

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Emergence of the physiological effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on land–atmosphere exchange of carbon and water

Chunhui Zhan<sup>1</sup>  | René Orth<sup>1</sup> | Mirco Migliavacca<sup>1,2</sup> | Sönke Zaehle<sup>3</sup>  | Markus Reichstein<sup>1</sup> | Jan Engel<sup>3</sup> | Anja Rammig<sup>4</sup> | Alexander J. Winkler<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department for Biogeochemical Integration, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

<sup>2</sup>European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Ispra, Italy

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biogeochemical Signals, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Land Surface–Atmosphere Interactions, TUM School of Life Sciences Weihenstephan, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany

## Correspondence

Chunhui Zhan, Department for Biogeochemical Integration, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany.  
Email: [czhan@bgc-jena.mpg.de](mailto:czhan@bgc-jena.mpg.de)

## Funding information

German Research Foundation, Grant/Award Number: 391059971; H2020 European Research Council, Grant/Award Number: 647204 and 855187; International Max Planck Research School for Global Biogeochemical Cycles

## Abstract

Elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (eCO<sub>2</sub>) influences the carbon assimilation rate and stomatal conductance of plants, thereby affecting the global cycles of carbon and water. Yet, the detection of these physiological effects of eCO<sub>2</sub> in observational data remains challenging, because natural variations and confounding factors (e.g., warming) can overshadow the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects in observational data of real-world ecosystems. In this study, we aim at developing a method to detect the emergence of the physiological CO<sub>2</sub> effects on various variables related to carbon and water fluxes. We mimic the observational setting in ecosystems using a comprehensive process-based land surface model QUINCY to simulate the leaf-level effects of increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and their century-long propagation through the terrestrial carbon and water cycles across different climate regimes and biomes. We then develop a statistical method based on the signal-to-noise ratio to detect the emergence of the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects. The eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on gross primary productivity (GPP) emerges at relatively low CO<sub>2</sub> increase ( $\Delta[\text{CO}_2] \sim 20$  ppm) where the leaf area index is relatively high. Compared to GPP, the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect causing reduced transpiration water flux (normalized to leaf area) emerges only at relatively high CO<sub>2</sub> increase ( $\Delta[\text{CO}_2] \gg 40$  ppm), due to the high sensitivity to climate variability and thus lower signal-to-noise ratio. In general, the response to eCO<sub>2</sub> is detectable earlier for variables related to the carbon cycle than the water cycle, when plant productivity is not limited by climatic constraints, and stronger in forest-dominated rather than in grass-dominated ecosystems. Our results provide a step toward when and where we expect to detect physiological CO<sub>2</sub> effects in in-situ flux measurements, how to detect them and encourage future efforts to improve the understanding and quantification of these effects in observations of terrestrial carbon and water dynamics.

## KEYWORDS

carbon cycle, CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization, hydrological cycle, land-atmosphere interactions, signal detection, terrestrial biosphere and Earth system model, terrestrial ecosystems

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2022 The Authors. *Global Change Biology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Plants are tightly coupled to the ambient atmosphere through their exchange of energy, water, and carbon. Through this coupling, plants play an essential role in controlling the global cycles of carbon and water, and also modulate earth's surface energy balance (Denissen et al., 2022; Friedlingstein et al., 2019; Gedney et al., 2006; Williams & Torn, 2015). Changing atmospheric conditions such as rising air temperature, or increasing dryness in turn directly impact on plants and their functioning (Bastos et al., 2020; Novick et al., 2016; Reichstein et al., 2013). Also changes in the atmospheric composition, such as elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (eCO<sub>2</sub>), alter plant productivity, for example by stimulating carbon assimilation and by reducing stomatal conductance (Ainsworth & Long, 2005; Norby & Zak, 2011; Walker et al., 2021). As a result, the light-use efficiency (LUE; Drake et al., 1997) and the water-use efficiency (WUE) of plants (WUE; Peñuelas et al., 2011; Ueyama et al., 2020) increase under eCO<sub>2</sub>. The combined effect is referred to as the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect (Körner et al., 2007; Walker et al., 2021). This study aims to identify the change in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at which the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects are distinguishable from the short-term and long-term climate effects.

Plant leaves respond directly to eCO<sub>2</sub> through the physiological mechanisms associated with the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect, which could potentially translate into changes in gross primary productivity (GPP) and transpiration (Tr) that can propagate further into the carbon and water cycles (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2017; Lemordant et al., 2018; Walker et al., 2021). Throughout this paper, the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects indicate particularly physiological effects. Specifically, the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect alters the carbon cycle by triggering changes in GPP resulting in changes in net primary production (NPP) and various aspects of biomass production, accumulation, and allocation (e.g., leaves or roots). The increased biomass production can potentially contribute to an increased leaf area index (LAI). Observational evidence suggests that this effect can vary substantially across different biomes and plant functional types (De Kauwe et al., 2014; Norby & Zak, 2011; Winkler et al., 2021). The water cycle is affected as eCO<sub>2</sub> is triggering changes in the leaf-level Tr flux which controls the largest fraction of the land-atmosphere water exchange (Good et al., 2015). The eCO<sub>2</sub>-induced change of Tr implies a potential influence on other components in the water cycle, such as soil evaporation, run-off, and consequently soil moisture (Lemordant et al., 2018; Leuzinger & Körner, 2007). However, reduced transpiration at the leaf level due to reduced stomatal conductance and stomatal density in response to eCO<sub>2</sub> (Ainsworth & Rogers, 2007; Woodward & Kelly, 1995) could be offset by a simultaneous increase in leaf area, and thus transpiration at canopy level as more carbon is invested in leaf growth in response to eCO<sub>2</sub> (Wullschlegel et al., 2002). These competing effects of eCO<sub>2</sub> could potentially compensate each other, resulting in a non-detectable effect on the water cycle. On the other hand, the increasing leaf area enhances GPP by controlling light interception (McCarthy et al., 2006).

The emergence of the effects of eCO<sub>2</sub> on carbon and water cycles in experiments and observations remain inconsistent. The intrinsic WUE inferred from 21 flux site measurements shows strong increase (Keenan et al., 2013), while the study by Knauer et al. (2017) indicates a smaller magnitude of WUE response at a recent large scale. Increased biomass is found in many free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment (FACE) experiments (Walker et al., 2019). However, tree-ring studies indicate the increased intrinsic WUE does not translate into the increased tree biomass (Peñuelas et al., 2011; van der Sleen et al., 2015). The diverse response of plant physiology to eCO<sub>2</sub> is observed in many other aspects. Results from field experiments show the magnitude of eCO<sub>2</sub> stimulation on carbon assimilation rate varies considerably across species and experimental conditions (Leakey et al., 2009; Norby et al., 1999; Norby & Zak, 2011; Walker et al., 2021). Meta-analysis indicates that stomatal conductance in young trees shows stronger response to eCO<sub>2</sub> than old trees, and deciduous forest shows stronger response than conifer forest (Medlyn et al., 2001). Furthermore, photosynthesis in C<sub>4</sub> plants is close to being saturated, while plants in the C<sub>3</sub> carbon pathway are expected to show a greater increase in carbon assimilation rate (Ainsworth & Rogers, 2007; Kramer, 1981; Leakey et al., 2009). C<sub>4</sub> plants may have more potential response to eCO<sub>2</sub> associated with high WUE (Way et al., 2014). Overall, the uncertain strength of eCO<sub>2</sub> effects across different climate zones and biomes prevents us from better understanding the governing processes, but this is necessary to anticipate future changes of carbon and water fluxes in the system.

This study aims to develop a methodology that would be helpful to define the detectable imprint of CO<sub>2</sub> on land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon and water given the natural variabilities. Such a detection is challenging with real-world data, mostly due to confounding factors impacting on long-term plant productivity, such as climatic variability, nitrogen deposition, and land cover change (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2021; McCarthy et al., 2010; Schimel et al., 2015). FACE experiments provide the opportunities to observe the response of ecosystems to eCO<sub>2</sub> in the field exposed in open-air conditions (Ainsworth & Long, 2005). Nevertheless, in these experiments, ecosystems are pushed into an "accelerating mode" where plants are exposed to a much higher rate of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration increase (~550ppm) in a short time period while the climate conditions are changing at a relatively slow speed. Process-based models provide the opportunity to conduct factorial experiments to isolate the role of individual drivers, which allows us to test a statistical trend-detection method. Using this method, we develop the concept of the emergence of the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect (EoC), which allows us to determine to which extent the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect can exceed the natural variability and confounding factors. Here, we perform three simulations with the terrestrial biosphere model QUINCY (QUantifying Interactions between terrestrial Nutrient CYcles and the climate system; Thum et al., 2019) to isolate the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects: (i) a reference simulation with transient CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and observation-based meteorological forcing, (ii) a simulation where the CO<sub>2</sub> is kept

constant at the level of 1901 while the meteorological forcing is identical to the reference simulation; and (iii) a simulation with the same set up of (i) but CO<sub>2</sub> is kept constant after the year 1988 at the level of 1988. The simulation (iii) is used to test our method in the recent time period, when the FLUXNET observations start to be recorded (Baldocchi et al., 2001). Additionally, the simulation (iii) is designed to study the role of the baseline CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in our findings. Analyzing the differences of carbon and water fluxes between simulations with transient and constant CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, we develop a statistical method based on the signal-to-noise ratio to detect the emergence of significant eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on these fluxes given their natural variability. The signal refers to the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects, and the noise indicates the inter-annual variability which is related mostly to climate variations. In other words, we seek to identify the point in time when the signal is distinguishable from the noise. We concentrate on the two variables which are most directly affected by rising CO<sub>2</sub>, GPP, and Tr at annual, seasonal, and diurnal scales. To exclude the potential compensation effect of increasing LAI, we normalize Tr by LAI ( $Tr_{norm}$ ) to obtain the transpiration flux per leaf area. Subsequently, we analyze eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on ecosystem properties (Table 1) which are important in the carbon and water cycle and investigate controls of the EoC. We also include Earth system models (ESMs) from the most recent Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6) to examine the controls of the EoC in other models than QUINCY with different process formulations. In this way, we validate to which extent the controls of spatial variations in EoC found from QUINCY also apply for CMIP6 simulations. Overall, this analysis will guide the investigation of the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects in measurements of water and carbon fluxes as being conducted at the various eddy covariance sites.

TABLE 1 Variables and metrics analyzed for the emergence of the elevated CO<sub>2</sub> effects

Variable or metric	Abbreviation
Gross primary productivity	GPP
Transpiration	Tr
Normalized transpiration per leaf area ( $Tr / LAI$ )	$Tr_{norm}$
Leaf area index	LAI
Net primary production	NPP
Biomass	
Evaporation	
Interception loss	
Root-zone soil moisture	
Light-use efficiency ( $GPP / \text{Absorbed photosynthetically active radiation}$ (APAR))	LUE
Underlying water-use efficiency ( $GPP \times \sqrt{VPD} / Tr$ )	uWUE
Normalized canopy conductance ( $\text{canopy conductance (gc)} / (VPD \times LAI)$ )	$g_{c, norm}$
95th percentile of daily GPP values in each year	GPP <sup>95</sup>
95th percentile of daily $Tr_{norm}$ values in each year	$Tr_{norm}^{95}$

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 | QUINCY model

#### 2.1.1 | Model description

The terrestrial ecosystem model, QUINCY (Thum et al., 2019), is designed to represent the coupled carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus cycles and their interactions with energy and water balances in terrestrial ecosystems. QUINCY simulates half-hourly carbon, water and energy fluxes as well as longer-term ecosystem dynamics across climate regimes and different plant functional types (PFTs), representing different plant growth forms (tree, grass), leaf types (leaves, needles), and phenology (evergreen, cold and drought deciduous, perennial). Calculation of coupled photosynthesis (Kull & Kruijt, 1998) and stomatal conductance (Medlyn et al., 2011) are taking for sunlit and shaded leaves separately along the vertical canopy gradient of light, foliar chlorophyll, and photosynthetic N. QUINCY accounts for limitations of photosynthesis by light, CO<sub>2</sub>, temperature, and water availability. Light attenuates in the canopy with exponentially increasing layer thickness when the canopy depth increases as a function of the cumulative LAI. GPP at the canopy level is integrated from leaf-level gross photosynthesis. The simulated diurnal and seasonal patterns of GPP have been evaluated against a number of benchmarks, including several FLUXNET sites. Leaf area development is dynamically dependent on plant production (and thereby its response to changing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, climate and water availability) as well as stand structural development and turnover through mortality and establishment. Transpiration is calculated as a function of the stomatal conductance of the canopy, aerodynamic conductance, and other parameters in terms of air density and humidity. Soil physics, moisture, and biogeochemistry are modelled for 15 layers with exponentially increasing depth. QUINCY calculates the litter and soil organic matter turnover by first-order kinetics with temperature and moisture dependencies. For more detailed explanations of the process representations in QUINCY, please refer to the model description by Thum et al. (2019). The code version used in this study (see code availability statement) corresponds to that of Thum et al. (2019), with minor bug fixes affecting the stability of the energy balance calculation, the calculation of grassland phenology as well as the use of the stomatal model by Medlyn et al. (2011).

#### 2.1.2 | Model setup

##### *Boundary conditions and meteorological forcing*

The QUINCY model is a 1D model applied at individual sites (336 sites) distributed across climate zones and biomes for the time period 1901–2018. As an offline land surface model, QUINCY takes time-dependent observation-based meteorological forcing variables as input such as short- and longwave radiation, air temperature, precipitation, vapor pressure deficit (VPD), atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, as well as other boundary conditions such as

geographic coordinates, PFTs, and soil physical and chemical parameters. At each site, a specific boundary condition and meteorological forcing are taken from the Climate Research Unit and Japanese reanalysis product (CRU JRA V2.1; Harris et al., 2020), and disaggregated to the model time step (half-hourly) using the statistical weather generator (Zaehle & Friend, 2010). The annual atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is obtained from the Global Carbon Project (Le Quéré et al., 2018). Soil physical and chemical properties are derived from soil texture (Saxton & Rawls, 2006). The texture data are taken from the nearest grid cell of SoilGrids dataset (Hengl et al., 2017). To improve the interpretability of the model simulations with respect to the occurrence of the eCO<sub>2</sub> signal, we reduce the model complexity and set the soil-soluble NH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub>, and PO<sub>4</sub> concentrations at a prescribed level so that the plant growth is not limited by the nutrient availability, and disregard the N and P deposition in the model.

#### Model simulation experiments for hypothesis testing

We conduct three factorial model experiments to disentangle the effects of eCO<sub>2</sub> from other drivers: (a) transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment. This simulation can be considered as a historical run that aims to approximate the observed system and thus takes the transient climate and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration for the period 1901–2018 as forcing. The transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment simulates an increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> of 110.63 ppm over 118 years; (b) constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment. This simulation includes the same transient climate as the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment. However, the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration does not change and is fixed to the initial value of 1901 (296.8 ppm) for the entire simulation period. The climate forcing data contain the effects of rising CO<sub>2</sub>. (c) freeze-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment. Here, the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> increases until 1988, as in the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment, but is then kept constant at this value in the years thereafter. The year 1988 was chosen as the time close to the setup of the first FLUXNET sites (Baldocchi et al., 2001).

## 2.2 | Statistical analysis

### 2.2.1 | The effect of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on annual average GPP and Tr<sub>norm</sub>

We first calculate the difference in annual average values of GPP and normalized transpiration (Tr<sub>norm</sub> = Tr/LAI) between the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> and the constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiments. The difference indicates the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on the target variable for the period 1901–2018. We cluster the sites based on site-PFT in four vegetation groups: tropical forest, temperate forest, boreal forest, and grasses (Table S1). We further classify the sites of each vegetation group into three temperature classes, “hot,” “warm,” and “cold” based on the quantiles of long-term mean 2 m air temperature between the sites in each group. Subdividing the temperature classes further based on the long-term mean annual precipitation (“low,” “middle,” and “high”), we


are able to assess the role of water availability in controlling the variability in GPP and normalized transpiration. While the CO<sub>2</sub>-induced change of LAI compensates the reduced leaf-level water loss at canopy Tr, it governs GPP in an opposite way. The structural change of increased LAI increases the amount of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (APAR) and therefore vegetation productivity. We also evaluate the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on annual average LUE (LUE = GPP/APAR). The part of increased GPP related to increased LAI can be thus disentangled.

### 2.2.2 | Emergence of the elevated CO<sub>2</sub> effects

Based on the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect, we hypothesize that the continuous CO<sub>2</sub> increase over a long period of time exerts a significant influence on the ecosystem (e.g., GPP), which stands out as the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect from natural variability and other factors after a given time and strength of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration increase. We define the EoC (ppm) as the change in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>]) required so that the annual mean values of a simulated variable in the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment diverges significantly from the constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment. The significant divergence between the annual mean values is defined by the point in Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>] when the signal exceeds the noise. The noise is intended as the interannual variability of the signal around the long-term changes. We retrieve the signal and noise from the linear fit in the historical time period for each experiment. The calculation of EoC consists of four steps: (1) for each site, we calculate annual averages for the target variable (e.g., GPP) from daily model output for both transient-CO<sub>2</sub> and constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiments for the time period 1901–2018. We calculate the absolute increase of the annual mean CO<sub>2</sub> level (i.e., Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>]) compared with the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the initial year in the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> experiment; (2) we apply linear least squares regressions to retrieve the trend in the evolution of the target variable along Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>] from both transient- and constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiments, respectively, over a given time period (Figure 1). We start with the time period 1901–1910 and iteratively expand this time period year by year by advancing the final year of the time window. For each time period, we compute the linear trend between the target variable and the Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>] and the uncertainty of the estimation. Accordingly, we obtain an estimate of the trend and its uncertainties for a total of  $n = 108$  points in time for each experiment at each site. The trend  $b$  and its standard error  $\sigma_b$  in the linear regression model are given by (Weisstein, n.d.):

$$b = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

$$\sigma_b = \sqrt{\frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2) - (\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y}) \times b) / (n-2)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}}$$



**FIGURE 1** Illustration of detection of emergence of the elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  effects (EoC). The solid lines depict the evolution of annual mean gross primary productivity (GPP) along increasing  $\text{CO}_2$  levels for one example site in QUINCY (80.75°W, 37.75°N, temperate broadleaved summer green tree). Black color denotes the evolution of GPP from the transient- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment, while gray color denotes the evolution of GPP from the constant- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment (for details, see Section 2.1.2.2), in which  $\text{CO}_2$  is used as the proxy of time. The shaded area represents the standard error of the linear regression slope (black or gray dashed line). The vertical dashed red line indicates the EoC, that is, the value of  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$  where the black and gray trends deviate significantly.

where  $x$  is the  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$  at time step  $i$ , and  $y$  is the value of target variable at time step  $i$ ; (3) the signal is retrieved as the absolute difference in the regression slopes  $\Delta b$  ( $b$  in transient- $\text{CO}_2$  minus  $b$  in constant- $\text{CO}_2$ ) as a function of  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$ , while the noise is estimated based on twice the sum of two  $\sigma_b$  from the transient- $\text{CO}_2$  and constant- $\text{CO}_2$  experiments to represent the statistical significance (two-sigma rule); (4) the EoC is defined as  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration difference ( $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$ ) between the time when the signal exceeds the noise for 5 consecutive years for the first time and the year 1901 (see Figure 1 for example). We also test the sensitivity of the arbitrary choice of 5 years in the calculation of EoC and present results also for  $n$  ( $n = 3, 5, 7, 9$ ) years (Figure S4). We show that the impact of our arbitrary choice is negligible on the results. Even though there could be a meteorological extreme event that has a strong impact in individual years, it has a limited influence on the slope of the linear regression over many years. For analyzing the freeze- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment, we use the same approach to derive the EoC. The only difference is that we set the initial year of keeping  $\text{CO}_2$  constant to 1988 instead of 1901.

This freeze- $\text{CO}_2$  approach makes sure that both experiments (transient and freeze- $\text{CO}_2$ ) share the same initial state and memory in the system. In addition and comparison to the freeze- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment, we assess this aspect also using the transient and constant- $\text{CO}_2$  experiments and derive the sensitivity of EoC over time by advancing the initial year (i.e., 1901, 1930, 1960, and 1988) in the analysis. In doing so, we shift the time series of the dependent variable (e.g., GPP) in the constant- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment along the y-axis

to match the value in the transient- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment in the respective initial year. In this analysis, we calculate EoC with varying initial states (Figure S13).

In this study, we mainly focus on the  $\text{CO}_2$ -induced change on annual average values of the relevant variables and metrics for all sites. Based on existing knowledge, we select variables or metrics (Table 1) that are hypothesized to be most sensitive to  $\text{eCO}_2$  (Drake et al., 1997; Knauer et al., 2017; Migliavacca et al., 2021; Novick et al., 2016; Ueyama et al., 2020) to investigate the first manifestations of  $\text{eCO}_2$ . In addition, to analyze the variation of the  $\text{CO}_2$  fertilization effect at different time scales, we apply the same detecting method at specific times-of-day in each year (e.g., 1 May, 8 am) instead of annual means, to derive the EoC at seasonal and diurnal scales for representative sites from each vegetation classes (Table S1).

Next to this trend-detection method, an alternative method is implemented to test the robustness of the current method. The alternative method defines the signal as the mean of the difference between the time series of the target variable from the transient- and constant- $\text{CO}_2$  experiments. The noise is estimated using twice the sum of the standard error in residuals from both time series after removing the long-term trend using the LOWESS fit function (Cleveland, 1981). The time of emergence is determined by the year when the signal exceeds the noise for 5 consecutive years for the first time. The EoC is defined as the  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration difference ( $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$ ) between the time of emergence and the year 1901 (Figure S14).

### 2.2.3 | Variable importance determined with random forest analysis

After determining EoC for each site-level simulation, we obtain the respective spatial distribution of EoC across sites. We evaluate the relative contribution from all drivers to the spatial variability in EoC by applying SHapley Additive exPlanation (SHAP) value analysis based on the random forest (RF) model. First, we train the RF model (scikit-learn RandomForestRegressor API in Python; Pedregosa et al., 2011) to predict the previously computed EoC patterns across sites using site-specific long-term (1901–2018) means of climate factors (i.e., temperature, precipitation, soil moisture, VPD, aridity index [evapotranspiration/precipitation]) and vegetation related factors (i.e., GPP, LAI, growing season length) as predictors (Figure S10). The long-term mean values are computed over the entire simulation period from the transient- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment. The out-of-bag score estimates the accuracy of the prediction from the RF model as compared with the actual EoC values, where a higher value (the maximum score equals 1) represents a better performance of the model. Finally, we use the module “SHAP TreeExplainer” from the software package shap in Python (Lundberg et al., 2020; Lundberg & Lee, 2017) to examine the influence of all the involved predictors. The average of the absolute SHAP values for each predictor indicates its impact on the target variable (i.e., spatial variability of EoC).



## 2.3 | Comparison with simulations from ESMs (CMIP6)


In addition, we perform the EoC analysis for GPP and  $Tr_{norm}$  using simulations from 7 ESMs from the most recent CMIP6. We use simulation output of the CMIP6 experiments 1pctCO2 and 1pctCO2-rad. In both experiments, the  $CO_2$  concentration increases gradually at a rate of 1% per year until quadrupling, starting at the pre-industrial equilibrium state (Meehl et al., 2014). The fully coupled model setup is used in the 1pctCO2 experiment, while for the 1pctCO2-rad experiment the  $CO_2$  concentration is kept at the pre-industrial level for the carbon cycle and the increasing  $CO_2$  has only a radiative effect (i.e.,  $CO_2$ -induced climatic changes; Jones et al., 2016). Therefore, the 1pctCO2 experiment is comparable to our transient- $CO_2$  experiment, and the 1pctCO2-rad experiment is comparable to our constant- $CO_2$  experiment, although the QUINCY simulations follow the observed  $CO_2$  concentration for the last 120 years. EoC is calculated by applying the same detection method as described in Section 2.2.2. To obtain comparability to the EoC results based on the QUINCY simulations, we select cells in gridded CMIP6 output which correspond to the locations of simulated sites with QUINCY. Furthermore, we only consider the CMIP6 time series from the year 1850 until the doubling of the atmospheric  $CO_2$  concentration, that is, roughly 560ppm. The ESMs used in this study are (1) Beijing Climate Center (BCC) BCC-CSM2-MR, (2) Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL) IPSL-CM6A-LR, (3) Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques (CNRM) CNRM-ESM2-1, (4) United Kingdom (UK) UKESM1-0-LL, (5) Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis (CCCma) CanESM5, (6) Meteorological Research Institute of the Japan Meteorological Agency (MRI) MRI-ESM2-0, and (7) Max Planck Institute for Meteorology (MPI) MPI-ESM1.2-LR. More details on the used CMIP6 ESMs can be found in Arora et al. (2020). Due to missing respective output, the analysis for normalized transpiration ( $Tr_{norm}$ ) only involves the first four models in the CMIP6 archive.

## 3 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 | The effect of elevated $CO_2$ on GPP

Our analysis based on model simulation experiments indicates that  $eCO_2$  generally increases GPP. This increase in GPP differs in magnitude and interannual variability across climate and vegetation types (Figure 2). The trend of increasing GPP over 118 years is clearly visible in all forested sites and less clear at grassland sites due to high year-to-year variability in GPP. In comparison to the forested sites, the variability in GPP is considerably higher at grassland sites, because grass-dominated ecosystems are more sensitive to climate variability partly related to shallower roots (Kulmatiski et al., 2020; Miguez-Macho & Fan, 2021) and less regulated by stomatal closure (Konings et al., 2017). Grasslands are also predominantly located in semi-arid regions, in which interannual variability of precipitation is large, and therefore has a larger imprint on GPP that it would have in mesic ecosystems with lower precipitation interannual variability (Maurer et al., 2020). The grassland sites that are located in relatively cold regions show less variability and more clear trends in GPP in contrast to grassland sites located in warmer (and drier) regions.

Overall, the results show that the  $CO_2$  fertilization effect is strong where vegetation productivity is not strongly limited by energy or water availability. Subdividing the temperature classes further based on the amount of annual precipitation, we are able to assess the role of water availability in controlling the variability in GPP (Figure S2). Sites located in relatively warm and wet regions in the temperate and the boreal forest vegetation class (Figure S2b,c) also exhibit the sharpest increase in GPP. This is probably related to the temperature-dependent response of photosynthetic rate of  $CO_2$  uptake through the kinetics of the Rubisco enzyme (Baig et al., 2015; Hickler et al., 2008; Long, 1991). However, the difference of increase in LUE across temperature and precipitation classes is not apparent compared to where we



**FIGURE 2** Differences in annual average gross primary productivity (GPP) between the transient- $CO_2$  and the constant- $CO_2$  experiments across climate and vegetation classes. All global sites (336 sites) are first grouped by vegetation type (a-d, Table S1) and then by long-term mean temperature using quantiles within each group (cold in blue:  $\leq 0.33$ ; warm in orange: 0.33-0.66; hot in purple:  $\geq 0.66$ ). The shaded area depicts standard deviation around the multi-sites mean value (solid lines).

find the sharp increase in GPP, especially in the temperate forest vegetation class (Figure S1). The increased carbon assimilation due to rising CO<sub>2</sub> leads to a build-up of more biomass, some of which is allocated to increased leaf growth resulting in an extension of the leaf area (Winkler et al., 2021). Canopies with higher LAI are more available for light interception and therefore it leads to enhancement of vegetation productivity. In temperate forest, the enhancement of GPP due to eCO<sub>2</sub> is the combination of increased both LAI and photosynthetic efficiency (McCarthy et al., 2006; Norby et al., 2005).

### 3.2 | The effect of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on transpiration per leaf area


Decreased transpiration (Tr) due to down-regulated gas exchange with the atmosphere at the leaf level can be offset by an extension in leaf area at the canopy level. The simulated Tr exhibits both increasing and decreasing trends in response to eCO<sub>2</sub>. To account for that, we normalized Tr by LAI which is denoted by Tr<sub>norm</sub>. Tr<sub>norm</sub> thus represents the transpiration per leaf area.

As expected, we find consistently decreasing Tr<sub>norm</sub> across all vegetation types and temperature classes (Figure 3). Similar to the result in Section 3.1 (Figure 2), the variability in Tr<sub>norm</sub> is high in grasslands. In contrast to GPP, Tr<sub>norm</sub> responds to eCO<sub>2</sub> strongly where temperature and precipitation are relatively low (i.e., cold and dry regions) except for tropical forest sites (Figure S3). Barton et al. (2012) suggested that the ratio of net photosynthesis to transpiration increases in proportion to the increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. They further demonstrated that stomatal conductance responds to eCO<sub>2</sub> not as strongly as the photosynthesis apparatus. At the leaf level, the decreased stomatal conductance is likely to result in the increase of leaf skin temperature (Leakey et al., 2009), which demands higher transpiration. However, the direct relationship between ambient


temperature and eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on stomatal regulation is still ambiguous (Barton et al., 2012; Medlyn et al., 2001).

### 3.3 | Emergence of the elevated CO<sub>2</sub> effects (EoC) in GPP and Tr<sub>norm</sub>

A lower EoC indicates a detection of eCO<sub>2</sub> effects earlier in the analyzed time period and thus a stronger response in the target variable to the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects compared to its background or natural variability. Our results show that the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect in GPP is strongest in the tropical forests. In total, 34 in 174 detected sites exhibit an EoC of less than 20 ppm (Figure 4). This means that a change in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> of 20 ppm is sufficient to detect the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect in the GPP time series for those sites. The forested northern mid- and high latitudes also exhibit significant changes in GPP, which, however, is only detectable at much higher Δ[CO<sub>2</sub>] (consistent with Schimel et al., 2015). GPP in arid regions is highly variable due to the high sensitivity toward intermittent water availability, and this prevents a detection of the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect. The effect of eCO<sub>2</sub> on GPP further rarely emerges in regions dominated by C4 grasses, most likely because they are less responsive to eCO<sub>2</sub> due to their different photosynthetic pathway (Leakey et al., 2009). Also, evidence from FACE experiments suggests that trees exhibit the greatest response to eCO<sub>2</sub> compared to C3 and C4 grasses (Ainsworth & Long, 2005). The magnitude of plants' responses to eCO<sub>2</sub> comes down to the variations of photosynthetic capacity, which is indicated by the maximum rate of RuBisCO carboxylase activity (V<sub>c,max</sub>) and the maximum rate of photosynthetic electron transport (J<sub>max</sub>; Long, 1991). We find a similar pattern of distribution for EoC in LUE (Figure S5) with EoC in GPP, which could support the physiological effect of eCO<sub>2</sub> on GPP rather than structural change, namely the change of LAI. The result from the alternative method (see Section 2.2.2) does not show apparent difference (Figure S14).



**FIGURE 3** Differences in annual average Tr<sub>norm</sub> between the transient-CO<sub>2</sub> and the constant-CO<sub>2</sub> experiments across climate and vegetation classes. All global sites (336 sites) are first grouped by vegetation type (a–d, Table S1) and then by temperature using quantiles (cold in blue: ≤0.33; warm in orange: 0.33–0.66; hot in purple: ≥0.66). The shaded area depicts standard deviation around the multi-sites mean value (solid lines).



**FIGURE 4** Spatial distribution of emergence of the elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  effects (EoC) in (a) gross primary productivity (GPP) and (b)  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$ . Bright color indicates an earlier detection (lower EoC), and dark color indicates a later detection (higher EoC). Non-colored points indicate sites where the elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  does not translate into significant changes in GPP or  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  within the historical time period.

EoC in  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  is substantially higher compared to GPP, that is, the signal emerges only at considerably higher  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2]$ . Furthermore, the global spatial pattern of EoC is more homogeneous for  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  than for GPP. Several equatorial sites exhibit a relatively low EoC (some of them even less than 40 ppm), but for most sites (85 in 141 detected sites) the signal only emerges at  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2] > 70$  ppm or not at all. Especially at sites in arid and semi-arid regions, no significant effect of  $\text{eCO}_2$  can be detected, even though a strong response in WUE is expected to occur in these water-limited ecosystems (Medlyn et al., 2001). In the QUINCY model, canopy conductance and transpiration do not scale linearly with LAI at canopy level. So, the  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  could still be affected by increasing LAI to some extent. Next to this, transpiration can be affected by other factors which may overshadow the role of stomatal conductance. For example, transpiration is affected by incoming radiation particularly when vegetation is strongly decoupled with the boundary layer, that is, a low exchange rate between vegetation and atmosphere (De Kauwe et al., 2017; Jarvis, 1985). Due to the limited representation of the

coupling between vegetation and the boundary layer in models, the reduced transpiration flux at the leaf-level might not scale to the canopy-level.

The freeze- $\text{CO}_2$  experiment (see Section 2.1.2.2) reveals if the results are still informative for climate change in recent years (1988–2018). Due to the limited length of the time period, there are only a few sites where the  $\text{eCO}_2$  effect on GPP can be detected (Figures S6 and S13). Nevertheless, as the result shown in Figure 4a, the signal first emerges in the tropical regions, with a rather low EoC of around 20 ppm. Furthermore, the EoC for tropical GPP is consistent between two time periods (1901–2018 and 1988–2018). This encourages future study of the  $\text{CO}_2$  fertilization effect in recent years.

### 3.4 | Seasonal and diurnal variation of EoC in GPP

We find plants respond differently to the effects of  $\text{eCO}_2$  across different climate zones and vegetation types, but also in different



seasons and times of the day. For example, EoC in GPP is lower in summer than in other seasons at sites in the temperate and boreal forests (Figure S7a,d), which is obviously driven by favorable growing conditions. However, this is not always the case at the diurnal time scale where lowest EoC are partly found at other times than noon. For the sites in temperate and boreal forests, the strong signal already emerges early in the morning on some days during summer. It could be related to the increased aridity at midday. The excessive atmospheric moisture demand at high temperature results in the midday depression of carbon uptake, and thus stomatal limitation, which can be simulated by the model. Unlike for the boreal forest site, at the tropical forest site (Figure S7b), the plant response to  $e\text{CO}_2$  can be detected for any time during the daytime and in all seasons. Although the effect of  $e\text{CO}_2$  on GPP cannot be detected at grass sites at the annual scale, we can detect it in the growing season, albeit only at very high  $\Delta[\text{CO}_2] > \sim 100\text{ppm}$  (Figure 3, Figure S7c). The EoC in  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  however is not detectable at any point of the seasonal and diurnal cycle, probably related to high variability of the meteorological conditions, which can be reduced to some extent by the aggregation to annual values. In the future, researchers may explore the drivers of the variation across diurnal and seasonal scales. Furthermore, we find the EoC in GPP is lower at some points of the seasonal and diurnal cycle than EoC in GPP at the annual scale (Figure S7). This motivates future study of  $e\text{CO}_2$  effects in observations at the seasonal and diurnal time scale.

### 3.5 | EoC in secondary variables triggered by plant physiological effects

Changes in GPP and  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  triggered by the effects of  $e\text{CO}_2$  can cascade into secondary state and process variables of the carbon (e.g., LAI, biomass, NPP) and water cycles (e.g., evaporation, interception loss, soil moisture). The EoC in LAI and biomass are generally low (Figure S8a,b), even lower than in the case of GPP. Note that this does not mean that LAI responds more strongly to  $\text{CO}_2$  increases than GPP, but rather this finding illustrates the effect of the internal variabilities of each variable on our results where LAI and biomass as state variables are less influenced by short-term and interannual hydro-meteorological variations and therefore its variation has a substantially lower standard deviation. The higher signal-to-noise ratio enables the detection of the  $e\text{CO}_2$  effects already early in the time series where  $\text{CO}_2$  has not yet increased much. Additionally, there is a non-linear relationship between GPP and LAI when LAI is high. GPP tends to saturate with high LAI due to clumping and the increase in shaded leaves in the canopy (Chen et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2019; Street et al., 2007). Furthermore, the modeled carbon pathways do not always agree with observational evidence from elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  experiments (Norby & Zak, 2011). EoC in NPP shows a similar spatial pattern compared to EoC in GPP, only the EoC is overall higher due to the added variability from autotrophic respiration (Figure S8c). We note that vegetation in the natural ecosystem is limited by nutrient availability. The primary way, in which nutrient


availability would interfere with the detectability method, is that there is less of a change in LAI compared to the change simulated assuming that nutrients were not limiting plant growth. For the development of the EoC method here, the complication of nutrient cycling in terrestrial biosphere models is equally unimportant as the question of ecosystem management. Thus, we simplify the setting in the model to pursue an understandable interpretation.

The natural variability of process and state variables in the water cycle (e.g., evaporation, interception, root-zone soil moisture) is substantially higher than for the carbon cycle variables. The increasing LAI could provide more shading area, resulting in a cooling of the surface soil layer. The evaporation from bare soil decreases as a consequence of this reduced radiative energy input. Consequently, the EoC in evaporation can be detected in sites located mainly in tropical regions and mid-latitude regions (Figure S8d). Evaporation from rainfall interception is expected to remarkably increase due to the substantial increase in LAI. However, the magnitude of increased interception loss does not stand out from the year-to-year variability controlled by stochastic precipitation events. Also, the root-zone soil moisture does not exhibit a clear response to  $e\text{CO}_2$ . This is related to the complex and interacting effects on related water fluxes such as soil evaporation, transpiration, interception loss, and runoff. The interannual variability in precipitation likely also overshadows the subtle changes in soil moisture in response to the effects of  $e\text{CO}_2$  (De Kauwe et al., 2021).


### 3.6 | First manifestations of elevated $\text{CO}_2$

In this section, we compare the EoC across several variables and metrics (Table 1) related to the carbon and water cycles. These variables and metrics include the underlying WUE (uWUE), the LUE, the normalized canopy conductance ( $g_{\text{c}_{\text{norm}}}$ ), LAI and the 95th percentiles of GPP ( $\text{GPP}^{95}$ ), and  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$  ( $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}^{95}$ ). EoC is lowest for LAI and  $\text{GPP}^{95}$  for most sites (159 in 250 detected sites; Figure 5). We consider the 95th percentile of daily GPP values in each year ( $\text{GPP}^{95}$ ) to be representative of the maximum capacity of vegetation productivity, which is less affected by day-to-day weather variability. EoC in  $\text{GPP}^{95}$  is significantly lower since much of the variability is removed compared to annual mean GPP. EoC in  $\text{GPP}^{95}$  and LAI are comparable in the vegetation classes tropical and boreal forests (Figure S9). However, EoC in LAI in the temperate forests and grass vegetation classes tends to be considerably higher. Probably, this is due to the different fraction of carbon allocated to foliage versus other plant components across vegetation types (De Kauwe et al., 2014).

EoC in LUE emerges first for sites located in the high latitudinal regions, where plant growth is considered to be energy limited. EoC in WUE and  $g_{\text{c}_{\text{norm}}}$  emerges first for sites in arid regions, where plant growth is limited by water availability. Compared to variables related to the carbon cycle (e.g., GPP,  $\text{GPP}^{95}$ , LAI), variables related to the water cycle (e.g.,  $g_{\text{c}_{\text{norm}}}$ ,  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}$ ,  $\text{Tr}_{\text{norm}}^{95}$ ) show weaker responses to the physiological effects of  $e\text{CO}_2$ .



**FIGURE 5** Comparison of EoC across variables and metrics. (a) Box plots depict the gross primary productivity (GPP), 95th percentile of daily GPP values in each year ( $GPP^{95}$ ), leaf area index (LAI), light-use efficiency (LUE), underlying water-use efficiency (uWUE),  $gC_{norm}$ ,  $Tr_{norm}$ , 95th percentile of daily  $Tr_{norm}$  values in each year ( $Tr_{norm}^{95}$ ). Box plots indicate medians and interquartile ranges, and are ordered according to the mean EoC across sites for each variable. Numbers above the boxplots indicate how many sites can be detected for each variable or metric (336 sites in total). (b) The map shows the first-emerging variable or metric with the lowest EoC. The white points on the map refer to the geographical locations of all sites.



**FIGURE 6** EoC in QUINCY versus coupled Earth system models (ESMs). Spatially varying EoC is plotted against the predictor that explains most of its spatial variability according to the SHAP value analysis illustrated in Figure S10. The relationship of (a) EoC in gross primary productivity (GPP) is plotted against respective leaf area index (LAI) of each model; and (b) EoC in  $Tr_{norm}$  is plotted against respective baseline GPP from each model. The dashed line denotes no significant relationship between EoC and the predictor.

### 3.7 | Explaining the spatial variability of EoC in GPP and $Tr_{norm}$

The ecosystem responses to  $eCO_2$  are complex and modulated by several concurrent effects. All drivers considered to explain the spatial variability of EoC are calculated as long-term mean values (see Section 2.2.3). We find that the spatial variability of EoC in GPP and  $Tr_{norm}$  between sites is mainly explained by varying levels of mean LAI and mean GPP, respectively (Figure S10). The higher the mean LAI (or mean GPP), the less  $\Delta[CO_2]$  is required such that the physiological effects of  $eCO_2$  emerge in GPP, respectively,  $Tr_{norm}$  fluxes. Next, we compare these relationships based on the QUINCY model with output from similar simulations of Earth system models conducted in CMIP6 (see Section 2.3). Most CMIP6 models qualitatively agree with the QUINCY results, that is, the negative relationship between spatial EoC in GPP and LAI, and the negative relationship between spatial EoC in  $Tr_{norm}$  and GPP (Figure 6). Four models in CMIP6 (Figure S11a,e,f,g) agree with QUINCY (Figure S11h), while the other three of them do not show a negative relationship between

EoC in GPP and the long-term mean LAI. Also, there are considerable differences between the magnitude of EoC across the models as well as the strength of the relationships vary among the individual models in CMIP6 (Figures S11 and S12). We note, however, that this direct comparison between the QUINCY and the CMIP6 simulations is limited due to the conceptually different setup of the analyzed simulations. Furthermore, in contrast to the QUINCY model, which is an offline terrestrial biosphere point model, the CMIP6 ensemble comprises fully coupled Earth system models, which represent a gridded and coupled land-atmosphere system. Despite these conceptual differences, the overall agreement between the QUINCY and CMIP6 models illustrated in Figure 6 corroborates our findings based on the QUINCY model formulation.

## 4 | CONCLUSION

We evaluate the plant physiological effects of elevated  $CO_2$  ( $eCO_2$ ) on the land-atmosphere exchange of carbon and water. Increasing

atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> stimulates plant carbon assimilation and reduces stomatal conductance, which both may result in a potential increase in ecosystem productivity and also affect ecosystem transpiration. Analyzing approximately the last 120 years simulated by the terrestrial biosphere model QUINCY, we assess how strong the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> needs to be such that the effects of eCO<sub>2</sub> surpass the noise and effects induced by short and long-term meteorological conditions.

We find that the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on GPP can be earlier detected compared with transpiration (Tr). The eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on GPP are different across climate and biomes, whereas eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on normalized transpiration (Tr<sub>norm</sub>) exhibit less spatial variability. The eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on GPP are detectable at relatively low CO<sub>2</sub> increase ( $\Delta[\text{CO}_2] \sim 20$  ppm) in regions where vegetation productivity is not strongly constrained by climatic conditions, that is, water- or temperature-limited plant growth. Carbon assimilation and carbon pools show stronger responses to eCO<sub>2</sub> across sites while we do not find a widespread strong eCO<sub>2</sub> effect in variables describing the water cycle. The transpiration at canopy level is regulated by the reduced stomatal conductance and meanwhile, the increasing LAI in response to eCO<sub>2</sub>. These two opposing effects appear to be cancelled each other out at ecosystem level and longer time scales, resulting in an insignificant eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on transpiration and other water cycle variables (e.g., evaporation, interception loss and soil moisture) which are affected by the response of Tr. While mostly GPP and LAI are the first variables to exhibit detectable eCO<sub>2</sub> effects, in northern high-latitude regions where vegetation growth is limited by radiation, LUE responds to eCO<sub>2</sub> first among all the other variables, and the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects on WUE emerges first in some sites located in semi-arid regions.

Climate variations can partly explain the spatial heterogeneity of the plant physiological effects of eCO<sub>2</sub>. The strongest response of GPP or Tr<sub>norm</sub> to eCO<sub>2</sub> occurs dominantly where GPP is not limited by either temperature or precipitation (e.g., sites in tropical regions). The weakest response of GPP or Tr<sub>norm</sub> occurs in arid regions (e.g., grassland sites), where the high variability overshadows the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect. In addition to climate factors, eCO<sub>2</sub>-induced plant physiological effects are amplified where vegetation productivity is already high. We find the long-term mean LAI is the dominant driver of spatial variability of the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on GPP, whereas the long-term mean GPP is the dominant driver of spatial variability of the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect on Tr<sub>norm</sub>. Despite the different model structures and simulation setups, the CMIP6 models essentially are consistent with the insights gained from the QUINCY model about what drives spatial variance in the EoC. Overall, our results thus suggest that high-LAI regions, for example, tree-dominated ecosystems are more sensitive to the eCO<sub>2</sub> effect than low-LAI, for example, grass-dominated ecosystems.

Models have the advantage for hypothesis testing by conducting idealized experiments. Using these experiments, we determine when and where we expect to detect the eCO<sub>2</sub> effects according to our theoretical understanding formulated in the models. This knowledge provides a first step toward assessing long-term changes and trends in carbon and water flux observations using eddy covariance measurements (Baldocchi et al., 2001). In a future study, we

will apply this methodology to analyze whether eCO<sub>2</sub> effects can already be detected in the time series of long-term measurement campaigns of land-atmosphere exchange fluxes, focusing on the regions and time scales of eCO<sub>2</sub> effects spotlighted in this precursory study. Overall, the model-based analyses presented here, along with the ongoing observational study focused on the detection and potential quantification of eCO<sub>2</sub> effects, are critical and have long been called for to provide robust assessments of how the system will continue to change as CO<sub>2</sub> continues to rise.

#### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Chunhui Zhan, Rene Orth, and Alexander J. Winkler jointly designed this study. Mirco Migliavacca, Sönke Zaehle, and Markus Reichstein contributed to ideas and experimental design. Alexander J. Winkler preprocessed the CMIP6 model simulations. Jan Engel contributed to technical assistance for the QUINCY model. All authors contributed to the writing of the paper, the discussion, and interpretation of the results.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Chunhui Zhan is supported by the International Max Planck Research School (IMPRS). Markus Reichstein and Alexander J. Winkler acknowledge the support by the European Research Council (ERC) Synergy Grant "Understanding and Modelling the Earth System with Machine Learning (USMILE)" under the Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement number 855187). René Orth is supported by the German Research Foundation (Emmy Noether grant number 391059971). Sönke Zaehle and Jan Engel were supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (QUINCY; grant number 647204). Chunhui Zhan thanks Silvia Caldararu and Lin Yu for their support in working with the QUINCY model. Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

#### FUNDING STATEMENT

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

#### DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available under <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.3xj3txk5>.

#### ORCID

Chunhui Zhan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7716-8969>

Sönke Zaehle  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5602-7956>

#### REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, E. A., & Long, S. P. (2005). What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and

- plant production to rising CO<sub>2</sub>. *The New Phytologist*, 165, 351–372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01224.x>
- Ainsworth, E. A., & Rogers, A. (2007). The response of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance to rising [CO<sub>2</sub>]: Mechanisms and environmental interactions. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 30, 258–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2007.01641.x>
- Arora, V. K., Katavouta, A., Williams, R. G., Jones, C. D., Brovkin, V., Friedlingstein, P., Schwinger, J., Bopp, L., Boucher, O., Cadule, P., Chamberlain, M. A., Christian, J. R., Delire, C., Fisher, R. A., Hajima, T., Ilyina, T., Joetzier, E., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C. D., ... Ziehn, T. (2020). Carbon-concentration and carbon-climate feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models. *Biogeosciences*, 17, 4173–4222. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-17-4173-2020>
- Baig, S., Medlyn, B. E., Mercado, L. M., & Zaehle, S. (2015). Does the growth response of woody plants to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> increase with temperature? A model-oriented meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 4303–4319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12962>
- Baldocchi, D., Falge, E., Gu, L., Olson, R., Hollinger, D., Running, S., Anthoni, P., Bernhofer, C., Davis, K., Evans, R., Fuentes, J., Goldstein, A., Katul, G., Law, B., Lee, X., Malhi, Y., Meyers, T., Munger, W., Oechel, W., ... Wofsy, S. (2001). FLUXNET: A new tool to study the temporal and spatial variability of ecosystem-scale carbon dioxide, water vapor, and energy flux densities. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 82, 2415–2434. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(2001\)082<2415:FANTTS>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2001)082<2415:FANTTS>2.3.CO;2)
- Barton, C. V. M., Duursma, R. A., Medlyn, B. E., Ellsworth, D. S., Eamus, D., Tissue, D. T., Adams, M. A., Conroy, J., Crous, K. Y., Liberloo, M., Löw, M., Linder, S., & McMurtrie, R. E. (2012). Effects of elevated atmospheric [CO<sub>2</sub>] on instantaneous transpiration efficiency at leaf and canopy scales in *Eucalyptus saligna*. *Global Change Biology*, 18, 585–595. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02526.x>
- Bastos, A., Ciais, P., Friedlingstein, P., Sitch, S., Pongratz, J., Fan, L., Wigneron, J. P., Weber, U., Reichstein, M., Fu, Z., Anthoni, P., Arneth, A., Haverd, V., Jain, A. K., Joetzier, E., Knauer, J., Lienert, S., Loughran, T., McGuire, P. C., ... Zaehle, S. (2020). Direct and seasonal legacy effects of the 2018 heat wave and drought on European ecosystem productivity. *Science Advances*, 6(24), eaba2724. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba2724>
- Chen, J. M., Mo, G., Pisek, J., Liu, J., Deng, F., Ishizawa, M., & Chan, D. (2012). Effects of foliage clumping on the estimation of global terrestrial gross primary productivity. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 26, GB1019. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GB003996>
- Cleveland, W. S. (1981). LOWESS: A program for smoothing scatterplots by robust locally weighted regression. *The American Statistician*, 35, 54. [10.2307/2683591De](https://doi.org/10.2307/2683591De)
- De Kauwe, M. G., Medlyn, B. E., Knauer, J., & Williams, C. A. (2017). Ideas and perspectives: How coupled is the vegetation to the boundary layer? *Biogeosciences*, 14, 4435–4453. [10.5194/bg-14-4435-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-4435-2017)
- De Kauwe, M. G., Medlyn, B. E., & Tissue, D. T. (2021). To what extent can rising [CO<sub>2</sub>] ameliorate plant drought stress? *The New Phytologist*, 231, 2118–2124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17540>
- De Kauwe, M. G., Medlyn, B. E., Zaehle, S., Walker, A. P., Dietze, M. C., Wang, Y.-P., Luo, Y., Jain, A. K., El-Masri, B., Hickler, T., Wårlind, D., Weng, E., Parton, W. J., Thornton, P. E., Wang, S., Prentice, I. C., Asao, S., Smith, B., McCarthy, H. R., ... Norby, R. J. (2014). Where does the carbon go? A model-data intercomparison of vegetation carbon allocation and turnover processes at two temperate forest free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment sites. *The New Phytologist*, 203, 883–899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12847>
- Denissen, J. M. C., Teuling, A. J., Pitman, A. J., Koirala, S., Migliavacca, M., Li, W., Reichstein, M., Winkler, A. J., Zhan, C., & Orth, R. (2022). Widespread shift from ecosystem energy to water limitation with climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 12, 677–684. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01403-8>
- Drake, B. G., González-Meler, M. A., & Long, S. P. (1997). More efficient plants: A consequence of rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>? *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*, 48, 609–639. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.48.1.609>
- Fernández-Martínez, M., Vicca, S., Janssens, I. A., Ciais, P., Obersteiner, M., Bartrons, M., Sardans, J., Verger, A., Canadell, J. G., Chevallier, F., Wang, X., Bernhofer, C., Curtis, P. S., Gianelle, D., Grünwald, T., Heinesch, B., Ibrom, A., Knohl, A., Laurila, T., ... Peñuelas, J. (2017). Atmospheric deposition, CO<sub>2</sub>, and change in the land carbon sink. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 9632. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-08755-8>
- Friedlingstein, P., Jones, M. W., O'Sullivan, M., Andrew, R. M., Hauck, J., Peters, G. P., Peters, W., Pongratz, J., Sitch, S., Le Quéré, C., Bakker, D. C. E., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Jackson, R. B., Anthoni, P., Barbero, L., Bastos, A., Bastrikov, V., Becker, M., ... Zaehle, S. (2019). Global carbon budget 2019. *Earth System Science Data*, 11, 1783–1838. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-1783-2019>
- Gedney, N., Cox, P. M., Betts, R. A., Boucher, O., Huntingford, C., & Stott, P. A. (2006). Detection of a direct carbon dioxide effect in continental river runoff records. *Nature*, 439, 835–838. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04504>
- Good, S. P., Noone, D., & Bowen, G. (2015). Hydrologic connectivity constrains partitioning of global terrestrial water fluxes. *Science*, 349, 175–177. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa5931>
- Harris, I., Osborn, T. J., Jones, P., & Lister, D. (2020). Version 4 of the CRU TS monthly high-resolution gridded multivariate climate dataset. *Scientific Data*, 7, 109. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0453-3>
- Hengl, T., de Jesus, J. M., Heuvelink, G. B. M., Gonzalez, M. R., Kilibarda, M., Blagotić, A., Shangguan, W., Wright, M. N., Geng, X., Bauer-Marschallinger, B., Guevara, M. A., Vargas, R., MacMillan, R. A., Batjes, N. H., Leenaars, J. G. B., Ribeiro, E., Wheeler, I., Mantel, S., & Kempen, B. (2017). SoilGrids250m: Global gridded soil information based on machine learning. *PLoS ONE*, 12, e0169748. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169748>
- Hickler, T., Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., Mjöfors, K., Miller, P., Arneth, A., & Sykes, M. T. (2008). CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization in temperate FACE experiments not representative of boreal and tropical forests. *Global Change Biology*, 14, 1531–1542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01598.x>
- Jarvis, P. G. (1985). Transpiration and assimilation of tree and agricultural crops: The 'omega factor'. In M. G. R. Cannell & J. E. Jackson (Eds.), *Attributes of trees as crop plants* (pp. 460–480). Institute of Terrestrial Ecology.
- Jones, C. D., Arora, V., Friedlingstein, P., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Dunne, J., Graven, H., Hoffman, F., Ilyina, T., John, J. G., Jung, M., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C., Pongratz, J., Raddatz, T., Randerson, J. T., & Zaehle, S. (2016). C4MIP – The Coupled Climate–Carbon Cycle Model Intercomparison Project: experimental protocol for CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2853–2880. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2853-2016>
- Keenan, T. F., Hollinger, D. Y., Bohrer, G., Dragoni, D., Munger, J. W., Schmid, H. P., & Richardson, A. D. (2013). Increase in forest water-use efficiency as atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations rise. *Nature*, 499, 324–327. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12291>
- Knauer, J., Zaehle, S., Reichstein, M., Medlyn, B. E., Forkel, M., Hagemann, S., & Werner, C. (2017). The response of ecosystem water-use efficiency to rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations: Sensitivity and large-scale biogeochemical implications. *The New Phytologist*, 213, 1654–1666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14288>
- Konings, A. G., Williams, A. P., & Gentine, P. (2017). Sensitivity of grassland productivity to aridity controlled by stomatal and xylem regulation. *Nature Geoscience*, 10, 284–288. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2903>
- Körner, C., Morgan, J., & Norby, R. (2007). CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization: When, where, how much? In J. G. Canadell, D. E. Pataki, & L. F. Pitelka (Eds.), *Terrestrial ecosystems in a changing world, global change—The IGBP series* (pp. 9–21). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32730-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32730-1_2)



- Kramer, P. J. (1981). Carbon dioxide concentration, photosynthesis, and dry matter production. *Bioscience*, 31, 29–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1308175>
- Kull, O., & Kruijt, B. (1998). Leaf photosynthetic light response: A mechanistic model for scaling photosynthesis to leaves and canopies. *Functional Ecology*, 12, 767–777. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.1998.00257.x>
- Kulmatiski, A., Adler, P. B., & Foley, K. M. (2020). Hydrologic niches explain species coexistence and abundance in a shrub–steppe system. *Journal of Ecology*, 108, 998–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13324>
- Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Friedlingstein, P., Sitch, S., Pongratz, J., Manning, A. C., Korsbakken, J. I., Peters, G. P., Canadell, J. G., Jackson, R. B., Boden, T. A., Tans, P. P., Andrews, O. D., Arora, V. K., Bakker, D. C. E., Barbero, L., Becker, M., Betts, R. A., Bopp, L., ... Zhu, D. (2018). Global carbon budget 2017. *Earth System Science Data*, 10, 405–448. <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-405-2018>
- Leakey, A. D. B., Ainsworth, E. A., Bernacchi, C. J., Rogers, A., Long, S. P., & Ort, D. R. (2009). Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> effects on plant carbon, nitrogen, and water relations: Six important lessons from FACE. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 60, 2859–2876. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp096>
- Lee, H., Park, J., Cho, S., Lee, M., & Kim, H. S. (2019). Impact of leaf area index from various sources on estimating gross primary production in temperate forests using the JULES land surface model. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 276–277, 107614. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2019.107614>
- Lemordant, L., Gentine, P., Swann, A. S., Cook, B. I., & Scheff, J. (2018). Critical impact of vegetation physiology on the continental hydrologic cycle in response to increasing CO<sub>2</sub>. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 115, 4093–4098. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1720712115>
- Leuzinger, S., & Körner, C. (2007). Water savings in mature deciduous forest trees under elevated CO<sub>2</sub>. *Global Change Biology*, 13, 2498–2508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01467.x>
- Liu, J., You, Y., Li, J., Sitch, S., Gu, X., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Lombardozi, D., Luo, M., Feng, X., Arneith, A., Jain, A. K., Friedlingstein, P., Tian, H., Poulter, B., & Kong, D. (2021). Response of global land evapotranspiration to climate change, elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, and land use change. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 311, 108663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2021.108663>
- Long, S. P. (1991). Modification of the response of photosynthetic productivity to rising temperature by atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations: Has its importance been underestimated? *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 14, 729–739. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1991.tb01439.x>
- Lundberg, S., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 4765–4774.
- Lundberg, S. M., Erion, G., Chen, H., DeGrave, A., Prutkin, J. M., Nair, B., Katz, R., Himmelfarb, J., Bansal, N., & Lee, S.-I. (2020). From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2, 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0138-9>
- Maurer, G. E., Hallmark, A. J., Brown, R. F., Sala, O. E., & Collins, S. L. (2020). Sensitivity of primary production to precipitation across the United States. *Ecology Letters*, 23, 527–536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13455>
- McCarthy, H. R., Oren, R., Finzi, A. C., & Johnsen, K. H. (2006). Canopy leaf area constrains [CO<sub>2</sub>]-induced enhancement of productivity and partitioning among aboveground carbon pools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 103, 19356–19361. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0609448103>
- McCarthy, H. R., Oren, R., Johnsen, K. H., Gallet-Budynek, A., Pritchard, S. G., Cook, C. W., LaDeau, S. L., Jackson, R. B., & Finzi, A. C. (2010). Re-assessment of plant carbon dynamics at the Duke free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment site: Interactions of atmospheric [CO<sub>2</sub>] with nitrogen and water availability over stand development. *The New Phytologist*, 185, 514–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.03078.x>
- Medlyn, B. E., Barton, C. V. M., Broadmeadow, M. S. J., Ceulemans, R., De Angelis, P., Forstreuter, M., Freeman, M., Jackson, S. B., Kellomäki, S., Laitat, E., Rey, A., Roberantz, P., Sigurdsson, B. D., Strassmeyer, J., Wang, K., Curtis, P. S., & Jarvis, P. G. (2001). Stomatal conductance of forest species after long-term exposure to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> concentration: A synthesis. *The New Phytologist*, 149, 247–264. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-8137.2001.00028.x>
- Medlyn, B. E., Duursma, R. A., Eamus, D., Ellsworth, D. S., Prentice, I. C., Barton, C. V. M., Crous, K. Y., Angelis, P. D., Freeman, M., & Wingate, L. (2011). Reconciling the optimal and empirical approaches to modelling stomatal conductance. *Global Change Biology*, 17, 2134–2144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02375.x>
- Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Taylor, K. E., Eyring, V., Stouffer, R. J., Bony, S., & Stevens, B. (2014). Climate model intercomparisons: Preparing for the next phase. *EOS. Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, 95, 77–78. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EO090001>
- Migliavacca, M., Musavi, T., Mahecha, M. D., Nelson, J. A., Knauer, J., Baldocchi, D. D., Perez-Priego, O., Christiansen, R., Peters, J., Anderson, K., Bahn, M., Black, T. A., Blanken, P. D., Bonal, D., Buchmann, N., Caldararu, S., Carrara, A., Carvalhais, N., Cescatti, A., ... Reichstein, M. (2021). The three major axes of terrestrial ecosystem function. *Nature*, 598, 468–472. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03939-9>
- Miguez-Macho, G., & Fan, Y. (2021). Spatiotemporal origin of soil water taken up by vegetation. *Nature*, 598, 624–628. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03958-6>
- Norby, R. J., DeLucia, E. H., Gielen, B., Calfapietra, C., Giardina, C. P., King, J. S., Ledford, J., McCarthy, H. R., Moore, D. J. P., Ceulemans, R., Angelis, P. D., Finzi, A. C., Karnosky, D. F., Kubiske, M. E., Lukac, M., Pregitzer, K. S., Scarascia-Mugnozza, G. E., Schlesinger, W. H., & Oren, R. (2005). Forest response to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> is conserved across a broad range of productivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 18052–18056. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0509478102>
- Norby, R. J., Wullschlegel, S. D., Gunderson, C. A., Johnson, D. W., & Ceulemans, R. (1999). Tree responses to rising CO<sub>2</sub> in field experiments: Implications for the future forest. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 22, 683–714. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.1999.00391.x>
- Norby, R. J., & Zak, D. R. (2011). Ecological lessons from free-air CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment (FACE) experiments. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 42, 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102209-144647>
- Novick, K. A., Ficklin, D. L., Stoy, P. C., Williams, C. A., Bohrer, G., Oishi, A. C., Papuga, S. A., Blanken, P. D., Noormets, A., Sulman, B. N., Scott, R. L., Wang, L., & Phillips, R. P. (2016). The increasing importance of atmospheric demand for ecosystem water and carbon fluxes. *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 1023–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3114>
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., & Cournapeau, D. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python, 6.
- Peñuelas, J., Canadell, J. G., & Ogaya, R. (2011). Increased water-use efficiency during the 20th century did not translate into enhanced tree growth. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20, 597–608. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00608.x>
- Reichstein, M., Bahn, M., Ciais, P., Frank, D., Mahecha, M. D., Seneviratne, S. I., Zscheischler, J., Beer, C., Buchmann, N., Frank, D. C., Papale, D., Rammig, A., Smith, P., Thonicke, K., van der Velde, M., Vicca, S., Walz, A., & Wattenbach, M. (2013). Climate extremes and the carbon cycle. *Nature*, 500, 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12350>
- Saxton, K. E., & Rawls, W. J. (2006). Soil water characteristic estimates by texture and organic matter for hydrologic solutions. *Soil Science*



- Society of America Journal*, 70, 1569–1578. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2005.0117>
- Schimel, D., Stephens, B. B., & Fisher, J. B. (2015). Effect of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> on the terrestrial carbon cycle. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112, 436–441. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1407302112>
- Street, L. E., Shaver, G. R., Williams, M., & Van Wijk, M. T. (2007). What is the relationship between changes in canopy leaf area and changes in photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub> flux in arctic ecosystems? *Journal of Ecology*, 95, 139–150. [10.1111/j.1365-2745.2006.01187.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2006.01187.x)
- Thum, T., Caldararu, S., Engel, J., Kern, M., Pallandt, M., Schnur, R., Yu, L., & Zaehle, S. (2019). A new model of the coupled carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus cycles in the terrestrial biosphere (QUINCY v1.0; revision 1996). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 4781–4802. [10.5194/gmd-12-4781-2019](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-4781-2019)
- Ueyama, M., Ichii, K., Kobayashi, H., Kumagai, T., Beringer, J., Merbold, L., Euskirchen, E. S., Hirano, T., Marchesini, L. B., Baldocchi, D., Saitoh, T. M., Mizoguchi, Y., Ono, K., Kim, J., Varlagin, A., Kang, M., Shimizu, T., Kosugi, Y., Bret-Harte, M. S., ... Yasuda, Y. (2020). Inferring CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization effect based on global monitoring land-atmosphere exchange with a theoretical model. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15, 084009. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab79e5>
- van der Sleen, P., Groenendijk, P., Vlam, M., Anten, N. P. R., Boom, A., Bongers, F., Pons, T. L., Terburg, G., & Zuidema, P. A. (2015). No growth stimulation of tropical trees by 150 years of CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization but water-use efficiency increased. *Nature Geoscience*, 8, 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2313>
- Walker, A. P., De Kauwe, M. G., Bastos, A., Belmecheri, S., Georgiou, K., Keeling, R. F., McMahon, S. M., Medlyn, B. E., Moore, D. J. P., Norby, R. J., Zaehle, S., Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Battipaglia, G., Brienen, R. J. W., Cabugao, K. G., Cailleret, M., Campbell, E., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., ... Zuidema, P. A. (2021). Integrating the evidence for a terrestrial carbon sink caused by increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. *The New Phytologist*, 229, 2413–2445. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16866>
- Walker, A. P., De Kauwe, M. G., Medlyn, B. E., Zaehle, S., Iversen, C. M., Asao, S., Guenet, B., Harper, A., Hickler, T., Hungate, B. A., Jain, A. K., Luo, Y., Lu, X., Lu, M., Luus, K., Megonigal, J. P., Oren, R., Ryan, E., Shu, S., ... Norby, R. J. (2019). Decadal biomass increment in early secondary succession woody ecosystems is increased by CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment. *Nature Communications*, 10, 454. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08348-1>
- Way, D. A., Katul, G. G., Manzoni, S., & Vico, G. (2014). Increasing water use efficiency along the C3 to C4 evolutionary pathway: A stomatal optimization perspective. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 65, 3683–3693. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru205>
- Weisstein, E. W. (n.d.). "Least Squares Fitting" from MathWorld—A Wolfram web resource. <https://mathworld.wolfram.com/LeastSquaresFitting.html>
- Williams, I. N., & Torn, M. S. (2015). Vegetation controls on surface heat flux partitioning, and land-atmosphere coupling. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42, 9416–9424. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066305>
- Winkler, A. J., Myneni, R. B., Hannart, A., Sitch, S., Haverd, V., Lombardozzi, D., Arora, V. K., Pongratz, J., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Goll, D. S., Kato, E., Tian, H., Arneth, A., Friedlingstein, P., Jain, A. K., Zaehle, S., & Brovkin, V. (2021). Slowdown of the greening trend in natural vegetation with further rise in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. *Biogeosciences*, 18, 4985–5010. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-18-4985-2021>
- Woodward, F. I., & Kelly, C. K. (1995). The influence of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration on stomatal density. *The New Phytologist*, 131, 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1995.tb03067.x>
- Wullschlegel, S. D., Tschaplinski, T. J., & Norby, R. J. (2002). Plant water relations at elevated CO<sub>2</sub>— implications for water-limited environments. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 25, 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.2002.00796.x>
- Zaehle, S., & Friend, A. D. (2010). Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter estimates. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 24, GB1005. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GB003521>

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

**How to cite this article:** Zhan, C., Orth, R., Migliavacca, M., Zaehle, S., Reichstein, M., Engel, J., Rammig, A., & Winkler, A. J. (2022). Emergence of the physiological effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on land-atmosphere exchange of carbon and water. *Global Change Biology*, 28, 7313–7326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16397>