



## **Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently**

S. Vicca, S. Luyssaert, J. Peñuelas, M. Campioli, F.S. Iii Chapin, Philippe Ciais, A. Heinemeyer, P. Högberg, W. L. Kutsch, B. E. Law, et al.

### **► To cite this version:**

S. Vicca, S. Luyssaert, J. Peñuelas, M. Campioli, F.S. Iii Chapin, et al.. Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently. Ecology Letters, 2012, 15, pp.520-526. 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01775.x . cea-00853260

**HAL Id: cea-00853260**

**<https://cea.hal.science/cea-00853260>**

Submitted on 2 Jul 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently

**Reference:**

Vicca Sara, Luyssaert Sebastiaan, Peñuelas J., Campioli Matteo, Janssens Ivan, et al.- Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently

Ecology letters - ISSN 1461-0248 - 15:6(2012), p. 520-526

Full text (Publishers DOI): <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01775.x>

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/969720151162165141>

# Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently

Vicca S<sup>1</sup>, Luyssaert S<sup>2</sup>, Peñuelas J<sup>3</sup>, Campioli M<sup>1</sup>, Chapin FS III<sup>4</sup>, Ciais P<sup>2</sup>, Heinemeyer A<sup>5</sup>, Högberg P<sup>6</sup>, Kutsch WL<sup>7</sup>, Law BE<sup>8</sup>, Malhi Y<sup>9</sup>, Papale D<sup>10</sup>, Piao SL<sup>11</sup>, Reichstein M<sup>12</sup>, Schulze ED<sup>12</sup>, Janssens IA<sup>1</sup>.

- 1 Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium
- 2 LSCE CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Orme des Merisiers, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- 3 Global Ecology Unit CREAM-CEAB-CSIC, CREAM (Center for Ecological Research and Forestry Applications), Edifici C, Universitat Autònoma Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain
- 4 Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK 99775, USA
- 5 Environment Department, Centre for Terrestrial Carbon Dynamics (York-Centre) at the Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, YO10 5DD, York, UK
- 6 Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), SE-901 83 Umeå, Sweden.
- 7 Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institut, Institute of Agricultural Climate Research, 38116 Braunschweig, Germany
- 8 Forest Ecosystems and Society Department, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331, USA
- 9 Environmental Change Institute, School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3QY, UK
- 10 Department of Forest Environment and Resources, University of Tuscia, I-01100 Viterbo, Italy
- 11 College of Urban and Environmental Sciences and KLESPME, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
- 12 Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, PO Box 100164, D-07701 Jena, Germany

**Article type:** Ideas and Perspectives

**Short running title:** Forests' biomass production efficiency

**Email:** SV [sara.vicca@ua.ac.be](mailto:sara.vicca@ua.ac.be); SL [sebastiaan.luyssaert@lsce.ipsl.fr](mailto:sebastiaan.luyssaert@lsce.ipsl.fr); JP [josep.penuelas@uab.cat](mailto:josep.penuelas@uab.cat); MC [matteo.campioli@ua.ac.be](mailto:matteo.campioli@ua.ac.be); FSC [terry.chapin@alaska.edu](mailto:terry.chapin@alaska.edu); PC [philippe.ciais@cea.fr](mailto:philippe.ciais@cea.fr); AH [andreas.heinemeyer@york.ac.uk](mailto:andreas.heinemeyer@york.ac.uk); PH [peter.hogberg@slu.se](mailto:peter.hogberg@slu.se); WK [werner.kutsch@vti.bund.de](mailto:werner.kutsch@vti.bund.de); BEL [bev.law@oregonstate.edu](mailto:bev.law@oregonstate.edu); YM [yadvinder.malhi@ouce.ox.ac.uk](mailto:yadvinder.malhi@ouce.ox.ac.uk); DP [darpa@unitus.it](mailto:darpa@unitus.it); SLP [slpiao@pku.edu.cn](mailto:slpiao@pku.edu.cn); MR [markus.reichstein@bgc-jena.mpg.de](mailto:markus.reichstein@bgc-jena.mpg.de); EDS [dschulze@bgc-jena.mpg.de](mailto:dschulze@bgc-jena.mpg.de); IAJ [ivan.janssens@ua.ac.be](mailto:ivan.janssens@ua.ac.be)

**Authorship:** SV, SL, JP and IAJ conceived the paper; SV performed the analyses and wrote the paper; all authors contributed substantially to discussions and revisions.

**Corresponding author:** Sara Vicca, universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium; [sara.vicca@ua.ac.be](mailto:sara.vicca@ua.ac.be); tel.: +3232652282; fax: +3232652271

**Keywords:** global forest database; biomass production; photosynthesis; biomass production efficiency; carbon allocation; nutrients; root symbionts

**Word count:** abstract: 150; main text: 2259; whole manuscript: 5936

**Figures:** 3 (of which one in BOX 1)

**Tables:** 3

**Boxes:** 2

**Number of references:** 39

## Abstract

Trees with sufficient nutrition are known to allocate carbon preferentially to aboveground plant parts. Our global study of 49 forests revealed an even more fundamental carbon allocation response to nutrient availability: forests with high nutrient availability use  $58 \pm 3\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SE; 17 forests) of their photosynthates for plant biomass production, while forests with low nutrient availability only convert  $42 \pm 2\%$  (mean  $\pm$  SE; 19 forests) of annual photosynthates to biomass. This nutrient effect largely overshadows previously observed differences in carbon allocation patterns among climate zones, forest types and age classes. If forests with low nutrient availability use  $16 \pm 4\%$  less of their photosynthates for plant growth, what are these used for? Current knowledge suggests that lower biomass production per unit photosynthesis in forests with low- versus forests with high nutrient availability reflects not merely an increase in plant respiration, but likely results from reduced carbon allocation to unaccounted components of net primary production, particularly root symbionts.

## Introduction

Plant physiologists often argue that, across species and biomes, plants respire a nearly constant fraction – approximately 50% – of the carbon taken up during photosynthesis (GPP) (Gifford 1994, 1995; Dewar *et al.* 1998; Waring *et al.* 1998; Enquist *et al.* 2007; Van Oijen *et al.* 2010). The remaining carbon – termed net primary production (NPP) – is converted into plant biomass and other complex molecules used for multiple purposes (e.g., root exudation, production of volatile organic compounds). The relative constancy of the partitioning of GPP into autotrophic respiration (Ra) and NPP would reflect the interdependence of respiration and photosynthesis. Respiration depends on the substrate provided by photosynthesis, which in turn relies on respiration to provide the energy required for construction of complex compounds such as carbon skeletons for protein synthesis (Krömer 1995; Hoefnagel *et al.* 1998). Unfortunately, the verification of this theory at the ecosystem scale is severely hampered by the fact that NPP and Ra are difficult to quantify for the entire ecosystem. While Ra occurs in every living plant cell within the ecosystem, NPP includes numerous carbon-consuming processes (plant growth, root exudation, carbon allocation to symbionts and production of volatile organic compounds). The paucity of accurate data on forest ecosystem Ra and NPP globally explains why the partitioning of GPP at the ecosystem scale remains poorly understood.

Because biomass production constitutes the largest fraction of NPP, biomass production is commonly used as a proxy for NPP (Waring *et al.* 1998; DeLucia *et al.* 2007; Drake *et al.* 2011; Goulden *et al.* 2011). In contrast to theoretical argumentations for a constrained NPP-to-GPP ratio (Dewar *et al.* 1998; Van Oijen *et al.* 2010), field measurements in forests revealed substantial variation in the biomass production-to-GPP ratio (DeLucia *et al.* 2007). The biomass production-to-GPP ratio was reported to be higher in forests of the temperate zone, in particular

in broadleaved temperate forests (DeLucia *et al.* 2007), and to decrease with increasing stand age (DeLucia *et al.* 2007; Goulden *et al.* 2011). These results are, however, tentative because the effect of stand age is confounded with forest type and climate zone; the majority of the young forests is located in the temperate zone (DeLucia *et al.* 2007; Drake *et al.* 2011).

Because biomass production and GPP data have become increasingly available in recent years, we revisited the global variation in ecosystem-scale carbon partitioning patterns using a global forest database (Luyssaert *et al.* 2007). For the current study, we selected only those forests that provided estimates of above- and belowground biomass production and GPP that were independent from each other (i.e., biomass production estimates via biometry and GPP via eddy covariance or in a few cases using a model). Whenever necessary, biomass production estimates of the resulting 49 forests were complemented with estimates of missing biomass components. This procedure did not affect our conclusions (see Appendix S1). Further detailed information regarding the dataset is provided in Appendix S1.

Last, to make a clear distinction with the NPP-to-GPP ratio (which comprises not only plant biomass production, but also production of volatile organic compounds, root exudates and root symbionts), we here introduce the term Biomass Production Efficiency (BPE) when referring to the biomass production-to-GPP ratio. Biomass production contains all the biomass produced within a year irrespective of whether this biomass dies within the same or subsequent years.

### **Variables explaining variation in biomass production efficiency**

Previous studies focussed on climate, forest type and stand age to explain the observed differences in the biomass production-to GPP ratio among forests (DeLucia *et al.* 2007; Goulden

*et al.* 2011). Nutrient availability and forest management (unmanaged versus management involving harvesting, thinning, etc.) significantly affect allocation patterns in forests (Shan *et al.* 2001; Litton *et al.* 2007; LeBauer & Treseder 2008). Plants exposed to ample nutrients invest relatively less carbon in roots, while plants growing under low nutrient availability use relatively more carbon for root growth at the expense of aboveground growth (Chapin 1980). Forest management also has been found to decrease root-to-shoot ratios (Shan *et al.* 2001) and both nutrient availability and forest management are thus potentially important factors influencing BPE. So far, however, they have not been assessed.

While information on climate, forest type, stand age and management practices is easily available, measured nutrient availability is not. Estimation of comparable nutrient availability is not a simple task and requires standardized measurements. Effective plant nutrient availability depends on multiple factors besides soil nutrient content (soil texture, pH, cation exchange capacity, moisture), such that it can differ substantially among sites with, for example, similar soil nitrogen contents but different soil texture. Furthermore, comparison of nutrient availability among ecosystems requires consideration of all plant nutrients, and not only nitrogen, as was demonstrated for a range of hardwood forests in northern United States and Canada (Vadeboncoeur 2010). Unfortunately, such a uniform estimation of nutrient availability in forests across the globe does not currently exist. In order to test whether BPE increased with increasing nutrient availability, we therefore assigned each of the 49 forests in our dataset to one of three categories: low-, medium-, or high-nutrient availability following the information available in literature (see Table S3 in Appedix S2).

Although this classification is not a simple task, information for forests of the low and high nutrient availability class was generally very clear. Forests of the low nutrient availability class were typically located on soils with extremely low nutrient content due to weathering, leaching, or low mineralization rates. In contrast, some of the forests assigned to the high nutrient availability class grew on former (fertilized) agricultural land, while others were located on soil types that are renowned as very fertile (see Appendix S2). Moreover, for 14 of the 17 forests of the high nutrient availability class, an explicit statement of the nutrient status was provided in publications (see Appendix S2). Last, a sensitivity analysis revealed that potential misclassification of sites with relatively little information would not influence our conclusions (Table S4).

As expected, differences in absolute biomass production between forests of similar nutrient status growing in different climate zones were large (Tables 1 and 3), but these differences were entirely attributable to differences in GPP, with BPE changing little within nutrient classes (Table 1). In contrast, the large differences in biomass production among temperate-zone forests of different nutrient availability were not solely due to variation in GPP. Whereas GPP did not significantly differ between temperate forests of the low and high nutrient availability class (+31%,  $p=0.19$ ; Table 1), biomass production was 78% higher in temperate forests of the high nutrient availability class than in temperate forests with low nutrient availability ( $p=0.01$ ; Table 1). This disproportionate increase in biomass production relative to GPP was most pronounced in woody biomass, with three-fold higher aboveground wood production at high compared to low nutrient availability ( $p=0.02$ ; Table 2), while foliage and root biomass production remained largely unchanged (Table 2;  $p=0.49$  and  $p=0.83$ , respectively). As a consequence of the much larger nutrient effect on biomass production compared to GPP, BPE was  $35\pm 9\%$  (mean $\pm$ SE)



higher for temperate forests of high nutrient availability than in temperate forests of low nutrient availability ( $p=0.03$ ; Table 1).

In order to test whether nutrient availability was indeed the key factor explaining variation in BPE, we performed a stepwise regression analysis including climate zone (boreal, temperate and tropical), forest type (coniferous, broadleaved and mixed), stand age, nutrient availability and forest management (i.e., unmanaged or managed). For more information regarding stepwise regression analysis, see Cohen (1991), Derr & Everitt (2002) and Appendix S4. In contrast to results reported in other analyses (DeLucia *et al.* 2007; Goulden *et al.* 2011), analysis of our data set indicated that neither climate zone, nor forest type or stand age significantly affected BPE, whereas nutrient availability affected BPE highly significantly ( $p<0.01$ ). Independently of climate or forest type, forests with high nutrient availability allocated on average  $58\pm3\%$  (mean $\pm$ SE of 17 forests) of their photosynthates to biomass production, whereas forests with low nutrient availability used on average only  $42\pm2\%$  (mean $\pm$ SE of 19 forests) of their photosynthates for biomass production (i.e., slopes of lines in Fig. 1;  $p<0.01$  for low versus high nutrient availability). This result of nutrient availability being the primary determinant of BPE was confirmed also by other statistical tests (see Appendix S4), irrespective of whether or not we accounted for measurement uncertainties.

Figure 2A further suggests that previously reported differences in BPE among boreal, temperate and tropical forests (DeLucia *et al.* 2007) were introduced by the uneven distribution of forests with high nutrient availability (with higher BPE) across the globe, being heavily biased towards the temperate zone. Likewise, the previously reported difference between coniferous and broadleaved forests (DeLucia *et al.* 2007) was not apparent when taking nutrient availability into

account, probably because nutrient-rich soils were occupied more by broadleaved than by coniferous forests (Fig. 2C).

In addition to nutrient availability, which was by far the dominant determinant of variation in BPE, management also affected BPE significantly according to the stepwise regression analysis ( $p=0.02$ ). Managed forests exhibited higher BPE than unmanaged forests for both low and high nutrient availability classes (Fig. 2B), but quantification of this effect remains premature because of the uneven distribution of unmanaged and managed forests among nutrient classes (Fig. 2B). Nonetheless, the distinction between unmanaged and managed forests appeared an important factor in the relationship between stand age and BPE, because the tendency for a negative age effect on BPE as observed in Figure 2D only became significant ( $p=0.04$ ) if management regime was not included in the stepwise regression analysis.

### **Underlying mechanisms**

The significantly higher BPE in forests with high nutrient availability as compared to forests of the medium or low nutrient availability class implies that either a smaller fraction of GPP is being respired in the forests with high nutrient availability, or a smaller fraction of GPP is partitioned to unaccounted NPP components (VOC emissions, root symbionts, root exudation), or a combination of both. Because estimates of carbon transfers to volatile organic compounds (VOC), and to root exudates and symbionts are not available for any of the forests in our database, the only way to test why BPE differs between forests of different nutrient availability is by comparing estimates of the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio. Many pitfalls arise when measuring  $R_a$  at the ecosystem level (Ryan *et al.* 1997; Amthor & Baldocchi 2001), ecosystem  $R_a$  is therefore most

often estimated as the residual of GPP minus biomass production, rendering these  $R_a$  estimates useless to test whether or not variation in the ratio of  $R_a$  to GPP could explain variation in BPE.

Only 11 of our sites provided ecosystem  $R_a$  and GPP estimates that were independent from biomass production. These 11 forests revealed no effect of nutrient availability on the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio (see Fig. 3 in BOX 1), suggesting that variation in the ratio of  $R_a$  to GPP does not explain the higher BPE in nutrient-rich forests. Obviously, the limited data availability constrains the robustness of this analysis. Nonetheless, in addition to this lack of empirical evidence for a difference in the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio among nutrient availability classes, it appears unlikely that nutrient-rich forests that grow faster (which would lead to more growth respiration) and that likely exhibit higher protein levels (which would lead to higher maintenance respiration) would exhibit considerably lower  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratios than nutrient-poor forests (see BOX 1 for a more thorough elaboration of the underlying rationale). We therefore hypothesize that the unmeasured NPP components explain the difference in BPE among nutrient availability classes. Particularly root symbionts are a plausible candidate (BOX 2).

Finally, managed forests exhibited higher BPE than unmanaged forests for both the high and low nutrient availability class. Management via thinning sometimes implies removal of biomass expected to grow sub-optimally, such as suppressed trees with large autotrophic respiration relative to GPP. Such removals may decrease the relative amount of maintenance respiration and consequently also the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio. The higher BPE in managed than in unmanaged forests may thus reflect this reduced  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio. In addition, managed forests may exhibit higher BPE than unmanaged forests because frequent anthropogenic disturbances tend to (further) increase nutrient availability.

231  
232 Our analysis of 49 forest sites where biomass production and GPP were independently measured  
233 revealed that nutrient availability may be the unifying mechanism controlling the ratio of biomass  
234 production-to-GPP that encompasses climate, forest type, and stand age as influencing factors.  
235 The carbon sink potential of forests largely depends on how carbon taken up during  
236 photosynthesis is partitioned. Photosynthates partitioned to  $R_a$  do not contribute to carbon  
237 sequestration but those converted into long-lived biomass do contribute. The observed pattern of  
238 higher carbon partitioning to plant biomass with increasing nutrient availability thus adds to our  
239 understanding of the processes governing long-term carbon sequestration in forests and may have  
240 far-reaching consequences for carbon cycle management. Further research is needed to verify  
241 how the higher BPE in forests with high nutrient availability, together with the previously  
242 reported decrease of soil organic matter decomposition in response to fertilization (Janssens *et al.*  
243 2010) determines ecosystem carbon sequestration.

244  
245 It remains unresolved whether the increased partitioning to biomass production relative to GPP  
246 associated with higher nutrient availability is related to a lower  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio or to a small  
247 fraction of NPP going to typically unaccounted for components such as VOC production, root  
248 symbionts, and root exudates in forests of high versus low nutrient availability. The present study  
249 points in the direction of the latter (see also BOX 2). Future (large-scale) experiments in which  
250 nutrient availability is manipulated and where all measurements needed to unravel carbon  
251 partitioning are made (i.e., independent estimates for all NPP components, GPP and  $R_a$ ) would  
252 help resolve these questions.

253

254

## Acknowledgements

We thank all site investigators, their funding agencies, the various regional flux networks (Afriflux, AmeriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, CarboEurope-IP, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux, TCOS-Siberia, USCCC), development of measurement and data submission protocols (funded by Office of Science (BER), U.S. Dept of Energy), and the Fluxnet project, whose work and support is essential for obtaining the measurements without which the type of integrated analyses conducted in this study would not be possible. The authors acknowledge Arie Weeren for statistical help and the FP7 GHG Europe project for financial support. SV is a post-doctoral research associate of the Fund for Scientific Research - Flanders, SL is funded by ERC Starting Grant 242564 and JP by grants Consolider Ingenio Montes CSD2008-00040 and CGL2010-17172.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Appendix S1:** Detailed information about the data used

**Appendix S2:** Nutrient classification

**Appendix S3:** Additional discussion regarding uncertainties on fine root production estimates

**Appendix S4:** Detailed information about statistical analyses

As a service to our authors and readers, this journal provides supporting information supplied by the authors. Such materials are peer-reviewed and may be re-organized for online delivery, but are not copy-edited or typeset. Technical support issues arising from supporting information (other than missing files) should be addressed to the authors.

## References

- Amthor, J.S. (2000). The McCree-de Wit-Penning de Vries-Thornley respiration paradigms: 30 years later. *Ann. Bot.*, 86, 1-20.
- Amthor, J.S. & Baldocchi, D.D. (2001). Terrestrial higher plant respiration and net primary production. In: *Terrestrial Global Productivity* (eds. Roy J, Saugier B & Mooney HA). Academic Press San Diego, pp. 33-59.
- Atkin, O.K., Scheurwater, I. & Pons, T.L. (2007). Respiration as a percentage of daily photosynthesis in whole plants is homeostatic at moderate, but not high, growth temperatures. *New Phytol.*, 174, 367-380.
- Burton, A.J., Pregitzer, K.S., Ruess, R.W., Hendrik, R.L. & Allen, M.F. (2002). Root respiration in North American forests: effects of nitrogen concentration and temperature across biomes. *Oecologia*, 131, 559-568.
- Campbell, C., Atkinson, L., Zaragoza-Castells, J., Lundmark, M., Atkin, O. & Hurry, V. (2007). Acclimation of photosynthesis and respiration is asynchronous in response to changes in temperature regardless of plant functional group. *New Phytol.*, 176, 375-389.
- Chapin, F.S. (1980). The mineral nutrition of wild plants. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 11, 233-260.
- Courty, P.E., Buée, M., Diedhiou, A.G., Frey-Klett, P., Le Tacon, F., Rineau, F., *et al.* (2010). The role of ectomycorrhizal communities in forest ecosystem processes: New perspectives and emerging concepts. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 42, 679-698.
- DeLucia, E.H., Drake, J.E., Thomas, R.B. & Gonzalez-Meler, M. (2007). Forest carbon use efficiency: is respiration a constant fraction of gross primary production? *Global Change Biol.*, 13, 1157-1167.

303 Dewar, R.C., Medlyn, B.E. & McMurtrie, R.E. (1998). A mechanistic analysis of light and  
 304 carbon use efficiencies. *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 573-588.

305 Drake, J.E., Davis, S.C., Raetz, L.M. & DeLucia, E.H. (2011). Mechanisms of age-related  
 306 changes in forest production: the influence of physiological and successional changes. *Global*  
 307 *Change Biol.*, 17, 1522-1535.

308 Enquist, B.J., Kerkhoff, A.J., Huxman, T.E. & Economo, E.P. (2007). Adaptive differences in  
 309 plant physiology and ecosystem paradoxes: insights from metabolic scaling theory. *Global*  
 310 *Change Biol.*, 13, 591-609.

311 Gifford, R.M. (1994). The global carbon cycle: a viewpoint on the missing sink. *Austr. J. Plant*  
 312 *Physiol.*, 21, 1-15.

313 Gifford, R.M. (1995). Whole plant respiration and photosynthesis of wheat under increased CO<sub>2</sub>  
 314 concentration and temperature: long-term vs. short-term distinctions for modelling. *Global*  
 315 *Change Biol.*, 1, 385-396.

316 Goulden, M.L., McMillan, A.M.S., Winston, G.C., Rocha, A.V., Manies, K.L., Harden, J.W., *et*  
 317 *al.* (2011). Patterns of NPP, GPP, respiration, and NEP during boreal forest succession. *Global*  
 318 *Change Biol.*, 17, 855-871.

319 Heinemeyer, A., Wilkinson, M., Vargas, R., Subke, J.A., Casella, E., Morison, J.I.L., *et al.*  
 320 (2012). Exploring the "overflow tap" theory: linking forest soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes and individual  
 321 mycorrhizosphere components to photosynthesis. *Biogeosci.*, 9, 79-95.

322 Hobbie, E.A. (2006). Carbon allocation to ectomycorrhizal fungi correlates with belowground  
 323 allocation in culture studies. *Ecology*, 87, 563-569.

324 Hoefnagel, M.H.N., Atkin, O.K. & Wiskich, J.T. (1998). Interdependence between chloroplasts  
 325 and mitochondria in the light and the dark. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1366, 235-255.

326 Högberg, M.N., Baath, E., Nordgren, A., Arnebrant, K. & Högberg, P. (2003). Contrasting  
 327 effects of nitrogen availability on plant carbon supply to mycorrhizal fungi and saprotrophs - a  
 328 hypothesis based on field observations in boreal forest. *New Phytol.*, 160, 225-238.  
 329 Högberg, M.N., Briones, M.J.I., Keel, S.G., Metcalfe, D.B., Campbell, C., Midwood, A.J., *et al.*  
 330 (2010). Quantification of effects of season and nitrogen supply on tree below-ground carbon  
 331 transfer to ectomycorrhizal fungi and other soil organisms in a boreal pine forest. *New Phytol.*,  
 332 187, 485-493.  
 333 Janssens, I.A., Dieleman, W., Luyssaert, S., Subke, J.A., Reichstein, M., Ceulemans, R., *et al.*  
 334 (2010). Reduction of forest soil respiration in response to nitrogen deposition. *Nature Geosci.*, 3,  
 335 315-322.  
 336 Krömer, S. (1995). Respiration during photosynthesis. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol.*  
 337 *Biol.*, 46, 45-70.  
 338 LeBauer, D.S. & Treseder, K.K. (2008). Nitrogen limitation of net primary productivity in  
 339 terrestrial ecosystems is globally distributed. *Ecology*, 89, 371-379.  
 340 Lilleskov, E.A., Fahey, T.J., Horton, T.R. & Lovett, G.M. (2002). Belowground ectomycorrhizal  
 341 fungal community change over a nitrogen deposition gradient in Alaska. *Ecology*, 83, 104-115.  
 342 Litton, C.M., Raich, J.W. & Ryan, M.G. (2007). Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Global*  
 343 *Change Biol.*, 13, 2089-2109.  
 344 Loveys, B.R., Atkinson, L.J., Sherlock, D.J., Roberts, R.L., Fitter, A.H. & Atkin, O.K. (2003).  
 345 Thermal acclimation of leaf and root respiration: an investigation comparing inherently fast- and  
 346 slow-growing plant species. *Global Change Biol.*, 9, 895-910.  
 347 Luyssaert, S., Inglis, I., Jung, M., Richardson, A.D., Reichstein, M., Papale, D., *et al.* (2007).  
 348 CO<sub>2</sub> balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical forests derived from a global database. *Global*  
 349 *Change Biol.*, 13, 2509-2537.



350 Piao, S., Luyssaert, S., Ciais, P., Janssens, I.A., Chen, A., Cao, C., *et al.* (2010). Forest annual  
 351 carbon cost: a global-scale analysis of autotrophic respiration. *Ecology*, 91, 652-661.  
 352 Read, D.J. & Perez-Moreno, J. (2003). Mycorrhizas and nutrient cycling in ecosystems - a  
 353 journey towards relevance? *New Phytol.*, 157, 475-492.  
 354 Reich, P.B., Walters, M.B., Ellsworth, D.S., Vose, J.M., Volin, J.C., Gresham, C., *et al.* (1998).  
 355 Relationships of leaf dark respiration to leaf nitrogen, specific leaf area and leaf life-span: a test  
 356 across biomes and functional groups. *Oecologia*, 114, 471-482.  
 357 Ryan, M.G., Lavigne, M.B. & Gower, S.T. (1997). Annual carbon cost of autotrophic respiration  
 358 in boreal forest ecosystems in relation to species and climate. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 28871-  
 359 28883.  
 360 Schulze, E.D. (2000). The carbon and nitrogen cycle in forest ecosystems. In: *Carbon and*  
 361 *Nitrogen Cycling in European Forest Ecosystems* (ed. Schulze ED). Springer, Berlin, p. 500.  
 362 Shan, J.P., Morris, L.A. & Hendrick, R.L. (2001). The effects of management on soil and plant  
 363 carbon sequestration in slash pine plantations. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 38, 932-941.  
 364 Treseder, K.K. (2004). A meta-analysis of mycorrhizal responses to nitrogen, phosphorus, and  
 365 atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in field studies. *New Phytol.*, 164, 347-355.  
 366 Turnbull, M.H., Tissue, D.T., Griffin, K.L., Richardson, S.J., Peltzer, D.A. & Whitehead, D.  
 367 (2005). Respiration characteristics in temperate rainforest tree species differ along a long-term  
 368 soil-development chronosequence. *Oecologia*, 143, 271-279.  
 369 Vadeboncoeur, M.A. (2010). Meta-analysis of fertilization experiments indicates multiple  
 370 limiting nutrients in northeastern deciduous forests. *Can. J. For. Res.*, 40, 1766-1780.  
 371 van der Heijden, M.G.A., Bardgett, R.D. & van Straalen, N.M. (2008). The unseen majority: soil  
 372 microbes as drivers of plant diversity and productivity in terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.*, 11,  
 373 296-310.

374 Van Oijen, M., Schapendonk, A. & Hoglind, M. (2010). On the relative magnitudes of  
375 photosynthesis, respiration, growth and carbon storage in vegetation. *Ann. Bot.*, 105, 793-797.  
376 Wallenda, T. & Kottke, I. (1998). Nitrogen deposition and ectomycorrhizas. *New Phytol.*, 139,  
377 169-187.  
378 Waring, R.H., Landsberg, J.J. & Williams, M. (1998). Net primary production of forests: a  
379 constant fraction of gross primary production? *Tree Physiol.*, 18, 129-134.  
380

## **BOX 1: Autotrophic respiration-to-GPP ratio**

The biomass production-to-photosynthesis ratio is typically used as a proxy for the ratio of net primary production (NPP) to photosynthesis (GPP), termed carbon use efficiency (CUE) (e.g. DeLucia *et al.* 2007). Alternatively, CUE can be determined using autotrophic respiration ( $R_a$ ) instead of biomass production, i.e.,  $CUE = 1 - (R_a : GPP)$ . Estimates of  $R_a$  (not derived from biomass production measurements) are usually obtained by upscaling respiration measured on parts of the vegetation (foliage, stem, branch) or by subtracting heterotrophic respiration from eddy covariance-based estimates of ecosystem respiration (see e.g. Piao *et al.* (2010)). Estimates of  $R_a$  (independent of biomass production) are less abundant than biomass production estimates, which is the primary reason why we focus on the biomass production-to-GPP ratio and not on the ratio of  $R_a$  to GPP. Nonetheless, we show the results of the 11 forests in our dataset that provided estimates of  $R_a$  that were independent of GPP and biomass production (Fig. 3). The  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio did not significantly differ among nutrient availability classes ( $p=0.34$  for ANOVA with nutrient availability as fixed factor), but with only two nutrient-rich forests, it is premature to draw meaningful conclusions.


Literature on respiration measurements at organ level (root, woody tissue, foliage) also provides no definite answer because both increases and decreases in the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio with increasing nutrient availability appear possible. Autotrophic respiration ( $R_a$ ) is typically positively related to tissue nitrogen concentrations (Chapin 1980). Because photosynthesis also increases with increasing nitrogen concentration, the  $R_a$ -to-GPP ratio of leaves appears relatively constant across species, climates and ecosystem types (Reich *et al.* 1998; Loveys *et al.* 2003; Turnbull *et al.* 2005; Atkin *et al.* 2007; Campbell *et al.* 2007), although under extreme conditions this ratio

may increase (Atkin *et al.* 2007; Campbell *et al.* 2007) and potentially indicates an increase of ‘wastage’ respiration needed to discard excess energy and prevent cell damage (Amthor 2000). In one study, the leaf respiration-to-photosynthesis ratio was higher in two forests suffering severe nutrient limitations as compared to neighbouring less nutrient-stressed forests (Turnbull *et al.* 2005).

On the other hand, in forests with high nutrient availability, a larger fraction of photosynthates typically is invested in wood compared to the fraction invested in wood in forests with low nutrient availability (Litton *et al.* 2007). This was also the case for the forests in our dataset (Table 1 and 2). Higher wood relative to foliage production may thus increase the Ra-to-GPP ratio in forests of high nutrient availability compared to forests of low nutrient availability. Further, several studies show a positive relation between root respiration per unit mass and root nutrient concentrations (Chapin 1980; Burton *et al.* 2002), but this may be counterbalanced by a decrease in standing root biomass as indicated by the negative fertilization effect on root respiration found in a recent meta-analytical study (Janssens *et al.* 2010).

While the effects of nutrient availability on the ratio of Ra to GPP remain unclear, a decrease in the Ra-to-GPP ratio for forests with high nutrient availability relative to forests of low nutrient availability seems unlikely according to the theory that plants respire a relatively constant fraction of GPP (Dewar *et al.* 1998; Van Oijen *et al.* 2010) due to interdependencies of respiration and photosynthesis (Hoefnagel *et al.* 1998).

.



**Figure 3:** Field estimates of autotrophic respiration (Ra) versus gross primary production (GPP). Each single data point represents one forest site and is the average value over all years for which data were available in the database. White, gray and black circles indicate sites of low-, medium- and high-nutrient availability, respectively. The equation refers to the linear fit through the data. One nutrient-poor site with  $Ra:GPP > 1$  was removed. We found no statistically significant nutrient-availability effect on  $Ra:GPP$  ( $p=0.34$ ), but these results remain tentative due to the small number of data points

## BOX 2: Testing where the missing carbon is going

In this study, we identified a gap in the current knowledge of forest carbon allocation: forests with high nutrient availability use  $16 \pm 4\%$  more of their photosynthates for biomass production than forests with low nutrient availability ( $16 \pm 4\%$  represents the difference between mean of 17 forests of high nutrient availability and mean of 19 forests of low nutrient availability; SE calculated as  $SE_{\text{difference}} = \sqrt{SE_1^2 + SE_2^2}$ , with  $SE_1$  and  $SE_2$  the SE for low- and high nutrient availability, respectively). This difference is, however, unlikely attributable to a difference in carbon partitioning to autotrophic respiration. It therefore appears likely that forests of low nutrient availability invest more photosynthates in non-biomass components of net primary production (NPP), which usually are not quantified in experiments or reported in the literature and therefore could not be taken into account in our analysis. These unaccounted for NPP components include volatile organic compounds, root exudates, and root symbionts. We hypothesize that carbon allocation to root symbionts in particular is a key factor explaining the higher biomass production efficiency in nutrient-rich relative to nutrient-poor forests. First support for this hypothesis is given in literature:

Symbiotic fungi are essential for the growth and health of forest trees (Courty *et al.* 2010), as they transport nutrients from soil to tree (van der Heijden *et al.* 2008; Courty *et al.* 2010). Up to 80% of plant nitrogen and 75% of plant phosphorus can be fungal-derived in forests (van der Heijden *et al.* 2008). In return for these nutrients, considerable amounts of carbon are transferred from tree to fungus (van der Heijden *et al.* 2008; Courty *et al.* 2010). Recent reviews (Hobbie 2006; Courty *et al.* 2010), mostly based on controlled short-term studies, state that the overall carbon flux to mycorrhizal fungi can constitute up to 30% of NPP (but observational estimates

remain scarce and highly variable; see Hobbie 2006 and Courty *et al.* 2010). Nonetheless, one long-term field study in a nutrient-rich, temperate oak forest (Heinemeyer *et al.* 2012) where the mycorrhizal soil carbon flux contribution was estimated at about 20% of NPP, confirms this order of magnitude.

It has been shown repeatedly that carbon transfer to fungal symbionts are strongly inversely related to nutrient availability (Wallenda & Kottke 1998; Lilleskov *et al.* 2002; Högberg *et al.* 2003; Read & Perez-Moreno 2003; Treseder 2004; Högberg *et al.* 2010), opening the door for a substantial effect on the biomass production efficiency (BPE). According to a meta-analytical review, mycorrhizal abundance declines substantially in response to nitrogen and phosphorus fertilization (15% and 32%, respectively) (Treseder 2004). Similar responses were observed along natural gradients in nutrient availability. Both biodiversity and proteolytic capabilities of ectomycorrhizal fungi declined along a gradient of increasing mineral nitrogen availability through Europe (Schulze 2000), phospholipid fatty acid attributed to mycorrhizal fungi dramatically decreased along a natural soil nitrogen gradient in a boreal forest (Högberg *et al.* 2003), and both taxonomic richness and sporocarp abundance decreased over an anthropogenic nitrogen deposition gradient in Alaska (Lilleskov *et al.* 2002).

Following this well-reported and strong relation between root symbionts and nutrient availability, we hypothesize that forests with high nutrient availability produce more biomass per unit photosynthesis than forests with low nutrient availability because the latter need to invest relatively more photosynthates in root symbionts.

## Tables

**Table 1:** Mean and standard deviation (in brackets) for gross primary production (GPP), total biomass production (BP) and the biomass production-to-GPP ratio (BPE) in boreal, temperate and tropical forests of different nutrient availability (low, medium and high). For statistics, see Table 3. The number of forests per group is indicated in Figure 2A.

Climate zone, nutrient availability	GPP (g C m <sup>-2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	BP (g C m <sup>-2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	BPE
Boreal, low	911 (184)	355 (124)	0.39 (0.10)
Temperate, low	1320 (718)	565 (264)	0.43 (0.05)
Tropical, low	2985 (591)	1233 (315)	0.41 (0.11)
Boreal, medium	803 (204)	390 (112)	0.49 (0.10)
Temperate, medium	1328 (372)	659 (208)	0.50 (0.11)
Temperate, high	1724 (408)	1008 (354)	0.58 (0.13)



**Table 2:** Mean and standard deviation (in brackets) for the ratio of belowground to aboveground biomass production (BBP:ABP), aboveground wood production (AWP), foliage production (FP), root production (RP) and the ratio of aboveground wood production to gross primary production (AWP:GPP) in boreal, temperate and tropical forests of different nutrient availability (low, medium and high). For statistics, see Table 3. The number of forests per group are indicated in superscript.


Climate zone, nutrient availability	BBP:ABP	AWP (g C m <sup>-2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	FP (g C m <sup>-2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	RP (g C m <sup>-2</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	AWP:GPP
Boreal, low	0.65 (0.29) <sup>5</sup>	100 (46) <sup>5</sup>	61 (24) <sup>5</sup>	125 (65) <sup>5</sup>	0.11 (0.02) <sup>5</sup>
Temperate, low	0.66 (0.31) <sup>6</sup>	166 (80) <sup>6</sup>	153 (98) <sup>6</sup>	205 (97) <sup>6</sup>	0.13 (0.03) <sup>6</sup>
Tropical, low	0.28 (0.09) <sup>5</sup>	348 (85) <sup>5</sup>	404 (151) <sup>5</sup>	282 (47) <sup>5</sup>	0.11 (0.03) <sup>5</sup>
Boreal, medium	0.45 (0.27) <sup>5</sup>	116 (32) <sup>5</sup>	72 (36) <sup>5</sup>	117 (68) <sup>5</sup>	0.15 (0.03) <sup>5</sup>
Temperate, medium	0.88 (0.90) <sup>7</sup>	212 (129) <sup>6</sup>	149 (97) <sup>7</sup>	238 (122) <sup>7</sup>	0.14 (0.07) <sup>6</sup>
Temperate, high	0.33 (0.17) <sup>17</sup>	493 (335) <sup>16</sup>	184 (50) <sup>16</sup>	218 (88) <sup>17</sup>	0.27 (0.14) <sup>16</sup>

**Table 3:** Statistical analysis for gross primary production (GPP), biomass production (BP), the biomass production-to-GPP ratio (BPE), the ratio of belowground to aboveground biomass production (BBP:ABP), aboveground wood production (AWP), foliage production (FP), root production (RP), and the wood production-to-GPP ratio (AWP:GPP). The column ‘stepwise fit’ indicates the predictor variable(s) (climate zone (C), forest type (F), management (M), stand age (A), nutrient availability (N)) selected by the stepwise regression at  $p < 0.05$ . ANOVA(1) shows results of ANOVA with the variables selected by the stepwise regression as fixed factors (or as covariable in case of stand age). ANOVA(2) gives results of a two-way ANOVA with climate zone and nutrient availability as fixed variables and thus corresponds to data shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Variable	Stepwise fit	ANOVA(1)	ANOVA(2)
GPP	C, N	Boreal<Temperate<Tropical ( $p < 0.01$ ) Nutrients: low=medium<high ( $p = 0.05$ )	C: $p < 0.01$ ; N: $p = 0.05$
BP	A, C, N	Boreal<Temperate<Tropical ( $p < 0.01$ ) Nutrients: low=medium<high ( $p < 0.01$ ) negative age effect ( $p = 0.01$ )	C: $p < 0.01$ ; N: $p < 0.01$
BPE	N, M	low=medium<high ( $p < 0.01$ ) Unmanaged<Managed ( $p = 0.07$ )	C: $p = 0.69$ ; N: $p < 0.01$
BBP:ABP	N	Nutrients: low=medium>high ( $p = 0.07$ )	C: $p = 0.69$ ; N: $p < 0.01$
AWP	C, N	Boreal=Temperate<Tropical ( $p < 0.01$ ) Nutrients: low=medium<high ( $p < 0.01$ )	C: $p < 0.01$ ; N: $p < 0.01$
FP	C, F	Boreal<Temperate<Tropical ( $p < 0.01$ ) Needle-leaved<broadleaved ( $p < 0.01$ )	C: $p < 0.01$ ; N: $p = 0.13$
RP	C	Boreal<Temperate=Tropical ( $p < 0.01$ )	C: $p < 0.01$ ; N: $p = 0.92$
AWP:GPP	N	Nutrients: low=medium<high ( $p < 0.01$ )	C: $p = 0.94$ ; N: $p = 0.01$

## Figures

**Figure 1:** Each circle represents the mean annual total biomass production $\pm$ SE versus mean annual gross primary production (GPP $\pm$ SE) for one forest. Colours indicate nutrient availability classes, error bars reflect uncertainties (see Appendix S1). Dotted, dashed and solid lines are linear fits ( $y=ax$ ) for the low-, medium- and high nutrient availability class, respectively ( $R^2=0.84$ ,  $R^2=0.66$ ,  $R^2=0.56$ , respectively;  $p<0.01$  for low- versus high nutrient availability (GLM analysis)). The squares on the right represent the mean biomass production efficiency (BPE: biomass production-to-GPP ratio). Error bars on these squares are standard errors on the means, reflecting measurement uncertainties and inter-annual variability in case of multi-year data. Letters next to the squares indicate significant differences at  $p<0.05$  (Tukey post-hoc test; ANOVA with nutrient availability as fixed factor).



**Figure 2:** Mean biomass production efficiency (BPE) versus nutrient availability class for (A) different climate zones, (B) management practices, (C) forest types and (D) BPE versus stand age for the three nutrient availability classes. Error bars represent the standard error on the mean and numbers indicate the number of forests per group. Stepwise regression analysis revealed a significant effect of nutrient availability ( $p < 0.01$ ) and forest management ( $p = 0.02$ ). Climate zone, forest type and stand age were not statistically significant ( $p > 0.1$ ). Note that for six forests no estimate for stand age was available and these sites were thus omitted from this analysis. Removing stand age from the regression model, which allows inclusion of these six sites, did not alter the outcome (data not shown).

