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Dieffenbachia longispatha (C3) and Aechmea magdalenae (Crassulacean acid metabolism, CAM) are syntopic, neotropical forest perennials in central Panama that are restricted to shaded habitats. This is of particular interest for A. magdalenae because, like other understory CAM bromeliad species, it appears functionally and structurally to be better suited to life in full sun. Growth irradiance (GI) effects on photosynthesis and growth in both species were explored in the context of sun/shade trade-off concepts largely derived from studies of C3 plants. Potted plants were grown outdoors in 1, 55, and 100% full sun for 5 mo under well-watered conditions. While both species grew faster in high compared to low light, maximum relative growth rates (RGR) in full sun were still extremely slow with A. magdalenae showing a RGR approximately half that of D. longispatha. Photosynthetic capacity increased with GI in D. longispatha but not in A. magdalenae. Aechmea magdalenae responded to GI with shifts in the activity of the different CAM phases. Both species were photoinhibited in full sun, but more so in A. magdalenae. Despite possessing many traits considered adaptive in high light, these results suggest that A. magdalenae is unlikely to attain sufficient growth rates to thrive in productive, high-light habitats.
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Physiological and morphological contrasts between C3 plants that thrive in open, sunny habitats and those that thrive in shaded habitats provide one of the best documented examples of phenotypic and evolutionary trade-offs in plant ecology (reviewed in Grime, 1977; Bazzaz and Pickett, 1980; Björkman, 1981, Evans et al., 1988, Pearcy and Sims, 1994; Larcher, 1995; Valladares, 2003; Givnish et al., 2004). Shade-grown C3 plants, as compared to those grown in high light, allocate relatively more biomass to photosynthetic tissues, producing thin, horizontally oriented foliage with little intracanopy shading. These shade leaves, in turn, have relatively high chlorophyll concentrations and high coefficients of light absorption. These features all contribute to the efficient interception and absorption of light for use in carbon gain. Shade-grown C3 plants also have relatively little root biomass and relatively low foliar concentrations of nitrogen-rich photosynthetic enzymes, obliging low transpiration rates and low light-saturated rates of photosynthesis. These features render shade-grown C3 plants more susceptible to light, drought, and heat stress in the event of sudden exposure to high light as may happen to understory plants during gap formation or deforestation (Mulkey and Pearcy, 1992; Lovelock et al., 1994). Thus, the physiological and morphological traits that allow shade-grown C3 plants to thrive in the understory are detrimental to their success in high light.

All the aforementioned traits, both at the leaf- and whole-plant level, exhibit a high degree of phenotypic plasticity, allowing individual genotypes or species to perform well over a range of light conditions (e.g., Silvera et al., 2003). But, consistent with evolutionary trade-off models, the range of plasticity in these characters generally differs between fast-growing plants native to productive high-light habitats as compared to plants native to low-light habitats (Seemann et al., 1987; Pearcy and Sims, 1994). For example, the light-saturated photosynthetic rates in light-demanding, early-successional tropical C3 tree species grown in the sun may be ~200% greater than that of the same species when grown in the shade. By contrast, the light-saturated photosynthetic rates in shade-tolerant, late-successional tropical C3 tree species grown in the sun is typically less than 100% greater than that of the same species when grown in the shade (Strauss-Debenedetti and Bazzaz, 1996). Similar differences in plasticity for other plant traits exist between sun-adapted and shade-adapted C3 species (e.g., Kitajima, 1996; Givnish et al., 2004). These differences in light-dependent phenotypic plasticity can, in large part, explain why certain C3 species are limited to either bright or shaded habitats (Bazzaz and Pickett, 1980; Sims and Kelley, 1998). The extent to which this sun/shade trade-off model can explain the local distribution of Crassulacean acid metabolism (CAM) species is not well known.

The present study examined how some of the aforementioned leaf and whole-plant characteristics responded to variation in growth irradiance in two syntopic neotropical understory perennials; the CAM-dependent monocot herb, Aechmea magdalenae André ex Baker (Bromeliaceae) and the C3-dependent monocot herb, Dieffenbachia longispatha Engler and Krause (Araceae). Previous studies have shown that, when growing in their native understory habitat, D. longispatha displays traits typical of shade-adapted species but that A. mag-
The specific objectives of this study were to examine the influence of extreme variation in growth irradiance on photosynthesis, biomass allocation, and plant growth in established individuals of *A. magdalenae* (CAM) and *D. longispatha*. The study was conducted in Panama with plants from the Barro Colorado Nature Monument (BCNM), a forest reserve in central Panama (9°10′ N, 79°51′ W) that includes Barro Colorado Island (BCI) and the adjacent mainland peninsulas. The BCNM is classified as a tropical moist forest under the Holdridge life zone system (Croat, 1978). Annual precipitation averages approximately 2600 mm with a distinct wet (May–December) and dry season (January–April). Detailed descriptions of vegetation, climate, and ecology of the island can be found in Croat (1978).

Photosynthetic and growth responses of the terrestrial CAM bromeliad *A. magdalenae* and the C3 perennial herb, *D. longispatha* were assessed when grown under a broad range of light conditions, from ~1 to 100% of full sun. Both of these herbaceous, perennial monocots are abundant and often co-occur in the BCNM (Croat, 1978; Skillman et al., 1999). Furthermore, both species have similar in situ annual growth rates, rooting depths, and biomass allocation patterns (Skillman et al., 1999).

**Growing conditions**—Small juvenile plants of both species were collected on the Gigante Peninsula of the BCNM and were allowed to establish in 1-L pots for several months under low light (2–5% full sun) in a screened growing house. An initial harvest was made on eight randomly chosen plants of each species at the start of the wet season. At the same time, the remaining potted plants of both species were transplanted into 19-L pots containing a 1:1 mixture of washed sand and forest soil. Between six and eight plants of each species were then randomly assigned to each of three light treatments. Using neutral density shade screen, shade house structures were established for growth of plants under full sun (i.e., no shade screen), approximately 50% of full sun, and approximately 1% of full sun. These plants were grown for 5 mo under these conditions. Light and temperature conditions in the three light treatments were frequently monitored (Table 1) with calibrated quantum sensors and shielded thermocouples connected to an electronic datalogger (Li-1000, Li Cor, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). On average, the low-light treatment received ~1% of the total daily PFD of the full sun treatment, while the medium light treatment received ~55% of the full sun treatment (Table 1). All plants received natural rainfall and additional water as needed. All plants received commercial nutrient fertilizer (Miracle-Gro 15-30-15 All Purpose Plant Food, Marysville, Ohio, USA) at the recommended concentrations once per week during establishment and throughout the course of the experiment.

**Foliar characteristics**—Near the end of the 5-mo growing period, several aspects of leaf physiology and composition were evaluated on healthy, fully expanded leaves of both species. Sampled leaves had developed on the plants in each of the respective light treatments. The maximum light- and CO₂-saturated rate of photosynthetic oxygen production (Pₘₐₓ) was measured at 30°C, 5% CO₂ in air, under ~1500 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ in harvested
leaf discs of a known area using a gas phase oxygen electrode (model LD2, Hansatech Instruments, Kings Lynn, UK) as described in Skillman et al. (1996). Photosynthetic physiology in CAM plants can have four distinct phases (sensu Osmond, 1978), which must be considered in the planning and interpretation of photosynthesis measurements. Phase I refers to the nighttime CO₂ uptake through open stomates wherein carboxylation reactions are mediated by phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PEPCase) leading to the nocturnal accumulation of malic acid in the leaves. Phase III refers to the decarboxylation of the stored malic acid during the daytime period (CAM phase III). Leaf absorptance was measured on the same leaf pieces using a Li 1800 spectroradiometer (Li Cor). These same leaf samples were oven-dried (70°C) to a constant weight to determine the specific leaf area (SLA: leaf area per unit leaf dry mass). Leaf chlorophyll and nitrogen (Nₜ) concentrations and carbon isotope ratios were measured for leaf discs of known area subsampled from the same leaves used in the photosynthesis measurements. Chlorophyll concentrations were assessed spectrophotometrically in 80% acetone extractions made from fresh leaf samples after Porra et al. (1989). Foliar Nₜ was determined with dried, ground leaf samples using a CHN elemental analyzer (Heraeus, Hanau, Germany). Relative differences in carbon isotope ratios (δ¹³C) were determined for CO₂ derived from 2- to 4-mg samples of dried ground leaf tissue at the Duke University Phytochromatography Center. Samples were combusted under nitrogen in an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Siras series II, Micromass, Manchester, UK) in automatic trapping mode. After correcting for other isotopes, the relative abundance of ¹³C in a CO₂ standard that had been calibrated against Pee Dee Belemite. Sample sizes for the Pmax, leaf absorbance, chlorophyll concentration, Nₜ, and δ¹³C data sets were four per species from each of the three light treatments. The maximum photosynthetic efficiency of photosynthesis was assessed in situ before dawn by measuring the chlorophyll fluorescence parameter, Fv/Fm (PAM 2000 chlorophyll fluorometer, Walz, Effeltrich, Germany) on healthy, fully enlarged intact leaves that had been dark-adapted for 10 min as per standard protocols (Skillman et al., 1996). This was done on six to eight plants per species from each of the three light treatments. To assess nocturnal acidification (CAM phase 1 activity), dawn-to-dusk fluctuations in titratable leaf sap acidity were measured in four A. magdalenae plants from each of the three light treatments.

Biomass allocation and growth—At the end of the 5-mo growing period, plants were removed from the pots, carefully washed free of soil, and divided into leaves, stems/support tissues (includes petals for D. longispatha but not A. magdalenae, which is apetiolate), and rhizomes/roots. The total leaf area of each harvested plant was evaluated with an optical leaf area meter (Li-3100, Li Cor). The components of each plant were dried separately to a constant mass and the dry masses were recorded. The relative growth rate (RGR) is the natural log of the change in plant dry mass over the duration of growth. The leaf area ratio (LAR) is the total plant leaf area divided by the total plant dry mass at final harvest. The growth rate per unit leaf area (unit leaf rate; ULR) is estimated from the ratio of RGR over LAR.

Statistics—Effects of growth irradiance on measured variables were inferred using analysis of variance methods and Scheffé means comparisons tests run separately for each species (Steel and Torrie, 1980). Before running statistical models, data sets were checked for homogeneity of variance and, when necessary, appropriate transformations were made.

Foliar characteristics—The maximum rate of photosynthesis (Pmax), on a leaf area basis, in A. magdalenae was relatively high in shade-grown plants but did not acclimate to increases in light (Fig. 1A). Dieffenbachia longispatha acclimated to the increasing light with a modest increase in Pmax per unit leaf area, as is generally observed in shade-adapted C3 plants (Fig. 1A). This same general pattern held when Pmax was expressed on the basis of leaf dry mass, leaf chlorophyll, and leaf nitrogen (Table 2); Pmax in A. magdalenae was relatively high when grown in deep shade but showed no significant changes with increasing growth irradiance, while Pmax in D. longispatha tended to increase with growth irradiance. Aechmea magdalenae had a light-dependent increase in carbon uptake during CAM phase I, as indicated by the nocturnal acidification data (Table 2).

Both species had qualitatively similar changes in leaf morphology and nitrogen concentration in response to the increase in light (Fig. 1B, C). Plants of both species grown in 55% and 100% of full sun produced heavier, thicker leaves than plants grown in deep shade, accounting for the tendency of SLA to decline with light. The SLA of A. magdalenae, across all light treatments, was lower than that of D. longispatha. Nitrogen concentration per leaf unit area increased with light in both species. Leaf nitrogen concentration per unit area was greater in A. magdalenae than in D. longispatha, but this pattern was reversed when Nₜ was expressed per unit leaf mass (cf., Fig. 1B, C).

Pre-dawn measurements of dark-adapted Fv/Fm in leaves of plants in each of the light treatments indicate that both species were chronically photoinhibited when grown in full sun (Fig. 2A). This high-light effect was greater for A. magdalenae than it was for the shade-adapted C3 perennial, D. longispatha. Similarly, both species tended to have less chlorophyll per unit leaf area in full sun compared to 1% and 55% sun treatments, but this difference was only significant for A. magdalenae (Fig. 2B). Likewise, leaf absorbance declined with increasing light for both species, but the effect was greatest for A. magdalenae (Fig. 2C). The chlorophyll ab ratio was unaffected by growth irradiance treatments in both study species (data not shown).

The δ¹³C values for the CAM perennial, A. magdalenae, ranged between −13 and −17 per mil and between −28 and −32 per mil for the C3 perennial, D. longispatha (Fig. 3). The δ¹³C values were observed to become less negative with increasing light in D. longispatha and, by contrast, became more negative with increasing light in A. magdalenae.

Allocation and growth—The allocation of plant biomass to foliage, belowground structures (roots and rhizomes), and support tissues (stem and petioles) as a percentage of total plant biomass is depicted for both study species from each of the three light treatments in Fig. 4. Less biomass was allocated to foliage (leaf mass ratio; LMR) and more allocated to support tissues in high light for both species. Absolute biomass belowground increased with growth irradiance in both species (data not shown), but in D. longispatha there was a proportionally greater increase in support tissue (thicker stems and petioles) so that the percentage belowground biomass (root mass ratio; RMR) decreased with increasing light. RMR for A. magdalenae responded more typically by increasing with increasing light. As expected based upon growth form differences, the
Fig. 1. (A) The light and CO$_2$ saturated rate of photosynthesis, (B) the specific leaf area, and (C) the nitrogen concentration in leaves sampled from four plants each of *Aechmea magdalenae* and *Dieffenbachia longispatha* from each of the three light treatments. Plotted points are means ± 1 SE. Significant differences between light treatments for each species are indicated by the different letters (lower case = *A. magdalenae*, upper case = *D. longispatha*) next to the data points for that species (*P* < 0.05 by Scheffe means comparison test). An absence of letters indicates that light treatment did not significantly affect that species for that variable.

**DISCUSSION**

*Photosynthesis, photoacclimation, and photooxidative stress*—Consistent with previous reports (Skillman et al., 1999), shade-grown *A. magdalenae* had a substantially higher $P_{\text{max}}$ than is typically observed in C3 understory herbaceous plants when expressed per unit leaf area, per unit leaf nitrogen, and per unit leaf chlorophyll (Fig. 1A and Table 2). There were no species differences among shade-grown plants when $P_{\text{max}}$ was expressed on a leaf mass basis. However, the similarity of $P_{\text{max}}$ on a leaf mass basis between shade-grown *A. magdalenae* and *D. longispatha* may be misleading because the structural and functional characteristics of the leaves of these two species are quite different. *Dieffenbachia longispatha* produces classic mesomorphic leaves made of typical photosynthetic chlorenchyma dorsiventrally differentiated into palisade and spongy mesophyll layers (J. Skillman, personal observation). By contrast, a substantial portion of the mass of *A. magdalenae* foliage is nonphotosynthetic, including structural fibers and the prominent water storage parenchyma (Skillman et al., 1999). Nitrogen concentration per unit leaf mass in *A. magdalenae*, ranging from ~2% to 2.5%, was substantially lower than that of *D. longispatha*, ranging from ~3.5% to 4%, across all light levels (cf. Fig. 1B and C). This is consistent with the anatomical distinctions between these species because leaf
structural materials and nonphotosynthetic water-storage cells are expected to have lower nitrogen concentrations than green photosynthetic cells.

Dieffenbachia longispatha displayed a modest capacity for photosynthetic acclimation to increased light conditions with an increase in $P_{\text{max}}$, as is typical of shade-adapted species (Strauss-Debenedetti and Bazzaz, 1996). On the other hand, $P_{\text{max}}$ did not change in response to increasing light in A. magdalenae. This is qualitatively consistent with fluorescence-based analyses of photosynthetic light acclimation in A. magdalenae previously reported (Skillman and Winter, 1997) and with findings reported for the shade-tolerant, terrestrial CAM bromeliad Bromelia humilis (Fetene et al., 1990). Thus, with respect to photoacclimation of $P_{\text{max}}$, shade-tolerant, terrestrial CAM bromeliads like A. magdalenae appear to have extremely limited phenotypic plasticity.

Even though $P_{\text{max}}$ in A. magdalenae was constant under contrasting growth conditions, the light-dependent increase in nocturnal aciddification (Table 2) indicates night-time carbon uptake was greater in high light compared to low (i.e., increased activity of CAM phase I). At the same time, the carbon isotope data (Fig. 3) suggest that there was also a light-dependent decrease in the duration of the day-time decarboxylation period (phase III) with a corresponding increase in daytime C3-like carbon fixation (i.e., increased duration of CAM phases II and/or IV). In principle, light-dependent reductions in the $\delta^{13}C$ in CAM foliage may be caused by (a) increased diffusion limitations on nocturnal carbon fixation during phase I, and/or (b) an increased reliance on RUBISCO-mediated fixation of external CO$_2$ during phases II and IV when the stomates are open during the day (Farquhar et al., 1986; Winter and Holton, 2002). But the observation that nocturnal aciddification is higher rather than lower in A. magdalenae plants grown in high light largely rules out the first possibility (Table 2). And, consistent with the second possibility, gas-exchange studies by Pitsch and Smith (1988) demonstrated an increase in the duration of phase IV, and to a lesser extent phase II, in high-light treated A. magdalenae plants. In addition, calculations based upon Winter and Holton’s (2002) empirically derived relationship between shoot $\delta^{13}C$ values and the percentage of 24-h carbon gain which occurs during the day also indicate an increase in daytime C3-like carbon fixation with increasing growth irradiance. These calculations, based upon data in Fig. 3, indicate that 24, 38, and 46% of the 24-h carbon gain in the A. magdalenae plants grown in low, medium, and high light, respectively, took place during phases II and/or IV.

Consequently, we speculate that the absence of an acclimation response of $P_{\text{max}}$ in A. magdalenae to increases in growth irradiance is functionally compensated for by the apparent flexibility in the relative expression of the different phases of the CAM cycle. This option as a means of greater carbon gain potential when grown in high light would not be available to C3 plants like D. longispatha, obscuring simple interpretations of phenotypic plasticity for carbon gain potential in CAM plants based on measurements of variation in $P_{\text{max}}$.

At the same time, the increased reliance on C3-like carbon fixation in A. magdalenae when grown in bright light may also have contributed to the severe photooxidative stress observed in this species. Indeed, assuming a light-saturated photosynthesis rate of 18 $\mu$mol CO$_2$ · m$^{-2}$ · s$^{-1}$ (Fig. 1) and the observed 148 mmol · m$^{-2}$ of titratable acidity in high-light grown A. magdalenae (Table 2), it is estimated that under light saturation, the high light A. magdalenae plants would only have been able to sustain phase III for 2.2 h, albeit at a high fixation rate during this short interval. This is qualitatively consistent with the prior analysis of the isotope data and it means that, over most of the day, high light A. magdalenae plants would have been operating under limiting (i.e., external) CO$_2$ in phase II and/or IV. Although CO$_2$ supply limitations under bright light results in photoinhibition in C3 and CAM plants alike, diffusion limitations during the day when the stomates are open are likely to have been greater for A. magdalenae than for D. longispatha because thick succulent CAM leaves tend to have higher mesophyll resistances than thin C3 leaves (Maxwell et al., 1997). The validity of this latter explanation for severe photoinhibition in A. magdalenae would depend upon the internal O$_2$ concentrations in the leaves during phases II and IV, and the role of internal O$_2$ in promoting vs. mitigating photoinhibition (Maxwell et al., 1998). Neither factor is well understood at this time. Nonetheless, from the available data, growth in high light conditions appears to increase phase II and IV activities in A. magdalenae, which allows for increased carbon uptake capacity during the day, while also raising the quantum requirement of carbon fixation during phase II and IV by promoting photoinhibition.

**Growth**—Several authors have reported light limitations on growth for A. magdalenae plants in the forest (Pitsch and Smith, 1988; Skillman et al., 1999; Villegas, 2001; Ticktin et al., 2003). Accordingly, these experimental shadehouse plants grew extremely slowly in deep shade and more quickly under brighter light (Fig. 5). What had not been predicted from these

---

### Table 2: Influence of growth irradiance treatments on different expressions of photosynthetic capacity ($P_{\text{max}}$) in the understory CAM plant Aechmea magdalenae and the understory C3 plant Dieffenbachia longispatha and nocturnal aciddification ($\Delta H^+$), a measure of CAM activity, in Aechmea magdalenae only. Growth irradiance treatment is expressed as a percentage of full sun conditions. Values are the means ± 1.0 SE. NA means “not applicable”. Sample sizes for different measurements are as reported in the Materials and Methods. Different superscripts within a row for each species indicate a significant difference at $P < 0.05$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth irradiance treatment (% full sun)</th>
<th>A. magdalenae</th>
<th>D. longispatha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{max}}$ per unit leaf dry mass (nmol O$_2$ · g$^{-1}$ · s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(±32)</td>
<td>(±54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{max}}$ per unit leaf nitrogen (µmol O$_2$ · mol N$^{-1}$ · s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(±13)</td>
<td>(±40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{max}}$ per unit leaf chlorophyll (µmol O$_2$ · mmol chl$^{-1}$ · s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(±3.9)</td>
<td>(±13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturnal $\Delta H^+$ (mmol H$^+$ · m$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>104$^a$</td>
<td>134$^{AB}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(±4)</td>
<td>(±26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 2. (A) The pre-dawn chlorophyll fluorescence ratio, Fv/Fm (N = 6–8), (B) leaf chlorophyll concentration (N = 4), and (C) leaf absorptance of 400–700 nm light (N = 4) in leaves sampled from plants of Aechmea magdalenae and Dieffenbachia longispatha from each of the three light treatments. All other information is described in the caption for Fig. 1.

Fig. 3. Effect of growth irradiance on carbon isotope discrimination in leaves (N = 4) from Aechmea magdalenae, a constitutive CAM plant, and Dieffenbachia longispatha, a C3 plant, sampled from plants in each of the three light treatments. All other information as described in the legend to Fig. 1.

earlier in situ studies was that, in intermediate and high light, growth of A. magdalenae was still extremely slow when compared to a shade-adapted C3 species like D. longispatha. We interpret the growth rates for each of these species in the medium- and high-light treatments as being their maximal possible growth rates because they started out as small, juvenile plants and were grown under presumably non-limiting conditions of light, temperature, and soil resources. Thus, A. magdalenae exhibited a narrower range of light-dependent phenotypic adjustments in growth than D. longispatha, a result that contradicts our hypothesis.

The remarkably slow growth of A. magdalenae in full sun runs counter to our initial expectation. This is of interest because this species displays many morphological and physiological characters typical of sun-adapted plants. In terms of leaf morphology, leaf orientation, and biomass allocation, A. magdalenae has much in common with sun-adapted, leaf-succulent, desert CAM species like Agaves and Yuccas (Nobel, 1988), some of which can sustain remarkably high rates of growth in full sun given adequate water and nutrients (Nobel, 1996). Thus, plant morphological characters assessed here do not explain the poor growth performance of A. magdalenae in full sun. Although the mechanistic basis for the restricted growth in full sun is poorly understood, the data presented here suggest that photosynthetic physiology, more so than whole-plant morphology, places a strong constraint on greater growth of A. magdalenae in high light. The inability to increase photosynthetic capacity (P max) with increasing light
Fig. 4. Biomass allocation patterns in (A) *Aechmea magdalenae* and (B) *Dieffenbachia longispatha* in plants from each of the three light treatments (*N* = 6–8).

(Fig. 1), the high susceptibility to chronic photoinhibition (Fig. 2), and the close association between nocturnal acidification of individual leaves and whole-plant growth per unit leaf area (Fig. 6), are each consistent with this suggestion. A more complete understanding of the proximal reasons for this limited growth potential awaits further study.

**Conclusions**—*Dieffenbachia longispatha* and *A. magdalenae* alike can survive in bright light, but inherent limitations on photosynthetic physiology and growth make it unlikely that either species could attain sufficient growth rates to *thrive* in productive, high-light habitats. More specifically, we have shown that this representative understory CAM bromeliad, *A. magdalenae*, has a limited ability to acclimate to high light and performs quite poorly in high light, even when compared to the more typical shade-adapted tropical forest understory

![Graphs showing biomass allocation patterns in *Aechmea magdalenae* and *Dieffenbachia longispatha*](image)

Fig. 5. (A) The relative growth rate (RGR), (B) the unit leaf rate (ULR), and (C) the leaf area ratio (LAR) in 6–8 plants of both study species from each of the three light treatments. All other information is described in the caption for Fig. 1.
C3 plant, *D. longispatha*. This argues for the interpretation that *A. magdalenae* is actually highly specialized for life in the understory, despite having many characteristics in common with more productive sun-adapted species. It will be interesting to see if these results can be generalized to various other shade-tolerant, terrestrial CAM bromeliads. The demonstration of strong shade-adaptation in this terrestrial understory bromeliad is also of interest for understanding the evolution of epiphytism in this genus because many related *Aechmea* species are epiphytic, potentially living in bright light in the upper canopy of neotropical forests (Crayn et al., 2004). Viewed more broadly, these findings challenge classic tradeoff models of sun- vs. shade-adapted species. This work demonstrates that the suite of traits in the archetypal shade-adapted species *D. longispatha* (i.e., thin, horizontally positioned, C3 leaves with low photosynthetic capacities) is not necessary for shade adaptation. Simultaneously, we have demonstrated that the reciprocal suite of traits exhibited by *A. magdalenae* (i.e., thick, vertically positioned CAM leaves with a high photosynthetic capacity), does not guarantee ecological success in high light.
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