The Effects of Thinning and Burning on Understory Vegetation in North America: A Meta-Analysis

Joshua Willms¹, Anne Bartuszevige², Dylan W. Schwilk¹, and Patricia L. Kennedy³

¹ Texas Tech University, Department of Biological Sciences

² Playa Lakes Joint Venture, Lafayette, CO 80026

³ Eastern Oregon Agriculture & Natural Resource Program and Department of Fisheries and Wildlife,
Oregon State University, Union, OR 97883. Corresponding Author:
pat.kennedy@oregonstate.edu

ABSTRACT

Management in fire-prone ecosystems relies widely upon application of prescribed fire and/or fire-surrogate (e.g., forest thinning) treatments to maintain biodiversity and ecosystem function. The literature suggests fire and mechanical treatments proved more variable in their effects on understory vegetation as compared to their effects on stand structure. The growing body of work comparing fire and thinning effects on understory vegetation offers an opportunity to increase the generality of conclusions through meta-analysis. We conducted a meta-analysis to determine if there were consistent responses of understory vegetation to these treatments in North American forests that historically experienced frequent surface fire regimes (< 20 years fire return interval, FRI). Means and standard errors were extracted from 32 papers containing data on the response of four understory functional groups (herbaceous, shrub, non-native, and total) to thinning and burning treatments to calculate effect sizes. Lack of replication and inconsistent reporting of results hindered our ability to include many studies in this analysis. For each response variable (species richness and percent cover), we compared three treatment pairs: burn vs control, thin vs control and thin vs burn. We calculated standardized mean differences (Hedges' *g*) for each pair and tested if this differed from zero using a random effects model fit with restricted maximum likelihood to account for variation by site. The most consistent effect of the

treatments was the increase in non-native species following mechanical thinning and reduction in shrub cover following a burn. These differences suggest the two treatments may not be surrogates in the short-term (less than 5 years). Increase of non-native species due to disturbance is well established but it is not clear if burning and thinning consistently have differential impacts. Response of non-native plants to disturbance is likely a complex function of a variety of site and landscape factors that cannot be evaluated by the current literature. We conclude that prescribed fire and thinning treatments can be used successfully to restore understory species richness and cover, but they can create different conditions and these potentially different outcomes need to be considered in the planning of a fuels reduction treatment. We discuss management options to reduce negative effects of the treatments and we suggest managers use current decision-making frameworks prior to designing an intervention.

Keywords: burning, disturbance, fire surrogates, forest understory, fuels reduction, meta-analysis, non-native understory vegetation, thinning

1. Introduction

North American frequent-fire forests have been shaped by fire over evolutionary and ecological time scales. However, for much of the 20th century, land managers concentrated on minimizing amount of land that burned. Compared to presettlement fire regimes in many contemporary forests, fire intervals have lengthened (Cyr et al. 2009, Aldrich et al. 2010, Spetich et al. 2011), although there is evidence for significant variability in historical fire return intervals (Odion et al. 2014). Increased recognition of the central role of fire in maintaining forest structure and function has contributed to a shift from fire exclusion to reintroduction of fire in fire-dependent forests, with the aim of reducing fuels and restoring historic stand structure (Agee and Skinner 2005). This recognition has prompted U. S. federal initiatives such as the National Fire Plan and Healthy Forest Restoration Act (2003) that mandate federal land managers restore forest structure and function and reduce risk of wildfire on federal lands. Use of widespread (i.e., over a large area) fuel treatments has led to increasing discussion of the effectiveness, suitability and ecological impacts of thinning and prescribed fire (Schoennagel et al. 2004, Schwilk et al. 2009, Schoennagel and Nelson 2011, Stephens et al. 2013).

53 Although prescribed fire is often the preferred fuel reduction practice, forest managers often face social
54 and economic constraints on burning particularly when human safety and property might be
55 compromised. Additionally, in forests thought to have departed significantly from historical fire return
56 intervals, there is concern that introducing fire may result in unnaturally high intensity fire that may be
57 difficult to manage or may have negative ecological effects (but see Bond et al. 2012 and Fontaine and
58 Kennedy 2012). Therefore, mechanical fuel reduction methods have increasingly been used to reduce
59 fuels or restore historic stand structure (Crow and Perera 2004). Uncertainty regarding the relative
60 ecological effects of prescribed fire versus mechanical treatments has led to increasing attention on these
61 so-called “fire surrogates” such as the National Fire and Fire Surrogate study (Schwilk et al. 2009,
62 McIver et al. 2013).

63 Early forest management emphasized recruiting trees for commercial harvest. However, in the last half
64 of the 20th century, forest management practices have shifted focus to include managing for ecosystem
65 services, including biodiversity. In most forests, the majority of plant biodiversity is in the understory
66 herbaceous layer. In addition to harboring high diversity, understory herbaceous communities have
67 profound effects on other ecosystem services such as forest nutrient cycling (reviewed by Gilliam 2007).
68 Most attention has been paid to the effects of fire and mechanical treatments on forest structure and fuels
69 (e.g., Moghaddas et al 2008, van Mantgem et al 2011, Kreye and Kobziar 2015, and reviewed in Fulé et
70 al 2012); the extent to which mechanical treatments or thinning approximate effects of prescribed fire on
71 forest understory vegetation is not as well understood. Results from the National Fire and Fire Surrogate
72 study demonstrated that fire and mechanical treatments proved more variable in their effects on
73 understory vegetation as compared to stand structure (Schwilk et al. 2009). This is not entirely
74 surprising: although both fire and thinning remove overstory trees and allow increased light to reach
75 understory plants, extent of canopy removal varies with thinning intensity and fire severity. According
76 to a recent review by Abella and Springer (2015) treatments must reduce tree canopy cover to <30-50%
77 to elicit appreciable responses from the forest understory.

78 In addition to variable treatment effects on forest cover, fire and thinning modify the abiotic
79 environment differently. Fire restructures microsites and soils that many plants depend on for
80 germination and growth (Bond and van Wilgen 1996, Gundale et al. 2005, 2006, DeLuca et al. 2006).

81 Thinning, on the other hand, removes or rearranges (as opposed to consumes) vegetation and may alter
82 nutrient dynamics (e.g., Boerner et al. 2006). Many mechanical thinning methods also result in soil
83 disturbance and compaction that fire does not cause (Schwilk et al. 2009). The differences exhibited
84 between fire and fire surrogate treatments may result in differences in responses between native and
85 nonnative species, and in the percent cover and species richness in the herbaceous and shrub layers
86 (Dodson 2004, Wienk et al. 2004, Metlen and Fiedler 2006, Collins et al. 2007, Nelson et al. 2008,
87 Zhang et al. 2008b, Fornwalt and Kaufmann 2014). The growing body of work comparing fire and
88 thinning effects on understory vegetation (recently reviewed by Abella & Springer 2015 for mixed
89 conifer forests in North America) offers an opportunity to increase the generality of conclusions through
90 meta-analysis.

91 Our objective was to conduct a meta-analysis of the literature that investigated effects of thin and burn
92 treatments on understory species in North American. Specifically, we were interested in the degree to
93 which thin treatments mimic prescribed burn treatments, and to what extent burning or thinning differ
94 from control treatments. We tested three pairwise comparisons: thinning treatments versus controls,
95 burning treatments versus controls, and thinning treatments versus burning treatments for percent cover
96 and species richness in total species, exotic species, herbaceous species, and shrub species.

97 We tested the following hypotheses: 1) total species richness and cover of herbaceous understory plants
98 will increase in thin and burn treatments compared to controls as an effect of increasing light availability
99 (Wienk et al. 2004, Metlen and Fiedler 2006, Fornwalt and Kaufmann 2014); 2) total cover of
100 understory shrubs will decrease in response to burning, but not to thinning in the short term because
101 burning consumes understory shrubs and these are slower to respond to increased light than are
102 herbaceous species (Nelson et al. 2008, Zhang et al. 2008b); and 3) non-native plant species are often
103 favored by disturbance and we expect both thinning and burning to increase non-native species richness
104 and cover relative to controls with the greatest increases in thinning treatments as a result of greater soil
105 disturbance in thinning relative to burning (Dodson 2004, Collins et al. 2007).

106 **2. Materials and Methods**

2.1 Literature Search and Vetting

In May 2014, we performed a search of the scientific literature investigating effects of prescribed fire and thinning treatments on understory vegetation. We used multiple databases: ISI Web of Science (<http://www.webofknowledge.com>) and AGRICOLA (<http://agricola.nal.usda.gov/>) both of which searched literature published since 1970 and Forest Science (<http://www.cabi.org/forestsscience/>) which searched literature published since 1939. We also supplemented these searches with a Google Scholar search (<http://scholar.google.com/>) which, despite limitations in coverage, includes gray literature publications as well as proceedings. In addition to these search engines, we included additional references gleaned from publications found in the literature search.

We used the following search terms ('*' indicate wild card searches uses to include plural forms, etc.):

- Understory AND native*
- Percent Cover AND native*
- Fire AND Understory*
- Understory AND exotic*
- Percent Cover AND exotic*
- Fire AND Percent Cover*
- Understory AND forb*
- Percent Cover AND forb*
- Burn* AND Understory
- Understory AND graminoid*
- Percent Cover AND graminoid*
- Burn* AND Percent Cover
- Understory AND shrub*
- Percent Cover AND shrub*
- Thin* AND Understory
- Thin* AND Percent Cover

134 The literature search from the databases yielded approximately 3,500 references, which were then vetted
135 for appropriate material. Documents were eliminated that dealt with medical issues (i.e., new treatments
136 for burn victims), investigations of ecological processes related to fire but not relevant to the scope of
137 this document (e.g., nutrient cycling, insect infestation), or modeling studies with little empirical data.
138 Because North American studies comprise the bulk of the literature and our power to examine larger
139 geographic patterns would be very low, we restricted our analyses to North America. We were
140 specifically interested in studies that collected quantitative data on the response of understory plants to a
141 prescribed fire or thinning treatment. We further narrowed our search to papers that specifically
142 compared thinning (understory or overstory) and prescribed fire. We excluded papers that only reported
143 the combined treatment of thinning and burning but did not include thinning or burning as separate
144 treatments. This vetting process yielded 57 references.

145 Because statistical reporting was not uniform across references, we performed a second round of vetting
146 to exclude papers that could not be placed in a quantitative meta-analysis. Papers that lacked replicated
147 treatments or failed to include a measure of variation (standard error, standard deviation or variance)
148 were excluded. In addition, studies that reported data collected 10 or more years after the thinning or
149 burning event were excluded because there wasn't sufficient literature to quantitatively examine long-
150 term effects of the treatments on understory vegetation. When multiple papers reported on the same
151 study (determined by location and study dates), we used only one of the published papers. Varying
152 levels of prescribed burn severity were inherent due to differences in species composition, terrain,
153 weather, and season. There were insufficient studies to quantitatively evaluate effects of burn severity on
154 understory vegetation. Thus, for studies that reported data for multiple levels of burning severity, the
155 moderate level of burning was selected for inclusion in this analysis. Varying forms of thinning and
156 mastication were used in thinning treatments. These included chainsaw, dragging a chain between
157 tractors, hand-thinning, thin-and-pile, thin-and-scatter, thin-only, thin-and-chip, partial-cut, and clear-
158 cut. Data were insufficient to quantitatively evaluate effects of various forms of thinning on understory
159 vegetation. Thus, for each paper that reported several types of thinning, data were selected that were as
160 close to a thin-only treatment as possible. If multiple thinning-only methods were used, we pooled data
161 across methods when possible. In some cases, separate papers reported results from the same

experiment (e.g., Phillips et al 2007 and Waldrop et al 2008). In these cases, we did include both as separate studies if they reported different response variables but we avoided including duplicated sites in any particular contrast.

2.2 Data Extraction and Analysis

We investigated effect of burning and thinning treatments on two response variables that describe effects on understory vegetation: species richness and plant cover. Each of these was recorded separately for each of two growth forms (herbaceous species and shrubs) and separately for exotic species and all species combined. This resulted in four vegetative categories (herbaceous, shrub, non-native and total) and two response types (cover and species richness) for a total of eight possible response variables, although not all were available in each study. Although the shrub and herbaceous categories are exclusive of one another, the other categories can overlap. For example, in several studies, non-native species are a subset of herbaceous species. When plots at multiple spatial scales were included in a study, we selected the scale closest to 100 m² as this was the most commonly reported scale across studies.

For each selected article, we extracted treatment means, sample size, and either standard deviations or standard errors of the mean for each response variable from the results text, tables or figures as required. In some cases, papers reported differences pre-post study and we used those differences rather than raw richness and cover values. We calculated pairwise treatment effect sizes for each response variable for three different pairwise comparisons: Thin vs Burn, Thin vs Control, and Burn vs Control. For each comparison, we calculated the bias-adjusted estimate of the standardized mean difference [“Hedge’s g ”, a bias corrected version of Cohen’s d (Gurevitch and Hedges 2001)] with the following equation:

$$(1) g = \frac{X^E - X^C}{S^{EC}} J$$

where X^E is the mean value of the response variable in the “experimental treatment” (Burn or Thin depending on contrast), X^C is the mean value of the response variables in the “experimental control” (Control or Burn depending on the contrast), S^{EC} is the pooled standard deviation of both groups, and J

188 is a term that corrects for bias due to small sample size (Gurevitch and Hedges 2001). The effect size, g ,
189 can be interpreted as the difference between the cover or species richness of plants in treatments relative
190 to controls, measured in units of standard deviations.

191 We conducted all analyses in R (R Development Core Team 2013) using the *metafor* package
192 (Viechtbauer 2010). We assumed that true effect sizes varied across sites (treatments differ in details,
193 forests differ in absolute cover and richness, and plot sizes could vary) and therefore, we used a random-
194 effects models (Gurevitch and Hedges 2001). We parameterized models using restricted maximum-
195 likelihood. To test whether mean effect sizes for a comparison differed significantly from zero, we
196 assumed a normal distribution of effect sizes and their confidence intervals (Viechtbauer 2010). Because
197 of the large number of response variables and pairwise treatment comparisons, we used a Holm p-value
198 adjustment (sequential Bonferroni correction) to control for multiple comparison error rate. Our *a priori*
199 alpha-level was 0.1, which balanced the likelihoods of Type 1 and Type 2 errors.

200 A handful of compromises and assumptions were necessary to reconcile each reference into a single,
201 comparable format. When papers reported mean species richness or percent cover values and standard
202 errors for multiple years per treatment, we selected the data closest to the average years since treatment
203 for the overall data set (3 years). Because native species represented over 99% of species richness and
204 percent cover for papers in which both parameters were reported, ‘native’ was substituted for ‘total’
205 species in cases where papers reported only ‘native’ (Collins et al. 2007, Dodson et al. 2007, and
206 Huffman et al. 2013).

207 The final data used to conduct this analysis were reported from a wide array of locations, forest types,
208 and ecological management histories (Table 1, Fig. 1). To account for this variation in sampling
209 methodologies and time-lines the following covariates were recorded: fire intensity, forest type, fuel
210 type, years since treatment, latitude, and longitude. We graphically explored the potential effects of
211 these covariates to detect potential interactions between these variables and our results. The only
212 covariate with explanatory power was longitude discretized as eastern vs western forests (east or west of
213 Longitude 100 West). Twenty-eight papers reported data from study sites in the western United States
214 and seven papers reported data from the eastern United States. We then ran all models using this discrete
215 factor, east vs west as a moderator variable and dropped it from the model when it was not significant.

216 An important consideration in meta-analyses is the file drawer effect (e.g., Murtaugh 2002). This is the
217 bias due to the elevated rate of publication of statistically significant results and rejection of non-
218 significant results. We sampled across a wide range of sources (international to regional journals,
219 government publications), so the bias due to differential publication rates likely is minimal in the dataset
220 we assembled. Additionally, we expect publication bias to be less important for this meta-analysis than
221 for some others: for many of these studies, either fuel reduction or forest overstory restoration were the
222 major focus of the work and the purpose of the applied treatments. Therefore, we argue that little effect
223 on understory measures would not likely discourage publication. However, to assess prevalence of
224 publication bias we visually examined funnel plots for each response variable and contrast (Stern and
225 Egger 2001, Viechtbauer 2010). We expect high heterogeneity across studies because of different
226 methods and different measurement scales. To quantify heterogeneity, we calculated I^2 :

227
$$I^2 = 100\% \times (Q - df) / Q$$

228 where Q is Cochran's heterogeneity statistic (Cochran 1954) and df is degrees of freedom tested for
229 significant heterogeneity (Viechtbauer 2010). For comparisons with heterogeneity test p-values less
230 than 0.05 and I^2 greater than 70%, we removed the outlier studies. We defined outlier studies as those
231 outside the pseudo-confidence region with bounds $\theta \pm 1.96SE$, where θ is the estimated effect or outcome
232 based on the fixed-effects model and SE is the standard error value from the y-axis. For cases where
233 outliers existed, we confirmed that our conclusions regarding the significant effect of treatments did not
234 change after removal of the outlier, but all of our reported results include all available data even
235 including such putative outliers.

3. Results

Our literature search and vetting resulted in 32 published studies. The length of time from treatment to sampling ranged from 1 to 8 years (mean = 2.8 years, median = 2 years). Only one paper reported data that were collected more than 5 years after treatment (Nelson et al. 2008). Although our search criteria included North America, after vetting, only studies located in the USA remained and our results were dominated by studies in the western US (26 western sites vs 6 eastern). Funnel plots for all comparisons are supplied in Appendix 1 (all studies). Removing outliers as described did not change results – the comparisons with outlier studies were comparisons in which the treatment effects were inconsistent. Total species richness showed the greatest heterogeneity across sites (Appendix 1).

3.1 Species Richness

Non-native species richness was higher in thin treatments than in control treatments (Fig 2, adjusted $p = 0.001$, $N = 7$), but this result is based entirely on western sites as no eastern thinning studies included this variable. Although non-native species richness was higher in burning treatments than in controls in all studies, this was not significant after Bonferroni correction (adjusted $p = 0.116$, $N=6$).

Burning had a variable effect on total species richness (native and exotic) with increases relative to controls at eastern, but not western sites (no main effect, latitude significant modifier, adjusted $p = 0.019$, $N = 12$), but this result is based on 9 western and only 3 eastern sites (Fig. 3).

3.2 Percent Cover

Burning decreased percent cover of shrubs compared to controls (Fig. 4, adjusted $p=0.014$, $N = 7$). There was no significant difference in shrub percent cover between thin and control treatments ($N = 7$), or between thin and burn treatments ($N = 6$). The effect of thinning on total understory cover was variable with little effect seen in most studies, but two eastern sites showed large negative effects of thinning on cover. This effect was significant after multiple comparison correction but was based on only these two eastern sites (Fig. 5, modifier $p = 0.043$, $n = 9$).

260 There was no significant difference in non-native percent cover or herbaceous percent cover among any
261 of the treatment groups. However, very few (4) papers reported percent cover data for non-native
262 species (Table 1).

263 **4. Discussion**

264 Understory communities' response to fire and thinning was highly variable across the included studies
265 and few comparisons had mean differences significantly different from zero. Our prediction that total
266 species richness and herbaceous cover would increase in response to treatments was partially supported
267 by the analysis (e.g., species richness increased after burns in eastern forests). These results combined
268 with the Abella and Springer review (2015) suggest there is no consistent evidence that native
269 herbaceous plants as a growth form respond to burning or thinning in the short-term. This does not mean
270 that herbaceous understory plants do not respond to treatment, but it is likely there are species-specific
271 responses that are lost when all taxa are lumped into the growth form category, herbaceous plants. We
272 agree with Havill et al. (2015) and Keeley (2015) that future research needs to focus on developing a
273 better mechanistic understanding of the way in which trait variation within plant functional types affects
274 responses to disturbance. Pyke et al. (2010) provide one approach to predicting how fire will affect
275 grassland plant populations that depends on the plant's life form and vital attributes for establishment
276 and survival, and their interaction with fire regime. This approach could be expanded to predict
277 responses of forest understory plants to both fire and thinning.

278 The most consistent effect of the treatments was the increase in non-native species following thinning
279 and reduction in shrub cover following a burn. The significant reduction of the shrub layer during a burn
280 which we predicted, was not observed in thinning, suggesting the two treatments may not be surrogates
281 in the short-term. However, thinning treatments that include removal of shrub layer are not well
282 represented in these studies so it is possible an overstory thin combined with mechanical shrub removal
283 would mimic the effects of a burn on the shrub stratum. This requires further investigation.

284 There was also an interesting regional effect of treatments; at eastern sites, burning treatments increased
285 total species richness relative to controls and thinning treatments decreased cover relative to controls.
286 This second result is likely a consequence of regional differences in treatments: thinning treatments in

the southeast often explicitly remove the shrub understory whereas, this is not a consistent feature of thinning treatments elsewhere (Schwilk et al 2009). One possible explanation for the regional burn result is that the more mesic and productive eastern sites have faster growth dynamics and therefore, understory herbaceous species respond more quickly to a burn than at western sites. Western sites may exhibit similar responses in longer-term datasets currently not available in the literature.

Increase of non-native species due to disturbance is well established (Bartuszevige and Kennedy 2009, Schwilk et al. 2009, Vilà and Ibáñez 2011, Abella and Springer 2015) and this analysis suggests thinning has a greater probability of creating conditions for non-native plants than burns in the short-term. The mechanism of this differential response is not clear and should be the subject of future investigation. Response of non-native plants to disturbance is likely a complex function of: 1) the plant's functional traits, 2) event-dependent factors such as seasonal timing or severity/intensity, 3) inter-disturbance intervals that affect length of recovery time between disturbances for sequestering resources or accumulating seed banks, and 4) environmental filters such as site climatic and edaphic conditions (Keeley et al 2005; Havill et al. 2015; Keeley 2015). There is insufficient information in the scientific literature to evaluate effects of disturbance intensity/severity, inter-disturbance intervals, site microclimate, and edaphic conditions on forest understories subjected to management treatments.

One concern of manipulating systems for conservation outcomes (e.g., fire surrogate treatments) is the risk of favoring non-native species. The increases in non-native species reported could be biologically significant if allowed to increase in forest understory or if taxa were introduced by the treatment application. However, some forest stands may be at greater risk for establishment of non-native species. For example, non-native species are less likely to establish in the interior of forests, and more likely to establish in areas near other large invasions, fragmented landscapes, and human establishments (Bartuszevige et al. 2006, Vilà and Ibáñez 2011, Johnson et al. 2016). Thus, an important consideration for treatment application is proximity to the wildland urban interface (WUI).

To prevent spread of non-native plants into forest ecosystems after treatment, managers should consider several management options including: no treatment, pre-treatment of exotic plants to reduce their abundance prior to treatment, seeding with native plants (Korb et al. 2004), reducing grazing by domestic livestock prior to and immediately after treatment (Keeley 2006), or conducting a low impact

315 disturbance (e.g. thinning alone, burning alone, or incremental treatments as opposed to both thinning
316 and burning, or conducting the treatments all at once) (Dodson and Fiedler 2006, Laughlin et al. 2008).
317 Thinning treatments in particular can be modified to reduce soil disturbance (which facilitates invasion
318 of non-native plants). Also, thinning in winter months when equipment will drive over snow will also
319 minimize soil disturbance and thus, probability of invasion (Gundale et al. 2005).

320 The goal of returning forest understory composition to its range of historic variability may not always be
321 feasible post-disturbance. Thus, to help guide the choice of management options we encourage
322 managers to use current decision-making frameworks prior to designing an intervention to control non-
323 native plants post-disturbance. For example, Hobbs et al. (2014) present a decision framework, derived
324 from recent research on novel ecosystems (Hobbs et al. 2009; Hulvey et al. 2013) which helps to
325 identify relative values of ecosystems in different conditions and the management options available in
326 each case. As seen from a landscape perspective, this framework provides a comprehensive approach to
327 decision-making and management, including much-needed prioritization of resource allocations.
328 Numerous alternative decision support approaches are also available (reviewed in Perring et al. 2015).

329 In conclusion, burning and thinning effects on understory plant species richness and cover were either
330 minor or highly variable. These disturbances, particularly thinning, increases non-native species which
331 is likely causing any increases in reported understory richness. It is important to understand the potential
332 threat of these species to native understory species in forested landscapes which is beyond the scope of
333 this study. Also, managers need to recognize that burns can reduce shrub cover which can take longer to
334 recover than herbaceous plants. If these shrubs provide important wildlife habitat or the shrubs are
335 species of conservation concern, thinning might be a better alternative for fuel reduction or forest
336 restoration. We conclude that prescribed fire and thinning treatments can be used successfully to restore
337 understory species richness and cover, but they can create different conditions and these potentially
338 different outcomes need to be considered in the planning of a fuels reduction treatment.

339 There is now a wide literature on the effects of thinning and prescribed fire. Given the diversity of forest
340 types represented and the enormous variation in treatments across studies, we expect very high study-to-
341 study variation in these ecological responses and, therefore, generalization requires a large number of
342 studies (Verheyen et al. 2016). Yet inconsistent reporting of results hindered our ability to include

343 studies in this analysis. Abella and Springer (2015) also point this out in their qualitative review. We
344 excluded over a dozen papers that lacked any reporting of variance. Others were excluded because the
345 data reported were summarized in a way that was incompatible with the majority of studies (e.g., only
346 pre or only post treatment differences reported [and therefore, differences between pre and post could
347 not be calculated]). There is growing attention to the value of shared data (Tenopir et al. 2011).
348 Although shared publicly available data is an important goal, traditional meta-analysis is possible using
349 only published summary statistics. For generalization in forest ecology, reporting treatment means and
350 measures of variance is a minimum that editors and reviewers should insist upon.

351 **5. Acknowledgments**

352 This paper was based on a report by Bartuszevige and Kennedy (2009). We thank the USDA/DOI Joint
353 Fire Science Program for funding the original report. We would also like to thank a number of people
354 who participated in the development of Bartuszevige and Kennedy (2009) and thus, contributed to this
355 paper. We thank John Cissel, Colette Coiner, Tim Swedberg, Kim McKague and Becky Jenison for
356 administrative support. Jim Gallagher, Robert Means, Kenneth Outcalt, Dana Perkins, Roger
357 Rosentreter, and Steve Sutherland contributed to the report design and John Bailey, Carl Fiedler, Joe
358 Fontaine, David Hibbs, Dana Perkins and two anonymous referees provided excellent reviews.

359 **References**

- 360 Abella, S. R., and J. D. Springer. 2015. Effects of tree cutting and fire on understory vegetation in mixed
361 conifer forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 335:281-299.
- 362 Agee, J., and C. Skinner. 2005. Basic principles of forest fuel reduction treatments. *Forest Ecology and*
363 *Management* 211:83–96.
- 364 Aldrich, S. R., C. W. Lafon, H. D. Grissino-Mayer, G. G. DeWeese, and J. A. Hoss. 2010. Three
365 centuries of fire in montane pine-oak stands on a temperate forest landscape. *Applied Vegetation*
366 *Science* 13:36–46.

367 Bartuszevige, A. M., D. L. Gorchov, and L. Raab. 2006. The relative importance of landscape and
 368 community features in the invasion of an exotic shrub in a fragmented landscape. *Ecography* 29:213–
 369 222.

370 Bartuszevige, A., and P. L. Kennedy. 2009. Synthesis of knowledge on the effects of fire and thinning
 371 treatments on understory vegetation in US dry forests. Special Report 1095. Oregon State Agricultural
 372 Experiment Station; Oregon State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Corvallis, OR, USA.

373 Boerner, R. E., T. Waldrop, and V. Shelburne. 2006. Wildfire mitigation strategies affect soil enzyme
 374 activity and soil organic carbon in loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) forests. *Canadian Journal of Forest*
 375 *Research* 36:3148–3154.

376 Bond, M. L., R. B. Siegel, R. L. Hutto, V. A. Saab, and S. A. Shunk. 2012. A new forest fire paradigm:
 377 the need for high-severity fires. *The Wildlife Professional* 2012:46-49.

378 Bond, W. J., and B. W. van Wilgen. 1996. *Fire and plants*. Chapman & Hall, London, UK.

379 Cochran W.G. 1954. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics*.10: 101-29.

380 Collins, B. M., J. J. Moghaddas, and S. L. Stephens. 2007. Initial changes in forest structure and
 381 understory plant communities following fuel reduction activities in a Sierra Nevada mixed conifer
 382 forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* 239:102–111.

383 Crow, T. R., and A. H. Perera. 2004. Emulating natural landscape disturbance in forest management—an
 384 introduction. *Landscape Ecology* 19:231–233.

385 Cyr, D., S. Gauthier, Y. Bergeron, and C. Carcaillet. 2009. Forest management is driving the eastern
 386 North American boreal forest outside its natural range of variability. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
 387 *Environment* 7:519–524.

388 DeLuca, T., M. MacKenzie, M. Gundale, and W. Holben. 2006. Wildfire-produced charcoal directly
 389 influences nitrogen cycling in ponderosa pine forests. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70:448–
 390 453.

391 Dodson, E. K. 2004. Monitoring change in exotic plant abundance after fuel reduction/restoration
 392 treatments in ponderosa pine forests of western Montana. Dissertation. University of Montana,
 393 Missoula, MT, USA.

394 Dodson, E., and C. Fiedler. 2006. Impacts of restoration treatments on alien plant invasion in *Pinus*
 395 *ponderosa* forests, Montana, USA. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 43:887–897.

396 Dodson, E. K., K. L. Metlen, and C. E. Fiedler. 2007. Common and uncommon understory species
 397 differentially respond to restoration treatments in ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir forests, Montana.
 398 *Restoration Ecology* 15:696–708.

399 Fontaine, J. B., and P. L. Kennedy. 2012. Avian and small mammal response to fire severity and fire
 400 surrogate treatments in U.S. fire-prone forests: a meta-analysis. *Ecological Applications* 22:1547-1561.

401 Fornwalt, P. J., and M. R. Kaufmann. 2014. Understorey plant community dynamics following a large,
 402 mixed severity wildfire in a *Pinus ponderosa*–*Pseudotsuga menziesii* forest, Colorado, USA. *Journal of*
 403 *Vegetation Science* 25:805–818.

404 Fornwalt, P. J., M. R. Kaufmann, and T. J. Stohlgren. 2010. Impacts of mixed severity wildfire on exotic
 405 plants in a Colorado ponderosa pine–Douglas-fir forest. *Biological Invasions* 12:2683–2695.

406 Fulé, P.Z., J. E. Crouse, J. P. Roccaforte, and E.L. Kalies. 2012. Do thinning and/or burning
 407 treatments in western USA ponderosa or Jeffrey pine-dominated forests help restore natural fire
 408 behavior? *Forest Ecology and Management* 269: 68 -81.

409 Fulé, P. Z., D. C. Laughlin, and W. W. Covington. 2005. Pine-oak forest dynamics five years after
 410 ecological restoration treatments, Arizona, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 218:129–145.

411 Gilliam, F. S. 2007. The ecological significance of the herbaceous layer in temperate forest ecosystems.
 412 *BioScience* 57:845–858.

413 Gundale, M. J., T. H. DeLuca, C. E. Fiedler, P. W. Ramsey, M. G. Harrington, and J. E. Gannon. 2005.
 414 Restoration treatments in a Montana ponderosa pine forest: effects on soil physical, chemical and
 415 biological properties. *Forest Ecology and Management* 213:25–38.

416 Gundale, M. J., K. L. Metlen, C. E. Fiedler, and T. H. DeLuca. 2006. Nitrogen spatial heterogeneity
 417 influences diversity following restoration in a ponderosa pine forest, Montana. *Ecological Applications*
 418 16:479–489.

419 Gurevitch, J., and L. Hedges. 2001. Meta-analysis: combining the results of independent experiments.
 420 Pages 378–398 in S. M. Scheiner and J. Gurevitch, editors. Design and analysis of ecological
 421 experiments. 2nd editions. Oxford University Press, New York, USA.

422 Havill, S., S. Schwinning, and K. G. Lyons. 2015. Fire effects on invasive and native warm-season grass
 423 species in a North American grassland at a time of extreme drought. *Applied Vegetation Science*
 424 18:637-649.

425 Hobbs, R. J., Higgs, E., and J. A. Harris. 2009. Novel ecosystems: implications for conservation and
 426 restoration. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 24: 599-605.

427 Hobbs, R. J., E. S. Higgs, C. M. Hall, P. Bridgewater, F. S. Chapin III, E. C. Ellis, J. J. Ewel, L. M.
 428 Hallett, J. A. Harris, K. B. Hulvey, S. T. Jackson, P. L. Kennedy, C. Kueffer, L. Lach, T. C. Lantz, A. E.
 429 Lugo, J. Mascaro, S. D. Murphy, C. R. Nelson, M. P. Perring, D. M. Richardson, T. R. Seastadt, R. J.
 430 Standish, B. M. Starzomski, K. N. Suding, P. M. Tognetti, L. Yakob, and L. Yung. 2014. Managing the
 431 whole landscape: historical, hybrid and novel ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*
 432 12:557-564.

433 Huffman, D., M. Stoddard, J. Springer, J. Crouse, and W. Chancellor. 2013. Understory plant
 434 community responses to hazardous fuels reduction treatments in pinyon-juniper woodlands of Arizona,
 435 USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 289:478–488.

436 Hulvey, K. B., R. J. Standish, L. M. Hallett, B. M. Starzomski, S. D. Murphy, C. R. Nelson, M. R.
 437 Gardner, P. L. Kennedy, T. Seastadt and K. N. Suding. 2013. Incorporating novel ecosystems into
 438 management frameworks. Pages 157-171 In R. J. Hobbs, E. Higgs, and C. Hall (Eds). *Novel Ecosystems.*
 439 *Intervening in the new ecological world order*. Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex, UK.

440 Johnson, S. E., K. L. Amatangelo, P. A. Townsend and D. M. Waller. 2016. Large, connected floodplain
 441 forests prone to flooding best sustain plant diversity. *Ecology* 97:3019-3030.

442 Kane, J. M., J. M. Varner, E. E. Knapp, and R. F. Powers. 2010. Understory vegetation response to
 443 mechanical mastication and other fuels treatments in a ponderosa pine forest. *Applied Vegetation*
 444 *Science* 13:207–220.

445 Keeley, J. E. 2006. Fire management impacts on invasive plants in the western United States.
 446 Conservation Biology 20:375–384.

447 Keeley, J. E. 2015. Attacking invasive grasses. Applied Vegetation Science 18: 541-542.

448 Keeley, J. E., C. J. Fotheringham, and M. Baer-Keeley. 2005. Determinants of postfire recovery and
 449 succession in Mediterranean-climate shrublands of California. Ecological Applications 15: 1515–1534.

450 Kerns, B. K., W. G. Thies, and C. G. Niwa. 2006. Season and severity of prescribed burn in ponderosa
 451 pine forests: implications for understory native and exotic plants. Ecoscience 13:44–55.

452 Kreye, J. K and L. N. Kobziar. 2015. The effect of mastication on surface fire behaviour, fuels
 453 consumption and tree mortality in pine flatwoods of Florida, USA. International Journal of Wildland
 454 Fire 24: 573-579.

455 Knapp, E. E., D. W. Schwilk, J. M. Kane, and J. E. Keeley. 2006. Role of burning season on initial
 456 understory vegetation response to prescribed fire in a mixed conifer forest. Canadian Journal of Forest
 457 Research 37:11–22.

458 Korb, J. E., N. C. Johnson, and W. Covington. 2004. Slash pile-burning effects on soil biotic and
 459 chemical properties and plant establishment: recommendations for amelioration. Restoration Ecology
 460 12:52–62.

461 Laughlin, D. C., J. D. Bakker, M. L. Daniels, M. M. Moore, C. A. Casey, and J. D. Springer. 2008.
 462 Restoring plant species diversity and community composition in a ponderosa pine-bunchgrass
 463 ecosystem. Plant Ecology 197:139–151.

464 Mason, G. J., T. T. Baker, D. S. Cram, J. C. Boren, A. G. Fernald, and D. M. VanLeeuwen. 2009.
 465 Mechanical fuel treatment effects on vegetation in a New Mexico dry mixed conifer forest. Forest
 466 Ecology and Management 257:868–875.

467 McIver, J. D., S. L. Stephens, J. K. Agee, J. Barbour, R. E. Boerner, C. B. Edminster, K. L. Erickson, K.
 468 L. Farris, C. J. Fettig, C. E. Fiedler, and others. 2013. Ecological effects of alternative fuel-reduction
 469 treatments: highlights of the National Fire and Fire Surrogate study (FFS). International Journal of
 470 Wildland Fire 22:63–82.

471 Metlen, K. L., and C. E. Fiedler. 2006. Restoration treatment effects on the understory of ponderosa
 472 pine/Douglas-fir forests in western Montana, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 222:355–369.

473 Moghaddas, J. J., R. A. York, and S. L. Stephens. 2008. Initial response of conifer and California black
 474 oak seedlings following fuel reduction activities in a Sierra Nevada mixed conifer forest. *Forest Ecology*
 475 *and Management* 255:3141–3150.

476 Murtaugh, P. A. 2002. Journal quality, effect size, and publication bias in meta-analysis. *Ecology*
 477 83:1162-1166.

478 Nelson, C. R., C. B. Halpern, and J. K. Agee. 2008. Thinning and burning result in low-level invasion
 479 by nonnative plants but neutral effects on natives. *Ecological Applications* 18:762–770.

480 O'Connor, C., R. Miller, and J. D. Bates. 2013. Vegetation response to western juniper slash treatments.
 481 *Environmental Management* 52:553–566.

482 Odion, D. C., C. T. Hanson, A. Arsenault, W. L. Baker, D. A. DellaSala, R. L. Hutto, W. Klenner, M. A.
 483 Moritz, R. L. Sherriff, T. T. Veblen, and others. 2014. Examining historical and current mixed-severity
 484 fire regimes in ponderosa pine and mixed-conifer forests of western North America. *PloS One* 9:e87852.

485 Perring, M. P., R. J. Standish, J. N. Price, M. D. Craig, T. E. Erickson, K. X. Ruthrof, A. S. Whiteley, L.
 486 E. Valentine, and R. J. Hobbs. 2015. Advances in restoration ecology: rising to the challenges of the
 487 coming decades. *Ecosphere* 6:1-25.

488 Phillips, R., and T. Waldrop. 2008. Changes in vegetation structure and composition in response to fuel
 489 reduction treatments in the South Carolina Piedmont. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255:3107–3116.

490 Phillips, R., Hutchinson, T., Brudnak, L., Waldrop, T., 2007. Fire and fire surrogate treatments in
 491 mixed-oak forests: effects on herbaceous layer vegetation. In: Butler, B.W., Cook, W., comps. *The Fire*
 492 *Environment—Innovations, Management, and Policy; Conference Proceedings*. 26–30th March 2007;
 493 Destin, FL. Proceedings RMRS-P-46. Fort Collins, CO, USA.

494 Provencher, L., and J. Thompson. 2014. Vegetation responses to pinyon-juniper treatments in eastern
 495 Nevada. *Rangeland Ecology and Management* 67:195–205.

496 Pyke, D.A., M. L. Brooks, and C. D'Antonio. 2010. Fire as a restoration tool: a decision framework for
 497 predicting the control or enhancement of plants using fire. *Restoration Ecology* 18: 274–284.

498 R Development Core Team. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
 499 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

500 Schoennagel, T., and C. R. Nelson. 2011. Restoration relevance of recent National Fire Plan treatments
 501 in forests of the western United States. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 9:271–277.

502 Schoennagel, T., T. Veblen, and W. Romme. 2004. The interaction of fire, fuels, and climate across
 503 Rocky Mountain forests. *BioScience* 54:661–676.

504 Schwilk, D., J. Keeley, E. Knapp, J. McIver, J. Bailey, C. Fettig, C. Fiedler, R. Harrod, J. Moghaddas,
 505 K. Outcalt, and others. 2009. The national Fire and Fire Surrogate study: effects of fuel reduction
 506 methods on forest vegetation structure and fuels. *Ecological Applications* 19:285–304.

507 Spetich, M. A., R. W. Perry, C. A. Harper, and S. L. Clark. 2011. Fire in eastern hardwood forests
 508 through 14,000 years. Pages 41–58 *in* Sustaining Young Forest Communities. Springer, Netherlands.

509 Stephens, S. L., J. D. McIver, R. E. J. Boerner, C. J. Fettig, J. B. Fontaine, B. R. Hartsough, P. L.
 510 Kennedy, and D. W. Schwilk. 2012. Effects of forest fuel reduction treatments in the United States.
 511 *BioScience* 62:549-560.

512 Sterne, J. A. C., and Egger, M. 2001. Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on
 513 choice of axis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 54: 1046–1055.

514 Tenopir, C., S. Allard, K. Douglass, A. U. Aydinoglu, L. Wu, E. Read, M. Manoff, and M. Frame. Data
 515 sharing by scientists: practices and perceptions. *PLoS One* 6(6): e21101.
 516 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021101

517 van Mantgem, P. J, N. L. Stephenson, E. Knapp, J. Battles, and J. E. Keeley. 2011. Long-term effects of
 518 prescribed fire on mixed conifer forest structure in the Sierra Nevada, California. *Forest Ecology and*
 519 *Management* 261: 989 – 994.

520 Verheyen, K., D. F. Pieter, L. Baeten, D. M. Waller, R. Hedl, M. P. Perring, H. Blondeel, J. Brunet, M.
 521 Chudomelova and G. Decocq. 2016. Combining biodiversity resurveys across regions to advance global
 522 change research. *BioScience* 67:73-83.

523 Viechtbauer, W. 2010. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical*
 524 *Software* 36:1–48.

525 Vilà, M. and I. Ibáñez. 2011. Plant invasions in the landscape. *Landscape Ecology* 26:461-472.
 526 Waldrop, T. A., D. A. Yaussy, R. J. Phillips, T. A. Hutchinson, L. Brudnak, and R. E. Boerner. 2008.
 527 Fuel reduction treatments affect stand structure of hardwood forests in western North Carolina and
 528 southern Ohio, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255:3117–3129.
 529 Waldrop, T., R. A. Phillips, and D. A. Simon. 2010. Fuels and predicted fire behavior in the southern
 530 Appalachian Mountains after fire and fire surrogate treatments. *Forest Science* 56:32–45.
 531 Weekley, C. W., E. S. Menges, A. L. Craddock, and R. Yahr. 2013. Logging as a pretreatment or
 532 surrogate for fire in restoring Florida scrub. *Castanea* 78:15–27.
 533 Wienk, C. L., C. H. Sieg, and G. R. McPherson. 2004. Evaluating the role of cutting treatments, fire and
 534 soil seed banks in an experimental framework in ponderosa pine forests of the Black Hills, South
 535 Dakota. *Forest Ecology and Management* 192:375–393.
 536 Wolk, B., and M. E. Rocca. 2009. Thinning and chipping small-diameter ponderosa pine changes
 537 understory plant communities on the Colorado Front Range. *Forest Ecology and Management* 257:85–
 538 95.
 539 Youngblood, A., K. L. Metlen, and K. Coe. 2006. Changes in stand structure and composition after
 540 restoration treatments in low elevation dry forests of northeastern Oregon. *Forest Ecology and*
 541 *Management* 234:143–163.
 542 Zald, H. S., A. N. Gray, M. North, and R. A. Kern. 2008. Initial tree regeneration responses to fire and
 543 thinning treatments in a Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forest, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*
 544 256:168–179.
 545 Zhang, J., M. W. Ritchie, and W. W. Oliver. 2008a. Vegetation responses to stand structure and
 546 prescribed fire in an interior ponderosa pine ecosystem this article is one of a selection of papers from
 547 the Special Forum on Ecological Studies in Interior Ponderosa Pine — First Findings from Blacks
 548 Mountain Interdisciplinary Research. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38:909–918.
 549 Zhang, J., J. Webster, R. F. Powers, and J. Mills. 2008b. Reforestation after the Fountain Fire in
 550 northern California: an untold success story. *Journal of Forestry* 106:425–430.

551 Zouhar, K., J. K. Smith, S. Sutherland, M. L. Brooks, and others. 2008. Wildland fire in ecosystems: fire
552 and nonnative invasive plants. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-42-vol. 6. Department of
553 Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. Ogden, UT, USA. 355 p.

Tables

Table 1. Papers with data included in this study. Some papers reported data from multiple sites (e.g., Waldrop et al 2008) or from multiple treatments. These are distinguished by abbreviations in parentheses.

Paper	Location	Measurements	Thinning Methodology	Fire Intensity	Forest Type	Years Since Treatment
Collins et al 2007	Blodgett Forest Research Station, California	Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover Total Cover Total Richness Exotic Cover Exotic Richness	Thinning from below and rotary mastication	Medium	Mixed conifer	2
Dodson et al 2007	Lubrecht Experimental Forest, Montana	Total Richness Exotic Cover	Improvement/selection cutting and low thinning	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas Fir	3.5
Dodson 2004	Lubrecht Experimental Forest, Montana	Exotic Richness	NA	Low	Ponderosa pine	2.5
Fornwalt et al 2010 (RL)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Total Cover	NA	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fornwalt et al 2010 (UH)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Total Cover	NA	High	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fornwalt et al 2010 (UL)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Total Cover Exotic Cover Exotic Richness	NA	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fornwalt et al 2010 (UM)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Total Cover	NA	Medium	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fornwalt et al 2014 (R)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Herbaceous Cover Herbaceous Richness	NA	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fornwalt et al 2014 (U)	Pike National Forest, Colorado	Herbaceous Cover Herbaceous Richness Total Cover Total Richness	NA	Medium	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2
Fulé et al 2005	Kaibab National Forest, Arizona	Total Cover Total Richness	NA	Low	Pine-oak	4
Huffman et al 2013	Kaibab NF, Arizona	Herbaceous Cover Herbaceous Richness	Thinning from below	Low	Pinyon - juniper	5

		Shrub Cover Shrub Richness Total Cover Total Richness Exotic Richness				
Kane et al 2010	Challenge Experimental Forest, California	Herbaceous Richness Shrub Richness Total Richness Exotic Richness	Mastication using a rotary drum style masticating head with fixed teeth	Medium	Ponderosa pine	4
Kerns et al 2006	Malheur NF, Oregon	Herbaceous Cover Exotic Cover Exotic Richness	NA	Low	Ponderosa pine	5
Knapp et al 2006	Sequoia National Park	Herbaceous Cover Herbaceous Richness Shrub Cover Shrub Richness Total Cover Total Richness	NA	Medium	Mixed conifer	3
Laughlin et al 2008	Coconino National Forest, Arizona	Total Richness	Thinning overstory vegetation	NA	Ponderosa pine	3
Mason et al 2009 (BA)	Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico	Herbaceous Cover Total Cover Total Richness	Non-commercial thin with slash scattered	NA	Mixed conifer	1
Mason et al 2009 (CO)	Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico	Herbaceous Cover Total Cover Total Richness	Non-commercial thin with slash scattered	NA	Mixed conifer	2
Mason et al 2009 (SL)	Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico	Herbaceous Cover Total Cover Total Richness	Commercial harvesting with slash removed	NA	Mixed conifer	2
Metlen and Fiedler 2006	Lubrecht Experimental Forest, Montana	Herbaceous Richness Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover Shrub Richness Total Cover Total Richness Exotic Cover Exotic Richness	Improvement/selection cutting and low thinning	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	2

Nelson et al 2008	Colville, Okanogan, Wenatchee National Forests, Washington	Herbaceous Richness Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover Shrub Richness Total Cover Total Richness Exotic Cover Exotic Richness	Mechanical removal of small-diameter trees	Low	Ponderosa pine	8
O'Connor et al 2013	High Desert Ecological Province, Oregon	Herbaceous Cover	Cut-and-leave	NA	Pinyon - juniper	2
Phillips et al 2007 (OH)	Central Appalachian Plateau, Ohio	Herbaceous Richness Herbaceous Cover Total Richness	Commercial thinning from below	Medium	Mixed hardwood	2
Phillips et al 2007 (SA)	Southern Appalachian Mountains, North Carolina	Herbaceous Richness Herbaceous Cover Total Richness	Chainsaw felling of small, suppressed trees and shrubs	Medium	Mixed hardwood	2
Phillips and Waldrop 2008	Clemson Experimental Forest, South Carolina	Total Richness	Cutting of trees to a residual tree spacing of ~6 m	Medium	<i>Pinus taeda</i> / <i>Pinus echinata</i>	2
Provencher and Thompson 2014	Smith Valley, Utah	Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover	Lop and scatter	NA	Pinyon - juniper woodlands	4
Waldrop et al 2010	Southern Appalachian Mountain, North Carolina	Shrub Cover	Chainsaw felling of small trees and shrubs	Medium	Mixed hardwood	3
Waldrop et al 2008 (GR)	Green River, North Carolina	Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover Total Cover	Chainsaw felling of trees > 1.8 m tall and all mountain laurel and rhododendron stems	Medium	Mixed hardwood	2
Waldrop et al 2008 (OH)	Ohio Hills, Ohio	Herbaceous Cover Shrub Cover Total Cover	Commercial thinning from below	Medium	Mixed hardwood	2
Weekley et al 2013	Lake Wales Ridge State Forest, Florida	Herbaceous Cover	Logging: harvesting of all merchantable pine	Medium	Longleaf pine	2

Wienk et al 2004	Badger Game Production Area, South Dakota	Total Richness	Cutting of trees to leave a basal area of ~12 m ² /ha, trees and slash removed	Low	Ponderosa pine	2
Wolk and Rocca 2009	Heil Valley Ranch, Colorado	Total Richness Exotic Richness	Chainsaw felling and hand crew or all-terrain vehicle skidding	NA	Ponderosa pine	3
Youngblood et al 2006	Blue Mountains, Oregon	Total Richness	Cut-to-length harvesting using a single-grip harvester and forwarder to remove merchantable live and standing dead and down material	Low	Ponderosa pine/Douglas fir	5
Zald et al 2008	Teakettle Experimental Forest, California	Herbaceous Cover	Removal of trees between 25 and 76 cm diameter at breast height, while retaining at least 40% canopy cover	Medium	Mixed conifer	1.5
Zhang et al 2008a	Blacks Mountain Experimental Forest, California	Shrub Cover Shrub Richness Total Richness	Mechanical thinning, not otherwise specified	NA	Ponderosa pine	5

Table 2. Contrast coefficient lower (lb) and upper (ub) confidence limits (90%) and adjusted *p* values for pairwise treatment contrasts (15 comparisons tested). Positive coefficients indicate response variable was higher in first treatment listed, negative indicates response was greater in second. We considered all hypotheses as one-tailed and therefore report 90% confidence intervals. We report experiment-wide adjusted *p*-values < 0.1 as significant (in bold).

Response	Burn vs Control			Burn vs Thin			Thin vs Control		
	lb	ub	adj. p	lb	ub	adj. p	lb	ub	adj. p
exotic richness	0.240	1.05	> 0.116	-0.880	-0.018	> 0.1	0.534	1.29	0.001
herb cover	-0.061	0.668	> 0.1	-0.407	0.339	> 0.1	-0.002	0.672	> 0.1
shrub cover	-1.36	-0.453	0.014	-1.56	-0.089	> 0.1	-0.384	0.728	> 0.1
total cover	-0.624	-0.031	> 0.1	-2.31	0.201	> 0.1	-0.166	0.696	> 0.1
total richness	-0.327	0.850	> 0.1	-0.338	1.36	> 0.1	-0.062	0.977	> 0.1

Figure 1: Geographic distribution of data sources; see Table 1 for details of each study. Each circle represents a study site. We searched literature from North American forests that historically experienced frequent surface fire regimes (< 20 years fire return interval). After vetting, only studies located in the USA remained.

Figure 2: Forest plot indicating standardized effect sizes (squares), standard deviations (error bars), and 95% confidence intervals of effect sizes for exotic species richness thinning vs control contrasts across relevant studies. The black polygon in the final row ("RE Model") indicates estimated average effect size with the horizontal extent of the polygon indicating the 95% $\alpha = 0.1$ confidence intervals of that estimate. Numbers on right of plot give these standardized effect sizes and upper and lower confidence intervals. Thinning treatments caused an increase in exotic species richness compared with control treatments (adjusted $p = 0.001$). Studies are listed on the left, see Table 1.

Figure 3: Burn vs Control effect sizes for total species richness (Hedge's g , Gurevitch and Hedges 2001). Mean effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals are shown for each study. Burning had a variable effect on total species richness with increases relative to controls at eastern, but not western sites (no main effect, latitude significant modifier, adjusted $p = 0.019$, $N = 12$).

Figure 4: Forest plot indicating standardized effect sizes (squares), standard deviations (error bars), and 95% confidence intervals of effect sizes for shrub cover burning vs control contrasts. Waldrop et al (2008) report data from two sites and these were treated separately in our analyses (OH = Ohio site, GR = North Carolina site Table 1). The black polygon in the final row ("RE Model") indicates estimated average effect size with the horizontal extent of the polygon indicating the 95% $\alpha = 0.1$ confidence intervals of that estimate. Numbers on right of plot give these standardized effect sizes and upper and lower confidence intervals. Burning treatments caused a decrease in shrub cover when compared with control treatments (adjusted $p = 0.014$). Studies are listed on the left, see Table 1.

Figure 5: Thin vs Control effect sizes for total understory cover (Hedge's g , Gurevitch and Hedges 2001). Mean effect sizes and confidence intervals are shown for each study. Burning had a variable effect on total species richness with increases relative to controls at eastern, but not western sites (no main effect, latitude significant modifier, adjusted $p = 0.002$, $N = 2015$).

Author(s) and Year

Shrub cover, Burn – Control [95% CI]

Standardized Mean Difference