

1 ***Quassia amara* L. diameter and total height under different light conditions: implications**  
2 **for the management of agroecosystems**

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Paulo, J. A.<sup>1</sup>, Villalobos, R.<sup>2</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Instituto Superior de Agronomia (ISA)

7 Centro de Estudos Florestais

8 1349-017 Lisboa

9 Portugal

10 <sup>2</sup>Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE)

11 Programa Bosques, Biodiversidad y cambio climático

12 30501 Turrialba

13 Costa Rica

14

15 **Authors email address:**

16 Joana A. Paulo:

17 <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1889-1721>

18 [joanaap@isa.ulisboa.pt](mailto:joanaap@isa.ulisboa.pt) (Corresponding author)

19 Roger Villalobos:

20 [rvillalo@catie.ac.cr](mailto:rvillalo@catie.ac.cr)

21

22 **Author Contribution Statement:**

23 Joana A. Paulo: methodology establishment; data analysis; modelling; paper writing

24 Roger Villalobos: data collection; data analysis; paper revision

25

## 26 **Abstract**

27 *Quassia amara* L. is a semi-sciophyte species that can be found growing as a large shrub or a  
28 small tree in Neotropical rainforests. It is traditionally harvested as a non-wood forest product for  
29 culinary, medicinal and insecticidal uses. Lack of knowledge on the ecological conditions that  
30 support tree growth limits the development of sustainable forest management plans of natural  
31 forests and the development of new agroecological cultivation models.

32 The overall objectives of the present work are to i) compare the *Quassia amara* L. growth in  
33 different forest structures; ii) evaluate the impact of light conditions on *Quassia amara* L.  
34 diameter growth, total height growth and height–diameter relationship, and iii) discuss  
35 implications for the sustainable management of the species in agroecosystems. Light conditions  
36 are characterized at the tree level by the crown illumination index (cii), which is a visual and  
37 ordinal index.

38 Results show that tree growth varies between plots with different forest structures and light  
39 conditions. The cii was able to characterize light conditions. Best light conditions were different  
40 for diameter and total height growth: cii value of 5.0 (tree crown completely exposed to overhead  
41 and lateral direct light) and cii value of 3.5 (tree crown exposed to some vertical/overhead direct  
42 light and low direct light) respectively. The cii did not affect the height–diameter relationship. A  
43 value of cii equal to 4 was found as an intermediate condition and recommended for the  
44 establishment of new agroecosystems including the *Quassia amara* L.

45

## 46 **Key words**

47 Agroforestry; bitter wood; crown illumination index; mixed forests; non-wood forest product;  
48 light condition; *Simaroubaceae*; Costa Rica.

49

## 50 **1. Introduction**

51 The importance and variety of non-wood forest products (NWFP) is recognized around the world  
52 and for different reasons (e.g., FAO 1995; Wong et al. 2001; Shackleton et al. 2011; Shackleton

53 and Pandey 2014), one being its contribution to increasing rural incomes associated with  
54 sustainable management practices taken in small-scale and family-owned farms, combining  
55 traditional knowledge with new societal demands and innovation (Ludvig et al. 2016;  
56 Pullanikkatil and Shackleton 2019). In Costa Rica and elsewhere in Central America, the number  
57 of trees, shrub and liana species traditionally used for their NWFP production is considerable  
58 (e.g., Nair and Latt 1998; Valle et al. 2000). It represents a large potential for local and regional  
59 development and poverty reduction (Pullanikkatil and Shackleton 2019), but it also requires some  
60 protection measures when they are present in the natural forest ecosystem (Wong et al. 2001).

61 *Quassia amara* L. (commonly known as hombre grande or bitter wood) is a species that can be  
62 found growing as a large shrub or a small tree in Neotropical rainforests (Croat 1978). According  
63 to Brown (1995) and Villalobos (1995), it is classified as a semi-sciophyte with high tolerance to  
64 shade conditions but with a requirement of direct exposure to sunlight in order to complete its life  
65 cycle, in particular due to its effect on flower and fruit production. An increase of the light  
66 conditions increases flower and fruit production although it does not influence seed fertility.  
67 Therefore, its natural regeneration appears to be limited by light and interspecific competition  
68 with upper-story forest species (Leigue 1997). Its distribution extends from Southern Mexico,  
69 through Central America, to northern South America, where it can be found in the Amazon  
70 Rainforest at altitudes ranging from sea level to 900 m (Brown 1995; Croat 1978). It is  
71 traditionally harvested in natural forests and used for culinary, medicinal and insecticidal purposes  
72 (Brown 1995; Ocampo 1995). Recently, it has also been increasingly studied and sought after for  
73 its efficacy in antiamoebic, antiplasmodial and antileukemic medicines (e.g., Bertani et al. 2006;  
74 Houel et al. 2009; Ocampo and Balick 2009), dermatologic and cosmetic uses (Burlando and  
75 Cornara 2017). This has resulted in increased interest in the species by rural communities  
76 (Ocampo and Rojas 2006) for the installation of new plantations in agroecosystems or for their  
77 extraction from natural forests.

78 The distribution, ecology and phenology of the *Quassia amara* L. have been studied in different  
79 regions from Costa Rica (e.g., Brown 1995; Villalobos, 1995; Cifuentes 1996; Leigue 1997).  
80 Although there are no studies or inventory data on the conservation status of the species' wild

81 populations, Silva et al. (2001) refer to its endangered status in Brazil, and Ocampo and Rojas  
82 (2006) suggest the need for the development of sustainable agroecological cultivation models in  
83 Costa Rica in order to preserve the natural populations. This requires both knowledge of the  
84 relationship between environmental conditions and tree growth and the availability of models for  
85 the simulation of growth and production (Vanclay 1994; Burkhardt and Tomé 2012). The present  
86 work contributes to fill this knowledge gap.

87 The objectives of the present research are i) to compare tree growth in different plots characterized  
88 by different forest structure types; ii) to understand the impact of light conditions on *Quassia*  
89 *amara* L.'s diameter growth, total height growth and height–diameter relationship, using the tree  
90 crown illumination index (cii) proposed by Clark and Clark (1992). iii) discuss implications for  
91 the sustainable management of the species in agroecosystems. The results allow us to discuss  
92 recommendations for the installation and sustainable management of new agroecosystems, such  
93 as agroforestry systems or mixed forests that include *Quassia amara* L., and the management of  
94 natural forests where the species is naturally distributed in Costa Rica.

95

## 96 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 97 2.1 Location and environmental description

98 The data sets were collected in the municipality of Talamanca, Limón province, Costa Rica. The  
99 region is naturally occupied by humid tropical forests, characterized by an annual mean  
100 temperature of 20°C, 2300 mm of annual precipitation falling over an average 190 days per year,  
101 with no presence of a dry season (Solano 1992). There are on average 4.1 (July) to 5.9 (March  
102 and April) hours per day of direct solar radiation (measured by a heliograph), with an average  
103 value of 5.0 hours (Ministerio del Ambiente y Energía 2013). The soils in the region are  
104 predominantly Ultisols (IUSS Working Group WRB 2006).

105

### 106 2.2 Data collection

107 The first data set, referred to as the permanent plot data set from now on, was collected in eight  
108 permanent plots. One of the plots was installed in the natural forest of the Kekoldi indigenous

109 reserve (9°38'N; 82°48'W). The remaining seven plots were installed in two private farm  
110 plantations (9°45'N; 82°55'W and 9°32'N; 82°37'W). The private farm plantations of *Quassia*  
111 *amara* were mainly installed in 1992. Only one of the plantations was planted in 1993 due to  
112 technical constrains in the previous year. The trees were planted after one year of growth in the  
113 nursery (two years after for the plot that was installed in 1993). The seeds used for the plantations  
114 were collected in the natural forest of the Kekoldi indigenous reserve. These eight plots differ in  
115 topographic location and forest structure type, representing a diverse range of growth conditions  
116 where *Quassia amara* L. can be cultivated or naturally found (Table 1). Three additional tree  
117 species occur in cultivation with *Quassia amara* L. in each one of the mixed stands:

- 118 • *Caryocar glabrum*, a native tree with a dense and spreading crown, which usually grows  
119 unbranched up to 25 m, traditionally harvested from natural forests for local use, a source  
120 of soap and wood. It is also cultivated for its fruit.
- 121 • *Magnolia mexicana*, a large native tree, growing up to 30 m, traditionally harvested from  
122 natural forests for food flavouring, medicine and as a source of wood.
- 123 • *Theobroma cacao*, a small native tree, growing up to 8 m with a globose crown, widely  
124 cultivated in lowland tropical areas around the world for its seed, which is a source of  
125 chocolate.

126

127 Table 1 here

128

129 According to the established forest inventory procedures defined by Marmillod et al. (1995),  
130 annual measurements of tree diameter at 0.3 m (d03) and tree total height (ht) were taken between  
131 the installation year 1995 and 2000. When a tree presented more than one shoot below 0.3 m  
132 height, individual shoots were measured separately. For each individual tree or shoot, the total  
133 number of branches at 1 m height (nbt) was recorded. Since 1997, light conditions for each tree  
134 were recorded annually using the ordinal crown illumination index (cii) proposed by Clark and  
135 Clark (1992). This index scores the source (vertical/overhead and lateral) and the relative amount  
136 of crown exposure to direct light:

- 137 1 – no direct light received by the crown either from overhead or side;  
138 1.5 – low direct light received laterally, and no overhead light received;  
139 2 – medium direct light received laterally, and no overhead light received;  
140 2.5 – high direct light received laterally, and no overhead light received;  
141 3 – some overhead direct light received (10% to 90% of the crown area exposed to vertical direct  
142 light), and no direct light received laterally;  
143 4 – full overhead light (more than 90% of the crown area exposed to vertical direct light), and no  
144 or low direct light received laterally by the crown;  
145 5 – crown completely exposed to overhead and lateral direct light.

146 The crown illumination index has been largely used for characterizing natural forests growing  
147 conditions in Neotropical rain forests (e.g., Cifuentes 1996; Clark and Clark 1999).

148 The second data set, referred to has the Kekoldi natural forest inventory data set  
149 (NatForest\_KK\_invent), was obtained during a forest inventory carried out in the natural forest  
150 of the Kekoldi indigenous reserve (Table 1). Trees are naturally regenerated, and their age is  
151 unknown. The management of the reserve by local communities includes the random cutting of  
152 some trees (Marmillod et al. 1995), but other than that the trees grow up to an unknown age. The  
153 forest inventory was carried out for the first time in 1997 and repeated in 1998, 1999 and 2000 (4  
154 measurements). During this inventory, the same variables were measured at the tree level: d03,  
155 ht, cii and nbt. Summary statistics of both data sets are presented in Table 2.

156

157 Table 2 here

158

### 159 2.3 Data analysis and modelling

160 The first step was the graphical analysis of the permanent plot data set by plot and measurement,  
161 considering the d03 and ht measurements. The NatForest\_KK\_invent data set was not included  
162 in this step due to the lack of information regarding tree age and the unevenly aged structure of  
163 the natural forest. A t-test, performed for  $\alpha = 5\%$ , was carried out for the comparison of the d03  
164 and ht mean values between plots using the TTEST procedure of SAS software (SAS Institute

165 Inc. 2011). The COCHRAN option was included in order to account for unequal variances  
166 between plots. This step allowed a first analysis of differences between plots that was later on  
167 followed by a modelling approach considering plot random effects.

168 The following step was an age-independent modelling approach carried out by the development  
169 of individual tree growth models for d03, ht, and a d03-ht relationship model. Growth models  
170 consist of equations that simulate the increment of each tree during a determined growth period  
171 (e.g., Burkhart and Tomé 2012). The measured growth is known to be the result of the interaction  
172 between the intrinsic tendency of the plant toward unlimited increase (biotic potential) and the  
173 restraints imposed by environmental resistance (growing conditions) and aging (e.g., Zeide 1993).  
174 Modelling the tree growth when age is not known is often necessary, for example, in old stands  
175 characterized by slow growing species, forest inventories, or in natural forests (e.g., Tomé et al.  
176 2006). Although tree age was known for all except one of the plots of the permanent plot data set,  
177 it was not so for the Kelkoldi data set due to the fact it was collected in natural forests. Moreover,  
178 because of the limited range of ages available (1 to 8 years), the age variable was not considered  
179 an independent variable in the models. Instead, and according to the objectives of the work, testing  
180 the significance of the cii variable measured at the tree level in the model parameters allowed us  
181 to research the effect of different shading conditions on individual tree growth. The nbt value was  
182 also tested in the growth models and d03-ht relationship model parameters.

183 Due to the short interval between two consecutive measurements (annual interval) and limited  
184 range of tree ages available, linear growth models were considered suitable and fitted for the d03  
185 and ht growth models. Each model is formulated as:

$$186 \quad y(t+1)_{ijm} = a + b y(t)_{ijm} + e_{ijm},$$

187 where  $y(t)$  is the tree diameter at 0.3m or the tree total height measured in year  $t$ , 'a' and 'b' are  
188 model parameters,  $i$  is the tree,  $j$  is the plot,  $m$  is the measurement, and  $e_{ijm}$  is the model error.

189 For the height-diameter relationship, a set of candidate models were considered. Paulo et al.  
190 (2011) suggest that the function form used to model the height-diameter relationship should be  
191 increased monotonically and have an upper asymptote. The candidate functions fulfil these  
192 requirements. They were the ones proposed by Paulo et al. (2011) based on the extended list

193 proposed by Huang et al. (2000) but restricted to pass by (d03 ; ht)=(0 ; 0.3) point for the present  
194 data set (see Table 2 in Paulo et al. 2011).

195 Our analytical approach was similar for both models, although the first step was only carried out  
196 for the height-diameter model:

197 i) Selection of the best-fitting model by the ordinary least squares method, setting all  
198 model parameters as free. In this step, the selected function was the one resulting in  
199 the lower value of mean square error (MSE) and the highest value of adjusted  $r^2$  (adj-  
200  $r^2$ ).

201 ii) Fitting of the model, including the plot random effect parameter, in all model  
202 parameters (e.g., Pinheiro and Bates 2000).

203 iii) Testing of the statistical significance ( $\alpha = 5\%$ ) of cii and nbt variables in all model  
204 parameters. The variables were tested in three distinct forms, resulting in the fitting  
205 of a set of alternative models:

206 a. Linear (the more the better):  $a = a_0 + a_1 X_{ijm}$

207 b. Parabolic (an optimum condition exists):  $a = a_0 + a_1 X_{ijm} + a_2 (X_{ijm})^2$

208 c. Hyperbolic (a maximum/optimum and asymptotic condition exists):  $a = a_0 + a_1 /$   
209  $X_{ijm}$ , where 'a', 'a<sub>0</sub>', 'a<sub>1</sub>',

210 where 'a', 'a<sub>0</sub>', 'a<sub>1</sub>', 'a<sub>2</sub>' are model parameters, and  $X_{ijm}$  is d03 or ht from tree  $i$ , in  $j$   
211 plot and  $m$  measurement.

212 iv) Comparison of the alternative models fitted in the previous step using the Akaike  
213 information criterion (AIC), and selection of the final model (lowest AIC value).

214 v) Evaluation of the model residuals variance by plotting the conditional studentized  
215 residuals as a function of the predicted value and of the model residuals normality by  
216 the normal probability plots of the conditional studentized residuals (e.g., Pinheiro  
217 and Bates 2000).

218 This approach allowed us to research the impact of light conditions at the tree level on *Quassia*  
219 *amara* and identify the plots where significant differences remained unaccounted for (when plot  
220 random effects appear significant in the final model). The fitting of the models was carried out

221 using the nonlinear least squares method implemented in the MODEL and NLINMIX procedures  
222 of SAS software (SAS Institute Inc. 2011).

223

### 224 3. Results

#### 225 3.1 Graphical analysis to the permanent plot data set

226 Plots in the permanent plot data set revealed significant differences in the d03 and ht of the trees,  
227 that increased with consecutive measurements (Figure 1). Differences were more pronounced for  
228 d03 than for ht.

229 Since the first measurement, carried out at 3 years of age, plot PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 was  
230 outperformed by all other plots for both variables. The same behaviour was not observed by plot  
231 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1, which was characterized by the same tree species composition.  
232 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 presented average values of d03 located in the central area of the figure and  
233 values of ht close to the plot with the largest measured values (PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1). A large  
234 dispersion of d03 and ht values was noticed in several plots, expressed by the large range values  
235 from the box plot upper and lower fences. This feature increased in the last measurements,  
236 particularly for d03 values of PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 and PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1.

237 Identifying the plots with larger d03 and ht values across the measurements did not show clear  
238 evidence for one single plot. Plot PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 maintained larger d03 values over all  
239 measurements, but plot PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1 had higher mean ht values over time. Regarding  
240 d03, PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1, PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2, PP\_Quassia\_pure\_1 and  
241 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 plots presented similar and intermediate values, with the first two reaching  
242 higher values than the last two after six years of age. For ht similarities between plots  
243 measurements were more evident for plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 and PP\_Quassia+Magnolia  
244 as well as PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1, PP\_Quassia\_pure\_1 and PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2.

245

246 Figure 1 here

247

248 The t-test (values not shown) confirmed the statistical significance of the some of the previous  
249 graphical observations regarding average values. The no rejection of the null hypothesis occurred  
250 when comparing the average values of plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 and PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1  
251 for mean d03 values, for ht values of plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 and PP\_Quassia+Magnolia,  
252 and for ht values of plots PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 and PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2.

253

### 254 3.2 Diameter growth model

255 Differences in tree d03 values and d03 growth between the plots were observed when plotting  
256 two consecutive measurements (Figure 2). NatForest\_KK\_invent data set showed the largest d03  
257 values with a maximum of 11.5 cm. For the permanent plot data set, PP\_Quassia\_NatForest plot  
258 was the one presenting larger d03 values at the last measurement (maximum d03 value 8.6 cm),  
259 followed by PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 (maximum d03 value 7.5 cm). Tree d03 growth was observed  
260 in Figure 2 by the vertical distance of one observation to the bisector line. It showed that plot  
261 PP\_Quassia\_NatForest d03 is limited and overcome by other permanent plots in general. For the  
262 NatForest\_KK\_invent data set, d03 growth was variable.

263

264 Figure 2 here

265

266 The inclusion of the nbt variable in the model parameters resulted in non-significant estimates of  
267 the model parameters, showing that the variable does not influence d03 growth. The final fitted  
268 model included the cii variable in a parabolic form in the intercept parameter and two plot random  
269 effects in the intercept and slope parameters (Table 3).

270

$$271 \quad d03_{t+1} = 0.1685 \text{ cii} - 0.0177 \text{ cii}^2 + u_0 + (1.0168 + u_1) \cdot d03_t$$

272

273 The significance of the plot random effect parameters in the intercept ('u<sub>0</sub>') for plots  
274 PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1 (0.2030), PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 (-0.1257), PP\_Quassia\_NatForest (-

275 0.1883), PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 (0.1779), PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 (-0.1458) and the  
276 NatForest\_KK\_invent data set (-0.1988) showed that differences in d03 between plots remain  
277 unexplained by the model. The positive value of the random effect parameter showed a higher  
278 d03 estimated value in plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1 and PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2, while the  
279 negative random effect associated to PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1, PP\_Quassia\_NatForest,  
280 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 plots and the NatForest\_KK\_invent data set shows that these are related to  
281 lower d03 growth. A significant random effect of the plot in the slope parameter ( $u_1$ ), which is  
282 associated to a higher value of growth rate of d03, was only observed for plot  
283 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 (0.0411).

284

285 Table 3 here

286

287 In this model, the maximum value for the intercept parameter occurs when  $c_{ii}$  is 4.8, a value close  
288 to 5.0 that corresponds to the maximum  $c_{ii}$  value according to the Clark and Clark (1992),  
289 characterizing a tree crown that is completely exposed to overhead and lateral direct light.  
290 Considering the population effect (setting  $u_0$  and  $u_1$  parameters to zero (Paulo et al. 2011)) and an  
291 average tree size from the data set with a  $d03_t$  of 3.5 cm, it's estimated value of  $d03_{t+1}$  is higher if  
292 the light conditions are characterized by increasing  $c_{ii}$  values with a maximum obtained for a  $c_{ii}$   
293 value close to 5.0. A tree of the same size, growing in the same plot but with lower access to light,  
294 will have a lower d03 growth (Figure 3).

295

296 Figure 3 here

297

298 The plot of the conditional studentized residuals showed that homoscedastic conditions were  
299 fulfilled and that normality conditions were considered acceptable (Figure 4).

300

301 Figure 4 here

302

303 3.3 Total height growth model

304 The inclusion of the nbt variable in the model parameters showed that the variable was not  
305 significant for the ht growth (parameter estimates not significantly different from zero). The final  
306 fitted model included the cii variable in a parabolic form in the slope parameters (Table 4).

307

$$308 \quad ht_{t+1} = 45.8725 + u_0 + (0.8580 + 0.0527 \text{ cii} - 0.00751 \text{ cii}^2 + u_1) ht_t$$

309

310 Table 4 here

311

312 The maximum value for the slope parameter (ht growth rate) occurs when cii is 3.5, a value that  
313 characterized tree crowns exposed to some vertical or overhead direct light and low direct light  
314 received laterally by the crown. Considering the population effect (setting  $u_0$  and  $u_1$  parameters to  
315 zero (Paulo et al. 2011)), one can estimate that an average tree with  $ht_t$  of 3.5 m will present a  
316 higher estimated value of  $ht_{t+1}$  if the light conditions are characterized by an intermediate cii value  
317 close to 3.5 (Figure 3).

318 The significance of the plot random effect parameters (Table 4) in the intercept was obtained for  
319 plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 (20.8893), PP\_Quassia\_NatForest (-33.5354) and  
320 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 (-24.0540). Significant plot random effect parameters in the slope  
321 parameter (ht growth rate) were found for the same plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 (-0.07579),  
322 PP\_Quassia\_NatForest (0.05426) and PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 (0.06120).

323 The plot of the conditional studentized residuals showed that homoscedastic conditions were  
324 fulfilled and that normality conditions were considered acceptable (Figure 4).

325

326 3.4 Height-diameter model

327 The relationship between these two variables demonstrated the existence of an asymptotic value  
328 of ht when d03 values increase, which is distinct between the plots of the data sets (Figure 5).

329

330 Figure 5 here

331

332 The fitting of the models showed that for the ones including three parameters, convergence of the  
333 estimates was not obtained. Even if the fitting was carried out at the plot level, for the best  
334 definition of initialization values of the parameters, the differences between plots, expressed by  
335 distinct parameter estimate values (in particular between plots PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 and  
336 PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 and the rest of the data set) did not allowed the convergence of these models.  
337 Among the other considered models characterized by two parameters, the selected one was:

$$338 \quad ht = 0.3 e^{\left[ \frac{-a \, d03}{b \, (d03+b)} \right]}$$

339 When including the cii variable in the model parameters, similar AIC values were obtained  
340 compared to the previous model, demonstrating that cii does not influence the d03-ht relationship.  
341 When including the nbt variable in the model parameters, AIC values were reduced showing that  
342 the resulting models outperformed the previous one. The best results were obtained when the nbt  
343 variable was included in a hyperbolic form in parameter 'a' (Table 5):

$$344 \quad ht = 0.3 e^{\left[ \frac{-(-3.6448 + 0.249/nbt + u_0) \, d03}{1.1423 \, (d03 + 1.1423) + u_1} \right]}$$

345 This model showed that the ht asymptotic value will be influenced by the nbt value, varying  
346 between 9.10 m for one single shoot (nbt = 1) to 7.29 m when the nbt tends to large values.

347 The significance of the plot random effect was obtained when included in the 'a' parameter ('u<sub>0</sub>')  
348 for the NatForest\_KK\_invent data set (0.1551), PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 (0.2614) and  
349 PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 (-0.3957) plots. In the 'b' parameter ('u<sub>1</sub>') significant values were obtained  
350 for the NatForest\_KK\_invent data set (-0.1891) and PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 (0.3786) plots.  
351 These random parameters showed that some differences remain unexplained regarding height-  
352 diameter relationship (Table 5).

353 The plot of the residuals showed that homoscedastic and normality conditions were fulfilled  
354 (Figure 4).

355

356 Table 5 here

357

#### 358 **4. Discussion**

359 *Quassia amara* L. is described as a semi-sciophyte species with higher tolerance to shade but  
360 requiring direct exposure to sunlight during flowering and fruit production stages (e.g., Brown  
361 1995; Villalobos 1995; Ocampo and Rojas 2006; Leigue 1997). This part of the tree's life cycle  
362 is essential for the establishment of natural regeneration, which can play a major role in large-  
363 scale landscape restoration in tropical regions (Chazdon and Guariguata 2016) and even surpasses  
364 active restoration practices in these natural forests (Crouzeilles et al. 2017). This feature is also  
365 encountered in other species producers of NWFP more extensively researched and found in  
366 tropical agroforestry landscapes such as *Coffea arabica*, *Camellia sinensis* L. and *Theobroma*  
367 *cacao* (Tscharntke et al. 2011). This evidences the importance of defining sustainable  
368 management plans for natural forests where NWFP are being extracted on the basis of reliable  
369 data collected with differentiated inventory methodologies and sampling schemes from forest  
370 inventories (e.g., Wong et al. 2001; Almeida and Tomé 2010). The inventories should not only  
371 allow the quantification of the species abundance and carbon stock but also of the natural  
372 regeneration, seed availability and characterization of light conditions. Proper inventory of NTFP  
373 stocks and research on NTFP ecology and sustainable harvest levels has been referred to as one  
374 of the eight crucial considerations for positioning NWFP on the development agenda by  
375 Shackleton and Pandey (2014), but these are still much less common than desirable around the  
376 globe and more so in tropical areas (e.g., Guariguata et al. 2010; Dhakal et al. 2016; Painkra et al.  
377 2017). This work contributes to this cause with a focus on the *Quassia amara* L. species.

378 The differences in tree growth between the plots were clear in the two data sets. These differences  
379 were observed during the graphical analysis and by the significance of some of the plot random  
380 coefficients in the final models. These indicated that additional research on the effects of  
381 additional site variables affecting tree growth should be carried out. An important factor to  
382 consider is the tree species' arrangement and density, which was different in the permanent plot  
383 data set. In the PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1 and PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 plots, for example, the

384 *Quassia amara* L. trees were planted in 3 x 3 m and in the middle of 4 *Caryocar glabrum* trees,  
385 while in the PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 and PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2 plots the *Quassia amara* L. trees  
386 were planted intercalated with adult *Theobroma cacao* tree rows. The complexity of the subject,  
387 the range of possible combinations, the time associated with data collection of forest growth, and  
388 the increase of computation capacity has converged in the development of recent modelling  
389 approaches that can be considered (Roszkopf et al. 2017). Other factors that were not accounted  
390 for by the model were the topographic location and soil properties (depth, texture), which could  
391 influence water drainage, nutrient uptake and later on root development (Bellingham and Tanner  
392 2006; Castilho et al. 2006).

393 Natural tropic forest areas are known for their high complexity in terms of light conditions,  
394 species composition, topography, etc. This leads to the development of variable environmental  
395 conditions that affect species distribution and growth in different ways. The data sets from natural  
396 forest areas (NatForest\_KK\_invent data set and PP\_Quassia\_NatForest plot) confirmed this high  
397 variability in terms of *Quassia amara* L. size. The fact that they included the highest values of  
398 d03 and ht was attributed to the presence of trees older than 7 years like the ones on the permanent  
399 data set, although age could not be determined. In terms of growth rates, the  
400 NatForest\_KK\_invent data set and the PP\_Quassia\_NatForest plot were associated to lower  
401 values, observed both graphically and by the negative values of the random coefficients of the  
402 fitted models. Excessive shading conditions and interspecific competition (e.g. Picard 2019)  
403 might be one of the causes of this slow growth that should be taken into consideration when  
404 defining management plans, in particular when considering d03 growth.

405 The two plots where the *Quassia amara* L. and *Theobroma cacao* species were mixed  
406 (PP\_Quassia+cacao\_1 and PP\_Quassia+cacao\_2) presented distinct results, but both were  
407 associated predominantly with negative values (when significant) of the plot random parameters  
408 of the fitted models. This was more evident for the d03 growth model. One plot was outperformed  
409 by the rest, while the other was able to reach average values of d03 and ht. The latter was installed  
410 in an area with a more variable topography (from a downhill to a hillside), and hypothesis about  
411 the influence of this variable in the variability of the measurements may be raised (Bellingham

412 and Tanner 2006; Castilho et al. 2006). The *Quassia amara* L., when compared to the cacao tree,  
413 seems to have a distinct need for light during its life cycle. For cacao, shade is needed for young  
414 trees and is less important in older cacao plantations (Tschardt et al. 2011). This suggested that  
415 the association of *Quassia amara* L. and *Theobroma cacao* species might not be favourable in  
416 mixed plantations, expect in areas were the last specie is characterized by older trees that might  
417 be pruned in order to increase light conditions to promote the *Quassia amara* L. growth and fruit  
418 production in case natural regeneration is one of the management purposes for the plantation.  
419 Although it was known that the *Theobroma cacao* trees was frequently pruned in the two plots,  
420 there were no records of dates when they occurred, their frequency, pruning intensity or the total  
421 height of these cacao trees. Since different tree height values and pruning practices may affect  
422 differently overhead and sided light conditions, this fact limited a more detailed analysis of the  
423 relationship between the two species.

424 The two plots where the *Quassia amara* L. and *Caryocar glabrum* species were mixed  
425 (PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_1 and PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2) presented similar results regarding d03  
426 growth as well as some of the larger values among all the permanent plots, appearing as a  
427 favourable species combination. Regarding ht growth, the plot behaviour was very distinct, and  
428 plot PP\_Quassia+Caryocar\_2 obtained similar results to the plot where the *Quassia amara* L. was  
429 mixed with *Magnolia mexicana* (PP\_Quassia+Magnolia). With similar values of tree spacing and  
430 topographic conditions, it is not possible to clarify the reason for the differences in ht values for  
431 these plots. Information about the *Caryocar glabrum* and *Magnolia mexicana* trees crown (total  
432 height, base of the crown, etc.) and local soil characteristics could be variables related to these  
433 differentiated results.

434 The two plots installed in pure forest plantations (PP\_Quassia\_pure\_1 and PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2)  
435 had similar ht growth, but plot PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 outperformed for d03. Since the two plots are  
436 differentiated by their topographic conditions, with PP\_Quassia\_pure\_1 being located downhill  
437 and PP\_Quassia\_pure\_2 located on a hillside, one might again hypothesize, as for the *Quassia*  
438 *amara* L. and *Theobroma cacao* plots, that the downhill location had a negative influence on tree  
439 growth due to the reduction of water drainage in the soil.

440 Regarding the tree level differences, the data set included annual and individual tree level  
441 evaluation of the light conditions, which was characterized by the crown illumination index (cii)  
442 proposed by Clark and Clark (1992). The assessment of the cii provides a simple and rapid  
443 evaluation of light conditions, either by visual observation or hemispherical photographs analysis  
444 (Keeling and Phillips 2007), reducing time-consuming measurements of the surrounding tree  
445 height and crown dimensions. Results showed that this variable was related to both diameter and  
446 total height growth. This showed that cii could provide an effective characterization of growth  
447 conditions, even in a dynamic way if assessed through time, and therefore it could be used for  
448 inventory and management purposes. Since the cii is evaluated on the basis of the crown of the  
449 surrounding trees, irrespective of the species, it is particularly useful for natural forest areas,  
450 multi-species and multi-strata cropping systems like agroforestry systems.

451 The cii value contributing for larger d03 and ht growth was different for the two variables. After  
452 a stage of increasing ht for increasing cii light conditions, a maximum ht growth was obtained for  
453 cii equal to 3.5. Similar results were obtained for cii equal to 3 or 4. These values indicate that  
454 favourable conditions for the *Quassia amara* L. ht growth are characterized by partial to full  
455 overhead light and no or low direct light received laterally by the crown. The complete exposure  
456 of the crown to overhead and lateral direct light (cii equal to 5) induces a reduction in ht growth.  
457 Maximum cii values (cii equal to 5) maximize d03 growth. Even so, it was observed that the  
458 differences in d03 growth obtained under cii values of 4 and 5 are not large. Finally, cii values of  
459 4 are found compatible, and intermediate conditions to both variables and were recommended as  
460 the best growth conditions for *Quassia amara* L. These suggested that the *Quassia amara* L.  
461 might be planted beneath and in the middle of taller tree species that provide lateral shade  
462 conditions (crown completely exposed to overhead and lateral direct light). These conditions  
463 might also be obtained by thinning and/or regular pruning operations of the taller tree species in  
464 the overstory, operations that can be an additional source of biomass, tree fodder and income for  
465 landowners (e.g., Salazar-Diaz and Tixier 2019). This issue leads to the open question related to  
466 the optimization of pruning intensity, frequency, crown pruning technics etc.

467 The present study contributed to existing literature on the determination of the relationship  
468 between light conditions and the *Quassia amara* tree species growth. It also contributed to the  
469 definition of suitable site characteristics and species combinations in agroforestry stands where  
470 *Quassia amara* may be included. Under sustainable management conditions, these are expected  
471 to help meet the increasing world demand of this species and avoid the overexploitation of the  
472 species in natural forests (Dawkins and Philip 1998; Sedjo and Botkin 2010; Silva et al. 2001).  
473 This work also raised awareness on the fact that the suitable conditions for *Quassia amara* L.  
474 wood production are still not fully understood. This is an essential step for increasing the  
475 awareness of farmers on the potential of the species. This knowledge gap contrasts with the  
476 growing knowledge of the chemical properties and industrial use potential of the species that  
477 ultimately presents a significant potential for increasing farmers' income and for the  
478 diversification of resources in forestry systems (e.g., Haggard et al. 1998), agroforestry systems  
479 (e.g., Salazar-Diaz and Tixier 2019) and/or agroecological production systems (e.g., Altieri 2002)  
480 in tropical areas.

481

## 482 **5. Conclusions**

483 Tree growth varies between plots with different forest structures and light conditions. Light  
484 condition, which is assessed at the tree level by the tree crown illumination index, was shown to  
485 be an important determinant of *Quassia amara*'s diameter and total height growth. Best light  
486 conditions are different for diameter and total height growth with intermediate values of cii (3.5)  
487 promoting total height growth and higher values (5.0) promoting tree diameter growth. Crown  
488 illumination index values of 4 are found compatible and intermediate conditions to both variables  
489 and were recommended as the best growth conditions for *Quassia amara* L.

490

## 491 **Acknowledgments**

492 Authors acknowledge researchers and officials of the old Project Conservation for Sustainable  
493 Development in Central America, of CATIE, which contributed to the establishment and  
494 measurement of research spaces on *Quassia amara* L., in particular: Dr. Daniel Marmillod, Rafael

495 Ocampo, Lilibeth Leigue, Juan Carlos Barrantes, José Masís, Francisco Ling. Authors  
496 acknowledge Inês Balsa for her contribution on the design of the graphical abstract. This work  
497 was supported by SuFORun Marie Skodowska-Curie Research and Innovation Staff Exchange  
498 project (H2020-MSCA-RISE-2015) and contract SFRH/BPD/96475/2013 established with  
499 Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (Portugal). Centro de Estudos Florestais is a research unit  
500 supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (Portugal) under contract  
501 UID/AGR/00239/2013.

502

### 503 **References**

- 504 Almeida, A., Tomé, M. 2010. Field sampling of cork value before extraction in Portuguese  
505 ‘montados’. *Agroforestry systems* 79: 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9260-8>
- 506 Altieri, M. A. 2002. Agroecology: the science of natural resource management for poor  
507 farmers in marginal environments 93 (1–3): 1-24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(02)00085-3)  
508 [8809\(02\)00085-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(02)00085-3)
- 509 Bellingham, P. J., Tanner, E. V. J. 2006. The Influence of Topography on Tree Growth,  
510 Mortality, and Recruitment in a Tropical Montane Forest. *Biotropica* 32: 378-384.  
511 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2000.tb00484.x>
- 512 Bertani, S., Houel, E., Stien, D., Chevlot, L., Jullian, V., Garavito, G., Bourdy, G. & Deharo,  
513 E. 2006. Simalikalactone D is responsible for the antimalarial properties of an Amazonian  
514 traditional remedy made with *Quassia amara* L. (Simaroubaceae). *Journal of*  
515 *Ethnopharmacology* 108(1): 155-157.
- 516 Burkhart, H. E., Tomé, M. 2012. *Modeling Forest Trees and Stands*. Springer. 457 pp.
- 517 Brown, N. R. 1995. The autecology and agroforestry potential of the bitterwood tree *Quassia*  
518 *amara* L. ex. Blom (Simaroubaceae). PhD thesis. Cornell University. 250 pp.
- 519 Burlando, B., Cornara, L. 2017. Revisiting Amazonian Plants for Skin Care and Disease.  
520 *Cosmetics* 4(3), 25. 12 pp. doi:10.3390/cosmetics4030025

521 Chazdon, R. L., Guariguata, M. R. 2016. Natural regeneration as a tool for large-scale forest  
522 restoration in the tropics: prospects and challenges. *Biotropica* 48(6): 716-730  
523 <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12381>

524 Castilho, V. C., Magnusson, W. E., R. Araújo, N. O., Luizão, R. C. C., Luizão, F. J., Lima,  
525 A. P., Higuchi, N. 2006. Variation in aboveground tree live biomass in a central Amazonian  
526 Forest: Effects of soil and topography. *Forest Ecology and Management* 234 (1): 85-96.  
527 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2006.06.024>

528 Cifuentes, M. F. 1996. Distribución espacial y potencial de aprovechamiento de *Quassia*  
529 *amara* L. (Simaroubaceae) en Río San Juan, Nicaragua. BsC thesis. Instituto Tecnológico de  
530 Costa Rica. Departamento de Ingeniería Forestal. Cartago. Costa Rica. 102 pp.

531 Clark, D. A., Clark, D. B. 1992. Life history diversity of canopy and emergent trees in a  
532 neotropical rain forest. *Ecological monographs* 62(3): 315 – 344

533 Clark, D. A., Clark, D. B. 1999. Assessing the growth of tropical rain forest trees: issues for  
534 forest modeling and management. *Ecological Applications* 9 (3): 981-997.

535 Croat, T. 1978. *Flora of Barro Colorado*. Stanford university press. Stanford, California.  
536 956 pp.

537 Crouzeilles, R., Ferreira, M. S., Chazdon, R. L., Lindenmayer, D. B., Sansevero, J. B.,  
538 Monteiro, L., Iribarrem, A., Latawiec, A. E., Strassburg, B. B. N. 2017. Ecological restoration  
539 success is higher for natural regeneration than for active restoration in tropical forests.  
540 *Applied ecology* 3 (11):e1701345 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701345>

541 Dawkins, H. C., Philip, M. S. 1998. *Tropical moist forest silviculture and management: a*  
542 *history of success and failure*. Wallingford, UK. 377 pp.

543 Dhakal, P., Paudel, D. R., Baral, D. R. 2016. Inventory of non-timber forest products in  
544 Western Nepal and strategies for sustainable management. *International Journal of*  
545 *Environment* 5 (3): 87-103.

546 FAO. 1995. *Non-wood forest products for rural income and sustainable forestry*. Non-Wood  
547 forest products 7. ISBN 92-5-103765-5. 21 pages.

548 <http://www.mekonginfo.org/assets/midocs/0001410-environment-non-wood-forest->  
549 [products-for-rural-income-and-sustainable-forestry.pdf](http://www.mekonginfo.org/assets/midocs/0001410-environment-non-wood-forest-products-for-rural-income-and-sustainable-forestry.pdf)

550 Guariguata, M. R., García-Fernández, C., Sheil, D., Nasi, R., Herrero-Jáuregui, C.,  
551 Cronkleton, P., Ingrama, V. 2010. Compatibility of timber and non-timber forest product  
552 management in natural tropical forests: Perspectives, challenges, and opportunities. *Forest*  
553 *Ecology and Management* 259 (3): 237-245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.11.013>

554 Haggard, J. P., Briscoe, C. B., Butterfield, R. P. 1998. Native species: a resource for the  
555 diversification of forestry production in the lowland humid tropics. *Forest Ecology and*  
556 *Management* 106 (2–3): 195-203. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(97\)00311-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(97)00311-3)

557 Houel, E., Bertani, S., Bourdy, G., Deharo, E., Jullian, V., Valentin, A., Chevalley, S. & Stien,  
558 D. 2009. Quassinoid constituents of *Quassia amara* L. leaf herbal tea. Impact on its  
559 antimalarial activity and cytotoxicity. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 126(1): 114-118.

560 Huang, S., Price, D., Titus, S. 2000. Development of ecoregion-based height-diameter models  
561 for white spruce in boreal forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 129: 125-141.

562 IUSS Working Group WRB. 2006. World reference base for soil resources 2006. 2nd edition.  
563 World Soil Resources Reports No. 103, FAO, Rome, 133 pp.

564 Keeling, H. C., Phillips, O. L. 2007. A calibration method for the crown illumination index  
565 for assessing forest light environments. *Forest Ecology and Management* 242: 431–437. doi:  
566 10.1016/j.foreco.2007.01.060

567 Leigue, L. 1997. Ecological elements for silviculture of *Quassia amara* in Talamanca, Costa  
568 Rica. Master thesis. Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE).  
569 Turrialba. Costa Rica. 121 pp. <http://hdl.handle.net/11554/4829>

570 Ludvig, A., Tahvanainen, V., Dickson, A., Evard, C., Kurttila, M., Cosovic, M., Chapman,  
571 E., Wilding, M., Weiss, G. 2016. The practice of entrepreneurship in the non-wood forest  
572 products sector: Support for innovation on private forest land. *Forest Policy and Economics*  
573 66: 31-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2016.02.007>

574 Marmillod, D., Chang, Y., Bedoya, R. 1995. Plan de aprovechamiento sostenible de *Quassia*  
575 *amara* em la Reserva Indígena de Kekoldi. In: Ocampo, RA. 1995. Potencial de *Quassia*

576 *amara* como insecticida natural. Colección diversidad biológica y desarrollo sustentable. IV.  
577 Metodologías. Serie Técnica. Informe Técnico nº 267. Centro Agronómico Tropical de  
578 Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE). Proyecto Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible em  
579 América Central (Olafo). Turrialba. Costa Rica. 185 pp.

580 Ministerio del Ambiente y Energía. 2013. Serie e brillo solar en Cota Rica. Instituto  
581 Meteorológico Nacional. 25 pp.  
582 <https://www.imn.ac.cr/documents/10179/20909/Series+de+Brillo+Solar+en+Costa+Rica>

583 Nair, P. K. R., Latt, C. R. 1998. Directions in Tropical Agroforestry Research. Forestry  
584 Sciences, vol 53. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9008-2\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9008-2_10)

585 Ocampo, R. A. 1995. Potencial de *Quassia amara* como insecticida natural. Colección  
586 diversidad biológica y desarrollo sustentable. IV. Metodologías. Serie Técnica. Informe  
587 Técnico nº 267. Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE).  
588 Proyecto Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible em América Central (Olafo). Turrialba.  
589 Costa Rica. 185 pp.

590 Ocampo, R., Balick, M. J. 2009. Plants of Semillas Sagradas: An Ethnomedicinal Garden in  
591 Costa Rica. Finca Luna Nueva Extractos. Costa Rica. 109 pp.

592 Ocampo, R., Rojas, R. D. 2006. Cultivo, conservación e industrialización del hombre grande  
593 (*Quassia amara*). Bougainvillea. San José, Costa Rica. 70 pp.

594 Painkra, M., Dutta, J., Ranga, M. M. 2017. Status Survey of Non Wood Forest Products in  
595 Surgujadistrict of Chhattisgarh: India. Applied Forest Ecology 5 (2): 20-27.

596 Paulo, J.A., Tomé, J., Tomé, M. 2011. Nonlinear fixed and random generalized height-  
597 diameter models for Portuguese cork oak stands. Annals of Forest Science 68: 295 – 309.

598 Picard, N. 2019. Asymmetric Competition Can Shape the Size Distribution of Trees in a  
599 Natural Tropical Forest. Forest Science, fxz018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forsci/fxz018>

600 Pinheiro, J. C., Bates, D. M. 2000. Mixed-effects models in S and S-Plus. Stat. And comput.  
601 series. Springer, New York, p 528.

602 Pullanikkatil D., Shackleton C.M. 2019. Poverty Reduction Strategies and Non-timber Forest  
603 Products. In: Pullanikkatil D., Shackleton C. (eds) Poverty Reduction Through Non-Timber

604 Forest Products. Sustainable Development Goals Series. Springer, Cham.  
605 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75580-9\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75580-9_1)

606 Roskopf, E., Morhart, C., Nahm, M. 2017. Modelling Shadow Using 3D Tree Models in  
607 High Spatial and Temporal Resolution. Remote Sens. 9(7): 10 pp  
608 <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9070719>

609 Salazar-Díaz, R., Tixier, P. 2019. Effect of plant diversity on income generated by  
610 agroforestry systems in Talamanca, Costa Rica. Agroforest Systems 93: 571–580. DOI:  
611 10.1007/s10457-017-0151-0

612 SAS Institute Inc. 2011. Introduction to Regression Procedures (Chapter). SAS/STAT 9.3  
613 User's Guide, SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC. 50 pp.

614 Shackleton, C. M., Pandey, A. K. 2014. Positioning non-timber forest products on the  
615 development agenda. Forest Policy and Economics 38: 1-7.  
616 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2013.07.004>

617 Shackleton, S., Shackleton, C. M., Shanley, P. 2011. Non-Timber Forest Products in the  
618 Global Context. Tropical Forestry, vol 7. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg DOI: 10.1007/978-3-  
619 642-17983-9

620 Silva, S. R., Buitrón, X., Oliveira, L. H., Martins, M. V. 2001. Plantas medicinales de Brasil:  
621 Aspectos generales sobre legislación y comercio. Quito, Ecuador. 44 pp.

622 Sedjo, R. A., Botkin, D. 2010. Using Forest Plantations TO SPARE Natural Forests.  
623 Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development 39(10): 14-30. DOI:  
624 10.1080/00139159709604776

625 Solano, J. 1992. Características Básicas del Período Seco en la Vertiente del Pacífico de Costa  
626 Rica. Tesis para optar al grado de Licenciatura en Geografía. Escuela de Ciencias  
627 Geográficas. Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica. In: Solano, J., Villalobos, R. Regione y  
628 subregione climáticas de Costa Rica. Instituto Meteorológico Nacional. 32 pp.  
629 [https://www.imn.ac.cr/documents/10179/20909/Regionalizaci%C3%B3n+clim%C3%A1tica](https://www.imn.ac.cr/documents/10179/20909/Regionalizaci%C3%B3n+clim%C3%A1tica+de+Costa+Rica)  
630 [a+de+Costa+Rica](https://www.imn.ac.cr/documents/10179/20909/Regionalizaci%C3%B3n+clim%C3%A1tica+de+Costa+Rica)

631 Tschardtke, T., Clough, Y., Bhagwat, S. A., Buchori, D., Faust, H., Hertel, D., Hölscher, D.,  
632 Juhrendt, J., Kessler, M., Perfecto, I., Scherber, C., Schroth, G., Veldkamp, E., Wanger, T.  
633 C. 2011. Multifunctional shade-tree management in tropical agroforestry landscapes – a  
634 review. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 48: 619-629.

635 Valle, G. R. R., Barbosa, K. O., Villalobos, R. 2000. Evaluación de los productos forestales  
636 no madereros en América Central. In: FAO. 2000. Evaluation de los recursos forestales  
637 mundiales 2000. Evaluación de los productos forestales no madereros en América Central.  
638 Programa de Evaluación de los Recursos Forestales. Forest Resources Assessment Wp 22.  
639 104 pp. <http://www.fao.org/3/ae159s/ae159s00.htm>

640 Vanclay, J. K. 1994. Modelling forest growth and yield: applications to mixed tropical forests,  
641 CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

642 Villalobos, R. S. 1995. Distribución de *Quassia amara* L. ex Blom en Costa Rica, y su  
643 relación com los contenidos de cuasina y neocuasina (insecticidas naturales) en sus tejidos.  
644 Master thesis. Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE).  
645 Turrialba. Costa Rica. 206 pp. <http://hdl.handle.net/11554/4806>

646 Wong, J. L. G., Thornber, K., Baker, N. 2001. Resource Assessment of Non-wood Forest  
647 Products: Experience and Biometric Principles, Volume 1. Food and Agriculture  
648 Organization of the United Nations. Rome, Italy. 109 pp.

649 Zeide, B. 1993. Analysis of Growth Equations, *Forest Science* 39 (3): 594–616.  
650 <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestscience/39.3.594>

651 **Figures caption**

652

653 Figure 1. Box-plot of tree diameter at 0.3 m (d03) – top – and total height (ht) – bottom –  
654 measurements for the permanent plot data set. Data from Plot PP\_Quassia\_NatForest are not  
655 included since tree age is not known. The vertical bars on each box plot indicate the upper and  
656 lower fences, which are located at a distance of 1.5 times the interquartile range ( $IQR = Q3 - Q1$ )  
657 above and below the box. Observations located outside the range of these bars are outliers and  
658 are identified by the isolated points.

659

660 Figure 2. Consecutive tree diameter at 0.3 m (d03) measurements (in cm), included in the  
661 permanent plots (top) and NatForest\_KK\_invent (bottom) data sets.

662

663 Figure 3. Tree diameter and total height estimates for year (t+1) obtained by considering distinct  
664 light conditions characterized by distinct cii values. The  $d03_t$  and  $ht_t$  values were defined as the  
665 average values encountered in the data sets ( $d03 = 3.5$  cm and  $ht = 350$  cm).  $ht_t$  estimated values  
666 are presented in meters to facilitate the plot of the two series values.

667

668 Figure 4. Plot of the conditional studentized residuals as a function of the predicted value (left  
669 side graphics) and normal probability plots (right side graphics). Top graphics refer to the d03  
670 growth model, middle graphics refer to the ht growth model (middle), and the bottom graphics  
671 refer to the d03-ht model.

672

673 Figure 5. Plot of total tree height (ht) against a diameter of 0.3 m (d03) pairs of measurements  
674 included in the permanent plots (top) and NatForest\_KK\_invent (bottom) data sets. d03 in cm and  
675 ht in m.

676

Table 1. Characterization of the permanent plot conditions: forest structure, topographic situation and number of trees.

Plot	Year of plantation	Site description	Stand structure	Topographic situation <sup>1</sup>	Plantation or forest area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Plot area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Number of trees in the plot
PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	1992	<i>Quassia amara</i> plantation (3m x 3m), in a mixture with adult <i>Caryocar glabrum</i> trees. Each <i>Quassia amara</i> tree was planted in the middle of 4 <i>Caryocar glabrum</i> trees.	Mixed stand	Hillside	542	412	49
PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	1992	<i>Quassia amara</i> plantation (3m x 3m), in a mixture with adult <i>Caryocar glabrum</i> trees. Each <i>Quassia amara</i> tree was planted in the middle of 4 <i>Caryocar glabrum</i> trees.	Mixed stand	Hillside	558	418	40

PP_Quassia+Magnolia	1993	<i>Quassia amara</i> plantation (3m x 3m) mixed with adult <i>Magnolia mexicana</i> trees. <i>Quassia amara</i> was in the middle of 4 <i>Magnolia mexicana</i> trees.	Mixed stand	Hillside	567	438	49
PP_Quassia_pure_1	1992	Pure forest plantation in rows (2.5m x 2.5m) in a previously natural forest area subject to clearing	Pure stand	Downhill	648	260	31
PP_Quassia+cacao_1	1992	<i>Quassia amara</i> plantation (3m x 3m) in rows, intercalated with adult <i>Theobroma cacao</i> tree rows. <i>Theobroma cacao</i> was frequently pruned.	Mixed stand	Downhill and Hillside	3460	760	52
PP_Quassia_NatForest	-	Natural forest. <i>Quassia amara</i> trees naturally regenerated.	Natural forest	Hillside	10000	1912	54

PP_Quassia_pure_2	1992	Pure <i>Quassia amara</i> plantation in rows (2.5m x 2.5m) in a previously natural forest area subject to clearing	Pure stand	Hillside	648	289.0	4877
PP_Quassia+cacao_2	1992	<i>Quassia amara</i> plantation (3m x 3m) in rows, intercalated with adult <i>Theobroma cacao</i> tree rows. <i>Theobroma cacao</i> was frequently pruned.	Mixed stand	Downhill	3264	760	49
NatForest_KK_invent	-	Natural forest. <i>Quassia amara</i> trees naturally regenerated.	Natural forest	Variable	-	-	402

<sup>1</sup> Downhill - Bottom of the slope, flat area; Hillside – high slope area, more than 40%; Tophill – transition between hillside and top of the mountain, with slope lower than 40%; Top of the mountain – flat and highly elevated area.

Table 2. Summary statistics of the measured variables included in the data sets.

Data set		Variable	minimum	mean	maximum	Standard deviation	mode
	Permanent plots data set (n = 2222)	age	1	4.8	8	2.07	-
		d03	0.33	3.31	8.56	1.61	-
		ht	0.25	3.27	6.87	1.25	-
		cii	1.0	2.1	4.0	0.53	2.0
		nbt	1	1.50	9	1.05	1
	Kekoli data set (n = 2657)	d03	0.54	4.48	11.51	1.85	-
		ht	0.50	4.16	7.18	1.11	-
		cii	1.0	2.78	5.0	1.08	4.0
		nbt	1	1.26	6	0.68	1

Age – tree age (year). Information not available for plot PP\_Quassia\_NatForest. d03 – diameter at 0.3 m height (cm); ht – total height (m); cii – crown illumination index (Clark and Clark 1992); nbt – number of total branches at 1 m height.

Table 3. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the tree annual d03 growth model.

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
a <sub>1</sub>		0.1685		0.0202	<0.0001
a <sub>2</sub>		-0.0177		0.0034	0.0001
b		1.0168		0.0101	<0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>			0.0248		<0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	0.2030		0.0588	0.0006
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	0.0810		0.0506	0.1096
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	-0.0726		0.0469	0.1219
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	-0.1257		0.0498	0.0116
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	-0.1458		0.0408	0.0004
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	-0.1882		0.0371	<.0001
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	0.0951		0.0619	0.1243
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	0.1779		0.0674	0.0084
u <sub>0</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	-0.1988		0.0294	<.0001
u <sub>1</sub>			0.0007		<0.0001
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	-0.0055		0.0146	0.7070
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	0.0180		0.0137	0.1867
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	0.0100		0.0193	0.6041
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	0.0411		0.0140	0.0034

Table 3. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the tree annual d03 growth model.

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	0.0076		0.0196	0.6968
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	-0.0098		0.0125	0.4310
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	-0.0347		0.0179	0.0521
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	-0.0270		0.0148	0.0683
u <sub>1</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	0.0002		0.0103	0.9888
Residual variance		0.0375			

Cov - Covariance parameter estimates

680

681

Table 4. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the ht growth model.

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
a <sub>0</sub>		45.8725		7.4971	0.0001
b <sub>1</sub>		0.8580		0.0243	<.0001
b <sub>2</sub>		0.0527		0.0103	<.0001
b <sub>2</sub>		-0.0075		0.0017	<.0001
u <sub>0</sub>			383.67		<0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	18.5401		11.6183	0.1106
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	20.8893		9.6299	0.0301
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	-2.8077		9.5954	0.7698
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	-1.8218		10.9269	0.8676
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	-24.0540		8.9681	0.0074
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	-33.5354		8.8013	0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	7.6015		12.6068	0.5466
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	16.1779		12.1179	0.1820
u <sub>0</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	-0.9900		7.9191	0.9005
u <sub>1</sub>			0.0023		<0.0001
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	-0.0101		0.0275	0.7120
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	-0.0758		0.0297	0.0106
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	0.00525		0.0296	0.8593

Table 4. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the ht growth model.

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	0.0305		0.0272	0.2614
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	0.0612		0.0299	0.0407
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	0.0543		0.0243	0.0254
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	-0.0191		0.0339	0.5743
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	-0.0311		0.0307	0.3113
u <sub>1</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	-0.0152		0.0201	0.4511
Residual variance		1337.41			

Cov - Covariance parameter estimates

Table 5. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the tree height-diameter model (d03).

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
a <sub>1</sub>		-3.6448		0.2570	<0.0001
a <sub>2</sub>		-0.2490		0.0226	0.0001
b		1.1423		0.0730	<0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>			0.0427		<0.0001
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	-0.0529		0.0907	0.5595
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	0.2614		0.0987	0.0081
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	-0.1497		0.1251	0.2312
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	-0.0147		0.0886	0.8681
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	-0.3957		0.1406	0.0049
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	0.0449		0.0870	0.6062
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	0.0718		0.1064	0.4999
u <sub>0</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	0.0799		0.09670	0.4103
u <sub>0</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	0.1551		0.0787	0.0489
u <sub>1</sub>			0.0467		<0.0001
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_1	-0.0213		0.1176	0.8560
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Caryocar_2	0.3786		0.1347	0.0050
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+Magnolia	0.05474		0.1266	0.6655
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_1	-0.0873		0.1112	0.4324

Table 5. Parameter and covariance parameter estimates for the tree height-diameter model (d03).

Parameter	Plot	Parameter estimate	Cov	Standard Error	Pr >  t
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia+cacao_2	0.238		0.1293	0.0661
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_NatForest	0.0156		0.1002	0.8460
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_1	-0.0922		0.1325	0.4865
u <sub>1</sub>	PP_Quassia_pure_2	0.1575		0.1448	0.2768
u <sub>1</sub>	NatForest_KK_invent	-0.1891		0.0787	0.0488
Residual variance		0.3497			

Cov - Covariance parameter estimates