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Abstract
Climate change is projected to cause significant shifts in precipitation patterns across the Amazon basin. This dissertation is designed to address key uncertainties surrounding our ability to predict the fate of the Amazon rainforest in a drier climate. The second chapter is an assessment of the ability of four leading dynamic vegetation models—CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS and JULES—to replicate observation from two long-term ecosystem-scale drought experiments in the eastern Brazilian Amazon. This analysis revealed that these four models can reliably predict plant and ecosystem carbon fluxes under the present climate, but still require substantial development for predicting the consequences of severe drought. These four models were not parameterized to mechanistically represent soil water-stress or the competitive differences in plant hydraulics that exist between tree species. Therefore, chapter three is a field-based study designed to quantify the range of variation in two plant hydraulic traits—xylem-$P_{50}$ and turgor loss point (TLP)—that exists in mature tropical trees. The field measurements were made on four genera common to both experimental study sites. Each genus was categorized \textit{a priori} into one of four plant functional types: early- versus late-successional that were each subdivided into drought-tolerant versus intolerant. Xylem-$P_{50}$ and TLP occurred at water potentials that were 0.7 to \(1.1\) MPa and \(0.75\) MPa higher, respectively, in the drought-intolerant genera compared to the tolerant genera. In comparison, the early- versus late-
successional genera showed no significant differences in xylem-P$_{50}$ and TLP, thereby revealing two orthogonal axes of competition: one along a successional gradient and the other along a soil moisture gradient. The results from chapter three were then used to parameterize and test a new mechanistic water-stress formulation in the Ecosystem Demography (ED2) model, which became the basis of chapter four. With the new water-stress formulation, ED2 successfully replicates the observed reductions in total aboveground biomass in the drought experiments. It also more realistically captures the compositional and structural shifts that occur as a result of severe droughts. This dissertation makes an important contribution that advances the science of tropical forest drought ecology and enhances our ability to make reliable predictions about the fate of tropical forests in a future drier climate.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
Anthropogenic climate change is likely to be one of the most consequential events to affect the terrestrial biosphere of our planet over the coming century (IPCC, 2014). Quantifying the relative sensitivity of various ecosystems to climate change is critical to finding a balance between fostering human development, sustaining ecosystem services and transferring vast stores of terrestrial organic carbon to the atmosphere and oceans. Accordingly, tropical forests are one of the most important ecosystems to understand because of their influence on the global climate system and the global carbon budget (Bonan et al., 2008; Malhi et al., 2008). Amazonia is the largest continuous tropical forest in the world; covering approximately 5.4 million km$^2$ (Malhi et al., 2008) and accounting for 25% of the world’s biodiversity (Dirzo et al., 2003) and 15% of terrestrial productivity (Field et al., 1998). This research addresses the fundamental question: what is the fate of the Amazon forest in a future drier climate?

Currently, the Amazon region appears to be more strongly limited by light availability compared to precipitation and temperature (Nemani et al., 2003). Indeed, direct phenological and gas exchange measurements have verified that the present assemblage of species has been selected to optimize for light by “greening up” and increasing net carbon assimilation during the dry season when incident radiation is the highest (Saleska et al., 2003; Huete et al., 2006; Hutyra et al., 2007). A comparative study of plant functional types (PFT) conducted in a subtropical region of South America corroborates this light-limiting hypothesis (Nemani et al., 2003), where early successional trees adjusted their hydraulic architecture to increase water transport efficiency in response to increased irradiance while late successional trees did not (Campanello et al., 2008).
Many global climate models (GCMs) are predicting a regime shift for the Amazon region as anthropogenic global change evolves over the 21st century, where higher temperature and lower precipitation are projected to become more limiting (Cox et al., 2000; Huntingford et al., 2008; Malhi et al., 2009). Consequently, early predictions by both a GCM that was unidirectionally coupled to a dynamic vegetation model (DVM) (Huntingford et al., 2008) and a fully coupled GCM (Cox et al., 2000) suggest widespread die-back of the Amazon forest by the end of the 21st century. Alternatively, an analysis of 21st century precipitation predictions by 19 GCMs found that the climate for eastern Amazonia tended toward that indicative of a seasonal deciduous forest (Malhi et al., 2009). The positive feedback from the release of CO$_2$ resulting from either of these two cases could significantly accelerate global climate changes (Cox et al., 2000). A more recent analysis of 22 different climate models coupled to a single DVM suggested that changes in vegetation resulting from changes in precipitation would be minor in comparison to the negative effects of higher temperatures and the positive effects of CO$_2$ fertilization (Huntingford et al., 2013). However, are any of these predictions realistic?

The paleo-record offers some insight into how Amazonia has historically responded to precipitation changes. According to various proxies obtained through dendrochronology (Schöngart et al., 2004; Jones et al., 2009), stable isotopes (Stute et al., 1995; Thompson et al., 1995, 1998), palynology and limnology (Baker et al., 2001; Bush et al., 2002, 2004), the Amazon forest experienced a range of climatic conditions through the Cenozoic. Contrary to the “refugia hypothesis” (Haffer, 1969; Haffer and Prance, 2001), $\delta^{13}$C$_{OM}$ (organic matter carbon) and lignin phenol sampled from a deep
sea core collected from the Amazon river fan (Leg 155 of the Ocean Drilling Program) showed that the average species composition between C₄ grasses, C₃ angiosperms and C₃ gymnosperms has changed little over the past 70 ky BP (Kastner and Goñi, 2003). Continental sources of pollen also suggest that the extent of forest expansion and contraction has only been limited to the margins of the Amazon basin (Colinvaux et al., 2001; Mayle et al., 2004). A GCM simulation through the last glacial maximum also supported the lack of vegetation change between C₃ and C₄ functional groups (Mayle et al., 2004). Interestingly, the model predicted a shift in southern Amazonia from the widely distributed evergreen forests typical of today’s more humid climate to an extensive deciduous forest, while the evergreen forest remained in the north (Mayle et al., 2004). Therefore, direct evidence and model simulations suggest that there was an inherent degree of resilience among the assemblage of tree species that allowed for alternative forested configurations rather than transitions between savanna and forested states as the climate changed.

Three caveats should be noted when drawing comparisons between today’s situation and the past. First, although individual plasticity or competitively mediated changes in canopy composition may enable persistent forested states, a considerable amount of C may still be released to the atmosphere as the balance between productivity and respiration shifts in response to changes in precipitation and temperature (Schuur et al., 2001). Second, global change is occurring more than an order of magnitude faster now than during the Pleistocene to Holocene transition (Bush et al., 2004). Third, unlike the past 22ky BP (Monnin et al., 2001), profound changes in atmospheric chemistry will be an important feature of anthropogenically driven climate change (IPCC, 2014). For
example, recent increases in water–use efficiency have been widely observed in forests around the world, which is likely the result of increasing atmospheric CO$_2$ (Keenan et al., 2013).

A broad range of drought resistance has been found across tree species in today’s tropical forests through ample biogeographical and physiological studies. For example, Engelbrecht et al., (2007) showed that drought sensitivity explained the distribution of 48 species across a precipitation gradient in Panama. A wide range of functional traits such as wood density (e.g. Baker et al., 2004), specific leaf area (Fyllas et al., 2009), leaf shape (Malhado et al., 2009), branch architecture (Meinzer et al., 2008), root architecture (Markesteijn & Poorter, 2009; Metcalfe et al., 2008), lethal leaf water potential, turgor loss point, lethal leaf relative water content (Baltzer et al., 2008), stem xylem conductivity (Fonti et al., 2010), leaf conductivity (Brodribb and Holbrook, 2003), stem capacitance (Pineda-García et al., 2013), and whole-plant leaf-area specific conductivity (Meinzer et al., 2008) have been associated with spatial variation in available soil moisture. Given these results, making generalizations about trade-offs between fitness under either a light or water limited regime is complex.

Ecological studies in the Tapajós (TNF) (Nepstad et al., 2002, 2007; Brando et al., 2008), and Caxiuanã (CAX) National Forests (Fisher et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010) were established in the eastern Brazilian Amazon to directly measure the effects of severe long-term experimental drought on a 1 ha forested ecosystem. Interestingly in both studies, tree mortality increased 2.5 to 4.5 times among the largest trees, but smaller trees (<20cm DBH) were marginally affected (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010). LAI also was reduced in the drought plots of both studies (Fisher et al., 2007;
Brando et al., 2008). However, Nepstad et al. (2002) reported that leaf-shedding as an early response to drought was not the cause of lower LAI; rather, leaf production declined later in the second year indicating a possible shift in C-allocation properties. It is possible that additional carbohydrate energy was required to repair leaf embolism (Brodribb and Holbrook, 2003), or more C was allocated below ground to scavenge for water. Yet, the plasticity of functional traits was not examined in these two drought experiments, and has been poorly studied in general (but see Fonti et al., 2010). But perhaps even more fundamental is that mechanism causing the larger trees to succumb to the drought was not identified.

Given these uncertainties, a properly parameterized mechanistic model can be useful for i) identifying the fundamental processes and associated trade-offs that lead to survival or mortality within a dynamic tropical ecosystem, and ii) predicting how compositional shifts will play out as climate changes, which is impractical to address experimentally in a field setting over several decades. The Ecosystem Demography (ED) model can meet this objective because it tracks competitive dynamics between plant functional types (PFT) and can be run into the future dynamically coupled to atmospheric models (Moorcroft et al., 2001; Medvigy et al., 2009). However, ED is not well configured to realistically predict responses to changes in precipitation regimes. The current parameterization incorporates successional differences between species by representing early, mid and late successional PFTs. But, many of the functional traits known to both control plant water-use and adjust to water stress are either not included in the current model parameterization, are a fixed property of individuals, or are the same across PFTs. Hence, it is therefore not surprising the ED simulation in Huntingford et
al., (2008) caused the forest to collapse under a higher temperature and lower precipitation regime.

Currently, most land surface models parameterize the hydraulic system of trees using resistor (e.g. Farquhar et al., 1980) or resistor-capacitor (e.g. Čermák et al., 2007; Kumagai et al., 2009) schemes; see for example: CLM (Oleson et al., 2008), IBIS (Foley et al., 1996), JULES (Cox, 2001; Clark et al., 2011), SiB3 (Sellers et al., 1996; Baker et al., 2008). These models, however, neglect the architecture of water-transport systems within vascular plants. Ultimately, hydraulic architecture is simultaneously responsible for the efficient, yet safe, transport of water in vascular plants, which reflects trade-offs necessary for enhancing fitness in a given environment (Fonti et al., 2010). In the tropics, little is known about how inherent structural differences between species will influence long-term community dynamics between competing species. Also, individuals are known to modify their conductive tissue in response to environmental changes (Campanello et al., 2008; Fonti et al., 2010); yet, the magnitude of this plasticity and how it differs within and between functional groups is poorly quantified.

Even in light of our growing knowledge about morphological and physiological adaptations to water-stress, little is known about the exact process by which trees succumb to intense water-stress. McDowell et al. (2008) proposed a framework that divides drought survival strategies between tolerance and avoidance and then sub-divided tolerance between isohydric and anisohydric. Isohydric plants use their stomata to maintain leaf water potential above a critical threshold, thereby restricting CO₂ exchange when water is limited. Anisohydric plants keep their stomata open under water-stress, thus allowing CO₂ exchange to continue to the point that cavitation may occur.
McDowell et al. (2008) used a piñon-juniper woodlands (*Pinus edulis-Juniperus monosperma*) that was affected by the 2001-2003 severe drought in the American Southwest as an example for this framework because the two dominant species were either isohydric (pinon pine) or anisohydric (juniper). Interestingly, the isohydric piñon pines suffered widespread mortality while the anisohydric junipers generally survived the drought. Carbon starvation was identified as the likely process that caused piñon pine mortality (Breshears et al., 2009). The framework proposed by McDowell et al., (2008) is particularly relevant for studying severe drought in the Amazon forest because Fisher et al. (2006) showed that of the seven species measured for physiological properties in the CAX drought experiment, all were isohydric. This result suggests there may be a limited range of strategies for coping with water-stress in tropical regions that have not been water limited over an evolutionary time scale.

**Research Framework**

This dissertation is organized around an integrated modeling and empirical framework (Medlyn et al., 2015). Once a scientific inquiry is motivated, the research flows in the following manner: (1) evaluate the state of our theoretical understanding within a model, (2) develop new hypotheses, (3) test the hypotheses through experimentation, (4) use experimental results to parameterize new model formulations, then return to 1 and identify new model uncertainties (Fig. 1.1).
Figure. 1.1 Framework guiding the research of this dissertation. The research was initially motivated by scientific uncertainties identified from a literature review. These uncertainties were evaluated theoretically using the Ecosystem Demography model. 2. Hypotheses were developed to resolve the highest impact uncertainties. 3. Field experiments were conducted to test the hypothesis. The ED model was updated to reflect the results of the field experiment. The model was evaluated again. New hypotheses will be developed for future research.

*Initial model evaluation*

Part 1. The Ecosystem Demography model, version 2 (ED2, Medvigy et al., 2009) is a state of the art terrestrial biosphere model that simultaneously tracks hydrology, land-surface biophysics, soil carbon and biogeochemistry (Moorcroft et al., 2001). An important innovation of ED2 relevant to this study is that it links fine-scale (sub-grid) and landscape level processes by representing competition between discrete demographic groups. Competition is tracked through sub-grid scale mortality and subsequent
reproduction and growth of similarly aged cohorts and PFTs. This unique feature can be adapted to also evaluate the competitive advantages of differing drought tolerance strategies within and between PFTs. ED2 incorporates a complete representation of land-surface biophysics that explicitly solves for the carbon, water and energy fluxes of the land surface including a multilayer soil model.

ED2 is presently configured to represent competition between three successional (early, mid, and late) tropical tree PFTs, each with different parameterizations for photosynthesis, growth and mortality. ED2 contains the following structural and functional traits that have been related to plant water-use: rooting depth, specific leaf area (SLA), leaf size, canopy roughness, wood density, tree height, C-allocation between leaves and fine roots (q), and ratio of sapwood area to leaf area (qsw, sw: sapwood). ED2 also includes a tunable parameter that encompasses the conductivity of the soil-to-leaf system (Kw, m² kg⁻¹ yr⁻¹). However, these traits and Kw are static at the cohort level.

A preliminary analysis was conducted to evaluate how the original formulation of ED2 predicts the drought response of the throughfall exclusion site at TNF. Several drought levels were simulated over a 9 year period (2000-2008). The model was run using NCEP reanalysis meteorological data. The simulations were initialized from a 500-year spin-up forest generated from recycled NCEP data for 1969 – 2008 for the TNF coordinates. The parameterization of ED2 (Medvigy et al., 2009) includes the original parameterization for tropical forests used in ED (Moorcroft et al., 2001). The drought levels tested were 0%, 25%, 40% and 50% to 70% by 5% increments; each imposed for the entire 9 yr simulation period. Hereafter, drought nomenclature is denoted as dr0 = drought 0%, dr25 = drought 25%, etc.
After a 500 year spin-up, the equilibrium aboveground biomass (AGB) is 3.2 and 13.8 kg C m\(^{-2}\) for PFT\(_{\text{early}}\) and PFT\(_{\text{late}}\), respectively (Fig. 1.2a). The PFT\(_{\text{mid}}\) did not establish itself during the spin-up. The change in AGB under each drought scenario relative to dr0 is insignificant up to dr60 (Fig. 1.2b). Reducing precipitation by 5% more to dr65 causes a 75% reduction in AGB in the 5\(^{\text{th}}\) year (Fig. 1.2c). Under dr70, the ecosystem completely collapses in the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) year of drought (Figure 1.2d). The mortality under dr65 occurs across all size classes (Fig. 1.3). This large-scale decline in AGB in all size classes sharply contrasts with the results of the TNF and CAX drought experiments, which observed a decline of 22% of total AGB in only the larger size classes (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010)

![Figure 1.2. Simulations of Tapajós National Forest aboveground biomass (AGB, kg C m\(^{-2}\)) between 2000 to 2008 for drought (dr) levels (a) 0%, (b) 60%, (c) 65% and (d) 70%. Early, mid and late are the succession plant functional types.](image-url)
A sensitivity test was performed on the functional traits $K_w$, $q$, and SLA to evaluate how much they alter ecosystem drought tolerance as measured by AGB. Both positive and negative adjustments of $q$ and SLA by 40% to 50% had only a minor effect on the response of AGB to drought. The greatest gain for drought tolerance came from adjusting downward the $K_w$ conductivity parameter from a baseline of 150 to 50 $m^2$ kg-$C^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$ (Fig. 1.4a,b). Again the threshold was 65; yet AGB was only reduced by half when $K_w$ was set to 50 $m^2$ kg-$C^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$. In comparison, adjusting $K_w$ downward to 100 $m^2$ kg-$C^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$ had a marginal effect on AGB (Fig. 1.4c), while adjusting it upward to 200 $m^2$ kg-$C^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$ resulted in even greater losses in AGB (Fig. 1.4d). The relationship between $K_w$ and soil moisture is curvilinear where conductivity becomes increasingly sensitive with declining soil moisture. This prediction by ED2 is consistent with the general observation that species growing in xeric regions have relatively lower xylem hydraulic conductivity (Lambers et al., 2008). The sensitivity analysis showed that regardless of which of the three trait parameter were adjusted the ecosystem was largely insensitive to reduced precipitation until a critical threshold was breeched. This prediction is consistent
Figure 1.4 Sensitivity test of aboveground biomass (AGB, kg C m\(^{-2}\)) of the Tapajós National Forest during a 9 yr (2000-2008) simulation with a 65% reduction in precipitation (dr65). For each simulation, only the plant hydraulic conductivity parameter, \(K_W\), was adjusted. (a) baseline parameterization, \(K_W = 150\) m\(^2\) kg-C\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\), (b) conductivity is severely reduced, \(K_W = 50\), (c) conductivity is moderately reduced, \(K_W = 100\), (d) conductivity is increased, \(K_W = 200\).
with the Tapajós drought experiment where the reduction in AGB occurred only after soil moisture available to the plants declined below a critical threshold (Nepstad et al., 2007). $K_{\text{WH}}$ showed the most promise for future inquiry since it conserved the greatest amount of AGB after the threshold was breeched.

Part 2. ED2 is one of several terrestrial biosphere models being used to evaluate the effects of drought on the Amazon forest (e.g. Baker et al., 2008; Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Huntingford et al., 2013). There is a range of predictions among these studies about both the magnitude of the response (e.g. Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Huntingford et al., 2013) and the key biological and ecological processes governing the response to drier soils (Baker et al., 2008; Castanho et al., 2013). While similar in many ways, there are fundamental differences between all of the models in how they represent key biological and ecological processes relevant to drought. Moreover, these previous modeling studies generally used different spin up procedures and prescribed different physical environments—e.g. soil texture, soil moisture drainage, partitioning of radiation, etc.—thus making it challenging to generalize the biological and ecological responses to a future drier climate in the Amazon. Therefore, Chapter 2 is a rigorous intercomparison between ED2 and four other terrestrial biosphere models (Community Land Model version 3.5 (CLM3.5), Integrated Biosphere Simulator version 2.6.4 (IBIS), Joint UK Land Environment Simulator version 2.1 (JULES) and Simple Biosphere model version 3 (SiB3)) and a hydrodynamic terrestrial ecosystem model (the Soil–Plant–Atmosphere (SPA) model). For the first time, the spin-up procedure, physical environments and prescribed drought simulations were standardized between the models. In Chapter 2, differences and
similarities in the model formulations are elucidated in order to parse out where the greatest uncertainties exist in our understanding of the biological and ecological responses to drought.

Hypothesis Development

The research described in Chapters 3 and 4 is designed to build on the specific model evaluation of ED2 and the model intercomparison in Chapter 2. The role conductive tissue plays in water transport within the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum is not explicitly represented in ED2. Rather, ED2 uses a phenomenological relationship between soil water supply and canopy water demand to represent the effect of soil water stress on gas exchange (Moorcroft et al., 2001). In this relationship, stomatal conductance is down-regulated as a function of soil moisture. Although still not directly causal, a more realistic representation would have stomatal conductance be a function of leaf water potential, not soil moisture. Therefore, Chapter 4 explores formally representing hydrodynamic flow of water through the tree within the ED2 model.

A porous-media, pipe model that explicitly represents capacitance and hydraulic conductivity can be used to simulate hydrodynamic flow through the xylem. The fundamental assumption of a pipe model is that water movement through the xylem is analogous to soil water movement and is governed by Darcy’s law. One major advantage of this approach is that the parameters represent the underlying physiological mechanisms that control water movement through plants and can be directly measured. Therefore, this formulation can realistically be extrapolated to novel environments
because the parameters remain within observed biological boundaries; whereas the $K_W$ parameter from ED2 cannot be directly measured.

Field experiments

The field campaign served as the basis for Chapter 3. Its underlying aim was to obtain the measurements required to parameterize the new hydrodynamic formulation for ED2 described above and evaluated in Chapter 4. Estimates of turgor loss point (TLP) and xylem-P50 are the two plant traits needed for the new parameterization. Turgor loss point is the integrated leaf water pressure when the cells lose turgor and is correlated with stomatal closure (Brodribb et al., 2003). Xylem-P$_{50}$ is the xylem water pressure when the xylem loses 50% of its conductivity. Xylem-P$_{50}$ is one metric of xylem cavitation that allows for a direct comparison between species (Meinzer et al., 2009).

Prior to this study it was not known how strongly the observed variation in tropical tree hydraulic traits (Baltzer et al., 2008; Anderegg et al., 2014) correlated with functional diversity associated with both succession and drought tolerance. Therefore, the field campaign was designed to test if a successional axis of competition among tropical trees is the same as or orthogonal to a drought-tolerance axis of competition. By extension, the quantitative results from this study were used to test the validity of the current PFT representation of tropical trees in the ED2 model (as well as terrestrial biosphere models in general—e.g. those in Chapter 2), which includes only three PFTs that operate along a successional axis of competition, versus the need to include additional PFTs that operate along a drought tolerance axis.
Model parameterization

Chapter 4 tests three alternative soil water-stress formulations within the structure of the ED2 model: (1) the original ED2 formulation that accounts for both soil moisture supply and atmospheric demand for plant water, (2) a more simplistic single-resistor formulation that is only a function of soil moisture supply and is typical of many terrestrial biosphere models, and (3) a more detailed and mechanistic hydrodynamic formulation that accounts for both supply and demand as a function of leaf water potential. Formulas 2 and 3 also included additional functional diversity related to drought tolerance, where the existing PFTs were subdivided into drought tolerant and intolerant groups and were parameterized using the field experiment data. In essence, formulation 2 was designed to evaluate if increasing functional diversity alone while using a more simplistic water-stress function improves ED2 model predictions of ecosystem drought responses. Formulation 3 in contrast, evaluates if inclusion of both plant hydrodynamics and functional diversity related to drought tolerance improves ED2 predictions of the ecosystem drought responses.

In summary, this dissertation is designed to advance the science of tropical forest drought ecology. Chapter 2 is the first model inter-comparison of tropical ecosystem drought responses that tests the suitability of terrestrial biosphere models for predicting drought responses of tropical forests and identifies key areas for future research and model development. Chapter 3 aims to reveal how functional traits associated with tree water-use and transport efficiency varies with both successional type and drought tolerance. Chapter 4 is an evaluation of how both different soil water-stress formulations and representing varying levels of functional diversity in a dynamic vegetation model
(i.e. ED) affect predictions of ecosystem responses to chronic drought. Also, the analysis in Chapter 4 aims to reveal additional sources of model uncertainty, which brings the Research Framework cycle (Fig 1.1) full circle so that the next set of field experiments are informed by both model and theoretical uncertainty.

References


tolerance in determining tree species distributions along the Malay–Thai Peninsula


Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an
Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. *Philosophical

Breshears DD, Myers OB, Meyer CW, Barnes FJ, Zou CB, Allen CD, McDowell NG,
Pockman WT (2009) Tree die-off in response to global change-type drought:
mortality insights from a decade of plant water-potential measurements. *Frontiers in

with other leaf physiological traits. Plant Physiology, 132, 2166-2173.

stomatal closure, leaf turgor and xylem vulnerability in eight tropical dry forest trees.
*Plant, Cell and Environment*, 26, 443-450.


Bush MB, Silman MR, Urrego DH (2004) 48,000 years of climate and forest change in a


Chapter 2

Confronting model predictions of carbon fluxes with measurements of Amazon forests subjected to experimental drought

(as published in New Phytologist)
Title: Confronting model predictions of carbon fluxes with measurements of Amazon forests subjected to experimental drought.

Thomas L. Powell¹, David R. Galbraith²,³, Bradley O. Christoffersen⁴, Anna Harper⁵,⁶, Hewlley M. A. Imbuzeiro⁷, Lucy Rowland⁸, Samuel Almeida⁹, Paulo M. Brando¹⁰, Antonio Carlos Lola da Costa¹¹, Marcos Heil Costa⁷, Naomi M. Levine¹, Yadvinder Malhi³, Scott R. Saleska⁴, Eleneide Sotta¹², Mathew Williams⁸, Patrick Meir⁸ and Paul R. Moorcroft¹*  

Affiliations:  
1. Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA  
2. School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom  
3. Environmental Change Institute, School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom  
4. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA  
5. College of Engineering, Mathematics, and Physical Science, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom  
6. Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA
7. Grupo de Pesquisas em Interação Atmosfera-Biosfera, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil

8. School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

9. Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Belém, Pará, Brazil

10. Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia, Brasília, Brazil

11. Centro de Geociências, Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, Pará, Brazil

12. Embrapa Amapá, Macapá, Amapá, Brazil

*corresponding author: paul_moorcroft@harvard.edu,
ph: +1-617-496-6744

Abstract:
• Considerable uncertainty surrounds the fate of Amazon rainforests in response to climate change.

• Carbon flux predictions of five terrestrial biosphere models (CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, JULES and SiB3) and a hydrodynamic terrestrial ecosystem model (SPA) were evaluated against measurements from two large-scale Amazon drought experiments.

• Model predictions agreed with the observed carbon fluxes in the control plots of both experiments, but poorly replicated the responses to the drought treatments. Most notably, with the exception of ED2, the models predicted negligible reductions in aboveground biomass in response to the drought treatments, which was in contrast to an observed ~20% reduction at both sites. For ED2, the timing of the decline in aboveground biomass was accurate, but the magnitude was too high for one site and too low for the other.

• Three key findings indicate critical areas for future research and model development. First, the models predicted declines in autotrophic respiration under prolonged drought in contrast to measured increases at one of the sites. Second, models lacking a phenological response to drought introduced bias in the sensitivity of canopy productivity and respiration to drought. Third, the phenomenological water-stress functions used by the terrestrial biosphere models to represent the effects of soil moisture on stomatal conductance yielded unrealistic diurnal and seasonal responses to drought.

Keywords: Amazon, tropical rainforest, drought, terrestrial biosphere model, carbon cycle, throughfall exclusion,
Introduction:

Changes in precipitation patterns are projected to be one of the biggest consequences for
the Amazon rainforest as global climate change intensifies over this century. Predicted
shifts in precipitation include: an increase in the frequency of extremely wet or dry
months (Lintner et al., 2012), regional increases or decreases in dry season length and
intensity (Malhi et al., 2008; Costa & Pires, 2010, Good et al., 2013, Joetzjer et al.,
2013), and either increased precipitation or chronic drying across large regions of the
basin (Cox et al., 2000, Li et al., 2006). Although the spatial and temporal patterns of
predicted shifts in precipitation vary considerably between climate models (Jupp et al.,
2010), there is increasing consensus toward drying and longer dry seasons (Joetzjer et al.,
2013). However, it is presently unclear how resilient forests in different regions will be
to a drier climate.

Process-based terrestrial biosphere models are key tools for assessing ecosystem
resilience to climate change because of their ability to mechanistically predict ecosystem
responses to novel environmental conditions. However, it is unclear whether current
model formulations can accurately capture the impacts of chronic drought on Amazon
forest ecosystems. Several modeling studies have been conducted to evaluate the
importance of different ecosystem processes and physiological mechanisms that either
modify Amazon carbon fluxes or confer tolerance during periods of water-stress (e.g.
Baker et al., 2008; Fisher et al., 2007, 2010; Sakaguchi et al., 2011). However, these
studies examined the predictions of single models using different meteorological forcing
data and different representations of the soil properties; therefore, it is difficult to
understand how contrasting terrestrial biosphere formulations and parameterizations affect predictions of different Amazon forests to severe water limitation. In this analysis, we performed a detailed evaluation of five terrestrial biosphere models (CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, JULES, SiB3) and a site-specific ecosystem model (SPA) to correctly capture the effects of water-limitation on carbon fluxes of two Amazon forests. Model predictions were compared against observations from the two throughfall exclusion (TFE) drought experiments located in the Caixuanã (CAX) and Tapajós (TNF) National Forests in the eastern Brazilian Amazon (Nepstad et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2007; Meir et al., 2009). All model simulations used standardized initial spin-up conditions, soil physics, and local meteorological forcings.

The TFE drought experiments are ideal for evaluating the model specific soil water-stress responses since they prevented approximately 50% of the precipitation from entering the soil without altering atmospheric conditions (Nepstad et al., 2002). Moreover, the TFEs serve as useful benchmarks for vegetation models since the simulated droughts cover a broader range of drying than is currently predicted by most climate models, thus ensuring conservative parameterizations. Also, unlike greenhouse-based drought manipulations, they evaluate ecosystem-level drought responses.

Although soil type and water table depth are considerably different between the two sites (see Methods), both drought experiments had similar responses involving reductions in wood production and elevated mortality of dominant trees in the treatment plots (Nepstad et al., 2007; Brando et al., 2008; da Costa et al., 2010).

In this study, the carbon dynamics of the TNF and CAX forests were simulated under observed precipitation (0% reduction), and three drought levels, classified as
substantial (30%), severe (50%, also TFE treatment level), and catastrophic (80%) reductions in precipitation. The six models were evaluated for their ability to predict reported carbon fluxes at the control and treatment levels. The models were compared to determine the level of agreement in the timing and magnitude of the response of ecosystem carbon fluxes to different levels of drought. Finally, the various formulations associated with soil water-stress were evaluated to determine the dominant mechanisms necessary for inclusion in terrestrial ecosystem models in order to provide useful information about the fate of the Amazon rainforest under future climate change.

Methods:

Study sites:
Two throughfall exclusion experiments were initiated in the Tapajós (2.897°S, 54.952°W) and Caxiuanã (1.737°S, 51.458°W) National Forests, Pará, Brazil, in 1999 and 2001, respectively, to assess whole ecosystem responses to drought. Mean annual precipitation at TNF is 2000 mm (Nepstad et al., 2002) with a wet season from December to mid-June, while at CAX mean annual precipitation is 2272 mm (Fisher et al., 2007) with a wet season from December to mid-July. Except for the below-average rainfall at TNF during the 2003 wet season, precipitation rates at the two sites during the experiments were typical (Fig. S2.1) (Rosolem et al., 2008). The soils at both sites are Oxisols, but they differ in texture and depth: TNF is comprised of 60% clay and 38% sand with no hardpan layers in the top 12 m and a water table > 80 m (Nepstad et al., 2002). CAX is 15% clay
and 78% sand with a stony/laterite layer 3-4 m deep, and a water table at approximately 10 m during the wet season (Fisher et al., 2007).

Aboveground biomass at the beginning of the TNF drought experiment—estimated for trees ≥10cm diameter at breast height using allometric equations from Chambers et al., (2001)—was ~15.0 kg C m⁻² (Nepstad et al., 2002). The TNF plot had a relatively rough canopy that ranged from 18 to 40 m in height with some emergent trees reaching 55 m. Aboveground biomass (trees ≥10cm dbh) at the beginning of the CAX drought experiment—estimated using the average of 8 published allometric equations—was ~21.4 kg C m⁻² (see Table 1 in da Costa et al., 2010). The CAX canopy was comparatively smooth with a mean height of 30 m.

A brief description of the experimental designs is given in Notes S3, and described in greater detail elsewhere (Nepstad et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2007). The observations against which the models are evaluated are listed in Table 2.2 and descriptions of the measurement methodologies can be found in Notes S3.

Model descriptions:

Five terrestrial biosphere models and one terrestrial ecosystem model were analyzed in this study. All the models had been parameterized prior to this study. The five biosphere models CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, JULES, and SiB3 used existing regional or global-scale parameterizations, while the SPA model had been parameterized for the CAX site as part of an earlier study (see references Tables 1, S2.3, S2.4). The definitions of model variables and parameters are given in Table S2.2. A brief description of the model formulations relevant for understanding how the modeled ecosystem responds to drought
is described below. The terrestrial biosphere models represented the biological response to water-stress with schemes relating to atmospheric demand and soil moisture supply. The former regulates carbon assimilation and evapotranspiration through biophysical processes that linked stomatal conductance to atmospheric humidity and the surface energy budget (Farquhar et al., 1980, Farquhar & Sharky 1982, Collatz et al., 1991), while the latter represented responses to soil water-stress and differed across all the models.

Table 2.1. Summary of the six models in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model name</th>
<th>Dynamic vegetation</th>
<th>Hydrodynamic</th>
<th>Canopy layers</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED2 Ecosystem Demography model version 2.1 (rv76)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Spatially variable</td>
<td>Medvigy et al., (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model name</td>
<td>Dynamic vegetation</td>
<td>Hydro-dynamic</td>
<td>Canopy layers</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Biosphere Simulator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version 2.6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Best et al., (2011), Clark et al., (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint UK Land Environment Simulator version 2.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiB3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 layers, each with sun and shade</td>
<td>Sellers et al., (1996); Baker et al., (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Biosphere model version 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 layers, each with sun and shade</td>
<td>Williams et al., (1996), (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil-Plant-Atmosphere model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the terrestrial biosphere models, CLM3.5, IBIS, JULES, and SiB3, are so-called ‘big leaf’ models in which the plant canopy is horizontally aggregated (see references in Table 2.1). In SiB3, the composition of the plant canopy is prescribed as a
single plant functional type (PFT) with a single canopy layer parameterized for tropical trees. In CLM3.5, IBIS and JULES, the canopy is comprised of different PFTs competing for available resources within the grid cell and the relative success of each PFT determines its fractional coverage. CLM3.5 and IBIS have two canopy layers, parameterized for sun and shade leaves, while JULES has 10 canopy layers, each with its own nitrogen content that both increased with height and was used to scale $V_{cmax}$ (i.e. the apparent maximum photosynthetic rate). In CLM3.5, IBIS, JULES and SiB3, leaf photosynthesis declines as soil water-stress increases through cumulative distribution functions of available soil moisture (see Table S2.3 and references therein). The specific functions vary between the models, yielding differing sensitivities of the plant canopy to decreasing soil moisture.

ED2 differs from the other models by being explicitly formulated at the scale of individual plants and using a system of size and age-structured partial differential equations to dynamically track the horizontally and vertically heterogeneous ensemble of individual trees growing within a grid cell (see references in Table 2.1). In addition, ED2 has three tropical forest PFTs (defined as early-, mid- and late-successional tree species) that differ in their photosynthesis, water-use, energy exchange, carbon allocation, and mortality (see Moorcroft et al. (2001), Medvigy et al. (2009) and M. Longo (unpublished)). Reflecting its individual-based nature, ED2 also explicitly represents mortality as a process distinct from other forms of tissue turnover, with per capita mortality rates varying as function of the carbon balance of the individual plants. Soil water-stress scales the maximum photosynthetic rate through a soil moisture supply
versus transpiration demand function (Table S2.3). The demand function includes a leaf biomass term that allows for leaf drop when soil moisture becomes limiting.

The SPA model (see references in Table 2.1) is a terrestrial ecosystem model that uses a hydrodynamic formulation to mechanistically simulate changes in water potential and storage from the soil, through the stem, to leaves in each canopy layer. SPA simulated a single tropical PFT with three canopy layers, each partitioned into an average sun or shade leaf fraction. Compared to the terrestrial biosphere models, SPA’s hydrodynamic formulation more mechanistically represents the genesis of plant water-stress. However, it has a much simpler formulation of carbon fluxes, assuming for example, that autotrophic respiration ($R_a$) was a fixed fraction of gross primary production ($GPP$) (Table S2.4). To facilitate comparison with the other models, SPA’s $R_a$ was subdivided into leaf ($R_{lf}$), root ($R_r$) and wood ($R_w$) respiration components by using the C:N ratios reported in Williams et al. (2002) to estimate the relative size of each respiring pool, with 10% of the wood pool assumed to be actively respiring.

*Simulation protocol and meteorological drivers:*

In order to isolate modeled biological responses to drought, the physical representation of the soil was standardized across all the models (Appendix A; Appendix B, Notes S4). The models were run off-line using site-level meteorological measurements made above the forest canopy at nearby weather stations. The TNF meteorological measurements covered 2002 to 2004 (N. Restrepo-Coupe, unpublished data) and were recycled sequentially over the eight-year simulation period from 1999 to 2006. The CAX meteorological measurements covered the entire 2001 to 2008 simulation period (da
Costa et al., 2010). Shortwave radiation was split into 68% direct and 32% diffuse and then further split into 43% visible and 57% near-IR for direct, and 52% visible and 48% near-IR for diffuse (Goudriaan, 1977).

All model simulations followed a standardized initialization, spin-up, and drought simulation protocol (Appendix A). The models were initialized with a near-bare-ground initial condition and then forced with sequentially recycled site-level meteorological drivers until aboveground biomass and soil carbon pools reached equilibrium under preindustrial atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations (278 ppm). The models were then brought up to present day atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations (380 ppm) following the exponential increase in CO$_2$ since 1750. The drought simulations were initialized from these spin-ups. The simulations were run with one baseline year followed by seven years of reduced precipitation for each site, (TNF: baseline1999, TFE 2000-2006 and CAX: baseline 2001, TFE 2002-2008). The site years were selected to coincide with the actual TFE experiments. During the experimental periods, precipitation was reduced by either 30%, 50%, or 80%. These are denoted throughout this paper as d30, d50 and d80, and with d0 identifying the control simulation. Consistent with the field experiment protocols, precipitation in the TNF simulations was reduced only during the wet season, while CAX precipitation was reduced all year, and the other meteorological variables (e.g. humidity) were not manipulated.

**Data Analysis and Presentation:**

The most detailed carbon accounting for either experiment is reported for the fourth year (2005) at CAX (see Table 2 of Metcalfe et al., 2010b), and so modeled ecosystem ($R_e$)
and component respiratory \((R)\) fluxes were evaluated against these reported values.

Similar data was not available for TNF; however, soil respiration \((R_s)\) (Davidson \textit{et al}., 2008) and net ecosystem production \((NEP)\), \textit{GPP} and \textit{R_e} from a neighboring flux tower site (Hutyra \textit{et al}., 2007) were available for the fourth (2003) year.

In the plots, the effect of drought on carbon fluxes is presented as the change \((\Delta)\) in magnitude with respect to the control \((d0)\) simulation with negative \(\Delta\) values indicating reductions in flux caused by drought. The ensemble median values of the model simulations were calculated rather than mean values so as not to over-weight individual model outliers. In the time series plots, 95% confidence intervals (CI) are shown for the ensemble means of the models and are a measure of model agreement about the associated flux. The 95% CI is not, however, a measure of whether or not the process is represented correctly; the latter is evaluated through the data-model comparison.

Observations are given as within plot means with 95% CIs indicating spatial variability. Errors were propagated by summing in quadrature absolute errors for addition and subtraction and relative errors for products and quotients (Taylor, 1997), assuming that reported observation errors were independent and random.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Site and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboveground biomass</td>
<td>\textit{AGB}</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2})</td>
<td>CAX: da Costa \textit{et al}., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Brando \textit{et al}., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross primary production of carbon</td>
<td>\textit{GPP}</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Hutyra \textit{et al}., 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Site and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter production</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Brando et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net ecosystem production of carbon</td>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Hutyra et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net primary production of carbon in wood</td>
<td>NPP(_w)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: da Costa et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autotrophic respiration</td>
<td>R(_a)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole ecosystems respiration</td>
<td>R(_e)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterotrophic respiration</td>
<td>R(_h)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf respiration</td>
<td>R(_lf)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root respiration</td>
<td>R(_r)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil respiration</td>
<td>R(_s)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Sotta et al., 2007,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metcalfe et al., 2010b,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Davidson et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood respiration</td>
<td>R(_w)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**

Since this analysis is principally concerned with agreement between the predictions of the individual models and the observations at the two drought experiments, model ensemble median and mean predictions with 95% CIs are shown, but are not emphasized. The
overall ecosystem responses predicted by the models in response to the two drought treatments are summarized in Figure 2.1, which shows the dynamics of aboveground biomass (AGB) (see also Table S2.1). As indicated by the AGB dynamics of the control (d0) simulations, the CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS and JULES terrestrial biosphere models predicted equilibrium AGB values similar to the observed value of 14.2 kg C m\(^2\) at TNF (Fig. 2.1a). At CAX, the terrestrial biosphere models had comparatively higher AGB predictions, yet all were lower than an observed value of 21.4 kg C m\(^2\) (Fig. 2.1b). SiB3 did not track AGB. In contrast, the SPA ecosystem model prediction for the CAX control plot was close to observed value, but at TNF it was more than double the observed value.

The models exhibited divergent predictions of AGB under increasing drought treatment levels (Figs. 2.1c,d, S2.2a,b, Table S2.1). The observed reductions in AGB at the treatment (d50) level at TNF and CAX were -3.2 kg C m\(^2\) and -3.8 kg C m\(^2\); however, CLM3.5, IBIS, JULES and SPA all exhibited little or no response at either site (Fig. 2.1c,d, Table S2.1). In contrast, ED2 predicted a marked reduction in AGB at TNF (-5.4 kg C m\(^3\)), and a small reduction at CAX (-1.4 kg C m\(^2\)). Although, the magnitude of ED2’s predicted decrease in AGB at TNF was too large, the timing of its predicted decrease in the third year of the drought treatment agreed with the observations. At the d80 treatment level, both CLM3.5 and ED2 predicted almost a complete loss of AGB, while IBIS, JULES and SPA still predicted only marginal losses in AGB by the end of the experiment (Fig. S2.2a,b).
Figure 2.1. Annual aboveground biomass ($AGB$, kg C m$^{-2}$) predicted for Tapajós (TNF, left side) and Caxiuanã (CAX, right side) National Forests. Colored lines are individual model predictions and black line is the 5 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Open symbols are published observations (Mean ± 95% CI (when reported), TNF: Brando et al., 2008, CAX: da Costa et al., 2010). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The Δ plots (c, d) show the amount the control (a, b) $AGB$ was altered by the 50% drought treatment.

Net Ecosystem Productivity and its Constituents:

Individual model predictions of control plot $NEP$ ranged between a small carbon source and a moderately strong carbon sink at both sites (Fig. 2.2a,c, Table S2.1). JULES and SiB3 simulations of $NEP$ agreed with the flux tower measurements at TNF in year four ($-0.09 \pm 0.05$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), predicting the control plot to be a weak carbon source (Fig. 2.2a, Table S2.1). On the other hand, CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, and SPA predicted TNF control plot $NEP$ to be a carbon sink (Fig. 2.2a, Table S2.1). At CAX, CLM3.5 predicted the control plot $NEP$ to be a weak carbon source, while ED2, IBIS, JULES, SiB3 and SPA predicted a carbon sink (Fig. 2.2c, Table S2.1).
Figure 2.2. Net and component ecosystem carbon fluxes (kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) in the fourth year of the experiment for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Carbon flux definitions and observation sources are given in Table 2.2. Colored symbols are model predictions and black symbols are observations (mean ± 95% CI). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The \(\Delta\) indicates the amount the control (d0) fluxes were altered by the 50% drought treatment.

At both sites, model predictions of \(GPP\) and component \(R\) fluxes in the control plots generally agreed well with the available measurements (Fig. 2.2b,d, Table S2.1). All models except SiB3 correctly predicted that autotrophic respiration (\(R_a\)) should exceed heterotrophic respiration (\(R_h\)) as observed at CAX.

When precipitation was reduced by 50%, all models, except IBIS at CAX, predicted considerable reductions in \(NEP\) at both sites (Fig. 2.2e,g, Table S2.1). Although measurements of overall \(NEP\) were unavailable for comparison, model predictions of the annual component \(R\) fluxes compared poorly with observations from CAX (Fig. 2.2h, Table S2.1). The response of individual model predictions of annual \(R_e\) and its components to d50 ranged from neutral to negative, while the observed responses
were neutral to positive. Almost the entire mismatch between observed $R_e$ and model predictions arose from the disagreement within the components of $R_a$, in particular $R_{lf}$ (Fig. 2.2h, Table S2.1). For comparative purposes, the TNF component $R$ fluxes for the fourth year are also provided in Figure 2.2f and Table S2.1 despite absence of validation data at this site. The patterns and magnitudes of the model predictions for TNF (Fig. 2.2f) were generally similar to those at CAX except for ED2 whose predictions changed substantially, reflecting the predicted reduction in $AGB$ at this site (Fig. 2.1c, Table S2.1).

Soil Respiration:

A direct comparison in the magnitude of observed and modeled $R_s$ was only possible for CAX because the meteorological drivers for the simulations were concurrent with the $R_s$ measurements between November 2001 and 2003 (Fig. S2.3). In the control plot, predictions of $R_s$ by CLM3.5, IBIS, and SPA were consistently in agreement with the magnitude and seasonality of the observations, while the magnitude of JULES and seasonal dynamics of ED2 and SiB3 exceeded the observations (Fig. S2.3a). At the treatment level, however, there was good agreement between model predictions and measurements of the $R_s$ response to $d50$ only during the wet season, but not the dry season (Fig. S2.3b).

The sensitivity of $R_s$ to $\theta$ in the observations was significantly different at the two sites, where a dependency was only observed at CAX (Fig. 2.3). Accordingly, the absence of a $\theta$ dependency in the IBIS and SPA formulas were more realistic at TNF (Fig. 2.3a); while the approximately parabolic relationship between $R_s$ versus $\theta$ found in JULES was more realistic for CAX, but incorrectly parameterized to match the
Figure 2.3. Periodic measurements of soil respiration ($R_s$, mean±95%CI, kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$, black symbols) as a function of volumetric soil water content ($\theta_s$, cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$) for (a) TNF (Davidson et al., 2008) and (b) CAX (Sotta et al., 2007). Concurrent $R_s$ predictions are given for each model (colored symbols). Closed symbols are for the control plots (d0), open symbols are for the treatment plots (d50).

observations (Fig. 2.3b). Predictions of $R_s$ by ED2 and SiB3 were excessively sensitive to soil moisture, but in contrasting directions relative to the observations. For ED2, $R_s$ declined well below the observations at low $\theta_s$, but rapidly exceeded them at high $\theta_s$ (Fig. 2.3). Interestingly, at the annual time scale, the low $R_s$ predictions by ED2 for the control plots were caused by relatively low $R_r$ rather than $R_h$ (Fig. 2.2b,d, Table S2.1). On the other hand, the parameterization of $R_s$ in SiB3 produced fluxes equal to the observations at low $\theta_s$, which then increased linearly to an optimal $\theta_s$ level (Fig. 2.3). Hence, SiB3’s $R_s$ was generally higher than the other models, particularly at TNF where $\theta_s$ was often
above the prescribed optimal level (~0.25 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) (Figs. 2.2b,d, 2.3, Table S2.1).

Moreover, SiB3’s over-estimation of $R_s$ in both control plots (e.g. Fig. 2.2b,d) was also due to its $R_s$ formulation. Unlike CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, and JULES, growth respiration ($R_g$) is not explicitly modeled in SiB3; rather, a relatively high, non-dimensional scalar (0.5) is used in its $R_s$ calculation to achieve plant carbon-balance closure (Table S2.4).

**Net Primary Production and Litter Fluxes:**

Model predictions of annual woody biomass increment ($NPP_w$) in the control plots of both sites were systematically higher than the observations, with the exception of JULES at TNF (Fig. 2.4a,b, Table S2.1). The model predictions of $NPP_w$ under the drought treatment at TNF were however, realistic in the sense that the models generally captured the observed decline in $NPP_w$ and the accompanying pattern of interannual variability (Fig. 2.4c,d). In contrast, $NPP_w$ was poorly captured under the drought treatment at CAX, where CLM3.5, ED2 and JULES all systematically over-predicted the changes in observed $NPP_w$; while IBIS and SPA under-predicted the observed reductions in $NPP_w$ in 2003, 2007 and 2008 (Fig. 2.4d, Table S2.1).

The predictions of litter fluxes for the control plots of both sites had a very large range (Fig. 2.5a,b, Table S2.1). IBIS’s litterfall predictions for the TNF control plot agreed well with the observations (~0.30 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), while ED and CLM3.5 both under-predicted observations, and JULES and SPA had litter fluxes that were significantly lower and higher, respectively, than the observations. At CAX, each model’s prediction of annual litterfall in the control plots was of a similar magnitude as its TNF prediction, except for a 35% lower prediction by SPA. Except for JULES, the
models generally predicted a long-term decline in litterfall, which contrasted the initial increase and then subsequent decline found in the observations at TNF (Fig. 2.5c,d).

Leaf area index ($LAI$) predictions for the control simulations at both sites varied significantly between models (Fig. 2.6a,b). The $LAI$ predictions of JULES, SIB3 and SPA were in agreement with observed $LAI$ values of 6 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ measured at TNF (Fig. 2.6a). In contrast, CLM3.5 and IBIS over-predicted TNF $LAI$ by 4 and 2 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$, respectively, while ED2 under-predicted it by 3 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$. The $LAI$ observations for the control plot at CAX were intermediate between the ED2 prediction of 4 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ and the JULES, SIB3 and SPA predictions around 7 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ (Fig. 2.6b). In both treatment plots
Figure 2.5. Annual litter production (kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Colored lines are individual model predictions and black line is the 5 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Open symbols are published observations (mean ± 95% CI, TNF: Brando et al., 2008). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The \(\Delta\) plots (c, d) show the amount the control (a, b) litter production was altered by the 50% drought treatment.

There was an overall decline in \(LAI\) by 20 to 30% over the first four years (Fig. 2.6c,d), and at TNF, the observed seasonality of \(LAI\) increased markedly (Fig. 2.6c). At CAX, observed \(LAI\) in the treatment plot remained suppressed by ~20% in the sixth year (Metcalf et al., 2010). Although, the leaf area formulations of CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS and SPA all contained soil moisture dependencies, their predictions of \(LAI\) displayed contrasting sensitivities to the d50 treatment (Fig. 2.6c,d). ED2 and SPA replicated the observed trends of \(LAI\) in the treatment plots. However, by the third year, the leaf-drop formulation in ED2 resulted in a recurring 90% loss of canopy foliage each dry season; whereas SPA predicted a 20% relative reduction in \(LAI\). In CLM3.5, \(LAI\) declined in a
stepwise fashion that was similar in magnitude to the observations, but only half the relative reduction. IBIS predicted a 30% reduction in LAI in the fourth year for the TNF treatment plot (not shown, as TNF LAI was not measured after 2003), but no response at all in the CAX treatment plot. The leaf area formulations for JULES and SiB3 were not dependent on soil moisture, and thus LAI did not display a significant drought response over the seven year experimental period.

![Graphs showing leaf area index (LAI) for TNF and CAX over years 1 to 4 of experiment.]

Figure 2.6. Leaf area index (LAI, m² m⁻²) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side) over years 1 to 4 of experiment. Colored lines are individual model predictions. Open symbols are published observations (Mean ± 95% CI, TNF: Nepstad & Moutinho, 2008; CAX: Fisher et al., 2007). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The Δ plots (c, d) show the amount the control (a, b) LAI was altered by the 50% drought treatment.
Carbon fluxes as a Function of Drought Level:

To better understand the drought sensitivities of the models, we examined their responses to three levels of drought: 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The range between the six models in cumulative NEP after seven years was large at the control level, with SiB3 on one end predicting both sites to be carbon neutral, and ED2 on the other end predicting both sites to be strong carbon sinks (data not shown). There was also considerable disagreement between models about the interannual variation of NEP where the magnitudes and signs were often opposing (Fig. 2.7a,b). As drought severity increased from d30 to d80, model agreement about the magnitude and interannual variability of \( \Delta \text{NEP} \) decreased (Figs. 2.7c-h, 2.8).

The contrasting trends in NEP under ambient and drought conditions reflected differences between the six models in their hypotheses about the balance between GPP and \( R \) for the two ecosystems. After seven years under the control simulation, modeled GPP ranged between 20.4 and 24.9 kg C m\(^{-2}\) 7yrs\(^{-1}\) at TNF and 22.5 and 27.4 kg C m\(^{-2}\) 7yrs\(^{-1}\) at CAX. CLM3.5 and SiB3 occupied the higher end of the range of GPP at both sites, while ED2, IBIS, JULES and SPA occupied the lower end. As drought intensity increased, there was increasing disagreement in both the cumulative magnitude (Fig. 2.8) and interannual variation (Fig. S2.4) of the model GPP predictions at both sites. Among the biosphere models, IBIS’s predictions of GPP were generally the least sensitive to the increasing levels of drought at both sites, while the greatest reductions were predicted by ED2 at the d30 and d50 levels for TNF (Figs. 2.8b,f, S2.4c,e), by CLM3.5 at the d30 and d80 levels at CAX and TNF, respectively (Figs. 2.8d,j), and by JULES at the d50 and d80 levels at CAX (Figs. 2.8h,i, S2.4f,h). The reductions in GPP predicted by the SPA
ecosystem model under the d50 and d80 drought levels at both sites were also comparatively small (Fig. 2.8f,h,j,l).

Figure 2.7. Annual net ecosystem production of carbon (NEP, kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Colored lines are individual model predictions and black line is the 6 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Drought levels are indicated by d30, d50 and d80, which are respectively 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The \(\Delta\) indicates the amount the d0 carbon fluxes were altered by the indicated drought level. Insets in (g) and (h) show full range for CLM3.5.
Figure 2.8. Change in the 7-yr cumulative net and component ecosystem carbon fluxes (kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) predicted by each model for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). The line in the box is the median value for the models. Carbon flux definitions are given in Table 2.2. Drought levels are indicated by d30, d50 and d80, which are respectively 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The $\Delta$ indicates the amount the d0 carbon fluxes were altered by the indicated drought level.

These differences in predicted $GPP$ could in part be accounted for by the contrasting formulations associated with soil water-stress. Canopy aggregated $GPP$ declines under soil water deficits through a combination of two sets of mechanisms, each operating differently among all six models. The first set modifies canopy leaf area. The substantially lower predictions of $GPP$ by ED2 at the d30 and d50 levels at TNF (Fig.
2.8b,f) were predominately caused by a reduction in LAI, first through leaf-shedding (Fig. 2.6c), then through a loss of AGB (Fig. 2.1a).

GPP also decreases through plant responses to atmospheric demand, i.e. vapor pressure deficit (VPD), and reductions in soil-water supply. In the terrestrial biosphere models, the photosynthesis routine accounts for the effects of VPD on stomatal conductance. The effects of supply are incorporated via a phenomenological function (β) that down-regulates stomatal conductance (gs) and as a consequence GPP, with decreasing soil moisture. (Throughout this paper the symbol gs includes β.) β varies between 0 and 1, where 1 implies stomata are only VPD regulated and 0 causes full stomatal closure (Fig. 2.9, Notes S1). Across all models, β increasingly trended toward 0 with increasing drought intensity and duration over the seven year simulation (Fig. S2.5).

β was also generally lower at each drought level at TNF compared to CAX (Fig. S2.5). Examination of diurnal-scale variation of β revealed contrasting dynamics between the models (Fig. 2.10a-e): β had a diurnal cycle in ED2, while in CLM3.5, IBIS, JULES and SiB3 it did not (Fig 2.10a-e). In addition, β in CLM3.5 and ED2 was responsive to individual rain events (Fig. 2.10a,b,f), whereas in IBIS, JULES and SiB3 changes in β were more gradual and occurred over seasonal timescales (Fig. 2.10c-f, S2.5e-j). Finally in ED2, IBIS, and JULES, β directly scaled net photosynthesis, while in CLM3.5 and SiB3 β scaled v_{cmax} (Table S2.3), dampening the effect of β on GPP following rain events (Fig. 2.10a,e). In contrast to the biosphere models, in SPA stomatal function is mechanistically linked to both the supply of soil moisture and atmospheric demand through a porous medium pipe-model formulation.
Figure 2.11 shows the predicted distributions of hourly midday (11:00-14:00) $g_s$ values at both sites that spans a six month period between the wet and dry seasons (May to November, during 2000 at TNF and during 2003 at CAX). In the control simulations at both sites, JULES had very broad distributions of $g_s$ that peaked around 400 mmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ leaf s$^{-1}$, while the distributions of $g_s$ in ED2 and IBIS were intermediate and peaked around 250 and 500 mmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ leaf s$^{-1}$, respectively, and the distributions of $g_s$ in CLM3.5 and SiB3 were relatively narrow and peaked around 150 and 300 mmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$.

Figure 2.9. Relationships between the soil water-stress factors ($\beta$) and volumetric soil moisture ($\theta_s$, cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$) for CLM3.5, IBIS, JULES and SiB3 for (a) TNF and (b) CAX. The function for each model is given in Table S2.3 and the parameter values used for each model are given in Table S2.2.
Figure 2.10. Diurnal trends of hourly ecosystem water-stress factor ($\beta$) and ecosystem gross primary production ($GPP$, mg C m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) at the TNF for (a) CLM3.5, (b) ED2, (c) IBIS, (d) JULES, and (e) SiB3 for two days, October 13-14, 2000. (f) Bottom panel shows a concurrent rain (mm hr\(^{-1}\)) event. d0 and d50 indicate 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation.
Figure 2.11. Density plots of modeled hourly stomatal conductance ($g_s$) during the midday (11:00 -14:00) over a 6 month period, May to November, in 2000 for TNF (left side) and 2003 for CAX (right side). d0 (solid) and d50 (dashed) indicate 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation. Inset in (k) shows full range of $g_s$ at the d50 level for the SPA model.
leaf s$^{-1}$, respectively (Fig. 2.11a-j). SPA, on the other hand, predicted a bimodal distribution, with the larger of the two peaks switching between TNF and CAX (Fig. 2.11k,l). Under the drought treatment, the $\beta$-correction caused a downward shift by 50 to 100 mmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ leaf s$^{-1}$ in the distributions of $g_s$ in CLM3.5, ED2, JULES at TNF, and SiB3, but not in JULES at CAX or IBIS at either site (Fig. 2.11a-j). The distributions of $g_s$ in CLM3.5 also became bimodal under drought. In SPA, the drought treatment at both sites resulted in a very narrow concentration of $g_s$ values just above 0 mmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ leaf s$^{-1}$ with a long positive tail, which was a substantially greater change compared to CLM3.5, ED2 and SiB3 (Fig. 2.11a-d,i,j).

There were considerable differences between the six models about the relative contribution of each constituent flux to $R_e$ in the control simulations for both sites. For all models except SiB3, $R_a$ was the dominant component of $R_e$, but by varying magnitudes (Figs. S2.6a,b, S2.7a,b). Accordingly, CLM3.5 was on one end of the range by estimating $R_a$ to be more than double $R_h$, and SiB3 was on the other end with $R_a$ and $R_h$ contributing equally to $R_e$. Also, the patterns of interannual variation of $R_h$ and $R_a$ were often opposing between models (Figs. S2.6a,b, S2.7a,b). Of the constituent fluxes of $R_a$, there was generally strong agreement about model predictions of $R_{lf}$ and $R_w$, and considerable uncertainty in $R_r$, which accounted for most of the uncertainty in $R_a$ (not shown, but similar pattern visible in Fig. 2.2b,d). One notable exception was IBIS’s significantly low predictions of $R_w$ (see also Fig. 2.2b,d).

Variation between model predictions of respiration fluxes also increased substantially with drought intensity, yet some clear patterns of individual models emerged (Fig. 2.8). ED2, JULES and SiB3 predicted increasingly the highest reductions
in $R_h$ as drought levels intensified owing to their decomposition formulations including a soil moisture factor. In ED2, the soil moisture factor regulating $R_h$ was so influential that it resulted in $\Delta$NEP being positive at the d30 and d50 drought levels (Figs. 2.7c-f, 2.8a,c,g). IBIS was the least sensitive to all drought levels, predicting only small increases in $R_h$ and reductions in $R_a$ at TNF (Fig. 2.8b,f,j), and virtually no response of its respiratory fluxes at CAX (Fig. 2.8d,h,l). While the cumulative seven year response of IBIS was small, its prediction of d50 $R_a$ at TNF comes into alignment with the other models by the seventh year (Fig. S2.7e), implying its respiration does eventually respond to the drought treatment. At the d80 level, the $R_h$ prediction of CLM3.5 was a significant positive outlier (Fig. 2.8j,l), thus reflecting the respiration of the additional dead biomass, which was not captured by ED2 even though it too experienced a high mortality flux (Fig. S2.2). These substantial increases in $R_h$ predicted by CLM3.5 occurred only in the second and third years at TNF and the third and fourth years at CAX; otherwise the $R_h$ predictions were in alignment with the other models (Fig. S2.6). Finally, for CLM3.5 at the d80 level, its predictions of $R_a$ had much more interannual variation relative to the similar behavior of the other models (Fig. S2.7).

**Discussion:**

Under current climate conditions, the six models analyzed here have a reasonably high degree of skill in replicating ecosystem carbon fluxes (Fig. 2.2a,b,d, Table S2.1). The models also had some success in capturing the responses to the experimental drought, as
generally capturing the observed reductions in $NPP_w$ (Fig. 2.4c,d), and ED2 correctly predicted the timing of the reduction in $AGB$ (Fig. 2.1c), but the models failed to accurately predict the magnitude of the drought-induced reductions in $AGB$ and accompanying component carbon fluxes ($R_e$, $R_a$, $R_r$, and $R_s$ at CAX and $R_s$ at TNF) (Figs. 2.1c,d, 2.2f,h, Table S2.1).

One explanation for this pattern of having high skill under current climate and poor skill under drier climate is that the models are poorly parameterized because they have been developed to replicate past observations of rainforests, which are rarely limited by water (Huete et al., 2006, Hutyra et al., 2007). Data-model assimilation using the observations from the two drought experiments may help to correct this problem. However, the results of this analysis more strongly suggest that the models require more realistic representations of key photosynthetic and respiratory drought response mechanisms. These are discussed in more detail below.

*Photosynthesis & soil water-stress.*

In all models except SPA, the stomatal response to decreasing soil moisture is represented by down-regulation imposed through a phenomenological function ($\beta$). The nature of the $\beta$-function differs across these models (Fig. 2.9, Table S2.3), and thus, each represents a contrasting hypothesis about how plant productivity is affected by available soil moisture. Any bias associated with $\beta$ translates directly into a corresponding bias in the magnitude and timing of the decline in $GPP$ as $\theta_s$ declines. For IBIS, JULES and SiB3, $\beta$ changed gradually as available soil moisture was drawn down or replenished (Fig. S2.5), but was effectively static over diurnal periods (Fig. 2.10c,d,e). In CLM3.5,
\( \beta \) was very responsive to rain events (Figures 2.10a,f) since it was parameterized based on \( \psi_s \) instead of \( \theta_s \) (Table S2.3), but was static during dry days. In contrast, in ED2 \( \beta \) had a clear diurnal cycle (Fig. 2.10b) because its value is affected by evaporative demand at the leaf, which changes significantly over the daily photoperiod. It is also important to note that in CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS and SPA the level of soil water supply is impacted by the changes in demand that are modulated through leaf area dynamics (Fig. 2.6). We return to this issue below.

The mechanistic hydrodynamic formulation in SPA has been shown to be effective in capturing both the seasonal and diurnal dynamics of stomatal control over GPP (Fisher et al., 2006) and thus, obviates the need for a \( \beta \)-type correction factor. However, the reduction in the mean density of ecosystem-averaged leaf-level \( g_s \) predicted by SPA for CAX in this study is considerably greater than the reduction of \( \sim 40 \text{ mmol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ leaf s}^{-1} \) reported for four canopy trees, and simulated by SPA in a local CAX parameterization using detailed soil hydraulic measurements (Fisher et al., 2006). In this study, using generic soil hydraulics parameters, the sensitivity of \( g_s \) to drought predicted by SPA increased. On the other hand, the drought induced reduction in \( g_s \) predicted by CLM3.5, ED2, and SiB3 was similar in magnitude to the individual level measurements reported by Fisher et al. (2006). These results indicate the challenge of generating at a regional scale the local hydraulic parameters required for a SPA-style mechanistic formulation of plant water-use. Therefore, for regional applications, where soil hydraulics data are limited, the \( \beta \)-formulations of CLM3.5, ED2 and SiB3 are relatively robust in terms of down-regulating \( g_s \).
Autotrophic respiration.

After the drought treatment was initiated, leaf dark respiration at CAX increased both in terms of unit leaf area and unit mass (Metcalf et al., 2010a). At the same time, LAI decreased, but the decline did not offset the increase in dark leaf respiration rate, resulting in an overall increase in \( R_{lf} \) (Fig. 2.2h). The predicted reductions in \( R_{lf} \) under the experimental drought directly conflict with these observations (Fig. 2.2h, Table S2.1). Of particular note, JULES and SiB3 explicitly down-regulate \( R_{lf} \) by \( \beta \) (Table S2.4) with this effect being stronger in JULES (Fig. 2.8h) since its decrease in \( \beta \) begins at a higher \( \theta_s \) relative to SiB3 (Fig. 2.9).

The results of this study suggest that respiration formulations need to be modified to test hypotheses about increases in maintenance respiration when soil moisture becomes severely limiting. For example, it is possible that \( R_{lf} \) increases under drought due to futile respiratory cycles or because of demand for additional energy to maintain solute gradients, repair damaged tissue (Würth et al., 2005; Meir et al., 2008; Metcalf et al., 2008), or repair leaf embolisms (Brodribb & Holbrook, 2003). Furthermore, all six models evaluated in this study follow the paradigm, either explicitly (SPA only) or heuristically, that growth declines when drought induces stomatal closure and down-regulates \( GPP \). However, many studies across a range of plant forms have shown that under water-stress growth declines before photosynthesis, such that they become uncoupled and carbon accumulates within the plant (Würth et al., 2005; reviewed by Muller et al., 2011). In many cases, the excess carbon is converted to carbon rich compounds that require extra energy to generate. Inclusion in future model iterations of formulations that up-regulate respiration during water-stress to account for all of these
discussed processes is critical for correctly computing the plant carbon balance during drought.

*Changes in plant carbon pools.*

Another critical component of capturing how \(GPP\) and \(R_a\) respond to soil water-stress, is correctly characterizing how carbon stocks change under drought. Accordingly, properly constraining seasonal leaf-area dynamics is imperative for reducing substantial biases in predicted \(GPP\) and \(R_a\) (Richardson *et al.*, 2012). Yet, all of the models failed to capture both the initial increase in litter production observed in the drought treatment plots at TNF (Fig. 2.5a) and, except for CLM3.5, ED2, and SPA, the reductions in LAI observed at both sites (Fig. 2.6c,d). While the mechanisms controlling leaf-shedding and flushing by tropical trees are not well understood (Kim *et al.*, 2012), they appear to be related to seasonal cumulative soil water deficit (Nepstad *et al.*, 2007, Brando *et al.*, 2010). The seasonally static leaf-area of CLM3.5, IBIS, and JULES and SiB3 introduced additional biases in their predictions of \(GPP\) and \(R_f\) (Fig. 2.6), while the phenological formulations of ED2 and SPA that are dependent on soil moisture appear to be more reasonable approximations for canopy leaf-area dynamics.

Similarly, correctly predicting \(R_a\) under drought conditions requires not only the per unit tissue \(R_a\) to be accurate, but also the changes in the plant’s carbon stocks. In this regard, the insensitivity of plant biomass to increasing water stress seen in Figure 2.1 is particularly problematic for the dynamic vegetation models. For IBIS, JULES, SPA and also SiB3 in terms of \(LAI\), even the d80 drought level did not trigger a reduction in biomass (Fig. S2.2), which implies that even though they contain mechanisms to modify
plant carbon balance under extreme drought, they still do not contain a mechanism that translates a carbon *imbalance* into a loss of biomass (D. Galbraith, unpublished).

Without a drought related mortality mechanism, these models will not be able to accurately predict carbon fluxes under drought because the fluxes will be derived from incorrect levels of biomass or leaf area. In CLM3.5 and ED2, significant changes in carbon stocks occurred (Figs. 2.1, 2.6) after chronically negative plant carbon balance occurred. Accordingly for ED2, the 50% reduction in *AGB* and 90% reduction in *LAI* at the d50 level at TNF cause the reductions in *GPP* and the component *R* fluxes (except *R_r*) to be considerably greater than predicted by the other models (Fig. 2.8f). Also, even for CLM3.5 and ED2, mortality due to negative carbon balance was incorrectly tuned to replicate the observed losses in *AGB* in the treatment plots (Figs. 2.1, S2.2).

*Net ecosystem carbon balance*

Changes in *NEP* are dependent not only on correctly quantifying changes in plant carbon stocks, but also on how rates of decomposition change in response to drought. Accordingly, CLM3.5 and ED2 reflect contrasting hypotheses about the rate soil carbon is respired under drought, which becomes evident in their contrasting predictions of *R_h* (Fig. S2.6) and resulting *NEP* (Figs. 2.7, 2.8) following their predicted *AGB* declines (Figs. 2.1c and S2.2). CLM3.5 predicted *R_h* to dramatically increase for the two years following its predicted *AGB* loss (Fig. S2.6g,h). Meanwhile, ED2 predicted a general decline in *R_h* under all drought levels (Fig. S2.6c-h), even though there was an increase in its soil carbon pool (not shown) following its predicted *AGB* loss (Fig 2.1c, S2.2). As a result, CLM3.5’s predicted *NEP* was significantly lower than the other models (Figs
2.7g,h, 2.8i,k); whereas ED2’s NEP prediction was similar to the other models (Figs 2.7e,h, 2.8e,k).

Overall the models compared well to the site specific empirically derived $R_s$ annual estimates (Davidson et al., 2008, Sotta et al., 2007) at the d0 level (Fig. 2.2b,d), but poorly under the d50 conditions (Fig. 2.2f,h, Table S2.1). The inability of the models to correctly capture drought effects on $R_s$ stems from the compounding effect of two related problems. First, in an adjacent forest at CAX, measurements of $R_r$ accounted for 42 and 61% of $R_s$ during the wet and dry seasons, respectively (Metcalf et al., 2007), while all models except SPA predicted $R_h$ to be the dominant component of $R_s$ (Fig 2.2d). Second, inaccurate soil moisture dependencies of $R_h$ are apparent from the poor agreement between the modeled dependencies of $R_s$ on $\theta_s$ compared to the observations (Fig. 2.3). In particular, the dependencies in ED2 and SiB3 resulted in extreme excursions from the $R_s$ observations at high (ED2 and SiB3) and low (ED2) $\theta_s$ values (Fig. 2.3). While no direct measurements of $NEP$ for the drought plots were available for evaluation, the predictions of $R_h$ (Fig. S2.6c-h), and consequently $NEP$ (Fig. 2.7c-h), under drought by ED2 and SiB3 were likely unrealistic given the mismatch between their predictions and the observations of $R_s$ (Fig S2.3). In order to make correct estimates of $NEP$ under drought, future model development must focus on correcting both the relative contribution of $R_h$ to $R_s$ and the parameterization of the dependency of $R_h$ on $\theta_s$. 
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Conclusions:

To our knowledge, this is the first time a series of terrestrial biosphere models run under a standardized protocol have been evaluated for their ability to predict how chronic drought affects plant and ecosystem carbon balances. This study demonstrates that terrestrial biosphere models are competent at predicting plant and ecosystem carbon fluxes under the present climate, but still require substantial development for predicting the consequences of severe drought scenarios. Model development should be focused on testing hypotheses associated with enhanced $R_a$ under severe water-stress, controls over leaf phenology, and drought induced mortality.
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Chapter 3

Do differences in xylem cavitation resistance and leaf hydraulic traits explain differences in drought tolerance among mature tropical rainforest trees?
Abstract

Considerable uncertainty surrounds the fate of Amazon rainforests due to predicted reductions in precipitation resulting from climate change and deforestation. Two long-term large-scale ecosystem drought experiments established in the eastern Brazilian Amazon observed an increase in mortality rates among some species while others had no change; yet a mechanistic cause for these differences was not implicated. In this study, xylem pressure at 50% conductivity (xylem-P50), leaf turgor loss point (TLP), cellular osmotic potential (πo) and cellular bulk modulus of elasticity (ε), all traits thought to confer drought tolerance, were measured on upper canopy branches and leaves of four genera found at both experimental sites. Each genus was placed a priori into one of four functional type categories: drought-tolerant versus intolerant based on the drought experiment results and subdivided into early versus late-successional based on wood density. We tested the hypotheses that these measured traits would be significantly different between each of the plant functional types and that they would be spatially conserved across sites. Xylem-P50, TLP, and πo, but not ε, occurred at significantly higher water potentials for the drought-intolerant type compared to the tolerant type; however, there were no significant differences between the early- and late-successional types. These results suggest that these three traits are important for defining trade-offs associated with drought tolerance, but appear to be orthogonal to traits associated with succession. Differences in these hydraulic traits that occurred between the drought-tolerant and intolerant types was conserved between the two research sites, even though
they were separated by 400 km, and had contrasting soil types and meteorology. This more detailed understanding of how xylem and leaf hydraulic traits vary between drought-tolerant and intolerant tropical tree species will facilitate a much needed improvement in the representation of plant hydrology in terrestrial biosphere models, which will enhance our ability to make robust predictions of tropical ecosystem responses to drought.
Introduction

Climate model predictions are converging toward longer dry seasons across much of the Amazon basin and considerable overall drying in the eastern region by the end of this century (Malhi et al., 2008; Joetzjer et al., 2013). Widespread deforestation is also predicted to cause lower precipitation through an extensive central corridor of the basin (Coe et al., 2013). Dynamic vegetation models are one of our most promising tools for assessing the consequences of these predicted changes in precipitation. However, it is unclear how resistant different species, and thus forests, across the Amazon basin might be to chronic drought because at present these models are poorly formulated to represent the physiological responses of different tree species (Gailbraith et al., 2010; Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Powell et al., 2013). The resolution to this problem requires a more detailed understanding of the mechanisms that cause mature trees to succumb to drought and the time dimension over which these mechanisms induce mortality in different species (McDowell et al., 2008; Hartman, 2011; McDowell et al., 2013).

Two in-situ ecosystem scale drought experiments were established in the eastern Brazilian Amazon—Tapajos (TNF) and Caxiuana (CAX) National forests—to directly assess the ecological impact of a chronic 50% reduction in precipitation (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010). Two key and consistent findings emerged from both experiments despite being separated by 400 km. First, mortality rates of the largest trees increased by 3.0 to 4.5-fold in the drought plots, while mortality of the subdominant trees (<10 cm DBH) was unchanged, thus resulting in a 20% reduction in aboveground biomass (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010). Second, the increase in mortality rates was not equal between genera (da Costa et al. 2010). A mechanistic cause for the
differential mortality rates was not implicated; yet, the results from the earlier studies now make it possible to test for differences in hydraulic traits between species identified as drought-tolerant and intolerant.

Maintaining connectivity of water through the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum is essential for vascular plants to maintain photosynthesis. Plants manage the risk of cavitation both anatomically and through stomatal regulation of transpiration. Anatomically, wider xylem elements, larger pit membrane pores, and a higher density of pit membranes between vessel elements can increase the efficiency of water transport and hence carbon gain, but also increase the vulnerability for embolisms to form in the xylem as tension builds (Wheeler et al., 2005, Choat et al., 2008; Poorter et al., 2010). The xylem pressure when 50% of conductivity is lost (xylem -P_{S0}) is a key trait that can be used to directly compare how different species balance this trade-off between maximizing water transport and minimizing risk of cavitation. More negative xylem-P_{S0} values have been associated with trees growing in drier climates in the tropics (Choat et al., 2007). However, species-wise differences in xylem vulnerability has not been experimentally linked to differences in mortality rates of in situ mature trees experimentally exposed to chronically dry soils.

Plants also minimize the risk of cavitation through stomatal closure. Turgor loss point (TLP) is an easily measured, higher order trait that is the point when the leaf becomes so dehydrated its cells lose turgor. TLP correlates with the leaf water potential when the stomata are 50% closed (Brodribb et al. 2003). Cellular osmotic potential at full hydration (\(\pi_o\)) and bulk modulus of elasticity of leaf cell walls (\(\mathcal{E}\)) are two first order traits that contribute to TLP. \(\pi_o\) is the amount leaf water potential is lowered by solutes in
the cells. $\varepsilon$ determines the volumetric change in the leaf cell as turgor declines and represents the amount of water available from cellular storage between full hydration and $TLP$. Species with lower $TLP$ and $\pi_0$ were found to be more prominent in the drier climates across the tropics (Choat et al., 2007; Baltzer et al. 2008), which is also general pattern that occurs between dry versus wet biomes (Bartlett et al., 2012). Conclusive patterns for $\varepsilon$ are more variable between these same studies.

It is also not known if the resistance of the drought-tolerant species was a result of plasticity in their hydraulic efficiency or stomatal sensitivity to drier soils as affected by $TLP$, $\pi_0$, or $\varepsilon$. Plasticity of hydraulic traits of tropical species has been poorly studied in general, but a few studies indicate that it may be important (e.g. Campanello et al., 2008; Fonti et al., 2010), but see also Bartlett et al. (2014). For example, when light environment in the understory increases after a disturbance, xylem conductivity increased in early-successional species but remained the same in late-successional species (Campanello et al., 2008). This result suggests an important interaction between traits that select for drought tolerance and successional status.

Wood density may be a useful trait for using as a proxy for drought tolerance since it has been measured for many tropical species (Fearnside, 1997) and is negatively correlated with precipitation gradient that exists across the Amazon basin (Baker et al., 2004, but see also ter Steege et al., 2006). Wood density correlates with successional type, where species with lower density tend to be early-successional and species with higher density tend to be late-successional (Poorter et al., 2010). However, it has not been experimentally determine on mature trees if traits that define successional type covary or are orthogonal to traits that confer drought tolerance.
Hydraulic resistance increases with tree height (Ryan et al., 2006), which implies that as precipitation patterns change in the future, the trade-off between growth versus hydraulic safety will become increasingly important for mature trees. Measurements of how these hydraulic traits differ in mature trees growing in the same ecosystem and experimentally treated with a severe and chronic drought has never been done. Accordingly, we tested four hypotheses. The first two hypotheses concern how \( TLP, \pi_0, \varepsilon \) and xylem-\( P_{50} \) varied between PFTs. \( TLP, \pi_0, \) and \( \varepsilon \) were predicted to occur at a lower leaf water potential, and xylem-\( P_{50} \) was predicted to occur at a lower stem water potential in canopy trees that are characterized as drought-tolerant relative to intolerant (H1), and late relative to early-successional (H2). The second two hypotheses tested spatial and temporal variation in the hydraulic traits. When variation in a hydraulic trait occurs between PFTs it was predicted to be conserved geographically (H3) due to the similarity in observed mortality rates between the two drought experiments. Temporally, trees characterized as both drought-tolerant and early-successional were predicted to have greater plasticity in \( TLP, \pi_0, \varepsilon \) and xylem-\( P_{50} \) compared those characterized as either drought-intolerant or late-successional (H4).

**Materials and Methods**

**Study Sites**

The study was conducted in the two Amazon rainforest throughfall exclusion experiments (TFE) located in the Caxiuanã (CAX; 1.737°S, 51.458°W) and Tapajós (TNF; 2.897°S, 54.952°W) National Forests, Pará, Brazil. The TFEs were established to directly measure whole ecosystem responses to severe and chronic drought (Nepstad et
The Tapajós TFE experiment ran from 2000 to 2004 (Nepstad et al., 2007); therefore post hoc measurements were made on the four selected species in the forest adjacent to the TFE plots. The Caxiuanã TFE experiment commenced in January 2002 was still running at the time of this study. Physical and biological characteristics of each site are summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Physical and biological characteristics of the Caxiuanã and Tapajós National Forest throughfall exclusion sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Caxiuanã</th>
<th>Tapajós</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean annual precipitation</td>
<td>2272 mm</td>
<td>2000 mm</td>
<td>Fisher et al., 2007, Nepstad et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet season (&gt;100 mm mo⁻¹)</td>
<td>Dec. to mid-Jul.</td>
<td>Dec. to mid-Jun.</td>
<td>Rosolem et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil type</td>
<td>clay: 15%, sand: 78%</td>
<td>clay: 60%, sand: 38%</td>
<td>Fisher et al., 2007, Nepstad et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water table depth</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>&gt;80 m</td>
<td>Fisher et al., 2007, Nepstad et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboveground biomass of trees &gt;10 cm dbh</td>
<td>214 t C ha⁻¹</td>
<td>150 t C ha⁻¹</td>
<td>da Costa et al., 2010, Nepstad et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief description of the TFE experimental design is given here; more detailed descriptions are provided in Nepstad et al., (2002) and Fisher et al., (2007). Two 1-ha plots, one control and one treatment plot, were established in each of the CAX and TNF forests. Both plots in each forest were selected to be structurally and floristically similar. A 1-2 m high leaky plastic septum was constructed over the entire understory of the treatment plot. The septum prevented approximately 50% of the rainfall from reaching the soil (Nepstad et al., 2002). The remaining rainfall was diverted off site through a
system of gutters and drainage ditches. The drainage ditches were 1 x 1 m and encircled each plot to also prevent lateral roots from accessing soil moisture from outside the plots (Nepstad et al., 2002).

Species selection and sampling

The four genera selected for this study were classified *a priori* into one of four categories: drought-tolerant versus intolerant and early- versus late-successional (Table 3.2). First, the genera were selected from those listed in Table 3.2 of da Costa et al. (2010), which lists changes in mortality rates of several genera tracked in the drought experiments. Genera that exhibited a change in mortality were designated drought-intolerant and those that exhibited no change were designated drought-tolerant. Second, the two species within each *drought* category were then designated as either early-successional or late-successional based on wood density being either low (<0.6 kg cm$^3$) or high (>0.8 kg m$^3$), respectively (Poorter et al., 2010). At each site, samples were collected from mature individuals belonging to single species (or two *Ingas* at CAX) representing each of the four selected genera and hence, functional groups (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2. Species selected to represent each plant functional group. Sites are noted by CAX for Caxiuanã and TNF for Tapajós National Forests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drought Sensitivity</th>
<th>Succession</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intolerant</strong></td>
<td>Genus: <em>Inga</em></td>
<td>CAX: <em>I. alba, I. gracilifolia</em></td>
<td>Genus: <em>Eschweilera</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: <em>I. alba</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: <em>E. coriacea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerant</strong></td>
<td>Genus: <em>Protium</em></td>
<td>CAX: <em>P. tenuifolium</em></td>
<td>Genus: <em>Licania</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: <em>P. robustum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: <em>L. canescens</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One or two branches approximately 3 cm in diameter, 2.5 m in length, containing several branchlets and >100 leaves were harvested from each individual at a height of 14 – 25 m. All branches were located in the upper crown and in full sunlight during the afternoon. The branches were harvested between 6:30 and 7:30 am local time, and the canopy was generally wet from rain or condensation from the night before, thus indicating minimal transpiration had yet occurred. After harvest, the branches were wrapped in plastic and the distal end was placed in water and transported for 30 to 60 minutes to the lab. The whole branches were stored in the lab in large plastic bags with the distal ends submerged in water until the leaves or branches could be prepared for measurements on the morning of the harvest. The exact number of trees, leaves and branches sampled from each species at each site is provided in Table S3.1.

A total of three measurement campaigns were carried out at each site. Each campaign was over a 2-4 week period, with at least one campaign in each of the wet and dry seasons. Seasonality in the data was not detected and therefore the data were pooled. Measurements for CAX were made in May 2011, November 2011, and October 2012. Measurements for TNF were made in January 2011, July 2011, and October 2012.

Leaf hydraulic traits
Dawn and midday leaf water potentials (\(\psi_{lf}\)) were measured in the forest immediately following the branch harvest using a PMS model 600 pressure chamber (PMS Instrument Co., Albany, OR). Pressure-volume (p-v) curves were constructed for each species to estimate \(TLP\), \(\pi_0\) and \(\varepsilon\). The p-v curves were composites of all of the leaves sampled for each species. Only fully expanded healthy leaves either second or third from the tip were
used. Initial rehydration of the leaves was not necessary since the leaves were often wet from rain or morning dew at the time of harvest (this was also confirmed by the initial chamber balance pressure being consistently < 0.2 MPa). Each leaf was patted dry, excised from its branch, weighed to 0.0001g and then pressurized in the pressure chamber to measure the leaf water potential. The leaves were allowed to desiccate on the bench between each set of mass and pressure measurements.

Xylem vulnerability

Xylem vulnerability was measured using the air-injection method (Sperry & Saliendra, 1994) on 11 to 13 cm branch segments that were approximately 0.6 cm in diameter. The branch segments were inserted in a pressure chamber where the xylem’s ability to resist cavitation from the positive pressure pushing through the pit membranes was assumed to be equivalent to the xylem’s ability to resist air seeding through pit membrane pores as tension within the vessel builds. The pressure chamber was constructed from a stainless steel, union tee, pipe adapter for 0.5 in OD inline tubes. Rubber plugs held in place with washers were used to make a seal between the branch segments and the chamber. Once inside the chamber, 0.5 cm of bark was removed from the distal end of the branch segment, the tip was shaved with a razor and then attached to the plumbing system using a 4 cm silicon coupling. The plumbing system consisted of a 1 l lactated ringer and Tygon® tubing. De-ionized water was unavailable at the remote locations of both field stations. Filtered (0.2 μm) well water was used rather than the weak solution of KCl in de-ionized water commonly used in other studies (e.g. Choat et al., 2010). We assumed
that the well water and rooting zone water contained similar chemical constituents and therefore the xylem was reacting similarly to both.

Flow rates were measured for 10 minutes from the proximal end of the branch segment for each measurement period. On each branch segment, the native flow rate was measured first followed by a 10 minute flushing with water under ~0.1 MPa to refill extremely weak vessels that may have cavitated. The flow rate measured after flushing was taken as the maximum flow rate. Subsequent flow rates were measured after each incremental increase in air pressure in the pressure chamber. The stem segments were disconnected from the plumbing system, pressurized for 10 minutes and then depressurized before being reconnected to the plumbing system and resuming flow. It was found on a subset of stem segments for each species that flow rates equilibrated after approximately 15 minutes after the plumbing system was reconnected. Therefore, water was allowed to flow through the stem segments for 30 minutes prior to commencing each measurement. The pressure head was between 15 and 20 cm when water was flowing through the branch.

**Statistics and Analysis**

The TLP was calculated using a change-point detection algorithm on composite p-v curves containing all data points for each species (Barr et al., 2013). A 95% CI was established for each TLP estimate from a 10000 iteration bootstrap sampling. Once the TLP was established, π₀ and ε were calculated for each species using the relationship between [100 – RWC (%)] and 1/ψ₀f (MPa) where π₀ equals 1/ψ₀f when [100 – RWC] equals 0 (i.e. the y-intercept) and ε equals the slope of the relationship between [100 –
RWC] and \( \psi_h \) in the linear portion of the curve prior to TLP. RWC is the water content of the leaf relative to being fully saturated and equals 100% when \( \psi_h \) is 0.

A Weibull function was fit to the relationship between xylem pressure and percent loss of conductance (PLC) relative to maximum conductance of the branch segment (Meinzer et al., 2009). The point where PLC reached 50% was defined as the xylem-P\(_{50}\). The error estimate for xylem-P\(_{50}\) was calculated using the maximum and minimum P\(_{50}\) values that could be established from the error on the parameter estimates of the Weibull functions.

Soil moisture was consistently lower throughout the rooting zone in the drought treatment plots (Fig. S3.1, see also Fisher et al. 2007 and Brando et al. 2008). For all four species measured at CAX, no significant differences were detected between the composite pressure-volume curves (Fig. S3.2) or xylem vulnerability curves (Fig. S3.3) constructed for each species measured in the control versus drought plots. Therefore, at CAX both the pressure-volume data and xylem vulnerability data collected from individuals growing in the control and drought plots were combined for each species.

**Results**

*Leaf traits*

Median TLPs ± CIs (95% confidence interval) of the two drought-intolerant species (*Inga* and *Eschweilera*) were significantly higher (range: -1.51 to -1.64 MPa) than the two drought-tolerant species (*Protium* and *Licania*, range: -2.33 to -2.46) at both TNF and CAX (Table 3.3, Fig. 3.1). In contrast, median TLPs ± CIs of the measured species
did not differentiate between the early- versus late-successional functional types. In this study, the CIs mark the boundaries within which 95% of the bootstrapped TLP estimates fall, since the bootstrapped estimates of TLP were not normally distributed around the mean (Fig. S3.4).

Figure 3.1. Boxplots showing the distribution of turgor loss point (TLP, MPa) estimates for each plant functional type measured at the Tapajós (open symbols) and Caxiuanã (closed symbols) National Forests. (a) *Inga* species (IS) represent early-successional drought-intolerant. (b) *Eschweilera coriacea* (EC) represent late-successional drought-intolerant. (c) *Protium* species (PS) represents early-successional drought-tolerant. (d) *Licania* species (LS) represent late-successional drought-tolerant.

At both sites median $\tau_0$ of the two drought-intolerant species were significantly higher (range: -1.56 to -1.82 MPa) than the two drought-tolerant species (range: -2.35 to -2.51 MPa); but no significant difference was detected between the early versus late-successional species (Table 3.3, Fig. 3.2). In contrast, differences in median $\zeta$ between the four species were not organized according to either of the drought tolerance or successional plant functional types (Fig. 3.3).
Figure 3.2. Boxplots showing the distribution of leaf osmotic potentials ($\pi_o$, MPa) for each plant functional type measured at the Tapajós (TNF) and Caxiuanã (CAX) National Forests. IS: *Inga* species represent early-successional drought-intolerant. EC: *Eschweilera coriacea* represent late-successional drought-intolerant. PS: *Protium* species represents early-successional drought-tolerant. LS: *Licania* species represents late-successional drought-tolerant. Note: outliers for LS at CAX extend to 186 MPa.

Figure 3.3. Boxplots showing the distribution of the leaf bulk modulus of elasticity ($\varepsilon$, MPa) for each plant functional type measured at the Tapajós (TNF) and Caxiuanã (CAX) National Forests. IS: *Inga* species represent early-successional drought-intolerant. EC: *Eschweilera coriacea* represent late-successional drought-intolerant. PS: *Protium* species represents early-successional drought-tolerant. LS: *Licania* species represents late-successional drought-tolerant. Note: outliers for LS at CAX extend to 186 MPa.
Table 3.3. Median estimates with 95% confidence intervals of measured leaf and xylem traits for the species at the Tapajós (TNF) and Caxiuanã (CAX) National Forests, which are representative of each of the four plant functional types. IS: *Inga* species. EC: *Eschweilera coriacea*. PS: *Protium* species. LS: *Licania* species. TLP: leaf turgor loss point. $\pi_\circ$: leaf osmotic potential. Xylem-$P_{50}$: water potential when 50% of conductance is lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drought sensitivity (Species ID)</th>
<th>Successional type (Species ID)</th>
<th>Trait:</th>
<th>TLP</th>
<th>$\pi_\circ$</th>
<th>Xylem-$P_{50}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAX</td>
<td>TNF</td>
<td>CAX</td>
<td>TNF</td>
<td>CAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerant</td>
<td>Early (IS)</td>
<td>$-1.64$</td>
<td>$-1.51$</td>
<td>$-1.82$</td>
<td>$-1.69$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late (EC)</td>
<td>$-1.64$</td>
<td>$-1.56$</td>
<td>$-1.78$</td>
<td>$-1.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Early (PS)</td>
<td>$-2.38$</td>
<td>$-2.53$</td>
<td>$-2.44$</td>
<td>$-2.35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late (LS)</td>
<td>$-2.46$</td>
<td>$-2.31$</td>
<td>$-2.52$</td>
<td>$-2.51$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dawn and midday \( \psi_{lf} \) estimates for the four CAX species are reported for both the control and drought treatment plots in Table 3.4. Differences in both dawn and midday \( \psi_{lf} \) were not organized according to the four PFT classifications. Dawn \( \psi_{lf} \) for all four species were near zero in the control plots and only *Protium* was considerably (and significantly) more negative than zero (-1.15 MPa) in the drought plot (Table 3.4). The control plot *Inga* and *Licania* midday \( \psi_{lf} \) were considerably higher (-0.38 and -0.14 MPa, respectively) than *Eschweilera* and *Protium* \( \psi_{lf} \) (-0.74 and -1.42 MPa, respectively). There was also a significant reduction in midday \( \psi_{lf} \) of *Eschweilera*, *Protium* and *Licania* (Table 3.4) growing in the drought plots.

Table 3.4: Dawn and midday leaf water potential \( (Y_{lf}, \text{MPa}) \) measured at Caxiuanã in the control and treatment plots on 11/18/2011. Each species represents one of the four plant functional types evaluated in this study: drought tolerant versus intolerant and early versus late successional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drought Tolerance</th>
<th>Succession</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Midday ( \psi_{lf} ) (MPa)</th>
<th>Dawn ( \psi_{lf} ) (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerant</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td><em>Inga alba</em></td>
<td>0.38±0.06</td>
<td>0.44±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td><em>Eschweilera coriacea</em></td>
<td>0.74±0.08*</td>
<td>1.95±0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td><em>Protium tenuifolium</em></td>
<td>1.42±0.03*</td>
<td>1.91±0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td><em>Licania octandra</em></td>
<td>0.14±0.02*</td>
<td>0.35±0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Xylem vulnerability**

With the exception of the late-successional species (*Eschweilera* and *Licania*) at TNF, the drought-intolerant species (*Inga* and *Eschweilera*) were more vulnerable to xylem cavitation under decreasing xylem pressure compared to the drought-tolerant species (*Protium* and *Licania*) (Fig. 3.4). Xylem-\( P_{50} \) of the drought-intolerant species ranged between -1.1 and -1.4 MPa, and between -1.8 to -2.3 MPa for the drought-tolerant
species. However, this pattern was reversed for the two late-successional species at TNF, where the xylem-$P_{50}$ of drought-tolerant species (*Licania*) was -1.4 MPa and -2.0 MPa for the drought-intolerant species (*Eschweilera*). The xylem vulnerability curves were steeper for the drought-intolerant species compared to the drought-tolerant species (Fig. 3.4).

![Figure 3.4](image)

**Figure 3.4.** Xylem vulnerability curves showing the percent loss of conductivity (PLC) with decreasing xylem pressure (MPa) of the selected species representing the four plant functional types measured at the Tapajós (TNF, open symbols) and Caxiuanã (CAX, closed symbols) National Forests. (a) *Inga*: early-successional drought-intolerant. (b) *Eschweilera*: late-successional drought-intolerant. (c) *Protium* early-successional drought-tolerant. (d) *Licania*: late-successional drought-tolerant. Vertical lines indicate point when 50% loss of conductance ($P_{50}$) was reached for the TNF (dashed) and CAX (solid) species.
Geographic and genus level conservation of traits

*Eschweilera coriacea* and *Inga alba* were found at both research sites with a sufficient number of canopy-sized individuals to construct robust p-v and xylem vulnerability curves. Because only two canopy sized individuals of *I. alba* occurred in the drought plots at CAX in 2011, *I. gracilifolia* was measured to supplement the *Inga* TLP data. No significant differences were detected between the *I. alba* and *I. gracilifolia* p-v curves (data not shown). There were no common species for *Protium* and *Licania* between the two research sites, thus two different species were selected for each genus.

Although the sites were separated by 400 km and soil properties differed markedly, *TLP*, *π₀*, and xylem-P₅₀ were generally conserved at the genus level across the two sites for all plant functional types, with the exception of xylem-P₅₀ of *Eschweilera* and *Licania* (Table 3.3, Figs. 3.1, 3.2, 3.4). Moreover, the pattern and magnitude of how the traits differed between drought-tolerant versus intolerant plant functional types was also conserved for all three traits, with the exception of *Eschweilera* and *Licania* xylem-P₅₀ at TNF. Hence, at each site the *TLP*, *π₀*, and xylem-P₅₀ of the drought-intolerant plant functional type was always 0.7 to 0.9 MPa higher than the drought-tolerant type (Table 3.3).

**Discussion**

In this study, we investigated how variations in leaf hydraulic traits (*TLP*, *π₀*, ε) and xylem vulnerability (xylem-P₅₀) correlate with drought tolerance and successional type of...
mature tropical trees growing across the eastern Amazon rainforest. Tree species from four genera were selected, each representing one of four different plant functional types (summarized in Table 3.2). Variations in these traits have been evaluated between global biomes, within the tropical forest biome, and between differing climate regions within the tropics (Choat et al., 2007, Baltzer et al., 2008; Bartlett et al., 2012; Anderegg, 2014). Results from these previous studies implied that differences in hydraulic traits confer drought tolerance. However, our study is the first to explicitly link measured differences in hydraulic traits to differential mortality rates of mature tropical tree species that were experimentally exposed to chronic drought.

Our results supported hypothesis one (H1) that drought adapted species can tolerate more negative water pressures before TLP (Fig. 3.1), \( \pi_0 \) (Fig. 2) and xylem-P \(_{50}\) (Fig. 3.4) are reached (Table 3.3). The drought-tolerant PFTs gained lower TLPs through \( \pi_0 \) adjustments (Fig. 3.2) and not through \( \varepsilon \) adjustments (Fig. 3.3). Our within-ecosystem result supports a more general hypothesis about \( \pi_0 \) being the dominant control over TLP across biomes (Bartlett et al., 2012). Gaining a lower TLP through \( \pi_0 \) requires active transport of solutes into the cell, which provides a physiological explanation for the observed increases in foliar respiration in the drought treatment plots at CAX (Metcalfe et al., 2010). At present, this cost for being drought-tolerant is poorly represented in dynamic vegetation models (Powell et al., 2013). Therefore, future research is needed to constrain the theoretical linkage between active solute transport for regulating turgor and total plant carbon balance.

The second hypothesis (H2), leaf hydraulic traits (TLP, \( \pi_0 \) and \( \varepsilon \)) and xylem-P \(_{50}\) would differ between early and late-successional species, was not supported by this
study. Our results suggest that variation in wood density is not necessarily a useful proxy for establishing a growth versus drought-tolerance axis of competition for mature trees. At the sapling stage, however, a strong relationship between wood density and cavitation resistance has been found for tropical trees (Markesteijn et al., 2011). Indeed, wood density reflects life-history strategies related to succession where slower-growing, shade-tolerant species tend to have denser wood (Poorter et al. 2010). Furthermore, variation in rainforest wood density seems to be better explained by the density of fiber cells and fiber cell-wall thickness than by vessel cross-sectional area (Poorter et al., 2010).

The spatial separation between the sites includes contrasting soil types, soil depths, water table depths, and meteorological conditions (Table 3.1), which leads to the surprising result that the observed increase in mortality rates and losses in aboveground biomass were similar (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010). However, given the similar ecosystem responses, it was predicted that the plant hydraulic traits would be spatially conserve (H3), which was supported with the only exception being Licania and Eschweilera xylem-P50 (Figs 1-4, Table 3.1). CAX and TNF are separated by approximately 400 km. It should be noted that our two study sites were confined to terra firme forests in the eastern portion of the Amazon basin. It is still unclear if these traits will be similarly conserved among these PFTs growing in seasonally inundated forests or forests along the eastern flank of the Andes where on average precipitation is higher and wood density is lower (Baker et al., 2004, ter Steege et al., 2006).

This study helps to clarify the resistance of the standing population of mature trees to reductions in precipitation. Our results did not support the fourth research hypothesis (H4) that there would be plasticity in the hydraulic traits of the early-
successional and drought-tolerant PFTs. Both the p-v curves and xylem vulnerability curves of the control and drought plots at CAX almost completely overlapped (Figs. S3.2, S3.3). Therefore, our results imply that the hydraulic systems of these *terra firma* tropical trees have a low capacity to acclimate to a drier climate. Plasticity in the measured plant hydraulic traits during the initial years of the drought experiment could not be ruled out; as our measurements were made in the 8th year of the drought experiment at CAX and after the study concluded at TNF. It is possible that a competitive release for water may have caused these traits to reverted back to pretreatment values after the 20% reduction in aboveground biomass occurred in the third year (Nepstad *et al*., 2007, da Costa *et al*., 2010). For example, the reduction in biomass may have partially alleviated the water stress in the drought plots by increasing per capita available soil moisture. However, any plasticity that occurred in the drought treatment plots likely would have been minor since the mean seasonal adjustment in TLP across all tropical species is <15% (Bartlett *et al*., 2014).

At longer ecological and evolutionary time scales, trait differences that occur during the seedling and sapling stage and during ontogeny may be critical for determining the long-term composition and resilience of tropical forests after a drought induced dieback. Plastisticy has been demonstrated to occur in xylem conductivity of early-successional saplings when its light environment increases (Campanello *et al*., 2008). Also, species distribution patterns across the Isthmus of Panama are determined by niche differentiation along soil moisture gradients where selection occurs during both the seedling and adult stages (Engelbrecht *et al*., 2007).
The leaf water potential measurements were taken near the end of the 2011 dry season at CAX (Table 3.4); a period when the ecosystem approaches its lowest available soil moisture (da Costa et al. 2010). Soil moisture measurements during this period indicated significantly less available soil water in the drought plots through at least a 2 m rooting depth (Fig. S3.1). Protium tenuifolium (early-successional drought-tolerant) was the only species measured in the treatment plot that began the day with its leaves under water stress (Table 3.2). Fisher et al. (2006) also measured leaf water potentials on 7 tree species growing the CAX experimental plots and found that all 7 species used an isohydric strategy to protect themselves from drought. An isohydric strategy is one where the stomata close at a set water potential threshold, which is typically well below the xylem-P50, in order to maintain a relatively large safety margin. In this study, Eschweilera and Protium in the drought plots had significant decreases in their midday leaf water potentials (Table 3.2), which decreased their safety margins with respect to their xylem-P50; hence, indicating that an anisohydric strategy may also be common.

Variation in the hydraulic traits exists among tropical tree species (Anderegg, 2014). However, prior to this study it was not clear if this variation in hydraulic traits correlated with differential mortality rates during droughts, or if it was related to a separate ecological process such as successional dynamics (Campanello et al., 2008, Markesteijn et al., 2011). Our results provide strong evidence that hydraulic traits determine drought-tolerance plant functional type and that these traits are orthogonal to the axis of variation for traits that determine successional type.

There is a critical need for improving the representation of functional diversity in dynamic vegetation models used for predicting how forests across the Amazon basin will
respond to severe and chronic drought (Anderegg, 2014). These models currently use a single water-stress parameterization for the moist tropical rainforest PFT (Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Powell et al., 2013). This study emphasizes the need to establish additional PFTs with contrasting water-stress parameterizations in dynamic vegetation models when these models are used to evaluate the effects of severe drought on forest ecosystems. There is not yet strong support for representing spatial (Figs. 3.1-3.4) and temporal (Figs. S3.2, S3.3) variation in hydraulic traits within each new tropical PFT. This study also provides critical information about the distributions of the error associated with TLP (Table 3.3, Figs. 3.1, S3.4) and xylem-P_{50} (Table 3.3) which can be used to constrain the different water-stress formulations the models. Finally, representing the variation in both xylem vulnerability and stomatal sensitivity to decreasing water pressure allows for testing the evolutionary stability of contrasting strategies during past episodes of extreme drought.

The air injection method only tests xylem vulnerability to cavitation that arises from the air seeding hypothesis, where air is drawn into vessels under tension through pit membrane pores (Tyree and Zimmerman, 2002). The air injection method does not test xylem vulnerability to the nucleation of voids developing either spontaneously in xylem water under tension or from seeding by hydrophobic imperfections on the vessel walls. However, the negative xylem pressure required to induce spontaneous nucleation is well beyond the injection pressures that eliminated flow in this study. Air seeding arising from defects on vessel walls cannot be entirely ruled out; however defects do not confer a known beneficial trade-off unlike weaker pit membranes. In fact, pit membranes can account for >50% of the xylem hydraulic resistance (Choat et al. 2008), which would be
reduced by more porous (i.e. weaker) membranes. Therefore, it is difficult to invoke a selective pressure that allows for the persistence of a vessel-wall-defect gene in relatively high abundances (Tyree and Zimmerman, 2002).

Conclusions

This study provides valuable insight into the traits controlling drought tolerance of tropical rainforest trees and provides much needed information for parameterizing more realistic water-stress functions in terrestrial biosphere models. Evidence from this study supports H1 and rejects H2 thereby suggesting that traits associated with drought tolerance are orthogonal to wood density, which is an important life history trait associated with succession. The evidence also supports H3 and rejects H4, thus suggesting that hydraulic traits of terra firma trees are largely conserved spatially and temporally. However, lack of plasticity in hydraulic traits indicates that mature trees belonging to the drought-intolerant functional type are vulnerable to reductions in precipitation because of their limited ability to adjust. Finally, variability in plant hydraulic traits does exist between tropical tree species, and this variability may have been and will be critical in determining the fate of the Amazon rainforest if precipitation patterns change.
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Chapter 4

Improving tropical forest drought responses in dynamic vegetation models: are drought-tolerance plant functional types or a mechanistic representation of plant water movement required?
Abstract

There is a critical need to understand the ecological implications of the predicted drying in many regions of the Amazon basin that may occur by end of this century. Dynamic vegetation models (DVM) have great potential for conducting this evaluation, but they are not currently formulated to make robust predictions about ecosystem drought responses. In this study, two potentially important mechanisms were evaluated for the first time within the framework of the Ecosystem Demography model, a DVM that is formulated to represent fine-scale competition between individuals belonging to different plant functional types with alternative drought tolerance strategies. The following research hypotheses were tested: (a) competition arising from drought-tolerant and intolerant functional diversity, (b) mechanistic plant water transport, or (c) both, are fundamental ecological controls and therefore, must be included in DVMs when used for making drought response predictions of tropical forests. The third hypothesis was confirmed that both greater functional diversity and plant hydrodynamics are required. Plant hydrodynamics capture the size-dependent physiological processes, which in turn enable DVMs to more correctly capture the observed structural shifts associated with size-dependent mortality. Increased functional diversity captures the observed compositional shifts in tropical forest tree species that occurs during extreme droughts. But, including functional diversity alone without the accompanying plant hydrodynamics predicts that the forests will be considerably more resistant to drought than has been observed.
Introduction

Climate models are converging toward a drier climate over significant portions of Amazonia as global climate change intensifies over this century (Joetzjer et al., 2013). The drying may occur as intensified wet and dry seasons (Lintner et al., 2012) or as increases in dry season length and intensity (Malhi et al. 2008, Costa and Pires 2010; Boisier et al., 2015). There is a critical need to understand the implications of these potential changes in precipitation on the different forest ecosystems across the Amazon basin because of the numerous and important ecosystem services they provide (Bonan, 2008). Dynamic vegetation models (DVMs) are one of our leading tools for assessing the effects of future perturbations on forested landscapes because of their ability to link biological responses that occur at multiple scales of organization. Early model predictions of the Amazon rainforest forecasted widespread reductions in biomass (Cox et al. 2004) and significant compositional shifts toward seasonal forests (Malhi et al., 2009). Then, later model predictions suggested changes in precipitation would likely have minor effects on vegetation (Huntingford et al., 2013; Powell et al., 2013). These contrasting results underscore the need for proper benchmarking to evaluate if DVMs are appropriately formulated for making these predictions.

Two ecosystem scale drought experiments located in the eastern Brazilian Amazon have great potential to serve as one set of benchmarks to test the ability of DVMs to capture ecosystem drought responses (Nepstad et al., 2007; Fisher et al., 2007; Brando et al., 2008; da Costa et al., 2010). In these two experiments, 50% of the incoming precipitation was intercepted over a 1-ha plot and diverted off-site. Although separated by 400 km and having contrasting soil types (clay vs. sand), there was
remarkable consistency in the drought responses of the two ecosystems. At both sites, aboveground biomass (\(AGB\)) was reduced by approximately 22% after three years of sustained drought (Brando et al., 2008; da Costa et al., 2010). The large upper canopy trees (diameter at breast height (dbh) > 40 cm) were the most vulnerable to the experimental drought, while the subdominant trees (dbh < 20 cm) were marginally affected (Nepstad et al., 2007; da Costa et al., 2010). There were also differential mortality rates between species, with some showing no increase under the drought treatment (da Costa et al., 2010). Finally, autotrophic respiration, most notably in the leaves, increased in trees exposed to the drought (Metcalf et al., 2010b). A detailed evaluation of six land surface models, four of which were DVMs, revealed a limited ability by all to capture many or all of these key results (Powell et al., 2013).

Under present climate conditions, DVMs are able to reasonably capture the spatial variability of \(AGB\) across the Amazon basin (Zhang et al., 2015). This result in part arises because water is not typically a limiting resource in the Amazon rainforest (Nemani et al., 2003; Huytra et al., 2007); and therefore under well-watered conditions, only temperature, humidity deficit and CO\(_2\) concentration near the leaf surface are needed to represent stomatal conductance (Leuning, 1995). However, during droughts, the soil moisture deficit must be accounted for in the calculation of stomatal conductance (Baldocchi, 1997).

It is not clear how sophisticated soil water-stress formulations need to be within DVMs. Two modifications to the biological representations of water-stress and water-transport in DVMs are proposed here for improving model predictions of tropical forest drought responses. The first proposal requires additional functional diversity to more
accurately reflect the range of drought tolerance adaptations. For example, DVMs currently use a single parameterization to represent the wide variation in xylem vulnerability to cavitation (Anderegg, 2014). An alternative proposal is that the mechanism of water-transport through the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum must be represented with considerably more detail (Fisher et al., 2007; Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Sperry and Love, 2015). These two proposals are not necessarily mutually exclusive. These formulations are incorporated into the Ecosystem Demography model, a DVM that is formulated to represent fine-scale competition between individuals that belong to different plant functional types with alternative drought tolerance strategies. This analysis tests the hypothesis that (a) drought-tolerant and intolerant functional diversity, (b) mechanistic plant water transport, or (c) both, may be fundamental ecological controls during episodes of severe soil moisture deficits and therefore, must be included in DVMs when used for making drought response predictions of tropical forests.

**Model development**

*The Ecosystem Demography model*

The Ecosystem Demography model, version 2 (ED2, Medvigy et al., 2009) is a state of the art dynamic vegetation model (DVM) ideally formulated to evaluate the research hypotheses of this analysis. ED2 simultaneously tracks hydrology, land-surface biophysics, soil carbon and biogeochemistry for multiple tropical plant functional types (PFTs) (Moorcroft et al., 2001). One important innovation of ED2 relevant to this study is that it bridges the gap between fine-scale (sub-grid) and landscape level processes by
Figure 4.1. Panel (a) graphically illustrates how ED2 represents the structure and composition of a simulated forest within one atmospheric grid cell. Sub-grid scale gaps are defined by age since disturbance and canopy structure and have independent soil layers. Gap areas are defined by parcels with similar properties; yet are not equal in size or necessarily contiguous in space. Panel (b) shows the mosaic canopy structure of a potential forest in one grid cell that results from the dynamics of competition.

representing competition between discrete demographic groups (Fig. 4.1). Competition is tracked through sub-grid scale mortality and subsequent reproduction and growth of similarly aged cohorts and PFTs. This unique feature can be adapted to also evaluate the competitive advantages of differing drought tolerance strategies within and between PFTs. ED2 incorporates a complete representation of land-surface biophysics that explicitly solves for the carbon, water and energy fluxes of the land surface including a
multilayer soil model that better represents soil moisture dynamics. As a result, ED2 can
either be run off-line using six standard meteorological forcing variables—precipitation,
pressure, radiation, wind-speed, temperature, and humidity, or coupled to the Regional
Atmospheric Modeling System, which allows for biophysical feedbacks to the
atmosphere during regional runs.

Table 4.1. Explanation of model variables and parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{ri}$</td>
<td>Root biomass a soil layer $i$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>Stem capacitance</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Total canopy demand for soil water (EDor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_x$</td>
<td>Xylem conductance</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_t$</td>
<td>Tree height</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>Index of vertical layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_g$</td>
<td>Leaf-level gross photosynthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_n$</td>
<td>Leaf-level net photosynthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_i$</td>
<td>Supply of available water in layer $i$ (EDor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{leaf}$</td>
<td>Leaf temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{max}$</td>
<td>Maximum evapotranspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLP</td>
<td>Turgor loss point of leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_s$</td>
<td>Volume of stem wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>Conductive path length</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_i$</td>
<td>Soil water-stress factor a for soil layer $i$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_t$</td>
<td>Total soil water-stress factor integrated over</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the soil column</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_i$</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content in soil layer $i$</td>
<td></td>
<td>m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_1$</td>
<td>Leaf water potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_s$</td>
<td>Soil water potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1$</td>
<td>Curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2$</td>
<td>Curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_1$</td>
<td>Empirical vulnerability curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_2$</td>
<td>Empirical vulnerability curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_3$</td>
<td>Empirical curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_4$</td>
<td>Empirical curve fitting parameter</td>
<td>DT: 3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>Acceleration of gravity</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>m s^-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hp$</td>
<td>Height penalty parameter</td>
<td>1.0-1.04</td>
<td>Unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_w$</td>
<td>Soil-plant conductivity parameter</td>
<td>$1.4260 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>m$^3$ s$^{-1}$ (kg C root)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{x,max}$</td>
<td>Maximum xylem conductivity parameter</td>
<td>DT: 3.0</td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^3$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI: 3.3</td>
<td>MPa$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Specific leaf area. See Model Development</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>m$^2$ kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{water}$</td>
<td>Density of water</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{wood}$</td>
<td>Wood density. See Model Development</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>g cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_f$</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content at field capacity</td>
<td>CAX: 0.193</td>
<td>m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: 0.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_w$</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content at the wilting point</td>
<td>CAX: 0.089</td>
<td>m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: 0.246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_{wood}$</td>
<td>Wood water content coefficient</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>kg H$_2$O m$^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Psi_w$</td>
<td>Soil matrix potential at wilting point</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this analysis, the original ED2 formulation (denoted as EDor) was configured to represent competition between two successional (early and late) tropical tree PFTs through inherent differences in photosynthesis, growth and mortality. For parameter derivations, see Moorcroft et al., (2001) and Medvigy et al., (2009). PFTs with higher wood density ($\rho_{\text{wood}}$) have lower mortality rates compared to PFTs with lower wood density. PFTs initially designated as ‘early’, ‘mid’ and ‘late’ successional were used during the bare-ground spin-up (see protocol below). At both study sites, only two of the three PFTs became established in the equilibrium forests from the bare-ground spin-up. At both sites the ‘late’ PFT ($\rho_{\text{wood}} = 0.90$ g cm$^{-3}$) became established and is designated as the late-successional type here. The ‘early’ ($\rho_{\text{wood}} = 0.53$ g cm$^{-3}$) PFT became established at CAX and the ‘mid’ ($\rho_{\text{wood}} = 0.71$ g cm$^{-3}$) became established at TNF; but here both are designated as the early-successional type for their respective sites. Specific leaf area (SLA) also varied between the three spin-up PFTs: both sites late-successional SLA = 9.66, CAX early SLA = 16.02, TNF early SLA = 11.64 m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$-C. EDor includes a tunable parameter that encompasses the conductivity of the entire soil-to-leaf system ($K_W$, m$^3$ kg$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$). $K_W$ is the same across PFTs and remains static as water-stress builds.

Leaf level photosynthesis ($P$) and transpiration ($T$) are calculated using the Farquhar et al. (1980) model (von Caemmerer and Farquhar, 1981; Ball et al., 1986) and scaled to the canopy following Leuning (1995), which accounts for the effect of vapor pressure deficit on stomatal conductance. Then, a scaling variable, $\beta$ (dimensionless), is used to down-regulate $P$ (kg CO$_2$, m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) and $T$ (kg H$_2$O, m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) to account for the effect of soil moisture limitation on stomatal conductance:
\[ P_n = P_g \beta - (1 - \beta') R_l \]  \hspace{2cm} \text{Eqn. 1a.}

\[ T_n = T_{\text{max}} \beta - (1 - \beta) T_{\text{min}} \]  \hspace{2cm} \text{Eqn. 1b.}

Subscripts \( n \) and \( g \) indicate \textit{net} and \textit{gross} photosynthesis or transpiration, respectively, and \( R_l \) is leaf respiration. Subscripts \( \text{max} \) and \( \text{min} \) indicate hydraulically unlimited potential transpiration and cuticular transpiration, respectively.

Figure 4.2. Curves representing the \( \beta \) scaling function for the original (EDor, Eqn. 2a), simple resistor (EDsr, Eqn. 3), and hydrodynamic (EDhd, Eqn. 8) formulations. (a) \( \beta \) is a function of soil water content \( (\Theta, \text{cm}^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}) \) as in the \textit{or} and \textit{sr} formulations. The \textit{or} formulation also includes water demand and therefore, diurnally \( \beta \) moves between the upper boundary curve when transpiration \( T_n \) is low \( (0.01 \text{ mm hr}^{-1}) \) and the lower boundary curve when \( T_n \) is high \( (0.72 \text{ mm hr}^{-1}) \). (b) \( \beta \) is a function of leaf water potential \( (\Psi_l, \text{MPa}) \) as in the \textit{hd} formulation. \textit{DT} indicates drought-tolerant. \textit{DI} indicates drought-intolerant.
Soil water-stress in EDor uses a phenomenological relationship between soil moisture supply ($S$) and transpirational demand ($D$):

$$\beta_t = \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \frac{S_i}{S_t}} \quad \text{Eqn. 2a}$$

$$S_t = K_w \theta_i B_{ri} \quad \text{Eqn. 2b}$$

$$D = T_{\text{max}} \, LAI \quad \text{Eqn. 2c}$$

Soil moisture supply is a function of $K_w$, volumetric soil moisture ($\theta_i$, m$^3$ m$^{-3}$) and root biomass ($B_i$, kg-C). The niche space for $S$ operates at the gap scale and therefore, leaf-level $D$ of each cohort is scaled by leaf area index ($LAI$, m$^2$ m$^{-2}$) to calculate the demand of all cohorts growing in the gap. The subscript $t$ is the total of $\beta$ integrated over all soil layers ($i$). Because this formulation includes both supply and demand, the soil moisture dependent curve along which $\beta$ operates falls within a range that is dependent on transpiration rates (Fig. 2a). For EDor, the $\beta$ function is parameterized the same for all tropical PFTs, thus precluding an explicit hydraulic axis of diversity.

Two alternative water-stress formulas were tested. Both formulations also down regulate $P$ and $T$ through the application of $\beta$ in Eqn. 1. The second formulation (referred to here as EDsr), tests a single-resistor formulation that is a Weibull function of soil water potential ($\Psi_s$):

$$\beta = \left[ - \left( \frac{\Psi_s}{a_1} \right)^{a_2} \right] \quad \text{Eqn. 3}$$

where $a_1$ and $a_2$ are fitting parameters. This is the most parsimonious of the three soil water-stress formulas tested and is common among land surface models (e.g. CLM3.5 (Oleson et al., 2008), IBIS (Foley et al., 1996), JULES (Cox, 2001; Clark et al., 2011), SiB3 (Sellers et al., 1996)) used to predict drought effects on the Amazon basin (e.g. Cox
et al., 2004; Baker et al., 2008; Harper et al., 2010; Sakaguchi et al., 2011). EDsr \( \beta \) is different from EDor \( \beta \) in two key ways. First, the \( \beta \) function was parameterized to represent drought-tolerant and intolerant PFTs using the xylem vulnerability curves in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. The early- and late-successional PFTs of EDor were each divided into a drought-tolerant and intolerant PFT, thus increasing the functional diversity to 4 PFTs that explicitly operate along light and soil moisture axes of competition. Second, each PFT-wise parameterization for \( \beta \) in EDsr operates along a single curve that is dependent only on soil moisture supply (Fig. 2a), which makes it diurnally static during rain free days (e.g. Fig. 2.10). In all other aspects, the early-versus late-successional PFTs were delineated the same way as EDor for CAX and TNF.

The third formula is a hydrodynamic pipe model that explicitly represents capacitance and hydraulic conductivity of the entire root to shoot path length to estimate change in leaf water potential (\( \Psi_l \)) over time (Jones, 1992; Williams et al., 1996). When applied to plants, a hydrodynamic pipe model relies on the fundamental assumption that water movement through xylem elements is controlled by pressure and gravitational potential differences, not solute potential differences, and thus can be represented by Darcy’s law for water movement through a porous medium. In plants, however, a time lag (approximately 0.5 h for tropical trees) exists between the onset of transpiration and the basal flow of sap because water is initially drawn from storage in the stem (Meinzer et al., 2004). This hysteresis can be represented in the pipe model by including a stem capacitor (\( C_s \)), which becomes the governing equation in the form:

\[
\frac{d\Psi_l}{dt} = \frac{\sigma_g [\Psi_s - \Psi_l - \rho_{water} \theta^h_l] - T_n}{C_s} \quad \text{Eqn. 4}
\]
where $g_x$ represents xylem conductance (kg H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ MPa). The physical effects of gravity on the transport of water is accounted for with $\rho_{\text{water}}gh_t$, which is water density (kg m$^{-3}$), acceleration of gravity (m s$^{-2}$) and tree height (m), respectively.

The variation in water-storage capacity of across tropical trees species is not well understood. Recent evidence suggests that wood density is a poor predictor of water storage since it is better explained by fiber cell-wall thickness than by total vessel lumen area (Poorter et al., 2010). However, one study found that stem diameter was a better predictor than species for stem water storage (Meinzer et al., 2004). Therefore, $C_s$ (kg H$_2$O m$^{-3}$) is a function of stem volume ($V_s$, m$^3$):

$$C_s = \theta_{\text{wood}}V_s$$

Eqn. 5

where $\theta_{\text{wood}}$ is a free parameter set equal across all PFTs and converts $V_s$ to kg-H$_2$O m$^{-3}$.

Xylem vulnerability to cavitation is accounted for by using a Weibull function that reduces a tunable maximum xylem conductivity parameter ($K_{x,\text{max}}$, kg H$_2$O m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$ MPa$^{-1}$): 

$$g_x = \frac{A_xK_{x,\text{max}}}{z} \exp\left[-\left(\frac{-\Psi_k}{c_1}\right)^{c_2}\right]$$

Eqn. 6a

$$z = h_xh_p^{h_t}$$

Eqn. 6b

The cross sectional active xylem area is given by $A_x$ (m$^2$) and $c_1$ and $c_2$ are xylem vulnerability curve-fitting parameters. Xylem conductivity is divided by the path length, $z$ (m), thus converting it to xylem conductance. The power function (Eqn. 6b) was incorporated into the path length to explore the effects of increased hydraulic resistance as trees grow taller (Ryan et al., 2006). The dimensionless parameter $h_p$ was adjust between 1.00 (no additional effect beyond gravity) and 1.04 (increases the path length of the tallest trees by a factor of 4).
The new \( \Psi_i \) for the next timestep (t+1) is calculated by:
\[
\Psi_i^{(t+1)} = \Psi_i^t + \Delta \Psi_i
\]
Eqn. 7

Although the mechanisms controlling stomatal closure are not completely understood and quite complex, there is a strong correlation between \( \Psi_i \) and stomatal conductance in tropical trees (Brodribb et al., 2003). Therefore, \( \beta \) becomes a Weibull function of \( \Psi_i \) in the EDhd formulation:
\[
\beta = \left[ -\left( \frac{-\psi_i}{c_4} \right)^{c_3} \right]
\]
Eqn. 8

where \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) are empirical curve fitting parameters that were tuned to set \( \beta = 0.5 \) when \( \Psi_i = TLP \), the turgor loss point of the leaf (Brodribb et al., 2003).

One major advantage of EDhd is that Eqns 4 – 6 represent physiological mechanisms that control water movement through plants and their parameters can be derived directly from empirical measurements. Also, EDhd can be reasonably extrapolated to novel environments because the parameters remain within observed biological boundaries. For Eqn. 6, \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) were obtained from the PFT-dependent xylem vulnerability curves in Figure 3.4. For Eqn 8, the TLPs from Figure 3.1 were used to derived \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) for the drought-tolerant and intolerant PFTs. The photosynthetic parameterization for the late-successional type was the same as EDor and for the early-successional type was the same as the CAX early-successional for EDor. SLA was set to 21.66 and 15.06 m^2 kg^{-1} C and \( \rho_{\text{wood}} \) was set to 0.60 and 0.85 g cm^{-3} for the early- and late-successional types, respectively. The remaining parameterization was unaltered from EDor.
The parameter values used in this analysis are given in Table 1. In EDor and EDsr, $\theta_s$ or $\Psi_s$ is passed from the soil hydraulic module to the photosynthesis module where $\beta$ is then calculated. In EDhd, $\Psi_s$ is passed from the soil hydraulic module to the hydrodynamic module, which converts $\Psi_s$ to $\Psi_l$ and then passes $\Psi_l$ to the photosynthesis module where $\beta$ is calculated (Fig. 4.3) (Xiangtao Xu and David Medvigy, personal communication). The hydrodynamic module was structured to interface with EDor in a manner that retains the original biophysical, ecological and demographic processes (Fig. 4.3) (Xiangtao Xu and David Medvigy, personal communication).

**Figure 4.3.** Schematic representing the modules from the original ED2 (black) and the new hydrodynamic module (red). Eqns. 4 – 7 are contained in the Plant Hydrodynamic Module. The $\beta$ functions (Eqns. 2,3,8) are contain within the Photosynthesis Module. Xylem-P$_{50}$ (Figure 3.4) is the plant functional trait used to parameterize Eqn. 6 and turgor loss point ($TLP$) is used to parameterize Eqn 8. Transpiration ($T_n$), leaf water potential ($\Psi_l$) and soil water potential ($\Psi_s$) are passed between modules to drive the hydraulic equations.
Methods

Study sites

Two throughfall exclusion experiments were established in the Caxiuanã (1.737°S, 51.458°W) and Tapajós National Forests (2.897°S, 54.952°W) Para, Brazil to assess whole ecosystem responses to soil moisture limitation. The two sites are separated by 400 km in the eastern Amazon rainforest. Mean annual precipitation at CAX is 2272 mm (Fisher et al., 2007) with a 7 month wet season (>100 mm mo⁻¹) from mid-December to mid-July (Rosolem et al., 2008). Mean annual precipitation at TNF is 2000 mm (Nepstad et al., 2002) with a 6 month wet season from mid-December to mid-June (Rosolem et al., 2008). Rainfall was normal at both sites except for the below average 2003 wet season at TNF (Rosolem et al., 2008). The soils at both sites are Oxisol, but the depth to the water table and the texture differs between them. Soils at CAX are comprised of 78% sand and 15% clay and a water table near 10 m during the wet season (Fisher et al., 2007). Soils at TNF are comprised of 38% sand and 68% clay and a water table >80 m (Nepstad et al., 2002). The aboveground biomass in 2000 for trees > 10 cm dbh at CAX was 20.4 kg C m⁻² based on the average of 8 published allometric relationships (see Table 1 in da Costa et al., 2010). The aboveground biomass in 1999 for trees > 10 cm dbh at TNF was 15.0 kg C m⁻² based on allometric equations from Chambers et al. (2001) (Nepstad et al., 2002).

A brief description of the experimental design is given below, but is described in greater detail elsewhere (Nepstad et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2007). At each site, a 1-ha control plot and 1-ha treatment plot were established in floristically and structurally similar plots. A 1-m wide trench surrounding each plot separated the surface rooting
zones from the adjacent forests (Nepstad et al., 2002). In the treatment plot, a leaky septum was constructed of clear plastic panels 1-2 m above the forest floor and effectively intercepted 50% of total above-canopy precipitation (~60% of throughfall) from reaching the forest floor (Nepstad et al., 2002). A network of gutters and the surrounding trench transported the intercepted water off-site. The panels were overturned every 2-3 days to remove accumulated litter. The wooden frame supporting the panels and gutters was not constructed in the control plot due to the high cost and maintenance.

The drought treatment at CAX was initiated in 2002 and in 2000 at TNF. At CAX, throughfall was excluded during the entire year, while at TNF throughfall was excluded only during the rainy season (January – June). The drought experiment ran from 2002 to 2008 in CAX and 2000 to 2004 in TNF.

The growth and survivorship of all trees >10 cm dbh was recorded each year at both sites. Litterfall was collected using 0.5 m² mesh traps, 64 traps in each plot at TNF (Brando et al., 2008) and 25 at CAX (Metcalf et al., 2010b). NEP, GPP and $R_e$ were measured from a nearby eddy covariance tower at TNF (Hutyra et al., 2007). At CAX, $R_l$ was estimated as the sum of light and dark respiration, where dark respiration was directly measured on leaves sampled from the canopy of each plot and light respiration was assumed to be 67% of dark respiration (Metcalf et al. 2010b). $R_w$ was estimated at CAX by multiplying a measured stem respiration rate of 0.6 μmol CO₂ m⁻² stem-surface-area s⁻¹ by the aboveground stem and branch surface area of the plot (Metcalf et al., 2010b). Excised roots ≤5 mm diameter were collected from 0-30 cm depth soil cores to estimate $R_r$ (Metcalf et al., 2007), which is likely a conservative estimate because it does not include respiration from deep or larger roots.
Simulation protocol and meteorological drivers

All simulations followed the same initialization, spin-up, and drought simulation protocol described in detail in Appendix A. Briefly, site-level meteorological drivers were sequentially recycled over 500 years to spin-up, from a near-bare-ground initial condition, an equilibrium potential forest for present day atmospheric CO₂ concentrations (390 ppm). Three PFTs were prescribed for the spin-ups of EDor and EDsr following the parameterization described above; however, only two out of the three PFTs became established at each site (EDor description above). The PFT with higher $\rho_{\text{wood}}$ was designated the late-successional type and the PFT with the lower $\rho_{\text{wood}}$ was designated the early-successional type. The spin-ups for EDsr and EDhd used only the drought-tolerant early- and late-successional PFTs. After the EDsr and EDhd spin-ups completed, the two successional PFTs were divided equally into drought-tolerant and drought-intolerant PFTs, increasing the total PFTs to 4. The drought simulations were initialized from these spin-ups and run for seven years. The site years were selected to coincide with the actual TFE experiments (CAX: TFE 2002-2008 and TNF: 2000-2006).

The CAX meteorological drivers covered the entire seven year drought simulation (da Costa et al., 2010). The TNF meteorological drivers covered 2002 – 2004 (N. Restrepo-Coupe, unpublished data) and were recycled. Both sets of meteorological drivers were measured above the canopies from towers adjacent to the drought experiments. Consistent with the field experiment protocols, precipitation in the TNF simulations was reduced by 50% only during the wet season, while CAX precipitation was reduced by 50% all year. The other meteorological variables (e.g. humidity) were
not manipulated. The drought simulations are denoted throughout this paper as d50 and the control simulations are denoted as d0.

Soil textures were prescribed as reported for each site (see Study sites). Otherwise, the physical representation of the soil was standardized across both sites and all models in order to isolate the biological responses to drought under different soil types and meteorological conditions. The maximum soil depth was 8 m with sixteen layers of increasing thickness and free drainage as the lower boundary. Soil hydraulic parameters were derived following Clapp & Hornberger (1978) and Cosby et al. (1984). The hydraulic conductivity at field capacity, soil matrix potential at the wilting point, and the soil matrix potential at the air-dry point were defined as 0.1 mm d\(^{-1}\), -1.5 MPa, -3.1 MPa, respectively (Clapp & Hornberger 1978). The maximum rooting depth was set to 5 m for the tallest (35 m) trees. A power function was used to describe the decline in root biomass through the soil profile.

A sensitivity analysis of EDhd was also performed to gain insight into underlying adaptations for drought tolerance. The stem capacitance parameter (\(\theta_{\text{wood}}\)) was adjusted between 0.8 and 2.0. The height penalty parameter (\(h_p\)) was adjusted between 1.00 and 1.04. Maximum hydraulic conductivity (\(K_{x,\text{max}}\)) was adjusted between 1.8 and 2.7 for drought-intolerant and 1.5 and 2.5 for drought-tolerant PFTs. The drought phenology parameter (\(\theta_{\text{crit}}\), m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\)), which increases the soil moisture threshold triggering leaf drop, was adjusted from 0.0 (used for the main set of simulations) to 0.09. The adjustment of \(\theta_{\text{crit}}\) to 0.09 was chosen for continuity with Chapter 2.
Results

Aboveground biomass

The overall ecosystem responses to the drought treatments predicted by the three water-stress formulas are summarized in Figure 4.4 for TNF and Figure 4.5 for CAX. EDo and EDsr marginally underpredict observed total aboveground biomass ($AGB$) (15.0 kg C m$^{-2}$) in the control plot at TNF (EDo: $AGB = 10.4$, EDsr $AGB = 11.2$ kg C m$^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.4a,b) and significantly underpredict (EDo: $AGB = 12.5$, EDsr $AGB = 14.6$ kg C m$^{-2}$) observed $AGB$ (20.4 kg C m$^{-2}$) at CAX (Fig. 4.5 a,b). In contrast, EDhd predicts higher (18.9 kg C m$^{-2}$) than observed total $AGB$ in the control plots of TNF (Fig. 4.4c), but is in agreement (21.7 kg C m$^{-2}$) with observed total $AGB$ at CAX (Fig. 4.5c). Both EDo and EDhd capture almost exactly the timing and magnitude of the observed 22% reduction in total $AGB$ after 5 years of drought treatment at TNF (Fig. 4.4a,c). In contrast, EDsr predicts a 50% smaller reduction in total $AGB$ by the end of the drought treatment at TNF (Fig. 4.4e). All three models predict a <5% reduction in total $AGB$ after 8 years in the drought treatment at CAX in comparison to the observed 21% reduction (Fig. 4.5d,e,f).

All three models predict differential drought responses by each PFT for $AGB$ (Figs 4.4d,e,f, 4.5d,e,f). At both sites, EDo predicts the early-successional PFT to have a ~15% stronger response to the drought treatment compared to the late-successional PFT (Figs. 4.4d, 4.5d). This pattern is also predicted by EDsr and EDhd. However, the addition of the drought-tolerant and intolerant PFTs in both EDsr and EDhd resulted in both the early- and late-successional drought-intolerant PFTs accounting for most of the reduction in $AGB$ in the TNF drought treatment (Figs. 4.4e,f), while at CAX the reduction in $AGB$ is largely accounted for by only the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT.
(Fig 4.5e,f). Also, EDhd predicts that the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT will be almost completely lost after the 4\textsuperscript{th} year of drought at TNF (Fig. 4.4.f).

Figure 4.4. Seven year time series of aboveground biomass ($AGB$, kg C m\(^{-2}\)) predicted for the Tapajós National Forest using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di), black is total $AGB$. Open symbols are published annual observations of $AGB$ (Brando \textit{et al.}, 2008). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0\% and 50\% reduction in precipitation. Panels a – c show the d0 control plot simulations. Panels d – f show the d50 treatment simulations and are presented as the percent the control plot $AGB$ was changed ($\Delta$) by the drought.

The reductions in $AGB$ was subdivided into three diameter-at-breast-height (dbh) size classes—small (dbh: < 20 cm), medium (dbh: 20 – 40 cm), large (dbh: > 40 cm)—to evaluate if the models predict differential responses between the three size classes. EDor predicts the smallest size-class is the most vulnerable and the largest size class is the most resistant to the drought (Figs. 4.6a,d,g, 4.7a,d,g). Also, EDor predicts
Figure 4.5. Seven year time series of aboveground biomass (AGB, kg C m$^{-2}$) predicted for the Caxiuanã National Forest using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di), black is total AGB. Open symbols are published annual observations of AGB (da Costa et al., 2010). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. Panels a – c show the d0 control plot simulations. Panels d – f show the d50 treatment simulations and are presented as the percent the control plot AGB was changed (Δ) by the drought.

The early-successional PFT is more vulnerable than the late-successional PFT in each size class (Figs. 4.6a,d,g, 4.7a,g), with one exception, the medium size class at CAX (Fig. 4.7d). The pattern is more variable for EDsr where the drought-tolerant PFTs in the smallest size class is generally the most vulnerable to the drought treatment (Figs. 4.6b, 4.7b). EDsr also predicts recovery by the end of the drought at TNF for the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT in the medium size class (Fig. 4.6e) and in the 4th and 5th years of the drought at CAX in the small size class (Fig. 4.7b). For TNF, EDhd contrasts with EDor where EDhd predicts the vulnerability to be even across size classes.
for the late-successional drought-intolerant PFT and highest in the two larger size classes for the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT. For CAX, EDhd predicts the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT is equally vulnerable in all three size classes and the early-successional drought-tolerant PFT is vulnerable only in the medium size class while the other two PFTs are drought resistant in all three size classes (Fig. 4.7c,f,i). Also at both sites, the small and medium size classes of the early-successional drought-tolerant PFT has periods of recovery over the 8 year drought treatment (Figs. 4.6c,f, 4.7c,f).

EDor and EDsr underestimate control plot measurements of leaf area index ($LAI$) at TNF (EDor: $LAI = 4.2$, EDsr: $LAI = 4.6$, observation range: $5.2 - 6.9 \, m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.8a,b) but predict $LAI$ similar in magnitude to measurements at CAX (EDor: $LAI = 4.8$, EDsr: $LAI = 5.1$ observation range: $4.2 - 5.8 \, m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.9a,b). In contrast, EDhd predictions of $LAI$ are similar in magnitude to measurements at TNF (5.9 $m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.8c), but overestimates measurements at CAX (6.3 $m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.9c). None of the models capture the small seasonal dynamics in observed control plot $LAI$ at TNF (Fig. 4.8a,b,c). Under the drought treatment at TNF, both EDor and EDhd predict reductions in $LAI$ that are similar in magnitude to the reductions observed by the end of the measurements in the 4th year ($\sim 1.0 \, m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.8d,f). In comparison, EDsr predicts a much smaller reduction in $LAI$ over the 4 year period ($\sim 0.5 \, m^2 \, m^{-2}$) (Fig. 4.8e). The reductions in EDor $LAI$ are accounted for by both PFTs, with the early-successional being slightly greater (Fig. 4.8d). The reductions in EDhd $LAI$ are accounted for primarily by the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT, with the late-successional drought-intolerant PFT only beginning to show a significant response in the 4th year (Fig. 4.8f). At CAX, all of the model formulations fail to capture the observed decline in $LAI$ over
the 2 year measurement period (Fig. 4.9d,e,f). At both sites, the LAI patterns of each PFT mirror the AGB patterns over the entire 8 year simulation of the drought plots (data not shown).

Figure 4.6. Seven year time series of the change (D) in aboveground biomass (AGB, kg C m⁻²) predicted for the Tapajós National Forest for three size classes using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Panels a-c show trees of <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh). Panels d-f show trees between 20-40 cm dbh. Panels g-i show trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di). The Δ indicates the percent the control AGB was altered by the 50% drought treatment.
Figure 4.7. Seven year time series of the change ($\Delta$) in aboveground biomass ($AGB$, kg C m$^{-2}$) predicted for the Caxiuanã National Forest for three size classes using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Panels a – c show trees of <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh). Panels d – f show trees between 20 – 40 cm dbh. Panels g – i show trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors indicate drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di). The $\Delta$ indicates the percent the control $AGB$ was altered by the 50% drought treatment.
Figure 4.8. Three year time series of leaf area index (LAI, m$^2$ m$^{-2}$) predicted for the Tapajós National Forest using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di), black is total LAI. Open symbols are published observations (Nepstad and Moutinho, 2008). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. Panels a – c show the d0 control plot simulations. Panels d – f show the d50 treatment simulations and are presented as the total amount the control plot LAI was changed ($\Delta$) by the drought.
Figure 4.9. Three year time series of leaf area index \((LAI, \text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2})\) predicted for the Caxiuanã National Forest using the original (EDor), single resistor (EDsr) and hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. Colored lines indicate early- (blue) and late- (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di), black is total \(LAI\). Open symbols are published observations (Fisher et al., 2007). \(d0\) and \(d50\) are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. Panels a – c show the \(d0\) control plot simulations. Panels d – f show the \(d50\) treatment simulations and are presented as the total amount the control plot \(LAI\) was changed \((\Delta)\) by the drought.

**Carbon fluxes**

The model predictions were compared to published observations of carbon fluxes measured at CAX and TNF. A detailed carbon budget was measured in the 4\(^{th}\) year at CAX (Metcalfe et al., 2010b) and therefore, the 4\(^{th}\) year is presented in this analysis for both sites as the evaluation of model predictions of photosynthesis and tissue scale respiration. Woody biomass production \((\text{NPP}_w)\) and litter production were measured each year and are presented for the entire 8 year simulation. The purpose of this section is for model validation, and therefore, since the published observations are of the aggregate ecosystem, PFT specific fluxes are not reported for each model.
Table 4.2 List of observations and associated references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Site and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboveground biomass</td>
<td>AGB</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2})</td>
<td>CAX: da Costa et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Brando et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross primary production of carbon</td>
<td>GPP</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Hutyra et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf area index</td>
<td>LAI</td>
<td>m(^{2}) m(^{-2})</td>
<td>CAX: Fisher et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Nepstad &amp; Moutinho, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter production</td>
<td></td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Brando et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net ecosystem production of carbon</td>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>TNF: Hutyra et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net primary production of carbon in wood</td>
<td>NPP(_w)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: da Costa et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Brando et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autotrophic respiration</td>
<td>R(_a)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole ecosystems respiration</td>
<td>R(_e)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: Hutyra et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterotrophic respiration</td>
<td>R(_h)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf respiration</td>
<td>R(_l)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root respiration</td>
<td>R(_r)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood respiration</td>
<td>R(_w)</td>
<td>kg C m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1})</td>
<td>CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDor and EDsr predict net ecosystem production (NEP) of the control plots at both sites to be substantial carbon sinks (range: ~0.3 to 0.4 kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) (Fig 4.10a,c).

In contrast, EDhd predicts each site to be a small carbon source, which is in strong agreement with flux tower measurements of NEP at TNF(-0.09 ± 0.005 kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)). (Note: error estimates are reported as ±95% CI). Under the drought treatment, EDsr
predicts both ecosystems to become even stronger carbon sinks in the fourth year, whereas both EDor and EDhd predict both sites as sources (Fig. 4.10e,g).

Figure 4.10. Net and component ecosystem carbon fluxes (kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) in the fourth year of the experiment for Caxiuanã (CAX, left side) and Tapajós (TNF, right side). Colored symbols indicate the original (EDor, blue), single resistor (EDsr, red) and hydrodynamic (EDhd, green) water-stress formulations. Black symbols are published observations (mean ± 95% CI; CAX: Metcalfe et al., 2010; TNF: Hutyra et al., 2007). Panels (a) to (d) show control plot (d0) carbon fluxes and panels (e) to (h) show drought treatment plot (d50) fluxes. The \(D\) indicates the total amount the control (d0) fluxes were altered by the 50% drought treatment. NEP: net ecosystem production, GPP: gross primary production, Re: ecosystem respiration, Rh: heterotrophic respiration, Ra: autotrophic respiration, Rl: leaf respiration: Rw: wood respiration, Rr: root respiration.

EDor and EDsr predictions of gross primary production (GPP) in the 4\(^{th}\) year for the control plots are similar in magnitude at both sites and agree with flux tower estimates (3.17 ± 0.03 kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) at TNF (Fig. 4.10b,d). In comparison, GPP predictions by EDhd are approximately 1.0 kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) lower than EDor at both sites and the measurements at TNF. All three models predict lower GPP under the drought
treatment at both sites, with EDor predicting a considerably greater reduction relative to
EDsr and EDhd (Fig. 4.10f,h).

Respiration definitions are given in Table 4.2. All three models were within the
range of observed ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) for the 4th year in the control plot at CAX
($3.26 \pm 0.29$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) and were approximately $1.0$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ less than
observations at TNF ($3.26 \pm 0.06$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.10b,d). All three models are in
agreement at both sites about the magnitude of heterotrophic respiration ($R_h$) in 4th year
(TNF: $\sim 1.2$, CAX: $\sim 1.5$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), but are significantly higher than the control plot
estimates at CAX ($1.02 \pm 0.10$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.10b,d). EDor and EDsr predictions
of autotrophic respiration ($R_a$) are similar in magnitude at both sites TNF: EDor = 1.5,
EDsr = 1.7, CAX EDor = 1.7, EDsr = 2.0 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$); however, only EDsr is within the
CI of the 4th year control plot measurements at CAX ($2.24 \pm 0.28$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$). $R_a$ for
EDhd is comparatively lower at both sites (TNF: 1.2, CAX: 1.3 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$).
Predictions of leaf ($R_l$) and wood ($R_w$) respiration in the 4th year at both sites is similar in
magnitude across models ($R_l = \sim 0.8$, $R_w = \sim 1.0$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) and are within the ranges
observed at CAX ($R_l: 0.73 \pm 0.20$, $R_w: 0.89 \pm 0.18$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.10b,d). All three
models are in agreement at both sites but significantly underpredict the 4th year
observations of root respiration ($R_r$) at CAX ($0.62 \pm 0.03$ kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.10b,d).
Under the drought treatment, all models are in agreement about ecosystem and
component respiration fluxes being suppressed in the 4th year at both sites(Fig. 4.10f,h),
which is in contrast to the observed marginal increases in all of these fluxes at CAX. It
should be noted however, that the drought predictions of $R_l$ and $R_w$ by all of the models
are within the range of measurement error at CAX (Fig. 4.10f).
Figure 4.11. Seven year time series of annual $NPP_w$ (kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) for (a, c) Caxianã (CAX) and (b, d) Tapajós (TNF). Colored lines indicate the original (EDor, blue), single resistor (EDsr, red) and hydrodynamic (EDhd, green) water-stress formulations. Open symbols are published observations (mean ± 95% CI (when reported), TNF: Brando et al., 2008, CAX: da Costa et al., 2010). d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The $\Delta$ plots (c, d) show the percent the control (a, b) $NPP_w$ was altered by the 50% drought treatment.

EDor and EDsr systematically over predict the observed $NPP_w$ for the control plots of both sites (TNF: EDor = ~0.50, EDsr =~0.59 observations = ~0.31, CAX: EDor = ~0.59, EDsr =~0.61, observations = ~0.20 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.11a,b). In contrast, predictions of $NPP_w$ by EDhd is similar in magnitude to observed $NPP_w$ in the control plot of CAX (~0.2 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), but lower than observations in the control plot of TNF (~0.18 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) (Fig. 4.11a,b). Lower $NPP_w$ predicted by EDhd relative to EDor and EDsr reflects lower available carbon for assimilation resulting from lower GPP (Fig.
4.10b,d). Under the drought treatment, the observed interannual variability is weakly captured by all three models at TNF and not capture at CAX (Fig. 4.11c,d). However, the magnitude of the reduction in $NPP_w$ under the drought treatment is realistically captured by EDor at TNF, but in all other cases the predicted reduction is too small (Fig. 4.11c,d). Furthermore, the patterns of the drought response of $NPP_w$ is similar between the models at both sites, but varies in magnitude with EDor having the strongest, while EDsr having the weakest response (Fig. 4.11c,d).

Figure 4.12. Seven year time series of the change in annual litterfall (kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) for the Tapajós drought experiment. Colored lines indicate the original (EDor, blue), single resistor (EDsr, red) and hydrodynamic (EDhd, green) water-stress formulations. Open symbols are published observations (mean ± 95% CI, TNF: Brando et al., 2008). The $\Delta$ indicates the percent the control litterfall was altered by the drought treatment.

Litter production in the control plot is similar between all three models at both sites (TNF; ~0.18, CAX: ~0.20 kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), thus indicating that the water stress-formulations and alternative PFTs do not produce systematic differences in leaf shedding under normal precipitation. The drought response of litter production predicted by each model reflects its total AGB response, where EDsr has a weak response at both sites and
EDor and EDhd have ~10% and ~25% decline in litter production at CAX and TNF, respectively. All three models predict a sustained reduction in litter production from the beginning, which is in contrast to the observed increase in litter production in the first three years of the TNF drought experiment (Fig 4.12).

Plant hydrodynamics

Diurnal patterns of \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) (expressed per unit leaf area), \( \beta \), and leaf temperature (\( T_{\text{leaf}} \)) were evaluated for EDhd and then \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) and \( \beta \) were compared to predictions by EDor. October 10, 2003 is used for illustrative purposes, since it was in the dry season and was preceded by several rain-free days. Both \( \beta \) and \( T_{\text{leaf}} \) can affect the magnitude of \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \), the former through a down-regulation of stomatal conductance and the latter through temperature dependent maintenance respiration. Since \( \beta \) and \( T_{\text{leaf}} \) are dependent on canopy position, all three variables were separated into small (dbh: <20 cm), medium (dbh: 20 – 40 cm) and large (dbh: >40 cm) size classes. \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) for all PFTs in both plots follows a typical diurnal pattern with the highest rates occurring in the morning followed by a midday suppression (Fig. 4.13). The midday suppression is particularly steep for the early-successional PFTs, but a late afternoon recovery is also predicted in the drought plots (Fig 4.13a,c,e). The magnitude of \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) is dependent on both PFT and size. In terms of PFT, in the control plot \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) of the early-successional PFT is typically more than double (range: 3.5 – 6.0 \( \mu \text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \)) that of the late-successional PFTs (range: 1.8 – 2.8 \( \mu \text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \)) (Fig. 4.13). In the drought plots, \( GPP_{\text{leaf}} \) of the early-successional drought-tolerant PFT is still double that of the late-successional drought-
tolerant PFT. But, $GPP_{leaf}$ of both the early- and late-successional drought-intolerant PFTs are approximately the same after 11:00. In terms of size effects, predictions of

Figure 4.13. Diurnal pattern of leaf-level gross primary productivity ($GPP_{leaf}$, μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ leaf s$^{-1}$) for trees of different size classes and plant functional types simulated for the Tapajós for October 2, 2003 using the hydrodynamic (EDhd) formulation. $GPP_{leaf}$ is divided between size classes: (a,b) trees <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh), (c,d) trees between 20-40 cm dbh, (e,f) trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue, left) and late- (red, right) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di). $d0$ and $d50$ indicate drought levels of 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation.
Figure 4.14. Diurnal pattern of leaf-level gross primary productivity (GPP<sub>leaf</sub>, μmol CO<sub>2</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> leaf s<sup>-1</sup>) for trees of different size classes and plant functional types simulated for the Tapajós for October 2, 2003 using the original (EDor) formulation. GPP<sub>leaf</sub> is divided between size classes: (a) trees <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh), (b) trees between 20-40 cm dbh, (c) trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue, left) and late- (red, right) successional plant functional types. d0 and d50 (dashed lines) indicate drought levels of 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation. Note the difference in scale on the y-axis compared to Figure 4.13.

GPP<sub>leaf</sub> of the early-successional PFTs in the largest size class of the control plot (Fig. 4.13e) is generally 1.0 μmol CO<sub>2</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> lower throughout the day compared to the medium and small size classes (Fig. 4.13a,c). In contrast, GPP<sub>leaf</sub> of the late-successional
PFTs is similar in magnitude across all size classes (Fig. 4.13b,d,f). The drought-tolerant PFTs also has higher $GPP_{leaf}$ than the drought-intolerant PFTs (Fig. 4.13), particularly in the early-successional PFTs (Fig. 4.13a,c,e). In comparison, in the control plot EDor also predicts the early-successional PFT to have higher $GPP_{leaf}$ than the late-successional PFT in the small and medium size classes (Fig. 4.14a,b); but in contrast, the rates are the same in the largest size class (Fig. 4.14c). Also in contrast to EDhd, $GPP_{leaf}$ increases in magnitude with size and it does not have the same midday suppression pattern. Finally, the overall magnitude of $GPP_{leaf}$ predicted by EDhd (Fig 4.13) is lower than predictions by EDor (Fig. 4.14) for the two larger size classes, but the same for the smallest size class. This difference is caused by the diurnal differences in $\beta$ described below.

The overall diurnal pattern of $\beta$ in the EDhd simulations is U-shaped with a broad minimum occurring during the midday (Fig. 4.15). The PFT and size class pattern of $\beta$ is similar to that of GPP, where the larger sized trees compared smaller trees, the early-successional PFTs compared to late-successional, and drought-intolerant PFTs compared to drought-tolerant, all experience greater relative reductions over the course of the day (Fig. 4.15). $\beta$ down regulates the stomata most strongly for the drought-intolerant early-successional PFTs. For example in the control plot, the midday values of $\beta$ for the medium and large size classes drops below 0.7 and 0.6, respectively, and in the drought plots it drops below 0.4 for both (Fig. 4.15c,e). The stomata began the day partially closed ($\beta < 1.0$) for both drought-intolerant PFTs in the largest size class of the control plot (Fig. 4.15e,f) and for all PFTs of all size classes in the drought plot (Fig. 4.15a-f). In comparison, midday values of $\beta$ in the EDor simulations are considerably higher and never drop below 0.9 for all size classes (Fig. 4.16). In the drought plot, EDor $\beta$ for both
PFTs in all size classes begin the day near 1.0 (Fig. 4.16), but each drop to a similar value as its EDhd drought-intolerant counterpart (Fig. 4.15).

Figure 4.15. Diurnal pattern of the soil water-stress scaling factor, $\beta$ (dimensionless), for trees of different size classes and plant functional types simulated for the Tapajós for October 2, 2003 using the hydrodynamic (EDhd) formulation. $\beta$ is divided between size classes: (a,b) trees \(<20\) cm diameter at breast height (dbh), (c,d) trees between 20-40 cm dbh, (e,f) trees \(>40\) cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue, left) and late- (red, right) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di). d0 and d50 indicate drought levels of 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation.
Figure 4.16. Diurnal pattern of the soil water-stress scaling factor, $\beta$ (dimensionless), for trees of different size classes and plant functional types simulated for the Tapajós for October 2, 2003 using the original (EDor) formulation. $\beta$ is divided between size classes: (a) trees <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh), (b) trees between 20-40 cm dbh, (c) trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue, left) and late- (red, right) successional plant functional types. d0 and d50 (dashed lines) indicate drought levels of 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation.

The diurnal pattern of $T_{leaf}$ in the EDhd simulations is hump-shaped with a peak occurring between 11:00 and 12:00 (Fig. 4.17). Leaf temperatures are about 1 – 2 °C higher for the drought-intolerant PFTs compared to the drought-tolerant PFTs in the
smallest size class (Fig. 4.17a,b). In the two larger size classes, differences between the PFTs are marginal (Fig. 4.17c-f), with the exception of the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT (Fig. 4.17c,e). Finally, the large late-successional PFTs have leaf temperatures approximately 2.5 °C greater than the two smaller size classes (Fig. 4.17f).

Figure 4.17. Diurnal pattern of leaf temperatures ($T_{leaf}$ °C) for trees of different size classes and plant functional types simulated for the Tapajós for October 2, 2003. Panels a-b show trees of <20 cm diameter at breast height (dbh). Panels c-d show trees between 20-40 cm dbh. Panels e-f show trees >40cm dbh. Colored lines indicate early- (blue, left) and late- (red, right) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di). d0 and d50 indicate drought levels of 0% and 50% reductions in precipitation.
The sensitivity analysis revealed that individually adjusting $K_{w,\text{max}}$, $\theta_{\text{woods}}$, and $h_{p}$ only modified the $AGB$ drought responses shown in Figure 4.4f by <5% for the drought-intolerant PFTs and <2% for the drought-tolerant PFTs. In contrast, raising the soil moisture threshold, $\Theta_{\text{crit}}$ to 0.09 m$^3$ m$^{-3}$ produced a large drought response across all models (Fig. 4.18). However, the largest reductions in $AGB$ incorrectly occurred with the late-successional PFTs instead of the drought-intolerant PFTs, most notably with EDor and EDhd (Fig. 4.18a,c).

Figure 4.18. Seven year time series of the change ($D$) in aboveground biomass ($AGB$, kg C m$^{-2}$) predicted for drought plots of the Tapajós National Forest using the (a) original (EDor), (b) single resistor (EDsr) and (c) hydrodynamic (EDhd) water-stress formulations. This differs from Fig 4.4d,e,f in that the drought phenology parameter ($\Theta_{\text{crit}}$) is set to 0.09. Colored lines indicate early (blue) and late (red) successional plant functional types. Darker colors are drought-tolerant (dt), lighter colors are drought-intolerant (di), black is total $AGB$. Open symbols are published annual observations of $AGB$ (Brando et al., 2008).
Discussion

Climate models project many regions of the Amazon basin will experience more extreme precipitation patterns or general drying by the end of this century (Joetzjer et al., 2013). Higher tree mortality rates are likely to be a significant consequence of these changes (Phillips et al., 2010). However, DVMs are poorly formulated to capture losses in live biomass during extreme drought events (McDowell et al., 2013; Powell et al., 2013), which arises from our still nascent understanding of the complex mechanisms underlying drought induced mortality (McDowell et al., 2008). In this study, two potentially important mechanisms were evaluated for the first time within the framework of a DVM: (1) hydrodynamic water-transport from the root to the leaf and (2) competition arising from diversity in plant hydraulic strategies.

To evaluate the role of plant hydrodynamics, three water-stress formulations were tested in the Ecosystem Demography model (Fig. 4.2): (1) a single-resistor formulation as a function of soil moisture (Eqn. 2a) (EDsr), (2) a supply and demand formulation as a function of soil moisture (Eqn. 3) (EDor), and (3) a supply and demand formulation as a function of leaf water potential (Eqn. 4) (EDhd). The later requires a hydrodynamic formulation to transfer the soil water potential to the leaf. Many DVMs (e.g. CLM3.5, IBIS and JULES, shown in Powell et al., 2013) use a variant of the single-resistor water-stress formulation as a function of soil moisture. However, using a DVM with such a formulation to evaluate ecosystem drought responses has been the subject of considerable scientific scrutiny (e.g. McDowell et al., 2013; Sperry and Love, 2015). Stomata respond to the leaf water balance, which is simultaneously modulated by the supply of water from the soil and the demand from the atmosphere. Therefore, a DVM with a more
mechanistic soil water-stress formulation that includes both supply of and demand for water in the leaf (Sperry and Love, 2015) should theoretically be more successful at capturing drought responses.

Currently available DVMs use a single water-stress parameterization (Powell et al., 2013) to represent the range of hydraulic trait diversity found in the tropical biome (e.g. Figs. 3.1, 3.2, 3.4; see also Baltzer et al., 2008; Anderegg, 2014). Species compositional shifts may be a consequence of extreme droughts in the tropics (da Costa et al., 2010), which underscores the imperative to develop DVMs with hydraulically diverse PFTs. EDsr was parameterized to represent multiple PFTs that spanned a range of hydraulic and successional diversity (Fig. 4.2a) to determine if the single-resistor formulation alone could be remedied with only greater diversity. Similarly, EDhd was also parameterized to represent both hydraulic and successional diversity (Fig. 4.2b), to evaluate if both diversity and hydrodynamics must be included in order to capture observed ecosystem responses to drought.

EDsr was able to capture the correct PFT dependent reductions in AGB at TNF, however, it was unable to replicate the magnitude of the observed reduction in total AGB (Figs. 4.4b,e, 4.5b,e) or the size-dependent reductions in AGB (Figs. 4.6b,e,h, 4.7b,e,h). Therefore, one key result from this analysis is that increasing functional diversity in the water-stress formula alone is not sufficient enough for improving the ability of DVMs to make reliable drought response predictions for tropical forests.

Although none of the models correctly captured the magnitude and timing of the drought response of AGB or NPP_w at both sites (Figs. 4.4, 4.5, 4.11), predictions by EDhd possess characteristics that suggest its formula should be preferentially selected that of
EDor and EDsr when evaluating the fate of Amazon rainforests in a drier climate. For example, unlike EDor, EDhd includes greater biodiversity with four PFTs that operate along both successional and drought axes of competition. While the exact fraction of drought-tolerant and drought-intolerant species has not been reported for either CAX or TNF, EDhd (and EDsr) captured the resistance of the drought-tolerant PFTs to biomass loss (Figs. 4.4e,f, 4.5e,f) that was reported by da Costa et al. (2010). Secondly, most of the biomass loss predicted by EDor is from the smallest size class (Figs. 4.6a and 4.7a). In contrast, predictions by EDhd more closely resemble the observations (CAX: da Costa et al., 2010, TNF: Nepstad et al. 2007), where the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT in the two larger size classes is the most vulnerable to drought (Figs. 4.6c,f,i, 4.7c,f,i). These size dependent differences between EDor and EDhd are explained by the size dependent differences in $\beta$ (Figs. 4.15, 4.16), which in turn controls the size dependent differences in $GPP_{leaf}$ (Figs. 4.13, 4.14). Also, EDhd predicts that $T_{leaf}$ does not play a role in the size dependent drought responses of $GPP_{leaf}$ and by extension AGB (Fig. 4.17).

EDhd predicts a relatively strong midday suppression in $GPP_{leaf}$ for both early-successional PFTs across all size classes (Fig4.13a,c,d) compared to the EDor predictions (Fig. 4.14). This prediction by EDhd is consistent with empirical evidence that suggests canopy trees at CAX use an isohydric strategy by closing their stomata during the day to conserve water (Fisher et al., 2006). Moreover, Edhd predicts that the isohydric strategy becomes very influential during severe droughts. Caution should be taken with the early morning prediction of $\beta$ by EDhd for the largest trees and trees growing in the drought plot (Fig. 4.15). For those trees, EDhd predicts $\beta$ to begin the day suppressed, being as
low as 0.5 for the early-successional drought-intolerant PFT. Yet, Ψf measurements for the four PFTs measured in the drought plot at CAX revealed that only trees from the early-successional drought-tolerant PFT begin the day under water-stress (Table 3.1). The other three PFTs start the day with Ψf near 0.0 MPa.

In each model formulation, each PFT was given an equivalent parameterization for CAX and TNF. The only two differences between the simulations for the two sites were edaphic and meteorological. EDhd and EDor predict that the plants should respond differently to these two physical differences (Figs. 4.4d,f vs 4.5d,f and Figs. 4.8d,f vs 4.9d,f). Yet despite these differences, the observations showed similar reductions in AGB and LAI (Brando et al., 2008; da Costa et al., 2010). Spatial variation in hydraulic traits may account for the disagreement between the observed drought responses and model predictions. However, none of the parameterizations from the sensitivity analysis reproduced the observed reductions in AGB at CAX. Plus, empirical evidence suggests that the two measured hydraulic traits used to parameterize EDhd (TLP and xylem-P50) are spatially conserved for the terra firma forests of the eastern Brazilian Amazon (Figs. 3.1, 3.4). Nevertheless, it is possible that either spatial variation in other plant traits exists and must be represented, or additional ecological or physiological processes need to be included. A few possible explanations are elucidated below.

Under current climate conditions, EDhd correctly predicts that NEP at TNF is a small C source in the fourth year (Fig. 4.10c). However, Edhd under predicts GPP and Re, the two components of NEP, relative to both the observations and the other two models (Fig. 4.10d). Also under current climate, all three formulations correctly captured the pattern of the component respiratory fluxes observed in the fourth year at CAX (Fig.
4.10b). Under the drought conditions, all three models failed to capture the increase in $R_a$, $R_l$, and $R_w$ at CAX (Fig. 4.10f). This result is consistent with the diagnosis of Powell et al. (2013), which includes multiple DVMs, suggesting that we need a more complete understanding of the respiratory costs associated with different drought survival strategies.

The drought phenology scheme used in all formulations causes a fraction of the leaves to drop once soil moisture falls below a critical threshold. The magnitude of leaf-shedding is dependent on the severity and duration of the soil moisture deficit, both of which can be modulated by $\theta_{crit}$. The permanent wilting point of the soil (-1.5 MPa) was used as the leaf shedding threshold (Clapp & Hornberger 1978). For the main set of simulation, $\theta_{crit}$ was set to 0.0—meaning that the leaf shedding threshold was unaltered. Under normal precipitation, the drought phenology scheme fails to capture the seasonal dynamics in LAI (Fig. 4.8a,b,c, see also Fig. 2.6a,b for EDor when $\theta_{crit} = 0.09$). Yet, EDor and EDhd, but not EDsr, captured the magnitude of the reduction in LAI by the 3rd year in the TNF drought plots (Fig. 4.8).

Leaf-shedding has been suggested as a preemptive adaptation to avoid drought (Pineda-García et al., 2013). The models failed to capture the increase in litter production in the initial years for the TNF drought plot (Fig. 4.12). Therefore, the soil moisture threshold causing leaves to shed was tested by increasing $\theta_{crit}$ to 0.09. Across all models, increasing $\theta_{crit}$ caused significant reductions in $AGB$ in the drought plots of TNF (Fig. 4.17). However, the reductions were most extensive in the late-successional PFTs, not the drought-intolerant PFTs. This result suggests that drought phenology is an important adaptive ecological process, but it requires better understanding and
representation in DVMs. For example, leaves of deciduous species in tropical dry forests have higher $TLP$s relative to the coexisting evergreen species (Sobrado, 1986), which suggests an important link between plant hydraulics and phenology. Indeed, linking drought phenology to plant hydraulics in EDhd has shown promise for capturing seasonal dynamics, but it is still untested under severe droughts (Xiangtao Xu, personal communication).

Xylem recovery may also explain the observed similarity in the drought responses between the two sites. However, the ability of air-filled xylem to refill while functional vessels are under tension is a topic of considerable debate. One side asserts that a plausible mechanism has yet to be presented; one which can overcome the physical constraints imposed by the instantaneous expansion of gas as water that is pumped into air-filled vessels comes in contact with water under negative pressure (Wheeler et al., 2013; Cochard and Delzon, 2013). The other side claims that while they indeed do lack a formal mechanism, empirical evidence clearly demonstrates its existence (Nardini et al., 2008; Brodersen and McElrone, 2013; Ogasa et al., 2013). The EDhd formula presented here has the potential to provide valuable insight about the ecological importance and evolutionary stability of xylem recovery when the vessels are under tension, and thus might help to resolve this debate. The EDhd formulation tested in this analysis has xylem recovery tightly coupled to recovery of soil moisture. Therefore, the formulation would need to include a new PFT with a time dimension for xylem recovery that is decoupled from the recovery of soil moisture. Furthermore, because xylem recovery was coupled to soil moisture in this analysis, this may explain why CAX, the site with higher annual precipitation, continued to have a muted drought response and both sites were relatively
insensitive to parameter tuning. Decoupling xylem recovery from soil moisture should be tested in future analyses.

Vessel tapering (West et al., 1999, Petit et al., 2008) and stem water storage (Pineda-García et al., 2013) have been invoked as adaptations that buffer trees against water-stress. An increase in vessel diameter from the apex to the base allows for more efficient flow at the base while reducing cavitation risk in the branches where xylem tension is greatest. The sensitivity test on the effects of height indicates that the EDhd formulation is congruent with this hypothesis because increasing $h_p$ produced minimal reductions in $AGB$ in the drought plot. On the other hand, stem water-storage provides a local reservoir of water, which allows for narrower, yet less conductive, vessels on the outer branches. The sensitivity test on $\theta_{wood}$ did not support this hypothesis, where increasing capacitance did not provide any additional buffer against biomass loss in the drought plots.

**Conclusions**

The results of this study support the hypothesis that functional diversity related to differences in plant hydrodynamics is an important ecosystem property because compositional shifts in tropical forest tree species that arise from differences in plant hydrodynamics is predicted to be a consequence of changes in precipitation patterns. Also, plant hydrodynamics capture size-dependent physiological processes, which in turn enable DVMs to more correctly capture structural shifts associated with size-dependent mortality caused by droughts. Therefore, representing drought-tolerance functional
diversity and plant hydrodynamics is essential in DVMs that are used to predict the fate of tropical ecosystems exposed to more frequent and extreme droughts.
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Chapter 5

Conclusions
This dissertation explores the ecological implications of the projected reductions in precipitation across the Amazon basin. Climate models are converging on either more extreme wet and dry seasons, a lengthening of the dry season length, or general drying in different regions across the basin (Malhi et al. 2008, Lintner et al., 2012, Joetzjer et al., 2013, Boisier et al., 2015). It is of considerable ecological interest to understand how these changes in precipitation may affect ecosystem services and where to target conservation efforts. While incredibly informative about fundamental mechanisms, manipulations on individuals and whole ecosystems are limited by issues associated with spatial and temporal scaling because of the difficulty in capturing emergent properties that arise in higher scales of organization. Therefore, state of the art terrestrial biosphere models, which dynamically track vegetation responses to physical forcings and scales to the landscape, are theoretically among our best tools, if not the only tool, for making this assessment.

The current formulations in terrestrial biosphere models are, however, untested against a robust set of benchmarks for tropical forest responses to drought. Therefore, the Chapter 2 of this dissertation explores whether or not a collection of terrestrial biosphere and ecosystem models that have been used to assess Amazon drought responses (e.g. Cox et al., 2004, Baker et al., 2008) are properly formulated in the first place. This model intercomparison standardized for the first time, the physical environment across all models so that the range of formulations representing the biological processes, such as photosynthesis, respiration, carbon allocation and storage, and competition could be evaluated. This study demonstrates that terrestrial biosphere models can reliably predict plant and ecosystem carbon fluxes under the present climate, but still require substantial
development for predicting the consequences of severe drought. Model development should be focused on testing hypotheses associated with enhanced autotrophic respiration under severe water-stress, controls over leaf phenology, stomatal responses to soil water-stress, and drought induced mortality.

An important finding of Powell et al. (2013) and others (e.g. Sakaguchi et al. 2011, Anderegg, 2014) calls into question how soil water-stress and water-transport are represented in terrestrial biosphere models. One concern is the lack of functional diversity in the soil water-stress parameterization, which precludes explicit competition between species with alternative growth versus xylem-safety strategies. Previous research has shown considerable diversity in plant hydraulic traits among tropical forest tree species (e.g. Baltzer et al., 2008; Bartlett et al., 2012), but very few have linked this physiological diversity to functional diversity at the ecosystem scale. Chapter 3 of this dissertation explores how plant hydraulic traits vary between species identified as early successional versus late successional and between species identified as drought tolerant versus drought intolerant. Chapter 3 also explores how plant hydraulic traits vary temporally and spatially for each of the four plant functional types. The evidence from this study suggests that traits associated with drought tolerance are orthogonal to wood density, which is an important life history trait associated with succession. The evidence also suggests that hydraulic traits of terra firma trees are largely conserved spatially and temporally. However, lack of plasticity in hydraulic traits indicates that mature trees belonging to the drought intolerant functional type are vulnerable to reductions in precipitation because of their limited ability to adjust. Finally, insights from this study
provide valuable information about plant hydraulic traits needed to parameterize more realistic water-stress functions in terrestrial biosphere models.

To date, formulations for representing soil water-stress and water transport are fairly simplistic relative to the detailed level of understanding we have about these processes (Sperry and Love, 2015). Chapter 4 of this dissertation explores the level of sophistication required in the soil water-stress and water transport formulations in order for terrestrial biosphere models to make robust predictions about tropical forest drought responses. Three different water-stress and water transport formulations, ranging in degrees of complexity, were evaluated using the Ecosystem Demography model (ED): (1) a single-resistor formulation as a function of soil moisture (EDsr), (2) a supply and demand formulation as a function of soil moisture (EDor), and (3) a hydrodynamic supply and demand formulation as a function of leaf water potential (EDhd). The hydrodynamic formulation transfers the soil water potential to the leaf. The results of this study support the hypothesis that functional diversity related to differences in plant hydrodynamics is an important ecosystem property because compositional shifts in tropical forest tree species that arise from differences in plant hydrodynamics is predicted by this analysis to be a consequence of changes in precipitation patterns. Also, plant hydrodynamics capture size-dependent physiological processes, which in turn enable terrestrial biosphere models to more correctly capture structural shifts associated with the observed size-dependent mortality that occurs during severe droughts (da Costa et al., 2010). Therefore, including functional diversity along a drought-tolerance gradient and plant hydrodynamics are essential when terrestrial biosphere models are used to predict the fate of tropical ecosystems subjected to severe droughts.
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Appendix A

Protocol for drought manipulations

See the Table 1 below for a summary and check-list of the required simulations.

GENERAL NOTE:
The simulations for both sites should begin with one baseline year using normal
precipitation (i.e. do not impose a drought) and then the drought manipulation with be
imposed for the following seven years. The baseline year for TNF is 1999 and the
manipulations years are 2000-2006. The baseline year for CAX is 2001 and the
manipulations years are 2002-2008.

SITE SPECIFIC INFORMATION:

**Tapajos National Forest (TNF)**

Experiment information (Nepstad et al. 2002):

1 ha treatment plot, 1 ha control plot. Rainfall input was reduced by 50%. Throughfall
was reduced by 60%. Stem flow was not excluded. Throughfall exclusion occurred only
during wet season (approx. Jan – Jun). Treatment period was Jan 2000 – Dec 2004

Simulation information:

1. General information:
   a. Coordinates: Use S83  lat: -3.02, lon:-54.97
   b. Soil depth: 8 meters.
c. Soil type: 60% clay, 38% sand (Nepstad et al., 2002)

d. Use free drainage.

e. Meteorological drivers: SOImet is from the km67 tower and covers 2002-2004 (supplied by Natalia). SHF met covers 1970 to 2008

2. Understanding the interaction between local and regional met driver, and the impacts of drought on an equilibrium forest:

a. **Summary**: We will do two sets of simulations; both initialized with bare-ground spin ups. The first set will use the Sheffield met drivers (SHF), the second set will use SOImet drivers (SOImet). Both sets will cover drought levels ranging from 0% - 90% reduction in above canopy precipitation.

b. **Spin up initialization**: Do one bare ground spin up using the SHF met drivers and do one bare ground spin up using the SOImet drivers. Follow the same bare-ground spin up protocol described in the SiteLevelSimulations document. Therefore, spin up to equilibrium (approximately 500yrs) with pre-industrial CO₂ (280 ppm) level. Then, perform a transient simulation from 1720 to 2000 with increasing atmospheric CO₂ to present day levels. (Tip: Run this just like the S67 site level spin ups, except change the soils and coordinates.)

For each set of simulations, use the same met drivers throughout the spin up and manipulation period. (If you use the SHF met drivers for the spin up, then use the SHF met drivers for the manipulation period. And, if you use the SOImet drivers for the spin up then use the SOImet drivers for
the manipulation period.) The meteorological forcing data should cycle sequentially throughout the spin up and manipulations periods.

c. **Manipulations**: Generate hourly and monthly output following the Moore Simulations Output document. See Table 1 for summary of all simulations.

i. Run a one year baseline period for 1999. NOTE: For the SOImet drivers, DO NOT USE 2002 for the baseline year. Use 2004 to create the baseline year (See Table 2). We need to use 2004, because 2002 is a dry year and we do not want to start the drought manipulation with the ecosystem already water-stressed by a natural drought. And, 1999 in the SHF met drivers is not a dry year, so this will remove an artefact when we compare the two.

ii. MONTHLY OUTPUT: Run all monthly simulations for a total of 8 years (1999-2006) using both meteorological drivers. The first year (1999) is a baseline year where no drought is imposed. Impose the treatment in the second year for the remaining 7 years of the simulation (2000-2006). For the treatment, reduce above canopy precipitation by 0% (control) and in 10% increments from 10% to 90% (drought treatments) between January and June. Use unadjusted precipitation for the months of July to December (similar to the actual TFE experiment).

iii. HOURLY OUTPUT: Run all hourly simulations for three years. Run 0% drought for the baseline year (1999). Then, impose all treatment levels (d00 to d90) in the second and third years of the
simulation. Use unadjusted precipitation from July to December each year.

Validation biomass information:


**LBA-ECO LC-14** Rainfall Exclusion Experiment, LAI, Gap Fraction, TNF, Brazil: 2000-05. Data set. Available on-line [http://lba.cptec.inpe.br/] from LBA Data and Information System, National Institute for Space Research (INPE/CPTEC), Cachoeira Paulista, Sao Paulo, Brazil. (Note: the data are easier to locate through the link on the Moore website.)

**Caxiuana (CAX)**

Experiment information:

Measurements were taken in a pre-treament year (2001) to establish a baseline for both the control and throughfall exclusion plots. The treatment period was Jan 2002 – present. Rainfall input was reduced by 50% throughout the whole year (i.e., panels were not removed during the dry season as in Tapajós). Two exceptions to this were: a) a 2-week period in November 2002 when the panels were completely removed and b) all of 2004, where panel damage reduced the amount of excluded rainfall to approximately 30 % (Antonio Carlos Lola da Costa, pers. comm.).
Simulation information:

1. General information:

   a. Coordinates: (Fisher et al. 2007) lat:-1.72, lon:-51.46.
   
   b. Soil depth: 8 meters.
   
   c. Soil type: 78% sand, 15% clay, 7% silt (following mid-values of Fisher et al. 2007).
   
   d. Use free drainage.
   

2. Understanding the interaction between local and regional met driver, and the impacts of drought on an equilibrium forest:

   a. Summary: Similar to TNF, do two sets of simulations; both initialized with bare-ground spin ups. The first set will use the Sheffield met drivers (SHF), the second set will use Site Level met drivers (SOImet). Both sets will cover drought levels ranging from 0% - 90% reduction in above canopy precipitation.

   b. Spin up initialization: Do one bare ground spin up using the SHF met drivers and do one bare ground spin up using the SOImet drivers. Follow the same bare-ground spin up protocol described in the SiteLevelSimulations document. Therefore, spin up to equilibrium (approximately 500yrs) with pre-industrial CO$_2$ (280 ppm) level. Then, perform a transient simulation from 1720 to 2000 with increasing
atmospheric CO$_2$ to present day levels. (Tip: Run theses just like the CAX06 spin ups, except change the soils and coordinates.)

For each set of simulations, use the same met drivers throughout the spin up and manipulation period. The meteorological forcing data should cycle sequentially throughout the spin up and manipulations periods.

**c. Control and drought simulations:** Generate hourly and monthly output following the Moore Simulations Output document. See Table 1 for summary of all simulations.

i. Run a one year baseline period for 2001 using the met year of 2001 for both the SHF and SOImet drivers.

ii. **MONTHLY OUTPUT:** Run these simulations for a total of 8 years (2001-2008) using both meteorological drivers. The first year (2001) is a baseline year where no drought is imposed. Impose the treatment in the second year for the remaining 7 years of the simulation (2002-2008). Reduce above canopy precipitation by 0% (control) and in 10% increments from 10% to 90% for the whole year during the drought period (2002-2008).

iii. **HOURLY OUTPUT:** Run all hourly simulations for three years. Run 0% drought for the baseline year (2001). Then, in the second and third years of the simulation impose all treatment levels (d00 to d90) for the entire year.
Validation biomass and summary of measurements:


Litterfall and coarse woody debris: Metcalfe et al., (2010).


Leaf, stem, root respiration: Metcalfe et al., (2010).

Table A1. Required drought simulations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>base-line yr</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE manipulation years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE BGspin SHEFmet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE BGspin SOImet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE manipulation years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE BGspin SHEFmet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE BGspin SOImet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE BGspin SHEFmet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAX_TFE BGspin SOImet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE BGspin SHEFmet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNF_TFE BGspin SOImet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Notes:
1. In all of the simulations (d00 to d90), include the baseline year with drought level set to 0. Baseline years: CAX: 2001, TNF: 1999.
4. BGspin: drought simulations initialized from a bare ground spin up.
5. SHEFmet: Sheffield meteorological driver.
6. SOImet: Site of interest meteorological driver.

Table A2. Match-up between the met driver year and the year of the simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation year</th>
<th>Meteorological driver year</th>
<th>TNF</th>
<th>CAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHEFmet</td>
<td>SOImet</td>
<td>SHEFmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BGspin</td>
<td>BGspin</td>
<td>BGspin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999*</td>
<td>2004*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * denotes the baseline year (do not impose a drought).
References:

Meteorological forcing data:


Tapajos National Forest


Caxiuana


Appendix B

(as published in New Phytologist)

Chapter 2 Supporting Information: Notes S1–S5, Tables S2.1–S2.4 and Figures S2.1–S2.7.
Table S2.1 Net and component ecosystem carbon fluxes (kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) in the fourth year of the experiment for TNF and CAX. Carbon flux definitions and observation sources are given in Table 2.2. d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The ∆ indicates the amount the control (d0) fluxes were altered by the 50% drought treatment. Observations are the mean ± 95% CI (when reported) of samples collected within each 1 ha plot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flux</th>
<th>CLM3.5</th>
<th>ED2</th>
<th>IBIS</th>
<th>JULES</th>
<th>SIB3</th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>CLM3.5</th>
<th>ED2</th>
<th>IBIS</th>
<th>JULES</th>
<th>SIB3</th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>Obs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGB d0(^1)</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.4 ± 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆AGB d50(^1)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-3.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP d0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.09 ± 0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆NEP d50</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPP d0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.17 ± 0.03</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆GPP d50</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_c) d0</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.26 ± 0.06</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.26 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆R(_c) d50</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_a) d0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.02 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆R(_a) d50</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flux</td>
<td>CLM3.5</td>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>IBIS</td>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>SIB3</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>CAX</td>
<td>CLM3.5</td>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>IBIS</td>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>SIB3</td>
<td>SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_a$ d0</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.24 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R_a$ d50</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_f$ d0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R_f$ d50</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$ d0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R_s$ d50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$ d0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R_s$ d50</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$ d0</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.28 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R_s$ d50</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP $w$ d0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.1 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flux</th>
<th>TNF</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CAX</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLM3.5</td>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>IBIS</td>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>SIB3</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>CLM3.5</td>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>IBIS</td>
<td>JULES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta NPP ) d50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter d0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{Litter} ) d50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.09 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. TNF AGB estimates are for 2005. CAX AGB estimates are for 2001 at the \( d_0 \) level and 2008 at the \( d_{50} \) level, which are the reported years of observations.
Notes S1 Explanation of symbols

Table S2.2 Explanation of symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d0</td>
<td>No drought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d30</td>
<td>30% reduction in precipitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d50</td>
<td>50% reduction in precipitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d80</td>
<td>80% reduction in precipitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆</td>
<td>Difference between drought and reference (e.g. d50-d0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;g&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Leaf-level gross C assimilation</td>
<td>μmol CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;n&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Leaf-level net C assimilation</td>
<td>μmol CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;p&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Leaf-level potential C assimilation (JULES)</td>
<td>μmol CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;GB&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Aboveground biomass</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;j&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Biomass in tissue &lt;i&gt;j&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>g C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;fri&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Fraction of root biomass a soil layer &lt;i&gt;i&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;fri,ap&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Apparent fraction of root biomass a soil layer &lt;i&gt;i&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Total canopy demand for soil water (ED2)</td>
<td>kg H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Maximum evapotranspiration (ED2)</td>
<td>kg H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPP</td>
<td>Gross primary production of carbon</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g&lt;sub&gt;s&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Stomatal conductance of CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mmol CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; leaf s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Index of vertical layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Index of leaf, wood and fine root components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAI</td>
<td>Leaf area index</td>
<td>m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f(N)</td>
<td>Nitrogen limitation function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>Net ecosystem production of carbon</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.2 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPP&lt;sub&gt;W&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Net primary production of carbon in wood</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Autotrophic respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Whole ecosystems respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;g&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Growth respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;h&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Heterotrophic respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;l&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Leaf respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;m&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Maintenance respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Root respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;s&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Soil respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;w&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Wood respiration</td>
<td>kg C m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Supply of available water in layer i (ED2)</td>
<td>kg H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&lt;sub&gt;lf&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Leaf temperature</td>
<td>CLM3.5: °K ED2: °C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Maximum carboxylation capacity of Rubisco</td>
<td>μmol CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-2&lt;/sup&gt; s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD</td>
<td>Vapor pressure deficit</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content in soil layer i</td>
<td>m&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; m&lt;sup&gt;-3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Soil water matric potential in soil layer i</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

model parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a&lt;sub&gt;vmax&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Q10 for $V_{c25}$</td>
<td>CLM: 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;nj&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Carbon to nitrogen ratio in tissue j (leaf, wood, fine roots)</td>
<td>CLM3.5: 29, 330, 29 SPA: 23, 97, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K&lt;sub&gt;w&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Soil-plant conductivity parameter</td>
<td>ED: $1.4260 \times 10^{-5}$ (kg C root)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.2 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V_{c25}$</td>
<td>Value of $V_{cmax}$ at 25 °C</td>
<td>CLM: 76.1</td>
<td>μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SiB: 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Factor that determines strength of $\beta$</td>
<td>IBIS: -5.0</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SiB3: 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_i$</td>
<td>Soil water-stress factor $a$ for soil layer $i$</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_k$</td>
<td>Total soil water-stress factor integrated over the soil column</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_f$</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content at field capacity</td>
<td>CAX: 0.193</td>
<td>m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: 0.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_w$</td>
<td>Volumetric soil water content at the wilting point</td>
<td>CAX: 0.089</td>
<td>m$^3$ m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TNF: 0.246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_{ho}$</td>
<td>Soil matrix potential when stomata are fully open</td>
<td>CLM: -66</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_w$</td>
<td>Soil matrix potential at wilting point</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{CLM}$</td>
<td>Respiration coefficient, rate g C converted g N (see note 1)</td>
<td>CLM: $3.17 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>gC gN$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_f$</td>
<td>Proportionality constant to convert $V_{cmax}$ to $R_{lf}$ (see note 1)</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>unitless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_r$</td>
<td>Root respiration coefficient</td>
<td>ED: 0.528</td>
<td>s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IBIS: $4.76 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Parameter is PFT dependent; value given is for broadleaf tropical trees.
Notes S2 Model specific soil water-stress functions (β)

The model specific β functions used to down-regulate GPP as soils dry are given in Table S3. Two unique features of the β function in CLM3.5 were that it scaled the leaf-level calculation of the maximum carboxylation capacity of Rubisco (V_{cmax}) and it was parameterized for soil matrix potential (ψ). The β calculation of ED2 differed from the other models by including leaf-water demand. Consequently for ED2, β had a hyperbolic functional form with respect to water-stress (i.e. β vs D/S). By contrast, β in the other models followed a sigmoidal shape as water-stress increased (i.e. β vs ψ or θ); however, its sensitivity to available soil moisture differed across models (Fig. 2.9). CLM, IBIS and JULES coupled the amount of soil water drawn from each layer (i) to the root biomass fraction contained in that layer (B_{ri}). By contrast, SiB3 and ED2 did not impose a cap on the amount of water drawn from a single soil layer when θ > θ_w. Both models prioritized water uptake across the different soil layers according to the amount of root biomass in each layer. However, when the supply of water was insufficient in any given soil layer, both models allowed water uptake to be passed onto different soil layers by adjusting the actual fraction of root biomass in each soil layer to an apparent root fraction (B_{ri,apparent}) that reflected the available soil moisture in that layer. In this manner, the relative contribution of water from each soil layer to transpiration was dynamic, thereby representing hydraulic redistribution.

Reference

Table S2.3 Formulations for the soil water-stress functions for CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, JULES and SiB3. Explanations of symbols are given in Table S2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Soil water-stress functions (β)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CLM3.5  | \[ V_{cmax} = V_{c25} (a_{vmax})^{\frac{T_{lf} - 15}{10}} f(T_{lf}) \beta f(N) \]  
\[ \beta_t = \sum_i \beta_i B_{ri} \]  
\[ \beta_i = \left( \frac{\psi_i - \psi_w}{\psi_{x0} - \psi_w} \right) \]  
total \( i = 12 \)                                                                                                               | Oleson et al., 2008 |
| ED2     | \[ A_n = A_g \beta_t - (1 - \beta_t) R_{lf} \]  
\[ \beta_t = \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + S_i} \]  
\[ D = ET_{max} LAI \]  
\[ S_i = K_w \theta_i B_{ri} \]  
total \( i = 16 \)                                                                                                            | Medvigy et al., 2009 |
| IBIS    | \[ A_n = A_g \beta_t - R_{lf} \]  
\[ \beta_t = \sum_i \beta_i B_{ri} \]  
\[ \beta_i = \frac{1 - \exp \left( \frac{\delta_i - \delta_w}{\delta_f - \delta_w} \right)}{1 - \exp (\alpha)} \]  
total \( i = 6 \)                                                                                                           | Foley et al. 1996   |
Table S2.3 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Soil water-stress functions (β)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>$A_n = \beta_t A_p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$A_p = A_g - R_{lf}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta_t = \sum_i \beta_i B_{ri}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta_i = \frac{\theta_i - \theta_w}{\theta_f - \theta_w}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total $i = 4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$V_{cmax} = V_{cmax,0} f(T_{lf}) \beta_t$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | $\beta_t = \sum_i \beta_i B_{rтипа}
dnt$ |
|       | $B_{rтипа} = \left( \frac{1 - \theta_i}{1 - \theta_f} \right) B_{ri}$ |
| SiB3  | |
|       | $\beta_i = \frac{(1+\alpha) \left( \frac{\theta_i - \theta_w}{\theta_f - \theta_w} \right)}{\alpha + \left( \frac{\theta_i - \theta_w}{\theta_f - \theta_w} \right)}$ |
|       | total $i = 10$ |

Notes S3 Model specific autotrophic respiration formulations

Model specific formulations for calculating $R_a$ are given in Table S2.4. Note that the respiration terms in Table S2.4 are calculated at the tissue level and therefore, are in units of μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ tissue s$^{-1}$; while the respiration terms in the main text have been scaled up to the ecosystem and are in the units given in Table S2.2. The description of the
respiration terms given in Table S2.2 applies to both the main text and the Equations in Table S2.4.

Table S2.4 Autotrophic respiration ($R_a$) formulations for CLM3.5, ED2, IBIS, JULES, SiB3 and SPA. Explanations of symbols are given in Table S2.2 but see note above about the units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Respiration functions</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLM3.5</td>
<td>$R_a = R_g + \sum_{j} R_{mj}$</td>
<td>Levis et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{mj} = \gamma_{CLM} \frac{B_j}{cn_j} f(T_j)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_g = 0.25(GPP - \sum_{j} R_{mj})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>$R_a = R_g + R_m$</td>
<td>Mediaevy et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_m = R_{if} + R_r$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{if} = \gamma_{if} V_{max} f(T_{if})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_r = \gamma_r B_r f(T_z)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_g = \max[0, 0.333(GPP - R_m)]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIS</td>
<td>$R_a = R_g + R_m$</td>
<td>Foley et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_m = R_{if} + R_r$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{if} = \gamma_{if} V_{max} f(T_{if})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_r = \gamma_r B_r f(T_z)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_g = 0.30(GPP - R_m)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.4 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Respiration functions</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULES</td>
<td>( R_a = R_g + R_m )</td>
<td>Cox 2001; Clark et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_{mj} = \gamma_{if} V_c max(\beta_e + f(N)) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_g = 0.25(GPP - R_m) )</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta_e = 1 ) for wood and roots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiB3</td>
<td>( R_m = R_{if} + R_r )</td>
<td>Sellers et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_{if} = \gamma_{if} V_c max f(T_{if}) \beta_e )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_r = 0.5GPP - R_{if} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>( R_a = 0.68GPP )</td>
<td>Williams et al., 1996, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_{aj} = R_a \left[ \frac{B_i}{cn_j} \right] )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes S4 TFE site description and C-flux methods

The TFE experiments were comprised of two one-hectare plots, one as a control and one as a treatment. The control and treatment plots were selected to be structurally and floristically similar. The throughfall exclusion system followed the same design for both sites (Nepstad et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2007). Transparent plastic panels (~0.5 m × 3 m) were installed throughout the treatment plot 1–2 m above the forest floor to channel
the intercepted throughfall off site. In total, ~75% of the forest floor was covered by the panels with the remainder being openings around the stems. Stemflow (assumed to be ~1–2% of total rainfall) was allowed to reach the forest floor. The panels caused the forest floor temperature to increase by < 0.3°C. The panels were overturned every 2–3 d to transfer litterfall to the forest floor. One by one meter drainage ditches were installed along the boundary of both plots to duplicate root damage. A deuterium tracer analysis demonstrated that the drainage ditches were effective in preventing trees within the exclusion plot from accessing soil water outside the plot boundary (Nepstad et al., 2002). The panels and gutter system was effective in removing c. 50% of total rainfall measured across a range of storm intensities (quantified at TNF (Nepstad et al., 2002) and assumed to be similar at CAX). The wooden structure supporting the panels was not installed in the control plots. One difference in experimental design between the two sites was that throughfall was only excluded during the wet season (January–June) at TNF, while it was excluded during the entire year at CAX. The TFE experiment ran from 2000 to 2004 in TNF and from 2002 to 2008 in CAX.

For the TNF TFE site, aboveground \( NPP_w \) was estimated using a singular diameter based allometric relationship (Chambers et al., 2001) applied to the annual census of trees in each plot (Brando et al., 2008). Litterfall was collected using 64 0.5 m\(^2\) mesh traps situated on the forest floor in the control plot and above the panels in the treatment plot. \( R_s \) was measured periodically using a dynamic chamber placed on each of 18 pvc soil collars within each plot (Davidson et al., 2008). \( NEP, GPP, \) and \( R_e \) were measured from a nearby eddy covariance tower in a floristically and structurally similar stand (Hutyra et al., 2007).
For the CAX TFE site, aboveground $NPP_w$ was estimated using an average of 8 diameter based allometric relationships (see Table 1 in da Costa et al., 2010) applied to the annual census of trees in each plot (da Costa et al., 2010). Fine litterfall (Metcalfé et al., 2010b) and $R_s$ (Sotta et al., 2007) were collected/measured similar to TNF TFE site with sample sizes of 25 and 16, respectively, within each plot. Canopy leaf biomass was estimated by multiplying $LAI$ by specific leaf area sampled in 2004 and 2007. $R_f$ was estimated for 2005 as the sum of dark and light respiration per unit leaf area scaled up to the canopy by $LAI$ (Metcalfé et al., 2010a, Metcalfé et al., 2010b). The dark respiration component was directly measured from leaves sampled through the canopy in both plots. The light respiration component was estimated as 67% of dark respiration. Stem respiration was estimated in both plots by multiplying a respiration rate of 0.6 μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ stem surface area s$^{-1}$ by the total estimated stem surface area within the plot (Metcalfé et al., 2010b). $R_r$ was estimated in 2005 from measurements of excised roots ≤ 5 mm diameter collected from 0-30 cm soil cores (Metcalfé et al., 2007). These estimates of $R_r$ are likely to be conservative because they do not include deep roots, mycorrhizae and microbial contributions.
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**Notes S5 Soil standardization protocol**

Soil hydraulic parameters, soil matrix potential at saturation (\( \Psi_s \), MPa), hydraulic conductivity at saturation (\( K_s \), m s\(^{-1}\)), and soil water content at saturation (\( \theta_s \), m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\)) were derived following Cosby *et al.* (1984). Volumetric soil water content (m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\)) at field capacity (\( \theta_{fc} \)), wilting point (\( \theta_{wp} \)), and air-dry point (\( \theta_{ad} \)) were derived following Clapp & Hornberger (1978). The hydraulic conductivity at field capacity (\( K_{fc} \)) was defined as 0.1 mm d\(^{-1}\); the soil matrix potential at the wilting point was defined as -1.5 MPa; and, the soil matrix potential at the air-dry point was defined as -3.1 MPa (Clapp & Hornberger 1978). Soil textures used for the simulations were prescribed as reported for each site: TNF had 60% clay and 38% sand (Nepstad *et al*., 2002) and CAX was 15% clay and 78% sand (Fisher *et al*., 2007). All models used 8 m depth and free drainage as the lower boundary condition. This physical standardization successfully yielded a similar soil physical environment across all of the models (B.O. Christoffersen, unpublished). The depth and distribution of roots, a biological property, was, however, model dependent.
Figure S2.1. Monthly rainfall (mm mo\(^{-1}\)) measured at (a) TNF from 2002 to 2004 and (b) CAX from 2001 to 2008 (red line and symbols). The black line and shaded area shows long-term (>30 years) precipitation patterns (mean±stdev.) for each site reported by Rosolem et al., (2008).

Figure S2.2. Change in aboveground biomass (\(AGB, \text{kg C m}^{-2}\)) with an 80% reduction (d80) in precipitation relative to the control (d0) simulations shown in Figure 1. Colored lines are individual model predictions and black line is the 5 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. (a) Tapajós National Forest. (b) Caxiuanã National Forest.
Figure S2.3. Time series of published periodic measurements of soil respiration ($R_s$) for CAX (Sotta et al., 2007) and concurrent individual model estimates for the (a) control (d0) and (b) treatment (d50) plots of CAX. Color lines are individual model predictions and the black line is the 6 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. d0 and d50 are drought levels indicating a 0% and 50% reduction in precipitation. The $\Delta$ plot (b) shows the amount the control (a) $R_s$ was altered by the 50% drought treatment.
Figure S2.4. Annual gross primary production (GPP, kg C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Colored lines are individual model predictions and the black line is the 6 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Drought levels are indicated by d30, d50 and d80, which are respectively 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The \(\Delta\) indicates the amount the d0 carbon fluxes were altered by the indicated drought level.
Figure S2.5. Full 7 year time series of the monthly mean water-stress factor ($\beta$) for (a, b) CLM3.5, (c, d) ED2, (e, f) IBIS, (g, h) JULES, (i, j) SiB3 at each treatment level (colored lines) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side).
Figure S2.6. Annual heterotrophic respiration ($R_h$, kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Colored lines are individual model predictions and the black line is the 6 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Drought levels are indicated by d30, d50 and d80, which are respectively 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The $\Delta$ indicates the amount the $d_0$ carbon fluxes were altered by the indicated drought level. Insets in (g) and (h) show full range for CLM3.5.
Figure S2.7. Annual autotrophic respiration ($R_a$, kg C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) for TNF (left side) and CAX (right side). Colored lines are individual model predictions and the black line is the 6 model ensemble mean. Shaded area is the 95% CI of the models. Drought levels are indicated by d30, d50 and d80, which are respectively 30%, 50% and 80% reductions in precipitation. The ∆ indicates the amount the d0 carbon fluxes were altered by the indicated drought level.
Table S3.1. Leaf and branch sample sizes for each species at each site. Leaves were used to construct the pressure-volume curves shown in Figure 3.1 and branches were used to construct the xylem vulnerability curves shown in Figure 3.4. Sites are indicated by CAX for Caxiuanã and TNF for Tapajós National Forests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Pressure volume curves</th>
<th>Xylem vulnerability curves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site: CAX*</td>
<td>TNF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trees</td>
<td>leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga species</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>15(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschweilera coriacea</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>19(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protium species</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>18(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licania species</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>23(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total sample size of control plus treatment plots. Parentheses indicate sample size from control plots only.
Figure S3.1. Soil water content (SWC, % volume, left axis) at three depths in the rooting zone, 0.5 m (solid), 1.0 m (dash) and 4.0 m (dot), of the control (black) and drought treatment (grey) plots at Caxiua. Soils were 78% sand. Soil moisture was measured continuously over the 8 year study and the differences between plots remained consistent (Fisher et al., 2007). Measurement shown here are from the 7 days immediately preceding the leaf water potential measurements on 18 November 2011. Precipitation (mm, bar) is shown on the right axis.
Figure S3.2. Pressure-volume curves showing the relationship between leaf water potential (MPa) and leaf water loss (mmol H$_2$O cm$^{-2}$) for each plant functional type measured in the control and drought plots at Caxiuanã. (a) *Inga* genus represents early-successional drought-intolerant. (b) *Eschweilera* genus represents late-successional drought-intolerant. (c) *Protium* genus represents early-successional drought-tolerant. (d) *Licania* genus represents late-successional drought-tolerant.
Figure S3.3. Xylem vulnerability curves showing the percent loss in conductance (PLC, %) with decreasing xylem pressure (MPa) for species measured at Caxiuana. The $P_{50}$ values indicate the xylem pressure when 50% of the conductance is lost. (a) *Inga* genus represents early-successional drought-intolerant. (b) *Eschweilera* genus represents late-successional drought-intolerant. (c) *Protium* genus represents early-successional drought-tolerant. (d) *Licania* genus represents late-successional drought-tolerant.
Figure S3.4. Frequency distribution of turgor loss point (TLP) estimates from a 10000 iteration bootstrap of the change point detection routine. Tapajós: grey bars. Caxiuanã: textured bars. (a) *Inga* represents early-successional drought-intolerant. (b) *Eschweilera* represents late-successional drought-intolerant. (c) *Protium* represents early-successional drought-tolerant. (d) *Licania* represents late-successional drought-tolerant.