

1 **Nutrient availability and climate as the main determinants of the ratio**
2 **of biomass to NPP in woody and non-woody forest compartments**

3
4 **Authors:** Marcos Fernández-Martínez ^{*ab}, Sara Vicca ^c, Ivan A. Janssens ^c, Matteo
5 Campioli ^c, Josep Peñuelas ^{ab}.

6
7 **Addresses:**

8 ^a CSIC, Global Ecology Unit, CREAF-CSIC-UAB, Cerdanyola del Vallés 08193, Catalonia,
9 Spain

10 ^b CREAF, Cerdanyola del Vallès 08193, Catalonia, Spain.

11 ^c Centre of Excellence PLECO (Plant and Vegetation Ecology), Department of Biology,
12 University of Antwerp, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium.

13
14 ***Corresponding author:**

15 Marcos Fernández-Martínez

16 Tel: +34 935 814 851

17 E-mail address: m.fernandez@creaf.uab.cat

18
19 **Conflict of interests:**

20 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

21

This is the accepted version of: Fernández-Martínez, M. et al. "Nutrient availability and climate as the main determinants of the ratio of biomass to NPP in woody and non-woody forest compartments" in Trees, structure and function (Springer), 2015. The final versión is available at DOI 10.1007/s00468-015-1319-8

22 **Abstract**

23 Forest ecosystems accumulate large amounts of carbon in living tissues. The residence time of
24 this carbon in the ecosystem depends largely on the turnover time of these tissues, which can be
25 estimated as a surrogate of the ratio of biomass to net primary production (B:NPP). We used a
26 global forest database of 310 sites containing data for biomass stocks and NPP to investigate the
27 differences of B:NPPs among species and forest compartments and to determine B:NPPs main
28 exogenous (mainly climate and nutrient availability) and endogenous (leaf habit and stand age)
29 drivers. We used asymptotic exponential functions to adjust the B:NPPs of woody compartments
30 to a theoretical stationary state to allow comparisons between forests of different ages. The
31 B:NPPs of woody tissues (branches, stems, and coarse roots) were positively influenced by
32 stand age, conversely to fine roots and leaves, which were weakly dependent on the age of the
33 forest. The B:NPPs of woody tissues were positively correlated with nutrient availability, whereas
34 fine-root B:NPPs decreased with increasing nutrient availability. The foliar B:NPP of evergreen
35 forests was positively correlated with water deficit, and the fine-root B:NPP was correlated
36 positively with the seasonality of precipitation and with annual thermal amplitude but negatively
37 with water deficit. Our results support the influence of climate on the B:NPPs of non-woody
38 compartments and identify nutrient availability as the main influence on the B:NPPs of woody
39 tissues.

40

41 **Keywords:** turnover, residence time, nutrient availability, climate, stationary state, carbon
42 sequestration

43 **1. Introduction**

44 Forest ecosystems accumulate and sequester large amounts of carbon, both as living tissues
45 and as soil organic matter (Dixon et al. 1994; Myneni et al. 2001; Pan et al. 2011). The expected
46 duration of a carbon atom in an ecosystem, however, strongly depends on the compartment of
47 the forest to which the atom was allocated (e.g. foliage, stems, roots; Luo et al. 2003; Zhang et al.
48 2010). To evaluate this duration, ecologists often use the term “turnover time” as the inverse of
49 “turnover rate” as defined by Margalef (1974). The study of turnover times of compartments is of
50 paramount importance not only to determine the duration of carbon sequestration in the living
51 biomass of an ecosystem, and therefore to properly assess carbon sequestration, but also to
52 provide a better understanding of carbon and nutrient cycling in forests.

53 The turnover time of carbon, also termed mean residence time, indicates the average time that a
54 carbon atom remains in its initial ecosystem compartment under the assumption of stationarity:
55 the condition for which input (biomass production) equal output (necromass production) (i.e.
56 biomass does not accumulate in the system). This assumption, however, is rarely realised
57 (except for foliage and fine roots), so the study of turnover times has usually been based on
58 modelling (Dewar 1991; Kicklighter et al. 1999; Barrett 2002; Luo et al. 2003; Karlberg et al. 2006;
59 Zhang et al. 2010) rather than on empirical data. In this sense, the ratio of biomass to net primary
60 production (B:NPP) may serve as a useful surrogate of the turnover times under determined
61 conditions (stationarity or pseudo-stationarity).

62 Extensive research has focused on the B:NPPs of foliage (Reich et al. 1992; Aerts 1995; Wright
63 and Westoby 2003) and fine roots (Dahlman and Kucera 1965; Nadelhoffer 2000; Gill and
64 Jackson 2000; Majdi et al. 2005), but very few studies have analysed other living compartments
65 such as branches, stems, or coarse roots, and, to the best of our knowledge, no single study has
66 yet synthesised the turnover times of all compartments in concert.

67 The factors controlling the variability of B:NPPs of different compartments in forests under various
68 environmental conditions (e.g. climate and nutrient availability) and endogenous characteristics

69 (e.g. stand age and leaf habit) remain undetermined. Detecting the potential controls of B:NPPs
70 of different compartments may help to predict the fate of carbon in different types of forests.

71 Endogenous factors such as stand age and leaf habit or type, combined with exogenous factors
72 such as climate, nutrient availability, or management, can influence B:NPPs in different ways in
73 different forest compartments. Nutrient-rich forests tend to have lower B:NPPs than nutrient-poor
74 forests (Jordan and Herrera 1981) because of a higher biomass production, but this relationship
75 has only been tested for foliage and fine roots (Reich et al. 1992; Aerts 1995; Ryser 1996).
76 Nutrient-rich forests typically allocate a larger proportion of their photosynthates to aboveground
77 biomass compared to nutrient-poor forests (Litton et al. 2007; LeBauer and Treseder 2008; Vicca
78 et al. 2012; Fernández-Martínez et al. 2014a), and the ultimate effect of nutrient availability on
79 carbon sequestration in ecosystems thus depends on the concerted response of the turnover
80 times of the various plant organs and on the allocation strategy. Changes in carbon allocation
81 may also lead to differences in carbon stocks in aboveground versus belowground compartments,
82 depending on nutrient availability, and therefore to contrasting relationships between B:NPP and
83 nutrient richness for aboveground versus belowground compartments. If these mechanisms were
84 real, we would expect the relationship between B:NPP and higher nutrient availability to be
85 positive in aboveground compartments and negative in belowground compartments.

86 The aim of this study was to calculate the B:NPPs of five compartments (foliage, branches, stems,
87 coarse roots, and fine roots) of forest ecosystems around the world and to explore the
88 endogenous (stand age and leaf habit and type) and exogenous (climate and management)
89 factors that control them. We also particularly investigated the role of nutrient availability as a
90 likely control of B:NPP.

91 **2. Materials and Methods**

92 *2.1. Data collection*

93 *2.1.1 Global forest database*

94 We updated and analysed a global forest database (Luyssaert et al. 2007) containing data from
95 1990 to 2012 for NPP and stand biomass for five forest compartments (foliage, branches, stems,
96 coarse roots, and fine roots [diameter ≤ 2 mm]) from 310 sites around the world comprising boreal,
97 temperate, Mediterranean, and tropical biomes, albeit the tropical and Mediterranean forests
98 were less well represented. Only 80 of the forests provided the necessary data to calculate
99 B:NPP for at least one of the compartments. The database also included descriptive information
100 of the forests, such as stand age, leaf type (needleleaved, broadleaved, or mixed forest), leaf
101 habit (evergreen, deciduous, or mixed forest), type of management (managed or unmanaged
102 forests), and nutrient availability (see Fernández-Martínez et al., 2014; Vicca et al., 2012), which
103 we used to calculate a proxy of *nutrient richness* (see section 2.2.3).

104 2.1.2 Climatic data

105 We extracted climatic data for our forests from the WorldClim database (Hijmans et al. 2005).
106 This database provides suitable climatic data with a high spatial resolution (30 arc seconds, ca. 1
107 km at the equator) and contains robust mean monthly climatic data derived from a lengthy time
108 series (1950 to 2000), including monthly temperature and precipitation and several other climatic
109 variables such as annual thermal amplitude and seasonality of precipitation.

110 The time series for evapotranspiration (MOD16A2) from MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging
111 Spectroradiometer) were downloaded for the period between 1 January 2000 and 27 December
112 2009 to obtain climatic proxies of potential and actual evapotranspiration (PET and AET,
113 respectively). We downloaded the data with a resolution of 9 km² (3 × 3 km) around the central
114 coordinates.

115 2.2. Data analyses

116 2.2.1 B:NPPs

117 We calculated B:NPP similar to previous studies (Dahlman and Kucera 1965; Margalef 1974;
118 Malhi et al. 1999; Gill and Jackson 2000), dividing stand biomass by mean NPP for each

119 compartment. The availability of NPP and biomass data was uneven for the compartments, so we
120 calculated B:NPP for foliage, branches, stems, and coarse and fine roots from 71, 44, 44, 70, and
121 80 forests, respectively.

122 Stand biomass was strongly age-dependent in non-stationary compartments such as branches,
123 stems, and coarse roots (**Figure S1**) (in contrast to foliage and fine roots). Previous studies have
124 suggested a strong relationship between NPP and stand age (Carey et al. 2001 and references
125 therein), but our data showed no clear trend with stand age (**Figure S2**). Nonetheless, comparing
126 the biomasses or B:NPPs of forests of differing average stand ages (and thus biomasses) would
127 be nonsensical for woody compartments. We avoided this problem and compared forests of
128 different ages by adjusting the biomasses and B:NPPs of branches, stems, and coarse roots to
129 their theoretical stationary state (at approximately 200 years of age, assumed to be when the
130 percent annual increase in biomass and B:NPP from most compartments was $<0.5\%$). We thus
131 removed fast-growing species (e.g. *Acer* sp., *Alnus* sp., *Betula* sp., and *Populus* sp.) from the
132 analyses. We calculated the stationary B:NPP by first fitting our data to an asymptotic exponential
133 function, as conceptually suggested by Houghton (2009). We then extracted the residuals of all
134 cases and summed them to the predicted biomass or B:NPP of the function for 200 y (i.e. raw
135 residuals + fitted B:NPP at 200 y). These adjusted values were used for regression models (see
136 section 2.2.4) and to obtain means. The fitted value at 200 y only changed the means of the
137 biomasses and B:NPPs, so our choice of age did not influence the significance of our results.

138 2.2.2 Climatic predictors

139 We used mean annual temperature (MAT) and precipitation (MAP) from the WorldClim database
140 and calculated the length of the warm period (sum of months $>5^{\circ}\text{C}$) using mean monthly
141 temperatures. We also extracted two key climatic variables: annual thermal amplitude (mean
142 maximum minus mean minimum temperature for the year) and seasonality of precipitation
143 (measured as the coefficient of variation of precipitation among months).

144 We calculated the percentage water deficit from the MODIS evapotranspiration time series as
145 $WD = (1 - [AET/PET]) * 100$, (Fernández-Martínez et al. 2014b) as an indicator of the intensity of
146 water stress the forests must withstand. We thus used eight climatic predictor variables: MAT,
147 MAP, mean temperature and precipitation for the warm period, length of the warm period, annual
148 thermal amplitude, seasonality of precipitation, and WD.

149 2.2.3 Assessment of nutrient availability

150 The forest database contained information about the nutrient status of the forests for variables
151 such as soil type, texture, pH, nitrogen and phosphorous content, nitrogen mineralisation, C:N
152 ratio, and CEC; foliar nitrogen and phosphorous concentrations; nitrogen deposition; and the
153 history of the stand or explicit reports of the fertility of the forests (Vicca et al. 2012; Fernández-
154 Martínez et al. 2014a), but information for all variables was not available for each site. We coded
155 each variable into three levels of nutrient availability, high, medium, and low, following the
156 methodology and data reported by Fernández-Martínez et al. (2014a). We then transformed each
157 three-level factor into three dummy variables, each indicating high, medium, or low nutrient
158 availability. We next performed a factor analysis to reduce the number of dimensions of our data
159 set using only dummy variables indicating high and low nutrient availability. The first resulting
160 factor (F1: nutrient richness covariate) explained 16% of the variance of the data and was
161 correlated positively with nutrient-rich and negatively with nutrient-poor dummy variables.

162 2.2.4 Statistical analyses

163 We used stepwise forward regression models to correlate the B:NPPs (previously adjusted to the
164 stationary state of 200 y) with the climatic variables (see section 2.2.2), the nutrient richness
165 covariate (F1), management, and leaf type and habit. Predictor covariates were entered twice for
166 selection in the models, with and without transformation to natural logarithms, to identify possible
167 nonlinearities. The dependent variables usually required transformation to meet the assumptions
168 of normality and homoscedasticity of the residuals. We evaluated the contribution of each
169 predictor variable to B:NPP using the *PMVD* (Proportional Marginal Variance Decomposition,

(Grömping 2007)) metric of the R (R Core Team 2013) package *relaimpo* (Grömping 2006) as a measure of the variance explained by each predictor. We excluded variables with high collinearity from the models (variance inflation factor [VIF] >5). We also used the three levels of nutrient availability (high, medium, and low) used by Vicca et al. (2012) and Fernández-Martínez et al. (2014b) to compare means among groups. Differences among groups were tested using ANOVA tables and the Tukey HSD test for multiple comparisons.

3. Results

3.1. Adjusted B:NPPs across forest types

A strong correlation between woody (branches, stems, and coarse roots) biomass and forest age (**Figure S1**) produced a strong correlation between woody B:NPPs and stand age (**Figure 1**). The asymptotic exponential functions indicated that branches reached a stable B:NPP of 45 y when trees were about 150 years old (**Figure 1a**). Stationary B:NPPs for stems and coarse roots reached 115 and 104 y, respectively, at an age of approximately 200 y (**Figure 1b and c**). The fitted functions between B:NPP and stand age presented a pseudo- R^2 of 0.31, 0.81, and 0.73 in branches, stems, and coarse roots, respectively (**Figure 1**). B:NPP and stand age were not significantly correlated for fine roots or evergreen foliage (**Figure 2**).

Stationary B:NPP did not significantly differ among biomes or leaf habits in woody compartments (ANOVA, $P > 0.05$) but differed significantly between leaf types for foliage and fine roots (ANOVA, $P < 0.01$; **Table 1**). Biome-averaged differences among woody fractions (branches, stems, and coarse roots), however, were large. The B:NPPs at the 20 and 80 percentiles were 21-80 y for branches, 71-171 y for stems, and 63-176 y for coarse roots. Differences among woody compartments were statistically significant for some species (**Table 1**). For example, *Fagus sylvatica* had a longer B:NPP in the stem (122 ± 19) and coarse-root (83.9 ± 18) fractions than in the branch fraction (22 ± 3 , $P < 0.05$). This trend was also consistent for *Picea abies* and *Pseudotsuga menziesii* ($P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.01$, respectively). The B:NPPs of fine roots and

leaves ranged between 1 and 5 y, with lower B:NPPs in deciduous than evergreen forests for both fine roots and leaves ($P < 0.01$, Table 1).

3.2. Controls of the B:NPPs

Our results indicated that the various forest compartments were correlated with different endogenous and exogenous factors (**Table 2**). Age-adjusted B:NPP was controlled by nutrients in the compartments that accumulate biomass over long periods (branches, stems, and coarse roots). Nutrient richness explained 20, 35, 9, and 6% of the variance in the B:NPPs of branches, stems, and coarse and fine roots, respectively. Foliage B:NPP was not correlated with nutrient availability ($P > 0.05$, **Table 2**). Nutrient-rich forests had longer B:NPPs than nutrient-poor forests in woody compartments (Tukey's test, $P < 0.05$; **Table S2, Figure 3a, b, and c**). The response of the B:NPPs of woody fractions to nutrient availability, however, differed from the response of the fine-root fraction (**Table 2, Figure 4**), which behaved oppositely (**Table S2, Figure 3d**). Forests with higher nutrient availability had longer B:NPPs in woody tissues (branches, stems, and coarse roots, **Figure 4a**) in comparison to nutrient-poor forests ($P < 0.05$), but forests with nutrient limitations had longer B:NPPs in fine roots than nutrient-rich forests ($P = 0.002$; **Figure 4b**). Nutrient availability was not aligned with old or young forests (ANOVA, $P > 0.1$). Our results should therefore not be biased because of age differences between nutrient-rich and nutrient poor forests. Despite the possible combined effect that nutrient availability and management can have on biomass production (Capioli et al. 2015), B:NPP did not differ significantly between managed and unmanaged forests in any compartment.

Carbon stocks in the biomasses of branches and stems increased with nutrient availability (**Table S2, Figure 5**; $P < 0.05$). Fine roots had the opposite trend, but the results were not statistically significant. Production (NPP) varied little (**Table S2, Figure 5**) among nutrient classes. The differences in B:NPP with nutrient availability were thus due to differences in stand biomass rather than to differences in NPP.

Leaf habit was responsible for the largest differences in foliage B:NPP (**Table S2**). Foliage B:NPP averaged approximately 1 y in deciduous forests and 4.3 ± 0.4 y in evergreen forests (**Table S2**). Branch B:NPP was longer in evergreen than deciduous forests (**Table 2**). Evergreen foliage B:NPPs were positively correlated with water deficit, and fine-root B:NPPs were higher in forests with low water stress (**Table 2**). The seasonality of precipitation, however, was the most (positively) correlated variable with fine-root B:NPP, explaining 58% of its variance. High values of annual thermal amplitude were also correlated with high fine-root B:NPPs. Evergreen foliage and fine-root B:NPPs were marginally positively correlated with stand age (**Figure 2, Table 2**).

4. Discussion

Our results identified large differences in B:NPPs among forest compartments but only small differences among tree species (**Tables 1 and S2, Figure 3**). The slow-growing species in this study may thus have similar structural and functional properties, which allowed us to compare the role of exogenous controls of B:NPP spatial variability. The B:NPPs were mostly driven by climate in non-woody tissues but by age and nutrient availability in woody tissues.

4.1. The role of climate in non-woody compartments

Climate played a significant role in determining the B:NPPs of non-woody compartments such as foliage and fine roots but not of branches, stems, and coarse roots. The negative correlation between foliar B:NPPs and water deficit may indicate that forests under high water stress are unable to sustain as much leaf biomass as forests with good hydric conditions, as previous studies have reported (Fernández-Martínez et al. 2014b).

Fine-root B:NPPs were strongly correlated with intra-annual climatic variability (thermal amplitude and especially the seasonality of precipitation). This relationship supports previous findings, suggesting that the B:NPPs of fine roots decrease with climatic seasonality (Gill and Jackson 2000). Climatic seasonality may lead to periods of extreme weather (e.g. drought or cold) during the year that may kill fine roots, thus decreasing their life span. This negative effect of seasonality may also indicate that warmer forests (with less seasonality) need a higher fine-root NPP to

246 sustain the same pools of fine-root biomass (Gill and Jackson 2000) due to the higher metabolic
247 rates.

248 In contrast to foliage and fine roots, the B:NPPs of woody tissues were not correlated with climate,
249 perhaps because woody tissues are organs that accumulate much biomass in a very recalcitrant
250 form and are therefore relatively insensitive to meteorological conditions. Also, the turnover of
251 woody tissues is primarily associated with tree mortality and is therefore less sensitive to normal
252 meteorological conditions (without considering events of extreme weather causing disturbances
253 such as windthrows, storms, or heat waves causing mass mortality).

254 *4.2. The role of nutrient availability in woody and non-woody compartments*

255 The positive effect of nutrient availability on woody B:NPPs was driven by the larger carbon pools
256 in nutrient-rich than in nutrient-poor forests, not by an increase in biomass production (NPP),
257 which remained fairly constant among the classes of nutrient availability (**Table S2**). We can thus
258 infer that either necromass production is higher in nutrient-poor forests or that nutrient-rich forests
259 can sustain more living biomass than nutrient-poor forests. This finding also supports the
260 hypothesis that nutrient-rich forests allocate larger proportions of photosynthates to wood than
261 nutrient-poor forests (Vicca et al. 2012). Woody compartments have longer B:NPPs than non-
262 woody organs (**Tables 1 and S2, Figure 3**), so our findings also suggest that nutrient-rich forests
263 are more likely to act as carbon sinks than nutrient-poor forests (Fernández-Martínez et al.
264 2014a). Nutrient-rich forests thus accumulate more biomass, and the carbon is more likely to
265 reside longer in the living biomass.

266 In contrast to woody compartments, fine-root B:NPPs are shorter in nutrient-rich forests,
267 supporting previous research suggesting that nutrient-poor forests increase the life-span of fine
268 roots to increase nutrient-use efficiencies and thus to avoid nutrient losses (Reich et al. 1992;
269 Aerts 1995; Ryser 1996). Foliar B:NPPs were not significantly correlated with nutrient richness,
270 which may be linked to the hypothesised higher resorptive capacity of leaves than of fine roots
271 (Freschet et al. 2010).

272 *4.3. Methodological considerations*

273 The non-stationarity of woody compartments that we have attempted to resolve by removing the
274 effect of stand age from our estimates of B:NPP suggests that our results should be interpreted
275 with caution. Turnover times in leaves and fine roots could theoretically be calculated as the pool-
276 to-flux ratio, because biomass in these compartments reaches a steady state at relatively young
277 ages (Ryan et al. 1997; Chen et al. 2007). This methodology (simple B:NPP calculation) to
278 evaluate turnover times, however, may certainly underestimate the real average time that an
279 amount of carbon will reside in compartments where biomass increases with time (i.e. branches,
280 stems, and coarse roots), leading to a strong association between turnover time and age (**Figure**
281 **1**). Biomass in woody compartments, however, tends to a steady state with age (Houghton 2009;
282 Fernández-Martínez et al. 2014b), so the pool-to-flux ratio might provide reliable estimates in old-
283 growth forests that have already reached a stationary state when the inputs equal the outputs
284 ($\text{NPP} - \text{necromass production} = 0$). The alternative to studying only old-growth forests is to adjust
285 the pool-to-flux ratio to a theoretical stationary state of the stands following an asymptotic function
286 describing the increase in pool-to-flux ratio with age, which is the methodology we have chosen.
287 By adjusting B:NPPs to the stationary state, we can provide surrogates of turnover times that
288 should be useful to forest managers and the modelling community.

289 **5. Conclusions**

290 We detected large differences in B:NPPs among forest compartments but only small differences
291 among tree species (**Tables 1 and S2, Figure 3**). Once the effect of stand age was removed for
292 compartments without stationary behaviour (**Figure. 1**), nutrient availability (**Figure 4**) and
293 climate (mostly water deficit and seasonality) were identified as playing crucial roles in
294 determining the B:NPPs of woody and non-woody tissues, respectively (**Table 2**).

295 **Acknowledgements**

296 This research was supported by the European Research Council Synergy grant ERC-2013-SyG
297 610028-IMBALANCE-P, the Spanish Government grant CGL2013-48074-P, and the Catalan
298 Government projects SGR 2014-274 and FI-2013. SV and MC are postdoctoral fellows of the
299 Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). We appreciate the financial support of the GHG-Europe
300 project.

301 **References:**

- 302 Aerts R (1995) The advantages of being evergreen. *Trends Ecol Evol* 10:402–407.
- 303 Barrett DJ (2002) Steady state turnover time of carbon in the Australian terrestrial biosphere.
304 *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 16:55–1–55–21. doi: 10.1029/2002GB001860
- 305 Campioli M, Vicca S, Luyssaert S, et al (2015) Management improves the efficiency of biomass
306 production in terrestrial ecosystems. *Nat. Geosci.* under revi:
- 307 Carey E V., Sala A, Keane R, Callaway RM (2001) Are old forests underestimated as global
308 carbon sinks? *Glob Chang Biol* 7:339–344. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2486.2001.00418.x
- 309 Chen JM, Thomas SC, Yin Y, et al (2007) Combining remote sensing imagery and forest age
310 inventory for biomass mapping. *J Environ Manage* 85:616–623.
- 311 Dahlman R, Kucera C (1965) Root productivity and turnover in native prairie. *Ecology* 46:84–89.
- 312 Dewar RC (1991) Analytical model of carbon storage in the trees, soils, and wood products of
313 managed forests. *Tree Physiol* 8:239–258. doi: 10.1093/treephys/8.3.239
- 314 Dixon RK, Solomon a M, Brown S, et al (1994) Carbon pools and flux of global forest ecosystems.
315 *Science* (80-) 263:185–90. doi: 10.1126/science.263.5144.185
- 316 Fernández-Martínez M, Vicca S, Janssens IA, et al (2014a) Nutrient availability as the key
317 regulator of global forest carbon balance. *Nat Clim Chang* 4:471–476. doi:
318 doi:10.1038/nclimate2177
- 319 Fernández-Martínez M, Vicca S, Janssens IA, et al (2014b) Spatial variability and controls over
320 biomass stocks, carbon fluxes and resource-use efficiencies in forest ecosystems. *Trees,*
321 *Struct Funct* 28:597–611. doi: 10.1007/s00468-013-0975-9
- 322 Freschet GT, Cornelissen JHC, van Logtestijn RSP, Aerts R (2010) Substantial nutrient
323 resorption from leaves, stems and roots in a subarctic flora: what is the link with other
324 resource economics traits? *New Phytol* 186:879–89. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03228.x
- 325 Gill R a., Jackson RB (2000) Global patterns of root turnover for terrestrial ecosystems. *New*
326 *Phytol* 147:13–31. doi: 10.1046/j.1469-8137.2000.00681.x
- 327 Grömping U (2006) Relative importance for linear regression in R: the package relaimpo. *J Stat*
328 *Softw* 17:1–27.

329 Grömping U (2007) Estimators of Relative Importance in Linear Regression Based on Variance
330 Decomposition. *Am Stat* 61:139–147. doi: 10.1198/000313007X188252

331 Hijmans RJ, Cameron SE, Parra JL, et al (2005) Very high resolution interpolated climate
332 surfaces for global land areas. *Int J Climatol* 25:1965–1978. doi: 10.1002/joc.1276

333 Houghton R. (2009) Terrestrial carbon and biogeochemical cycles. In: Levin S (ed) *Princet. Guid.*
334 *to Ecol.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp 340 – 346

335 Jordan CFF, Herrera R (1981) Tropical rain forests: are nutrients really critical? *Am Nat* 117:167–
336 180.

337 Karlberg L, Gustafsson D, Jansson P-E (2006) Modeling carbon turnover in five terrestrial
338 ecosystems in the boreal zone using multiple criteria of acceptance. *Ambio* 35:448–458.

339 Kicklighter DW, Bruno M, Donges S, et al (1999) A first-order analysis of the potential role of CO₂
340 fertilization to affect the global carbon budget: a comparison of four terrestrial biosphere
341 models. *Tellus B* 51:343–366. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-0889.1999.00017.x

342 LeBauer DS, Treseder KK (2008) Nitrogen limitation of net primary productivity in terrestrial
343 ecosystems is globally distributed. *Ecology* 89:371–379. doi: 10.1890/06-2057.1

344 Litton CM, Raich JW, Ryan MG (2007) Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Glob Chang Biol*
345 13:2089–2109. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01420.x

346 Luo Y, White LW, Canadell JG, et al (2003) Sustainability of terrestrial carbon sequestration: A
347 case study in Duke Forest with inversion approach. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 17:1–13. doi:
348 10.1029/2002GB001923

349 Luyssaert S, Inglima I, Jung M, et al (2007) CO₂ balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical
350 forests derived from a global database. *Glob Chang Biol* 13:2509–2537. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
351 2486.2007.01439.x

352 Majdi H, Pregitzer K, Morén A-S, et al (2005) Measuring Fine Root Turnover in Forest
353 Ecosystems. *Plant Soil* 276:1–8. doi: 10.1007/s11104-005-3104-8

354 Malhi Y, Baldocchi DD, Jarvis PG (1999) The carbon balance of tropical, temperate and boreal
355 forests. *Plant, Cell Environ* 22:715–740. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-3040.1999.00453.x

356 Margalef R (1974) *Ecología trófica*. In: Margalef R (ed) *Ecología, Ediciones*. Barcelona, pp 435 –
357 472

358 Myneni RB, Dong J, Tucker CJ, et al (2001) A large carbon sink in the woody biomass of
359 Northern forests. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 98:14784–9. doi: 10.1073/pnas.261555198

360 Nadelhoffer K (2000) The potential effects of nitrogen deposition on fine-• root production in
361 forest ecosystems. *New Phytol* 147:131–139.

362 Pan Y, Birdsey R a, Fang J, et al (2011) A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests.
363 *Science* 333:988–93. doi: 10.1126/science.1201609

364 R Core Team (2013) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. *R Found Stat*
365 *Comput* 1:409. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-74686-7

- 366 Reich PB, Walters MB, Ellsworth DS (1992) Leaf Life-Span in Relation to Leaf , Plant , and Stand
367 Characteristics among Diverse Ecosystems. *Ecol Monogr* 62:365–392.
- 368 Ryan MG, Binkley D, Fownes JH (1997) Age-Related Decline in Forest Productivity: Pattern and
369 Process. *Adv Ecol Res* 27:213–262.
- 370 Ryser P (1996) The importance of tissue density for growth and life span of leaves and roots: a
371 comparison of five ecologically contrasting grasses. *Funct Ecol* 10:717–723. doi:
372 10.2307/2390506
- 373 Vicca S, Luyssaert S, Peñuelas J, et al (2012) Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently.
374 *Ecol Lett* 15:520–6. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01775.x
- 375 Wright IJ, Westoby M (2003) Nutrient concentration, resorption and lifespan: leaf traits of
376 Australian sclerophyll species. *Funct Ecol* 17:10–19. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2435.2003.00694.x
- 377 Zhang L, Luo Y, Yu G, Zhang L (2010) Estimated carbon residence times in three forest
378 ecosystems of eastern China: Applications of probabilistic inversion. *J Geophys Res*
379 115:G01010. doi: 10.1029/2009JG001004

380

381 **Figure captions**

382 **Figure 1:** Relationships of the B:NPPs of a) branches, b) stems, and c) coarse-roots with stand
383 age. Data were fitted using an asymptotic exponential function.

384 **Figure 2:** Relationships of the B:NPPs of a) foliage and b) fine roots with stand age.

385 **Figure 3:** B:NPPs of a) branches, b) stems, c) coarse roots, and d) fine roots for different levels
386 of nutrient availability. The branch, stem, and coarse-root B:NPPs have been adjusted to the
387 stationary state (200 y) using the equations in **Figure 1**. Exact values can also be found in **Table**
388 **S2**. Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences using Tukey's HSD test for
389 multiple comparisons at the 0.05 level.

390 **Figure 4:** Relationships of the B:NPPs of (a) stems and (b) fine roots with nutrient richness.

391 **Figure 5.** Stand biomass and NPP of branches, stems, coarse-roots and fine-roots for different
392 levels of nutrient availability. The biomasses for branches, stems, and coarse roots have been
393 adjusted to the stationary state (200 y) using an asymptotic exponential function (see Materials
394 and Methods for further information). Exact values can also be found in **Table S2**. Different letters
395 above the bars indicate significant differences using Tukey's HSD test for multiple comparisons at
396 the 0.05 level.

397

398 **Table 1:** B:NPPs (mean years \pm standard error) of leaves, branches, stems, and coarse and fine
 399 roots across species and biomes adjusted to the stationary state (200 y) (except for foliage and
 400 fine roots). The number of forests is shown in parentheses. Different letters within a column
 401 indicate significant differences among groups ($P < 0.05$) using Tukey's HSD test for multiple
 402 comparisons.


Species	Foliage	Branches	Stems	Coarse roots	Fine roots
<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	2.5 (1)				
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	1.1 \pm 0.1 (12)	21.6 \pm 3.0 (5)	121.9 \pm 19.2 (5)	83.9 \pm 17.6 (8)	1.1 \pm 0.04 (8)
<i>Larix gmelinii</i>		20.9 (1)	100.2 (1)	37.0 (1)	
<i>Picea abies</i>	4.4 \pm 0.4 (11)	31.3 \pm 16.6 (5)	134.1 \pm 31.1 (5)	86.1 \pm 7.4 (7)	1.4 \pm 0.4 (7)
<i>Picea mariana</i>	9.5 (2)			186.7 (2)	5.5 (1)
<i>Pinus banksiana</i>	2.0 (1)			277.9 (1)	3.4 (1)
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	4.1 \pm 0.5 (13)	99.7 \pm 35.2 (12)	118.5 \pm 17.9 (12)	132.5 (2)	2.0 (2)
<i>Pinus radiata</i>	5.3 (1)		167.5 (1)	155.5 (1)	0.7 (1)
<i>Pinus strobus</i>				163.3 \pm 18.1 (4)	
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	4.4 \pm 1.1 (6)	134.7 \pm 99.0 (3)	93.8 \pm 23.1 (3)	124.2 \pm 63.5 (3)	2.1 \pm 0.6 (3)
<i>Pinus taeda</i>				167.4 (1)	
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	3.5 \pm 0.5 (12)	35.8 \pm 5.6 (12)	94.0 \pm 14.1 (12)	85.0 \pm 15.6 (12)	6.1 \pm 0.6 (11)
Biome					
Boreal evergreen	5.4 \pm 1.1 ^a (9)	134.7 \pm 99.9 ^a (3)	93.8 \pm 23.1 ^a (3)	172.8 \pm 36.9 ^a (6)	3.0 \pm 0.7 ^{ab} (5)
Boreal deciduous	1.0 ^b (2)	20.9 ^a (1)	100.2 ^a (1)	37.0 ^a (1)	2.2 ^{ab} (1)
Temperate evergreen	4.1 \pm 0.3 ^a (42)	99.5 \pm 22.8 ^a (32)	139.7 \pm 20.3 ^a (32)	132.5 \pm 15.8 ^a (31)	3.7 \pm 0.6 ^a (24)
Temperate deciduous	1.1 \pm 0.1 ^b (15)	30.2 \pm 7.7 ^a (7)	113.4 \pm 14.7 ^a (7)	184.4 \pm 89.8 ^a (12)	1.4 \pm 0.2 ^b (12)

405 **Table 2:** Summary of the models for the B:NPPs of evergreen foliage, branches, stems, and coarse and fine roots using stepwise forward
406 regressions. For these analyses, the B:NPPs of woody compartments were adjusted to 200 y using an asymptotic exponential function (see
407 Materials and Methods). Values indicate $\beta \pm$ standard error, and the proportion of variance explained (in %) is shown in parentheses. For
408 branches, stems, and coarse roots, the reported variance explained by stand age (*) is the R^2 from the asymptotic exponential functions in
409 **Figure 1** and is not accounted for in the R^2 of the stepwise models. All coefficients were significant at the 0.05 level except those marked with † ,
410 indicating significance at the 0.1 level, or by n.s., indicating that the term was not significant. PS, precipitation seasonality; ThA, annual thermal
411 amplitude; WD, water deficit. Ln indicates natural-log transformation. For leaf habit, D indicates deciduous and E indicates evergreens.

Stepwise regression	Ln foliage	Ln branches	Ln stems	Ln coarse roots	Ln fine roots
Leaf habit		D < E (11)			
Nutrient richness (F1)		0.48 \pm 0.15 (20)	0.59 \pm 0.15 (35)	0.36 \pm 0.14 (9)	-0.18 \pm 0.09 (6)
PS					0.69 \pm 0.08 (58)
Ln ThA				0.26 \pm 0.14 (5) †	0.25 \pm 0.10 (5)
Ln WD	0.30 \pm 0.13 (8)				-0.23 \pm 0.09 (4)
Ln Age	0.28 \pm 0.13 (7)	(31)*	(81)*	(73)*	0.19 \pm 0.08 (5)
R^2	15	31	35	14	78


412

413 **Figure 1**
414



415


416 **Figure 2**
417



418
419


420
421

Figure 3




422
423

424 Figure 4
425



427
428

Figure 5



429

430 **Supplementary material**

431 **Figure captions**

432 **Table S1:** B:NPPs (mean years \pm standard error) of leaves, branches, stems, and coarse and
433 fine roots across species and biomes. The B:NPPs were not adjusted to the stationary state. The
434 number of forests is shown in parentheses.

435


Species	Foliage	Branches	Stems	Coarse roots	Fine roots
<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	2.5 (1)				
<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	1.1 \pm 0.1 (12)	20.3 \pm 3.1 (5)	87.4 \pm 18.1 (5)	66.4 \pm 17.2 (8)	1.1 \pm 0.04 (8)
<i>Larix gmelinii</i>		19.3 (1)	65.2 (1)	28.6 (1)	
<i>Picea abies</i>	4.4 \pm 0.4 (11)	26.0 \pm 17.9 (5)	42.9 \pm 11.1 (5)	35.5 \pm 10.8 (7)	1.4 \pm 0.4 (7)
<i>Picea mariana</i>	9.5 (2)			162.8 (2)	5.5 (1)
<i>Pinus banksiana</i>	2.0 (1)			133.3 (1)	3.4 (1)
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	4.1 \pm 0.5 (13)	84.7 \pm 37.0 (12)	62.4 \pm 23.2 (12)	62.3 (2)	2.0 (2)
<i>Pinus radiata</i>	5.3 (1)		8.2 (1)	10.4 (1)	0.7 (1)
<i>Pinus strobus</i>				24.1 \pm 11.5 (4)	
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	4.4 \pm 1.1 (6)	41.9 \pm 9.7 (3)	71.0 \pm 39.8 (3)	118.0 \pm 67.9 (3)	2.1 \pm 0.6 (3)
<i>Pinus taeda</i>				7.6 (1)	
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	3.5 \pm 0.5 (12)	26.8 \pm 7.2 (12)	62.8 \pm 20.9 (12)	62.6 \pm 20.2 (12)	6.1 \pm 0.6 (11)
Biomes					
Boreal Evergreen	5.4 \pm 1.1 (9)	41.9 \pm 9.7 (3)	71.0 \pm 39.8 (3)	132.1 \pm 35.2 (6)	3.0 \pm 0.7 (5)
Boreal Deciduous	1.0 (2)	19.3 (1)	65.2 (1)	28.6 (1)	2.2 (1)
Temperate Evergreen	4.1 \pm 0.3 (41)	66.3 \pm 19.4 (32)	64.5 \pm 13.8 (32)	56.2 \pm 11.8 (31)	3.7 \pm 0.6 (24)
Temperate Deciduous	1.1 \pm 0.1 (15)	25.8 \pm 4.8 (7)	75.4 \pm 15.0 (7)	81.1 \pm 18.6 (12)	1.4 \pm 0.2 (12)

436
437

Table S2: B:NPPs, biomasses, and net primary productions (NPPs) of foliage, branches, stems, and coarse and fine roots grouped by leaf type (foliage) and nutrient availability. The B:NPPs and mean biomasses of branches, stems, and coarse roots were adjusted to the theoretical stationary state (200 y, see **Figure 1**). N indicates the number of forests. Different letters within a column and compartment indicate differences between groups using Tukey’s test for multiple comparisons at the 0.05 level.

Compartment		B:NPP (years)	Biomass (gC m ⁻²)	NPP (gC m ⁻² y ⁻¹)		N
<i>Leaf habit</i>						
Foliage	Evergreen	4.3 ± 0.4 ^a	499.8 ± 90.9 ^a	129.6	± 22.7 ^a	53
	Deciduous	1.1 ± 0.1 ^b	198.2 ± 22.3 ^b	180.4	± 16.7 ^b	18
<i>Nutrient availability</i>						
Branches	High	295.8 ± 49.9 ^a	6965.1 ± 1402.9 ^a	32.7	± 5.8 ^a	4
	Medium	80.2 ± 42.9 ^b	1918.6 ± 287.6 ^b	106.4	± 21.4 ^a	7
	Low	60.8 ± 21.3 ^b	2065.9 ± 328.3 ^b	69.5	± 11.5 ^a	22
Stems	High	349.3 ± 54.3 ^a	36740.9 ± 7075.4 ^a	177.8	± 12.4 ^{ab}	4
	Medium	128.2 ± 14.2 ^b	9085.9 ± 1063.6 ^b	135.1	± 22.5 ^b	7
	Low	104.7 ± 12.8 ^b	16902.2 ± 3555.6 ^b	293.2	± 44.6 ^a	24
Coarse roots	High	294.4 ± 101.7 ^a	5541.7 ± 1319.9 ^a	60.8	± 9.3 ^a	8
	Medium	125.1 ± 13.1 ^b	5426.4 ± 2343.3 ^a	58.8	± 12.4 ^a	17
	Low	115.8 ± 18.5 ^b	4360.6 ± 1088.1 ^a	76.2	± 13.8 ^a	26
Fine roots	High	1.6 ± 0.2 ^a	311.1 ± 27.4 ^a	197.8	± 9.5 ^a	7
	Medium	1.5 ± 0.2 ^a	274.6 ± 52.2 ^a	173.6	± 28.8 ^a	11
	Low	3.9 ± 0.7 ^b	447.6 ± 69.6 ^a	138.2	± 19.0 ^a	25

444 **Figure S1.** Relationships between biomass and stand age for branches, stems, and coarse roots. Data were fitted using an asymptotic
445 exponential function.
446



450 **Figure S2.** Relationships between net primary production (NPP) and stand age for a) branches, b) stems, and c) coarse roots. Any of the
451 fractions presented significant relationships.

