

# Reviewing the use of resilience concepts in forest sciences

Nikinmaa, L.<sup>1,2</sup>, Lindner, M.<sup>1</sup>, Cantarello, E.<sup>3</sup>, Jump, A. S.<sup>4</sup>, Seidl, R.<sup>5,6</sup>, Winkel, G.<sup>1</sup> and Muys, B.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*European Forest Institute*

<sup>2</sup>*KU Leuven*

<sup>3</sup>*Bournemouth University*

<sup>4</sup>*University of Stirling*

<sup>5</sup>*University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Vienna*

<sup>6</sup>*Technical University of Munich*

Laura Nikinmaa, Marcus Lindner, Georg Winkel

European Forest Institute, Platz der Vereinten Nationen 7, 53113 Bonn, Germany

Bart Muys

Division of Forest, Nature and Landscape, KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200E - box 2411, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

Elena Cantarello

Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Bournemouth University, Poole, BH12 5BB, United Kingdom

Alistair Jump

Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, the United Kingdom

Rupert Seidl

Institute of Silviculture, Department of Forest- and Soil Sciences, University of Natural Resources and Life

Sciences in Vienna, Peter Jordan Str. 82, A-1190, Austria

Ecosystem Dynamics and Forest Management Group, School of Life Sciences, Technical University of Munich,

Hans-Carl-von-Carlowitz-Platz 2, 85354 Freising, Germany

Corresponding author:

Laura Nikinmaa, [laura.nikinmaa@efi.int](mailto:laura.nikinmaa@efi.int), + 49 1736293088, ORCID: 0000-0003-4020-1045

## ABSTRACT

*Purpose of the review* Resilience is a key concept to deal with an uncertain future in forestry. In recent years, it has received increasing attention from both research and practice. However, a common understanding of what resilience means in a forestry context, and how to operationalise it is lacking. Here, we conducted a systematic review of the recent forest science literature on resilience in the forestry context, synthesising how resilience is defined and assessed.

*Recent findings* Based on a detailed review of 255 studies, we analysed how the concepts of engineering resilience, ecological resilience, and social-ecological resilience are used in forest sciences. A clear majority of the studies applied the concept of engineering resilience, quantifying resilience as the recovery time after a disturbance. The two most used indicators for engineering resilience were basal area increment and vegetation cover, whereas ecological resilience studies frequently focus on vegetation cover and tree density. In contrast, important social-ecological resilience indicators used in the literature are socio-economic diversity and stock of natural resources. In the context of global change, we expected an increase in studies adopting the more holistic social-ecological resilience concept, but this was not the observed trend.

*Summary* Our analysis points to the nestedness of these three resilience concepts, suggesting that they are complementary rather than contradictory. It also means that the variety of resilience approaches does not need to be an obstacle for operationalisation of the concept. We provide guidance for choosing the most suitable resilience concept and indicators based on the management, disturbance and application context.

**KEYWORDS:** forest management, engineering resilience, ecological resilience, social-ecological resilience, disturbance, indicators

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:** We thank the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture for providing the funding for this research (project SURE - SUstaining and Enhancing REsilience of European Forests).

## 1. Introduction

Global change causes shifts in forest disturbance regimes [1,2] that can potentially reduce the capacity of forests to provide ecosystem services [3]. The change may furthermore alter the distribution of species [4,5] including forest-dependent species that, if not able to migrate as their habitat shifts, can face extinction [6]. Interacting disturbances can alter forest development pathways [7], and an increased disturbance frequency can erode the capacity of forests to recover [8,9]. In addition to environmental changes, societies and societal demands towards forests are changing, and therefore forest-related policies must change as well to meet these demands, e.g. in relation to climate change mitigation [10] or the development of a wood-based bioeconomy [11]. It has been suggested that neither the traditional command-and-control forest management nor classical risk management in forestry are able to respond adequately to this multitude of changes and challenges [12,13].

Resilience is one of the current buzzwords in science and policy and fostering resilience has been proposed as a solution to deal with the uncertainty caused by global change [14–16]. However, resilience is a difficult concept to define, as demonstrated by the numerous definitions and approaches available in the literature [17,18]. This ambiguity is partly due to the widespread use of the term in different disciplines and systems. As a result, the scientific literature diverges on whether resilience should be considered as a system property, process or outcome of management [18]. In the literature on social-ecological systems, three broad conceptualisations of the term resilience have emerged: engineering, ecological and social-ecological resilience [19]. Engineering resilience is often cited as first defined by Pimm [20]. Following a disturbance in a given system, it is characterised as the time that it takes for variables to return to their pre-disturbance equilibrium. This definition assumes the existence of a single equilibrium state. Ecological resilience, defined by Holling [21], is “*a measure of the persistence of systems and of their ability to absorb change and disturbance and still maintain the same relationships between populations or state variables*”. Holling’s theory includes the proposition that systems can be in multiple equilibria (i.e. have multiple basins of attraction). A basin of attraction is a concept from systems science describing a portion of the phase space in which every point will eventually gravitate back to the attractor [22]. A disturbance can move the system from one basin to another, and cross a threshold during the process. Finally, the concept of social-ecological resilience considers natural and social systems to be strongly coupled social-ecological systems [23]. Social-ecological resilience considers the maintenance of the current regime and the adaptive capacity of a coupled human-natural system [24]. Several variants of social-ecological resilience exist but all focus on the adaptive capacity of the social-ecological system as a whole [25]. Among them, the Resilience Alliance, the school of thought in the footsteps of Holling, defined resilience as “*the capacity of a social-ecological system to absorb or withstand perturbations and other stressors such that the system remains within the same regime, essentially maintaining its structure and functions. It describes the degree to which the system is capable of self-organisation, learning, and adaptation*” [26,27].

While resilience is widely considered in forest ecology, the resilience concept has not been implemented widely in the daily practice of forest management [28]. However, elements of resilience thinking, e.g. the necessity to learn and adapt, are a necessity for forest managers who are confronted with the frequent challenge of unexpected disturbance patterns interfering with well-planned management procedures. A primary limitation to implementing resilience in forest management is that, despite the growing body of research, forest resilience continues to be a vague concept for decision makers. Reviews of existing resilience concepts and their relevance to natural resource management in general [29,30] and forest management in particular [31] have been conducted previously, yet there is no common agreement to date on how resilience in the context of forestry should be defined or applied. Different resilience concepts are used in seemingly similar situations without much effort paid to the justification of the selected concept. Guidance for developing and implementing measurement, monitoring, and evaluation schemes of resilience is widely lacking [18,32]. These challenges in operationalising resilience prevent a widespread implementation of resilience thinking in forest management. In order to answer a core question of forest managers today, namely, how to manage forests to increase their resilience to global change, a clearer understanding of the use of the resilience concepts in forest science is needed to provide a way forward for both researchers and forest managers.

This paper aims at facilitating the application of resilience in the context of forestry by clarifying its meaning and purpose through performance of a systematic review of the resilience concepts and their assessment approaches used in forest science. We had three objectives:

1. To evaluate the adoption of the three mentioned concepts in resilience research in forest sciences. We were particularly interested in the current use and geographical spread of the concepts, the trend in their use, as well as the methods and indicators applied to assess resilience.
2. To analyse similarities and differences between the applied resilience concepts, and to examine how conflicting they are with each other.
3. To develop guidance for the use of the resilience concepts in forest management and policy.

We hypothesised that:

- In the context of facing global change, the use of more holistic resilience concepts, such as social-ecological resilience, is increasing.
- Forest resilience is a widely adopted concept in forest science, but its large variety of approaches prevents its mainstreaming into forestry practice.

## 2. Materials and methods

We reviewed how forest resilience is currently assessed in the scientific literature. We searched the literature using the *Scopus* database (Relx Group, 2018) using the search string TITLE-ABS-KEY (“resilience” AND “forest”) ALL (“measur\*” OR “manag\*”) PUBYEAR > 1999. Applying the search string in the *Scopus* database guaranteed that results were published in scientific journals. As resilience related research started to increase dramatically after 1999 [24], the focal time period was 2000-2018. The cut-off date for including new publications was August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018. We screened all identified abstracts. All abstracts that 1) were published in

a peer-reviewed scientific journal in English, and 2) had the word “resilience” in relation to an active verb (e.g. manage, calculate, enhance, improve, assess) and 3) focused on forest-related systems (e.g. tree species or forest-dependent communities), natural resource management or landscape management, were further screened. We also accepted studies that proposed a way to assess resilience for non-specified ecosystems as these could also apply to forests. Further screening of the full papers checked if they 4) have definition of resilience; and 5) propose a method to assess resilience either in qualitative or quantitative terms. Only the studies that fulfilled all five criteria were selected for further analysis.

To examine how widely the three different resilience concepts were adopted in the literature, the studies were classified into three groups based on their concept of resilience: engineering, ecological, and social-ecological resilience. The classification was done by recording the resilience concept used and comparing them with the foundational studies for the respective concept, see higher. If studies mentioned several concepts, we focused on the method used to evaluate resilience, and derived the adopted concept from there. We also evaluated the trend in the number of studies published per year, and in the share of the three concepts among studies. In addition, we assessed the biome where the study was conducted. For biome delineation, we used the definitions of Olson et al. [33]. The distribution across biomes was calculated in relation to the number of studies in the three resilience concept classes separately. Biomes that represented less than 5 % of the studies in any of the resilience concept categories were grouped in “Other”.

To explore if the three resilience concepts conflicted with each other and in what situations they were applied, we assessed the response system/variable (resilience of what?) and the disturbance of concern (resilience to what?) of each study. The categories for the response system/variable were: Tree populations, Non-tree vegetation, Forest animal and fungal communities, Soil, Forest ecosystem, Not specified ecosystem, Forest-related social-ecological system, Forest industry, and Other. The categories for the disturbance of concern were: Drought, Fire, Wind, Climate change, Other abiotic disturbance, Biotic disturbance, Forest management operation, Land-use, Global change, Societal, economic and policy shocks, Multiple disturbances, and Other. In addition, we assessed whether the proposed evaluation method in the studies was qualitative or quantitative. Furthermore, we recorded the main method used to assess resilience. The distinguished categories for the method used were: Tree-level sampling, Vegetation sampling, Animal population sampling, Soil sampling, Multiple agent (animal population, vegetation and soil) sampling, Forest site inventory, Conceptual modelling, Empirical modelling, Process-based modelling, Geographical Information System/Remote sensing approach, Historical records, Meta-analysis, Surveys, and Multi-tool (when there was no single prevalent method).

We examined the indicators used to assess resilience (see Online Resource 3). As most of the studies assessed more than one indicator, we recorded the total number of indicators used to assess resilience in each study. For example, if a study assessed resilience with regard to species richness, species composition, functional diversity, number of seedlings, and drought index, we counted five indicators in total. We documented the ten most widely used indicators for each resilience concept by calculating the relative number of studies using them. In the case of the tenth most used indicator, we recorded all the indicators that were used with the same frequency. In addition, we classified the indicators according the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework [34]. We further organised the indicators into larger groups (see Online Resource 4). Grouping the individual

indicators together gives a better overview of which compartments of a system are used to study resilience and how the compartments vary according to the resilience concept used. A compartment here describes the part of the system under study, e.g. forest structure, soil properties, and socio-economic structure. The indicator groups were: Climate indicators, Soil properties, Disturbance effects, Forest structure, Forest regeneration, Tree and ecosystem production and transpiration, Biodiversity, Land-use, Ecosystem management objective, Socio-economic capacity, Socio-economic diversity, Finance and technological infrastructure, Governance, Time, and Other. In the previously described example of the study reporting five resilience indicators, we would have counted three indicators describing Biodiversity, one for Forest regeneration and one for Climate. We analysed the trend of the average number of indicators used to evaluate resilience over time by fitting a linear regression to the time series of the average number of indicators in R [35]. To buffer extreme values, we used a three-year moving average of the indicators used. In addition, we performed a non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) to describe how studies were ordered based on the recorded indicator groups, and how this was related to the resilience concept they used. We used the metaMDS function with Gower distance and seed 123 from the package “vegan” [36] in R [35]. Figures were created with the package “ggplot2” [37].


## 3. Results

The initial search resulted in 2,629 peer-reviewed studies that were all screened (see Online Resource 1). The abstracts that fulfilled the first three selection criteria were chosen for further analysis, narrowing the set down to 625 studies (see Online Resource 2). Of these a final set of 255 studies also fulfilled the selection criteria 4 and 5 [8,9,13,16,31,38–287]. One of the reviewed studies was in press during the review process and was published in 2019 but we included it in the studies published in 2018.

### 3.1. Trends in forest resilience research

The 255 studies identified as relevant for our review were classified according to the resilience concept they used. The majority of the studies employed the engineering resilience concept (54 %), while ecological and socio-ecological resilience concepts were applied in 31 % and 15 % of studies respectively.


The publication rate of studies assessing resilience had steadily increased over the investigated period (Fig. 1). The use of the engineering resilience concept appeared to have increased strongly after 2012. The use of ecological resilience had also increased but at a slower rate than engineering resilience. Social-ecological resilience was the least used concept and its application appeared to have increased only moderately.



**Fig. 1** The development of the use of the three resilience concepts in forest resilience studies from 2000 to 2018. The figure shows the number of studies using engineering, ecological or social-ecological resilience concepts and the total number of forest resilience studies published per year. The cut-off date for the review was in mid-August 2018, and therefore not all studies published in 2018 were included in the review.

### 3.2. Geographical spread of resilience concept applications

Our review contained studies from 11 different biomes (Fig. 2). Engineering resilience was mostly used in studies of temperate broadleaved and mixed forests, and in Mediterranean forests, woodlands and scrubs (24 % and 19 % of the studies using engineering resilience concept, respectively). Ecological resilience was often used in studies that concerned either several biomes (20 %) or temperate conifer forests (18 %). Social-ecological resilience was used the most in tropical broadleaved forests (23 %) as well as in temperate conifer forests (21 %).



**Fig. 2** The use of the resilience concepts by forest biome. The figure shows the share of the biomes studied for each of the three resilience concepts. N/A means that no biome was mentioned in a study.

### 3.3. Resilience of what and to what

Forest ecosystems were the most studied system (34 % of all studies). Engineering resilience was most used for studying either tree populations or forest ecosystems (35 % of studies using the engineering resilience concept), whereas ecological resilience was the most used in forest ecosystems and non-specified ecosystem studies (49 % and 24 % of studies using the ecological resilience concept, respectively). Social-ecological resilience was used in forest-related social-ecological systems and studies on the forest industry (73 % and 20 % of the studies using the social-ecological resilience concept, respectively) (Table 1).

**Table 1** The percentages of the studied systems (“resilience of what”) in relation to the three resilience concepts and all of the reviewed studies.

<i>System of interest</i>	<i>Engineering resilience (%)</i>	<i>Ecological resilience (%)</i>	<i>Social-ecological resilience (%)</i>	<i>All studies (%)</i>
<i>Trees (individual or populations)</i>	35	15	0	23
<i>Forest animal population</i>	6	5	0	5
<i>Forest ecosystem</i>	35	49	0	34
<i>Non-tree vegetation</i>	12	4	0	7
<i>General ecosystem</i>	5	24	0	10
<i>Soils</i>	5	1	0	3
<i>Forest industry</i>	0	0	20	3
<i>Forest related social-ecological system</i>	0	1	73	12
<i>Other</i>	3	0	8	3

Drought was the most studied disturbance (22 % of all the studies) and 32 % of the studies applying the concept of engineering resilience focused on drought. Fire was the second most studied disturbance (13 % of all the studies), and 17 % of the studies of engineering resilience focused on fire. Ecological resilience was used equally for studying the effects of drought, climate change or other disturbances (15 % of the studies using the ecological resilience concept, each). Finally, social-ecological resilience was most used in studies concerned with global change and more specifically climate change (28 % and 21 % of the studies using the social-ecological resilience concept, respectively).

For studies using an engineering resilience concept, the most common method was to either collect tree-level samples (26 %) or other vegetation samples (24 %). Studies assessing ecological resilience mostly relied on conceptual modelling (28 %) or vegetation samples (19 %). Studies using a social-ecological resilience concept also made use of conceptual modelling (45 %) or socio-economic surveys (25 %). The majority of the studies assessing engineering and ecological resilience were quantitative (78 % and 65 % respectively), whereas the majority of the studies focusing on the social-ecological resilience concept were qualitative (83 %).

### 3.4. Indicators used to assess resilience

The most used indicators for each resilience concept are shown in Table 2. Engineering and ecological resilience shared six of their respective top-ten indicators, whereas the top indicators used to assess social-ecological resilience were completely different from the other two concepts. The ecological indicators used in the social-ecological resilience concept were less specific, compared to the ones used in the engineering and ecological resilience concept. The State-type indicators dominated the most used indicators list (52.5 %) whereas Response- and Pressure-type indicators were less common (32.5 % and 15.0 % respectively).


**Table 2** The most frequently used indicators for each resilience concept. Numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of studies applying a given resilience concept using the indicator. The colour of the cell expresses the type of indicator according to the classification of OECD's environmental indicators [34]. Blue cells are Pressure-type indicators, green cells are State-type indicators and yellow cells are Response-type indicators.

<i>Indicator rank of occurrence</i>	<i>Engineering resilience</i>	<i>Ecological resilience</i>	<i>Social-ecological resilience</i>	<i>All reviewed studies</i>
1	Basal area increment (27.5 %)	Vegetation cover (13.9 %)	Socio-economic diversity (30.0 %)	Basal area increment (17.6 %)
2	Vegetation cover (15.4 %)	Density or number of trees (13.9 %)	Biodiversity (22.5 %)	Vegetation cover (12.5 %)
3	Species richness (10.3 %)	Basal area increment (11.4 %)	Stock of natural resources (20.0 %)	Species composition (9.0 %)




4	Species composition (10.3 %)	Biomass (11.4 %)	Networks (20.0 %)	Species richness (8.2 %)
5	Precipitation (10.3 %)	Species composition (11.4 %)	Knowledge (17.5 %)	Biomass (7.5 %)
6	Standardised Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (9.6 %)	Species diversity (10.1 %)	Income (17.5 %)	Regeneration (7.1 %)
7	Density or number of surviving trees (9.6 %)	Basal area (10.1 %)	Access to resources (15.0 %)	Precipitation (7.1 %)
8	Regeneration (8.1 %)	Regeneration (8.1 %)	Participation in community organisations (15.0 %)	Standardised Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (6.3 %)
9	Biomass (7.4 %)	Species richness (8.9 %)	Education (12.5 %)	Density/number of surviving trees (5.1 %)
10	Density or number of seedlings (7.4 %)	Mortality (8.9 %)	Agricultural practices (10.0 %)	Socio-economic diversity (4.7 %)
		Disturbance severity (8.9 %)	Human Population density (10.0 %)	
			Ecosystem services (10.0 %)	
			Employment (10.0 %)	
			Housing (10.0 %)	
			Health services (10.0 %)	
			Individual health (10.0 %)	
			Water and sanitation (10.0 %)	
			Transport (10.0 %)	
			Skills (10.0 %)	

The most used indicator groups for engineering and ecological resilience were related to forest structure (20% and 24% respectively) and forest biodiversity (19% and 15% respectively). For studies focusing on social-ecological resilience, the most used indicators were related to the socio-economic capacities (41%) and the second most used indicator group was related to finances and technical infrastructure (14%). The NMDS analysis of studies based on the indicator groups used showed a clear separation between engineering/ecological resilience and social-ecological resilience (Fig. 3). Based on the similarity with regard to the indicator groups used, engineering and ecological resilience concepts have a strong overlap. In contrast, studies that used social-ecological resilience employed very different groups of indicators.



**Fig. 3** The indicator groups used to assess resilience, ordinated in two dimensions based on the NMDS analysis. The NMDS gives a representation of the relationship between objects (studies) and descriptors (indicator groups) in a reduced number of dimensions. The x- and y-axes are the first two axes with the highest explicative values in ordination space. The location of different indicator groups are shown in letters. The indicator groups are Forest structure (F1), Biodiversity (F2), Climate indicators (CI), Forest regeneration (F3), Tree and ecosystem production and transpiration (F4), Disturbance effects (DE), Soil properties (S), Land use (LU), Ecosystem management objective (EMO), Socio-economic capacities (SEC), Socio-economic diversity (SED), Finances and technological infrastructure (FTI), Governance (G), Time, and Other.

The average number of indicators used per study did increase over time ( $p$ -value 0.01). However, the number of indicators used did not increase for all of the resilience concepts. For ecological resilience and social-ecological resilience the average amount of indicators per study significantly increased ( $p$ -values  $<0.001$  and  $0.004$ , respectively), whereas it did not increase for engineering resilience ( $p$ -value 0.5) (Fig. 4). Assessments of social-ecological resilience use on average more indicators than assessments of ecological or engineering resilience (7 indicators vs. 4 and 3, respectively).



**Fig. 4** The moving average of number of indicators per study. The averages are calculated for three-year periods except for 2000 and 2018, which were calculated for two-year periods.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Adoption of the three resilience concepts in the forest literature

Our results for the first objective show that forest resilience is globally studied and that each of the alternative resilience concepts is widely applied in the scientific literature. Of the three concepts, engineering resilience is clearly the most frequently used in forest science, with ecological resilience the second most frequently applied and social-ecological resilience being the least used concept.

The frequent and increasing use of engineering resilience in forest resilience literature was surprising, as we hypothesised that the more holistic concept of social-ecological resilience would get more commonly used in response to the serious problems caused by global change [288]. Other studies proposed several reasons for the widespread use of engineering resilience. First, the concept is very versatile and can be adapted to different systems, as recovery can be measured based on a variety of indicators [289]. Engineering resilience was the only concept where the average number of indicators used per study has not increased significantly during the last 18 years. One explanation might be that the key indicators for engineering resilience

have been identified in previous research already, and that there is no need to broaden the indicator set. For example, 31 out of the 136 reviewed studies using the engineering resilience concept adopted the approach presented by Lloret et al. [8] to examine the resilience of trees to drought by measuring the basal area increment before, during and after the drought. Second, the concept is clearly defined and intuitive to understand. This is in contrast to ecological and social-ecological resilience which are both debated concepts in terms of their exact definitions [290].

However, our search terms could also have caused a bias towards engineering resilience. It is conceivable that studies applying the social-ecological resilience concept would focus less on measuring or quantifying resilience, thus lacking an active verb connected with resilience. As such studies come from more diverse scientific backgrounds, perhaps they place less emphasis on how resilience is quantified or assessed. The strong presence of the reviewed articles belonging to the ecological literature, in which resilience is studied as a system property and the focus is on the capacity of systems to resist change and recover from a disturbance [18], supports this interpretation. Furthermore, resilience receives considerable criticism from the social sciences [291–293] and it is therefore conceivable that some social science studies on resilience related research questions may not actually use the term, as they reject its conceptual approach [294]. Therefore, the scarcity of studies adopting the concept of social-ecological resilience in our review might be due to the recommendation to use social-ecological resilience as an analytical approach for social-ecological systems, rather than a descriptive concept of a system property [290]. Such an analytical approach does not necessarily aim to quantify resilience but rather to deal with uncertainty. Nevertheless, our results show that social-ecological resilience can be assessed in both qualitative [161,167] and quantitative [174] ways.

The use of engineering resilience also has clear limitations. As the concept assumes the existence of only one stable state [20] and measures performance against the pre-disturbance state, it is thus mainly applied in studies over a short timeframe and for situations where the environmental conditions are variable but where a regime shift is unlikely. Yet, such a situation can rarely be assumed under global change [295]. In such a setting of continuous change, maintaining high engineering resilience might require a high level of anthropogenic inputs, e.g. fertilisers or intensive re-planting of selected tree species, which in turn would lead to so called “coerced resilience” that mimics the response of a resilient ecosystem but is only possible with continuous human intervention and risks being highly maladaptive [296]. Furthermore, assessing resilience in a deterministic (as opposed to considering stochasticity) and short-term manner could lead to missing important system pathways and long-term trajectories. These shortcomings of the concept for the analysis of forest systems increase with the impact of global change, and the concept should hence be used only with a clear acknowledgement of its limitations.

## 4.2. The differences and complementarity among the resilience concepts

As to the second objective, there is an apparent difference in the use of engineering and ecological resilience on the one hand and social-ecological resilience on the other hand with regard to the systems and disturbances studied and the indicators used (Fig. 3). Previous

literature reviewing the concept of resilience has identified several disparities in the conceptualisation of the resilience definitions and the underlying assumptions, which are in line with our findings. Resilience has been perceived differently depending on the disciplinary background [18]. Ecological literature, where engineering and ecological resilience are commonly used, regards resilience as a system property whereas the study of social-ecological systems looks at resilience as a strategy for managing complexity and uncertainty [18]. Furthermore, the ecological literature focuses on the capacity of a system to resist change and recover from it, whereas the social-ecological systems literature has a strong focus on transformation and self-evolvement of the system as a crucial part of management [18,297].


On a conceptual level, the difference between the concepts lies in how they view the existence and shape of basins of attractions. For engineering resilience, resilience is measured by the steepness of the slope of the basin, indicating how quickly the system can return to the bottom after a disturbance [298]. For ecological resilience, the existence of multiple basins of attraction is assumed, and resilience is a measure for how much pressure is required for the system to move from one basin to another [298]. Social-ecological resilience assumes the existence of multiple basins of attractions as well [297], but the focus of this concept is on shaping the basin of attraction to keep the system contained in its current attractor via changing the social part of the system. This disciplinary disparity can explain why engineering and ecological resilience concepts use a very similar set of indicators whereas social-ecological resilience uses distinctively different types of indicators (see Table 2 and Figure 3).

Our results reflect this conceptual background. For example, drought resilience of trees was the most commonly studied topic and engineering resilience was the most adopted concept for that topic. While much of this popularity can be attributed to a key paper published by Lloret et al. [8], tree growth is also a system that is unlikely to have multiple stable states, making the use of ecological or social-ecological resilience concepts unnecessary. Similarly, the prominent use of engineering resilience to assess forest ecosystems in our results could be explained by the authors' perception of the existence of multiple basins of attractions for the studied system. While many scientists support the notion of forest ecosystems having multiple basins of attraction [299–301], some scientists see the evidence as limited [31] and therefore prefer to use the engineering resilience instead of the two other concepts. The aim and scope of the research clearly determined the researchers' choice of the resilience concept in the reviewed studies. For this reason, some authors adopt a different concept of resilience in different studies [9,144,198], underlining the importance of precisely defining the term in each instance of its use [302], as well as reflections on the applicability of the chosen definition. Attention should furthermore be paid to whether or not resilience is used as a descriptive or normative concept as striving for enhanced resilience might lead to debates on the trade-offs of achieving a resilient system [18].

The definitions of the three concepts further illustrate a difference in complexity: engineering resilience is purely defined as recovery of the system, ecological resilience includes aspects of both resistance and recovery of the system, whereas social-ecological resilience includes resistance, recovery, adaptive capacity and the ability to transform [297]. It should be noted that studies using engineering resilience do not necessarily ignore the resistance or adaptive capacity of the system, but they consider them as independent concepts besides resilience, rather than as integral parts of resilience [39,94,208]. Some scientists argue for separating resistance, resilience and adaptive capacity into their own concepts for conceptual clarity and better operationalisation of resilience [94,289]. However, others argue that reducing resilience to such

a simple dimension is focusing on maintaining the status quo of the system and this could actually lead to losing the resilience of social-ecological system [297].

We argue that instead of striving towards one single resilience definition, resilience could be understood as an overarching concept of nested hierarchies as described also by the theory of basins of attraction [26]. According to this hierarchy, engineering resilience is nested inside ecological resilience, which in turn is nested inside social-ecological resilience (Fig. 6). Moving from one concept to another either adds or removes different dimensions from the system under study and changes the system boundaries. The interest in a certain property together with the disturbance of concern therefore indicate the resilience concept that is most applicable for the respective question or system to be analysed. The increasing complexity with increasing hierarchical levels of resilience also suggests that a broader suite of indicators is required to assess higher levels of resilience, which was supported by the results of our review.



**Fig. 6** The hierarchy of resilience concepts and assumptions behind each concept. The circles on the right show how resilience concepts are related to one another. The boxes on the left indicate increasing complexity in the systems that are studied by the respective resilience concepts. Variable environmental conditions mean conditions where the conditions vary but remain in the historical range of variation. Changing environmental conditions mean that the conditions are no longer within the range of historical variation of the environment.

### 4.3. Guidance on navigating the world of resilience

Regarding our third objective on how to implement resilience in forestry practice, our review underlines that forest resilience is a flexible concept and can be adapted to many situations and questions. That is one reason for the popularity of the concept [17], as well as the widespread

use in various biomes and research designs. For example, the engineering resilience concept was mainly used for studying pulse-type disturbances, such as drought and fire in the temperate and Mediterranean forest, ecological and social-ecological resilience were also used for press-type of disturbances, such as climate and global change, with more geographical spread.

Regardless of the resilience concept the authors use, variable study scopes, combined with either simplification tendency (engineering resilience) or complexity (social-ecological analysis) of the concepts may hinder the wider implementation of resilience thinking in forest management practice. The results of the review support our first hypothesis on how forest resilience lacks the consistent operational use that would be needed for implementation in practice. The lack of clarity in applying the concepts is a clear shortcoming. Some of the studies reviewed provide guidance and pathways for managing forests for resilience [31,88,94,198], proving that the concept can be operationalised with sufficient effort invested. Nevertheless, the resilience concepts lack established indicator frameworks that could be adopted by forest managers. The classification of the indicators according the OECD's PSR-framework showed that a majority of the indicators currently used in the forest resilience literature are state-type indicators. For a holistic indicator-based assessment, more focus should be placed on developing further indicators to assess both pressures and system responses to disturbances [303]. Guidance is needed to help forest managers to both choose which resilience concept could be the most suitable for their situation as well as identify proper indicators for assessing the selected concept. In the next sections we will address how managing for resilience is different from the risk management in forestry, and how to choose a suitable resilience concept.

Some might consider resilience thinking to be redundant with current forest management practices. Dealing with uncertainty via risk assessments is a well-established practice in forestry [304]. Risk is by definition the effect of uncertainty on objectives [305], frequently expressed quantitatively in probabilistic terms [306], and risk-based management strategies are most effective when hazard probabilities are known [307]. However, the impacts of changes in disturbance regimes as well as of shocks caused by political and societal changes are currently unknown [308], which can cause risk management approaches to fail [307]. In contrast, resilience prepares for minimizing the damage caused by unknown, novel risks [307], making it a suitable management approach also for situations where the character and the magnitude of the risks are hard to identify.

Based on our review of the literature on forest resilience, we provide some suggestions to guide practitioners and scientists in choosing the most suitable concept for them and which possible ways exist to assess these concepts.

1. *Identify the managed system*

To choose the appropriate resilience concept, it is important to define the managed system [302]. Is the main interest to assess the resilience of one important tree species, ecosystem services provided, or a regional supply chain of forest enterprise? Does this system have alternative basins of attractions? Are the environmental and social changes likely to push the system to another stable state? Engineering resilience is a powerful concept for relatively simple systems (e.g. tree species growth, plant or animal population) that are not likely to change in the near future. Therefore, it could be appropriately used in assessing short-term resilience [289]. If alternative states for the system are known, e.g. forests transforming into savannah [301], or the system is rather complex (e.g. forest ecosystem), ecological resilience should be used instead of

engineering resilience. If the system also includes social parts, as for example in a community forest and forest enterprise, social-ecological resilience should be used to capture the interactions between social and ecological systems.

2. *Identify the stressors or disturbances affecting the system.* In addition to defining the system, the disturbances affecting the system should be identified [302]. Is the scope to assess the resilience to one single disturbance event e.g. storm, an interaction of several disturbances, e.g. drought, storm and bark beetles, or an ongoing change, e.g. climate or societal change? As engineering resilience measures the recovery to a pre-disturbance state, it should be used only in cases where the pre-disturbance state is still achievable, meaning the system is not strongly affected by press type disturbance as, for example, climate change. Ecological resilience is suitable for both pulse and press type disturbances as well as changes in disturbance frequency, if the system of interest is an ecological system. Finally, managers and researchers facing changes in forest policies, market demands, or social use of the forest should use the concept of social-ecological resilience. While this concept is perhaps the most difficult to adopt, it emphasises the need to reflect on the resilience of the social system as an interdependent counterpart of the natural system [297].
3. *Identify the temporal scale of interest.* Engineering resilience can be appropriately used for assessing resilience on a short temporal scale [289]. However, many scientists caution against using engineering resilience over longer time scales as social and environmental conditions change and focusing on short term recovery might lead to ignoring the slow variables ensuring resilience [289,309,310]. For longer management time scales, we recommend using either ecological or social-ecological resilience.
4. *Consider the trade-off between accuracy and cost-efficiency in indicator selection.* Our study revealed increasing requirements for indicator measurement, evaluation, and/or assessment in going from engineering to ecological and social-ecological resilience approaches. While the selection of indicators depends on the studied system, the presented indicators (Table 2) show a selection of the most used ones that have been applied in different systems and variable disturbance assessments. However, the use of indicators should always be carefully considered as one indicator might declare a system resilient and another one vulnerable. Therefore, using a holistic set of indicators that describe both structures as well as functions of the system is recommended [289]. This might require considerably more work from the researchers and managers but it reduces the risk of falsely assessing resilience.

Several other ways of defining and assessing resilience exist outside the social-ecological systems literature [18,311,312]. However, the concepts of engineering, ecological and social-ecological resilience are very prominent in the forest science literature and we believe that our review contributes to clarifying the use of these concepts. More focus should be paid on how resilience concepts are implemented in practice. One further research direction should therefore look at how resilience is operationalised in forest management practice, e.g. by reviewing forest management plans and conducting social- empirical research with forest managers about how they deal with resilience related forest management decisions in practice. This work could result in recommendations on how scientific findings and concepts related to forest resilience can support forest management practice, such as a sophisticated decision support framework for the



selection of the applicable resilience concept and indicators. More work will also be needed on how to interpret specific indicators and how to balance impacts on diverse management objectives across the proposed indicators.

## 5. Conclusions

In our rapidly changing world, resilience has gained wide popularity in forest management, but operationalising the concept still lags behind. We show how three major resilience concepts for studying social-ecological systems are used in the forest science literature, and how their assessment methods and interpretations differ. The variety of used resilience indicators is broad, with several popular ones emerging, such as basal area increment and the extent of vegetation cover.

Our first hypothesis was that in a context of global change the use of broader resilience concepts, such as social-ecological resilience, would be increasing over time in comparison to more specific concepts, such as ecological and engineering resilience. This was not supported by the data, as the use of engineering resilience has clearly increased in comparison to ecological and social-ecological resilience. The context of the investigated studies appeared to be the main driver behind their choice for a resilience concept. However, we showed here that these resilience concepts are not exclusive but rather form a hierarchy with engineering resilience being an aspect of ecological resilience, and ecological resilience being part of the overarching social-ecological resilience. In this context, we provide guidance to forest managers and policy makers on how to consider context specific information on management type, disturbance regime, temporal scale of interest, and indicator needs that will help making forest resilience operational.

Our second hypothesis was that forest resilience is a widely adopted concept in forest sciences, but it shows a large variety of assessment approaches, which may prevent its mainstreaming into forestry practice. The ordination of the studies based on the indicators they used confirms the large variety of approaches forest scientists use to assess resilience. However, we also showed that these approaches can be clearly attributed to one of three nested resilience concepts, that may be a useful basis for further improved operationalisation. Consequently, we reject this hypothesis, and give guidance for a context specific selection of a suitable resilience concept and a related set of indicators, as a first step to future operationalisation.

### Compliance with Ethical Standards

#### Conflict of interests

Laura Nikinmaa and Marcus Lindner have received part of their salaries from the project “Sustaining and Enhancing the Resilience of the European Forests” that is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Alistair Jump, Bart Muys, Elena Cantarello, Georg Winkel and Rupert Seidl declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Human and Animal Rights and Informed Consent

This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects performed by any of the authors.

## Funding

Laura Nikinmaa and Marcus Lindner have received part of their salaries from a project that was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

Rupert Seidl acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through START grant Y895-B25.

Alistair Jump, Bart Muys, Elena Cantarello and Georg Winkel received no funding for their work on this article.

## 6. References

Papers of particular interest, published recently, have been highlighted with:

● Of importance

●● Of major importance

1. Seidl R, Thom D, Kautz M, Martin-benito D, et.al. Forest disturbances under climate change. *Nat Clim Chang*. 2017;7:395–402.

2. Turner MG. Disturbance and landscape dynamics in a changing world. *Ecology*. 2010;91:2833–49.

3. Thom D, Seidl R. Natural disturbance impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity in temperate and boreal forests. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc*. 2016;91:760–81.

4. Lindner M, Maroschek M, Netherer S, Kremer A, Barbati A, Garcia-Gonzalo J, et al. Climate change impacts, adaptive capacity, and vulnerability of European forest ecosystems. *For Ecol Manage*. 2010;259:698–709.

5. Thuiller W. Patterns and uncertainties of species' range shifts under climate change. *Glob Chang Biol*. 2004;10:2020–7.

6. Thomas CD, Cameron A, Green R, Bakkenes EM, Beaumont LJ, Collingham YC, et al. Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature*. 2004;427:145–8.

7. Johnstone JF, Allen CD, Franklin JF, Frelich LE, Harvey BJ, Higuera PE, et al. Changing disturbance regimes, ecological memory, and forest resilience. *Front Ecol Environ*. 2016;14:369–78.

8. Lloret F, Keeling EG, Sala A. Components of tree resilience: Effects of successive low-growth episodes in old ponderosa pine forests. *Oikos*. 2011;120:1909–20.

9. Seidl R, Vigl F, Rössler G, Neumann M, Rammer W. Assessing the resilience of Norway spruce forests through a model-based reanalysis of thinning trials. *For Ecol Manage*. 2017;388:3–12.

10. Grassi G, House J, Dentener F, Federici S, Den Elzen M, Penman J. The key role of forests in meeting climate targets requires science for credible mitigation. *Nat Clim Chang*. 2017;7:220–6.

- 615 11. Philp J. Balancing the bioeconomy: supporting biofuels and bio-based materials in public  
616 policy. *Energy Environ Sci* [Internet]. Royal Society of Chemistry; 2015;8:3063–8. Available  
617 from: <http://xlink.rsc.org/?DOI=C5EE01864A>
- 618 12. Puettmann KJ, Coates KD, Messier C. *A Critique of Silviculture - Managing for*  
619 *Complexity*. Washington DC, USA: Island Press; 2009.
- 620 13. Messier C, Puettmann KJ, Coates KD. *Managing Forests as Complex Adaptive Systems -*  
621 *Building Resilience to the Challenge of Global Change*. 1st ed. Messier C, Puettmann KJ,  
622 Coates KD, editors. London: Routledge; 2013.
- 623 14. Spears BM, Ives SC, Angeler DG, Allen CR, Birk S, Carvalho L, et al. Effective  
624 management of ecological resilience - are we there yet? *J Appl Ecol*. 2015;52:1311–5.
- 625 15. DEFRA. *The National Adaptation Programme and the Third Strategy for Climate*  
626 *Adaptation Reporting*. 2018.
- 627 16. Chambers JC, Beck JL, Campbell S, Carlson J, Christiansen TJ, Clause KJ, et al. Using  
628 resilience and resistance concepts to manage threats to sagebrush ecosystems, Gunnison sage-  
629 grouse, and Greater sage-grouse in their eastern range: A strategic multi-scale approach. *Gen*  
630 *Tech Report* [Internet]. 2016;RMRS-GTR-3:143. Available from:  
631 <https://www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/53201>
- 632 17. Brand FS, Jax K. Focusing the meaning(s) of resilience: Resilience as a descriptive  
633 concept and a boundary object. *Ecol Soc*. 2007;12.
- 634 18. ●● Moser S, Meerow S, Arnott J, Jack-Scott E. The turbulent world of resilience:  
635 interpretations and themes for transdisciplinary dialog. *Clim Change*. Climatic Change;  
636 2019;153:21–40. **The authors performed a meta-analysis on review papers of resilience.**  
637 **They discuss the challenges in defining resilience and provide guidance around how to**  
638 **engage in a productive dialogue across the different resilience interpretations.**
- 639 19. Bone C, Moseley C, Vinyeta K, Bixler RP. Employing resilience in the United States  
640 Forest Service. *Land use policy* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;52:430–8. Available from:  
641 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.01.003>
- 642 20. Pimm SL. The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature*. 1984;307:321–6.
- 643 21. Holling CS. Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*.  
644 1973;4:1–23.
- 645 22. Boeing G. *Visual Analysis of Nonlinear Dynamical Systems : Chaos , Fractals , Self-*  
646 *Similarity and the Limits*. Systems. 2016;4.
- 647 23. Folke C, Carpenter S, Elmqvist T, Gunderson L, Walker B. *Resilience and Sustainable*  
648 *Development : Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations*. 2002;31:437–40.
- 649 24. ● Folke C. Resilience [Internet]. *Oxford Res. Encycl*. 2016. p. 1–63. Available from:  
650 [http://environmentalscience.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.001.0001/a](http://environmentalscience.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.001.0001/acrefore-9780199389414-e-8)  
651 [crefore-9780199389414-e-8](http://environmentalscience.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.001.0001/acrefore-9780199389414-e-8) **This encyclopedia article gives a useful explanation of the**  
652 **history of resilience as a term and how it has evolved.**
- 653 25. Quinlan AE, Berbés-Blázquez M, Haider LJ, Peterson GD. Measuring and assessing  
654 resilience: broadening understanding through multiple disciplinary perspectives. *J Appl Ecol*.  
655 2016;53:677–87.
- 656 26. Walker B, Holling CS, Carpenter SR, Kinzig A. Resilience, Adaptability and

657 Transformability in Social – ecological Systems. *Ecol Soc* [Internet]. 2004;9:5. Available  
658 from: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/>

659 27. Holling CS, Gunderson LH. *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human and*  
660 *natural systems*. Island Press; 2002.

661 28. Reyer CPO, Brouwers N, Rammig A, Brook BW, Epila J, Grant RF, et al. Forest  
662 resilience and tipping points at different spatio-temporal scales: Approaches and challenges. *J*  
663 *Ecol*. 2015;103:5–15.

664 29. Brown ED, Williams BK. *Resilience and Resource Management*. Environ Manage.  
665 Springer US; 2015;56:1416–27.

666 30. Xu L, Marinova D, Guo X. Resilience thinking: a renewed system approach for  
667 sustainability science. *Sustain Sci*. 2015;10:123–38.

668 31. Newton AC, Cantarello E. Restoration of forest resilience: An achievable goal? *New For*.  
669 Springer Netherlands; 2015;46:645–68.

670 32. Rist L, Moen J. Sustainability in forest management and a new role for resilience thinking.  
671 *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2013;310:416–27. Available from:  
672 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.08.033>

673 33. Olson DM, Dinerstein E, Wikramanayake ED, Burgess ND, Powell GVN, Underwood  
674 EC, et al. *Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World: A New Map of Life on Earth*. Bioscience.  
675 2001;51:933–8.

676 34. OECD. *Environment Monographs 83 - OECD Core Set of Indicators for Environmental*  
677 *Performance Reviews*. Paris; 1993.

678 35. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. Vienna,  
679 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2018. Available from: [https://www.r-](https://www.r-project.org/)  
680 [project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/)

681 36. Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, et al. *vegan:*  
682 *Community Ecology Package* [Internet]. R package version 2.5-4.; 2019. Available from:  
683 <https://cran.r-project.org/package=vegan>

684 37. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis* [Internet]. Springer-Verlag  
685 New York; 2016. Available from: <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>

686 38. Arnan X, Rodrigo A, Retana J. Post-fire recovery of Mediterranean ground ant  
687 communities follows vegetation and dryness gradients. *J Biogeogr*. 2006;33:1246–58.

688 39. Rivest D, Paquette A, Shipley B, Reich PB, Messier C. Tree communities rapidly alter  
689 soil microbial resistance and resilience to drought. *Funct Ecol*. 2015;29:570–8.

690 40. Roccaforte JP, Sánchez Meador A, Waltz AEM, Gaylord ML, Stoddard MT, Huffman  
691 DW. Delayed tree mortality, bark beetle activity, and regeneration dynamics five years  
692 following the Wallow Fire, Arizona, USA: Assessing trajectories towards resiliency. *For Ecol*  
693 *Manage*. 2018;428:20–6.

694 41. Roovers P, Verheyen K, Hermy M, Gulinck H. Experimental trampling and vegetation  
695 recovery in some forest and heathland communities. *Appl Veg Sci*. 2004;7:111–8.

696 42. Royer-Tardif S, Bradley RL, Parsons WFJ. Evidence that plant diversity and site  
697 productivity confer stability to forest floor microbial biomass. *Soil Biol Biochem* [Internet].  
698 Elsevier Ltd; 2010;42:813–21. Available from:

699 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2010.01.018>

700 43. Rubio-Cuadrado Á, Bravo-Oviedo A, Mutke S, Del Río M. Climate effects on growth  
701 differ according to height and diameter along the stem in *Pinus pinaster* ait. *IForest*.  
702 2018;11:237–42.

703 44. Rubio-Cuadrado Á, Camarero JJ, del Río M, Sánchez-González M, Ruiz-Peinado R,  
704 Bravo-Oviedo A, et al. Long-term impacts of drought on growth and forest dynamics in a  
705 temperate beech-oak-birch forest. *Agric For Meteorol* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018;259:48–59.  
706 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.04.015>

707 45. Rydgren AK, Økland RH, Hestmark G. Disturbance Severity and Community Resilience  
708 in a Boreal Forest. *Ecology*. 2004;85:1906–15.

709 46. Savage M, Mast JN. How resilient are southwestern ponderosa pine forests after crown  
710 fires? *Can J For Res* [Internet]. 2005;35:967–77. Available from:  
711 <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/x05-028>

712 47. Schäfer C, Grams TEE, Rötzer T, Feldermann A, Pretzsch H. Drought stress reaction of  
713 growth and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  in tree rings of European beech and Norway spruce in monospecific versus  
714 mixed stands along a precipitation gradient. *Forests*. 2017;8.

715 48. Schaffhauser A, Curt T, Tatoni T. The resilience ability of vegetation after different fire  
716 recurrences in Provence. *WIT Trans Ecol Environ*. 2008;119:297–310.

717 49. Arthur CM, Dech JP. Species composition determines resistance to drought in dry forests  
718 of the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence forest region of central Ontario. *J Veg Sci*. 2016;27:914–  
719 25.

720 50. Selwood KE, Clarke RH, Cunningham SC, Lada H, Mcgeoch MA, Mac Nally R. A bust  
721 but no boom: Responses of floodplain bird assemblages during and after prolonged drought. *J*  
722 *Anim Ecol*. 2015;84:1700–10.

723 51. Serra-Maluquer X, Mencuccini M, Martínez-Vilalta J. Changes in tree resistance,  
724 recovery and resilience across three successive extreme droughts in the northeast Iberian  
725 Peninsula. *Oecologia* [Internet]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2018;187:343–54. Available  
726 from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-018-4118-2>

727 52. Shinoda M, Nandintsetseg B, Nachinshonhor UG, Komiyama H. Hotspots of recent  
728 drought in Asian steppes. *Reg Environ Chang*. 2014;14:103–17.

729 53. Silva Pedro M, Rammer W, Seidl R. Tree species diversity mitigates disturbance impacts  
730 on the forest carbon cycle. *Oecologia*. 2015;177:619–30.

731 54. Sohn JA, Saha S, Bauhus J. Potential of forest thinning to mitigate drought stress: A meta-  
732 analysis. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2016;380:261–73. Available from:  
733 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.07.046>

734 55. Stevens-Rumann CS, Kemp KB, Higuera PE, Harvey BJ, Rother MT, Donato DC, et al.  
735 Evidence for declining forest resilience to wildfires under climate change. *Ecol Lett*.  
736 2018;21:243–52.

737 56. Taeger S, Zang C, Liesebach M, Schneck V, Menzel A. Impact of climate and drought  
738 events on the growth of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) provenances. *For Ecol Manage*  
739 [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2013;307:30–42. Available from:  
740 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.06.053>

741 57. Temperli C, Hart SJ, Veblen TT, Kulakowski D, Hicks JJ, Andrus R. Are density  
742 reduction treatments effective at managing for resistance or resilience to spruce beetle  
743 disturbance in the southern Rocky Mountains? For Ecol Manage [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.;  
744 2014;334:53–63. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.08.028>

745 58. Thompson ID, Okabe K, Parrotta JA, Brockerhoff E, Jactel H, Forrester DI, et al.  
746 Biodiversity and ecosystem services: Lessons from nature to improve management of planted  
747 forests for REDD-plus. *Biodivers Conserv*. 2014;23:2613–35.

748 59. Trouvé R, Bontemps JD, Collet C, Seynave I, Lebourgeois F. Radial growth resilience of  
749 sessile oak after drought is affected by site water status, stand density, and social status. *Trees*  
750 - *Struct Funct*. 2017;31:517–29.

751 60. Bates JD, Davies KW. Seasonal burning of juniper woodlands and spatial recovery of  
752 herbaceous vegetation. For Ecol Manage [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2016;361:117–30.  
753 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.10.045>

754 61. Van Vierssen N, Wiersma YF. A Comparison of All-Terrain Vehicle ( ATV ) Trail  
755 Impacts on Boreal Habitats Across Scales. *Nat Areas J* [Internet]. 2015;35:266–78. Available  
756 from: <http://www.bioone.org/doi/full/10.3375/043.035.0207>

757 62. Vanha-Majamaa I, Shorohova E, Kushnevskaya H, Jalonen J. Resilience of understory  
758 vegetation after variable retention felling in boreal Norway spruce forests – A ten-year  
759 perspective. For Ecol Manage [Internet]. 2017;393:12–28. Available from:  
760 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.02.040>

761 63. Verbesselt J, Umlauf N, Hirota M, Holmgren M, Van Nes EH, Herold M, et al. Remotely  
762 sensed resilience of tropical forests. *Nat Clim Chang*. 2016;6:1028–31.

763 64. Vitali V, Büntgen U, Bauhus J. Silver fir and Douglas fir are more tolerant to extreme  
764 droughts than Norway spruce in south-western Germany. *Glob Chang Biol*. 2017;23:5108–  
765 19.

766 65. Wakelin SA, Macdonald LM, O’Callaghan M, Forrester ST, Condon LM. Soil functional  
767 resistance and stability are linked to different ecosystem properties. *Austral Ecol*.  
768 2014;39:522–31.

769 66. Wardle DA, Jonsson M. Long-term resilience of above- and belowground ecosystem  
770 components among contrasting ecosystems. *Ecology*. 2014;95:1836–49.

771 67. Willig MR, Presley SJ, Bloch CP. Long-term dynamics of tropical walking sticks in  
772 response to multiple large-scale and intense disturbances. *Oecologia*. 2011;165:357–68.

773 68. Wilson DJ, Ruscoe W a, Burrows LE, McElrea LM, Choquenot D. An experimental study  
774 of the impacts of understory forest vegetation and herbivory by red deer and rodents on  
775 seedling establishment and species composition in Waitutu Forest, New Zealand. *N Z J Ecol*.  
776 2006;30:191–207.

777 69. Windmuller-Campione MA, Long JN. If long-term resistance to a spruce beetle epidemic  
778 is futile, can silvicultural treatments increase resilience in spruce-fir forests in the Central  
779 Rocky Mountains? *Forests*. 2015;6:1157–78.

780 70. Winter MB, Baier R, Ammer C. Regeneration dynamics and resilience of unmanaged  
781 mountain forests in the Northern Limestone Alps following bark beetle-induced spruce  
782 dieback. *Eur J For Res*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2015;134:949–68.

783 71. Belote RT, Jones RH, Wieboldt TF. Compositional stability and diversity of vascular

784 plant communities following logging disturbance in Appalachian forests. *Ecol Appl*.  
785 2012;22:502–16.

786 72. Wu CH, Lo YH, Blanco JA, Chang SC. Resilience assessment of lowland plantations  
787 using an ecosystem modeling approach. *Sustain*. 2015;7:3801–22.

788 73. Xu Y, Shen ZH, Ying LX, Ciais P, Liu HY, Piao SL, et al. The exposure, sensitivity and  
789 vulnerability of natural vegetation in China to climate thermal variability (1901–2013): An  
790 indicator-based approach. *Ecol Indic* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;63:258–72. Available  
791 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.12.023>

792 74. Yan H, Zhan J, Zhang T. Resilience of forest ecosystems and its influencing factors.  
793 *Procedia Environ Sci* [Internet]. 2011;10:2201–6. Available from:  
794 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2011.09.345>

795 75. Zang C, Hartl-Meier C, Dittmar C, Rothe A, Menzel A. Patterns of drought tolerance in  
796 major European temperate forest trees: Climatic drivers and levels of variability. *Glob Chang*  
797 *Biol*. 2014;20:3767–79.

798 76. Zemp DC, Schleussner CF, Barbosa HMJ, Rammig A. Deforestation effects on Amazon  
799 forest resilience. *Geophys Res Lett*. 2017;44:6182–90.

800 77. Abbott I, Le Maitre D. Monitoring the impact of climate change on biodiversity: The  
801 challenge of megadiverse Mediterranean climate ecosystems. *Austral Ecol*. 2010;35:406–22.

802 78. Alongi DM. Mangrove forests: Resilience, protection from tsunamis, and responses to  
803 global climate change. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci*. 2008;76:1–13.

804 79. Anjos LJS, de Toledo PM. Measuring resilience and assessing vulnerability of terrestrial  
805 ecosystems to climate change in South America. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2018;13:e0194654.  
806 Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194654>

807 80. Arianoutsou M, Koukoulas S, Kazanis D. Evaluating post-fire forest resilience using GIS  
808 and multi-criteria analysis: An example from Cape Sounion National Park, Greece. *Environ*  
809 *Manage*. 2011;47:384–97.

810 81. Ayala-Orozco B, Gavito ME, Mora F, Siddique I, Balvanera P, Jaramillo VJ, et al.  
811 Resilience of Soil Properties to Land-Use Change in a Tropical Dry Forest Ecosystem. *L*  
812 *Degrad Dev* [Internet]. 2017;325:315–25. Available from:  
813 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ldr.2686>

814 82. Bernhardt-Römermann M, Gray A, Vanbergen AJ, Bergès L, Böhner A, Brooker RW, et  
815 al. Functional traits and local environment predict vegetation responses to disturbance: A pan-  
816 European multi-site experiment. *J Ecol*. 2011;99:777–87.

817 83. Bahamondez C, Thompson ID. Determining forest degradation, ecosystem state and  
818 resilience using a standard stand stocking measurement diagram: Theory into practice.  
819 *Forestry*. 2016;89:290–300.

820 84. Baker WL. Transitioning western U.S. dry forests to limited committed warming with bet-  
821 hedging and natural disturbances. *Ecosphere* [Internet]. 2018;9:e02288. Available from:  
822 <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ecs2.2288>

823 85. Bhaskar R, Arreola F, Mora F, Martinez-Yrizar A, Martinez-Ramos M, Balvanera P.  
824 Response diversity and resilience to extreme events in tropical dry secondary forests. *For Ecol*  
825 *Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018;426:61–71. Available from:  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.09.028>

- 827 86. Buma B, Wessman CA. Disturbance interactions can impact resilience mechanisms of  
828 forests. *Ecosphere*. 2011;2:1–13.
- 829 87. Burkhard B, Fath BD, Müller F. Adapting the adaptive cycle: Hypotheses on the  
830 development of ecosystem properties and services. *Ecol Modell* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.;  
831 2011;222:2878–90. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.05.016>
- 832 88. • Cantarello E, Newton AC, Martin PA, Evans PM, Gosal A, Lucash MS. Quantifying  
833 resilience of multiple ecosystem services and biodiversity in a temperate forest landscape.  
834 *Ecol Evol*. 2017;7:9661–75. **This article provides a quantitative way to assess forest**  
835 **resilience that includes some of the socio-economic aspects of forests. A good example on**  
836 **how resilience could be measured.**
- 837 89. Carrillo-Saucedo SM, Gavito ME, Siddique I. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal spore  
838 communities of a tropical dry forest ecosystem show resilience to land-use change. *Fungal*  
839 *Ecol* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2018;32:29–39. Available from:  
840 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2017.11.006>
- 841 90. Churchill DJ, Larson AJ, Dahlgreen MC, Franklin JF, Hessburg PF, Lutz JA. Restoring  
842 forest resilience: From reference spatial patterns to silvicultural prescriptions and monitoring.  
843 *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. 2013;291:442–57. Available from:  
844 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.11.007>
- 845 91. Clason AJ, Macdonald SE, Haeussler S. Forest response to cumulative disturbance and  
846 stress: Two decades of change in whitebark pine ecosystems of west-central British  
847 Columbia. *Écoscience* [Internet]. 2014;21:174–85. Available from:  
848 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.2980/21-2-3686>
- 849 92. Cole LES, Bhagwat SA, Willis KJ. Long-term disturbance dynamics and resilience of  
850 tropical peat swamp forests. *J Ecol*. 2015;103:16–30.
- 851 93. Bialecki MB, Fahey RT, Scharenbroch B. Variation in urban forest productivity and  
852 response to extreme drought across a large metropolitan region. *Urban Ecosyst. Urban*  
853 *Ecosystems*; 2018;21:157–69.
- 854 94. DeRose RJ, Long JN. Resistance and Resilience: A Conceptual Framework for  
855 Silviculture. *For Sci* [Internet]. 2014;60:1205–12. Available from:  
856 <https://academic.oup.com/forestscience/article/60/6/1205-1212/4583924>
- 857 95. Craven D, Filotas E, Angers VA, Messier C. Evaluating resilience of tree communities in  
858 fragmented landscapes: Linking functional response diversity with landscape connectivity.  
859 *Divers Distrib*. 2016;22:505–18.
- 860 96. Ding H, Pretzsch H, Schütze G, Rötzer T. Size-dependence of tree growth response to  
861 drought for Norway spruce and European beech individuals in monospecific and mixed-  
862 species stands. *Plant Biol*. 2017;19:709–19.
- 863 97. Dodd M, Barker G, Burns B, Didham R, Innes J, King C, et al. Resilience of New Zealand  
864 indigenous forest fragments to impacts of livestock and pest mammals. *N Z J Ecol*.  
865 2011;35:83–95.
- 866 98. Drever CR, Peterson G, Messier C, Bergeron Y, Flannigan M. Can forest management  
867 based on natural disturbances maintain ecological resilience? *Can J For Res* [Internet].  
868 2006;36:2285–99. Available from: [http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/x06-](http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/x06-132)  
869 132



- 870 99. Estevo CA, Nagy-Reis MB, Silva WR. Urban parks can maintain minimal resilience for  
871 Neotropical bird communities. *Urban For Urban Green* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2017;27:84–9.  
872 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2017.06.013>
- 873 100. García-López JM, Allué C. A phytoclimatic-based indicator for assessing the inherent  
874 responsitivity of the European forests to climate change. *Ecol Indic.* 2012;18:73–81.
- 875 101. Gazol A, Ribas M, Gutiérrez E, Camarero JJ. Aleppo pine forests from across Spain  
876 show drought-induced growth decline and partial recovery. *Agric For Meteorol* [Internet].  
877 Elsevier B.V.; 2017;232:186–94. Available from:  
878 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.08.014>
- 879 102. Gazol A, Camarero JJ, Anderegg WRL, Vicente-Serrano SM. Impacts of droughts on the  
880 growth resilience of Northern Hemisphere forests. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr.* 2017;26:166–76.
- 881 103. Gazol A, Camarero JJ, Vicente-Serrano SM, Sánchez-Salguero R, Gutiérrez E, de Luis  
882 M, et al. Forest resilience to drought varies across biomes. *Glob Chang Biol.* 2018;24:2143–  
883 58.
- 884 104. Bihn JH, Verhaagh M, Brändle M, Brandl R. Do secondary forests act as refuges for old  
885 growth forest animals? Recovery of ant diversity in the Atlantic forest of Brazil. *Biol*  
886 *Conserv.* 2008;141:733–43.
- 887 105. Girard F, Payette S, Gagnon R. Rapid expansion of lichen woodlands within the closed-  
888 crown boreal forest zone over the last 50 years caused by stand disturbances in eastern  
889 Canada. *J Biogeogr.* 2008;35:529–37.
- 890 106. Granda E, Gazol A, Camarero JJ. Functional diversity differently shapes growth  
891 resilience to drought for co-existing pine species. *J Veg Sci.* 2018;29:265–75.
- 892 107. Guimarães H, Braga R, Mascarenhas A, Ramos TB. Indicators of ecosystem services in a  
893 military Atlantic Forest area, Pernambuco—Brazil. *Ecol Indic* [Internet]. Elsevier;  
894 2017;80:247–57. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.05.030>
- 895 108. Halofsky JS, Halofsky JE, Burcu T, Hemstrom MA. Dry forest resilience varies under  
896 simulated climate-management scenarios in a central Oregon, USA landscape. *Ecol Appl.*  
897 2014;24:1908–25.
- 898 109. Halpin CR, Lorimer CG. Trajectories and resilience of stand structure in response to  
899 variable disturbance severities in northern hardwoods. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier  
900 B.V.; 2016;365:69–82. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.01.016>
- 901 110. Hernandez-Montilla MC, Martinez-Morales MA, Vanegas GP, De Jong BHJ.  
902 Assessment of hammocks (Petenes) resilience to sea level rise due to climate change in  
903 Mexico. *PLoS One.* 2016;11.
- 904 111. Hood SM, Baker S, Sala A. Fortifying the forest: thinning and burning increase  
905 resistance to a bark beetle outbreak and promote forest resilience. *Ecol Appl* [Internet].  
906 2016;26:1984–2000. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/eap.1363>
- 907 112. Ibarra JT, Martin M, Cockle KL, Martin K. Maintaining ecosystem resilience: Functional  
908 responses of tree cavity nesters to logging in temperate forests of the Americas. *Sci Rep.*  
909 2017;7:1–9.
- 910 113. Jaramillo VJ, Martínez-Yrizar A, Maass M, Nava-Mendoza M, Castañeda-Gómez L,  
911 Ahedo-Hernández R, et al. Hurricane impact on biogeochemical processes in a tropical dry  
912 forest in western Mexico. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018;426:72–80. Available

913 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.12.031>

914 114. Johnson AB, Winker K. Short-term hurricane impacts on a neotropical community of  
915 marked birds and implications for early- stage community resilience. *PLoS One*. 2010;5.

916 115. Borkenhagen A, Cooper DJ. Tolerance of fen mosses to submergence, and the influence  
917 on moss community composition and ecosystem resilience. *J Veg Sci*. 2018;29:127–35.

918 116. Johnstone JF, Chapin FS, Hollingsworth TN, Mack MC, Romanovsky V, Turetsky M.  
919 Fire, climate change, and forest resilience in interior AlaskaThis article is one of a selection of  
920 papers from The Dynamics of Change in Alaska’s Boreal Forests: Resilience and  
921 Vulnerability in Response to Climate Warming. *Can J For Res* [Internet]. 2010;40:1302–12.  
922 Available from: <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/X10-061>

923 117. Johnstone JF, Allen CD, Franklin JF, Frelich LE, Harvey BJ, Higuera PE, et al.  
924 Changing disturbance regimes, ecological memory, and forest resilience. *Front Ecol Environ*.  
925 2016;14:369–78.

926 118. Kaarlejärvi E, Hoset KS, Olofsson J. Mammalian herbivores confer resilience of Arctic  
927 shrub-dominated ecosystems to changing climate. *Glob Chang Biol*. 2015;21:3379–88.

928 119. Kerkhoff AJ, Enquist BJ. The Implications of Scaling Approaches for Understanding  
929 Resilience and Reorganization in Ecosystems. *Bioscience* [Internet]. 2007;57:489–99.  
930 Available from: <http://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/57/6/489/236142/The->  
931 [Implications-of-Scaling-Approaches-for](http://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/57/6/489/236142/The-Implications-of-Scaling-Approaches-for)

932 120. Knudby A, Jupiter S, Roelfsema C, Lyons M, Phinn S. Mapping coral reef resilience  
933 indicators using field and remotely sensed data. *Remote Sens*. 2013;5:1311–34.

934 121. Leuteritz TEJ, Ekbja HR. Not All Roads Lead to Resilience : a Complex Systems  
935 Approach to the Comparative Analysis of Tortoises in Arid Ecosystems. *Ecol Soc*.  
936 2008;13:www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss1/art1/.

937 122. Luce C, Morgan P, Dwire K, Isaak D, Holden Z, Rieman B. Climate change, forests,  
938 fire, water, and fish: Building resilient landscapes, streams, and managers. *Gen. Tech. Rep.*  
939 *RMRS-GTR-290*. Fort Collins, CO; 2012.

940 123. Ludwig JA, Coughenour MB, Liedloff AC, Dyer R. Modelling the resilience of  
941 Australian savanna systems to grazing impacts. *Environ Int*. 2001;27:167–72.

942 124. Magnuszewski P, Ostasiewicz K, Chazdon R, Salk C, Pajak M, Sendzimir J, et al.  
943 Resilience and alternative stable states of tropical forest landscapes under shifting cultivation  
944 regimes. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:1–20.

945 125. Magruder M, Chhin S, Palik B, Bradford JB. Thinning increases climatic resilience of  
946 red pine. *Can J For Res* [Internet]. 2013;43:878–89. Available from:  
947 <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/cjfr-2013-0088>

948 126. Bottero A, D’Amato AW, Palik BJ, Bradford JB, Fraver S, Battaglia MA, et al. Density-  
949 dependent vulnerability of forest ecosystems to drought. *J Appl Ecol*. 2017;54:1605–14.

950 127. Malika VS, Lindsey G, Katherine JW. How does spatial heterogeneity influence  
951 resilience to climatic changes? Ecological dynamics in southeast Madagascar. *Ecol Monogr*.  
952 2009;79:557–74.

953 128. Mallik AU, Kreutzweiser DP, Spalvieri CM, Mackereth RW. Understory plant  
954 community resilience to partial harvesting in riparian buffers of central Canadian boreal

955 forests. For Ecol Manage [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2013;289:209–18. Available from:  
 956 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2012.09.039>

957 129. Martínez-Vilalta J, López BC, Loepfe L, Lloret F. Stand- and tree-level determinants of  
 958 the drought response of Scots pine radial growth. *Oecologia*. 2012;168:877–88.

959 130. Mitchell PJ, O’Grady AP, Pinkard EA, Brodribb TJ, Arndt SK, Blackman CJ, et al. An  
 960 ecoclimatic framework for evaluating the resilience of vegetation to water deficit. *Glob Chang*  
 961 *Biol*. 2016;22:1677–89.

962 131. Montúfar R, Anthelme F, Pintaud JC, Balslev H. Disturbance and Resilience in Tropical  
 963 American Palm Populations and Communities. *Bot Rev*. 2011;77:426–61.

964 132. Moris J V., Vacchiano G, Ascoli D, Motta R. Alternative stable states in mountain forest  
 965 ecosystems: the case of European larch (*Larix decidua*) forests in the western Alps. *J Mt Sci*.  
 966 2017;14:811–22.

967 133. Nitschke CR, Innes JL. A tree and climate assessment tool for modelling ecosystem  
 968 response to climate change. *Ecol Modell*. 2008;210:263–77.

969 134. Pardini R, de Bueno AA, Gardner TA, Prado PI, Metzger JP. Beyond the fragmentation  
 970 threshold hypothesis: Regime shifts in biodiversity across fragmented landscapes. *PLoS One*.  
 971 2010;5.

972 135. Ponce Campos GE, Moran MS, Huete A, Zhang Y, Bresloff C, Huxman TE, et al.  
 973 Ecosystem resilience despite large-scale altered hydroclimatic conditions. *Nature* [Internet].  
 974 Nature Publishing Group; 2013;494:349–52. Available from:  
 975 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature11836>

976 136. Reyes G, Kneeshaw D. Ecological Resilience: Is It Ready for operationalisation in forest  
 977 management? In: Daniels JA, editor. *Adv Environ Res*. New York, USA: Nova Science  
 978 Publishers, Inc.; 2014. p. 195–212.

979 137. Broncano MJ, Retana J, Rodrigo A. Predicting the recovery of *Pinus halepensis* and  
 980 *Quercus ilex* forests after a large wildfire in northeastern Spain. *Plant Ecol*. 2005;180:47–56.

981 138. Sakschewski B, Von Bloh W, Boit A, Poorter L, Peña-Claros M, Heinke J, et al.  
 982 Resilience of Amazon forests emerges from plant trait diversity. *Nat Clim Chang*.  
 983 2016;6:1032–6.

984 139. Salamon-Albert É, Abaligeti G, Ortmann-Ajkai A. Functional response trait analysis  
 985 improves climate sensitivity estimation in beech forests at a trailing edge. *Forests*. 2017;8.

986 140. Sánchez-Pinillos M, Coll L, De Cáceres M, Ameztegui A. Assessing the persistence  
 987 capacity of communities facing natural disturbances on the basis of species response traits.  
 988 *Ecol Indic* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;66:76–85. Available from:  
 989 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.01.024>

990 141. Sánchez-Salguero R, Camarero JJ, Rozas V, Génova M, Olano JM, Arzac A, et al.  
 991 Resist, recover or both? Growth plasticity in response to drought is geographically structured  
 992 and linked to intraspecific variability in *Pinus pinaster*. *J Biogeogr*. 2018;45:1126–39.

993 142. Scheffer M, Carpenter S, Foley JA, Folke C, Walker B. Catastrophic shifts in  
 994 ecosystems. *Nature*. 2001;413:591–6.

995 143. Schirpke U, Kohler M, Leitinger G, Fontana V, Tasser E, Tappeiner U. Future impacts  
 996 of changing land-use and climate on ecosystem services of mountain grassland and their

997 resilience. *Ecosyst Serv* [Internet]. The Authors; 2017;26:79–94. Available from:  
998 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.06.008>

999 144. Seidl R, Rammer W, Spies TA. Disturbance legacies increase the resilience of forest  
1000 ecosystem structure, composition, and functioning. *Ecol Appl*. 2014;24:2063–77.

1001 145. Sharma A, Goyal MK. Assessment of ecosystem resilience to hydroclimatic disturbances  
1002 in India. *Glob Chang Biol* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018;24:e432–41. Available from:  
1003 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.07.079>

1004 146. Spasojevic MJ, Bahlai CA, Bradley BA, Butterfield BJ, Tuanmu MN, Sistla S, et al.  
1005 Scaling up the diversity-resilience relationship with trait databases and remote sensing data:  
1006 The recovery of productivity after wildfire. *Glob Chang Biol*. 2016;22:1421–32.

1007 147. Stampoulis D, Andreadis KM, Granger SL, Fisher JB, Turk FJ, Behrangi A, et al.  
1008 Assessing hydro-ecological vulnerability using microwave radiometric measurements from  
1009 WindSat. *Remote Sens Environ* [Internet]. Elsevier Inc.; 2016;184:58–72. Available from:  
1010 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.06.007>

1011 148. Bruelheide H, Luginbühl U. Peeking at Ecosystem Stability : Making Use of a Natural  
1012 Disturbance Experiment to Analyze Resistance and Resilience Author ( s ): Helge Bruelheide  
1013 and Ute Luginbühl Peeking at ecosystem experiment use of a natural disturbance stability :  
1014 making to resist. *Ecology*. 2009;90:1314–25.

1015 149. Tambosi LR, Martensen AC, Ribeiro MC, Metzger JP. A framework to optimize  
1016 biodiversity restoration efforts based on habitat amount and landscape connectivity. *Restor*  
1017 *Ecol*. 2014;22:169–77.

1018 150. Torrico JC, Janssens MJJ. Rapid assessment methods of resilience for natural and  
1019 agricultural systems. *An Acad Bras Cienc*. 2010;82:1095–105.

1020 151. Van De Leemput IA, Van Nes EH, Scheffer M. Resilience of alternative states in  
1021 spatially extended ecosystems. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:1–17.

1022 152. Viglizzo EF, Noretto MD, Jobbágy EG, Ricard MF, Frank FC. The ecohydrology of  
1023 ecosystem transitions: A meta-analysis. *Ecohydrology*. 2015;8:911–21.

1024 153. Walker XJ, Mack MC, Johnstone JF. Predicting Ecosystem Resilience to Fire from Tree  
1025 Ring Analysis in Black Spruce Forests. *Ecosystems*. Springer US; 2017;20:1137–50.

1026 154. Wallem PK, Anderson CB, Martínez-Pastur G, Lencinas MV. Using assembly rules to  
1027 measure the resilience of riparian plant communities to beaver invasion in subantarctic  
1028 forests. *Biol Invasions*. 2010;12:325–35.

1029 155. Waltz AEM, Stoddard MT, Kalies EL, Springer JD, Huffman DW, Meador AS.  
1030 Effectiveness of fuel reduction treatments: Assessing metrics of forest resiliency and wildfire  
1031 severity after the Wallow Fire, AZ. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2014;334:43–  
1032 52. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.08.026>

1033 156. Wittkuhn RS, McCaw L, Wills AJ, Robinson R, Andersen AN, Van Heurck P, et al.  
1034 Variation in fire interval sequences has minimal effects on species richness and composition  
1035 in fire-prone landscapes of south-west Western Australia. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet].  
1036 Elsevier B.V.; 2011;261:965–78. Available from:  
1037 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2010.10.037>

1038 157. Wu T, Kim YS. Pricing ecosystem resilience in frequent-fire ponderosa pine forests. *For*  
1039 *Policy Econ* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2013;27:8–12. Available from:

1040 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2012.11.002>

1041 158. Xu C, Liu H, Anenkhonov OA, Korolyuk AY, Sandanov D V., Balsanova LD, et al.  
 1042 Long-term forest resilience to climate change indicated by mortality, regeneration, and growth  
 1043 in semiarid southern Siberia. *Glob Chang Biol.* 2017;23:2370–82.

1044 159. Buma B, Wessman CA. Forest resilience, climate change, and opportunities for  
 1045 adaptation: A specific case of a general problem. *For Ecol Manage* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.;  
 1046 2013;306:216–25. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.06.044>

1047 160. Zenner EK, Dickinson YL, Peck JE. Recovery of forest structure and composition to  
 1048 harvesting in different strata of mixed even-aged central Appalachian hardwoods. *Ann For*  
 1049 *Sci.* 2013;70:151–9.

1050 161. Akamani K. A community resilience model for understanding and assessing the  
 1051 sustainability of forest-dependent communities. *Hum Ecol Rev* [Internet]. 2012;19:99–109.  
 1052 Available from: [http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/for\\_articles/1/](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/for_articles/1/)

1053 162. Akamani K, Hall TE. Determinants of the process and outcomes of household  
 1054 participation in collaborative forest management in Ghana: A quantitative test of a community  
 1055 resilience model. *J Environ Manage.* 2015;147:1–11.

1056 163. Akamani K, Wilson PI, Hall TE. Barriers to collaborative forest management and  
 1057 implications for building the resilience of forest-dependent communities in the Ashanti region  
 1058 of Ghana. *J Environ Manage.* 2015;151:11–21.

1059 164. Ballard HL, Belsky JM. Participatory action research and environmental learning:  
 1060 Implications for resilient forests and communities. *Environ Educ Res.* 2010;16:611–27.

1061 165. Beeton TA, Galvin KA. Wood-based bioenergy in western Montana: The importance of  
 1062 understanding path dependence and local context for resilience. *Ecol Soc.* 2017;22.

1063 166. Bernetti I, Ciampi C, Fagarazzi C, Sacchelli S. The evaluation of forest crop damages  
 1064 due to climate change. An application of Dempster-Shafer method. *J For Econ* [Internet].  
 1065 Elsevier GmbH.; 2011;17:285–97. Available from:  
 1066 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfe.2011.04.005>

1067 167. Bowditch EAD, McMorran R, Bryce R, Smith M. Perception and partnership:  
 1068 Developing forest resilience on private estates. *For Policy Econ* [Internet]. Elsevier;  
 1069 2019;99:110–22. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2017.12.004>

1070 168. Brown HCP, Sonwa DJ. Diversity within village institutions and its implication for  
 1071 resilience in the context of climate change in Cameroon. *Clim Dev.* Taylor & Francis;  
 1072 2018;10:448–57.

1073 169. Chapin FS, Peterson G, Berkes F, Callaghan T V., Angelstam P, Apps M, et al.  
 1074 Resilience and Vulnerability of Northern Regions to Social and Environmental Change.  
 1075 *AMBIO A J Hum Environ* [Internet]. 2004;33. Available from:  
 1076 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8618949%0AMitigation>

1077 170. Calderon-Aguilera LE, Rivera-Monroy VH, Porter-Bolland L, Martínez-Yrizar A, Ladah  
 1078 LB, Martínez-Ramos M, et al. An assessment of natural and human disturbance effects on  
 1079 Mexican ecosystems: Current trends and research gaps. *Biodivers Conserv.* 2012;21:589–617.

1080 171. Chapin FS, Lovcraft AL, Zavaleta ES, Nelson J, Robards MD, Kofinas GP, et al. Policy  
 1081 strategies to address sustainability of Alaskan boreal forests in response to a directionally  
 1082 changing climate. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2006;103:16637–43. Available from:

1083 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0606955103>

1084 172. Chapin FS, McGuire AD, Ruess RW, Hollingsworth TN, Mack MC, Johnstone JF, et al.  
 1085 Resilience of Alaska's boreal forest to climatic change This article is one of a selection of  
 1086 papers from The Dynamics of Change in Alaska's Boreal Forests: Resilience and  
 1087 Vulnerability in Response to Climate Warming. *Can J For Res* [Internet]. 2010;40:1360–70.  
 1088 Available from: <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/X10-074>

1089 173. Daniels JM. Assessing socioeconomic resiliency in Washington counties. Gen. Tech.  
 1090 Rep. - Pacific Northwest Res. Station. USDA For. Serv. Portland, Oregon; 2004.

1091 174. DasGupta R, Shaw R. An indicator based approach to assess coastal communities'  
 1092 resilience against climate related disasters in Indian Sundarbans. *J Child Fam Stud*.  
 1093 2015;24:85–101.

1094 175. Dessalegn M. Threatened common property resource system and factors for resilience:  
 1095 Lessons drawn from serege-commons in Muhur, Ethiopia. *Ecol Soc*. 2016;21.

1096 176. Doughty CA. Building climate change resilience through local cooperation: a Peruvian  
 1097 Andes case study. *Reg Environ Chang*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2016;16:2187–97.

1098 177. Dymond CC, Tedder S, Spittlehouse DL, Raymer B, Hopkins K, McCallion K, et al.  
 1099 Diversifying managed forests to increase resilience. *Can J For Res* [Internet]. 2014;44:1196–  
 1100 205. Available from: <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/cjfr-2014-0146>

1101 178. Dymond CC, Spittlehouse DL, Tedder S, Hopkins K, McCallion K, Sandland J.  
 1102 Applying resilience concepts in forest management: A retrospective simulation approach.  
 1103 *Forests*. 2015;6:4421–38.

1104 179. Fuller L, Quine CP. Resilience and tree health: A basis for implementation in sustainable  
 1105 forest management. *Forestry*. 2016;89:7–19.

1106 180. Hale JD, Pugh TAM, Sadler JP, Boyko CT, Brown J, Caputo S, et al. Delivering a multi-  
 1107 functional and resilient urban forest. *Sustain*. 2015;7:4600–24.

1108 181. Candan F, Broquen P. Aggregate stability and related properties in NW Patagonian  
 1109 Andisols. *Geoderma* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2009;154:42–7. Available from:  
 1110 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.09.010>

1111 182. Harris CC, McLaughlin W, Brown G, Becker DR. Rural communities in the inland  
 1112 Northwest: an assessment of small rural communities in the interior and upper Columbia  
 1113 River basins. [Internet]. Portland, Oregon; 2000. Available from:  
 1114 [https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?auth=shibb&url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat00846a&AN=ucfl.024909820&site=eds-](https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?auth=shibb&url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat00846a&AN=ucfl.024909820&site=eds-live&scope=site%5Cnhttp://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10938)  
 1115 [live&scope=site%5Cnhttp://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10938](http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10938)  
 1116

1117 183. Jarzebski MP, Tumilba V, Yamamoto H. Application of a tri-capital community  
 1118 resilience framework for assessing the social–ecological system sustainability of community-  
 1119 based forest management in the Philippines. *Sustain Sci*. Springer Japan; 2016;11:307–20.

1120 184. Kelly C, Ferrara A, Wilson GA, Ripullone F, Nolè A, Harmer N, et al. Community  
 1121 resilience and land degradation in forest and shrubland socio-ecological systems: Evidence  
 1122 from Gorgoglione, Basilicata, Italy. *Land use policy* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2015;46:11–20.  
 1123 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.01.026>

1124 185. Kim M, You S, Chon J, Lee J. Sustainable land-use planning to improve the coastal  
 1125 resilience of the social-ecological landscape. *Sustain*. 2017;9:1–21.

- 1126 186. Knoot TG, Schulte L a, Tyndall JC, Palik BJ. The State of the System and Steps Toward  
1127 Resilience of Disturbance- dependent Oak Forests. *Ecol Soc.* 2010;15:5.
- 1128 187. Lyon C. Place Systems and Social Resilience: A Framework for Understanding Place in  
1129 Social Adaptation, Resilience, and Transformation. *Soc Nat Resour.* 2014;27:1009–23.
- 1130 188. Magis K. Community resilience: An indicator of social sustainability. *Soc Nat Resour.*  
1131 2010;23:401–16.
- 1132 189. Moen J, Keskitalo ECH. Interlocking panarchies in multi-use boreal forests in Sweden.  
1133 *Ecol Soc.* 2010;15.
- 1134 190. Nightingale A, Sharma JR. Conflict resilience among community forestry user groups:  
1135 Experiences in Nepal. *Disasters.* 2014;38:517–39.
- 1136 191. Pinkerton EW, Benner J. Small sawmills persevere while the majors close: Evaluating  
1137 resilience and desirable timber allocation in British Columbia, Canada. *Ecol Soc.* 2013;18.
- 1138 192. Carnwath G, Nelson C. Effects of biotic and abiotic factors on resistance versus  
1139 resilience of Douglas fir to drought. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:1–19.
- 1140 193. Salvati L, De Angelis A, Bajocco S, Ferrara A, Barone PM. Desertification Risk, Long-  
1141 Term Land-Use Changes and Environmental Resilience: A Case Study in Basilicata, Italy.  
1142 *Scottish Geogr J.* 2013;129:85–99.
- 1143 194. Sarkki S, Heikkinen H. The resilience of communities and nature-based livelihoods in  
1144 northern Finland. In: Nuttall M, Tervo-Kankare K, Karjalainen T, editors. *NGP Yearb 2012*  
1145 *Negot Resour Engag people Human-environment relations North.* Oulu; 2012. p. 95–107.
- 1146 195. Sarkki S, Ficko A, Wielgolaski F, Abraham E, Bratanova-Doncheva S, Grunewald K, et  
1147 al. Assessing the resilient provision of ecosystem services by social-ecological systems:  
1148 introduction and theory. *Clim Res [Internet].* 2017;AdvanceVie:1–9. Available from:  
1149 [http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/cr/Resilience in SENSitive mountain FOREst ecosystems](http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/cr/Resilience%20in%20SENSitive%20mountain%20FOREst%20ecosystems%20under%20environmental%20change/av2/)  
1150 [under environmental change/av2/](http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/cr/Resilience%20in%20SENSitive%20mountain%20FOREst%20ecosystems%20under%20environmental%20change/av2/)
- 1151 196. Saxena A, Guneralp B, Bailis R, Yohe G, Oliver C. Evaluating the resilience of forest  
1152 dependent communities in Central India by combining the sustainable livelihoods framework  
1153 and the cross scale resilience analysis. *Curr Sci.* 2016;110:1195–207.
- 1154 197. Schoennagel T, Balch JK, Brenkert-Smith H, Dennison PE, Harvey BJ, Krawchuk MA,  
1155 et al. Adapt to more wildfire in western North American forests as climate changes. *Proc Natl*  
1156 *Acad Sci [Internet].* 2017;114:4582–90. Available from:  
1157 <http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1617464114>
- 1158 198. • Seidl R, Spies TA, Peterson DL, Stephens SL, Jeffrey A. Searching for resilience :  
1159 addressing the impacts of changing disturbance regimes on forest ecosystem services. *J Appl*  
1160 *Ecol.* 2016;53:120–9. **This article studies how resilience can be used in forest**  
1161 **management as a response to the changing disturbance regimes. It proposes pathways to**  
1162 **manage forests for resilience and ensure the maintenance of the ecosystem service**  
1163 **provision.**
- 1164 199. Singer J, Hoang H, Ochiai C. Post-displacement community resilience: Considering the  
1165 contribution of indigenous skills and cultural capital among ethnic minority Vietnamese. *Asia*  
1166 *Pac Viewp.* 2015;56:208–22.
- 1167 200. Smith JW, Moore RL, Anderson DH, Siderelis C. Community Resilience in Southern  
1168 Appalachia: A Theoretical Framework and Three Case Studies. *Hum Ecol.* 2012;40:341–53.

- 1169 201. Ticktin T, Quazi S, Dacks R, Tora M, Mcguigan A, Hastings Z, et al. Linkages between  
1170 measures of biodiversity and community resilience in Pacific Island agroforests. *Conserv*  
1171 *Biol.* 2018;0:1–11.
- 1172 202. Toledo VM, Ortiz-Espejel B, Cortés L, Moguel P, Ordoñez M de J. The multiple use of  
1173 tropical forests by indigenous peoples in Mexico: A case of adaptive management. *Conserv*  
1174 *Ecol* [Internet]. 2003;7:9. Available from: <http://www.consecol.org/vol7/iss3/art9>
- 1175 203. Chaer G, Fernandes M, Myrold D, Bottomley P. Comparative resistance and resilience  
1176 of soil microbial communities and enzyme activities in adjacent native forest and agricultural  
1177 soils. *Microb Ecol.* 2009;58:414–24.
- 1178 204. Townsend PA, Masters KL. Lattice-work corridors for climate change: A conceptual  
1179 framework for biodiversity conservation and social-ecological resilience in a tropical  
1180 elevational gradient. *Ecol Soc.* 2015;20.
- 1181 205. Bottero A, D’Amato AW, Palik BJ, Kern CC, Bradford JB, Scherer SS. Influence of  
1182 Repeated Prescribed Fire on Tree Growth and Mortality in *Pinus resinosa* Forests, Northern  
1183 Minnesota. *For Sci* [Internet]. 2017;63:94–100. Available from:  
1184 <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/10.5849/forsci.16-035>
- 1185 206. Stuart-Haëntjens E, De Boeck HJ, Lemoine NP, Mänd P, Kröel-Dulay G, Schmidt IK, et  
1186 al. Mean annual precipitation predicts primary production resistance and resilience to extreme  
1187 drought. *Sci Total Environ.* 2018;636:360–6.
- 1188 207. Summerville KS. Forest lepidopteran communities are more resilient to shelterwood  
1189 harvests compared to more intensive logging regimes. *Ecol Appl.* 2013;23:1101–12.
- 1190 208. Moretti M, Legg C. Combining plant and animal traits to assess community functional  
1191 responses to disturbance. *Ecography (Cop).* 2009;32:299–309.
- 1192 209. Chergui B, Fahd S, Santos X. *Quercus suber* forest and *Pinus* plantations show different  
1193 post-fire resilience in Mediterranean north-western Africa. *Ann For Sci. Annals of Forest*  
1194 *Science*; 2018;75.
- 1195 210. Chompuchan C, Lin CY. Assessment of forest recovery at Wu-Ling fire scars in Taiwan  
1196 using multi-temporal Landsat imagery. *Ecol Indic* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2017;79:196–206.  
1197 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.04.038>
- 1198 211. Creed IF, Spargo AT, Jones JA, Buttler JM, Adams MB, Beall FD, et al. Changing forest  
1199 water yields in response to climate warming: Results from long-term experimental watershed  
1200 sites across North America. *Glob Chang Biol.* 2014;20:3191–208.
- 1201 212. Curran TJ, Gersbach LN, Edwards W, Krockenberger AK. Wood density predicts plant  
1202 damage and vegetative recovery rates caused by cyclone disturbance in tropical rainforest tree  
1203 species of North Queensland, Australia. *Austral Ecol.* 2008;33:442–50.
- 1204 213. Curzon MT, D’Amato AW, Palik BJ. Bioenergy harvest impacts to biodiversity and  
1205 resilience vary across aspen-dominated forest ecosystems in the Lake States region, USA.  
1206 *Appl Veg Sci.* 2016;19:667–78.
- 1207 214. D’Amato AW, Bradford JB, Fraver S, Palik BJ. Effects of thinning on drought  
1208 vulnerability and climate response in north temperate forest ecosystems. *Ecol Appl. Wiley*  
1209 *Online Library*; 2013;23:1735–42.
- 1210 215. Dănescu A, Kohnle U, Bauhus J, Sohn J, Albrecht AT. Stability of tree increment in  
1211 relation to episodic drought in uneven-structured, mixed stands in southwestern Germany. *For*



- 1212 Ecol Manage. 2018;415–416:148–59.
- 1213 216. Danielson TM, Rivera-Monroy VH, Castañeda-Moya E, Briceño H, Travieso R, Marx  
1214 BD, et al. Assessment of Everglades mangrove forest resilience: Implications for above-  
1215 ground net primary productivity and carbon dynamics. For Ecol Manage [Internet]. Elsevier;  
1216 2017;404:115–25. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.08.009>
- 1217 217. Das P, Behera MD, Roy PS. Modeling precipitation dependent forest resilience in India.  
1218 Int Arch Photogramm Remote Sens Spat Inf Sci - ISPRS Arch. 2018;42:263–6.
- 1219 218. DeClerck F, Barbour M, Sawyer J. Species richness and stand stability in conifer forests  
1220 of the Sierra Nevada. Ecology [Internet]. 2006;87:2787–99. Available from:  
1221 [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2006\)87\[2787:SRASSI\]2.0.CO;0](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[2787:SRASSI]2.0.CO;0)<http://0.0.0.2>
- 1222 219. Derroire G, Balvanera P, Castellanos-Castro C, Decocq G, Kennard DK, Lebrija-Trejos  
1223 E, et al. Resilience of tropical dry forests – a meta-analysis of changes in species diversity and  
1224 composition during secondary succession. Oikos. 2016;125:1386–97.
- 1225 220. Di Mauro B, Fava F, Busetto L, Crosta GF, Colombo R. Post-fire resilience in the Alpine  
1226 region estimated from MODIS satellite multispectral data. Int J Appl Earth Obs Geoinf  
1227 [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2014;32:163–72. Available from:  
1228 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0303243414000944>
- 1229 221. Diaconu D, Kahle HP, Spiecker H. Thinning increases drought tolerance of European  
1230 beech: a case study on two forested slopes on opposite sides of a valley. Eur J For Res.  
1231 Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2017;136:319–28.
- 1232 222. Díaz-Delgado R, Lloret F, Pons X, Terradas J. Satellite Evidence of Decreasing  
1233 Resilience in Mediterranean Plant Communities After Recurrent Wildfires. Ecology  
1234 [Internet]. 2002;83:2293–303. Available from:  
1235 [https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-](https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083%5B2293:SEODRI%5D2.0.CO%3B2)  
1236 [9658\(2002\)083%5B2293:SEODRI%5D2.0.CO%3B2](https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083%5B2293:SEODRI%5D2.0.CO%3B2)
- 1237 223. Dörner J, Dec D, Zúñiga F, Sandoval P, Horn R. Effect of land use change on Andosol's  
1238 pore functions and their functional resilience after mechanical and hydraulic stresses. Soil  
1239 Tillage Res. 2011;115–116:71–9.
- 1240 224. Duveneck MJ, Scheller RM. Measuring and managing resistance and resilience under  
1241 climate change in northern Great Lake forests (USA). Landsc Ecol. Springer Netherlands;  
1242 2016;31:669–86.
- 1243 225. Dynesius M, Hylander K, Nilsson C. High resilience of bryophyte assemblages in  
1244 streamside compared to upland forests. Ecology. 2009;90:1042–54.
- 1245 226. Fahey RT, Bialecki MB, Carter DR. Tree growth and resilience to extreme drought  
1246 across an urban land-use gradient. Arboric Urban For. 2013;39:279–85.
- 1247 227. Fahey RT, Fotis AT, Woods KD. Quantifying canopy complexity and effects on  
1248 productivity and resilience in late- successional hemlock — hardwood forests. Ecol Appl.  
1249 2015;25:834–47.
- 1250 228. Fernandez-Manso A, Quintano C, Roberts DA. Burn severity influence on post-fire  
1251 vegetation cover resilience from Landsat MESMA fraction images time series in  
1252 Mediterranean forest ecosystems. Remote Sens Environ [Internet]. Elsevier Inc.;  
1253 2016;184:112–23. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.06.015>
- 1254 229. García-Romero A, Oropeza-Orozco O, Galicia-Sarmiento L. Land-use systems and

1255 resilience of tropical rain forests in the Tehuantepec Isthmus, Mexico. *Environ Manage.*  
1256 2004;34:768–85.

1257 230. Gazol A, Camarero JJ. Functional diversity enhances silver fir growth resilience to an  
1258 extreme drought. *J Ecol.* 2016;104:1063–75.

1259 231. George JP, Grabner M, Karanitsch-Ackerl S, Mayer K, Weißenbacher L, Schueler S.  
1260 Genetic variation, phenotypic stability, and repeatability of drought response in European  
1261 larch throughout 50 years in a common garden experiment. *Tree Physiol.* 2017;37:33–46.

1262 232. González-De Vega S, De las Heras J, Moya D. Resilience of Mediterranean terrestrial  
1263 ecosystems and fire severity in semiarid areas: Responses of Aleppo pine forests in the short,  
1264 mid and long term. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2016;573:1171–7. Available  
1265 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.03.115>

1266 233. Abella SR, Fornwalt PJ. Ten years of vegetation assembly after a North American mega  
1267 fire. *Glob Chang Biol.* 2015;21:789–802.

1268 234. Hancock MH, Legg CJ. Diversity and stability of ericaceous shrub cover during two  
1269 disturbance experiments: one on heathland and one in forest. *Plant Ecol Divers.* 2012;5:275–  
1270 87.

1271 235. Heer K, Behringer D, Piermattei A, Bässler C, Brandl R, Fady B, et al. Linking  
1272 dendroecology and association genetics in natural populations: Stress responses archived in  
1273 tree rings associate with SNP genotypes in silver fir (*Abies alba* Mill.). *Mol Ecol.*  
1274 2018;27:1428–38.

1275 236. Heinimann HR. A concept in adaptive ecosystem management-An engineering  
1276 perspective. *For Ecol Manage.* 2010;259:848–56.

1277 237. Helman D, Lensky IM, Yakir D, Osem Y. Forests growing under dry conditions have  
1278 higher hydrological resilience to drought than do more humid forests. *Glob Chang Biol.*  
1279 2017;23:2801–17.

1280 238. Herrero A, Zamora R. Plant responses to extreme climatic events: A field test of  
1281 resilience capacity at the southern range edge. *PLoS One.* 2014;9:1–12.

1282 239. Hirota M, Holmgren M, Van Nes EH, Scheffer M. Global Resilience of Tropical Forest.  
1283 *Science* (80- ) [Internet]. 2011;334:232–5. Available from:  
1284 <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/334/6053/232.short>

1285 240. Hoffmann N, Schall P, Ammer C, Leder B, Vor T. Drought sensitivity and stem growth  
1286 variation of nine alien and native tree species on a productive forest site in Germany. *Agric*  
1287 *For Meteorol.* 2018;256–257:431–44.

1288 241. Huang W, Fonti P, Larsen JB, Ræbild A, Callesen I, Pedersen NB, et al. Projecting tree-  
1289 growth responses into future climate: A study case from a Danish-wide common garden.  
1290 *Agric For Meteorol* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2017;247:240–51. Available from:  
1291 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.07.016>

1292 242. Jacobs BF. Restoration of degraded transitional (piñon-juniper) woodland sites improves  
1293 ecohydrologic condition and primes understory resilience to subsequent disturbance.  
1294 *Ecohydrology.* 2015;8:1417–28.

1295 243. Jacquet K, Prodon R. Measuring the postfire resilience of a bird-vegetation system: A  
1296 28-year study in a Mediterranean oak woodland. *Oecologia.* 2009;161:801–11.

- 1297 244. Acuña V, Giorgi A, Muñoz I, Sabater F, Sabater S. Meteorological and riparian  
1298 influences on organic matter dynamics in a forested Mediterranean stream. *J North Am*  
1299 *Benthol Soc.* 2007;26:54–69.
- 1300 245. Johnstone JF, McIntire EJB, Pedersen EJ, King G, Pisaric MJF. A sensitive slope:  
1301 Estimating landscape patterns of forest resilience in a changing climate. *Ecosphere.* 2010;1.
- 1302 246. Julio Camarero J, Gazol A, Sangüesa-Barreda G, Cantero A, Sánchez-Salguero R,  
1303 Sánchez-Miranda A, et al. Forest Growth Responses to Drought at Short- and Long-Term  
1304 Scales in Spain: Squeezing the Stress Memory from Tree Rings. *Front Ecol Evol* [Internet].  
1305 2018;6:1–11. Available from:  
1306 <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fevo.2018.00009/full>
- 1307 247. Karavani A, Boer MM, Baudena M, Colinas C, Díaz-Sierra R, Pemán J, et al. Fire-  
1308 induced deforestation in drought-prone Mediterranean forests: drivers and unknowns from  
1309 leaves to communities. *Ecol Monogr.* 2018;88:141–69.
- 1310 248. Keyser TL, Brown PM. Drought response of upland oak (*Quercus* L.) species in  
1311 Appalachian hardwood forests of the southeastern USA. *Ann For Sci* [Internet]. *Annals of*  
1312 *Forest Science;* 2016;73:971–86. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13595-016-0575-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13595-016-0575-0)  
1313 [0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13595-016-0575-0)
- 1314 249. Kipfer T, Moser B, Egli S, Wohlgemuth T, Ghazoul J. Ectomycorrhiza succession  
1315 patterns in *Pinus sylvestris* forests after stand-replacing fire in the Central Alps. *Oecologia.*  
1316 2011;167:219–28.
- 1317 250. Kunz J, Löffler G, Bauhus J. Minor European broadleaved tree species are more  
1318 drought-tolerant than *Fagus sylvatica* but not more tolerant than *Quercus petraea*. *For Ecol*  
1319 *Manage.* 2018;414:15–27.
- 1320 251. Larson AJ, Lutz JA, Gersonde RF, Franklin JF, Hietpas FF. Potential site productivity  
1321 influences the rate of forest structural development. *Ecol Appl.* 2008;18:899–910.
- 1322 252. Lawrence D, Radel C, Tully K, Schmook B, Schneider L. Untangling a decline in  
1323 tropical forest resilience: Constraints on the sustainability of shifting cultivation across the  
1324 globe. *Biotropica.* 2010;42:21–30.
- 1325 253. Leão TCC, Lobo D, Scotson L. Economic and Biological Conditions Influence the  
1326 Sustainability of Harvest of Wild Animals and Plants in Developing Countries. *Ecol Econ.*  
1327 2017;140:14–21.
- 1328 254. Lebrija-trejos AE, Bongers F, Pérez-garcía EA, Meave JA, Lebrija-trejos E, Ciencias F  
1329 De, et al. Successional Change and Resilience of a Very Dry Tropical Deciduous Forest  
1330 following Shifting Agriculture Successional Change and Resilience of a Very Dry Tropical  
1331 Deciduous Forest Following Shifting Agriculture. *Biotropica.* 2008;40:422–31.
- 1332 255. Aikio S. The contribution of direct and indirect flows to the resilience of element cycles.  
1333 *Acta Oecologica.* 2004;26:129–35.
- 1334 256. Leite M de S, Tambosi LR, Romitelli I, Metzger JP. Landscape ecology perspective in  
1335 restoration projects for biodiversity conservation: A review. *Nat a Conserv.* 2013;11:108–18.
- 1336 257. Lin TC, Hamburg SP, Lin KC, Wang LJ, Chang C Te, Hsia YJ, et al. Typhoon  
1337 Disturbance and Forest Dynamics: Lessons from a Northwest Pacific Subtropical Forest.  
1338 *Ecosystems.* 2011;14:127–43.
- 1339 258. Lloret F, Siscart D, Dalmases C. Canopy recovery after drought dieback in holm-oak

- 1340 Mediterranean forests of Catalonia (NE Spain). *Glob Chang Biol.* 2004;10:2092–9.
- 1341 259. Lloret F, Estevan H, Vayreda J, Terradas J. Fire regenerative syndromes of forest woody  
1342 species across fire and climatic gradients. *Oecologia.* 2005;146:461–8.
- 1343 260. Long JN, Windmuller-Campione M, De Rose RJ. Building resistance and resilience:  
1344 Regeneration should not be left to chance. *Forests.* 2018;9:1–12.
- 1345 261. Lopez-Toledo L, Anten NPR, Endress BA, Ackerly DD, Martínez-Ramos M. Resilience  
1346 to chronic defoliation in a dioecious understorey tropical rain forest palm. *J Ecol.*  
1347 2012;100:1245–56.
- 1348 262. Lucash MS, Scheller RM, J. Gustafson E, R. Sturtevant B. Spatial resilience of forested  
1349 landscapes under climate change and management. *Landsc Ecol.* Springer Netherlands;  
1350 2017;32:953–69.
- 1351 263. Madrigal-González J, Herrero A, Ruiz-Benito P, Zavala MA. Resilience to drought in a  
1352 dry forest: Insights from demographic rates. *For Ecol Manage.* 2017;389:167–75.
- 1353 264. Malinga GM, Valtonen A, Nyeko P, Roininen H. High resilience of galling insect  
1354 communities to selective and clear-cut logging in a tropical rainforest. *Int J Trop Insect Sci.*  
1355 2014;34:277–86.
- 1356 265. Marqués L, Camarero JJ, Gazol A, Zavala MA. Drought impacts on tree growth of two  
1357 pine species along an altitudinal gradient and their use as early-warning signals of potential  
1358 shifts in tree species distributions. *For Ecol Manage.* 2016;381:157–67.
- 1359 266. Andivia E, Natalini F, Fernández M, Alejano R, Vázquez-Piqué J. Contrasting holm oak  
1360 provenances show different field performance but similar resilience to drought events eight  
1361 years after planting in a mediterranean environment. *IForest.* 2018;11:259–66.
- 1362 267. Martínez-Yrizar A, Jaramillo VJ, Maass M, Búrquez A, Parker G, Álvarez-Yépiz JC, et  
1363 al. Resilience of tropical dry forest productivity to two hurricanes of different intensity in  
1364 western Mexico. *For Ecol Manage.* 2018;426:53–60.
- 1365 268. Matusick G, Ruthrof KX, Fontaine JB, Hardy GESJ. Eucalyptus forest shows low  
1366 structural resistance and resilience to climate change-type drought. *J Veg Sci.* 2016;27:493–  
1367 503.
- 1368 269. McLaren KP, McDonald MA. Coppice regrowth in a disturbed tropical dry limestone  
1369 forest in Jamaica. *For Ecol Manage.* 2003;180:99–111.
- 1370 270. Merlin M, Perot T, Perret S, Korboulewsky N, Vallet P. Effects of stand composition and  
1371 tree size on resistance and resilience to drought in sessile oak and Scots pine. *For Ecol*  
1372 *Manage.* 2015;339:22–33.
- 1373 271. Moretti M, Duelli P, Obrist MK. Biodiversity and resilience of arthropod communities  
1374 after fire disturbance in temperate forests. *Oecologia.* 2006;149:312–27.
- 1375 272. Na-U-Dom T, Garcia M, Mo X. Ecosystem Resilience to Drought and Temperature  
1376 Anomalies in the Mekong River Basin. *IOP Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci.* 2017;68:12012–7.
- 1377 273. Navarro-Cerrillo RM, Rodríguez-Vallejo C, Silveiro E, Hortal A, Palacios-Rodríguez G,  
1378 Duque-Lazo J, et al. Cumulative drought stress leads to a loss of growth resilience and  
1379 explains higher mortality in planted than in naturally regenerated *Pinus pinaster* stands.  
1380 *Forests.* 2018;9:1–18.
- 1381 274. O’Brien MJ, Ong R, Reynolds G. Intra-annual plasticity of growth mediates drought

- 1382 resilience over multiple years in tropical seedling communities. *Glob Chang Biol.*  
1383 2017;23:4235–44.
- 1384 275. O'Hara KL. Multiaged forest stands for protection forests: concepts and applications. *For*  
1385 *Snow Landsc Res.* 2006;80:45–55.
- 1386 276. O'Hara KL, Ramage BS. Silviculture in an uncertain world: Utilizing multi-aged  
1387 management systems to integrate disturbance. *Forestry.* 2013;86:401–10.
- 1388 277. Andivia E, Madrigal-González J, Villar-Salvador P, Zavala MA. Do adult trees increase  
1389 conspecific juvenile resilience to recurrent droughts? Implications for forest regeneration.  
1390 *Ecosphere* [Internet]. 2018;9:e02282. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ecs2.2282>
- 1391 278. Pérez-Ramos IM, Zavala MA, Marañón T, Díaz-Villa MD, Valladares F. Dynamics of  
1392 understorey herbaceous plant diversity following shrub clearing of cork oak forests: A five-  
1393 year study. *For Ecol Manage.* 2008;255:3242–53.
- 1394 279. Pilaš I, Medved I, Medak J, Medak D. Response strategies of the main forest types to  
1395 climatic anomalies across Croatian biogeographic regions inferred from FAPAR remote  
1396 sensing data. *For Ecol Manage.* 2014;326:58–78.
- 1397 280. Poorter L, Bongers F, Aide TM, Almeyda Zambrano AM, Balvanera P, Becknell JM, et  
1398 al. Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature* [Internet]. Nature Publishing  
1399 Group; 2016;530:211–4. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature16512>
- 1400 281. Pretzsch H, Schütze G, Uhl E. Resistance of European tree species to drought stress in  
1401 mixed versus pure forests: Evidence of stress release by inter-specific facilitation. *Plant Biol.*  
1402 2013;15:483–95.
- 1403 282. Príncipe A, van der Maaten E, van der Maaten-Theunissen M, Struwe T, Wilmking M,  
1404 Kreyling J. Low resistance but high resilience in growth of a major deciduous forest tree  
1405 (*Fagus sylvatica* L.) in response to late spring frost in southern Germany. *Trees - Struct Funct.*  
1406 2017;31:743–51.
- 1407 283. Proença V, Pereira HM, Vicente L. Resistance to wildfire and early regeneration in  
1408 natural broadleaved forest and pine plantation. *Acta Oecologica* [Internet]. Elsevier Masson  
1409 SAS; 2010;36:626–33. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2010.09.008>
- 1410 284. Rais A, van de Kuilen JWG, Pretzsch H. Growth reaction patterns of tree height,  
1411 diameter, and volume of Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* [Mirb.] Franco) under acute  
1412 drought stress in Southern Germany. *Eur J For Res.* 2014;133:1043–56.
- 1413 285. Reiners WA, Driese KL, Fahey TJ, Gerow KG. Effects of Three Years of Regrowth  
1414 Inhibition on the Resilience of a Clear-cut Northern Hardwood Forest. *Ecosystems.*  
1415 2012;15:1351–62.
- 1416 286. Reis SM, de Oliveira EA, Elias F, Gomes L, Morandi PS, Marimon BS, et al. Resistance  
1417 to fire and the resilience of the woody vegetation of the “Cerradão” in the “Cerrado”–Amazon  
1418 transition zone. *Rev Bras Bot.* 2017;40:193–201.
- 1419 287. Riva MJ, Liniger H, Valdecantos A, Schwilch G. Impacts of land management on the  
1420 resilience of mediterranean dry forests to fire. *Sustain.* 2016;8.
- 1421 288. Balint PJ, Stewart RE, Desai A, Walters LC. *Wicked Environmental Problems.*  
1422 Washington DC, USA: Island Press; 2011.
- 1423 289. Müller F, Bergmann M, Dannowski R, Dippner JW, Gnauck A, Haase P, et al. Assessing

1424 resilience in long-term ecological data sets. *Ecol Indic* [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;65:10–  
1425 43. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.10.066>

1426 290. Brand FS, Jax K. Focusing the meaning(s) of resilience: Resilience as a descriptive  
1427 concept and a boundary object. *Ecol Soc*. 2007;12.

1428 291. Weichselgartner J, Kelman I. Geographies of resilience: Challenges and opportunities of  
1429 a descriptive concept. *Prog Hum Geogr*. 2015;39:249–67.

1430 292. Brown K. Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience? *Prog Hum Geogr*.  
1431 2014;38:107–17.

1432 293. Cote M, Nightingale AJ. Resilience thinking meets social theory: Situating social change  
1433 in socio-ecological systems (SES) research. *Prog Hum Geogr*. 2012;36:475–89.

1434 294. Olsson L, Jerneck A, Thoren H, Persson J, O’Byrne D. Why resilience is unappealing to  
1435 social science: Theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Sci*  
1436 *Adv*. 2015;1:1–12.

1437 295. Steffen W, Rockström J, Richardson K, Lenton TM, Folke C, Liverman D, et al.  
1438 Trajectories of the Earth System in the Anthropocene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.  
1439 2018;115:8252–9.

1440 296. Rist L, Felton A, Nyström M, Troell M, Sponseller RA, Bengtsson J, et al. Applying  
1441 resilience thinking to production ecosystems. *Ecosphere*. 2014;5:1–11.

1442 297. Folke C, Carpenter SR, Walker B, Scheffer M, Chapin T, Rockström J. Resilience  
1443 thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecol Soc*. 2010;15.

1444 298. Gunderson LH. ECOLOGICAL RESILIENCE-IN THEORY AND APPLICATION.  
1445 *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*. 2000;31:425–39.

1446 299. Verstraeten G, Vancampenhout K, Desie E, De Schrijver A, Hlava J, Schelfhout S, et al.  
1447 Tree species effects are amplified by clay content in acidic soils. *Soil Biol Biochem* [Internet].  
1448 Elsevier; 2018;121:43–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.02.021>

1449 300. Scheffer M, Hirota M, Holmgren M, Van Nes EH, Chapin FS. Thresholds for boreal  
1450 biome transitions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2012;109:21384–9. Available from:  
1451 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1219844110>

1452 301. Hirota M, Holmgren M, Van Nes EH, Scheffer M. Global Resilience of Tropical Forest  
1453 and Savanna to Critical Transitions. *Science* (80- ) [Internet]. 2011;334:232 LP – 235.  
1454 Available from: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/334/6053/232.abstract>

1455 302. Carpenter S, Walker B, Anderies JM, Abel N. From Metaphor to Measurement:  
1456 Resilience of What to What? *Ecosystems*. 2001;4:765–81.

1457 303. Wolfslehner B, Vacik H. Evaluating sustainable forest management strategies with the  
1458 Analytic Network Process in a Pressure-State-Response framework. *J Environ Manage*.  
1459 2008;88:1–10.

1460 304. Yousefpour R, Bredahl Jacobsen J, Thorsen BJ, Meilby H, Hanewinkel M, Oehler K. A  
1461 review of decision-making approaches to handle uncertainty and risk in adaptive forest  
1462 management under climate change. *Ann For Sci*. 2012;69:1–15.

1463 305. ISO I. Risk management–Principles and guidelines. *Int Organ Stand Geneva, Switz*.  
1464 2009;

- 1465 306. Hanewinkel M, Hummel S, Albrecht A. Assessing natural hazards in forestry for risk  
1466 management: a review. *Eur J For Res.* 2011;130:329–51.
- 1467 307. Park J, Seager TP, Rao PSC. Lessons in risk- versus resilience-based design and  
1468 management. *Integr Environ Assess Manag.* 2011;7:396–9.
- 1469 308. Messier C, Puettmann K, Chazdon R, Andersson KP, Angers VA, Brotons L, et al. From  
1470 Management to Stewardship: Viewing Forests As Complex Adaptive Systems in an Uncertain  
1471 World. *Conserv Lett.* 2015;8:368–77.
- 1472 309. Biggs R, Schlüter M, Biggs D, Bohensky EL, BurnSilver SB, Cundill G, et al. Toward  
1473 Principles for Enhancing the Resilience of Ecosystem Services. *Ssrn.* 2012;
- 1474 310. Chapin FS, Carpenter SR, Kofinas GP, Folke C, Abel N, Clark WC, et al. Ecosystem  
1475 stewardship: sustainability strategies for a rapidly changing planet. *Trends Ecol Evol.*  
1476 2010;25:241–9.
- 1477 311. Hosseini S, Barker K, Ramirez-Marquez JE. A review of definitions and measures of  
1478 system resilience. *Reliab Eng Syst Saf.* 2016;145:47–61.
- 1479 312. Roostaie S, Nawari N, Kibert CJ. Sustainability and resilience: A review of definitions,  
1480 relationships, and their integration into a combined building assessment framework. *Build*  
1481 *Environ [Internet]. Elsevier;* 2019;154:132–44. Available from:  
1482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.02.042>
- 1483

