode that is the nearest to a shoot, which finally develops a new bud at the tip (Fig. 1a, 2, Supporting information). In terms of ramet behaviour this mean that a new ramet is produced from a ramet at the tip of a clonal fragment (Araki and Ohara, 2008). Rhizomes also occasionally extend to shoots from internodes other than the nearest, resulting in rhizome 'branching'. Thus, if a new ramet
is formed from a non-tip ramet, it was treated as 'branching' clonal growth in this study.
It was hypothesized that clonal growth occurred at different rates between tip and non-tip
ramets and between newly born and older ramets. We therefore classified ramets
according to I) age and position, followed by II) size.

248 I) Three classes were defined for age-position in a fragment:

249 1-y-tip: ramet at the tip of a fragment and appearing in that year, age = 1.

250 2-y-tip: at the tip of a fragment and appearing before that year, age ≥ 2 .

Non-tip: at an intermediate position of a fragment and appearing before that year, age ≥
252 2.

253 II) Ramets were first grouped into two size categories according to the number of leaves: 254 (1) one-leaf (1L), and (2) two or more (rarely three or four) leaves (2L). Ramets in the 2L 255 category were then further divided according to leaf length: < 10, 10-15, 15-20 and ≥ 20 256 cm. Ramets in 1L were not subdivided by leaf length because of a smaller variance in leaf 257 length (Araki et al. 2009). Ramets were thus categorized into a total of 15 stages (1-y-tip 258 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; 2 - y - tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$; non-tip 1L, $2L - < 10, ..., 2L - \ge 20$ 259 2L- \geq 20). Hereafter, the age-position is denoted by h and the size class by k (k = 1, ..., K= 5) as $_{k}^{h}$. 260

261

262 Structure of the matrix model

Examples of the transition patterns of surviving ramets and those of recruiting new ramets by clonal growth are shown in Fig. 1a. If a ramet at the 1-y-tip age-position performs clonal growth, it transitions to non-tip (ramet A in pattern 1-1); otherwise, it transitions to 2-y-tip (ramet A in pattern 1-2). If a ramet at the 2-y-tip age-position conducts clonal growth, it transitions to non-tip (ramet B in pattern 2-1); otherwise, it stays at the 2-y-tip
(ramet B in pattern 2-2). A ramet at the non-tip remains in this position (ramet C in pattern
3) regardless of its clonal growth (branching). These transitions are illustratively
summarized as blue arrows in Fig. 1b. The position of a daughter ramet is always at the
1-y-tip (red arrows in Fig. 1b).

272 For simplicity, it was assumed that the size of a daughter ramet was not affected 273 by the stage, i.e. either by the age-position or size category, of the mother. Let N_k be the 274 probability that a daughter belongs to size class k. Let E_l^h and C_l^h be the expected number 275 of daughters and the probability that a mother recruited a new ramet via clonal growth 276 (clonal reproduction), when the mother belongs to age-position h and size class l, 277 respectively. The expected number of daughters in size class k produced by a ramet in 278 age-position h and size class l, R_{kl}^{h} , can then be written as $R_{kl}^{h} = N_k E_l^{h} C_l^{h}$ (right matrix in 279 Fig. 1c).

When a ramet in size class *l* survives with the probability S_l , it transitions to size class *k* with probability T_{kl} (left matrix in Fig. 1c). Genet dynamics of *C. keiskei* are thus modelled in the matrix model framework as illustrated in Fig. 1c. In the following, the left blue 15 × 15 matrix is referred to as T_{SC} (this matrix is formed by not only T_{kl} but also S_l and C_l^h) and the red right matrix as **R**. The largest real eigenvalue of the matrix $T_{SC} + \mathbf{R}$ is referred to as 'genet growth rate' that integrates clonal growth and ramet size growth.

287

288 Statistical estimation of matrix elements

289 Statistical estimation of C_l^h , N_k , E_l^h , S_l and T_{kl} was carried out separately for each genet. 290 In the following we therefore do not explicitly indicate genet identity. Because we applied the matrix model that assumes stationarity, all data were pooled across years. The estimations were conducted in a Bayesian modelling framework separately for the five parameter sets. Some additional technical details are described in the Supporting information.

295 Information regarding whether a ramet in age-position h and size class l in year 296 t produced a daughter ramet was obtained from three annual censuses of shoots, as well 297 as from the belowground information such as the rhizome connections between ramets 298 from excavated fragments. Focusing on the tip parts, how a series of shoots were observed 299 during the censuses, and on the fragments excavated in 2007, we classified connection 300 patterns incorporating above- and belowground information into eight groups (Fig. 2). 301 For example, if a ramet newly born in 2007 (defined as year t) was positioned in front of 302 a ramet born in 2006 (year t - 1), this indicated that the latter ramet performed clonal 303 growth in the summer of 2006 (year t - 1) at the 1-y-tip position. If an apical bud was 304 observed in front of the former, this showed that a 1-y-tip ramet performed clonal growth 305 in the 2007 summer (pattern-1). If the ramet did not have a bud, it belonged to pattern-2. 306 This classification was performed for every branch in a fragment (when branching clonal 307 growth was performed, a new 'branch' appeared in the fragment; throughout the paper, 308 'branching' is used to represent a clonal growth while a "branch" indicates a part of one 309 fragment). We then counted the numbers of branches of the eight patterns. Fragments 310 excavated in 2008 and 2009 were similarly classified (in these cases, the excavated year 311 was defined as year t and the longest series begins with year t - 3).

For branching clonal growth ($C^{\text{non-tip}}$), the numbers of triplets consisting of a mother ramet, an old daughter and a new bud (or new ramet) and those of potential nontip ramets of branching clonal growth were counted (these were not classified into size classes). When we counted new daughter ramets belonging to the size class *k*, if some
newly emerged shoots connected to dead ramets or to interrupted rhizomes, they were
excluded because such ramets were probably not newly born (Supporting information).
The numbers of new buds were counted if a ramet produced a bud.

Following Araki et al. (2007), if a ramet observed in 2005 appeared neither in 2006 nor 2007, it was classified as dead from 2005 to 2006. Subsequently, some of these ramets were excavated and found to be alive. They were re-labelled as surviving ramets. Mortality from 2006 to 2007 and later was not considered. We counted the numbers of surviving and dead ramets for each size class. We also counted the numbers of ramets that were transmitted from size class l to k, conditional on survival.

325 To evaluate uncertainty caused by these limited count data, we applied a 326 Bayesian approach. This was done separately for C_l^h , N_k , S_l and T_{kl} , while for E the 327 average number of new buds was used, because most of the existing ramets produced just one daughter ramet and two or more were rare (Supporting information). For $C_l^{1-y-tip}$ and 328 $C_l^{2-y-tip}$, a generalized linear model (GLM) was applied. Using flat prior distributions, we 329 330 produced random samples from the posterior distributions of the coefficients in the GLM by Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulation and transformed them to those of C_l^{1-} 331 ^{y-tip} and $C_l^{2-y-tip}$ (further details are provided in the Supporting information). For $C^{non-tip}$, 332 N_k , S_l and T_{kl} , flat conjugate prior distributions were applied. Random samples were drawn 333 334 from the (binomial or multinomial) posterior distributions (details are provided the 335 Supporting information).

336

337 Matrices and genet growth rate

338 By randomly combining random samples from the posterior distributions of $\{C_l^h\}$, $\{N_k\}$,

339 {*S_l*}, {*T_{kl}*} and the fixed value for *E*, we produced 10000 matrices ($\mathbf{T}_{SC} + \mathbf{R}$) and for each 340 computed the largest real eigenvalues showing the genet growth rate.

341 In order to examine which component (T_{SC} or **R**) contributed to determining the 342 differences in the growth rates between the genets, if any, we produced another two 343 matrices: in matrix (1), let clonal growth ($\{C_l^h\}, \{N_k\}, E$) be common to the genets; in 344 matrix (2), let the survival and transition ($\{S_l\}, \{T_{kl}\}$) be common to the genets. For (1), 345 by pooling the three genets' data on clonal growth, random samples from the posterior 346 distribution for $\{C_l^h\}$ and $\{N_k\}$ were produced by respectively MCMC and by using the 347 conjugate prior. The mean numbers of buds for the three genets were used for E. 348 Combining this with the random samples of $\{S_l\}$ and $\{T_{kl}\}$ for each genet, we then produced 10,000 matrices and computed eigenvalues for the three genets. For (2), by 349 350 pooling the three genets' data on survival and transition, we produced 2000 random 351 samples of $\{S_l\}$ and $\{T_{kl}\}$. We then combined them with the random samples from clonal growth ($\{C_l^h\}, \{N_k\}$) for each genet to produce 10000 matrices, and computed 352 353 eigenvalues for the three genets. If the posterior distributions of eigenvalues vary from 354 the original ones only for (1), it implies that inter-genet differences had effects on clonal 355 growth but little influence on survival and transition, and vice versa.

To examine the contribution of branching, we set the branching probability to 0 for the 10000 matrices and calculated the eigenvalues for each genet. If the posterior distribution decreases, it indicates a contribution of branching to the maintenance of that genet.

Finally, we conducted a sensitivity analysis. In this case, the commonly used formula was considered insufficient due to the need to know the partial derivatives of λ with respect to C_l^h and the others. We derived suitable formulae (Supporting information) and calculated sensitivity for each of the 10,000 matrices.

364

```
365 Results
```

366 Genet identification

367 Of 2114 ramets in the 28×2 m plot, 2021 were identified and grouped into 28 genotypes. 368 There were four dominant genotypes with respectively 809, 152, 648 and 367 ramets; 369 hereafter genets e-1, e-2, e-3 and e-4, respectively. Nineteen genotypes were represented 370 by only one ramet, and the other five were represented by 2-13 ramets. The four dominant 371 genets were also found in the 5 m lattice of the original 100 × 90 m plot (Araki et al., 372 2007).

373

374 Aboveground shoot demography

375 A total of 1525, 1868 and 2113 ramets were found in the 28×2 m plot in 2005, 2006 and 376 2007, respectively. The numbers of ramets counted during the three annual censuses of 377 aboveground shoots are summarized for the four dominant genets in Table 1. In the four 378 genets, 108 to 701 ramets emerged every growing season. More new ramets (NEW) were 379 found in 2006 than in 2007 and the number of ramets increased from 2005 to 2006 for all 380 the genets (Table 1). New ramets mostly emerged clonally with two leaves 15-20 cm in 381 length in genets e-1 and e-3, and with two leaves 10-15 cm in length for genet e-2 382 (Supporting information). Recruitment rates of ramets per genet were calculated as 8-383 20% based on ramet numbers existing in the previous year and newly emerged in the 384 current year. The four genets were distributed to form clonal patches except in a section 385 of intermingled parts where the range of genet e-2 overlapped with genets e-1 and e-3 386 (Supporting information).

387

388 Belowground rhizome connection and fragments

389 The C. keiskei parts dug up from 2007 to 2009 contained 943 living ramets (including 390 638 censused ramets and ramets connecting to a fragment but located outside the plot) 391 and 139 buds. Old tissues of 58 remains from dead ramets were also found in fragments. 392 These were also separated into 515 fragments. The numbers of branches varied from 2 393 (56 fragments) or 3 (19 fragments) to more (the maximum was 9 followed by 8, one 394 fragment for each), while 431 fragments had no branches. The biggest fragment, in genet 395 e-2, contained 34 living or dead ramets and buds with 9 branches (Supporting 396 information). This fragment also contained the longest series of 11 ramets and a new bud 397 at the tip, indicating that this genet was born at least 10 years ago. The average was 2.21 398 ramets per fragment. The dominant genets, e-1, e-2 and e-3, had 307, 57 and 125 399 fragments, respectively (Table S1b), with a total of 478, 152 and 279 living ramets (genet 400 e-4 was not found in this area).

Among 210 newly emerged ramets in 2006 and 2007, 46.2% were connected to dead tissues or not connected to anything (isolated), implying that these were not newly born but had not emerged in the previous censuses and that the recruitment rates of 8-20% were overestimated.

405

406 **Features of clonal growth in each genet**

Table 2 shows the number of fragments associated with each connection pattern which informs the occurrence of clonal growth in certain ages and positions in the 2006 and 2007 growing seasons. Pattern-4 and -6 in Fig. 2 were dominant connection patterns in genets e-1 and e-3, while pattern-6 was less frequent in genet e-2. Most fragments 411 belonged to pattern-8. Based on these data combined with those of fragments excavated 412 in 2008 and 2009, we classified all fragments, separately for every branch, and counted 413 the number of successful and unsuccessful clonal growth occurrences for each stage 414 (Supporting information). Ramets at the 1-y-tip position exhibited higher clonal growth 415 frequencies than those at the 2-y-tip, especially in genet e-2 with 38.5% versus 11.3% and 416 marginally in genet e-1 with 38.8% versus 32.2% and in genet e-3 20.4% versus 20.3% 417 (these were further examined with Bayesian modelling, below). The average branching 418 frequency was 3.4, 3.1 and 1.4% for genets e-1, e-2 and e-3, respectively (Supporting 419 information). The numbers of buds per mother ramet ranged from one (91.9%) to three 420 (1.6%), with a mean of 1.10, 1.00 and 1.12 for genets e-1, e-2 and e-3, respectively 421 (Supporting information).

422

423 Survival and transitions of ramets between size classes

424 The observed numbers of ramets that did or did not change size class, the numbers of 425 surviving and dead ramets from 2005 to 2007 and the numbers of new ramets for each 426 size class are summarized in the Supporting information. In the 2L category, most ramets 427 remained in the same size class or transitioned to a larger size class, whereas more than 428 half of the 1L ramets grew to the 2L size classes. This tendency did not differ between the 429 three genets (Supporting information). Surviving and newly born ramets from genets e -430 1 and e-3 were mostly within the 2L 15-20 cm size class and those from genet e-2 were 431 within the 2L 10-15 cm size class (Supporting information).

432

433 Matrix and genet growth rate

434 By randomly combining 2000 samples from the posterior distributions of C_l^h (Supporting

information; some of 95% credible intervals of C_l^h overlapped between genets and 435 436 between 1-y-tip and 2-y-tip), N_k (Supporting information), S_l (Supporting information), 437 T_{kl} (Supporting information) and the fixed value of E, we produced 10000 matrices for 438 each genet. Intrinsic growth rates (the largest real eigenvalues) for the three genets, 439 derived from the largest real eigenvalues, were differently distributed (Fig. 3a). Genet e-440 1 tended to show higher growth rates (99.8% across 10000 matrices were highest, median 441 = 1.13) and genet e-2 was the lowest for 77.7% (median = 1.02). The 95% credible 442 interval of genet e-1 did not overlap with those of genets e-2 and e-3 (median = 1.05). 443 The interval of genet e-2 was relatively wide, presumably because of the smaller sample 444 size, and overlapped even to include the median of e-3. These patterns suggest that genet 445 growth rates varied among genets. It is also noteworthy to point out that the tendency of 446 these growth rates were consistent with changes of observed numbers of ramets from 447 2006 to 2007 (Table 1): 1.00 (genet e-1), 0.96 (genet e-2) and 0.98 (genet e-3).

448 Figure 3b-c compares how the posterior distributions of eigenvalues were affected when either clonal growth (C_l^h, N_k, E) or survival and transition (S_l, T_{kl}) of ramets 449 450 was unified over genets. The difference between genets e-1 and e-3 was reduced when 451 the clonal growth data were pooled (Fig. 3b). On the other hand, when the survival and 452 transition data were pooled, the difference between genets e-1 and e-3 was largely 453 unaffected (Fig. 3c), and the differences to genet e-2 were reduced. This implies the 454 effects of clonal growth and suggests much weaker influences of survival-transition on 455 the genet growth rates.

456 If no branching was assumed, the medians of posterior distributions of 457 eigenvalues declined in all three genets by 4.7-9.0% (Fig. 4), among which genet e-1 458 showed the largest decline. This result suggests that branching ramet recruitment 459 significantly contributes to maintaining genet dynamics despite the clonal growth 460 probabilities being lower than those at fragment tips. The sensitivity of $C^{non-tip}$ also 461 exhibited much higher values than $C^{1-y-tip}$ and $C^{2-y-tip}$ (Supporting information). While Fig. 462 4 shows an extreme case when the branching never occurs, the sensitivity expresses 463 changes of the largest eigenvalue by a (infinitesimally) small change of the branching 464 probability. The consistent results between the two support the definite contribution of 465 branching to the maintenance of the genets.

466

467 **Discussion**

468 Variation of genet dynamics

469 We here proposed a 'genet dynamics' approach, exploring the fundamental elements for 470 ramet demography of genets in a clonal plant species by deriving demographic 471 information from ramet connections in clonal fragments. To this end, we defined the 472 intrinsic growth rate of a genet using the maximum real eigenvalue of a matrix model 473 reflecting clonal growth and survival-transitions depending on age-position and size of 474 each ramet in the genet (Fig. 1). It was quantitatively detected that genet growth rates 475 varied between dominant genets with closely adjacent locations in a natural population 476 (Fig. 3, Supporting information). The differences resulted from the different probabilities 477 and contributions of such demographic traits as clonal growth, ramet size growth and 478 branching to the genet growth rates depending on genets (Fig. 3b-c, 4).

Demographic variations between genets have been reported within experimental
populations (Geber et al. 1992, Cheplick 1997, Prati and Schmid 2000), between genet
patches in a population (Falinska 1995, Kawai and Kudo 2018) and between populations
of clonal plant species (Nantel and Gagnon 1999, Barsoum et al. 2004). Differences in

483 genet performance are caused by such factors as genetic variation, age of establishment 484 and environmental heterogeneity (Prati and Schmid 2000, Pan and Price 2002, Timerman 485 and Barrett 2019). Investigation of genet dynamics after simultaneous death in dwarf 486 bamboo, a monocarpic clonal plant, revealed that more productive genets survived and 487 spread initially, replacing less productive ones (Matsuo et al. 2018, Tomimatsu et al. 488 2020). Kawai and Kudo (2018) detected different ramet productivity between genets 489 located in different snow melt habitats. In the present study, we investigated already 490 established adjacent genets and the area where ramets of some genets were intermingled 491 (Supporting information). The assumption was that genetic variation would sometimes 492 interact with environmental conditions and/or differences of ages to contribute to genet 493 dynamics variations. Indeed, genet e-1 was found distributed over a large area of about 494 15×25 m (see Araki et al. 2009), implying a relatively long time since establishment, 495 and showed the highest genet growth rate (Fig. 3).

496

497 Ramet demography for population and genet dynamics

498 To understand population dynamics, demographic traits of individuals in a population are 499 generally investigated (Silvertown et al. 1993, Menges and Dolan 1998, Logofet 2016). 500 As for clonal plant populations, recruitment, mortality and growth of ramets were 501 explored based on ramet census, from which annual variations of ramet numbers and 502 biomass, frequencies of clonal recruitment per ramet and contributions to a population 503 were estimated (Tanner 2001). In the case of Rubus, clonal growth has the greatest impact 504 on population growth rates, suggesting a significant contribution of clonal growth to 505 population development (Lambrecht-McDowell and Radosevich 2005). Guàrdia et al. 506 (2000) used a matrix model to conclude that clonal growth contributed less population growth in *Achnatherum calamagrostis* while the population growth rate was higher than
1.0. Growth and survival of ramets in the certain size class caused the different dynamics
between populations in *Helianthus divaricatus* (Nantel and Gagnon 1999).

510 Genet growth rates were also observable as an increase in numbers and area 511 occupied by ramets of a certain genet. For example, de Witte and Stöcklin (2010) 512 measured changes in genet sizes from plant morphology. Reusch (2006) monitored 513 changes in the lattice point numbers for each genet to assess genet growth in a seagrass 514 population. If not all ramet members are identifiable and multiple genets are intermingled 515 with one another, statistical inference of genet growth rates from sampled data is required; 516 the present study established a statistical method for this purpose (Fig. 1, 2). In this study, 517 we found that ramets located at the tip of a fragment more frequently produced offspring 518 (Supporting information). This clonal growth seems to support genet maintenance rather 519 than contribute to genet expansion, because the rhizomes expanded in all directions, 520 forming a complex clonal structure. Moreover, clonal growth of non-tip ramets showed 521 higher sensitivity (Supporting information), suggesting that clonal growth of older ramets 522 was also important to maintain genets. This implies that in genets containing older ramets, 523 e.g. larger genets, branching clonal growth has a greater impact on genet growth and 524 longevity. Thus, once a genet occupies a certain area, it would be able to survive for a 525 long time.

526

527 Applications of belowground information

528 Estimation of the elements in the matrix model was achieved using both data from 529 aboveground censuses and information from belowground directional connection of 530 ramets (Fig. 2). We were able to classify excavated fragments into eight patterns, although 531 belowground organs exhibited very complex structures. Belowground information is as 532 important as aboveground data for advancing studies on plant species (Klimešová et al. 533 2018, Ott et al. 2019), and integrating both types of data demands novel approaches suited 534 to particular data and species characteristics. For example, Wildová et al. (2007) 535 excavated to parameterize the architecture of belowground clonal organs as well as 536 aboveground performances, which showed different impact on population and 537 community structure between aboveground and underground traits among species. From 538 belowground excavation after two annual censuses, Araki and Ohara (2008) also derived 539 preliminary insight of ramet reproductive demography that ramets perform clonal growth 540 before repeated flowering. In contrast to these approaches, the present study investigated 541 directional rhizome connections of ramets (Fig. 2) and estimated consecutive clonal 542 growth rates at tips (Fig. S3) to understand clonal growth strategy of genet as well as 543 ramet. This growth rate also enables prediction of genet distribution and thus sizes for a 544 given period. In fact, genet e-1 covered a 15×25 m area (see Araki et al. 2007) and 545 occupied over more than half the area of the 28×2 m plot (Fig. S1). Based on the distance 546 between ramets (average 22.7 cm in Araki and Ohara 2008), combining the distributions 547 of rhizome lengths and turning angles enables calculation of the number of years needed 548 to attain the expansion of a given genet size as it fits the reality.

549

550 From genet demography to population dynamics

551 Population dynamics can also be estimated from demographic traits of genets. If a genet 552 growth rate was smaller than 1.0, we could predict the reduction of ramets in that genet 553 and its disappearance, using the stationary assumption in the matrix model. All studied 554 genets of *C. keiskei* showed growth rates greater than 1.0, and few dead ramets were found 555 during the experimental period. In our study plot, nine of 19 seedlings with one leaf 556 shorter than 10 cm found in 2005 did not emerge in 2006 and 2007. These findings can 557 provide evidence of birth and death of genets, but there were no observations of genets 558 with two or more ramets disappearing. The employed statistical analysis incorporated 559 only growth but not the birth and death of genets. Suzuki et al. (2006) estimated genet 560 mortality in *Festuca rubra* from ramet demographic data and genet identification by 561 applying spatial theory using the probabilities of genet identity of ramets, as described in 562 Harada et al. (1997).

563

564 Conclusion

565 Fundamental demographic elements are important in understanding life-history 566 characteristics of species. This study formulated genet growth rates in terms of both clonal 567 growth and ramet size growth per genet in a population. Genet dynamics and associated 568 variability between genets were statistically investigated using a matrix model of ramet 569 demography within each genet. The structure and growth pattern of the rhizome of C. 570 keiskei include continuous clonal growth at the tip end of the rhizome and spatial spread. 571 However, once a genet was established, clonal growth at the tip as well as growth of non-572 tip ramets contributed to genet maintenance rather than expansion. Consequently, 573 dominant genets with positive genet growth rates would tend to persist for a long period, 574 contributing to population maintenance in this herbaceous clonal plant.

575

576 **References**

- 577 Abrahamson, W. 1980. Demography and vegetative reproduction. –In: Solbrig, O. T.
- 578 (ed.), Demography and evolution in plant populations: Botanical monographs, Vol.
- 579 15. Olympic Marketing Corp., pp. 89–106.
- 580 Alpert, P. and Stuefer, J. 1997. Division of labour in clonal plants. –In: de Kroon, H.
- and van Groenendael, J. M. (eds.), The ecology and evolution of clonal plants.
 Backhuys Publishers., pp. 137–154.
- Araki, K. and Ohara, M. 2008. Reproductive demography of ramets and genets in a
 rhizomatous clonal plant *Convallaria keiskei*. J. Plant Res. 121: 147–154.
- 585 Araki, K. S., Shimatani, I. K. and Ohara, M. 2022. Data from: Genet dynamics and its
- variation among genets of a clonal plant Convallaria keiskei. Dryad Digital
 Repository, https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.j9kd51cgc.
- 588 Araki, K., Lian, C. L., Shimatani, K. and Ohara, M. 2006. Development of
- 589 microsatellite markers in a clonal perennial herb, *Convallaria keiskei.* Mol. Ecol.
- 590 Notes 6: 1144–1146.
- 591 Araki, K., Shimatani, K. and Ohara, M. 2007. Floral distribution, clonal structure, and
- 592 their effects on pollination success in a self-incompatible *Convallaria keiskei*
- 593 population in northern Japan. Plant Ecol. 189: 175–186.
- 594 Araki, K., Shimatani, K. and Ohara, M. 2009. Dynamics of distribution and
- 595 performance of ramets constructing genets: a demographic-genetic study in a
- 596 clonal plant, *Convallaria keiskei*. Ann. Bot. 104: 71–79.
- 597 Barsoum, N., Muller, E. and Skot, L. 2004. Variations in levels of clonality among
- 598 *Populus nigra* L. stands of different ages. Evol. Ecol. 18: 601–624.
- 599 Bell, A. D. 2008. Plant form: An illustrated guide to flowering plant morphology. –

- 600 Timber Press.
- 601 Cain, M. L. and Damman, H. 1997. Clonal growth and ramet performance in the
- 602 woodland herb, *Asarum canadense*. J. Ecol. 85: 883–897.
- 603 Caswell, H. 2001. Matrix population models: construction, analysis and interpretation,
- 604 2nd edn. Sinauer Assoc.
- 605 Cheplick, G. P. 1997. Responses to severe competitive stress in a clonal plant:
- 606 differences between genotypes. Oikos 79: 581–591.
- de Witte, L. C. and Stöcklin, J. 2010. Longevity of clonal plants: why it matters and
 how to measure it. Ann. Bot. 106: 859–870.
- 609 Decruyenaere, J. G. and Holt, J. S. 2005. Ramet demography of a clonal invader,
- 610 *Arundo donax* (Poaceae), in Southern California. Plant Soil 277: 41–52.
- 611 Ehrlén, J. and Lehtilä, K. 2002. How perennial are perennial plants? Oikos 98: 308–
 612 322.
- Eriksson, O. 1993. Dynamics of genets in clonal plants. Trees 8: 313–316.
- 614 Eriksson O. and Bremer, B. 1993. Genet dynamics of the clonal plant *Rubus saxatilis*. –
- 615 J. Ecol. 69: 533–542.
- 616 Fair, J., Lauenroth, W. K. and Coffin, D. P. 1999. Demography of *Bouteloua gracilis* in
- a mixed prairie: analysis of genets and individuals. J. Ecol. 87: 233–243.
- 618 Falinska, K. 1995. Genet disintegration in *Filipendula ulmaria*: consequences for
- 619 population dynamics and vegetation succession. J. Ecol. 83: 9–21.
- 620 Franklin, S., Alpert, P., Salguero-Gómez, R., Janovský, Z., Herben, T., Klimešová, J.
- and Douhovnikoff, V. 2021. Next-gen plant clonal ecology. –Perspect. Plant Ecol.
- 622 Evol. Syst. 49: 125601.
- 623 Guàrdia, R., Roventós, J. and Caswell, H. 2000. Spatial growth and population

- dynamics of a perennial tussock grass (*Achnatherum calamagrostis*) in a badland
 area. J. Ecol. 88: 950–963.
- Geber, M., Watson, M. and Furnish, R. 1992. Genetic differences in clonal demography
 in *Eichhornia crassipes.* J. Ecol. 80: 329–341.
- 628 Harada, Y., Kawano, S. and Iwasa, Y. 1997. Probability of clonal identity: inferring the
- relative success of sexual versus clonal reproduction from spatial genetic patterns.
 J. Ecol. 85: 591–600.
- Hartnett, D. and Bazzaz, F. 1985. The regulation of leaf, ramet and genet dynamics in
- 632 experimental populations of the rhizomatous perennial *Solidago canadensis*. J.
- 633 Ecol. 73: 429–443.
- Herben, T. and Klimešová, J. 2020. Evolution of clonal growth forms in angiosperms. –
 New Phytol. 225: 999–1010.
- Huber, H., Whigham, D. F. and O'Neill, J. 2004. Timing of disturbance changes the
- balance between growth and survival of parent and offspring ramets in the clonal
- 638 forest understory herb *Uvularia perfoliata*. Evol. Ecol. 18: 521–539.
- 639 Jackson, J. B. C., Buss L. W. and Cook, R. E. 1985. Population biology and evolution
- 640 of clonal organisms. Yale Univ. Press.
- 541 Janovský, Z., Herben, T. and Klimešová, J. 2017. Accounting for clonality in
- 642 comparative plant demography growth or reproduction? Folia Geobot. 52:
 643 433–442.
- 544 Jonsdottir, I. and Watson, M. 1997. Extensive physiological integration. –In: de Kroon,
- 645 H. and van Groenendael, J. (eds.), The ecology and evolution of clonal plants.
- 646 Backhuys Publishers, pp. 109–136.
- 647 Kawai, Y. and Kudo, G. 2018. Variations in ramet performance and the dynamics of an

648

alpine evergreen herb, Gentiana nipponica, in different snowmelt conditions. -

649 Am. J. Bot. 105: 1813–1823.

- 650 Klimeš, L., Klimesova, J., Hendriks, R. and van Groenendael, J. 1997. Clonal plant
- architecture: a comparative analysis. –In: de Kroon, H. and van Groenendael, J. M.
- 652 (eds.), The ecology and evolution of clonal plants. Backhuys Publishers, pp. 1–30.
- 653 Klimešová, J., Martínková, J., Ottaviani, G. 2018. Belowground plant functional
- 654 ecology: Towards an integrated perspective. Funct. Ecol. 32: 2115–2126.
- 655 Klimešová, J. Mudrák, O., Martínková, J., Lisner, A., Lepš, J., Filartiga, A. L. and
- Ottaviani, G. 2021. Are belowground clonal traits good predictors of ecosystem
 functioning in temperate grasslands? Funct. Ecol. 35: 787–795.
- 658 Kouassi, K. I., Barot, S., Laossi, K. R., Gignoux, J. and Zoro Bi, I. A. 2014.
- Relationships between ramet and genet dynamics in two clonal palms. For. Ecol.
 Manag. 312: 101–107.
- 661 Lambrecht-McDowell, S. C. and Radosevich, S. R. 2005. Population demographics and
- trade-offs to reproduction of an invasive and noninvasive species of *Rubus*. Biol.
 Invas. 7: 281–295.
- 664 Logofet, D. O. 2016. Estimating the fitness of a local discrete-structured population:
- From uncertainty to an exact number. Ecol. Model. 329: 112–120.
- 666 Matsuo, A. Hiroshi, T., Sangetsu, Y., Suyama, Y. and Makita, A. 2018. Genet dynamics
- of a regenerating dwarf bamboo population across heterogeneous light
- 668 environments in a temperate forest understorey. Ecol. Evol. 8: 1746–1757.
- 669 Menges, E. S. and Dolan, R. W. 1998. Demographic viability of populations of Silene
- 670 *regia* in midwestern prairies: relationships with fire management, genetic variation,
- 671 geographic location, population size and isolation. J. Ecol. 86: 63–78.

- Nantel, P. and Gagnon, D. 1999. Variability in the dynamics of northern peripheral
- 673 versus southern populations of two clonal plant species, *Helianthus divaricatus* and
 674 *Rhus aromatica.* J. Ecol. 87: 748–760.
- 675 Ohara, M., Araki, K., Yamada, E. and Kawano, S. 2006. Life-history monographs of
- G76 Japanese plants. 6: *Convallaria keiskei* Miq. (Convallariaceae). Plant Species
 G77 Biol. 21: 119–126.
- Ott, J. P., Klimešová, J. and Hartnett, D. C. 2019. The ecology and significance of
 below-ground bud banks in plants. Ann. Bot. 123: 1099–1118.
- Pan, J. J. and Price J. S. 2002. Fitness and evolution in clonal plants: the impact of
 clonal growth. Evol. Ecol. 15: 583–600.
- Parks, J. C. and Werth, C. R. 1993. A Study of spatial features of clones in a population
 of bracken fern, *Pteridium aquilinum* (Dennstaedtiaceae). Ann. Bot. 80: 537–
 544.
- 685 Prati, D. and Schmid, B. 2000. Genetic differentiation of life-history traits within
- 686 populations of the clonal plant *Ranunculus reptans*. Oikos 90: 442–456.
- 687 Reusch, T. B. H. 2006. Does disturbance enhance genotypic diversity in clonal
- organisms? A field test in the marine angiosperm *Zostera marina*. Mol. Ecol. 15:
 277–286.
- 690 Salguero-Gómez, R., Jones, O. R., Archer, C. R., Buckley, Y. M., Che-Castaldo, J.,
- 691 Caswell, H., Hodgson, D., Scheuerlein, A., Conde, D. A., Brinks, E., de Buhr, H.,
- 692 Farack, C., Gottschalk, F., Hartmann, A., Henning, A., Hoppe, G., Römer, G.,
- 693 Runge, J., Ruoff, T., Wille, J., Zeh, S., Davison, R., Vieregg, D., Baudisch, A.,
- 694 Altwegg, R., Colchero, F., Dong, M., de Kroon, H., Lebreton, J. D., Metcalf, C. J.
- E., Neel, M. M., Parker, I. M., Takada, T., Valverde, T., Vélez-Espino, L. A.,

696	Wardle, G. M., Franco, M. and Vaupel, J. W. 2015. The COMPADRE Plant
697	Matrix Database: an open online repository for plant demography. – J. Ecol. 103:
698	202–218.
699	Silvertown, J. 2008. The evolutionary maintenance of sexual reproduction: Evidence
700	from the ecological distribution of asexual reproduction in clonal plants Int. J.
701	Plant Sci. 169: 157–168.
702	Silvertown, J., Franco, M., Pisanty, I. and Mendoza, A. 1993. Comparative plant
703	demography-relative importance of life-cycle components to the finite rate of
704	increase in woody and herbaceous perennials. – J. Ecol. 81: 465–476.
705	Suzuki, J. I., Herben, T., Krahulec, F., Štorchová, H. and Hara, T. 2006. Effects of
706	neighbourhood structure and tussock dynamics on genet demography of Festuca
707	rubra in a mountain meadow. – J. Ecol. 94: 66–76.
708	Tanner, J. E. 2001. The influence of clonality on demography: Patterns in expected
709	longevity and survivorship. – Ecology 82: 1971–1981.
710	Timerman, D. and Barrett, S. C. H. 2019. The spatial ecology of sex ratios in a
711	dioecious plant: Relations between ramet and genet sex ratios. – J. Ecol. 107:
712	1804–1816.
713	Tomimatsu, H. Matsuo, A., Kaneko, Y., Kudo, E., Taniguchi, Y., Saitoh, T., Suyama,
714	Y. and Makita, A. 2020. Spatial genet dynamics of a dwarf bamboo: Clonal
715	expansion into shaded forest understory contributes to regeneration after an
716	episodic die-off. – Plant Species Biol. 35: 185–196.
717	Tuomi, J. and Vuorisalo, T. 1989. Hierarchical selection in modular organisms. –
718	Trends Ecol. Evol. 4: 209–213.
719	Utech, F. H. and Kawano, S. 1976. Floral vascular anatomy of <i>Convallaria majalis</i> L.

30

- and *C. keisukei* Miq. (Liliaceae-Convallariinae). Bot. Mag. Tokyo 89: 173–182.
- van Groenendael, J. M. and de Kroon, H. 1990. Clonal growth in plants: regulation and
 function. SPB Academic Publishing.
- 723 Whigham, D. F. 2004. Ecology of woodland herbs in temperate deciduous forests. –
- 724 Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 35: 583–621.
- 725 Wildová, R., Gough, L., Herben, T., Hershock, C. and Goldberg, D. E. 2007.
- Architectural and growth traits differ in effects on performance of clonal plants: An
- analysis using a field-parameterized simulation model. Oikos 116: 836–852.
- 728
- 729
- 730

731 **Figure legends**

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the life-history transition of ramets in a genet in a
clonal perennial plant species, *Convallaria keiskei*.

(a) Examples of transition patterns of mother ramets from year t - 1 to t. (b) All transition patterns of ramets. Blue components show the position and age transitions of ramets, red components indicate ramet recruitment through clonal growth. The survivals are not shown for simplicity. (c) Matrix for genet dynamics. Details of the symbols in the matrix elements are described in the text.

Figure 2. Eight clonal fragment patterns found in *Convallaria keiskei* and obtained information about clonal growth occurring in year t - 1 and t in each fragment.

Years of aboveground growth were obtained from the 2005 (correspond to year t - 2) to 741 742 2007 (correspond to year t) censuses and rhizome connections were derived from 743 belowground excavation in 2007. The two right columns show the transition probability 744 of clonal growth by focal (mother) ramets. Years and arrows in parentheses indicate birth 745 years of offspring (right side of the arrow) and connections between the focal ramets (left 746 side of the arrow). In case of year t - 1 season of the column, year t at the right side of the 747 arrow means clonal growth and no number is no clonal growth. In case of year t season, 748 year t + 1 at the right side of the arrow means clonal growth and no number is no clonal 749 growth.

Figure 3. Posterior distributions of growth rates of the three dominant genets.

(a) When clonal growth and the survival-transition data were separated according to
genets, (b) when clonal growth data were pooled and the survival-transition data were
separated according to genets, and (c) when the survival-transition data were pooled and
clonal growth data were separated by genet.

755

Figure 4. Posterior distributions of growth rates of the three dominant genets, with and without branching. Genets (a) e-1, (b) e-2 and (c) e-3.

757

756

758 Supplemental information

- 759 Appendix I: Technical details in the statistical estimation of matrix elements in Methods
- 760 Appendix II: Summary of data
- 761 **Table S1a**. The number of tip ramets performing clonal growth or not, in each age-
- position and size class in the three dominant genets.
- 763 **Table S1b**. The number of clonal fragments of each fragment size (number of ramets
- in a fragment) in the three dominant genets.
- 765 **Table S1c**. The number of triplets consisting of one mother and one older daughter
- ramets and one new bud (Branching) and of non-tip ramets potentially branching clonal
- 767 growth (Non-tip) in the three dominant genets.
- **Table S1d**. The number of ramets having one, two or three new buds in the threedominant genets.
- 770 **Table S1e.** The number of ramets transmitted from size class k (rows) to l (columns)
- in the three dominant genets. Genets (1) e-1, (2) e-2 and (3) e-3.
- Table S1f. The number of survival and dead ramets in each size class in three dominant
- genets from 2005 to 2006 in the three dominant genets.
- **Table S1g**. The numbers of new ramets in each size class in three dominant genets.
- 775 Appendix III: Supporting results
- Table S2a. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the posterior
- distributions of the coefficients in the logistic regression (GLM) for the clonal growth
- probabilities in the three dominant genets.

779	Table S2b. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the posterior
780	distributions of the probabilities of branching via non-tip ramets for the three dominant
781	genets.

... .

.

. .

.

Table S2c. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the posterior
distributions of new ramets in each size class for the three dominant genets.

Table S2d. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the posterior
distributions of the probabilities that ramets survive in each size class in the three
dominant genets.

787 **Table S2e**. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the posterior

distributions of the probabilities that ramets moved between size classes in the three

789 dominant genets. Genets (1) e-1, (2) e-2 and (3) e-3.

- - -

790 **Table S2f**. Medians and 95% credible intervals (in parentheses) of the sensitivity for

the clonal growth probabilities in each size class in the three dominant genets.

Figure S1. Morphological characteristics of underground organs and state of the field survey of *Convallaria keiskei*. A rhizome fragment connecting ramets and elongating at the tip (b) and the underground organ of a shoot (a); aboveground shoots in the study plot in the following year of making ramets (c, d). Sheath leaves start to expand aboveground (c) and fully expanded leaves of the existing ramets with pink tag and newly appearing one with orange tag (d).

Figure S2. A map of ramet distribution in a 28×2 m plot for a *Convallaria keiskei*

population. The X axis of X = 0-28 corresponds to X = 20-48 and Y axis of Y = 0-2

800 is Y = 50-52 in the text. The ramets appeared at least once for the study periods were 801 plotted.

Figure S3. The clonal growth probability of 1-y-tip and 2-y-tip ramets in each size class for the three dominant genets. Medians (solid line) and 95% credible intervals (dashed line) of the posterior distributions are shown. Genets (a) e-1, (b) e-2 and (c) e-

805

3.

Table 1. Summary of census data of ramets in four genets in 2005, 2006 and 2007. The total number and number of surviving (SUR), newly emerged (NEW) and unemerged (UEM) ramets were calculated for each genet. Dashes indicate that data were neither calculated nor estimated. *Numbers in parentheses represent recovering ramets that did not emerge in the previous year. †Numbers in parentheses represent unemerged ramets in the second successive year.

Const ID	Year –	No. of ramets			
Genet ID		Total	SUR	\mathbf{NEW}^*	$\mathbf{U}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{M}^{\dagger}$
e-1	2005	600	_	—	_
	2006	701	581	120	19
	2007	700	603	97 (8)	98 (11)
e-2	2005	108	_	_	_
	2006	137	104	33	4
	2007	131	119	12 (1)	18 (3)
e-3	2005	477	_	_	_
	2006	550	451	99	26
	2007	538	448	90 (16)	102 (10)
e-4	2005	236	_	—	_
	2006	297	227	70	9
	2007	319	255	64 (3)	42 (6)

Table 2. Number of fragments observed in the three genets and the total of each clonal fragment pattern. Patterns correspond to those illustrated in Figure 2.

Dottorn*		Total		
Fattern	e-1	e-2	e-3	Totai
1	5	3	2	10
2	8	4	4	16
3	4	3	0	7
4	18	6	9	33
5	7	1	2	10
6	21	2	12	35
7	5	0	0	5
8	32	16	39	87



(C) Survival and transition Tsc

2	year <i>t</i> - 1, size class <i>l</i>		
	1-y-tip	2-y-tip	Non-tip
1-y-tip	0	0	0
2-y-tip	$T_{kl}S_l \\ (1 - C_l^{1-y-tip})$	$\frac{T_{kl}S_l}{(1-C_l^{2-y-tip})}$	0
Non-tip	$T_{kl}S_lC_l^{1-y-tip}$	$T_{kl}S_lC_l^{2-y-tip}$	T _{kl} S _l

Clonal growth (reproduction) R

year t - 1, size class l

	2 2 2 2	1-y-tip	2-y-tip	Non-tip	
+	1-y-tip	$N_k E_l^{1-y-tip} C_l^{1-y-tip}$	$N_k E_l^{2-y-tip}$ $C_l^{2-y-tip}$	N _k E _l ^{non-tip} C ^{non-tip}	
	2-y-tip	0	0	0	
	Non-tip	0	0	0	

year t, size class k

Pattern



Clonal growth			
year <i>t</i> - 1	year t		
$C_j^{1-y-tip}$	$C_j^{1-y-tip}$		
$(t - 1 \rightarrow t)$	$(t \rightarrow t + 1)$		
$C_i^{1-y-tip}$	$1 - C_i^{1-y-tip}$		
$(t-1 \to t)$	$(t \rightarrow)$		
$1 - C_i^{1-y-tip}$	$C_i^{2-y-tip}$		
$(t - 1 \rightarrow)$	$(t-1 \rightarrow t+1)$		
$1 - C_i^{1-y-tip}$	$1 - C_i^{2-y-tip}$		
$(t - 1 \rightarrow)$	$(t - 1 \rightarrow)$		
$C_i^{2-y-tip}$	$C_i^{1-y-tip}$		
$(t-2 \rightarrow t)$	$(t \to t + 1)$		
$C_i^{2-y-tip}$	$1 - C_i^{1-y-tip}$		
$(t-2 \rightarrow t)$	$(t \rightarrow)$		
$1 - C_i^{2-y-tip}$	$C_i^{2-y-tip}$		
$(t - 2 \rightarrow)$	$(t-2 \rightarrow t+1)$		
$1 - C_j^{2-y-tip}$	$1 - C_j^{2-y-tip}$		





Growth rate