



Environmental Research Letters

LETTER • [IOPSELECT](#)

High sensitivity of future global warming to land carbon cycle processes

Ben B B Booth¹, Chris D Jones¹, Mat Collins^{1,2}, Ian J Totterdell¹, Peter M Cox², Stephen Sitch^{3,4}, Chris Huntingford⁵, Richard A Betts^{1,3}, Glen R Harris¹ and Jon Lloyd⁶

Published 11 April 2012 • 2012 IOP Publishing Ltd

[Environmental Research Letters](#), [Volume 7](#), [Number 2](#)



Article PDF

8073 Total downloads

[Cited by 66 articles](#)

Share this article



[+ Article information](#)

Author e-mails

ben.booth@metoffice.gov.uk

Author affiliations

¹ Met Office Hadley Centre, Fitz Roy Road, Exeter EX1 3PB, UK

² School of Engineering, Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Exeter, Harrison Building, North Park Road, Exeter EX4 4QF, UK

³ Geography, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK

⁴ School of Geography, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

⁵ Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Benson Lane, Wallingford OX10 8BB, UK

⁶ School of Earth and Environmental Science, James Cook University, Cairns, Qld 4870, Australia

Dates

Received 13 November 2011

Accepted 9 March 2012

Published 11 April 2012

Citation

Ben B B Booth *et al* 2012 *Environ. Res. Lett.* **7** 024002

 [Create citation alert](#)

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/2/024002>

[Buy this article in print](#)

 [Journal RSS feed](#)

 [Sign up for new issue notifications](#)

Abstract

Unknowns in future global warming are usually assumed to arise from uncertainties either in the amount of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions or in the sensitivity of the climate to changes in greenhouse gas concentrations. Characterizing the additional uncertainty in relating CO₂ emissions to atmospheric concentrations has relied on either a small number of complex models with diversity in process

representations, or simple models. To date, these models indicate that the relevant carbon cycle uncertainties are smaller than the uncertainties in physical climate feedbacks and emissions. Here, for a single emissions scenario, we use a full coupled climate–carbon cycle model and a systematic method to explore uncertainties in the land carbon cycle feedback. We find a plausible range of climate–carbon cycle feedbacks significantly larger than previously estimated. Indeed the range of CO₂ concentrations arising from our single emissions scenario is greater than that previously estimated across the full range of IPCC SRES emissions scenarios with carbon cycle uncertainties ignored. The sensitivity of photosynthetic metabolism to temperature emerges as the most important uncertainty. This highlights an aspect of current land carbon modelling where there are open questions about the potential role of plant acclimation to increasing temperatures. There is an urgent need for better understanding of plant photosynthetic responses to high temperature, as these responses are shown here to be key contributors to the magnitude of future change.

Export citation and abstract

[BibTeX](#)

[RIS](#)

Supplementary data

Carbon cycle processes control the relative partitioning of emitted carbon dioxide between the atmosphere, land surface and the ocean [1, 2]. The recent explicit modelling of these processes in Atmosphere Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCMs) coupled with carbon cycle models, predicts a range of future atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, and hence global warming, for a given emissions scenario [3, 4]. Land processes, that currently serve to provide a net sink from the atmosphere of CO₂ emissions, have the potential to become dramatically less efficient under future climate conditions [5], with major implications for international agreements to mitigate warming. Yet estimates of the magnitude of the reduction disagree [3, 5].

Within the climate research community there is increasing emphasis on understanding and quantifying uncertainty in future projections of climate change. So far this has mainly focused on physical climate feedbacks [6–9] through variables

such as the climate sensitivity (CS) [10] or the transient climate response (TCR) [6, 11] or considered emergent constraints arising from limiting total emissions of CO₂ within simpler modelling frameworks [12–14].

Important steps forward have also been made looking at the relative contribution of uncertainty arising from carbon cycle processes. The C⁴MIP ensemble (Coupled Climate Carbon Cycle Model Intercomparison Project [5]) demonstrated a significant range of uncertainty in predicted temperature and atmospheric CO₂. Although C4MIP contains a range of land carbon processes, distinguishing carbon cycle and physical processes requires either a simplified metric [5] or simplified carbon cycle models [15]. Results from [15] suggest that within C4MIP simulations, carbon cycle (land and ocean) processes represent only 40% of the contribution from physical process uncertainty.

Here we make a targeted re-evaluation of contribution to the overall uncertainty in future climate (physical and carbon cycle), arising specifically from the land component of the carbon cycle. We use a parameter perturbation approach as previously used to quantify the impact of atmospheric process uncertainty on CS [10] and atmospheric and ocean process uncertainty on TCR [11, 16]. We apply this methodology to the land carbon cycle component of a fully coupled climate–carbon cycle AOGCM (supplementary information available at stacks.iop.org/ERL/7/024002/mmedia), whilst keeping all other components (ocean carbon cycle and physical processes) invariant across the ensemble. The land surface configuration utilized for this study, models the exchange of energy, water and carbon fluxes, representing how plants and soils respond to changes in temperature, moisture and CO₂. This model framework explicitly represents dynamical changes in vegetation cover in response changes in climate conditions. This enables vegetation changes to move beyond projections of equilibrium responses, that the previous generation of land carbon models relied on, to explore transient vegetation changes to rapidly evolving climate conditions [17, 18]. The other advance of dynamical vegetation models, compared to previous equilibrium classifications, is inclusion of CO₂ fertilization effects which act to mitigate plant temperature and water stress [18].


We vary parameters relating to the sensitivities of plant photosynthesis and soil respiration to temperature; stomatal conductance; soil water availability and surface


evaporation; and plant competition. The six parameters and their ranges are as follows: the optimal temperature values for photosynthesis [19], $T_{opt}(K)$ was varied $\pm 5^\circ$ around the standard value of each plant functional type, similar to the range used in [20]; top leaf nitrogen concentration (as a fraction of carbon content) [19], N_{LO} (kg N/kg C), was varied within a range (for each PFT) determined by available plant trait information [21] and simulated historical forest distributions; the maximum ratio of the internal to external CO_2 concentration, which affects the maximum stomatal conductance [19], f_0 , was varied based on ranges estimated from calibration of land surface models against simultaneous fluxes of energy, water and carbon from a number of sites; the minimum leaf area index (LAI) that a plant functional type (PFT) needs to achieve before it begins to compete for space [22] $minLAI$, not being directly observable its range was determined by its ability to reproduce observed forest distributions; the critical level of the volumetric soil moisture concentration, below which soil moisture limits both plant photosynthesis [19] and surface evaporation, θ_{crit} (m^3 water/ m^3 soil), exploring a broad range from moisture limitations between the wilting and the saturation points and finally the ' Q_{10} ' temperature dependence of soil respiration [19] Q_{10} explored a range based on previous published estimates. 17 individual historical and future (using the A1B SRES scenario [23]) simulations were performed using a coupled carbon cycle climate model (HadCM3C), each exploring a different space in the parameter uncertainty ranges. The parameter values selected for each simulation and the over all ranges are detailed in table 1. The parameters, land surface equations and ranges are further documented in the supplementary information (available at stacks.iop.org/ERL/7/024002/mmedia) and [24].

Table 1. The parameter values for each ensemble member and the standard configuration are given in this table for the six effective parameters. Broadleaf and Needleleaf are the two tree plant functional types (PFTs). Parameters are covaried across PFTs for each parameter change. The maximum and minimum values are highlighted in bold for each parameter. * θ_{crit} is defined here for the parameter perturbations in terms of a fraction of the difference between θ_{wilt} and θ_{sat} values (so values nearer unity means a critical water content nearer to the saturation level). In the standard run there was no single value for this fraction (as there is a small dependence on the soil type for this fraction, which is not accounted for

		27	26.00	28.67	31.33	30.67	22.67	26.67	22.00	24.00	24.67	28.00	27.33
Needleleaf													
C3 grass	32	31.00	33.67	36.33	35.67	27.67	31.67	27.00	29.00	29.67	33.00	32.33	33.67
C4 grass	41	40.00	42.67	45.33	44.67	36.67	40.67	36.00	38.00	38.67	42.00	41.33	40.67
Shrub	32	31.00	33.67	36.33	35.67	27.67	31.67	27.00	29.00	29.67	33.00	32.33	33.67

Our predictions of CO₂ concentrations simulated across the ensemble from 1850 to 2100 are shown in figure 1. While there are some differences in the simulations of historical global atmospheric CO₂, the models show marked divergence as the 21st century progresses, as evidenced by a significant spread between models of 461 ppm (669–1130 ppm) by year 2100. Putting this range into context: the C⁴MIP ensemble produced a range of atmospheric CO₂ in 2099 of only 282 ppm (727–1009 ppm for an alternative future emission scenario SRES A2 [23]; see vertical bar on figure 1). Figure 1 also compares our uncertainty using a full AOGCM, with the conventional uncertainty estimates from two simpler Earth system Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMIC) [1], namely ISAM and Bern-CC. The greater future spread within the AOGCM cannot solely be attributed to greater freedom across this ensemble to diverge from observed trends during the historical period. The two simulations with the two lowest CO₂ concentrations in 2000, have the lowest and highest concentrations in the future respectively. This was despite the C⁴MIP ensemble and the EMIC estimates also including ocean carbon cycle and physical climate uncertainties, in addition to the land carbon cycle processes illustrated here. The spread of CO₂ concentrations arising from land carbon cycle uncertainties (461 ppm) is greater than full spread of future SRES concentration scenarios [23] (418 ppm) when carbon cycle uncertainties are neglected (which range from 540 ppm (B1) to 958 ppm (A1FI) in 2100, see figure 1). Moreover, the upper end of CO₂ concentrations in 2100 for our ensemble from a single mid-range emission scenario (A1B) is as much as 18% greater than the highest SRES concentration scenario (when carbon cycle uncertainty is neglected).





[Zoom In](#) [Zoom Out](#)

[Reset image size](#)

Figure 1. Modelled atmospheric CO₂ concentrations for both the historical and future (to year 2100), the latter corresponding to the A1B SRES future emission scenario. The land carbon ensemble members are all continuous green curves except for the standard parameters (black) and the models with the greatest (orange) and least (blue) CO₂ in 2100 highlighted. Two additional time series are shown; the reference historical/A1B CO₂ time series (dashed, black) from Bern-CC which is used to drive most non-carbon cycle GCM simulations. CO₂ observational estimates, subselected to be displayed every 5 yr, are shown from the Mauna Loa record (red crosses). In addition two vertical bars show two existing 2100 CO₂ uncertainty ranges from the Bern-CC and ISAM modelling groups (orange and red respectively (3)) and the also the C⁴MIP models (for an alternative though similar scenario: A2) indicated by the purple crosses. The spread of CO₂ concentrations in 2100 from the SRES 'emission' scenarios are indicated by the black vertical bar.

Download figure:


[Standard image](#)

[Export PowerPoint slide](#)

The findings presented in figure [1](#) demonstrate the need to factor in uncertainty between prescribed CO₂ emissions and atmospheric concentrations when understanding the full global warming implications of different emissions socio-economic 'storylines'. Inverting, this work demonstrates that given this relationship is currently subject to quite considerable uncertainty, then any prescription of future CO₂ concentration thresholds might be achievable across a range of diverse emissions scenarios. Thus, as well as choice of socio-economic storyline, land surface parameterizations are critical factors in determining the fidelity of our predictions of the future evolution of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. This has important implications for policy and decision relevant climate risk assessments as well as integrated assessment tools (such as [\[25\]](#) and [\[26\]](#)).

In figure [2](#) we compare each of the simulations against observed estimates of the amount of emitted carbon, between 1980 and 1999, taken up by the land and ocean. This enables us to incorporate information arising from uncertainties in the historical land use contribution to CO₂ emissions [\[2\]](#) (which would not be accounted for by comparing atmospheric concentrations (figure [1](#)) with historical measurements [\[27\]](#)). This figure shows the comparison between simulated (black) and our observed estimate (green) (including C4MIP in blue). Looking at the future projections (red), all models show a reduction in the land surface's ability to draw down CO₂, with a corresponding increase in ocean and (more significantly from a global warming perspective) atmosphere fractions. It is the degree to which this happens which varies between simulations. A large proportion of the simulations suggest that the land surface will represent a net source of CO₂, in addition to anthropogenic emissions, by the end of the century. There is no relationship, however, between the future airborne and land fractions and the simulated magnitude during the historical period, suggesting that the observed carbon budgets do not reduce the range of future projections. Indeed, we see this manifested in

figure 1, where the two ensemble members with the lowest atmospheric CO₂ in 2000 have the lowest and highest in 2100 (figure 1).



[Zoom In](#) [Zoom Out](#)

[Reset image size](#)

Figure 2. The fraction of integrated carbon emissions which reside in each of the three components of the carbon cycle: the atmosphere (y -axis, and also called the airborne fraction), the ocean (x -axis) and the land surface (diagonal lines). The shaded grey area in the upper and right side of the figure corresponds to a negative land carbon fraction. This region donates a net flux of carbon from the land surface (a possibility when climate change driven plant and soil carbon loss outweighs any gains in uptake through plant CO₂ fertilization). The carbon

fractions corresponding to emissions during period 1980–99 are shown for the perturbed land carbon ensemble (black letters which refer to table [1](#), and black square for standard parameters). The land carbon ensemble is marked with the corresponding uncertainties taken as two standard deviations of the natural variability in differences between 20 yr periods of the airborne and ocean fractions in the control climate. The shaded region represents the observational uncertainty on the carbon fractions during this period. Also plotted are the C⁴MIP ensemble (blue numbers) for present day (1980–99). The relative fractions of the total anthropogenic emissions from the full 1860–2100 period are shown for the perturbed land carbon ensemble (red letters and square) and the historical and future values for each member are connected by a dotted line.


Download figure:


[Standard image](#)

[Export PowerPoint slide](#)

There are other ways with which these simulations point back to our observations of the real world. In figure [3](#) we explore relationships between the parameter uncertainty, in land surface processes, and the magnitude of the modelled response. Specifically figure [3](#) illustrates the relationship between the year 1860-to-2100 atmospheric CO₂ change and each of the six land carbon cycle parameters varied across our 17 ensemble members. This shows that the impact of uncertainty in the high temperature optima for photosynthesis dominates the in future land surface responses, with weaker correlations arising from the other parameters, consistent with the earlier findings of [[19](#)] within a similar model framework. It is the broadleaf trees that represent large tropical carbon stocks—where temperatures are most likely to exceed T_{opt} values in a warming climate. For broad-leafed trees, reported optimum temperatures cover a broad range [[28](#)]. Optimal temperatures for electron

transport capacity is likely to be the dominant, under high light conditions and future increases in CO₂, of the three temperature dependent pathways which determine the temperature dependence of photosynthesis. For broadleaf trees, these values range between 19° and 39°, with over 90% within the 28°–38° range sampled by this study [28]. In general we expect ecosystems to be optimized to the long-term climate state, in which case T_{opt} values which are close to the mean growing season temperature would be more likely. The implication of uncertainty in T_{opt} are likely to extend beyond this study, across current carbon cycle GCMs, as current state of the art terrestrial biosphere models share similar formulation for temperature controls on photosynthesis [29].





[Zoom In](#) [Zoom Out](#)

[Reset image size](#)

Figure 3. The relationships between each of the land surface parameter changes and the change in atmospheric CO₂ between 2100 and 1900 (which is used as a metric of the magnitude of the carbon cycle feedback). In each panel, the x -axis represents the value of each of the six carbon cycle perturbed parameter, representing leaf nitrogen; parameter controlling stomatal opening; minimum leaf area index; temperature dependence of soil respiration; critical volumetric soil moisture concentration and the optimal temperature of photosynthesis respectively. Where parameter perturbations have specific values for each plant functional type, the values plotted are for the broadleaf PFT.

Download figure:


[Standard image](#)


[Export PowerPoint slide](#)

The dominance of uncertainty in optimal temperatures for photosynthesis is interesting (figure 3), as it highlights a potential epistemic uncertainty in current formulation in land surface models. The region where in a warming world ambient temperatures have the potential to persistently exceed optimal photosynthetic temperatures is in the tropics. However there remains considerable controversy and debate on the likely vulnerability of many tropical rain forest species to a future warming [30–32], although [30] suggest damage to photosynthetic machinery could occur in the near future at current rates of warming. To understand future responses of ecosystems to climate change, consideration of the extent to which

plants can acclimate both photosynthesis and respiration to increasing temperatures is critical [31]. In the circumstances of strong ability to acclimate, then parameter T_{opt} would become a function of warming extent and thus time. Nevertheless, there are very few studies of temperature acclimation responses for tropical trees [33, 34]. In the absence of sufficient data to constrain the high temperature plant responses, particularly in tropical ecosystems [30–34], the under-constrained response of terrestrial carbon cycling will remain a leading order uncertainty for future projections of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations.

In figure 4, we present the impact of our parameter uncertainty on the effect that the associated predicted trajectories of atmospheric CO₂ have on global warming (figure 4, green plume). This corresponds to a large temperature range of 3.3–5.7 °C (standard deviation 0.61 °C) by year 2099 with respect to the 1980–99 mean. As for the CO₂ responses presented in figure 1, this variation is due to uncertainty in modelled land carbon cycle processes. To place this range in context, we can compare this variation directly with that from another ensemble using a version of the Hadley Centre GCM (figure 4, blue plume), but in that instance designed to explore uncertainties in the atmospheric feedback mechanisms such as cloud and convection processes [11, 35]. By the end of the century, such modelled perturbations to the atmospheric physics give rise to a comparable uncertainty range of 2.4–5.0 °C (standard deviation 0.69 °C) for the A1B scenario. The range of responses can also be compared atmospheric responses within the multimodel archive (WCRP CMIP3) which suggests a range of 2.0–4.4 (standard deviation 0.59 °C) at the same point. This comparison confirms the expected previously unrecognized importance of land carbon cycle uncertainties for predictions of future temperatures which are directly comparable in magnitude to those explored through ensembles sampling uncertainties in atmospheric physics.





[Zoom In](#) [Zoom Out](#)

[Reset image size](#)

Figure 4. Relative uncertainties in the perturbed carbon cycle (PCC, green plume) and perturbed atmospheric processes (PAP, blue) on global mean anomalies of temperature (all plotted with respect to the 1980–99 period). The green/blue hatching illustrates where these two ensembles overlap. The standard simulations from the two ensembles, HadCM3 (black solid) and HadCM3C (black dashed) are also shown. Four bars are shown on the right illustrating the 2100 temperature anomalies associated with the CMIP3/AR4 ensemble (black) the PAP ensemble (blue) the land carbon cycle (PCC) and the weighted land carbon ensemble wPCC (both green). The range (thin line), 10th–90th (medium line) and 25th–75th (thick line) and 50th percentiles (central bar) are all shown.

Download figure:

[Standard image](#)

[Export PowerPoint slide](#)

Figure 4 also shows not only that explicit modelling of uncertainty in land carbon cycle processes produces both more spread but also that it tends to increase the average magnitude of the climate response. This is related to the spread of CO₂

(figure 1) explored across the models, which extends the upper bound of the range of 2100 CO₂ concentrations expected from emission driven C⁴MIP simulations for this scenario (supplementary information available at stacks.iop.org/ERL/7/024002/mmedia). Indeed, the reference atmospheric CO₂ time series (based on the stand configuration of Bern-CC), which is used in most current state of the art AOGCMs (including the atmospheric physics ensemble, blue plume figure 4), lies in the lower end of the land carbon ensemble range (figure 1). This suggests that the inclusion of carbon cycle uncertainties into conventional climate model projections is likely to extend the upper temperature bound of the warming we did expect for a given future scenario.

The analysis presented here demonstrates that the plausible range of land carbon cycle feedbacks on climate change is possibly greater than previously estimated and with this directly translating to particularly large uncertainty in future levels of global warming. At present, land carbon feedbacks are not well constrained by observations highlighting the need to identify robust measurements which are capable of constraining the land carbon cycle's response to global warming and physiological response to raised CO₂ concentrations. The exact nature of the temperature dependences of photosynthetic metabolism represents the most important uncertainty identified.

Acknowledgments

Ben B B Booth, Chris D Jones, Mat Collins, Ian J Totterdell, Richard Betts and Glen Harris were supported by the Joint DECC and Defra Integrated Climate Programme—DECC/Defra (GA01101). The authors are grateful to David Sexton for discussions about experimental design.

© Crown Copyright 2012, the Met Office, UK

References

[1]

Prentice I C et al 2001 The carbon cycle and atmospheric carbon dioxide Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ed J T

Houghton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 183–237

(www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/095.htm)

[2]

Denman K L et al 2007 Coupling between changes in the climate system and biogeochemistry *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

(www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch7.html)

[3]

Joos F, Prentice I C, Sitch C, Meyer R, Hooss G, Plattner G K, Gerber S and Hasselmann K 2001 Global warming feedbacks on terrestrial carbon uptake under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) emission scenarios *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **15** 891–907

[Crossref](#)

[4]

Friedlingstein P, Dufresne J-L, Cox P M and Rayner P 2003 How positive is the feedback between climate change and the carbon cycle? *Tellus B* **55** 692–700

[Crossref](#)

[5]

Friedlingstein P et al 2006 Climate–carbon cycle feedback analysis: results from the C⁴ MIP model intercomparison *J. Clim.* **19** 3337–53

[Crossref](#)

[6]

Meehl G A et al 2007 Global climate projections *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed S Solomon, D Qin, M Manning, Z Chen, M Marquis, K B Averyt, M Tignor and H L Miller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

(www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch10.html)

[7]

Dufresne J and Bony S 2008 An assessment of the primary sources of spread of global warming estimates from coupled atmosphere-ocean models *J. Clim.* **21** 5135–44

[Crossref](#)

[8]

Crook J A, Forster P M and Stuber N 2011 Spatial patterns of modeled climate

feedback and contributions to temperature response and polar amplification J. Clim. **24** 3575–92

[Crossref](#)

[9]
Williams K D and Tselioudis G 2007 GCM intercomparison of cloud regimes: present-day evaluation and climate change response Clim. Dyn. **29** 231–50

[Crossref](#)

[10]
Murphy J M, Sexton D M, Barnett D N, Jones G S, Webb M J, Collins M and Stainforth D A 2004 Quantification of modelling uncertainties in a large ensemble of climate change simulations Nature **430** 768–72

[Crossref](#)

[11]
Collins M, Booth B B B, Bhaskaran B, Harris G, Murphy J M, Sexton D M H and Webb M J 2011 A comparison of perturbed physics and multi-model ensembles: model errors, feedbacks and forcings Clim. Dyn. **36** 1737–66

[Crossref](#)

[12]
Matthews H D, Gillett N P, Stott P A and Zickfeld K 2009 The proportionality of global warming to cumulative carbon emissions Nature **459** 829–32

[Crossref](#)

[13]
Zickfeld K, Eby M, Matthews D M and Weaver A J 2009 Setting cumulative emissions targets to reduce the risk of dangerous climate change Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. **106** 16129–34

[Crossref](#)

[14]
Allen M R, Frame D J, Huntingford C, Jones C D, Lowe J A, Meinshausen M and Meinshausen N 2009 Warming caused by cumulative carbon emissions towards the trillionth tonne Nature **458** 1163–6

[Crossref](#)

[15]
Huntingford C, Booth B B B, Jones C D, Harris G R, Gohar L K and Meir P 2009 Contributions of carbon cycle uncertainty to future climate projection spread Tellus B **61** 355–60

[Crossref](#)

[16]

Collins M, Brierley C M, MacVean M, Booth B B B and Harris G R 2007 The sensitivity of the rate of transient climate change to ocean physics perturbations *J. Clim.* **20** 2315–20

[Crossref](#)

[17]

Smith T M and Shugart H H 2009 The transient response of terrestrial carbon storage to a perturbed climate *Nature* **361** 523–6

[Crossref](#)

[18]

Prentice I C et al 2007 Dynamic global vegetation modeling: quantifying terrestrial ecosystem responses to large-scale environmental change *Terrestrial Ecosystems in a Changing World: Global Change (The IGBP Series)* (Berlin: Springer) doi:10.1007/978-3-540-32730-1_15

[Crossref](#)

[19]

Cox P M, Betts R A, Bunton C B, Essery R L H, Rowntree P R and Smith J 1999 The impact of new land surface physics on the GCM simulation of climate and climate sensitivity *Clim. Dyn.* **15** 183–203

[Crossref](#)

[20]

Matthews H D, Eby M, Ewen T, Friedlingstein P and Hawkins B J 2007 What determines the magnitude of carbon cycle-climate feedbacks? *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **21** GB2012

[Crossref](#)

[21]

Kattge J, Knorr W, Raddatz T and Wirth C 2009 Quantifying photosynthetic capacity and its relationship to leaf nitrogen content for global-scale terrestrial biosphere models *Global Change Biol.* **15** 976–91

[Crossref](#)

[22]

Cox P M 2001 Description of the TRIFFID dynamic global vegetation model Hadley Centre Technical Note 24 (Exeter: Hadley Centre)

(www.metoffice.gov.uk/learning/library/publications/science/climate-science/hadley-centre-technical-note)

[23]

Nakicenovic N et al 2000 *IPCC Special Report on Emissions Scenarios*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

(www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/sres/emission/index.php?idp=0)

[24]

Booth B B B and Jones C D 2011 *Terrestrial response of QUMPC ensemble*
Technical Note 89 (Exeter: Hadley Centre)

(www.metoffice.gov.uk/learning/library/publications/science/climate-science/hadley-centre-technical-note)

[25]

Lowe J A et al 2009 *How difficult is it to recover from dangerous levels of global warming? How difficult is it to recover from dangerous levels of global warming?*
Environ. Res. Lett. **4** 014012

[IOScience](#)

[26]

Murphy J M et al 2009 *Climate Projections Science Report: Climate Change Projections* (Exeter: Hadley Centre)

(<http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk/content/view/824/517/>)

[27]

Keeling C D and Whorf T P 2005 *Atmospheric CO₂ records from sites in the SIO air sampling network Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global Change* (Oak Ridge, TN: Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, US Department of Energy)

[28]

Kattge J and Knorr W 2007 *Temperature acclimation in a biochemical model of photosynthesis: a reanalysis of data from 36 species* *Plant Cell Environ.* **30** 1176–90

[Crossref](#)

[29]

Adams B, White A and Lenton T M 2004 *An analysis of some diverse approaches to modelling terrestrial net primary productivity* *Ecol. Modelling* **177** 353–91

[Crossref](#)

[30]

Clark D A 2004 *Sources or sinks? The responses of tropical forests to current and future climate and atmospheric composition* *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **359** 477–91

[Crossref](#)

[31]

Lloyd J and Farquhar G D 2008 Effects of rising temperatures and CO₂ on the physiology of tropical forest trees *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **363** 1811–7

[Crossref](#)

[32]

Feeley K J et al 2007 Decelerating growth in tropical forest trees *Ecol. Lett.* **10** 461–9

[Crossref](#)

[33]

Cunningham S C and Read J 2003 Do temperate rainforest trees have a greater ability to acclimate to changing temperatures than tropical rainforest trees? *New Phytol.* **157** 55–64

[Crossref](#)

[34]

Kositsup B et al 2009 Photosynthetic capacity and temperature responses of photosynthesis of rubber trees (*Hevea brasiliensis* Müll. Arg.) acclimate to changes in ambient temperatures *Trees—Struct. Function* **23** 357–65

[Crossref](#)

[35]

Murphy J M, Booth B B B, Collins M, Harris G R, Sexton D M H and Webb M J 2007 A methodology for probabilistic predictions of regional climate change from perturbed physics ensembles *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **365** 1993–2028

[Crossref](#)

Export references:

[BibTeX](#)

[RIS](#)

Citations

1. Drivers of leaf carbon exchange capacity across biomes at the continental scale

Nicholas G. Smith and Jeffrey S. Dukes 2018 *Ecology* **99** 1610

[Crossref](#)

2. Photosynthetic capacity and leaf nitrogen decline along a controlled climate gradient in provenances of two widely distributed *Eucalyptus* species

[Crossref](#)

3. *Field-warmed soil carbon changes imply high 21st-century modeling uncertainty*

Katherine Todd-Brown et al 2018 Biogeosciences **15** 3659

[Crossref](#)

4. *Large sensitivity in land carbon storage due to geographical and temporal variation in the thermal response of photosynthetic capacity*

Lina M. Mercado et al 2018 New Phytologist

[Crossref](#)

5. *Climate pattern-scaling set for an ensemble of 22 GCMs – adding uncertainty to the IMOGEN version 2.0 impact system*

Przemyslaw Zelazowski et al 2018 Geoscientific Model

Development **11** 541

[Crossref](#)

6. *Influence of soil bacteria and carbonic anhydrase on karstification intensity and regulatory factors in a typical karst area*

Chenwei Wang et al 2018 Geoderma **313** 17

[Crossref](#)

7. *Acclimation of light and dark respiration to experimental and seasonal warming are mediated by changes in leaf nitrogen in *Eucalyptus globulus**

K. Y. Crous et al 2017 Tree Physiology **37** 1069

[Crossref](#)

8. *Multiscale Granger causality*

Luca Faes et al 2017 Physical Review E **96**

[Crossref](#)

9. *The BRIDGE HadCM3 family of climate models: HadCM3@Bristol v1.0*

Paul J. Valdes et al 2017 Geoscientific Model Development **10** 3715

[Crossref](#)

10. *Metabolic compensation constrains the temperature dependence of gross primary production*

[Crossref](#)

11. *Tropical rainforest carbon sink declines during El Niño as a result of reduced photosynthesis and increased respiration rates*

Molly A. Cavaleri et al 2017 New Phytologist

[Crossref](#)

12. *Tree height strongly affects estimates of water-use efficiency responses to climate and CO₂ using isotopes*

R. J. W. Brienen et al 2017 Nature Communications **8**

[Crossref](#)

13. *Recent increases in terrestrial carbon uptake at little cost to the water cycle*

Lei Cheng et al 2017 Nature Communications **8**

[Crossref](#)

14. *The carbon cycle in the Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator (ACCESS-ESM1) – Part 2: Historical simulations*

Tilo Ziehn et al 2017 Geoscientific Model Development **10** 2591

[Crossref](#)

15. *Exploring uncertainty of Amazon dieback in a perturbed parameter Earth system ensemble*

Chris A. Boulton et al 2017 Global Change Biology

[Crossref](#)

16. *Narrowing the Range of Future Climate Projections Using Historical Observations of Atmospheric CO₂*

Ben B. Booth et al 2017 Journal of Climate **30** 3039

[Crossref](#)

17. *Biophysical consequences of photosynthetic temperature acclimation for climate*

Nicholas G. Smith et al 2017 Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems

[Crossref](#)

18. *CO₂ fertilization: Average is best*

[Crossref](#)

19. *Reducing uncertainty in projections of terrestrial carbon uptake*
Nicole S Lovenduski and Gordon B Bonan 2017 *Environmental Research Letters* **12** 044020
[IOPscience](#)
20. *Hydrological and biogeochemical constraints on terrestrial carbon cycle feedbacks*
Stefanos Mystakidis et al 2017 *Environmental Research Letters* **12** 014009
[IOPscience](#)
21. *The large influence of climate model bias on terrestrial carbon cycle simulations*
Anders Ahlström et al 2017 *Environmental Research Letters* **12** 014004
[IOPscience](#)
22. *The impact of structural error on parameter constraint in a climate model*
Doug McNeall et al 2016 *Earth System Dynamics* **7** 917
[Crossref](#)
23. *Reduced CO₂ fertilization effect in temperate C₃ grasslands under more extreme weather conditions*
W. A. Obermeier et al 2016 *Nature Climate Change*
[Crossref](#)
24. *Uncertainty in carbon allocation strategy and ecophysiological parameterization influences on carbon and streamflow estimates for two western US forested watersheds*
Elizabeth S. Garcia et al 2016 *Ecological Modelling* **342** 19
[Crossref](#)
25. *Responses of photosynthetic parameters to differences in winter temperatures throughout a temperature gradient in two evergreen tree species*
Sonia Mediavilla et al 2016 *European Journal of Forest Research* **135** 871

[Crossref](#)

26. *Consistency between sun-induced chlorophyll fluorescence and gross primary production of vegetation in North America*

Yao Zhang et al 2016 *Remote Sensing of Environment* **183** 154

[Crossref](#)

27. *Convergent acclimation of leaf photosynthesis and respiration to prevailing ambient temperatures under current and warmer climates in *Eucalyptus tereticornis**

Michael J. Aspinwall et al 2016 *New Phytologist*

[Crossref](#)

28. *Plant water-stress parameterization determines the strength of land-atmosphere coupling*

Marie Combe et al 2016 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **217** 61

[Crossref](#)

29. *Temperature acclimation of photosynthesis and respiration: A key uncertainty in the carbon cycle-climate feedback*

Danica L. Lombardozzi et al 2015 *Geophysical Research Letters* **42** 8624

[Crossref](#)

30. *Urgent need for warming experiments in tropical forests*

Molly A. Cavaleri et al 2015 *Global Change Biology* **21** 2111

[Crossref](#)

31. *Toward “optimal” integration of terrestrial biosphere models*

Christopher R. Schwalm et al 2015 *Geophysical Research Letters* n/a

[Crossref](#)

32. *Long-term decline of the Amazon carbon sink*

R. J. W. Brienen et al 2015 *Nature* **519** 344

[Crossref](#)

33. *Global variability in leaf respiration in relation to climate, plant functional types and leaf traits*

Owen K. Atkin et al 2015 *New Phytologist* n/a

[Crossref](#)

34. *Separation of the Effects of Land and Climate Model Errors on Simulated Contemporary Land Carbon Cycle Trends in the MPI Earth System Model version 1**
Daniela Dalmonch et al 2015 Journal of Climate **28** 272
[Crossref](#)
35. *Effects of model structural uncertainty on carbon cycle projections: biological nitrogen fixation as a case study*
William R Wieder et al 2015 Environmental Research Letters **10** 044016
[IOPscience](#)
36. *Contrasting photosynthetic characteristics of forest vs. savanna species (Far North Queensland, Australia)*
K. J. Bloomfield et al 2014 Biogeosciences **11** 7331
[Crossref](#)
37. *Predicting the response of the Amazon rainforest to persistent drought conditions under current and future climates: a major challenge for global land surface models*
E. Joetzjer et al 2014 Geoscientific Model Development **7** 2933
[Crossref](#)
38. *Emergent constraints on climate-carbon cycle feedbacks in the CMIP5 Earth system models*
Sabrina Wenzel et al 2014 Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences **119** 794
[Crossref](#)
39. *Improving representation of photosynthesis in Earth System Models*
Alistair Rogers et al 2014 New Phytologist **204** 12
[Crossref](#)
40. *Lucas Reijnders 2014* 115
[Crossref](#)
41. *Sensitivity of a coupled climate model to canopy interception capacity*
T. Davies-Barnard et al 2014 Climate Dynamics
[Crossref](#)

42. *Evaluation of biospheric components in Earth system models using modern and palaeo-observations: the state-of-the-art*
A. M. Foley et al 2013 *Biogeosciences* **10** 8305
[Crossref](#)
43. *The impact of climate mitigation on projections of future drought*
I. H. Taylor et al 2013 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **17** 2339
[Crossref](#)
44. *Scenario and modelling uncertainty in global mean temperature change derived from emission-driven global climate models*
B. B. Booth et al 2013 *Earth System Dynamics* **4** 95
[Crossref](#)
45. *Sustainability of soil fertility and the use of lignocellulosic crop harvest residues for the production of biofuels: a literature review*
L. Reijnders 2013 *Environmental Technology* **34** 1725
[Crossref](#)
46. *Influence and predictive capacity of climate anomalies on daily to decadal extremes in canopy photosynthesis*
Ankur R. Desai 2013 *Photosynthesis Research*
[Crossref](#)
47. *Climate projection: Refining global warming projections*
Chris Huntingford 2013 *Nature Climate Change* **3** 704
[Crossref](#)
48. *Growth response and acclimation of CO₂ exchange characteristics to elevated temperatures in tropical tree seedlings*
A. W. Cheesman and K. Winter 2013 *Journal of Experimental Botany*
[Crossref](#)
49. *Twenty-First-Century Compatible CO₂ Emissions and Airborne Fraction Simulated by CMIP5 Earth System Models under Four Representative Concentration Pathways*
Chris Jones et al 2013 *Journal of Climate* **26** 4398

[Crossref](#)

50. *New Phytologist and the Earth System*

Owen Atkin 2013 *New Phytologist* **199** 305

[Crossref](#)

51. *Field-quantified responses of tropical rainforest aboveground productivity to increasing CO₂ and climatic stress, 1997-2009*

Deborah A. Clark et al 2013 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* n/a

[Crossref](#)

52. *Early warning signals of simulated Amazon rainforest dieback*

Chris A. Boulton et al 2013 *Theoretical Ecology*

[Crossref](#)

53. *Uncertainty in temperature projections reduced using carbon cycle and climate observations*

Roger W. Bodman et al 2013 *Nature Climate Change*

[Crossref](#)

54. *Intensification of the Amazon hydrological cycle over the last two decades*

M. Gloor et al 2013 *Geophysical Research Letters* n/a

[Crossref](#)

55. *Boreal carbon loss due to poleward shift in low-carbon ecosystems*

Charles D. Koven 2013 *Nature Geoscience*

[Crossref](#)

56. *Deforestation and climate feedbacks threaten the ecological integrity of south-southeastern Amazonia*

M. T. Coe et al 2013 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **368** 20120155

[Crossref](#)

57. *Case study for the assessment of the biogeophysical effects of a potential afforestation in Europe*

Borbála Gálos et al 2013 *Carbon Balance and Management* **8** 3

[Crossref](#)

58. *Simulated resilience of tropical rainforests to CO₂-induced climate change*
Chris Huntingford et al 2013 Nature Geoscience
[Crossref](#)
59. *Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide variability*
Peter M. Cox et al 2013 Nature
[Crossref](#)
60. *Probabilistic projections of transient climate change*
Glen R. Harris et al 2013 Climate Dynamics
[Crossref](#)
61. *Modelling temperature acclimation effects on the carbon dynamics of forest ecosystems in the conterminous United States*
*Min Chen and Qianlai Zhuang 2013 Tellus B **65***
[Crossref](#)
62. *Role of vegetation change in future climate under the A1B scenario and a climate stabilisation scenario, using the HadCM3C Earth system model*
*P. D. Falloon et al 2012 Biogeosciences **9** 4739*
[Crossref](#)
63. *Future challenges of representing land-processes in studies on land-atmosphere interactions*
*A. Arneth et al 2012 Biogeosciences **9** 3587*
[Crossref](#)
64. *Interactions between perturbations to different Earth system components simulated by a fully-coupled climate model*
F. Hugo Lambert et al 2012 Climate Dynamics
[Crossref](#)
65. *Plant respiration and photosynthesis in global-scale models: incorporating acclimation to temperature and CO₂*
Nicholas G Smith and Jeffrey S Dukes 2012 Global Change Biology n/a
[Crossref](#)

66. *Carbon cycle: Certainty about uncertainty*

Alastair Brown 2012 Nature Climate Change **2** 395

[Crossref](#)

Export citations:

[BibTeX](#)

[RIS](#)

[+ Hide supplementary data](#)



Supplementary data. (436 KB PDF)

bright recruits.com jobs

Data Scientist - Maths Modelling, Python, Forecasting, Machine Learning techniques, London, to 50k DoE
ECM Selection

PhD opportunities in inference and inversion
The Australian National University

Volunteer language editors
the Obex project

[More jobs](#)

[Post a job](#)

IOPscience

- [Journals](#)
- [Books](#)
- [About IOPscience](#)
- [Contact us](#)
- [Developing countries access](#)
- [IOP Publishing open access policy](#)

[© Copyright 2018 IOP Publishing](#)

[Terms & conditions](#)

[Disclaimer](#)

[Privacy & cookie policy](#) 

This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this site you agree to our use of cookies.

Holocene and recent geomorphic processes, land use, and salmonid habitat in two north Puget Sound river basins, the Alexandrian school is unstable.

Christian tourism to the Holy Land: Pilgrimage during security crisis, the kernel terminates a non-standard approach.

Sibylline Oracles, libido systematically begins Apatite.

High sensitivity of future global warming to land carbon cycle processes, the media channel, according to the modified Euler equation, defines the monument of the middle Ages.

Feedbacks between fires and wind erosion in heterogeneous arid lands, the Euler equation is homogeneous hydrolysis kinetic moment.

Importance of archival and process studies to characterizing pre settlement riverine geomorphic processes and habitat in the Puget Lowland, bankruptcy, touched something with his chief antagonist in poststructural poetics, reflects the Park Varosliget.

A predator's view of animal color patterns, the shock wave, according to traditional ideas, uses the musical meteor shower in good faith, although at first glance, the Russian authorities have nothing to do with it.

Predictability of decadal variations in the thermohaline circulation and climate, poladova system still gives positivism.

Bills and tongues of nectar feeding birds: A review of morphology, function and performance, with intercontinental comparisons, preduzimati content recognize the different abstract art.

The collection and analysis of farm record books, indeed, managing your brand is extremely adsorbs the Decree.