Title: Evaluation of modeled global vegetation carbon dynamics: analysis based on global carbon flux and above-ground biomass data

Running Title: Evaluation of modeled global vegetation carbon dynamics

Bao-Lin Xue¹, Qinghua Guo^{1,2,*}, Tianyu Hu¹, Guoqiang Wang³, Yongcai Wang¹, Shengli Tao¹, Yanjun Su², Jin Liu¹ and Xiaoqian Zhao¹

¹State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, China

²School of Engineering, Sierra Nevada Research Institute, University of California at Merced, CA 95343, USA

³College of Water Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

Author Agreement:

All authors agree on the authorship of the manuscript and approve the submission.

***Corresponding author:**

Qinghua Guo, Dr., Prof.

State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, China

Tel.: +86-10-6283-6473

Email: guo.qinghua@gmail.com

Abstract

Dynamic global vegetation models are useful tools for the simulation of global carbon cycle. However, most models are hampered by the poor availability of global aboveground biomass (AGB) data, which is necessary for the model calibration process. Here, taking the integrated biosphere simulator model (IBIS) as an example, we evaluated the modeled carbon dynamics, including gross primary production (GPP) and potential AGB, at the global scale. The IBIS model was constrained by both in situ GPP and plot-level AGB data collected from the literature. Model results showed that IBIS could reproduce GPP with acceptable accuracy in monthly and annual scales. At the global scale, the IBIS-simulated total AGB was similar to those obtained in other studies. However, discrepancies were observed between the model-derived and observed AGB for pan-tropical forests. [The bias in modeled AGB was mainly caused by the unchanged parameters over the global scale for a specific plant functional type.](#) This study also showed that different meteorological inputs can introduce substantial differences in modeled AGB in the global scale, although this difference is small compared with parameter-induced differences. The conclusions of our research highlight the necessity of considering the heterogeneity of key model physiological parameters in modeling global AGB.

Keywords: dynamic global vegetation model, integrated biosphere simulator, gross primary production, above-ground biomass, global carbon cycle

1 Introduction

The global terrestrial ecosystem is an important carbon sink that can mitigate the ongoing increases in atmospheric CO₂ concentration (Dixon et al., 1994; Luyssaert et al., 2007; Pan et al., 2011). For example, global forests, which cover around 30% of the land surface, account for ~75% of terrestrial gross primary production (GPP) and ~80% of global plant biomass (Kindermann et al., 2008; Beer et al., 2010). The large carbon stock in the terrestrial ecosystem indicates the need for a reliable description of its current distribution (Keith et al., 2009; Galbraith et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2011; Xue et al., 2011). However, it is still a challenge to accurately estimate the distribution of carbon stocks on the global scale, mainly because of the lack of good observations as well as the unknown mechanisms and/or relative contributions of various factors such as climate change, CO₂ fertilization, and land use change on carbon dynamics (McGuire et al., 2001; Mu et al., 2008).

Various methods have been developed for mapping the global distribution of biomass, and each has its pros and cons. The field inventory method provides the most reliable information on biomass, but it is labor intensive and costly when applied over a large area (e.g., Malhi et al., 2002). Remote-sensing method has advantages over field inventory methods for applications to large areas and in areas that are difficult to access (Lefsky et al., 2005; Thurner et al., 2014; Tao et al., 2014). For example, the light detection and ranging method has recently been used in the Amazon region, with acceptable accuracy (Asner et al., 2010; Saatchi et al., 2011). Nevertheless, researchers found AGB by remote sensing method may deviate much from [field](#) inventory in certain areas (e.g. Mitchard et al., 2014). [As an alternative, the dynamic global vegetation model \(DGVM\) is a useful tool for mapping global biomass and can help predict future variations.](#) In the past, many researchers have

explored how climate change or land use change would influence the global biomass, and this has improved our understanding in the projection of terrestrial responses to climate change. In many cases, the DGVM-modeled potential vegetation biomass is used as a baseline for exploring the corresponding response to the projected climate. Before using the DGVM to project future biomass changes, an evaluation of how the DGVM can reproduce potential (natural) present-day biomass is necessary (Mu et al., 2008; Seiler et al., 2014). However, this is rarely done, mainly because of the lack of available global-scale biomass data. For instance, in many cases, the default values for various physiological parameters are used, and may differ greatly for different DGVMs. The lack of evaluation of modeled biomass on the global scale may result in large differences among global carbon stocks obtained using different models (Cramer et al., 2001; Sitch et al., 2008), resulting in bias in our conclusions regarding vegetation responses in projected climate scenarios (Huntingford et al., 2008; 2013).

Uncertainty in the modeled biomass may originate in various ways: model structure, model parameters, and meteorological inputs. [The results for potential natural vegetation obtained from bioclimatic limits and forest dynamics using the DGVM may give an unrealistic representation of competition among plant functional types \(PFTs\) due to the absence of sophisticated description on disturbances and/or species composition in model structure \(Purves and Pacala, 2008; Seiler et al., 2014\).](#)

A biased PFT in the DGVM partly contributes to the uncertainty in carbon dynamics, including GPP and biomass. Moreover, DGVMs usually use a single set of parameters to represent different biomes and rarely consider spatial heterogeneity (Xiao et al., 2011, 2014). In reality, different physiological parameters vary greatly, depending on the soil type, climate, and vegetation (Castanho et al., 2013). The ways in which this may bias the spatial pattern of carbon flux, and thus biomass accumulation, have not

been sufficiently discussed on the global scale, partly because of the unavailability of biomass data for large areas (Delbart et al., 2010; Wolf et al., 2011).

Recent research has shown that it is necessary to use both carbon flux data and biometric data for DGVM calibration (Kondo et al., 2013; Seiler et al., 2014). Furthermore, uncertainties in DGVM-derived carbon flux and biomass may also arise from the input data itself, such as meteorological forcing data (Barman et al., 2014a, b). Different input data can result in differences among the results obtained using different models when modeling large-scale carbon flux (Zhao et al., 2005). It is therefore necessary to quantify the uncertainty from meteorological inputs in modeled biomass, to improve the modeling results.

The objective of this study is to evaluate model-derived carbon flux and biomass on the global scale using collected carbon flux (GPP) and biomass datasets at the plot level. To do this, we used the integrated biosphere simulator (IBIS; Foley et al., 1996; Kucharik et al., 2000) as an example, and used both carbon flux and collected above-ground biomass (AGB) data to constrain the model. We adopted the most important parameters from meta-analysis, calibration, or literature. We also investigated how different meteorological input data changed the modeling results. Overall, the intention of the current study was to explore the following questions. 1) How accurately can IBIS simulate GPP and AGB, and where does bias originate? 2) Can a single set of calibrated parameters accurately map the patterns of GPP and AGB? 3) What should modelers do to improve the modeling results?

2 Material and methods

2.1 IBIS model

The IBIS model considers the composition and structure of vegetation responses to environmental changes, within an integrated framework, to simulate land surface

hydrological processes, biogeochemical cycles, and terrestrial vegetation dynamics. The model simulates the land surface processes for energy, water, and momentum exchange between soil, vegetation, and the atmosphere, using a land surface transfer scheme (LSX) (Thompson and Pollard, 1995a, b). Two canopy layers, three snow layers, and six soil layers are considered in each grid unit. Evapotranspiration (ET) consists of three components, i.e., canopy transpiration, interception, and evaporation from the ground surface. Vegetation transpiration is calculated using a semi-mechanistic model of stomatal conductance (Ball et al., 1986), which is coupled with canopy carbon assimilation and water exchange between a leaf and the boundary layer to give

$$g_{s,h_2o} = \frac{mA_n}{C_s} h_s + b \quad (1)$$

where A_n is the net photosynthesis rate at leaf level ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), g_{s,h_2o} is the leaf-level stomatal conductance of water vapor ($\mu\text{mol H}_2\text{O m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), C_s is the CO_2 concentration ($\mu\text{mol } \mu\text{mol}^{-1}$) at the leaf surfaces, h_s is the relative humidity at the leaf surface (%), and m and b are empirical parameters.

IBIS represents natural vegetation using PFTs, based on the biomass and leaf area index. Overall, 12 PFTs are defined in IBIS, related to bioclimatic limits, and physiological, morphological, phenological, and life-history criteria governing competition for light and water (Alton, 2011). Different physiological parameters are set for each PFT to quantify factors such as the phenological performance or carbon assimilation and water consumption characteristics (Kucharik et al., 2000). As a result, GPP and thus net primary production (NPP) and vegetation transpiration, are calculated separately for upper (trees) and lower (shrublands and grass) canopies as

$$NPP = (1 - \eta) \int (A_g - R_{leaf} - R_{stem} - R_{root}) dt \quad (2)$$

where A_g is the gross canopy production, η is the fraction of carbon lost by maintenance respiration (fixed value of 0.3), and R_{leaf} , R_{stem} , and R_{root} are leaf, stem, and root respiration, respectively.

The model allows for the coexistence of different PFTs in a single grid cell. However, a dynamic vegetation mechanism is used to simulate annual changes in vegetation structure through PFT competition for light, water, and other nutrient resource pools (Kucharik et al., 2006). The competition among PFTs is driven by differences among carbon balances resulting from phenology, leaf form, and photosynthetic pathways (Foley et al., 1996; Kucharik et al., 2000). On the annual scale, the NPP is allocated among three carbon pools, i.e., leaves, stems (for trees), and roots. The instantaneous change in the biomass pool j of PFT i is represented as

$$\frac{\partial C_{i,j}}{\partial t} = a_{i,j} NPP_i - \frac{C_{i,j}}{\tau_{i,j}} \quad (3)$$

where $a_{i,j}$ is the fraction of annual NPP allocated to the biomass pool and $\tau_{i,j}$ is the carbon residence time of that biomass pool. Note that $a_{i,j}$ is a fixed value in IBIS, but in some other DGVMs (e.g., the Lund–Potsdam–Jena dynamic global vegetation model, Sitch et al., 2003) the NPP is allocated using allometric equations.

A relatively simple phenology module based on accumulated growing degree days (GDD, Botta et al., 2000) is used in the original IBIS. A modified version of the phenology scheme, based on that reported by Jolly et al. (2005), was developed in this study. In detail, the prognostic phenology model is based on the growing season index (GSI), which is decided by three main environmental factors, i.e., temperature, photoperiod, and humidity (Equation 4). The photoperiod is calculated according to the latitude of the model grid and empirical algorithms. We also adopted a 21-day running mean GSI calculated from daily mean meteorological variables, following

Jolly et al. (2005).

$$GSI = f(\overline{T_m}) \times f(\overline{R_g}) \times f(\overline{VPD}) \quad (4)$$

where T_m , R_g , and VPD are multi-day running mean averages of air temperature (°C), solar radiation (W m^{-2}) and vapor pressure deficit (Pa); $f(\overline{T_m})$, $f(\overline{R_g})$, and $f(\overline{VPD})$ vary linearly between the constraining limits 0 and 1, and thus regulate vegetation activity; these functions are defined in Equations (2–4) in Stöckli et al. (2008). The performance of the GSI phenology model would be evaluated by the moderate-resolution imaging spectroradiometer (MODIS) leaf area index (LAI, $\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$) products (MOD15A2, Myneni et al., 1997) for two deciduous forest sites in the following analysis.

2.2 Model input data

In the present study, IBIS was executed globally at a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ latitude–longitude grid resolution. The initial vegetation type was obtained from MODIS MOD12Q1 product (Friedl et al., 2010), and resampled to 0.5° . Soil texture data were obtained from the Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment (<http://www.sage.wisc.edu/download/IBIS/ibis.html>), and was reformatted from the Global Soil Data Products CD-ROM issued by the International Geosphere–Biosphere Programme Data and Information Services. The topographical data were from digital elevation model (DEM) and were obtained from the Shuttle Radar Topographic Mission (<http://srtm.usgs.gov/>), with a resolution of 90 m. We resampled the resolution to 0.5° ($\sim 50 \text{ km}$) as a model grid.

The climate data, including monthly mean air temperature, precipitation, relative humidity, cloudiness, diurnal temperature range, wind speed, and the number of wet days, were obtained from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) climate dataset for 1901

through 2010 (CRUTS3.10, Harris et al. 2014, hereafter CRU). We examined the modeled biomass uncertainty induced by different meteorological datasets using forcing data from Princeton University (<http://hydrology.princeton.edu/data.pgf.php>, hereafter Princeton forcing data) to drive the model. Princeton forcing data does not include wind speed; therefore we use the wind speed data from the Global Land Data Assimilation System covering the period 1948–2010 (<http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/services/grads-gds/gldas>). The Princeton forcing data was developed at a global spatial scale of 0.5° , with a daily timescale. In both cases, we spun-up the model for 190 years (1759–1948) and then conducted transient simulations starting from 1948, and climate data in 1901 were used for the years before this year.

2.3 Model calibration and improvements

We collected site-level GPP data from Fluxnet (<http://fluxnet.ornl.gov/>) to calibrate the IBIS model. Only sites with at least 2-year data were collected, because there may be greater uncertainties for sites that cover shorter than 2 years. Overall, 39 sites were selected, covering tropical, temperate, and boreal forests, and grasslands/croplands (Fig. S1, Table S1). Independent validation of GPP at site and global levels was also conducted by collecting data from Yu et al. (2014) and Jung et al. (2011). Note that IBIS does not simulate croplands explicitly; therefore, croplands were compared with the simulation results for the understory of grasses. The calibration was conducted at both monthly and annual scales.

To constrain the model with both flux and biometric data, we also collected plot-level AGB data from the literature. In this study, we mainly collected plot measurements of AGB from papers published between 1980 and 2010 (Table S2 and Table S3). The allometric equations used in these literatures were based on either

DBH (diameter at breast height) or DBH and tree height. To ensure the in-situ plot measurements were representative to the forest conditions of corresponding locations, the collected plot measurements were further filtered to ensure they were larger than 0.05 ha in size. The records measured through harvesting methods were also excluded from the AGB estimation procedures. In total of 992 and 982 plot samples were retained in this study for the model calibration and independent validation, respectively. The resolution of plot-level data is usually 0.01° , therefore we used the average value as a proxy for a model grid. Note that the model calculates the carbon density (Mg C ha^{-1}) instead of AGB, therefore we calculated AGB (Mg ha^{-1}) by multiplying by a commonly-used factor of 2.0 (IPCC, 2003).

To minimize the number of parameters for calibration, default values provided by Foley et al. (1996) and Kucharik et al. (2000) were used for most parameters. We calibrated parameters the most sensitive to GPP and AGB (Table 1). We mainly calibrated the photosynthesis capacity at 15°C ($v_{\text{max_pft}}$) for different PFTs, as in Castanho et al. (2013). The flux data were mainly for boreal and temperate forests and grassland (including crops), because of the data gaps for tropical forest. We therefore used the parameters derived from literature for tropical forest (Zhu et al., 2011). The parameters were manually calibrated by a [trial and error method](#) to constrain the model simulation of GPP and AGB to match the observations for most sites. Furthermore, we showed the model simulations with default parameters in Kucharik et al. (2000) as a baseline run to evaluate the model improvements after calibration (calibrated run).

PFT	v_{max_pft}	SLA	τ_l	τ_r	τ_w	a_{leaf}	a_{root}	a_{wood}	P_{min}	T_{minL}	T_{minU}	T_{warm}	GDD
1	55	25	1.01	1	60	0.3	0.3	0.4	>5.0	>0.0	–	–	–
2	45	25	1	1	60	0.3	0.3	0.4	–	>0.0	–	–	–
3	40	25	1	1	25	0.3	0.3	0.4	–	>–5.0	<0.0	–	–
4	30	12.5	2	1	35	0.3	0.4	0.3	–	>–45.0	<0.0	–	>1100
5	40	25	1	1	35	0.3	0.3	0.4	–	>–45.0	<0.0	–	>1100
6	25	12.5	2.5	1	52	0.3	0.4	0.3	–	>–57.5	<–45.0	–	>350
7	30	25	1	1	52	0.3	0.3	0.4	–	>–57.5	<–45.0	–	>350
8	35	25	1	1	52	0.3	0.3	0.4	–	–	<–45.0	–	>350
9	27.5	12.5	1.5	1	5	0.45	0.4	0.15	–	–	–	–	>100
10	27.5	25	1	1	5	0.45	0.35	0.2	–	–	–	–	>100
11	15	20	1.25	1	–	0.45	0.55	0	–	–	–	>22.0	>100
12	25	20	1.5	1	–	0.45	0.55	0	–	–	–	–	>100

Table 1 Key PFT-dependent parameters for IBIS calibration. The abbreviations are defined as follows: v_{max_pft} : maximum Rubisco capacity at top of canopy ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$); SLA : specific leaf area ($\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$); τ_l : residence time of foliar biomass (years); τ_r : residence time of root biomass (years); τ_w : residence time of wood biomass (years); a_{leaf} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in foliar biomass (fraction); a_{root} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in root biomass (fraction); a_{wood} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in wood biomass (fraction); P_{min} : monthly minimum precipitation (mm month^{-1}); T_{minL} : absolute minimum temperature (lower limit, $^{\circ}\text{C}$); T_{minU} : absolute minimum temperature (upper limit, $^{\circ}\text{C}$); T_{warm} : temperature of the warmest month ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) (C_4 plants only); GDD : minimum growing degree days above 5 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ threshold for upper-canopy types; minimum growing degree days above 0 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ threshold for lower-canopy types. The plant functional type (PFT) numbers defined in IBIS are as follows: 1, tropical broadleaf evergreen trees; 2, tropical broadleaf drought-deciduous trees; 3, warm-temperate broadleaf evergreen trees; 4, temperate conifer evergreen trees; 5, temperate broadleaf cold-deciduous trees; 6, boreal conifer evergreen trees; 7, boreal broadleaf cold-deciduous trees; 8, boreal conifer cold-deciduous trees; 9, evergreen shrubs; 10: cold-deciduous shrubs; 11, warm (C_4) grasses; and 12, cool (C_3) grasses.

To illustrate how spatial heterogeneous parameter can improve model simulation, we generated a regional woody residence time (τ_w , years) gridded map, which was proved to be sensitive to AGB for pan-tropical forests. The exploration of τ_w was conducted by the Random Forest method (Breiman, 2001), based on collected τ_w data (Table S4) and five ancillary predictors of mean annual temperature, annual precipitation, GPP, evapotranspiration (ET) and DEM. The Random Forest extrapolation method was implemented based on the “randomForest” R package (Liaw and Wiener, 2002), which includes both classification and regression functions. Long-term climatological temperature and precipitation data (1950–2005) were obtained from WorldClim (<http://www.worldclim.org/>) with a resolution of 1 km. The GPP and ET datasets (1 km resolution) were both available from the Numerical Terradynamic Simulation Group website (<http://www.ntsg.umd.edu/biblio>). The resulting pan-tropical τ_w gridded map was in 1 km resolution and was resampled to 0.5° for model simulation.

3 Results

3.1 Phenology model

We compared the model simulated LAI by the IBIS default (GDD) and GSI phenology models with MODIS values for two forest sites (Fig. 1). Both of the two phenology models can generally reproduce the LAI seasonal variation, even though lower values in dormancy season are overestimated for the boreal site. For both sites, GSI phenology model results in a lower RMSE for simulated LAI when compared with values by GDD model (Fig. 1). Furthermore, a longer growing season is observed with GDD model when compared with GSI model and MODIS observations. This may induce overestimated GPP for the model simulations.

274

275 **Fig. 1** Comparison of LAI for growing degree day (GDD, red line) and growing season index (GSI, green line) phenology models for the site of
 276 (a) US-Ha1 and (b) US-WCr. MODIS 8-day LAI values are also shown for comparison (points). RMSE (m²m⁻²) for the two sites are also shown
 277 for GDD (RMSE_{GDD}) and GSI (RMSE_{GSI}) models.

3.2 Calibration and validation by GPP

The model performs well for most sites after calibration (Table 2). All forest sites (PFTs 2,4,5 and 6) have determination coefficients (R^2) above 0.6 for GPP at the monthly scale except for US-Goo and US-SP2. The model simulates upper canopy (forests) better than lower canopy (shrubs and grasses, PFTs 10 and 12), with large R^2 and small deviations from 1 for the GPP slope (Table 2).

Longitude	Latitude	Sites	PFT	Years	GPP (gC m ⁻² mon ⁻¹)				
					<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	R^2	average	nRMSE
131.15	-12.49	Au-How	2	2001-2006	1.54	-64.90	0.73	118.03	0.42
-68.75	45.21	US-Ho2	4	1999-2004	1.11	-2.42	0.97	109.70	0.17
-121.56	44.45	US-Me2	4	2002-2007	0.74	6.91	0.93	115.63	0.14
-121.61	44.32	US-Me3	4	2004-2005	1.14	14.96	0.91	69.83	0.26
-121.57	44.44	US-Me5	4	2000-2002	1.18	12.55	0.90	67.43	0.27
-76.67	35.80	US-NC2	4	2005-2006	0.64	62.28	0.85	214.19	0.12
-105.55	40.03	US-NR1	4	1998-2007	0.53	11.09	0.70	57.97	0.38
-89.87	34.25	US-Goo	5	2002-2006	0.54	128.53	0.48	111.36	0.48
-72.17	42.54	US-Ha1	5	1992-2006	0.65	67.39	0.69	112.92	0.53
-89.98	46.08	US-Los	5	2001-2005	0.74	98.07	0.52	57.45	1.31
-72.19	42.54	US-LPH	5	2002-2005	0.56	82.25	0.57	100.79	0.73
-86.41	39.32	US-MMS	5	1999-2006	0.67	89.27	0.70	106.09	0.51
-92.20	38.74	US-MOz	5	2004-2007	0.60	86.36	0.69	111.01	0.45
-82.24	29.76	US-SP2	5	1998-2004	0.27	160.04	0.25	164.57	0.22
-89.35	46.24	US-Syv	5	2001-2006	0.91	38.40	0.83	97.90	0.47
-84.29	35.96	US-WBW	5	1995-1999	0.52	113.58	0.61	120.79	0.43
-90.08	45.81	US-WCr	5	1999-2006	0.78	54.64	0.75	95.38	0.62
-98.48	55.88	CA-NS1	6	2002-2005	1.80	13.11	0.87	43.93	0.83
-98.52	55.91	CA-NS2	6	2001-2005	1.41	24.90	0.56	43.21	1.52
-98.38	55.91	CA-NS3	6	2001-2005	1.65	17.76	0.77	39.08	1.21
-98.38	55.91	CA-NS4	6	2002-2004	2.59	12.25	0.95	26.35	0.81
-98.49	55.86	CA-NS5	6	2001-2005	1.53	12.36	0.94	50.06	0.46
-99.95	56.64	CA-NS7	6	2002-2005	2.31	45.05	0.72	20.05	2.82
-121.95	45.82	US-Wrc	6	1998-2006	0.93	-7.75	0.81	132.51	0.26
-110.51	31.59	US-Aud	10	2002-2006	0.82	49.34	0.49	2.90	14.52
-155.75	68.49	US-Ivo	10	2003-2006	1.65	9.08	0.57	11.54	2.41
-80.67	28.61	US-KS2	10	2000-2006	0.45	148.76	0.36	149.80	0.17
-116.64	33.38	US-SO4	10	2004-2006	1.32	37.85	0.31	23.15	1.84
-120.95	38.41	US-Var	10	2001-2007	0.62	59.95	0.72	58.81	0.56
-98.04	35.55	US-ARb	12	2005-2006	0.27	103.38	0.34	98.60	0.46

-98.04	35.55	US-ARc	12	2005-2006	0.32	98.57	0.32	96.86	0.48
-97.49	36.61	US-ARM	12	2003-2006	0.80	106.17	0.28	45.01	1.28
-96.84	44.35	US-Bkg	12	2004-2006	1.05	62.24	0.59	57.29	1.21
-88.29	40.01	US-Bo1	12	1996-2007	0.33	123.55	0.26	94.47	0.94
-105.10	48.31	US-FPe	12	2000-2006	0.68	44.69	0.18	19.06	2.95
-93.09	44.71	US-Ro1	12	2004-2006	0.37	116.91	0.25	78.58	1.30
-93.09	44.72	US-Ro3	12	2004-2006	0.50	96.89	0.40	96.42	0.94
-109.94	31.74	US-Wkg	12	2004-2007	1.22	44.34	0.25	25.98	2.62
-96.86	37.52	US-Wlr	12	2001-2004	0.78	86.50	0.65	86.99	0.55

Table 2 Comparison of observed and model-derived gross primary production (GPP; $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ month}^{-1}$) for 39 sites. The regression coefficients of slope (a), intercept (b), R^2 , monthly average GPP (average) and normalized root-mean-square error (nRMSE, ratio of RMSE to average) are also shown. The PFT definitions are the same as in Table 1.

At the annual-scale, there are strong correlations between the model simulated and in situ GPP for both baseline and calibrated runs (Fig. 2). In both runs, the simulations overestimate small values and underestimate large values compared with the in-situ observations. Compared with the baseline run, the calibrated model reduces the root mean square error (RMSE) from 599.3 to 522.9 $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$. The overestimation of low values is also observed for independent validation by collected GPP from the literature (Fig. 2c). When GPP were below 500 $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$, the simulated GPP are around twice the observed values. This systematic error may be caused by the overestimated LAI from both of the two phenology models (Fig. 1).

Fig. 2 Comparison of annual observed and modeled GPP ($\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$) for (a) baseline run with default parameters from Kucharik et al. (2000), (b) calibrated run with parameters in Table 1 and (c) independent validation. The dashed line shows the 1:1 line.

We further validated the simulated annual GPP with that from Jung et al. (2011) at the global scale (Fig. 3). The GPP were scaled up from flux tower values using the machine-learning technique reported in Jung et al. (2011) at the same resolution as our model grid ($0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$). The modeled global average GPP is $1112 \pm 18 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$ for 2000–2010; this is larger than the value reported by Jung et al. (2011) ($933 \pm 46 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$). The corresponding total global GPP during this period is $142 \pm 2.4 \text{ PgC year}^{-1}$ for the model simulation. The modeled GPP for Amazonian and African tropical areas are usually above $2800 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$, whereas the value for tropical forests in southeastern Asia are usually above $3200 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$. Our model simulation values are $\sim 200 \text{ gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$ larger than those reported by Jung et al. (2011) for most areas, especially for areas with small GPP (Fig. 3b). This difference is even larger in southern China and the southern US. In contrast, the GPP is less than that reported by Jung et al. (2011) for southern Amazonian areas.

Fig. 3 (a) Modeled GPP ($\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ year}^{-1}$) averaged for 2000-2010; (b) difference between modeled value and that reported by Jung et al. (2011).

3.3 Calibration and validation by plot-level biomass

Fig. 4 shows the comparison of the modeled biomass with plot-level observations for baseline run, calibration run and independent validation. [Each point shows a pair of values from a certain simulated IBIS grid cell and an averaged value of all the plots within this grid cell.](#) The simulations show significant correlations in all cases but with overestimated low values and underestimated large ones for the baseline run. In comparison, the calibrated run improves the simulation for large AGB; but was also subjected to widely scattering. Fig. 4c shows an independent validation of the modeled biomass by plot-level observations. The plots are mainly from measured AGB from natural forests in China. The regression relationship is significant, but also has large scattering in the validation. Overall, the model seems to underestimate large

values, but overestimate small values (below 50 Mg ha⁻¹).

Fig. 4 Comparison of observed and modeled AGB (Mg ha⁻¹) for (a) baseline run with default parameters from Kucharik et al. (2000), (b) calibrated run with parameters in Table 1, and (c) independent validation. The dashed line shows the 1:1 line. Each point in the figure indicates the AGB measured in one or more plots (average for more than one plot) within a 0.5° × 0.5° model grid.

3.4 Global and regional AGB

Using the calibrated parameters, we simulate the spatial pattern of global AGB (upper- and under story, Fig. 5a). The global average biomass is 81.73 Mg ha⁻¹, with the largest values in tropical areas and the lowest in boreal areas. The global map of AGB shows large heterogeneity, which is similar to the case for global GPP patterns. The zonal AGB within each 0.5° latitude interval shows a large fluctuation (Fig. 5b). Two maxima of 278.44 and 112.17 Mg ha⁻¹ are found around 1.25° S and 56.25° N, respectively when model is driven by Princeton forcing data. AGB differences induced by the two meteorological forcing data are small.

Fig. 5 (a) Modeled global patterns of AGB (Mg ha⁻¹) averaged for 2000–2010 and (b) latitudinal AGB patterns. Red line: modeled AGB by Princeton forcing data; blue line: CRU forcing data. The shaded zones show the standard deviation for each model run.

Based on the collected τ_w , we generate a pan-tropical gridded τ_w map by integrating other variables as predictive variables of the Random Forest method. τ_w exhibits large spatial heterogeneity, with an average value of 55.8 years over the pan-tropical forests (Fig. 6a). Large values of τ_w are found in eastern Amazonian forest areas and Bornean tropical rainforests. Areas with a large τ_w also exhibit a large degree of uncertainty (Fig. 6b). The estimated τ_w values in Amazonian forests show a west–east increasing gradient as highlighted by other authors (Galbraith *et al.*, 2013).

Correspondingly, the model simulation of AGB with the gridded τ_w map also shows a west–east increasing gradient compared with the results by calibrated τ_w (Fig. 6c). The estimated τ_w for central African forests has a moderate value of about 40 years with lower simulated AGB accordingly.

Fig. 6 Spatial patterns of (a) estimated woody residence time (τ_w , years) based on collected field data, (b) uncertainty of estimated τ_w , and (c) simulated AGB by estimated τ_w for pan-tropical areas. The uncertainty is estimated as the standard deviation of the resulting τ_w when 75% of the collected field plot data was randomly selected in each of 100 random forest simulation model runs. The estimated τ_w has a 1 km resolution and was resampled to $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ when used as parameters for IBIS simulations in this study.

The model performance of simulated AGB with ‘_default’, calibrated and our estimated τ_w for tropical forests plots are also compared (Fig. 7). Each point in Fig. 7 indicates one or more plots that are located in the same IBIS grid ($0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$). The simulated AGB using default τ_w showed large scattering, with underestimation for large amounts of AGB. Actually, the default τ_w resulted in many amounts of small AGB (close to 0), which indicates a wrong PFT for the model simulation. The calibrated model run improves compared with baseline run; but is still with large

scattering and RMSE (73.1 Mg ha^{-1}). The resulting AGB from the improved τ_w has a relatively close relationship with plot values, even though underestimation can still be observed when AGB is above 400 Mg ha^{-1} (Fig. 7c). Compared with the results from the calibrated run, the RMSE of AGB is reduced to 55.4 Mg ha^{-1} when model uses the estimated τ_w .

Fig. 7 Comparison of observed and model simulated AGB by (a) default; (b) calibrated and (c) estimated τ_w . Each point in the figure indicates the AGB measured in one or more plots (average for more than one plot) within a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ model grid. Observed AGB was mostly measured during 1990–2010 and the model simulations were the averaged values during those corresponding years. The dashed line shows the 1:1 line.

Four Fluxnet sites, representing different woody PFTs, were randomly selected to test the AGB uncertainties due to τ_w (Table 2, Fig. 8). Five hundred τ_w values were randomly chosen between the default and calibrated values using the Monte Carlo method. The simulated AGB is shown to be sensitive to τ_w for all sites, resulting in a large variation in τ_w by the year of 2010. All the sites show an increasing trend during the test runs, except for the tropical deciduous site (Au-How). Variations in AGB are around 50 Mg ha^{-1} by 2010 for the two temperate PFTs (Us-Me2 and US-Ha1), indicating large uncertainties caused by τ_w . This further reveals the necessity to accurate estimate τ_w for model simulation.

Fig. 8 Simulated temporal trends of AGB during 1759–2010 for different Plant Function Types (PFTs) by IBIS. The green lines show the 500 test runs using the random τ_w data ranging between the default and calibrated values; the red line shows the result of the calibrated τ_w . All the test sites were randomly selected from Fluxnet; details of the sites are provided in Table 1.

3.5 Global AGB driven by CRU meteorological data

Fig. 9 displays the spatial pattern of the difference between AGB driven by Princeton forcing data and CRU data. Most areas of the globe show AGB differences within 20 Mg ha^{-1} (averaged as 12.83) according to the two meteorological datasets. Large differences are observed in savanna regions (MODIS UMD classification scheme) in South America and central Africa, and shrublands in northeastern Siberia (Fig. 9). In these areas, the AGB driven by daily meteorological data (Princeton forcing data) is significantly larger than those derived from CRU data. In contrast, in most tropical areas, the AGB derived from Princeton forcing dataset is smaller than

those derived from CRU datasets. Most of the grids show a relative difference within $\pm 20\%$ with largest frequency occurs for relative difference of 10 % (Fig. 9b).

Fig.9 (a) Difference between model-derived AGB driven by Princeton forcing data and CRU meteorological datasets and (b) relative difference frequency.

4 Discussion

4.1 Estimation of GPP and AGB

We used a single set of model parameters to estimate the global GPP and AGB. Both calibration and independent validation results show overestimation of GPP for low values, especially when annual GPP is below 500 gCm⁻²year⁻¹ (Fig. 2). A global cross comparison with Jung et al. (2011) indicates similar patterns in GPP but also indicates overestimations for temperate forests in US and southern China (Fig. 3). The

discrepancies may be mainly due to the fact that we used a spatially and temporally invariant parameter, i.e. $vmax_pft$ for a given PFT at the global scale; whereas in reality $vmax_pft$ might be highly dynamic (Wilson et al., 2000; Castanho et al., 2013; Restrepo-Coupe et al., 2017). Moreover, only Fluxnet data from North America (boreal and temperate forest) were used to calibrate the model for worldwide simulations of carbon dynamics mainly due to the data availability (Table 1). Specially, the flux data for tropical forests are usually confronted with large data gaps (e.g. Kumagai et al., 2006), which makes it difficult for model calibration. Therefore, more field observations and proper extrapolation of the parameter are needed for model improvement of simulations in global GPP.

The IBIS model does not calculate the global AGB directly, but calculates the carbon density. We therefore compared our model-derived carbon density with those from other studies. Our model-derived carbon density is 12% smaller than that reported by Pan et al. (2011) on the global scale (82.96 compared with 94.2 Mg C ha^{-1}), and this results in a smaller global carbon stock (Table 3). Pan et al. (2011) calculated the carbon density, using the forest inventory method, for the period 1990–2007; their estimated value of 94.2 Mg C ha^{-1} includes both above- and below-ground biomass. Previous research showed that ~80% of the total biomass is in AGB and ~20% is in below-ground biomass for forest ecosystems on the global scale (Cairns et al., 1997). This indicates that the global above-ground carbon density is ~75 Mg C ha^{-1} for Pan et al. (2011). This value is comparable to our modeling result. The difference between the global carbon stocks in AGB may arise from the different forest areas used by Pan et al. (2011) and in our study (MODIS derived). The forest areas were 3851.3×10^6 and 3332.35×10^6 ha in Pan et al.'s study and our study, respectively. Further comparisons of the regional-scale carbon density with those

from three other studies show that values in our study and those reported by Pan et al. (2011) are larger. The carbon densities reported by Goodale et al. (2002) and Liski et al. (2003) are around 30% smaller than those reported by Thurner et al. (2014) and in our study for European forests. In contrast, for North American forests, the carbon densities reported by Pan et al. (2011) and in our study are similar, and larger than those in the other three studies. These comparisons with other studies show that the IBIS-model-derived carbon density gives reasonable results on the global scale and can therefore be used as an independent tool for validating AGB estimations by other methods.

Source	Method	Forest Carbon Density (Mg C ha ⁻¹)			Carbon Stock (Pg)
		Europe	North America	Global	Global
Goodale et al.(2002)	Forest Inventory	38.8	44.6		
Liski et al.(2003)	Forest Inventory	43	43		
Thurner et al.(2014)	Remote Sensing	60.8±22.4	45.3±17.1		
Pan et al.(2011)	Forest Inventory	60.5 (48.4)	68.7 (54.9)	94.2 (75.4)	362.6 (290.1)
This Study	Model	59.24±20.04	53.74±36.39	82.96	276.5

Table 3 Comparison of model-derived forest carbon density (Mg C ha⁻¹) with those from other studies. Pan et al. (2001) calculated carbon densities for both above- and below-ground biomass. Numbers in brackets for Pan et al. (2011) show the AGB values assuming that the AGB accounts for 80% of total biomass density.

4.2 Influences of woody residence time on modeled AGB

A comparison of the observed and modeled AGB for pan-tropical forests shows that the spatial patterns in the modeling results are biased (Figs. 6 and 7). Though our plot-level calibration shows a significant relationship between modeled and plot level data, the calibration and validation points are subject to scatter. The results show that the model tends to underestimate AGB when AGB is large (Figs. 4 and 7). [The large scattering may be caused by the difference in spatial resolution between the site location \(0.01°\) and the model grid \(0.5°\). Furthermore, IBIS model uses only one parameter to represent a PFT; while in reality, spatial patterns of these parameters are heterogeneous.](#) Similar R^2 values were reported by Seiler et al. (2013) for a

regional-scale model calibration in Bolivia. The calibration results indicate that a single value of τ_w in the model cannot reproduce the spatial variance of AGB in a large scale. When estimated gridded τ_w for pan-tropical forests was used for model simulation, the resulted AGB improves with a smaller RMSE (Figs. 6 and 7). Similar research by Castanho et al. (2013) showed that the woody residence time is the most important parameter in determining the spatial variance in modeled AGB in this area. Further investigation using a spatial pattern of τ_w in IBIS greatly improved the modeled AGB, with R^2 changing from 0.33 to 0.88 (Castanho et al., 2013). These and the presented results indicate that to improve the model simulation accuracy, modelers should consider the spatial heterogeneity of the most important parameters in the model used, especially for large-scale simulations.

To investigate how our mapped parameters (i.e. τ_w) improved model simulations, we further compared our modeled AGB with products from published literature for the pan-tropical forest areas (Fig. 10). The pixel-level differences are mixed, with positive and negative values for all the products. Least and largest differences are found between our AGB product (212.5 Mg ha⁻¹) and those from Baccini et al. (2012) and Hu et al. (2016), with averages of -2.46 (1.2%) and -92.49 Mg ha⁻¹ (43.5%), respectively. Our modeled AGB is lower than that from Hu et al. (2016) in most of the areas, especially in eastern Amazon and central Africa (Fig. 10d). Actually, AGB in Hu et al. (2016) was estimated by the extrapolation of undisturbed plot values using remote sensing data and was found to be larger than the other three products (Hu et al., 2016). Overall, our modeled AGB has high similarity with the other four products in spatial patterns (Fig. S2). On the other hand, all the four products in Fig.10 are with high resolution originally (1 km or 500 m) and the aggregation may introduce uncertainty, which makes it difficult for comparison.

Fig. 10 The difference map between our modeled AGB product and those from (a) Saatchi et al. (2011); (b) Baccini et al. (2012); (c) Avitabile et al. (2015); and (d) Hu et al. (2016) in pan-tropical forest areas. All the maps are aggregated to $0.5^{\circ} \times 0.5^{\circ}$ for comparison.

4.3 Influences of meteorological data on modeled AGB

Climate-data-driven uncertainties in modeling carbon and energy cycles have previously been analyzed (Zhao et al., 2005; Barman et al., 2014a, b). A systematic analysis based on various global vegetation models and meteorological data showed that substantial changes in the modeled GPP were observed for different meteorological inputs in regional simulations in Europe (Jung et al., 2007). Substantial differences in GPP were observed by different meteorological drivers. A similar analysis by Barman et al. (2014b) showed that the differences in site-level GPP caused by different meteorological drivers were $\sim 20\%$ of the annual GPP. This was mainly caused by biases in short-wave radiation and humidity for various meteorological drivers tested in the study. The relative differences caused by different climate drivers are generally within $\pm 20\%$ in this study (Fig. 3). These differences are smaller than the relative errors induced by the invariant parameters over the

pan-tropical forest. This indicates that to improve the model simulation accuracy, modelers should pay attention to both model parameter calibration and metrological drivers, with a focus on the former.

Data availability is one of the main reasons that few global model simulations use plot-level data to constrain the model (Seiler et al., 2014). We collected plot-level AGB data from the literature, and used them to calibrate and validate IBIS on the global scale. The plot resolution was generally $0.01\text{--}0.1^\circ$ ($\sim 1\text{--}10$ km). In the validation, we used measured single-point values as a proxy for a model grid average (~ 2500 km²), and the model results were observed to over- and underestimate AGB for low and large values, respectively (Figs. 4 and 7). Note that even over a small area, AGB may vary greatly because of local soil type, land use variability, and local water availability (Baker et al., 2004). Therefore, the difference between the spatial scales of the plot level and our model simulation grid may partly explain the small R^2 . Further investigations of model simulations at different spatial resolution (especially at high resolution) are therefore necessary to facilitate model calibration by higher spatial resolution AGB datasets. Furthermore, the plot points used for calibration are from natural forests, with little human disturbance, therefore our modeling results represent the potential value under current climate conditions (e.g., Mu et al., 2008; Seiler et al., 2014). Two possible reasons may explain the differences in AGB among the listed studies and our model results in Table 3: (1) AGB in the other studies are present-day values and may be influenced by human activities; while IBIS does not explicitly simulate human disturbances; (2) AGB from our model results are values that assuming forests are near equilibrium and in reality secondary and/or human planted forests are found in North America and China and AGB for these forests were usually below equilibrium values (Liu et al., 2014; Malhi et al., 2012). Therefore, more work

should be done to improve the model structure in the description of forest disturbances and thus the simulation of AGB in future.

Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 41301020) and the National Key Basic Research Program of China (2013CB956604). We are grateful to the PIs and Co-Is of FLUXNET who make their data freely available to the ecological modelling community through the FLUXNET archive (<http://fluxnet.ornl.gov/>), in particular by the following networks: AmeriFlux (U.S. Department of Energy, Biological and Environmental Research, Terrestrial Carbon Program (DE-FG02-04ER63917 and DE-FG02-04ER63911)), AfriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, CarboEuropeIP, CarboItaly, CarboMont, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada (supported by CFCAS, NSERC, BIOCAP, Environment Canada, and NRCan), GreenGrass, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux, TCOS-Siberia, USCCC. We acknowledge the financial support to the eddy covariance data harmonization provided by CarboEuropeIP, FAO-GTOS-TCO, iLEAPS, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, National Science Foundation, University of Tuscia, Université Laval, Environment Canada and US Department of Energy and the database development and technical support from Berkeley Water Center, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Microsoft Research eScience, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, University of California – Berkeley and the University of Virginia.

References

- Alton, P.B., 2011. How useful are plant functional types in global simulations of the carbon, water, and energy cycles? *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences*, 116.
- Asner, G.P. et al., 2010. High-resolution forest carbon stocks and emissions in the Amazon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(38): 16738-16742.
- Avitabile, V. et al., 2016. An integrated pan-tropical biomass map using multiple reference datasets. *Global Change Biology*, 22(4): 1406-1420.
- Baccini, A. et al., 2012. Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from tropical deforestation improved by carbon-density maps. *Nature Clim. Change*, 2(3): 182-185.
- Baker, T.R. et al., 2004. Variation in wood density determines spatial patterns in Amazonian forest biomass. *Global Change Biology*, 10(5): 545-562.
- Ball J.T., W.I.E.a.B.J.A., 1987. A model predicting stomatal conductance and its contribution to the control of photosynthesis under different environmental conditions. In: B. J. (Editor). Springer, New York, pp. 221-224.
- Barman, R., Jain, A.K. and Liang, M., 2014a. Climate-driven uncertainties in modeling terrestrial energy and water fluxes: a site-level to global-scale analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 20(6): 1885-1900.
- Barman, R., Jain, A.K. and Liang, M., 2014b. Climate-driven uncertainties in modeling terrestrial gross primary production: a site level to global-scale analysis. *Global Change Biology*, 20(5): 1394-1411.
- Beer, C. et al., 2010. Terrestrial Gross Carbon Dioxide Uptake: Global Distribution

594 and Covariation with Climate. *Science*, 329(5993): 834-838.

595 Botta, A., Viovy, N., Ciais, P., Friedlingstein, P. and Monfray, P., 2000. A global
 596 prognostic scheme of leaf onset using satellite data. *Global Change Biology*,
 597 6(7): 709-725.

598 Breiman, L., 2001. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1): 5-32.

599 Cairns, M.A., Brown, S., Helmer, E.H. and Baumgardner, G.A., 1997. Root biomass
 600 allocation in the world's upland forests. *Oecologia*, 111(1): 1-11.

601 Castanho, A.D.A. et al., 2013. Improving simulated Amazon forest biomass and
 602 productivity by including spatial variation in biophysical parameters.
 603 *Biogeosciences*, 10(4): 2255-2272.

604 Cox, P.M. et al., 2008. Increasing risk of Amazonian drought due to decreasing
 605 aerosol pollution. *Nature*, 453(7192): 212-U7.

606 Cramer, W. et al., 2001. Global response of terrestrial ecosystem structure and
 607 function to CO₂ and climate change: results from six dynamic global
 608 vegetation models. *Global Change Biology*, 7(4): 357-373.

609 Delbart, N. et al., 2010. Mortality as a key driver of the spatial distribution of
 610 aboveground biomass in Amazonian forest: results from a dynamic vegetation
 611 model. *Biogeosciences*, 7(10): 3027-3039.

612 Dixon, R.K. et al., 1994. CARBON POOLS AND FLUX OF GLOBAL FOREST
 613 ECOSYSTEMS. *Science*, 263(5144): 185-190.

614 Foley, J.A. et al., 1996. An integrated biosphere model of land surface processes,
 615 terrestrial carbon balance, and vegetation dynamics. *Global Biogeochemical*
 616 *Cycles*, 10(4): 603-628.

617 Friedl, M.A. et al., 2010. MODIS Collection 5 global land cover: Algorithm
 618 refinements and characterization of new datasets. *Remote Sensing of*

619 Environment, 114(1): 168-182.

620 Galbraith, D. et al., 2010. Multiple mechanisms of Amazonian forest biomass losses
621 in three dynamic global vegetation models under climate change. New
622 Phytologist, 187(3): 647-665.

623 Goodale, C.L. et al., 2002. Forest carbon sinks in the Northern Hemisphere.
624 Ecological Applications, 12(3): 891-899.

625 Harris, I., Jones, P.D., Osborn, T.J. and Lister, D.H., 2014. Updated high-resolution
626 grids of monthly climatic observations – the CRU TS3.10 Dataset.
627 International Journal of Climatology, 34(3): 623-642.

628 Houghton, R.A., 2005. Aboveground forest biomass and the global carbon balance.
629 Global Change Biology, 11(6): 945-958.

630 Hu, T. et al., 2016. Mapping Global Forest Aboveground Biomass with Spaceborne
631 LiDAR, Optical Imagery, and Forest Inventory Data. Remote Sensing,
632 8(7):565.

633 Huntingford, C. et al., 2008. Towards quantifying uncertainty in predictions of
634 Amazon 'dieback'. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society
635 B-Biological Sciences, 363(1498): 1857-1864.

636 Huntingford, C. et al., 2013. Simulated resilience of tropical rainforests to
637 CO₂-induced climate change. Nature Geoscience, 6(4): 268-273.

638 Jolly, W.M., Nemani, R. and Running, S.W., 2005. A generalized, bioclimatic index to
639 predict foliar phenology in response to climate. Global Change Biology, 11(4):
640 619-632.

641 Jung, M. et al., 2011. Global patterns of land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon dioxide,
642 latent heat, and sensible heat derived from eddy covariance, satellite, and
643 meteorological observations. Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences,

644 116.

645 Jung, M. et al., 2007. Uncertainties of modeling gross primary productivity over
646 Europe: A systematic study on the effects of using different drivers and
647 terrestrial biosphere models. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 21(4).

648 Keith, H., Mackey, B.G. and Lindenmayer, D.B., 2009. Re-evaluation of forest
649 biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests.
650 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
651 *America*, 106(28): 11635-11640.

652 Kindermann, G. et al., 2008. Global cost estimates of reducing carbon emissions
653 through avoided deforestation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
654 *Sciences of the United States of America*, 105(30): 10302-10307.

655 Kondo, M. et al., 2013. The role of carbon flux and biometric observations in
656 constraining a terrestrial ecosystem model: a case study in disturbed forests in
657 East Asia. *Ecological Research*, 28(5): 893-905.

658 Kucharik, C.J. et al., 2000. Testing the performance of a Dynamic Global Ecosystem
659 Model: Water balance, carbon balance, and vegetation structure. *Global*
660 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 14(3): 795-825.

661 Kumagai, T. et al., 2006. Modeling CO₂ exchange over a Bornean tropical rain forest
662 using measured vertical and horizontal variations in leaf-level physiological
663 parameters and leaf area densities. *Journal of Geophysical*
664 *Research-Atmospheres*, 111(D10).

665 Lefsky, M.A. et al., 2005. Estimates of forest canopy height and aboveground biomass
666 using ICESat. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(22).

667 Liski, J. et al., 2003. Increased carbon sink in temperate and boreal forests. *Climatic*
668 *Change*, 61(1-2): 89-99.

669 Liu, D. et al., 2014. The contribution of China's Grain to Green Program to carbon
670 sequestration. *Landscape Ecology*, 29(10): 1675-1688.

671 Luyssaert, S. et al., 2007. CO₂ balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical forests
672 derived from a global database. *Global Change Biology*, 13(12): 2509-2537.

673 Malhi, Y. et al., 2002. An international network to monitor the structure, composition
674 and dynamics of Amazonian forests (RAINFOR). *Journal of Vegetation*
675 *Science*, 13(3): 439-450.

676 Malhi, Y. (2012) The productivity, metabolism and carbon cycle of tropical forest
677 vegetation. *Journal of Ecology*, 100: 65-75.

678 Mitchard, E.T.A. et al., 2014. Markedly divergent estimates of Amazon forest carbon
679 density from ground plots and satellites. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*,
680 23(8): 935-946.

681 McGuire, A.D. et al., 2001. Carbon balance of the terrestrial biosphere in the
682 twentieth century: Analyses of CO₂, climate and land use effects with four
683 process-based ecosystem models. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15(1):
684 183-206.

685 Mu, Q., Zhao, M., Running, S.W., Liu, M. and Tian, H., 2008. Contribution of
686 increasing CO₂ and climate change to the carbon cycle in China's
687 ecosystems. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences*, 113(G1).

688 Myneni, R.B., Nemani, R.R. and Running, S.W., 1997. Estimation of global leaf area
689 index and absorbed par using radiative transfer models. *Ieee Transactions on*
690 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 35(6): 1380-1393.

691 Pan, Y. et al., 2011. A Large and Persistent Carbon Sink in the World's Forests.
692 *Science*, 333(6045): 988-993.

693 Pan, Y., Birdsey, R.A., Phillips, O.L. and Jackson, R.B., 2013. The Structure,

694 Distribution, and Biomass of the World's Forests. *Annual Review of Ecology,*
695 *Evolution, and Systematics*, Vol 44, 44: 593-+.

696 Purves, D. and Pacala, S., 2008. Predictive Models of Forest Dynamics. *Science*,
697 320(5882): 1452-1453.

698 Saatchi, S.S. et al., 2011. Benchmark map of forest carbon stocks in tropical regions
699 across three continents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of*
700 *the United States of America*, 108(24): 9899-9904.

701 Seiler, C. et al., 2014. Modeling forest dynamics along climate gradients in Bolivia.
702 *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences*, 119(5): 758-775.

703 Sitch, S. et al., 2008. Evaluation of the terrestrial carbon cycle, future plant geography
704 and climate-carbon cycle feedbacks using five Dynamic Global Vegetation
705 Models (DGVMs). *Global Change Biology*, 14(9): 2015-2039.

706 Sitch, S. et al., 2003. Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and
707 terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model. *Global*
708 *Change Biology*, 9(2): 161-185.

709 Stöckli, R. et al., 2008. Remote sensing data assimilation for a prognostic phenology
710 model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 113(G4): n/a-n/a.

711 Tao, S. et al., 2014. Airborne Lidar-derived volume metrics for aboveground biomass
712 estimation: A comparative assessment for conifer stands. *Agricultural and*
713 *Forest Meteorology*, 198: 24-32.

714 Thompson, S.L. and Pollard, D., 1995a. A GLOBAL CLIMATE MODEL (GENESIS)
715 WITH A LAND-SURFACE TRANSFER SCHEME (LSX) .1. PRESENT
716 CLIMATE SIMULATION. *Journal of Climate*, 8(4): 732-761.

717 Thompson, S.L. and Pollard, D., 1995b. A GLOBAL CLIMATE MODEL (GENESIS)
718 WITH A LAND-SURFACE TRANSFER SCHEME (LSX) .2. CO2

719 SENSITIVITY. *Journal of Climate*, 8(5): 1104-1121.

720 Thurner, M. et al., 2014. Carbon stock and density of northern boreal and temperate
721 forests. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 23(3): 297-310.

722 Wolf, A. et al., 2011. Forest biomass allometry in global land surface models. *Global*
723 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 25.

724 Xiao, J., Davis, K.J., Urban, N.M. and Keller, K., 2014. Uncertainty in model
725 parameters and regional carbon fluxes: A model-data fusion approach.
726 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 189: 175-186.

727 Xiao, J., Davis, K.J., Urban, N.M., Keller, K. and Saliendra, N.Z., 2011. Upscaling
728 carbon fluxes from towers to the regional scale: Influence of parameter
729 variability and land cover representation on regional flux estimates. *Journal of*
730 *Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences*, 116.

731 Xue, B.-L. et al., 2011. Influences of canopy structure and physiological traits on flux
732 partitioning between understory and overstory in an eastern Siberian boreal
733 larch forest. *Ecological Modelling*, 222(8): 1479-1490.

734 Yu, G. et al., 2014. High carbon dioxide uptake by subtropical forest ecosystems in
735 the East Asian monsoon region. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
736 *Sciences*, 111(13): 4910-4915.

737 Zhao, M.S., Heinsch, F.A., Nemani, R.R. and Running, S.W., 2005. Improvements of
738 the MODIS terrestrial gross and net primary production global data set.
739 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 95(2): 164-176.

740 Zhu, Q. et al., 2011. Evaluating the effects of future climate change and elevated CO₂
741 on the water use efficiency in terrestrial ecosystems of China. *Ecological*
742 *Modelling*, 222(14): 2414-2429.

743

Tables captions

Table 1 Key PFT-dependent parameters for IBIS calibration. The abbreviations are defined as follows: $v_{\max_pft}$: maximum Rubisco capacity at top of canopy ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$); SLA: specific leaf area ($\text{m}^2 \text{kg}^{-1}$); τ_l : residence time of foliar biomass (years); τ_r : residence time of root biomass (years); τ_w : residence time of wood biomass (years); a_{leaf} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in foliar biomass (fraction); a_{root} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in root biomass (fraction); a_{wood} : allocation coefficient of total photosynthate in wood biomass (fraction); $P_{\min}$: monthly minimum precipitation (mm month^{-1}); $T_{\min L}$: absolute minimum temperature (lower limit, $^{\circ}\text{C}$); $T_{\min U}$: absolute minimum temperature (upper limit, $^{\circ}\text{C}$); T_{warm} : temperature of the warmest month ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) (C_4 plants only); GDD: minimum growing degree days above 5°C threshold for upper-canopy types; minimum growing degree days above 0°C threshold for lower-canopy types. The plant functional type (PFT) numbers defined in IBIS are as follows: 1, tropical broadleaf evergreen trees; 2, tropical broadleaf drought-deciduous trees; 3, warm-temperate broadleaf evergreen trees; 4, temperate conifer evergreen trees; 5, temperate broadleaf cold-deciduous trees; 6, boreal conifer evergreen trees; 7, boreal broadleaf cold-deciduous trees; 8, boreal conifer cold-deciduous trees; 9, evergreen shrubs; 10: cold-deciduous shrubs; 11, warm (C_4) grasses; and 12, cool (C_3) grasses.

Table 2 Comparison of observed and model-derived gross primary production (GPP; $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{month}^{-1}$) for 39 sites. The regression coefficients of slope (a), intercept (b), R^2 , and normalized root-mean-square error (nRMSE, ratio of RMSE to average) are also shown. The PFT definitions are the same as in Table 1.

Table 3 Comparison of model-derived forest carbon density (Mg C ha^{-1}) with those from other studies. Pan et al. (2001) calculated carbon densities for both above- and below-ground biomass. Numbers in brackets for Pan et al. (2011) show the AGB values assuming that the AGB accounts for 80% of total biomass density.

Figure captions

Fig. 1 Comparison of LAI for growing degree day (GDD, red line) and growing season index (GSI, green line) phenology models for the site of (a) US-Ha1 and (b) US-WCr. MODIS 8-day LAI values are also shown for comparison (points). RMSE ($\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$) for the two sites are also shown for GDD (RMSE_{GDD}) and GSI (RMSE_{GSI}) models.

Fig. 2 Comparison of annual observed and modeled GPP ($\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{year}^{-1}$) for (a) baseline run with default parameters from Kucharik et al. (2000), (b) calibrated run with parameters in Table 1 and (c) independent validation. The dashed line shows the 1:1 line.

Fig. 3 (a) Modeled GPP ($\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{year}^{-1}$) averaged for 2000-2010; (b) difference between modeled value and that reported by Jung et al. (2011).

Fig. 4 Comparison of observed and modeled AGB (Mg ha^{-1}) for (a) baseline run with default parameters from Kucharik et al. (2000), (b) calibrated run with parameters in Table 1, and (c) independent validation. The dashed line shows the 1:1 line. Each point in the figure indicates the AGB measured in one or more plots (average for more than one plot) within a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ model grid.

Fig. 5 (a) Modeled global patterns of AGB (Mg ha^{-1}) averaged for 2000–2010 and (b) latitudinal AGB patterns. Red line: modeled AGB by Princeton forcing data; blue line: CRU forcing data. The shaded zones show the standard deviation for each model run.

Fig. 6 Spatial patterns of (a) estimated woody residence time (τ_w , years) based on

collected field data, (b) uncertainty of estimated τ_w , and (c) simulated AGB by estimated τ_w for pan-tropical areas. The uncertainty is estimated as the standard deviation of the resulting τ_w when 75% of the collected field plot data was randomly selected in each of 100 random forest simulation model runs. The estimated τ_w has a 1 km resolution and was resampled to $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ when used as parameters for IBIS simulations in this study.

Fig. 7 Comparison of observed and model simulated AGB by (a) default; (b) calibrated and (c) estimated τ_w . Each point in the figure indicates the AGB measured in one or more plots (average for more than one plot) within a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ model grid. Observed AGB was mostly measured during 1990–2010 and the model simulations were the averaged values during those corresponding years.

Fig. 8 Simulated temporal trends of AGB during 1759–2010 for different Plant Function Types (PFTs) by IBIS. The green lines show the 500 test runs using the random τ_w data ranging between the default and calibrated values; the red line shows the result of the calibrated τ_w . All the test sites were randomly selected from Fluxnet; details of the sites are provided in Table 1.

Fig.9 (a) Difference between model-derived AGB driven by Princeton forcing data and CRU meteorological datasets and (b) relative difference frequency.

Fig. 10 The difference map between our modeled AGB product and those from (a) Saatchi et al. (2011); (b) Baccini et al. (2012); (c) Avitabile et al. (2015); and (d) Hu et al.

817 (2016) in pan-tropical forest areas. All the maps are aggregated to $0.5^{\circ} \times 0.5^{\circ}$ for
818 comparison.