

Forest response to elevated CO₂ is conserved across a broad range of productivity

Richard J. Norby, Evan H. DeLucia, Birgit Gielen, Carlo Calfapietra, Christian P. Giardina, John S. King, Joanne Ledford, Heather R. McCarthy, David J. P. Moore, Reinhart Ceulemans, Paolo De Angelis, Adrien C. Finzi, David F. Karnosky, Mark E. Kubiske, Martin Lukac, Kurt S. Pregitzer, Giuseppe E. Scarascia-Mugnozza, William H. Schlesinger, and Ram Oren

PNAS 2005;102;18052-18056; originally published online Dec 5, 2005;
doi:10.1073/pnas.0509478102

This information is current as of November 2006.

Online Information & Services	High-resolution figures, a citation map, links to PubMed and Google Scholar, etc., can be found at: www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/50/18052
References	This article cites 40 articles, 4 of which you can access for free at: www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/50/18052#BIBL This article has been cited by other articles: www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/102/50/18052#otherarticles
E-mail Alerts	Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article or click here .
Rights & Permissions	To reproduce this article in part (figures, tables) or in entirety, see: www.pnas.org/misc/rightperm.shtml
Reprints	To order reprints, see: www.pnas.org/misc/reprints.shtml

Notes:

Forest response to elevated CO₂ is conserved across a broad range of productivity

Richard J. Norby^{a,b}, Evan H. DeLucia^c, Birgit Gielen^d, Carlo Calfapietra^e, Christian P. Giardina^f, John S. King^g, Joanne Ledford^a, Heather R. McCarthy^h, David J. P. Mooreⁱ, Reinhart Ceulemans^d, Paolo De Angelis^e, Adrien C. Finzi^j, David F. Karnosky^k, Mark E. Kubiske^l, Martin Lukac^m, Kurt S. Pregitzer^k, Giuseppe E. Scarascia-Mugnozzaⁿ, William H. Schlesinger^{b,h}, and Ram Oren^h

^aEnvironmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6422; ^bDepartment of Plant Biology and ⁱProgram in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801; ^dDepartment of Biology, University of Antwerp, B-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium; ^eDepartment of Forest Environment and Resources, University of Tuscia, I-01100 Viterbo, Italy; ^fU.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, North Central Research Station, Houghton, MI 49931; ^gDepartment of Forestry and Environmental Resources, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695; ^hNicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0328; ^jDepartment of Biology, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215; ^kEcosystem Science Center, School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI 49931; ^lU.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, North Central Research Station, Rhinelander, WI 54501; ^mSchool of Agricultural and Forest Sciences, University of Wales, Bangor LL57 2UW, United Kingdom; and ⁿInstitute of Agro-Environmental and Forest Biology, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 05010 Porano (TR), Italy

Contributed by William H. Schlesinger, November 1, 2005

Climate change predictions derived from coupled carbon-climate models are highly dependent on assumptions about feedbacks between the biosphere and atmosphere. One critical feedback occurs if C uptake by the biosphere increases in response to the fossil-fuel driven increase in atmospheric [CO₂] (“CO₂ fertilization”), thereby slowing the rate of increase in atmospheric [CO₂]. Carbon exchanges between the terrestrial biosphere and atmosphere are often first represented in models as net primary productivity (NPP). However, the contribution of CO₂ fertilization to the future global C cycle has been uncertain, especially in forest ecosystems that dominate global NPP, and models that include a feedback between terrestrial biosphere metabolism and atmospheric [CO₂] are poorly constrained by experimental evidence. We analyzed the response of NPP to elevated CO₂ (≈550 ppm) in four free-air CO₂ enrichment experiments in forest stands. We show that the response of forest NPP to elevated [CO₂] is highly conserved across a broad range of productivity, with a stimulation at the median of 23 ± 2%. At low leaf area indices, a large portion of the response was attributable to increased light absorption, but as leaf area indices increased, the response to elevated [CO₂] was wholly caused by increased light-use efficiency. The surprising consistency of response across diverse sites provides a benchmark to evaluate predictions of ecosystem and global models and allows us now to focus on unresolved questions about carbon partitioning and retention, and spatial variation in NPP response caused by availability of other growth limiting resources.

CO₂ fertilization | global change | leaf area index | net primary productivity

Analysis and prediction of the effects of human activities, particularly the combustion of fossil fuels, on climate and the biological, physical, and social responses to changing climate require an integrated view of the complex interactions between the biosphere and atmosphere. Carbon cycle models are now being coupled to atmosphere–ocean general circulation climate models to achieve a dynamic analysis of the relationships between C emissions, atmospheric chemistry, biosphere activity, and climatic change (1–3).

Exchanges between the terrestrial biosphere and atmosphere are represented in models using empirical and theoretical expressions of net primary productivity (NPP), the net fixation of C by green plants into organic matter, or the difference between photosynthesis and plant respiration. Because the photosynthetic uptake of carbon that drives NPP is not saturated at current atmospheric concentrations (4), NPP should increase as fossil-fuel combustion adds to the atmospheric [CO₂]. Increased C uptake into the biosphere in response to rising [CO₂] (“CO₂

fertilization”) can create a negative feedback that slows the rate of increase in atmospheric [CO₂] (3, 5). Hence, assumptions regarding CO₂ fertilization of the terrestrial biosphere greatly affect predictions of future atmospheric [CO₂] (3). The response of NPP to [CO₂] in models can be prescribed (1) or calculated through a mechanistic representation (3, 5). In either case, the predicted responses of net ecosystem production (or NPP minus heterotrophic respiration), net C exchange with the atmosphere, and the climatic responses to atmospheric [CO₂] will be incorrect if the magnitude of the CO₂ fertilization effect is not represented accurately.

Experimental data should provide useful guidance to models, thereby increasing our confidence in model predictions. Experiments have unequivocally shown that plants can grow faster and larger in a CO₂-enriched atmosphere (6–8), and the mechanisms of response are well understood (4). The relevance of this evidence to prediction of global C budgets over decadal time frames, however, may be limited. As spatial and temporal scales increase beyond what can be captured in experiments, modifying influences of resource availability and biogeochemical feedbacks within the ecosystem become increasingly important, and these tend to diminish the simple response to elevated [CO₂] observed in small-scale experiments. The problem is especially severe with forests because of the inherent difficulty in conducting relevant experiments at appropriate spatial and temporal scales with large and long-lived organisms and complex ecosystems. Nevertheless, the potential responses of forests to rising [CO₂] cannot be ignored in global C cycling analyses and predictions of climatic change because forest ecosystems contribute ≈50% of global NPP and ≈80% of terrestrial NPP (9). With the development of Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment (FACE) technology (10, 11), it is now possible to elevate atmospheric [CO₂] in large plots in intact forest ecosystems without altering other microclimatic and biotic variables (12). Recognizing that the results from any single experiment may not be broadly representative, here we provide the an analysis of NPP data from the four FACE experiments operating in forest stands.

Materials and Methods

The forest stands examined in the FACE experiments (Table 1) represent a broad range of productivity, climatic and soil con-

Conflict of interest statement: No conflicts declared.

Abbreviations: APAR, absorbed photosynthetically active radiation; FACE, Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment; LAI, leaf area index; NPP, net primary productivity; NPPe, NPP in elevated [CO₂]; NPPc, NPP in current [CO₂].

^bTo whom correspondence may be addressed: E-mail: rjn@ornl.gov or schlesin@duke.edu.

© 2005 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA

Table 1. Characteristics of the four FACE experiments

Characteristic	DukeFACE	AspenFACE	ORNL-FACE	POP-EUROFACE
Location	Durham, NC	Rhineland, WI	Oak Ridge, TN	Tuscania (Viterbo), Italy
Latitude, longitude	35°58'N, 79°05'W	45°40'N, 89°37'W	35°54'N, 84°20'W	42°22' N, 11°48' E
Mean annual precipitation, mm	1,140	810	1,390	818*
Mean annual temperature, °C	15.5	4.9	14.2	14.1
Growing season, [†] days	200	150	190	247
Soil classification (U.S.)	Ultic Hapludalf	Alfic Haplorthod	Aquic Hapludult	Pachic Xerumbrept
Soil texture	Clay loam	Sandy loam	Silty clay loam	Loam and silt loam
Total soil N, g·kg ⁻¹	0.79	1.20	1.12	1.1–1.4
Overstory vegetation	<i>Pinus taeda</i> L.	<i>Populus tremuloides</i> Michx., <i>Acer saccharum</i> Marsh., <i>Betula papyrifera</i> Marsh.	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i> L.	<i>Populus alba</i> L., <i>P. nigra</i> L., <i>P. × euramericana</i> Dode Guinier
Peak leaf area index, [‡] m ² ·m ⁻²	3.4	2.7–3.4	5.5	4.6–7.4
Year planted	1983	1997	1988	1999
Year treatment initiation	1996	1997	1998	1999

*The POP-EUROFACE experiment used irrigation to avoid drought, so inferences regarding precipitation should be avoided for this site.

[†]For deciduous stands, the growing season is the duration that trees have leaves; for the evergreen system, it is the period of active stem growth.

[‡]Values of leaf area index are expressed as leaf area per ground area; the range in values describes portions of experimental plots occupied by different species after LAI was no longer increasing.

ditions, stand developmental history, and life history characteristics of the dominant species, although all four are young stands in the temperate zone. Two experiments were initiated in established monoculture plantations that had fully occupied the sites: an evergreen loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) stand at DukeFACE and a deciduous sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) stand at ORNL-FACE. The other two experiments, AspenFACE and POP-EUROFACE, comprise simple multispecies assemblages dominated by *Populus* spp. that were initiated on previously bare ground.

Each experiment used FACE technology to control the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere in replicated 25- to 30-m-diameter plots in the tree stands. The DukeFACE, ORNL-FACE, and AspenFACE experiments used similar technology, whereby pure CO₂ was mixed with a turbulent air-stream in a plenum and released through vertical vent pipes at the up-wind side of each plot (10). In the POP-EUROFACE experiment, pure CO₂ was released at supersonic velocity directly into the atmosphere from pipes on the up-wind side of each plot (11). The average atmospheric [CO₂] in current-CO₂ plots across all years of these experiments was 376 ppm, and the FACE systems (10, 11) provided additional CO₂ sufficient to maintain an average concentration (across all experiments) in the elevated-CO₂ plots of 550 ppm (13). These CO₂ treatments were chosen on the basis of current projections of atmospheric [CO₂] anticipated for 2050 (14). Detailed descriptions of the exposure systems and the CO₂ concentration dynamics are provided for DukeFACE (10), ORNL-FACE (15), AspenFACE (16, 17), and POP-EUROFACE (11).

Our analysis of NPP was based on all years and subplots for which data were available and canopy development was complete. Our goal was to understand the response of closed-canopy forests. We therefore excluded data from stands with an expanding canopy, which would not be informative of the response of the global forest (7). For ORNL-FACE and DukeFACE, the CO₂ treatments were initiated after canopy development was complete, and 5–6 years of data were used (1999–2003 and 1997–2002, respectively). The plots in the AspenFACE experiment were planted half with a monoculture of trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), one fourth with an equal mixture of trembling aspen and paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*), and one fourth with a mixture of trembling aspen and sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*). On the basis of our canopy closure criterion, 1 year (2003) of data from the aspen stand and 3 years (2001–2003) from the aspen–birch stand were included in the analysis; the

aspen–maple stand was not included because the canopy was still open. Six of the 12 plots in AspenFACE received elevated concentrations of ozone; these were not included in the analysis. The plots in the POP-EUROFACE were split into subplots, each occupied by a different *Populus* species; data from all subplots from 2000–2001 were used.

NPP, expressed as grams of C per square meter of land surface per year, was calculated as annual carbon increments ($I_{\text{wood}} + I_{\text{leaf}} + I_{\text{coarse root}} + I_{\text{fine root}}$), plus the major inputs to detritus, litterfall, and fine root turnover ($D_{\text{litterfall}} + D_{\text{fine root}}$) (18), although different approaches were used in the four experiments. The annual increments of stem wood (I_{wood}) and coarse woody root ($I_{\text{coarse root}}$) were estimated by applying site-specific allometric equations to periodic measurements of the diameter of trees in current and elevated CO₂ plots. Harvest data from the POP-EUROFACE (19) and AspenFACE experiments (20); and the tree height–diameter relationship for trees at DukeFACE (21) indicate that exposure to elevated [CO₂] did not affect the allometric relationships between plant parts. The allometric equation used at ORNL-FACE incorporated basal area, height, taper, and wood density to reduce the possibility of the allometry being altered by elevated [CO₂] (15). In the pine forest at DukeFACE, I_{leaf} also was estimated from allometric regression (22) applied at different intervals (18); $I_{\text{leaf}} = 0$ for the deciduous forests. The production of leaf litter ($D_{\text{litterfall}}$) was estimated from litter baskets at all sites (23–25). In most cases biomass measurements were converted to C units by using the measured C content of different tissues, which varied between 0.4 and 0.5 (26, 27); when measured values were not available, C content was assumed equal to 0.5.

The contribution of fine roots ($I_{\text{fine root}}$, $D_{\text{fine root}}$) to NPP typically was low in these forests ($\approx 3\%$ in AspenFACE, 6% in DukeFACE, 7% in POP-EUROFACE, and 16% in ORNL-FACE) and was estimated differently among sites. At ORNL-FACE (28) and PopFACE (29), fine-root production was measured directly by using minirhizotrons and in-growth cores. The DukeFACE experiment used a compartment flow model for estimating fine-root production (30); AspenFACE calculated fine-root turnover from published rates of aspen fine-root production and mortality (31) that were then applied to allometrically determined peak standing fine-root biomass (20). Other components of NPP (e.g., losses to herbivory and root exudation) were not included in our analysis because data were not available. The combined contribution of herbivory and dissolved organic C in the DukeFACE experiment was only 3%

A useful analytical tool for interpreting plant responses that are confounded with ontogenetic or stand development has been to separate the response into structural and functional components (25), which also is an important analytical framework used in ecosystem models (34) and remote sensing analysis (32). Here, the structural component is leaf area by which light is absorbed, and the functional component is the conversion of light energy to organic matter. Our analysis suggested that at low LAI, elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$ was causing structural changes and increased APAR even after LAI in current $[\text{CO}_2]$ had reached a maximum. At higher LAI, there was no additional gain in light absorption even if elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$ increased LAI (a consequence of Beer's Law), and increased NPP in elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$ was primarily or wholly attributable to increased ϵ .

Our experimental evidence provides a standard to evaluate models that generate predictions of a NPP response to CO_2 fertilization as an intermediate step in predicting a C cycle feedback between the biosphere and atmosphere. Six dynamic global vegetation models predicted increasing global NPP in response to rising $[\text{CO}_2]$, with the forcing defined by the IS92a emissions scenario (14) and the response based on a standard photosynthesis model (5). The increase in NPP between 1999 and 2049 (the years corresponding to the current and elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$ in our data set) ranged from 15% to 32%, indicating some substantial discrepancies between models and data. Nevertheless, the average of the six models was 22%, in close agreement with the mean response of 23% reported here. A coupled carbon-climate model (1), which prescribes the CO_2 fertilization response using a β -factor formulation (35), used a β of 0.65 as the "control" value, also in good agreement with our experimental results. Although there are other assumptions involved in the subsequent calculations of net ecosystem production and in the interactions between $[\text{CO}_2]$ effects and climate change influences, the congruence of the NPP predictions with the experimental evidence we present here should add confidence in overall model results.

The concurrence across sites in the NPP response does not resolve all issues attending CO_2 fertilization. The mean response, while appropriate for global analyses, masks several sources of significant variation that could be especially important in determining how a specific site will respond to rising $[\text{CO}_2]$. At the DukeFACE, a wide range of response to CO_2 enrichment across replicate plots correlated with differences in soil N availability. Under low N availability, CO_2 enrichment increased NPP by 19%, whereas under intermediate and high N availability the percent CO_2 stimulation was 27% (36). Where soils are poor or prolonged water limitation occurs, represented only through within-site variation in our dataset, forests may have limited capacity to support any response to CO_2 enrichment (37). Concurrent increases in tropospheric ozone could negate the productivity increases from elevated $[\text{CO}_2]$ (17, 20). In addition to controlling spatial variability in response, N availability may also be a factor in determining whether the responses observed here can be sustained for decades (38, 39). The data in our analysis all come from fast-growing, early successional stands, and there has been no evidence to date for a negative feedback on NPP through N availability in these stands (20, 40, 41).

NPP represents the amount of organic C entering an ecosystem; it does not address the fate of that C. Model comparisons demonstrate that whether additional C storage occurs in vegetation or in soil is crucial to understanding the future C cycle and its control of the climate system (2). Experimental results demonstrate that the

partitioning of C between plant organs with different turnover rates determines the potential of an ecosystem to store additional C and whether the storage occurs in plant biomass or in soil. At DukeFACE, increased NPP was associated with C sequestration in stem wood (18, 42), whereas at ORNL-FACE increased NPP was partitioned to production of fine roots (28). Fine roots decompose rapidly and add C to soil, where most is respired by microbes, but a fraction may be sequestered into soil organic matter pools (28). Although the two forests have a similar NPP response to CO_2 enrichment, and over the short term their net ecosystem production response was similar (42), the longer-term trajectory of C cycling will differ. In our four-site dataset, the percentage of NPP gain partitioned to wood varied from 11% to 93%, and there was no discernible pattern between forest types. Global productivity models vary nearly as much in the fraction of C stored in vegetation vs. soil: from 35% to 85% (2). Results from some of the DukeFACE plots showed that the enhancement in wood production under CO_2 enrichment was not sustained at levels observed during the first 3 years of the experiment, but the initial enhancement was reestablished in half a plot that was supplied with nitrogen (37). Imposing additional treatments on existing FACE experiments or designing experiments that account for multiple constraints will remove some of the uncertainty in the controls over partitioning. With the response of NPP to CO_2 fertilization better resolved, it becomes especially important to understand the controls on C partitioning as a priority challenge in relating NPP to C cycling and storage in forest ecosystems.

The effect of CO_2 fertilization on forest NPP is now firmly established, at least for young stands in the temperate zone. Recent observations of older and larger deciduous trees in a mature Swiss forest (43) demonstrated that physiological responses (e.g., photosynthesis, foliar N and nonstructural carbohydrate concentrations) were similar to those of younger trees, thereby increasing our confidence that our results are more generally relevant. NPP and stand-level growth responses could not be measured in the Swiss study, but stem basal area increment was not significantly stimulated by elevated CO_2 . Although interpreted as an indication of C saturation (43), this conclusion was based on the stem growth response of only 10 CO_2 -enriched trees with high variance, and it is not at odds with our conclusion about the response of NPP. While the ongoing FACE experiments will continue to provide data relevant to questions about the fate of additional C in CO_2 -enriched forests, there is not a compelling reason for new, single-factor FACE experiments in young, temperate-zone forests. Rather, the limitations of our current data show the need for new experiments in mature forests and in unexplored biomes, particularly tropical forests that contribute much to global NPP.

The DukeFACE, ORNL-FACE, and AspenFACE experiments are supported by the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science, Biological and Environmental Research (BER). POP-EUROFACE was supported by the EU-POPFACE (ENV4-CT97-0657), EU-EUROFACE (EVR1-CT-2002-40027), Center of Excellence "Forest and Climate" (MIUR Italian Ministry of University and Research), Italy-USA Bilateral Project on Climate Change of the Italian Ministry of Environment. The synthesis activity was supported by BER and by the National Science Foundation Research Coordination Network on Terrestrial Ecosystem Response to Atmospheric and Climatic Change (Grant 0090238). B.G. acknowledges the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders (Belgium). Oak Ridge National Laboratory is managed by UT-Battelle, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC05-00OR22725.

- Berthelot, M., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Dufresne, J. L. & Monfray, P. (2005) *Global Change Biol.* **11**, 959–970.
- Dufresne, J. L., Friedlingstein, P., Berthelot, M., Bopp, L., Ciais, P., Fairhead, L., Le Treut, H. & Monfray, P. (2002) *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **29**, 1405.
- Thompson, S. L., Govindasamy, B., Mirin, A., Caldeira, K., Delire, C., Milovich, J., Wickett, M. & Erickson, D. (2004) *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31**, L23211.

- Long, S. P., Ainsworth, E. A., Rogers, A. & Ort, D. R. (2004) *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* **55**, 591–628.
- Cramer, W., Bondeau, A., Woodward, F. I., Prentice, I. C., Betts, R. A., Brovkin, V., Cox, P. M., Fisher, V., Foley, J. A., Friend, A. D., *et al.* (2001) *Global Change Biol.* **7**, 357–373.
- Curtis, P. S. & Wang, X. Z. (1998) *Oecologia* **113**, 299–313.

7. Norby, R. J., Wullschleger, S. D., Gunderson, C. A., Johnson, D. W. & Ceulemans, R. (1999) *Plant Cell Environ.* **22**, 683–714.
8. Wullschleger, S. D., Post, W. M. & King, A. W. (1995) in *Biotic Feedbacks in the Global Climatic System: Will Warming Feed the Warming?*, eds. Woodwell, G. M. & Mackenzie, F. T. (Oxford Univ. Press, New York), pp. 85–107.
9. Field, C. B., Behrenfeld, M. J., Randerson, J. T. & Falkowski, P. (1998) *Science* **281**, 237–240.
10. Hendrey, G. R., Ellsworth, D. S., Lewin, K. F. & Nagy, J. (1999) *Global Change Biol.* **5**, 293–309.
11. Miglietta, F., Peressotti, A., Vaccari, F. P., Zaldei, A., DeAngelis, P. & Scarascia-Mugnozza, G. (2001) *New Phytol.* **150**, 465–476.
12. Nowak, R. S., Ellsworth, D. S. & Smith, S. D. (2004) *New Phytol.* **162**, 253–280.
13. King, J. S., Hanson, P. J., Bernhardt, E., DeAngelis, P., Norby, R. J. & Pregitzer, K. S. (2004) *Global Change Biol.* **10**, 1027–1042.
14. Houghton, J. T., Ding, Y., Griggs, D. J., Noguera, M., van der Linden, P. J. & Xiaosu, D. (2001) *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis: Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.).
15. Norby, R. J., Todd, D. E., Fuels, J. & Johnson, D. W. (2001) *New Phytol.* **150**, 477–487.
16. Karnosky, D. F., Mankovska, B., Percy, K., Dickson, R. E., Podila, G. K., Sober, J., Noormets, A., Hendrey, G., Coleman, M. D., Kubiske, M., *et al.* (1999) *Water Air Soil Pollution* **116**, 311–322.
17. Karnosky, D. F., Pregitzer, K. S., Zak, D. R., Kubiske, M. E., Hendrey, G. R., Weinstein, D., Nosal, M. & Percy, K. E. (2005) *Plant Cell Environ.* **28**, 965–981.
18. Hamilton, J. G., DeLucia, E. H., George, K., Naidu, S. L., Finzi, A. C. & Schlesinger, W. H. (2002) *Oecologia* **131**, 250–260.
19. Calfapietra, C., Gielen, B., Galema, A. N. J., Lukac, M., De Angelis, P., Moscatelli, M. C., Ceulemans, R. & Scarascia-Mugnozza, G. (2003) *Tree Physiol.* **23**, 805–814.
20. King, J. S., Kubiske, M. E., Pregitzer, K. S., Hendrey, G. R., McDonald, E. P., Giardina, C. P., Quinn, V. S. & Karnosky, D. F. (2005) *New Phytol.* **168**, 623–636.
21. DeLucia, E. H., George, K. & Hamilton, J. G. (2002) *Tree Physiol.* **22**, 1003–1010.
22. Naidu, S. L., DeLucia, E. H. & Thomas, R. B. (1998) *Can. J. Forest Res.-Revue Canadienne de Recherche Forestiere* **28**, 1116–1124.
23. Cotrufo, M. F., De Angelis, P. & Polle, A. (2005) *Global Change Biol.* **11**, 971–982.
24. Finzi, A. C., Allen, A. S., DeLucia, E. H., Ellsworth, D. S. & Schlesinger, W. H. (2001) *Ecology* **82**, 470–484.
25. Norby, R. J., Sholtis, J. D., Gunderson, C. A. & Jawdy, S. S. (2003) *Oecologia* **136**, 574–584.
26. Gielen, B., Calfapietra, C., Lukac, M., Wittig, V. E., De Angelis, P., Janssens, I. A., Moscatelli, M. C., Grego, S., Cotrufo, M. F., Godbold, D. L., *et al.* (2005) *Tree Physiol.* **25**, 1399–1408.
27. Norby, R. J., Hanson, P. J., O'Neill, E. G., Tschaplinski, T. J., Weltzin, J. F., Hansen, R. A., Cheng, W. X., Wullschleger, S. D., Gunderson, C. A., Edwards, N. T., *et al.* (2002) *Ecol. Appl.* **12**, 1261–1266.
28. Norby, R. J., Ledford, J., Reilly, C. D., Miller, N. E. & O'Neill, E. G. (2004) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 9689–9693.
29. Lukac, M., Calfapietra, C. & Godbold, D. L. (2003) *Global Change Biol.* **9**, 838–848.
30. Matamala, R. & Schlesinger, W. H. (2000) *Global Change Biol.* **6**, 967–979.
31. Pregitzer, K. S., Zak, D. R., Maziasz, J., DeForest, J., Curtis, P. S. & Lussenhop, J. (2000) *Ecol. Appl.* **10**, 18–33.
32. Potter, C. S., Randerson, J. T., Field, C. B., Matson, P. A., Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A. & Klooster, S. A. (1993) *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **7**, 811–841.
33. Amthor, J. S. & Koch, G. W. (1995) in *Carbon Dioxide and Terrestrial Ecosystems*, eds. Koch, G. W. & Mooney, H. A. (Academic, San Diego, CA), pp. 399–414.
34. Woodward, F. I., Smith, T. M. & Emanuel, W. R. (1995) *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **9**, 471–490.
35. Friedlingstein, P., Fung, I., Holland, E., John, J., Brasseur, G., Erickson, D. & Schimel, D. (1995) *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **9**, 541–556.
36. Finzi, A. C., DeLucia, E. H., Hamilton, J. G., Richter, D. D. & Schlesinger, W. H. (2002) *Oecologia* **132**, 567–578.
37. Oren, R., Ellsworth, D. S., Johnsen, K. H., Phillips, N., Ewers, B. E., Maier, C., Schafer, K. V. R., McCarthy, H., Hendrey, G., McNulty, S. G., *et al.* (2001) *Nature* **411**, 469–472.
38. Hungate, B. A., Dukes, J. S., Shaw, M. R., Luo, Y. Q. & Field, C. B. (2003) *Science* **302**, 1512–1513.
39. Luo, Y., Su, B., Currie, W. S., Dukes, J. S., Finzi, A., Hartwig, U., Hungate, B., McMurtrie, R. E., Oren, R., Parton, W. J., *et al.* (2004) *Bioscience* **54**, 731–739.
40. Finzi, A. C., Moore, D. J., DeLucia, E. H., Kim, H. S., Jackson, R. L., Lichter, J., McCarthy, H., Oren, R., Pippin, J. S. & Schlesinger, W. H. (2006) *Ecology* **87**, 15–25.
41. Norby, R. J. & Iversen, C. M. (2006) *Ecology* **87**, 5–14.
42. DeLucia, E. H., Moore, D. J. & Norby, R. J. (2005) *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **19**, GB3006.
43. Körner, C., Asshoff, R., Bignucolo, O., Hättenschwiler, S., Keel, S. G., Pelaez-Riedl, S., Pepin, S., Siegwolf, R. T. W. & Zotz, G. (2005) *Science* **309**, 1360–1362.