



HAL
open science

Productivity, Respiration, and Light-Response Parameters of World Grassland and Agro-Ecosystems Derived From Flux-Tower Measurements

G. Gilmanov Tagir, Vincent Allard, D. Baldocchi, Pierre Béziat, Eric Ceschia,
Pierre Cellier, J.F. Soussana

► **To cite this version:**

G. Gilmanov Tagir, Vincent Allard, D. Baldocchi, Pierre Béziat, Eric Ceschia, et al.. Productivity, Respiration, and Light-Response Parameters of World Grassland and Agro-Ecosystems Derived From Flux-Tower Measurements. *Rangeland Ecology and Management*, 2009, pp.1-73. ird-00411045

HAL Id: ird-00411045

<https://ird.hal.science/ird-00411045>

Submitted on 25 Aug 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Productivity, Respiration, and Light-Response Parameters of World Grassland and**
2 **Agro-Ecosystems Derived From Flux-Tower Measurements**

3
4
5 *Tagir G. Gilmanov*¹

6 and data contributors²:

7 *L. Aires*⁴, *K. Akshalov*⁴, *V. Allard*⁴, *C. Ammann*⁴, *M. Aubinet*⁴, *M. Aurela*⁴, *J. Baker*⁵, *D.*
8 *Baldocchi*⁴, *J. Balogh*⁴, *M. Balzarolo*⁴, *L. Belelli*⁴, *Z. Barcza*⁴, *C. Bernacchi*⁴, *C.*
9 *Bernhofer*⁴, *V.S. Baron*⁵, *J. Berringer*⁴, *P. Beziat*⁴, *D. Billesbach*⁵, *J. Bradford*³, *K.*
10 *Brehe*⁵, *N. Buchmann*⁴, *E. Ceschia*⁴, *P. Cellier*⁴, *Shiping Chen*⁴, *D. Cook*⁴, *C. Corradi*⁴, *R.*
11 *Coulter*⁴, *R. Czerny*⁴, *E. Dellwik*⁴, *A. Detwyler*⁵, *H. Dolman*⁴, *M. Dourikov*⁵, *W. Dugas*³,
12 *J. Elbers*⁴, *W. Emmerich*³, *W. Eugster*⁴, *D. Fitzjarrald*⁴, *L. Flanagan*⁴, *A. Frank*³, *J.*
13 *Fuhrer*⁴, *D. Gianelle*⁴, *T. Griffis*⁵, *T. Gruenwald*⁴, *M. Haferkamp*³, *Guo Haiquang*⁴, *N.*
14 *Hanan*⁴, *R. Harding*⁴, *L. Haszpra*⁴, *M. Heuer*⁵, *J. Heilman*⁴, *A. Hensen*⁴, *S. Hollinger*⁴, *A.*
15 *Jacobs*⁴, *D. Janous*⁴, *W. Jans*⁴, *D.A. Johnson*³, *M. Jones*⁴, *T. Kato*⁴, *G. Katul*⁴, *G. Kiely*⁴,
16 *W. Kutsch*⁴, *G. Lanigan*⁴, *T. Laurila*⁵, *P. Leahy*⁴, *S. Li*⁵, *A. Lohila*⁵, *V. Magliulo*⁴, *A.*
17 *Manzi*⁴, *M. Marek*⁴, *R. Matamala*⁴, *T. Meyers*^{4,5}, *P. Mielnick*³, *A. Miyata*⁴, *E. Moors*⁴, *J.*
18 *Morgan*³, *C. Moureaux*⁴, *M. Nasyrov*⁵, *J. Olejnik*⁴, *J. Olesen*⁴, *W. Oechel*⁴, *C. Owensby*⁵,
19 *D. Papale*⁴, *C. Pio*⁴, *J. Prueger*⁵, *A. Raschi*⁴, *C. Rebmann*⁴, *M. Reichstein*⁴, *H. da Rocha*⁴,
20 *N. Rogiers*⁴, *N. Saliendra*³, *M.J. Sanz*⁴, *K. Schelde*⁴, *R. Scott*⁴, *P. Sims*³, *R.H. Skinner*⁵, *H.*
21 *Soegaard*⁴, *J.-F. Soussana*⁴, *M. Sutton*⁴, *A. Suyker*⁴, *T. Svejcar*³, *M. Torn*⁵, *Z. Tuba*⁴, *S.*
22 *Verma*⁴, *M. Waterloo*⁴, *G. Wohlfahrt*⁴, *Bin Zhao*⁴, *Guangsheng Zhou*⁴

1 Authors are ¹Associate professor at the Department of Biology and Microbiology, South
2 Dakota State University, Brookings, SAG 304, Box 2207B, SD 57007, USA, and
3 ²researchers who contributed their data to the ³USDA-ARS RANGEFLUX data set,
4 ⁴FLUXNET La Thuile data set, or ⁵WORLDGRASSAGRIFLUX data set.

5
6 Research was supported in part by the Science Applications International Corporation,
7 Subcontract # 4400089887 to Gilmanov Research and Consulting, LLP.

8
9
10 Correspondence: Tagir G. Gilmanov, Department of Biology and Microbiology, South
11 Dakota State University, SAG 305, Box 2207B, Brookings, SD 57006, USA. Email:
12 tagir.gilmanov@sdstate.edu

13
14

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Latin symbols

- 1
2
- 3 **Latin symbols**
- 4 A_{max} – maximum gross photosynthetic assimilation ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)
- 5 $CumNEE$ – cumulative net ecosystem CO_2 exchange ($\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2}$)
- 6 F_c – net CO_2 flux ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 7 GPP – annual gross primary production ($\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$)
- 8 k_T – coefficient in the exponential equation for respiration temperature dependence ($^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$)
- 9 L – leaf area index ($\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$)
- 10 L_{max} – seasonal maximum leaf area index ($\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$)
- 11 P_d – daytime integral of the net ecosystem CO_2 flux ($\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 12 P_g – gross photosynthetic assimilation ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 13 Q – incoming photosynthetically active radiation ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 14 Q_a – absorbed photosynthetically active radiation ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 15 $PCPN$ – atmospheric precipitation (mm d^{-1} , mm yr^{-1})
- 16 r_d – daytime ecosystem respiration rate ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)
- 17 R_d – daytime ecosystem respiration ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 18 R_e – total ecosystem respiration ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 19 RE – annual total ecosystem respiration ($\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$)
- 20 RH – air relative humidity (%)
- 21 R_n – nighttime ecosystem respiration ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 22 R_{net} – net radiation (W m^{-2} ; $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)
- 23 r_0 – ecosystem respiration rate at temperature $T_s = 0$ $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)

1 r_n – night-time ecosystem respiration rate ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)

2 R_n – nighttime ecosystem respiration ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; $\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)

3 R_{net} – net radiation (W m^{-2} ; $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)

4 T_a – air temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)

5 t_r – time of sunrise (h)

6 t_s – time of sunset (h)

7 T_s – soil temperature (typically, at 5 cm depth) ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)

8 $V_{c,max}$ – maximum rate of carboxylation ($\text{mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)

9 W_s – volumetric soil moisture ($\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$)

10

11 **Greek symbols**

12 α – apparent quantum yield of gross photosynthetic assimilation ($\text{mmol CO}_2 \text{ mol quanta}^{-1}$)

14 ε , ε_{ecol} – gross ecological light-use efficiency ($\text{mmol CO}_2 \text{ (mol incident quanta)}^{-1}$)

15 ε_{phys} – gross physiological light-use efficiency ($\text{mmol CO}_2 \text{ (mol absorbed quanta)}^{-1}$)

16 λ – latent heat of evaporation (MJ kg^{-1})

17 θ – convexity (curvature) coefficient of the light-response equation (dimensionless)

18 ρ_d – diffusion resistance to carbon transport (s m^{-1})

19 ρ_x – carboxylation resistance to carbon transport (s m^{-1})

20

21

22

23

24

ABSTRACT

1
2
3 Grasslands and agroecosystems occupy nearly a third of the land surface area, but their
4 quantitative contribution to the global carbon cycle remains uncertain. We used a set of
5 316 site-years of year-round net CO₂ exchange (F_c) measurements to quantitatively
6 analyze gross primary productivity, ecosystem respiration, and light-response parameters
7 of extensively and intensively managed grasslands, shrublands/savanna, wetlands, and
8 cropland ecosystems worldwide. Analyzed data set included data from 72 flux-tower sites
9 worldwide partitioned into gross photosynthesis (P_g) and ecosystem respiration (R_e)
10 components using the light-response functions method (Gilmanov et al. 2003, Bas. Appl.
11 Ecol. 4:167-183) from the RANGEFLUX and WorldGrassAgriflux data sets
12 supplemented by data from 46 sites partitioned using the temperature-response method
13 (Reichstein et al. 2005, Gl. Change. Biol. 11:1424-1439) from the FLUXNET La Thuile
14 data set. Maximum values of the apparent quantum yield ($\alpha = 75 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$),
15 photosynthetic capacity ($A_{max} = 3.4 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), maximum daily gross
16 photosynthesis ($P_{g,max} = 116 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), and gross ecological light-use efficiency
17 ($\epsilon_{ecol} = 59 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$) of intensively managed grasslands and high-productive croplands
18 exceed those for forest ecosystems, indicating high potential of non-forest ecosystems for
19 uptake and sequestration of atmospheric CO₂. Maximum values of annual gross primary
20 production ($8600 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), total ecosystem respiration ($7900 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), and
21 net CO₂ exchange ($2400 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for non-forest ecosystems are observed in
22 intensively managed grasslands and high-yield crops, and are comparable or higher than
23 in forest ecosystems (excluding tropical forests). On the average, 80% of the non-forest

1 sites were sinks for atmospheric CO₂, with mean annual net CO₂ uptake 848 g CO₂ m⁻²
2 yr⁻¹ for intensively managed grasslands and 933 g CO₂ m⁻² yr⁻¹ for croplands. The new
3 flux-tower data indicate the need to revise substantially previous views of grassland and
4 agricultural ecosystems as being predominantly a source of carbon, or having a neutral
5 role, in the regional and continental carbon budgets.

6

7 **Key Words:** gross primary production, ecosystem respiration, net CO₂ flux partitioning,
8 light-response functions method, grasslands, croplands

9

10

11

INTRODUCTION

Quantifying the contribution of various ecosystem types in terms of carbon budget and total continental and global exchange of carbon has been recognized as a fundamental task since the very beginning of the carbon cycle science (Rodin and Bazilevich 1968; Whittaker and Likens 1973; Lieth 1975; Rodin et al. 1975; Olson et al. 1983). While generalizations on the role of forest, wetland, and tundra ecosystems in the global carbon budget have been provided recently, resulting in a general consensus on the contribution to the carbon budget of these ecosystem types (Griffiths and Jarvis 2005; Davidson and Janssens 2006; Birdsey et al. 2007; Bridgham et al. 2007; Tarnocai et al, 2007), there is considerably less agreement with respect to grassland and cropland ecosystems.

Available estimates of carbon budgets at the country or continental levels typically characterize grasslands as weak sinks, or as approaching a carbon-neutral state, while croplands are considered moderate to strong sources of atmospheric carbon (Smith and Falloon 2005; Conant et al. 2007). It should be emphasized, however, that those assessments are not based on direct measurements of carbon exchange, but rather on indirect measures such as biomass and soil organic matter inventories. As a rule, indirect measures involve lumping agricultural fields, where organic matter is produced, with locations (feedlots, harvest processing plants, ethanol facilities etc.) where harvested biomass is transported and utilized.

Although fully justified as initial “zero approximations”, indirect measures are fundamentally inadequate as tools for understanding the precise contributions of different land areas to regional CO₂ exchange. In contrast, our objective is to get reliable,

1 measurement-based estimates of carbon fluxes into and out of the system at the
2 ecosystem scale provided by tower records. According to some authors, corn fields
3 producing good harvests of grain with no soil organic matter loss due to advanced
4 agronomic management, but considered together with ethanol producing plants where
5 this corn is processed, will be viewed as only a small net sinks for atmospheric carbon
6 (Powlson et al., 2005; Farrell et al. 2006) or even as net carbon sources (Patzek et al.,
7 2005). This completely overshadows the fact that the field itself is often a very strong
8 sink for atmospheric CO₂ (e.g., Buyanovsky and Wagner, 1998; Hollinger et al. 2005).

9 The last decade has been characterized by an explosive growth in number and
10 duration of observations from nonforest flux tower stations all over the world. Through
11 the La Thuile synthesis process of the FLUXNET network (Baldocchi 2008; Agarwal et
12 al. 2008) and other cooperation initiatives, these observations are now available for
13 comparative analysis and generalization. In this publication we present the first synthesis
14 of results from tower CO₂ flux measurements at 118 tower sites representing grassland,
15 cropland, shrubland, savanna and wetland ecosystems of the world-- with the final goal
16 of obtaining measurement-based estimates of their role as net sinks or sources of
17 atmospheric CO₂. Such estimates provide a scientific basis for establishing carbon credit
18 market and poverty alleviation projects.

19

20

METHODS

21 Data for this study were provided by the WorldGrassAgriFlux data set (Gilmanov et al.
22 2007b) currently including data from 72 nonforest sites (Table 1, method L) for which
23 original 30-min (or 20-min in some sites) net CO₂ flux, F_c , was partitioned into gross

1 primary productivity, P_g , and ecosystem respiration, R_e , components using light-response
2 function methods (Gilmanov et al. 2003a,b, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007a). These data were
3 combined with an additional 46 nonforest sites (Table 1, method T) from the FLUXNET
4 La Thuile dataset (Agarwal et al. 2008) that were partitioned into P_g and R_e components
5 using temperature-response methods (Reichstein et al. 2005). In most cases, we used
6 daily P_g and R_e estimates directly from the La Thuile dataset, though sometimes it was
7 necessary to correct negative values of daily gross primary production that were
8 occasionally generated by the night-time temperature response method (cf. Stoy et al.
9 2006).

10 In total, tower sites included in our analysis represent 316 site-years of
11 measurements during the 1997-2006 period (Table 1). They are grouped into the
12 following categories: extensively managed grasslands (ungrazed or lightly grazed, uncut
13 or cut occasionally), intensively managed grasslands (regularly cut, grazed, fertilized,
14 irrigated, etc.), croplands, shrublands/savannas, and wetlands. The geographic
15 distribution of sites is illustrated in Fig. 1.

16

17 **Net Tower Flux (F_c) Partitioning into Photosynthesis (P_g) and Respiration (R_e)**

18 Analysis of flux tower measurements requires processing algorithms (Lee et al. 2004;
19 Burba and Anderson 2007; Baldocchi 2008a) that describe the net result of interacting
20 ecosystem components that absorb CO_2 (mostly, photosynthetic assimilation by
21 autotrophic organisms), and those that release CO_2 (metabolic CO_2 production, R_e , is the
22 major component of CO_2 efflux during the growing season). Because photosynthesis and
23 respiration respond rather differently to major environmental drivers (e.g., Thornley and

1 Johnson 2000), partitioning of tower-based $\{F_c\}$ data into photosynthetic assimilation
2 and ecosystem respiration components is recognized as an necessary step in post-
3 processing of net flux data for use in predictive modeling of ecosystem carbon cycling
4 (Gilmanov et al. 2003b, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007a; Reichstein et al. 2005; Stoy et al.
5 2006).

6 Using the ecophysiological sign convention (positive flux from atmosphere to
7 ecosystem), and excluding plants with CAM-type metabolism, the instantaneous gross
8 photosynthesis rate, P_g , used in this study was obtained as a sum of daytime net CO₂
9 exchange, F_c , and daytime ecosystem respiration, R_d , minus the rate of change of CO₂
10 storage in the atmospheric layer between the soil surface and the CO₂ sensor at the tower
11 (Gilmanov et a. 2007). When estimates of the storage term were not available (e.g. for
12 communities with low canopy height and sufficient turbulent transport) the gross
13 productivity was approximated as:

14

$$15 \quad P_g(t) = \begin{cases} F_c(t) + R_d(t), & Q(t) > 0, \\ 0, & Q(t) = 0. \end{cases} \quad [1]$$

16

17 where $Q(t)$ is the intensity of photosynthetically active radiation (Gilmanov et al. 2004).

18

19 Because direct measurements of the daytime ecosystem respiration R_d are quite
20 difficult to make, two main approaches of its indirect estimation (leading to the two
21 major methods of net flux partitioning into photosynthesis and respiration components)
22 were used:

1 (i) establishing relationship of the night-time respiration:

2

$$3 \quad R_n(t) = \begin{cases} F_c(t), & Q(t) = 0 \\ 0, & Q(t) > 0, \end{cases} \quad [2]$$

4

5 to environmental drivers affecting it (e.g., soil temperature, T_s) and using these
6 relationships to estimate daytime respiration, R_d . This approach has been widely used for
7 forest-type ecosystems (Goulden et al. 1996) and was used in this study for the first round
8 of network-level aggregation of the raw 30-min data into daily gross primary productivity
9 and ecosystem respiration values (<http://www.fluxdata.org/DataInfo/>).

10 (ii) obtaining estimates of daytime ecosystem respiration R_d through identification
11 of the respiration term in the ecosystem-scale light-response functions describing
12 relationships of the daytime flux F_c to photon flux density, Q , leaf area index, L , soil
13 temperature, T_s , water content of the soil, W_s , air relative humidity, HR , and other
14 factors. In general, light-response functions include rather complicated analytical or
15 algorithmic expressions (e.g., those suggested by Thornley and Johnson [2000, p. 248-
16 249]), taking into account most of the major ecophysiological parameters of
17 photosynthesis (quantum yield α , maximum photosynthesis A_{max} , convexity of the light
18 response, θ , leaf area index, L). When fully expanded, these expressions can require
19 several lines of printed text. At the other end of the complexity spectrum lie simple $F_c(Q)$
20 relationships like the ramp function by Blackman (1905), Mitscherlich's saturated
21 exponent (1909), and the rectangular hyperbola by Tamiya (1951); the latter being a
22 nearly standard approach to light-response fitting at the early stages of flux tower data

1 analysis (Ruimy et al. 1995). These simple models are convenient and, in some cases, fit
2 observed data well; however, they share the major drawback of lacking the ability to
3 describe light-response patterns of varying convexity (curvature).

4 Under the widely accepted eco-physiological framework, the convexity of the
5 light-response is represented by the fraction of diffusion resistance to the total (diffusion
6 + carboxylation) resistance to carbon transport: $\theta = \rho_d / (\rho_d + \rho_x)$ (Thornley and Johnson
7 2000). Taking into account the differences in leaf morphology and biochemistry in
8 different plant groups (e.g., C₃ vs. C₄ photosynthesis types), the ability to describe light-
9 response curves of different convexity seems to be a necessary requirement for an
10 adequate light-response function model. Our experience with quantification of the tower-
11 based light-response data from a wide range of nonforest ecosystems led us to use the
12 nonrectangular hyperbolic model (Rabinowich 1951; Thornley and Johnson 2000):

$$14 \quad F_c(Q; \alpha, A_{\max}, \theta, r_d) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\alpha Q + A_{\max} - \sqrt{(\alpha Q + A_{\max})^2 - 4\alpha A_{\max} \theta Q} \right) - r_d, \quad [3]$$

15
16 where Q denotes photon flux density, α is the quantum yield, A_{\max} maximum gross
17 photosynthesis, θ is the convexity parameter of the light-response curve, and r_d is
18 daytime ecosystem respiration rate, for days when solar radiation is the major driver of
19 daytime CO₂ exchange. This model provides a powerful and flexible tool to describe
20 light-response at the various nonforest tower sites (Gilmanov et al. 2003a,b, 2004, 2005,
21 2006, 2007a).

22 Under semi-arid and arid conditions, when significant warming of the soil in the
23 afternoon period is observed, the pattern of data points on the light-response plane $\{Q,$

1 $F_c\}$ is often characterized by a hysteresis-like loop with the morning branch of the light-
 2 response curve lying above the afternoon branch. In such cases, these light-response
 3 patterns were effectively described by the modified nonrectangular hyperbolic model
 4 (Gilmanov et al. 2003a):

5

$$6 \quad F_c(Q, T_s; \alpha, A_{\max}, \theta, r_d) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\alpha Q + A_{\max} - \sqrt{(\alpha Q + A_{\max})^2 - 4\alpha A_{\max} \theta Q} \right) - r_0 e^{k_T T_s},$$

7 [4]

8 where the daytime respiration term r_d of eq. [3] is modified to $r_0 e^{k_T T_s}$ to represent an
 9 exponential increase of respiration with soil temperature, T_s , and k_T and r_0 are empirical
 10 parameters estimated in the process of fitting eq. [4] to the daytime data

11 $\{Q(t_i), T_s(t_i), F_c(t_i)\}$, and t_i is time between the sunrise and sunset, $t_r \leq t_i \leq t_s$. For days
 12 described by eq. [4], average daytime respiration rate, r_d , was calculated as:

13

$$14 \quad r_d = \frac{r_0}{(t_s - t_r)} \int_{t_r}^{t_s} e^{k_T T_s(t)} dt .$$

15 [5]

16

16 Numerical fitting of parameters α , A_{\max} , θ , r_d or r_0 and k_T of equations [3] or [4] was
 17 achieved using procedures from the “Global Optimization Package” by Loehle
 18 Enterprises (2009) available under the “Mathematica” software system (Wolfram
 19 Research 2009). It should be emphasized that to avoid serious errors of light-response
 20 parameter estimation resulting from fitting equations to data lumped over several days (as
 21 sometimes can be seen in publications on the subject, e.g., Ruimy et al. 1995; Zhang et al.
 22 2006; Zhao et al. 2006), only single day datasets $\{Q(t_i), T_s(t_i), F_c(t_i)\}$ were used in this

1 study to identify the light-curves and the light-temperature response surfaces of CO₂
2 exchange.

3 It should also be noted that parameters obtained by fitting equations [3] or [4] to
4 flux-tower data sets are ecosystem-scale parameters referring to a ground unit (e.g., per 1
5 m² ground surface) and should be distinguished from leaf-level light-response parameters
6 used in physiological studies, which correspond to units of leaf area (e.g., $A_{L,max}$, α_L , etc.).
7 Only under special conditions (monoculture with convexity $\theta = 0$), is photosynthetic
8 capacity per unit ground area (A_{max}) equal to the product of photosynthetic capacity per
9 unit leaf area ($A_{L,max}$) and the leaf area index (L): $A_{max} = A_{L,max} * L$ (cf. Thornley and
10 Johnson 2000).

11 For measurement days that allow identification of parameters of models [3] or [4],
12 total daytime respiration, R_d , was calculated as the product of average daytime rate, r_d ,
13 and the length of the daylight period:

14

$$15 \quad R_d = r_d(t_s - t_r). \quad [6]$$

16

17 For days with daytime data inappropriate for light-response analysis, parameters k_T and r_0
18 were estimated by fitting an exponential equation $F_C = r_0 e^{k_T T_s}$ to the nighttime data
19 $\{T_s(t_i), F_C(t_i)\}_{Q(t_i)=0}$.

20 Eventually, total daily gross primary production, P_g , was obtained as the sum of daytime

21 respiration total R_d and the daytime net flux integral, $P_d = \int_{t_r}^{t_s} F_C(t) dt$:

22

1 $P_g = P_d + R_d.$ [7]

2

3 Gap-filling of P_g and R_e values for days with missing measurements was achieved
4 using various methods characterized in the recent review by Moffat et al. (2007), with
5 particular emphasis on (i) extrapolation of parameters of light- and temperature-response
6 functions to days with missing flux measurements, calculations of fluxes at the 30-min
7 time scale, and estimation of daily P_g and R_e values as integrals of corresponding 30-min
8 estimates; and (ii) nonlinear regressions of daily P_g and R_e values from daily aggregated
9 values of predictors such as photosynthetically active radiation, air and soil temperature,
10 soil water content, etc.

11

12 **Seasonal Patterns of Parameter Dynamics**

13 Numerical estimation of the major light-response parameters on a daily basis, i.e.
14 obtaining the values α , A_{max} , θ , r_d for as many days t as allowed by the quality and
15 quantity of the data, permits evaluation of time-functions $\alpha(t)$, $A_{max}(t)$, $\theta(t)$, $r_d(t)$
16 characterizing seasonal patterns of the dynamics of these parameters. These patterns are
17 revealed most clearly through smoothing of the empirical time series of the parameter
18 estimates. In this study we used one of the simplest and easily interpretable methods –
19 calculation of the mean parameter value and its standard error, e.g.,

20 $\{\bar{\alpha}_j, s_{\bar{\alpha}_j}\}$, $\{\bar{A}_{max,j}, s_{\bar{A}_{max,j}}\}$, etc. for every calendar week, j , of the year of

21 observations ($j = 1, \dots, 52$). Using weekly average values instead of individual daily

22 estimates proved to be most appropriate for comparison between ecosystems and years,

1 particularly for such parameters as quantum yield, α , exhibiting large day-to-day
2 variability.

3

4 **Seasonal Dynamics and Annual Budgets of GPP, RE, and NEE**

5 Estimated values of $P_g(t)$ and $R_e(t)$ for the year-round or observation period were
6 integrated over the 365 days (or over the measurement season – when no year-round data
7 were available) to obtain annual (seasonal) totals of gross primary production, GPP , and
8 total ecosystem respiration, RE . Cumulative NEE total to day t , $CumNEE(t)$, was
9 calculated by integrating daily values of $F_c(t) = P_g(t) - R_e(t)$. The net ecosystem CO_2
10 exchange for years or growing seasons, NEE , was calculated as the difference ($GPP - RE$).

11

12 **Ecosystem-Scale Light-Use Efficiency**

13 Comparative physiological studies at the leaf, individual, or population level commonly
14 calculate the light-use efficiency of gross photosynthesis P_g with respect to absorbed
15 photosynthetically active radiation, Q_a , resulting in a *gross physiological* light-use
16 efficiency coefficient (Larcher 1995):

17

$$18 \quad \varepsilon_{phys} = \frac{P_g}{Q_a}, \quad [8]$$

19

20 where both the photosynthesis P_g and absorbed radiation Q_a are expressed in molar units
21 (e.g., it is convenient to measure ε in mmol CO_2 per mol quanta). However, in
22 comparative ecological studies it is preferable to use the coefficient of *gross ecological*

1 light-use efficiency (cf. Odum 1959 (p. 54); Cooper 1970; Austin et al. 1978; Colinvaux
2 1993):

3

$$4 \quad \varepsilon_{ecol} = \frac{P_g}{Q}, \quad [9]$$

5

6 calculated per unit of *total incoming* photosynthetically active radiation, Q . It should be
7 emphasized that while the physiological light-use efficiency coefficient, ε_{phys} ,
8 characterizes physiological and biochemical parameters (and is often used in studies
9 performed at the unit leaf area or unit of photosynthetically active biomass basis), ε_{ecol} , as
10 a rule, is calculated per unit ground surface (m^{-2} , ha^{-1} , etc.), and thus also takes into
11 account such ecosystem-level properties as population density, aboveground biomass,
12 and leaf area. Thus, gross ecological light-use efficiency characterizes ecosystems as a
13 whole with respect to ability for utilization of available radiation resources. For example,
14 consider two ecosystems with physiologically similar species and therefore similar light-
15 use efficiencies per unit leaf area, but with LAI in the first ecosystem twice as small as
16 the second (e.g. due to management). For moderate LAI values (e.g., $< 3 \text{ m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$ in the
17 second ecosystem), the photosynthetic uptake per unit of ground surface, P_g , and the
18 absorbed radiation, Q_a , in the second ecosystem will be approximately twice as large as
19 in the first, so that there will be little difference between the two ecosystems in terms of
20 their physiological light-use efficiency ε_{phys} . On the other hand, the incoming radiation,
21 Q , will be the same in the two ecosystems, resulting in ecological light-use efficiency,
22 ε_{ecol} , in the second ecosystem being two times higher than in the first.

23

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Light-Response Functions and Parameters

Within the broad range of climatic conditions and ecosystem types represented in the data set, we observed a variety of patterns of light-response. For comparative purposes, it is convenient to distinguish four major categories differentiated in terms of convexity and presence of the hysteresis-like loop on the light-response scatter diagram $\{Q, F_c\}$ (Fig. 2).

In the latter case, plotting the 3-D scatter diagram of the diurnal dynamics of the measurement data and of the response surface $F_c(Q, T_s)$ (eq. [4]) fitted to them provides a partial explanation the loop on the 2-D $\{Q, F_c\}$ plot caused by the increase of ecosystem respiration with the increase of temperature in the afternoon hours (Fig. 3). For the cases shown in Figures 2 and 3, numerical estimates and statistical characteristics of parameters in equations [3] and [4] are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Nonrectangular hyperbolic equation [3] and its modification [4] taking into account temperature-dependence of daytime respiration, were found to be good numerical tools to fitting light-responses of nonforest ecosystems for days when photosynthetically active radiation was the dominant factor governing the ecosystem CO_2 exchange. It is important to emphasize that the nonrectangular hyperbola provided a close fit to light-response data and provided consistent estimates of the light-response parameters for days when the $\{Q, F_c\}$ plots showed no saturation with respect to Q and were characterized by convexity parameter θ close to 1 (cf. Fig. 2A). The rectangular hyperbola, Mitscherlich's equation, and other approximations lacking convexity parameter fitted to data with such a pattern, yield highly biased estimates of the initial slope, plateau, and the intercept parameters.

1 Estimates of the apparent quantum efficiency, α , in nonforest ecosystems cover a
2 wide range of values (Fig. 4A), from 5 mmol mol⁻¹ in the desert shrublands of Central
3 Asia (Karrykul) to 75 mmol mol⁻¹ in intensively managed grasslands of the North
4 Atlantic (Cabauw, the Netherlands), with mean value $\alpha_{\text{nonfor}} = 33.3$ mmol mol⁻¹ and
5 standard deviation $s_{\text{nonfor}} = 14.2$ mmol mol⁻¹. The lower 10% quantile of the α values in
6 the sample (5-17 mmol mol⁻¹) included extensively managed arid and semiarid grasslands
7 and shrublands (Karrykul, Cottonwood, Karnap, Audubon, Lethbridge, Kherlenbayan,
8 Tojal, and Fort Peck), while the upper 10% quantile (50-75 mmol mol⁻¹) encompassed
9 intensively managed grasslands (Cabauw, Carlow, Neustift, Easter Bush, Oensingen,
10 Lille Valby, Grillenburg, Haller, Rigi-Seebodenalp), extensively managed grasslands
11 under favorable weather conditions (Laqueuille-extensive, Jornada), and intensive
12 agricultural crops (Lonzee). Interestingly, most productive crop sites, characterized by
13 the highest A_{max} and $P_{g,\text{max}}$ values, did not make it to the upper 10% quantum yield
14 quantile, though they belong to the upper 20% quantum yield quantile.

15 In addition to scatter plots for the pooled data set, understanding relationships
16 between parameters within a particular ecosystem is of interest. Presently, only a subset
17 of extensively managed grasslands shows scatter diagrams with pronounced patterns of
18 co-variation (Fig. 5).

19 In evaluating obtained estimates of the quantum yield, we should first note that
20 our maximum estimate of 75 mmol mol⁻¹ is only two thirds of the theoretical maximum
21 of quantum efficiency of gross photosynthesis estimated by Good and Bell (1980) as 110
22 mmol mol⁻¹. Comparing our nonforest estimates with those reviewed by Ruimy et al.
23 (1995), from which we estimated mean $\bar{\alpha}_{\text{forest}} = 37$ mmol mol⁻¹ with standard

1 deviation $s_{\text{forest}} = 17 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$ (we have excluded data in Ruimy et al. 1995 with α
2 values greater than theoretical maximum of quantum efficiency), one can see that
3 quantum efficiency of nonforest ecosystems is not statistically different from forests. In
4 fact, $\alpha_{\text{max, nonforest}}$ estimated for intensively managed Cabauw grassland in The
5 Netherlands (75 mmol mol^{-1}) was numerically higher, but statistically not significantly
6 different from the maximum quantum efficiency determined for the chestnut coppice near
7 Paris, France ($\alpha_{\text{max, forest}} = 73 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$) (Mordacq et al 1991).

8 The values of maximum average weekly gross photosynthesis, A_{max} , for nonforest
9 sites of the world (Fig. 4A) span from $0.2 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Fort Peck mixed prairie during
10 a drought year) to $3.4 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Mead, irrigated continuous corn), with the lower
11 10% quantile ($0.2\text{-}0.36 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) including Fort Peck, Dubois, Miles City,
12 Kherlenbayan, Xilinhot, Karrykul, Kubuqi, Burns, and Karnap, and the upper 10%
13 quantile ($2\text{-}3.4 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) including intensive crops (Mead, Bondville, Lonzee,
14 Ames), intensively managed grasslands (Cabauw, Carlow, Lille Valby), and tallgrass
15 prairies (Shidler, Fort Reno). The mean photosynthetic capacity of nonforest ecosystems,
16 $1.2 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (SD = $0.68 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), lies at the upper end of the mean A_{max}
17 range for different forest types from eddy covariance estimates, $0.66 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to
18 $1.3 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (mean = $0.97 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) (Falge et al. 2002; Funk and Ler dau
19 2004). At the same time, the highest A_{max} value for nonforest ecosystems found in
20 intensive corn cultures of the Midwest of the USA ($3.4 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) were
21 substantially higher than $A_{\text{max}} = 2.64 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ estimated from data by Jarvis (1994)
22 for a Sitka spruce culture in Scotland.

1 The values of daytime ecosystem respiration rate, r_d , in all ecosystems remained
2 substantially lower than corresponding A_{max} values (cf. Fig. 6, left), but also displayed
3 substantial variability among ecosystem types (Fig. 4B), with maximum weekly average
4 r_d ranging from 0.04 mg CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹ (Burns, drought year) to 0.50 mg CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹
5 (Haller, warm and wet year). The lower 10% quantile of maximum weekly r_d values
6 included arid and semiarid grasslands and shrublands (Burns, Karnap, Kherlenbayan,
7 Karrykul, Cottonwood, Burns, Dubois, Kubuqi) and tundra (Barrow), while the upper
8 10% quantile of r_d distribution was represented by intensively managed grasslands
9 (Haller, Neustift, Cabauw, Carlow, Oensingen, Lille Valby, Easter Bush), intensive crops
10 (Ames, Mead), tallgrass prairies (Shidler, Rannels Ranch), and a semidesert grassland in
11 a year with exceptionally high precipitation (Jornada).

12 The weekly maxima of the coefficient of gross ecological light-use efficiency, ϵ ,
13 resulting from this study were in the range from 3 to 59 mmol mol⁻¹ (mean 22, standard
14 deviation 12.4 mmol mol⁻¹), and, understandably, were lower than the weekly maxima of
15 the apparent quantum yield, α (Fig. 6, right). It is interesting, however, that for some
16 ecosystems, particularly for agricultural C₄-crops and tropical grasslands dominated by
17 C₄-species, ϵ values were not considerably lower than α (e.g., see Fig. 6E, 6F and 6H,
18 right). This is a direct result of relatively high values of the convexity coefficient of the
19 light-response curves of C₄ species; at the ultimate case of $\theta = 1$, the values of α and ϵ
20 will become equal, provided input radiation levels remains within the range of linear
21 light-response.

22 On the contrary, in C₃-communities characterized by lower convexity values ($\theta =$
23 0 in the extreme case of rectangular hyperbolic light-response), ecological light-use

1 efficiency remains substantially lower than quantum yield (Fig. 6A, right). The lower
2 10% quantile of light-use efficiency values ϵ (2.6 – 6.4 mmol mol⁻¹) includes deserts,
3 desert and dry steppe grasslands, shortgrass and sagebrush steppes, mixed prairies,
4 California grasslands and chaparral, and tundra (Karrykul, Karnap, Audubon Ranch,
5 Kendall, Xilinhot, CPER, Fort Peck, Cottonwood, Burns, Kubuqi, Kherlenbayan, Sky
6 Oaks, Barrow, Atqasuk, Ivotuk). The upper 10% quantile of the ϵ values (40-59 mmol
7 mol⁻¹) mostly includes high-yield crops (Risbyholm, Langerak, Molenweg, Mead,
8 Bondville, Oensingen, Gebesee, Lonzee, Batavia), as well as highly productive
9 intensively and extensively managed grasslands (Carlow, Lille Valby, Oensingen,
10 Neustift).

11 For comparison with ϵ_{max} estimates for nonforest ecosystems, we calculated
12 average weekly values of light-use efficiency for the twelve most productive forest
13 ecosystems in the FLUXNET La Thuile database. These twelve ϵ_{max} values ranged
14 between 29.1 and 47.7 mmol mol⁻¹, with the highest value corresponding to the 2001 data
15 set for the Duke loblolly pine forest (North Carolina), which is less than $\epsilon_{max} = 59$ mmol
16 mol⁻¹ for a high-yield crop (also, see Table 5 for $P_{g,max}$ comparison of forests and
17 nonforest ecosystems). Thus, the light-use efficiency data are in agreement with
18 observations earlier in this section that the values of the maximum apparent quantum
19 yield in nonforest ecosystems (particularly, intensively managed grasslands) are
20 comparable and even higher than those for forest ecosystems.

21

22 **Parameter Interrelations**

1 As expected, numerical values of light-response parameters among different ecosystems
2 did not vary independently of each other, but demonstrated patterns of correlation shown
3 in Figs. 4 and 5. Our results for this extensive data set are in agreement with earlier
4 studies based on smaller subsets of flux-tower data, suggesting that the plateau parameter
5 of gross photosynthesis, A_{max} , is a good predictor for other light-response parameters,
6 including quantum yield, α , ecosystem respiration rate, r_d , and light-use efficiency, ϵ
7 (Gilmanov et al. 2007a; Owen et al. 2007). Baldocchi and Xu (2005) found that A_{max} is a
8 good predictor for another photosynthetic parameter, the maximum rate of carboxylation,
9 $V_{c,max}$. Nevertheless, while in previous studies mostly linear relationships between A_{max}
10 and other parameters were identified, the wider range of parameter variations in our data
11 set has revealed a number of distinct nonlinearities. For example, an allometric
12 relationship $\alpha = 30.36(A_{max})^{0.55}$ with R^2 value of 0.55 was obtained for the
13 relationship between apparent quantum yield and maximum photosynthesis (Fig. 4A).
14 The better fit of the allometric (nonlinear) description of the $\alpha(A_{max})$ relationship
15 compared with the simple linear model is demonstrated by the fact that the nonlinear
16 model conveys a decrease in α with decreasing A_{max} as the latter is approaching zero,
17 while the linear model predicts an unrealistic α_0 value of $\sim 15 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$ even when A_{max}
18 $\rightarrow 0$.

19 Daytime ecosystem respiration, r_d , also demonstrated an allometric relationship to
20 A_{max} described as $r_d = 0.22(A_{max})^{0.71}$ characterized by $R^2 = 0.69$ (Fig. 5B). In this
21 case, the linear model also provided a reasonable fit to the data ($R^2 = 0.67$), though its
22 applicability to areas with low A_{max} values is limited by an unrealistically high intercept
23 of $r_{d0} = 0.09 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ as $A_{max} \rightarrow 0$. From the patterns of data points on Figs. 5C

1 and 5D one may see that the relationships between ecological light-use efficiency,
2 maximum daily gross photosynthesis, and L_{max} may be approximated by both the linear,
3 and the allometric equations, though the latter provides better description in the lower
4 range of A_{max} and L_{max} .

5 For various reasons, not all flux sites collected data on maximum leaf area (L_{max})
6 and/or maximum aboveground green biomass (G_{max}). Nevertheless, with the limited data
7 available (Figs. 5F and 5H) we were able to establish nonlinear allometric (with
8 allometry coefficient < 1) dependence of maximum photosynthesis parameters (A_{max} ,
9 $P_{g,max}$) and the standard morphometric characteristics such as maximum aboveground
10 biomass, G_{max} and maximum leaf area index, L_{max} (Figures. 5F and 5H).

11

12 *Seasonal Patterns of Parameter Dynamics*

13 Because light-response parameters evaluated from flux-tower measurement data sets
14 represent not only physiological characteristics (which also change in time with
15 phenology and environmental conditions) but also the ecosystem-scale attributes like
16 aboveground biomass, leaf area index and others, such parameters exhibit pronounced
17 variation in magnitude during the year. Seasonal changes of these parameters, though
18 specific for particular sites and years, have general patterns that are revealed by time-
19 plots of parameter values aggregated at the weekly time step (Fig. 6). Pronounced
20 seasonal dynamics of light-response parameters shown on Fig. 6 in cold and temperate
21 environments is apparently driven by radiation and temperature inputs (Fig. 6, A, D),
22 while under arid conditions it mainly reflects fluctuation of precipitation (Fig. 6 E, F).
23 This climatically driven unimodal pattern of seasonal parameter change was particularly

1 pronounced in species-poor ecosystems or monocultures with relatively narrow
2 production period, be that a floodplain meadow in the tundra zone (Fig. 6A) or
3 agricultural crops (Figs. 6G and 6H). In ecosystems with higher species diversity and
4 broader production period (up to year-round production in tropical conditions), the
5 general seasonal pattern of parameter dynamics was compounded by additional
6 fluctuations reflecting different reactions of various species groups (e.g., cool and warm-
7 season grasses) to weather variability and management pressure (grazing, mowing)
8 during various parts of the year (Figs. 6 B, C, D). These data may help to explain
9 difficulties experienced by those attempting to simulate year-round dynamics of gross
10 primary productivity and light-response parameters by modification of the hypothetical
11 maximum parameter value by factors-multipliers describing effects of various drivers like
12 radiation, temperature, moisture, etc. (cf. Monteith 1972; Ciais et al. 2001).

13

14 **Seasonal Dynamics and Annual Budgets of GPP, RE, and NEE**

15 Depending on a number of external (e.g. radiation, temperature, precipitation) and
16 internal ecological factors (e.g. leaf area, phenological state, water and nutrient supply),
17 the functions of gross primary productivity, $P_g(t)$, and total ecosystem respiration, $R_e(t)$,
18 demonstrated pronounced temporal dynamics during the year, as exemplified by the
19 measurement-based estimates of $P_g(t)$ and $R_e(t)$ presented on Fig. 7. On the other hand,
20 the curve of cumulative net ecosystem exchange, $CumNEE(t)$ showed much smoother
21 behavior, and its value at the end of the year, NEE, provides a summary of ecosystem
22 carbon budget.

1 Data from the WorldGrassAgriFlux data set demonstrated a great variety of
2 seasonal patterns of productivity and respiration dynamics, some of the typical curves are
3 illustrated in Fig. 7. There are three major seasonal patterns of the cumulative NEE curve:
4 (i) equilibrium (S-shaped), (ii) permanent accumulation, and (iii) permanent release of
5 carbon. The equilibrium pattern (i) characterizing non-harvested ecosystems with marked
6 seasonality of primary productivity was exemplified by data from a floodplain tundra
7 meadow at Cherskii in the Far North-East of Russia (Fig. 7A). With the period of
8 decomposition activity (May-September) completely encompassing the production period
9 (June-August) and with maximum decomposition lagging behind maximum production,
10 the curve of cumulative *NEE* assumed a characteristic S-shaped form with the net annual
11 ecosystem CO₂ exchange nearly zero. The accumulative pattern (ii) is described by the
12 more or less monotonous accumulation of net ecosystem production in ecosystems with a
13 period of marked domination of production over decomposition processes observed in
14 both grassland (Fig. 7F) and cropland ecosystems (Fig. 7G). The third pattern (iii) –
15 nearly permanent domination of respiratory efflux over assimilatory uptake resulting in
16 significant net loss of carbon from the ecosystem at the end of the year, as exemplified by
17 measurements at the Audubon (AZ) desert grassland on a high carbonate soil (Emmerich
18 2003) (Fig. 7D). These three major patterns were accompanied by a variety of
19 intermediate variants with local maxima and minima of the *CumNEE(t)* curve reflecting
20 weather fluctuations and harvesting, finally leading to either net uptake (Fig. 7C) or net
21 loss of carbon from the ecosystem (Fig. 7B, 7E and 7H).

22 Year-round integration of the $P_g(t)$, $R_e(t)$, and $F_c(t)$ curves provided estimates of
23 annual *GPP*, *RE*, and *NEE* totals for all the site-years in this study. These data stratified

1 by major ecosystem groups (extensively and intensively managed grasslands, shrublands
2 and savanna, wetlands, and croplands) are summarized in Table 4. The highest mean
3 gross primary production ($5767 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and ecosystem respiration (4990 g CO_2
4 $\text{m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) were achieved in intensively managed grasslands. Not surprisingly, the highest
5 mean annual net ecosystem CO_2 exchange ($933 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) was found in croplands.
6 To supplement these basic statistical characteristics, Fig. 8 shows the distributions of the
7 *GPP*, *RE*, and *NEE* values in the pooled data set of estimates from all site-years in the
8 database. They show that while the *GPP* and *RE* values in our sample had a wide range
9 of variation ($95 - 8600 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for gross production and $112 - 7880 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$
10 for respiration), with *GPP* and *RE* values fairly well distributed over their ranges (Fig. 8A
11 and 8B), the net CO_2 exchange values concentrated between $-1342 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and
12 $2394 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ had a distinctly unimodal distribution (Fig. 8 C). The average *NEE*
13 value for our sample of 316 nonforest ecosystems is $485 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ($\text{SD} = 696 \text{ g CO}_2$
14 $\text{m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). Comparing these statistics with the mean ($671 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and standard
15 deviation ($988 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) of published *NEE* values for 506 site-years from flux
16 towers worldwide (Baldocchi 2008b), we did not detect a difference between the two
17 *NEE* averages at the 1% level of significance. The higher mean *NEE* value for
18 Baldocchi's sample is easily explained, taking into account that it contains a number of
19 growing forest sites with high *NEE*, while the WorldGrassAgriFlux data set includes
20 mostly nonforest sites (with occasional near-climax shrubland and savanna ecosystems).
21 A particularly interesting question, in the context of comparing basic parameters of the
22 carbon cycle, regards identifying maximum rates of photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation in
23 various ecosystems. For this purpose, in Table 5 we have compiled the data of the two

1 dozen (or maximum available) site-years with maximum values of daily photosynthesis,
2 $P_{g,max}$, and annual GPP for our five types of nonforest ecosystems and for the forest sites
3 represented in the most recent FLUXNET database. With respect to the annual GPP ,
4 forest ecosystems achieved the highest estimates of photosynthetic CO_2 uptake, with
5 maximum $GPP = 14339 \text{ g } CO_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for a tropical forest in French Guyana (Table 5F)
6 compared to maximum $GPP = 8600 \text{ g } CO_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for a tropical grassland in Rondonia,
7 Brazil (Table 5 A). In contrast, maximum daily rates of photosynthetic uptake were
8 recorded not in forests, but in the intensive crops of the Midwestern United States, with
9 $P_{g,max} = 116 \text{ g } CO_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ estimated for irrigated corn in a corn-soybean rotation (Mead,
10 NE) in 2001 (Table 5E). These data clearly demonstrate that even in other types of
11 nonforest ecosystems (e.g. shrublands and savanna), in addition to intensive agricultural
12 crops, maximum rates of gross photosynthetic assimilation ($50 - 76 \text{ g } CO_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) are
13 quite comparable to those in most productive forests ($55 - 99 \text{ g } CO_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). Apparently,
14 the major reason why annual GPP in forests is typically higher than nonforested
15 ecosystems is the length of production period. In tropical forests, production may
16 encompass the whole year, while in most nonforest ecosystems it is temporally limited by
17 temperature and water availability.

18 **Source/Sink Activity of Nonforest Ecosystems**

19 The data on annual budgets of production, respiration, and net exchange of nonforest
20 ecosystems obtained in our study allow quantitative consideration of important question
21 about the magnitude and significance of the source or sink activity of various ecosystem
22 types. Since H.T. Odum (1956) (see also Baldocchi 2008b), a convenient way to
23 visualize the net carbon budget of ecosystems for comparative purposes is to construct an

1 *RE versus GPP* scatter diagram and compare the distribution of data points with respect
2 to the 1:1 diagonal. Points below the diagonal correspond to sinks ($GPP > RE$, $NEE > 0$),
3 while points above the diagonal describe sources of carbon ($GPP < RE$, $NEE < 0$).
4 H.T. Odum's plot for the whole nonforest data set (Fig. 9) demonstrates that for four out
5 of every five site-years, gross production was higher than ecosystem respiration,
6 indicating net ecosystem sink activity. Stratification of the data with respect to ecosystem
7 type (Fig. 10) shows that for all types of nonforest ecosystem in our database there were
8 considerably more years with net CO₂ uptake than release. However, years with net
9 source activity occasionally occurred in all ecosystems except wetlands.
10 The distributions of *NEE* for different ecosystems presented in Fig. 11 provide a more
11 detailed description of the matter. Source-type activity more frequently occurred in
12 extensively managed grasslands, shrublands/savanna, and croplands, than in intensively
13 managed grasslands and wetlands. As a rule, source-type activity was associated with
14 years of drought, excessive grazing and hay mowing, high organic matter content of soils
15 (e.g. grasslands on peat) or high CaCO₃ reserves in the soil profile, and transitional
16 successional status of the ecosystem (e.g., grasslands of previously forested soils). For
17 agroecosystems, source activity is often observed in crops with intensive soil preparation
18 and relatively short leaf duration periods (e.g. soybeans). However, it should be
19 emphasized that for all ecosystems examined in our study, carbon sink activity was
20 frequently observed, with the highest net carbon uptakes in intensively managed
21 grasslands and cropland ecosystems (Fig. 11, Table 4).

22 These observations are in obvious contradiction with conclusion of the first State
23 Of the Carbon Cycle Report (SOCCR) (King et al. 2007) and some earlier authors (e.g.,

1 Reicosky 1997; Smith and Falloon 2005) who emphasized net source or neutral activity
2 of agricultural ecosystems. In this context, it is appropriate to consider the argument by
3 C. Körner (2003) regarding the critical significance of the representativeness of flux
4 tower data sets. Recognizing the relevance of Körner's arguments to the situation in the
5 early 2000s, it should be emphasized that, at least with regard to nonforested ecosystems,
6 the present set of flux tower sites includes a wide range of climatic conditions and
7 management regimes and, therefore, is much less biased towards highly productive
8 ecosystems.

9 **Ecosystem-Scale Production and Respiration in Relation to Major Ecological** 10 **Factors**

11 Relationships of production and decomposition to major ecological factors attracted
12 attention of ecologists and geographers of the 20th century (Weaver 1924; Walter 1939;
13 Budyko and Efimova 1968; Rosenzweig 1968; Lieth 1975) and were later approached
14 under the framework of dynamic global vegetation models (DGVM) and related models
15 (e.g., Woodward et al. 2001; Cramer et al. 2001). Presently, these problems are back in
16 the focus of ecosystem, regional and global ecology, not only because of the recognition
17 of their relevance to global climatic change, but also because today, for the first time,
18 measurement-based quantitative estimates of gross productivity and total ecosystem
19 respiration are readily available through post-processing of net CO₂ exchange
20 measurements at flux towers.

21 Besides radiation and temperature, which are already taken into account by the
22 light-temperature-response function method, the next most important factor influencing
23 ecosystem productivity and respiration is water (e.g., Slatyer 1967; Boyer 1982). Though

1 water content or water potential of top-soil horizons are the most desirable predictors for
2 production and decomposition modeling, such data are not yet readily available for many
3 flux tower stations, making it necessary for us to limit consideration to available
4 precipitation data.

5 Both theory and empirical data indicate nonlinear relationships between
6 photosynthesis, productivity, and decomposition rates on water content and/or water
7 potential (Denmead and Shaw 1962; Wildung et al. 1975; Singh et al. 1980; Eastin and
8 Sullivan 1984; Mielnick and Dugas 2000). In contrast, observations of the linear response
9 of productivity in certain ecosystem types occasionally appear in the literature (Walter
10 1939; Le Houèrou and Hoste. 1977; Sala et al. 1988). Our data allow a fresh look at this
11 old problem using new ecosystem-scale estimates of *GPP* and *RE* values in relation to
12 precipitation *PCPN* (Fig. 12-14). Within the whole WorldGrassAgriFlux data set, we
13 found that the subsets of extensively managed grasslands, intensively managed
14 grasslands, and shrublands-savanna exhibit patterns of relationship of *GPP* and *RE* to
15 precipitation and dryness index, while the data for wetlands and croplands did not
16 produce recognizable patterns.

17 Gross production and ecosystem respiration of extensively managed grasslands
18 demonstrate nonlinear patterns in response to annual precipitation that may be expressed
19 by Mitscherlich's equation (Fig. 12A and 12B) describing a saturated relationship (cf.
20 Lieth 1975). Deviation of the data points from the trend, which increases in amplitude
21 with increasing precipitation, indicates a diminishing response to precipitation. As shown
22 in Figs. 12C and 12D, the decrease of precipitation use efficiency is linked to the dryness
23 index (ratio of annual net radiation, R_{net} , to the amount of energy required for evaporation

1 of precipitation, $\lambda * PCPN$, where λ is the latent heat coefficient) (Budyko and Efimova,
2 1968; Long et al. 1991).

3 Intensively managed grasslands, which are typically located in climates with more
4 favorable precipitation and less drought stress, still exhibit responses to precipitation and
5 dryness; this response is especially pronounced for gross primary production (Fig. 13).

6 Shrublands and savanna ecosystems, with their broad range of precipitation and dryness
7 index, demonstrate strong nonlinearity of response to precipitation and dryness for both
8 the assimilation and respiration components of the carbon cycle (Fig. 14).

9

10

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The light-response parameters of nonforest terrestrial ecosystems have a wide range of variability, from relatively low values of photosynthetic capacity ($A_{max} = 0.2 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in drought-stressed grasslands), quantum yield ($\alpha = 5 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$ in deserts), daytime ecosystem respiration ($r_d = 0.04 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in drought-stressed sagebrush steppe), and gross ecological light-use efficiency ($\epsilon = 2.6 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$ in sedge and tussock tundras of Alaska), to the highest values ever recorded for terrestrial ecosystems (intensively managed grasslands and agricultural crops: $A_{max} = 3.4 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, $\alpha = 75 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$, $r_d = 0.50 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, $\epsilon = 59 \text{ mmol mol}^{-1}$). Under optimal conditions, gross primary productivity in nonforest terrestrial ecosystems can surpass productivity of forests, with maximum rates of daily gross photosynthetic assimilation, $P_{g,max}$, achieving values greater $100 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ in intensive agricultural crops ($P_{g,max} = 116 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), while for forest ecosystems $P_{g,max}$ values remain below $100 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ (FLUXNET data base: www.fluxdata.org). Nevertheless, due to limitation by radiation, temperature, water, and nutrient resources, as well as management practices, maximum values of annual gross photosynthesis (GPP) of nonforest ecosystems estimated from flux-tower measurements remain below $10000 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, while in many types of forests they considerably exceeded this value (with maximum $GPP > 14000$ calculated for a tropical forest in French Guyana). The annual values of both GPP and RE for extensively and intensively managed grasslands, and shrubland/savanna ecosystems are nonlinearly related to annual precipitation, $PCPN$, and dryness index, $R_{net}/(\lambda*PCPN)$, indicating the potential sensitivity of these ecosystems to anthropogenic climate change.

1 The average annual net CO₂ exchange of our sample of 316 *NEE* values for
2 nonforest ecosystems indicates that on average, nonforest ecosystems act as net sinks for
3 atmospheric CO₂, with the highest rates of annual CO₂ uptake in agricultural crops (mean
4 $NEE_{crop} = 933 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and intensively managed grasslands (mean $NEE_{grassint} =$
5 $848 \text{ g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). These data, based on continuous long-term flux-tower
6 measurements, confirm that grasslands and agricultural crops play a significant role in the
7 carbon budget and have high carbon sequestration potential (Lal et al. 1998; Follett et al.
8 2001; Follett and Schuman 2005). These findings directly contradict conclusions of
9 earlier authors (e.g., Smith and Faloon 2005; Conant et al. 2007 in SOCCR) about the
10 negative or nearly neutral role agroecosystems play in continental carbon budgets. These
11 earlier studies were based on C-inventory methods and did not utilize flux-tower
12 measurements. Clearly, further analyses are needed to determine the extent to which
13 flux-tower networks and the GIS and remote-sensing methods used to up-scale flux
14 measurements to the regional level are representative, and to support our conclusion
15 about the significant sink role of managed grasslands and intensive agricultural crops in
16 the carbon budget.

17

18

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1

2

3 The authors thank managers of the RANGEFLUX data base Patricia Mielnick and the
4 FLUXNET data base Dario Papale, Markus Reichstein, and Deb Agrawal for assistance
5 with updating tower flux data. We also thank Mary Brooke McEachern for help with
6 editing the manuscript of the paper.

7

LITERATURE CITED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Agarwal, D., M. Humphrey, C. van Ingen, N. Beekwilder, M. Goode, K. Jackson, M. R. L. Rodriguez, and R. Weber. 2008. FLUXNET synthesis dataset collaboration infrastructure. *FluxLetter (The Newsletter of FLUXNET)* 1: 5-7.

Austin, R. B., G. Kingston, P. C. Longden, and P. A. Donovan. 1978. Gross energy yields and the support energy requirements for the production of sugar from beet and cane: a study of four production areas. *Journal of Agricultural Science* 91:661-675.

Baldocchi, D. 2008a. *Advanced topics in biometeorology and micrometeorology*. <http://nature.berkeley.edu/biometlab/espm228/>.

Baldocchi, D. 2008b. "Breathing" of the terrestrial biosphere: lessons learned from a global network of carbon dioxide flux measurement systems. *Australian Journal of Botany* 56: 1-26.

Baldocchi, D., and L. Xu. 2005. Carbon exchange of deciduous broadleaved forests in temperate and Mediterranean regions. *In*: H. Griffiths and P. G. Jarvis, editors. *The carbon balance of forests*. Taylor and Francis, New York, p. 187-215.

Birdsey, R. A., J. C. Jenkins, M. Johnston, E. Huber-Sannwald, B. Amero, B. de Jong, J. D. E. Barra, N. R. French, F. Garcia-Oliva, M. Harmon, L. S. Heath, V. J. Jaramillo, K. Johnsen, B. E. Law, E. Martin-Spiotta, O. Masera, R. Neilson, Y. Pan, and K. S. Pregitzer. 2007. North American Forests. in A. W. King, L. Dilling, G. P. Zimmerman, D. M. Fairman, H. R.A., G. Marland, R. A.Z., and T. J. Wilbanks [eds.]. *The First State of the Carbon Cycle Report (SOCCR): The North American Carbon Budget and Implications for the Global Carbon Cycle*. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science

- 1 Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. National Oceanic and
2 Atmospheric Administration, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC, USA, p.
3 117-126.
- 4 Blackman, F. F. 1905. Optima and limiting factors. *Annals of Botany* 19: 281-295.
- 5 Boyer, J.S. 1982. Plant productivity and environment. *Science* 218:443-448.
- 6 Bridgham, S. D., J. P. Megonigal, J. K. Keller, N. B. Bliss, and C. Trettin. 2007. Wetlands. In: A.
7 W. King, L. Dilling, G. P. Zimmerman, D. M. Fairman, H. R.A., G. Marland, R. A.Z.,
8 and T. J. Wilbanks [eds.]. The First State of the Carbon Cycle Report (SOCCR): The
9 North American Carbon Budget and Implications for the Global Carbon Cycle. A Report
10 by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change
11 Research. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Climatic Data
12 Center, Asheville, NC, USA, p. 139-148.
- 13 Budyko, M. I., and N. A. Efimova. 1968. The use of solar energy by the natural plant cover of
14 the USSR. *Botanicheskii Zhurnal* 53:1384-1389.
- 15 Burba, G., and D. Anderson. 2007. *Introduction to the eddy covariance method. General*
16 *guidelines, and conventional workflow. LI-COR Biosciences.*
17 *http://www.licor.com/env/PDF_Files/EddyCovariance_readonly.pdf.*
- 18 Buyanovsky, G. A., and G. H. Wagner. 1998. Changing role of cultivated land in the global
19 carbon cycle. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 27:242-245.
- 20 Ciais, P., P. Friedlingstein, A. Friend, and D. S. Schimel. 2001. Integrating global models of
21 terrestrial primary productivity. In: J. Roy, B. Saugier, and H. A. Mooney [eds.]
22 Terrestrial global productivity. Academic Press, San Diego et al., p. 449-478.
- 23 Colinvaux, P. A. 1993. Ecology 2. Wiley, New York.

1 Conant, R. T., K. Paustian, F. Garcia-Oliva, H. H. Janzen, M. J. Jaramillo, D. E. Johnson, and S.
2 N. Kulshreshtha. 2007. Agricultural and grazing lands. *In*: A. W. King, L. Dilling, G. P.
3 Zimmerman, D. M. Fairman, R. A. Houghton, G. Marland, A. Z. Rose, and T. J.
4 Wilbanks, editors. The first state of the carbon cycle report (SOCCR): The North
5 American carbon budget and implications for the global carbon cycle. A report by the
6 U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change
7 Research. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Climatic Data
8 Center, Asheville, NC, USA, p. 107-116.

9 Cooper, J. P. 1970. Potential production and energy conversion in temperate and tropical grasses.
10 *Herbage Abstracts* 40:1-13.

11 Cramer, W., R. J. Olson, S. D. Prince, J. M. O. Scurlock, and
12 members_of_the_Global_Primary_Production_Data_Initiative. 2001. Determining
13 present patterns of global productivity. *In*: J. Roy, B. Saugier, and H. A. Mooney [eds.].
14 Terrestrial global productivity. Academic Press, San Diego et al., p. 429-448.

15 Davidson, E. A., and I. A. Janssens. 2006. Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon decomposition
16 and feedbacks to climate change. *Nature* 440: 165-173.

17 Denmead, O. T., and R. H. Shaw. 1962. Availability of soil water to plants as affected by soil
18 moisture content and meteorological conditions. *Agronomy Journal* 54: 385-390.

19 Eastin, J. D., and C. Y. Sullivan. 1984. Environmental stress influences on plant persistence,
20 physiology, and production. *In*: M. B. Tesar [ed.]. Physiological basis of crop growth and
21 development. American Society of Agronomy and Crop Science Society of America,
22 Madison, Wisconsin, p. 201-236.

23 Emmerich, W. E. 2003. Carbon dioxide fluxes in a semiarid environment with high carbonate

1 soils. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 116: 91-102.

2 Falge, E., J. Tenhunen, D. Baldocchi, M. Aubinet, P. Bakwin, P. Berbigier, C. Bernhofer, J. M.

3 Bonnefond, G. Burba, R. Clement, K. J. Davis, J. A. Elbers, M. Falk, A. H. Goldstein, A.

4 Grelle, A. Granier, T. Grünwald, J. Gudmundsson, D. Hollinger, I. A. Janssens, P.

5 Keronen, A. S. Kowalski, G. Katul, B. E. Law, Y. Malhi, T. Meyers, R. K. Monson, E.

6 Moors, J. W. Munger, W. Oechel, K. T. P. U, K. Pilegaard, U. Rannik, C. Rebmann, A.

7 Suyker, H. Thorgeirsson, G. Tirone, A. Turnipseed, K. Wilson, and S. Wofsy. 2002.

8 Phase and amplitude of ecosystem carbon release and uptake potentials as derived from

9 FLUXNET measurements. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 113:75-95.

10 Farrell, A. E., M. O'Hare, D. M. Kammen, R. J. Plevin, B. T. Turner, and A. D. Jones. 2006.

11 Ethanol can contribute to energy and environmental goals. *Science* 311:506-508.

12 Follett, R. F., J. M. Kimble, and R. Lal [eds.]. 2001. The potential of U.S. grazing lands to

13 sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton,

14 Florida.

15 Follett, R. F., and G. E. Schuman. 2005. Grazing land contributions to carbon sequestration. *In:*

16 D. A. McGilloway [ed.]. *Grassland: a global resource*. Wageningen Academic Publishers,

17 Wageningen, p. 265-277.

18 Funk, J. L., and M. T. Lerdau. 2004. Photosynthesis in forest canopies. *In:* M. D. Lowman and

19 H. B. Rinker[eds.]. *Forest canopies*. Elsevier Academic Press, Amsterdam et al., p. 335-

20 358.

21 Gilmanov, T. G., A. B. Frank, M. R. Haferkamp, T. P. Meyers, J. A. Morgan, L. L. Tieszen, B.

22 K. Wylie, and L. B. Flanagan. 2005. Integration of CO₂ flux and remotely-sensed data for

23 primary production and ecosystem respiration analyses in the Northern Great Plains:

1 Potential for quantitative spatial extrapolation. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 14:
2 271-292.

3 Gilmanov, T. G., D. A. Johnson, and N. Z. Saliendra. 2003a. Growing season CO₂ fluxes in a
4 sagebrush-steppe ecosystem in Idaho: Bowen ratio/energy balance measurements and
5 modeling. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 4: 167-183.

6 Gilmanov, T. G., D. A. Johnson, N. Z. Saliendra, K. Akshalov, and B. K. Wylie. 2004. Gross
7 primary productivity of the true steppe in Central Asia in relation to NDVI: Scaling-up
8 CO₂ fluxes. *Environmental Management* 39: S492-S508.

9 Gilmanov, T. G., J. F. Soussana, L. Aires, V. Allard, C. Ammann, M. Balzarolo, Z. Barcza, C.
10 Bernhofer, C. L. Campbell, A. Cernusca, A. Cescatti, J. Clifton-Brown, B. O. M. Dirks,
11 S. Dore, W. Eugster, J. Fuhrer, C. Gimeno, T. Gruenwald, L. Haszpra, A. Hensen, A.
12 Ibrom, A. F. G. Jacobs, M. B. Jones, G. Lanigan, T. Laurila, A. Lohila, G. Manca, B.
13 Marcolla, Z. Nagy, K. Pilegaard, K. Pinter, C. Pio, A. Raschi, N. Rogiers, M. J. Sanz, P.
14 Stefani, M. Sutton, Z. Tuba, R. Valentini, M. L. Williams, and G. Wohlfahrt. 2007a.
15 Partitioning European grassland net ecosystem CO₂ exchange into gross primary
16 productivity and ecosystem respiration using light response function analysis.
17 *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 121: 93-120.

18 Gilmanov, T. G., T. J. Svejcar, D. A. Johnson, R. F. Angell, N. Z. Saliendra, and B. K. Wylie.
19 2006. Long-term dynamics of production, respiration, and net CO₂ exchange in two
20 sagebrush-steppe ecosystems. *Rangeland Ecology and Management* 59: 585-599.

21 Gilmanov, T. G., S. B. Verma, P. L. Sims, T. P. Meyers, J. A. Bradford, G. G. Burba, and A. E.
22 Suyker. 2003b. Gross primary production and light response parameters of four Southern
23 Plains ecosystems estimated using long-term CO₂-flux tower measurements - art. no.

1 1071. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 17: doi: 10.1029/2002GB002023, 2003.

2 Gilmanov, T. G., and WORLDGRASSAGRIFLUX Data Set Participants. 2007b. Productivity,
3 respiration, CO2 sink potential, and light-response parameters of world grasslands
4 derived from flux-tower data partitioning. *Eos Trans. AGU*, 88(52), *Fall Meet. Suppl.*,
5 *Abstract B32B-03*.

6 Good, N. E., and D. H. Bell. 1980. Photosynthesis, plant productivity and crop yield. *In*: P. S.
7 Carlson, editor. *The biology of crop productivity*. Academic Press, New York, p. 3-51.

8 Goulden, M. L., J. W. Munger, S.-M. Fan, B. C. Daube, and S. C. Wofsy. 1996. Measurements
9 of carbon sequestration by long-term eddy covariance: methods and critical evaluation of
10 accuracy. *Global Change Biology* 2: 169-182.

11 Griffiths, H., and P. Jarvis [eds.]. 2005. *The carbon balance of forest biomes*. Taylor & Francis,
12 New York et al.

13 Hollinger, S. E., C. J. Bernacchi, and T. P. Meyers. 2005. Carbon budget of mature no-till
14 ecosystem in North Central Region of the United States. *Agricultural and Forest*
15 *Meteorology* 130: 59-69.

16 Jarvis, P. G. 1994. Capture of carbon dioxide by a coniferous forest. *In*: J. L. Monteith, R. K.
17 Scott, and M. H. Unsworth [eds.]. *Resource capture by crops*. Nottingham University
18 Press, Loughborough, Leicestershire, p. 351-374.

19 King, A. W., L. Dilling, G. P. Zimmerman, D. M. Fairman, R. A. Houghton, G. Marland, A. Z.
20 Rose, and T. J. Wilbanks, editors. 2007. *The first state of the carbon cycle report*
21 (SOCCR): *The North American carbon budget and implications for the global carbon*
22 *cycle. A report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on*
23 *Global Change Research*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National

- 1 Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC, USA.
- 2 Körner, C. 2003. Slow in, rapid out – carbon flux studies and Kyoto target. *Science* 300:1242-
3 1243.
- 4 Lal, R., J. M. Kimble, R. F. Follett, and C. V. Cole [eds]. 1998. The potential of U.S. cropland to
5 sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect. Ann Arbor Press, Chelsea, MI.
- 6 Larcher, W. W. 1995. Physiological plant ecology: ecophysiology and stress physiology of
7 functional groups. Springer-Verlag, Berlin ; New York.
- 8 Le Houèrou, H. N., and C. H. Hoste. 1977. Rangeland production and annual rainfall relations in
9 the Mediterranean basin and in the African Sahelo-Sudanian Zone. *Journal of Range*
10 *Management* 30: 181-189.
- 11 Lee, X., W. Massman, and B. Law [eds]. 2004. *Handbook of Micrometeorology: A Guide for*
12 *Surface Flux Measurement and Analysis*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 13 Lieth, H. 1975. Modeling the primary productivity of the world. *In*: H. Lieth, R. H. Whittaker
14 [eds.]. *Primary Productivity of the Biosphere*. Springer-Verlag, New York, p. 237-263.
- 15 Loehle Enterprises. 2007. Global optimization 6.0. Global nonlinear optimization using
16 Mathematica. Loehle Enterprises, Naperville, Illinois.
- 17 Long, S. P., M. B. Jones, and M. J. Roberts, eds. 1991. *Primary productivity of grass ecosystems*
18 *of the tropics and sub-tropics*. Chapman & Hall, London; New York.
- 19 Mielnick, P. C., and W. A. Dugas. 2000. Soil CO₂ flux in a tallgrass prairie. *Soil Biology and*
20 *Biochemistry* 32:221-228.
- 21 Mitscherlich, E. A. 1909. Das Gesetz des Minimums und das Gesetz des abnehmenden
22 Bodenertrages. *Landwirtschaftliches Jahrbuch der Schweiz* 38: 537-552.
- 23 Moffat, A. M., D. Y. Hollinger, A. D. Richardson, A. G. Barr, C. Beckstein, B. H. Braswell, G.

1 Churkina, A. R. Desai, E. Falge, J. H. Gove, M. Heimann, D. Hui, A. J. Jarvis, J. Kattge,
2 A. Noormets, V. J. Stauch, D. Papale, and M. Reichstein. 2007. Comprehensive
3 comparison of gap-filling techniques for eddy covariance net carbon fluxes. *Agricultural*
4 *and Forest Meteorology* 147: 209-232.

5 Monteith, J. L. 1972. Solar radiation and productivity in tropical ecosystems. *Journal of Applied*
6 *Ecology* 9: 747-766.

7 Mordacq, L., J. Ghasghaie, and B. Saugier. 1991. A simple method for measuring the gas
8 exchange of small trees. *Functional Ecology* 5:572-576.

9 Odum, E. P. 1959. Fundamentals of ecology. Philadelphia.

10 Odum, H. T. 1956. Primary production in flowing waters. *Limnology and Oceanography* 1:102-
11 117.

12 Olson, J. S., J. A. Watts, and L. J. Allison. 1983. Carbon in live vegetation of major world
13 ecosystems (Oak Ridge National Laboratory Technical Report ORNL-5862).
14 Washington, D.C. U.S. Dept. of Energy, Springfield, Va.

15 Owen, K. E., E. Falge, R. Geyer, X. Xiao, P. Stoy, C. Ammann, A. Arain, M. Aubinet, M.
16 Aurela, C. Bernhofer, B. H. Chojnicki, A. Granier, T. Gruenwald, J. Hadley, B.
17 Heinesch, D. Hollinger, A. Knohl, W. Kutsch, A. Lohila, T. Meyers, E. Moors, C.
18 Moureaux, K. Pilegaard, N. Saigusa, S. Verma, T. Vesala, C. Vogel, J. Tenhunen, M.
19 Reichstein, and Q. Wang. 2007. Linking flux network measurements to continental scale
20 simulations: Ecosystem carbon dioxide exchange capacity under non-water-stressed
21 conditions. *Global Change Biology* 13:734-760.

22 Patzek, T. W., J. Lee, B. Li, J. Padnick, S. A. Yee, S. M. Anti, R. Campos, and K. W. Ha. 2005.
23 Ethanol from corn: Clean renewable fuel for the future, or drain on our resources and

- 1 pockets? *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:319-336.
- 2 Powlson, D. S., A. B. Riche, and I. Shield. 2005. Biofuels and other approaches for decreasing
3 fossil fuel emissions from agriculture. *Annals of Applied Biology* 146:193-201.
- 4 Rabinowich, E. I. 1951. Photosynthesis and related processes. Interscience Publishers, Inc, New
5 York.
- 6 Reichstein, M., E. Falge, D. Baldocchi, D. Papale, R. Valentini, M. Aubinet, P. Berbigier, C.
7 Bernhofer, N. Buchmann, M. Falk, T. Gilmanov, A. Granier, T. Grünwald, K.
8 Havránková, D. Janous, A. Knohl, T. Laurela, A. Lohila, D. Loustau, G. Matteucci, T.
9 Meyers, F. Miglietta, J.-M. Ourcival, D. Perrin, J. Pumpanen, S. Rambal, E. Rotenberg,
10 M. Sanz, J. Tenhunen, G. Seufert, F. Vaccari, T. Vesala, and D. Yakir. 2005. On the
11 separation of net ecosystem exchange into assimilation and ecosystem respiration: review
12 and improved algorithm. *Global Change Biology* 11: 1424-1439.
- 13 Reicosky, D. C. 1997. Tillage-induced CO₂ emission from soil. *Nutrient Cycling in*
14 *Agroecosystems* 49:273-285.
- 15 Rodin, L. E., and N. I. Bazilevich. 1968. Production and mineral cycling in terrestrial vegetation.
16 Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.
- 17 Rodin, L. E., N. I. Bazilevich, and N. N. Rozov. 1975. Productivity of the world's main
18 ecosystems. *In*: D. E. Reichle, J. F. Franklin, and D. W. Goodall [eds.]. Productivity of
19 the World Ecosystems. Proceedings, Symposium Fifth General Assembly of Special
20 Committee of IBP. National Acad. of Sci., Washington, D.C., p. 13-26.
- 21 Rosenzweig, M. L. 1968. Net primary production of terrestrial communities: Prediction from
22 climatological data. *American Naturalist* **102**:67-74.
- 23 Ruimy, A., P. G. Jarvis, and D. D. Baldocchi. 1995. CO₂ fluxes over plant canopies and solar

1 radiation: a review. *Advances in Ecological Research* 26: 1-68.

2 Sala, O. E., W. J. Parton, L. A. Joyce, and W. K. Lauenroth. 1988. Primary production of the
3 central grassland region of the United States. *Ecology* 69:40-45.

4 Singh, J. S., M. J. Trlica, P. G. Risser, R. E. Redmann, and J. K. Marshall. 1980. Autotrophic
5 subsystem. Pages 59-200. In: A.I. Breymeyer and G. M. Van Dyne [eds.]. *Grasslands,*
6 *systems analysis and man*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

7 Slatyer, R. O. 1967. *Plant-water relationships*. Academic Press, London, New York.

8 Smith, P., and P. Falloon. 2005. Carbon sequestration in European croplands. Pages 47-55 in H.
9 Griffiths and P. G. Jarvis, editors. *The carbon balance of forest biomes*. Taylor and
10 Francis, New York.

11 Stoy, P. C., J. Y. Juang, K. A. Novick, J. M. Uebelherr, R. Oren, G. G. Katul, and M. B. S.
12 Siqueira. 2006. An evaluation of models for partitioning eddy covariance-measured net
13 ecosystem exchange into photosynthesis and respiration. *Agricultural and Forest*
14 *Meteorology* 141: 2-18.

15 Tamiya, H. 1951. Some theoretical notes on the kinetics of algal growth. *Botanical Magazine* 6:
16 167-173.

17 Tarnocai, C., C.-L. Ping, and J. Kimble. 2007. Carbon cycle in the permafrost region of North
18 America. Pages 127-138 in A. W. King, L. Dilling, G. P. Zimmerman, D. M. Fairman, H.
19 R.A., G. Marland, R. A.Z., and T. J. Wilbanks, eds. *The First State of the Carbon Cycle*
20 *Report (SOCCR): The North American Carbon Budget and Implications for the Global*
21 *Carbon Cycle. A Report by the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the*
22 *Subcommittee on Global Change Research*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric
23 Administration, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC, USA.

- 1 Thornley, J. H. M., and I. R. Johnson. 2000. Plant and crop modelling. A mathematical approach
2 to plant and crop physiology. The Blackburn Press, Caldwell, New Jersey.
- 3 Walter, H. 1939. Grassland, Savanne und Busch der ariden Teile Afrikas in ihrer ökologische
4 Bedingtheit. *Jahrbuch für wissenschaftliche Botanik* 87:850-860.
- 5 Weaver, J. E. 1924. Plant production as a measure of environments. *Journal of Ecology* 12: 205-
6 237.
- 7 Whittaker, R. H., and G. E. Likens. 1973. Carbon in the biota. In: G. M. Woodwell and E. V.
8 Pecan, eds. *Carbon and the biosphere*. National Technical Information Service,
9 Springfield, Virginia, p. 281-302.
- 10 Wildung, R. E., T. R. Garland, and R. L. Buschbom. 1975. The interdependent effects of soil
11 temperature and water content on soil respiration rate and plant root decomposition in
12 arid grassland soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 7:373-378.
- 13 Wolfram Research. 2009. www.wolfram.com.
- 14 Woodward, F. I., M. R. Lomas, and S. E. Lee. 2001. Predicting the future productivity and
15 distribution of global terrestrial vegetation. In: J. Roy, B. Saugier, and H. A. Mooney
16 [eds.]. *Terrestrial global productivity*. Academic Press, San Diego et al., p. 521-541.
- 17 Zhao, L., S. Gu, G. Yu, X. Zhao, Y. Li, S. Xu, and H. Zhou. 2006. Diurnal, seasonal and annual
18 variation in net ecosystem CO₂ exchange of an alpine shrubland on Qinghai-Tibetan
19 plateau. *Global Change Biology* 12: 1940-1953.
- 20 Zhang, L.-M., Y. Gui-Rui, X.-M. Sun, X.-F. Wen, C.-Y. Ren, Y.-L. Fu, Q.-K. Li, Z.-Q. Li, Y.-F.
21 Liu, D.-X. Guan, and J.-H. Yan. 2006. Seasonal variation of ecosystem apparent quantum
22 yield (α) and maximum photosynthesis rate (P_{max}) of different forest ecosystems in
23 China. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 137: 176-187.

24

FIGURES AND TABLES

1

2

3 Figure 1. Geographical distribution of the 118 nonforest flux tower sites considered in
4 this study.

5

6 Figure 2. Major types of ecosystem light-response functions: A - linear, convexity $\theta = 1$
7 (corn crop, Bondville, IL, USA, 1999, day 188); B - nonrectangular hyperbolic,
8 convexity $0 < \theta < 1$ (soybeans, Rosemount, MN, USA, 2004, day 207); C - rectangular
9 hyperbolic, $\theta = 0$ (meadow bromegrass/alfalfa, Lacombe, Alberta, Canada, 2003, day
10 151); D - hysteresis (floodplain meadow, Cherskii, East Siberia, Russia, 2005, day 1900,
11 $k_T = 0.056 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$).

12

13 Figure 3. Light-temperature response surfaces fitted by modified nonrectangular equation
14 [4] for representative days for: A - Douulun steppe, China, 2006, day 218; B – Brookings
15 sown pasture, SD, USA, 2005, day 190; C – Howard wet-dry savanna, Australia, 2002,
16 day 34; and D – Rondonia tropical grassland, Brazil, 1999, day 270.

17

18 Figure 4. Scatter diagrams of maximum weekly values of light-response (α , A_{max} , $P_{g,max}$,
19 L_{max}), metabolic (r_d , $R_{e,max}$), and efficiency (ϵ , G_{max}) parameters for the pooled data set
20 including grasslands (extensively and intensively managed), shrublands and savannas,
21 wetlands, and croplands: A - α vs A_{max} ; B - r_d vs A_{max} ; C - ϵ vs A_{max} ; D - A_{max} vs L_{max} ; E -
22 $P_{g,max}$ vs A_{max} ; F - A_{max} vs G_{max} ; G - $R_{e,max}$ vs $P_{g,max}$; and H - $P_{g,max}$ vs L_{max} . Dashed lines

1 describe linear or allometric equations characterizing patterns of co-variation between
2 parameters.

3

4 Figure 5. Scatter diagrams of maximum weekly values of light-response (α , A_{max} , $P_{g,max}$,
5 L_{max}), metabolic (r_d , $R_{e,max}$), and efficiency (ϵ , G_{max}) parameters for the extensively
6 managed grasslands data subset: A - α vs A_{max} ; B - r_d vs A_{max} ; C - ϵ vs A_{max} ; D - A_{max} vs
7 L_{max} ; E - $P_{g,max}$ vs A_{max} ; F - A_{max} vs G_{max} ; G - $R_{e,max}$ vs $P_{g,max}$; and H - $P_{g,max}$ vs L_{max} .

8 Dashed lines describe linear or allometric equations characterizing patterns of co-
9 variation between parameters.

10

11 Figure 6. Seasonal dynamics of light-response parameters: maximum photosynthesis,
12 A_{max} , daytime ecosystem respiration, r_d , quantum yield, α , and gross ecological light-use
13 efficiency, ϵ , in selected nonforest ecosystems: A – floodplain meadow, Cherskii, 2003;
14 B – mixed prairie, Cottonwood, 2006; mixed prairie, Gudmundsen Ranch, 2006; D-
15 tallgrass prairie, Fort Reno, 2005; E – wet-dry savanna, Howard, 2002; F – tropical
16 grassland, Rondonia, 1999; G – sugar beet, Lonzee, 2004; H – corn crop, Bondville,
17 1999.

18

19 Figure 7. Seasonal dynamics and annual budgets of gross primary productivity, $P_g(t)$,
20 total ecosystem respiration, $R_e(t)$, and cumulative net ecosystem CO₂ exchange,
21 $CumNEE(t)$ for selected nonforest sites and years: A – floodplain meadow, Cherskii,
22 2003; B – sown northern temperate grassland, Jokioinen, 2001-2002; C – temperate
23 grassland, Grillenburg, 2005; D – desert grassland, Audubon Ranch, 2004; E - dry

1 savanna, Skukuza, 2002; F – tropical grassland, Rondonia, 1999; G – corn crop,
2 Bondville, 2003; H – soybean crop, Mead, 2002.

3

4 Figure 8. Frequency distributions of gross primary production (A), ecosystem respiration
5 (B), and net ecosystem CO₂ exchange (C) estimates in the pooled set site-years from
6 nonforest flux tower sites.

7

8 Figure 9. Scatter plot of *RE* versus *GPP* values for the pooled set of site-years from
9 nonforest flux tower stations of the world. The 1:1 diagonal is shown as a dashed line.

10

11 Figure 10. Scatter plots of the *RE* versus *GPP* values for various types of nonforest
12 ecosystems: A - extensively managed grasslands; B – intensively managed grasslands; C
13 – shrublands and savanna; D – wetlands; E – croplands.

14

15 Figure 11. Histograms of statistical distributions of the annual net ecosystem CO₂
16 exchange values (*NEE*) in various types of nonforest ecosystems: A - extensively
17 managed grasslands; B – intensively managed grasslands; C – shrublands and savanna; D
18 – wetlands; E – croplands.

19

20 Figure 12. Response of gross primary production, *GPP*, (A, C) and ecosystem
21 respiration, *RE*, (B, D) of extensively managed grasslands on the annual precipitation
22 *PCPN* (A, B) and the dryness index $DI = R_{net}/(\lambda*PCPN)$. The dashed lines indicate
23 nonlinear regressions describing predominant trends.

1

2 Figure 13. Response of gross primary production, *GPP*, (A, C) and ecosystem
 3 respiration, *RE*, (B, D) of intensively managed grasslands on the annual precipitation
 4 *PCPN* (A, B) and the dryness index $DI = R_{net}/(\lambda*PCPN)$. The dashed lines indicate
 5 nonlinear regressions describing predominant trends.

6

7 Figure 14. Response of gross primary production, *GPP*, (A, C) and ecosystem
 8 respiration, *RE*, (B, D) of shrublands and savanna on the annual precipitation *PCPN* (A,
 9 B) and the dryness index $DI = R_{net}/(\lambda*PCPN)$. The dashed lines indicate nonlinear
 10 regressions describing predominant trends.

11

12

13 Table 1. Nonforest flux tower sites analyzed in this study.

14

Site	Latitude	Longitude	Elevation	PCPN	Tyear	Years	Investigator(s)	Method*
Croplands								
Ames, IA, USA, corn	41.720	-93.410	300	814	8.9	2003	J. Prueger	L
Auradé, France	43.549	1.108	243	690	13.3	2005	E. Ceschia, P. Beziat	T
Batavia-agro, IL, USA	41.859	-88.223	227	921	10.5	2005-2006	R. Matamala; D. Cook	T
Bondville, IL, USA, corn	40.006	-88.292	300	990	11.3	1997-2005	S. Hollinger; C. Bernacchi, T. Meyers	L
Bondville, IL, USA, soybeans	40.006	-88.292	300	990	11.3	1998-2006	S. Hollinger; C. Bernacchi, T. Meyers	L
Bondville- companion, IL, USA	40.006	-88.292	219	990	11.3	2005-2006	S. Hollinger; C. Bernacchi	T
Borgo Cioffi-crop, Italy	40.524	14.957	20	490	19.0	2004-2006	V. Magliulo	T
Carlou, Ireland	52.859	-6.918	59	824	9.4	2004-2006	M. Jones; G. Lanigan	L
Doulun, China	42.046	116.280	1350	399	3.3	2005-2006	Shiping Chen	L
Foulum-crop, Denmark	56.484	9.587	51	712	8.0	2005	J. Olesen; K. Schelde C. Rebmann, W.	T
Gebesee, Germany	51.100	10.914	162	492	9.6	2004-2006	Kutsch	T
Grignon, France	48.844	1.952	125	600	11.1	2005-2006	P. Cellier	T
Haller, PA, USA	48.860	-77.840	352	974	9.7	2003	R.H. Skinner	L

Klingenberg, Germany	50.893	13.222	480	850	7.0	2004-2006	C. Bernhofer; T. Gruenwald	T
Lamasquère, France, irrigated	43.493	1.237	180	690	13.3	2005	E. Ceschia	T
Langerak, France	52.004	4.806	-1	786	9.8	2005-2006	E. Moors, J. Elbers, W. Jans	T
Lonzee, Belgium	50.552	4.745	165	800	10.0	2004-2006	C. Moureaux, M. Aubinet	L
Mase, Japan, paddy field	36.054	140.027	13	1200	13.7	2002-2003	A. Miyata	T
Mead, NE, USA, corn rainfed	41.180	-96.440	363	887	9.7	2001-2003	S. Verma, A. Suyker	L
Meadm NE, USA, soybeans rainfed	41.180	-96.440	363	887	9.7	2002-2004	S. Verma, A. Suyker	L
Mead, maize rotation irrigated	41.165	-96.470	362	887	9.7	2001-2003	S. Verma, A. Suyker	T
Mead, NE, USA, corn irrigated	41.165	-96.477	361	728	10.1	2001-2004	S. Verma, A. Suyker	T
Mead, NE, USA, soybeans irrigated	41.165	-96.470	362	728	10.1	2002-2004	S. Verma, A. Suyker	T
Molenweg, Netherlands	51.650	4.639	1	800	9.8	2005	E. Moors, J. Elbers	T
Oensingen, Switzerland	47.286	7.734	452	1100	9.0	2005	N. Buchmann; W. Eugster	T
Ponca City, OK, USA, winter wheat	36.767	-97.133	310	866	14.8	1997	S. Verma	L
Risbyholm, Denmark	51.530	12.097	10	575	9.0	2004-2005	H. Soegaard	T
Rosemount, MN, USA	44.714	-93.090	260	799	6.8	2004-2005	T. Griffis, J. Baker	L

Extensively managed grasslands

Alinya, Spain	42.202	1.449	1770	669	13.0	2003-2005	M.J. Sanz	L
Amplero, Italy	41.867	13.633	884	1365	10.0	2003-2005	M. Balzarolo	L
Atquasuk, AK, USA	70.470	-157.409	N/A	127	NA?	1999-2006	W. Oechel	T
Audubon Ranch, AZ, USA	31.591	-110.510	985	382	16.0	2002-2006	T. Meyers	L
Barrow, AK, USA	71.323	-156.626	1	124	-12.5	1998-2002	W. Oechel	T
Batavia Prairie, IL, USA	41.841	-88.241	226	921	10.5	2005-2006	R. Matamala	L
Bily Kriz, Czech Republic	49.495	18.545	855	1200	5.5	2004-2006	M. Marek, R. Czerny	T
Brookings, SD, USA	44.311	-96.798	495	550	5.8	2004-2006	T. Meyers, T. Gilmanov, M. Heuer	L
Bugacpuszta, Hungary	46.800	18.900	100	500	10.8	2003-2006	Z. Tuba,	L
Canaan Valley, WV, USA	39.063	-79.421	988	900	8.2	2004	T. Meyers	L
Cheyenne, WY, USA	41.183	-104.900	1910	397	7.2	1997-1998	J. Morgan	L
Cottonwood, SD, USA	43.950	-101.847	735	447	7.7	2004-2006	T. Meyers, A. Detwyler, K. Brehe	L
CPER, CO, USA	40.683	-104.750	1660	332	9.2	2001-2004	J. Morgan	L
Doulun, China	42.047	116.284	1350	399	3.3	2006	Shiping Chen	L
Duke grassland, NC, USA	35.971	-79.090	163	1145	15.5	2001-2005	G. Katul	L
Fort Peck, MT, USA	48.308	-105.101	634	310	7.7	2000-2006	T. Meyers	L
Fort Reno, OK, USA	35.557	-98.017	421	870	14.9	2005	M. Torn, D. Billesbach	L
Freeman Ranch, TX, USA	29.930	-98.010	244	959	19.4	2004	J. Heilman	L

Goodwin Creek, MS, USA	34.250	-89.970	70	1455	15.7	2002-2006	T. Meyers	L
Grillenburg, Germany	50.951	13.514	400	853	7.2	2004-2006	C. Bernhofer, T. Gruenwald	L
Gudmundsen Ranch, NE, USA	42.069	-101.407	1081	560	7.9	2006	D. Billesbach	L
Haibei, China	37.617	101.317	3250	561	-1.7	2002-2003	T. Kato	T
Ivotuk, Alaska	68.486	-155.750	550	250	-9.0	2004-2006	W. Oechel W. Dugas, P. Mielnick	T
Jornada, NM, USA	32.600	-106.750	1320	272	N/A	2000-2001	M. Nasyrov, N. Saliendra	L
Karnap, Uzbekistan	40.000	65.500	310	237	14.6	2001	Saliendra	L
Kendall, AZ, USA	31.737	-109.942	1531	356	17.0	1999-2006	W. Emmerich	L
Khakasia, Russia	54.773	90.002	430	304	0.5	2002-2004	L. Belelli	L
Khakasia-3, Russia	54.705	89.078	N/A	N/A	N/A	2004	L. Belelli	T
Kherlenbayan, Mongolia	47.214	108.737	1235	196	1.2	2003	S. Li J.-F. Soussana, V. Allard	L
Laqueuille, France	45.643	2.736	1040	1013	8.6	2002-2006	Allard	L
Lethbridge, Canada	49.709	-112.940	960	378	6.4	1998-2002	L. Flanagan	L
Little Washita, OK, USA	34.967	-97.983	335	750	16.3	1997-1998	T. Meyers	L
Malga Arpaco, Italy	46.117	11.703	1699	1200	6.3	2003-2004	A. Raschi	L
Mandan, ND, USA	46.767	-100.917	518	404	5.0	1999-2001	A. Frank	L
Matra, Hungary	47.842	19.726	350	605	10.6	2004-2005	J. Balogh	T
Miles City, MT, USA	46.300	-105.967	719	343	7.9	2000-2001	M. Haferkamp	L
Monte Bondone, Italy	46.016	11.047	1550	1189	5.5	2003-2006	D. Gianelle	T
Neal Smith, IA, USA	41.558	-93.296	280	826	9.1	2005	J. Prueger	L
Neustift, Austria	47.117	11.317	970	850	6.3	2001-2006	G. Wohlfahrt	L
Oensingen, Switzerland	47.283	7.733	450	1100	9.0	2002-2003	C. Ammann, J. Fuhrer	L
Rannels Ranch, KS, USA	39.139	-96.523	324	840	12.9	1998-1999	C. Owensby	L
Rigi-Seebodenalp, Switzerland	47.058	8.457	1025	1327	7.3	2003	W. Eugster, N. Rogiers M. Waterloo, A. Manzi	L
Rondonia, Brazil	-10.762	-62.357	306	1664	23.9	1999	Manzi	L
Santarem, Brazil	-3.012	-54.537	N/A	N/A	N/A	2001-2002	D. Fitzjarrald	L
Shidler, OK, USA	36.933	-96.683	356	942	14.8	1997-1999	S. Verma, A. Suyker K. Akshalov, N. Saliendra, D. A. Johnson	L
Shortandy, Kazakhstan	51.667	71.000	367	323	1.6	1998-2001	W. Dugas, P. Mielnick	L
Temple, TX, USA	31.100	-97.333	219	878	19.6	1998-1999	Mielnick	L
Tojal, Portugal	38.477	-8.025	190	750	15.5	2004-2006	C. Pio, L. Aires	L
Vicara Ranch, CA, USA	38.407	-120.951	129	500	15.9	2001-2006	D. Baldocchi	L
Walnut River, KS, USA	37.521	-96.855	408	1030	13.1	2002-2004	R. Coulter, D. Cook	L
Woodward, OK, USA	36.600	-99.583	630	586	14.3	1997-2002	P. Sims, J. Bradford	L
Xilinhot grazed, China	43.554	116.671	1250	360	2.0	2006	Shiping Chen	L
Xilinhot-fenced, China	43.546	116.678	1250	360	2.0	2006	Shiping Chen	T
Xilinhot-typical fenced, China	44.134	116.329	1030	290	2.0	2004-2006	Guangsheng Zhou	T

Intensively managed grasslands								
Cabauw- extension. The Netherlands	51.954	4.903	-1	786	9.8	2005	E. Moors, J. Elbers	T
Cabauw, The Netherlands	51.967	4.917	-1	800	10.0	2003	A. Hensen	T
Cabauw, The Netherlands	51.971	4.927	-1	786	9.8	2004-2006	E. Moors, J. Elbers	T
Carlow-grassland, Ireland	52.850	-6.900	50	804	10.1	2003	M. Jones, G. Lanigan	L
Dripsey-grass, Ireland	51.919	-8.751	187	1450	9.5	2002-2005	G. Kiely, P. Leahy	T
Easter Bush, UK	55.867	-3.200	190	890	8.0	2003-2004	M. Sutton	L
Haarweg, The Netherlands	51.970	5.630	7	760	9.5	2002	A. Jacobs	T
Haastrect, Netherlands	52.004	4.806	-2	786	9.8	2003	E. Moors	T
Haller, PA, USA	40.862	-77.840	352	974	9.7	2003-2005	R.H. Skinner	L
Hegihátsál, Hungary	46.950	16.650	248	759	8.9	1999	Z. Barcza, L. Haszpra	T
Horstermeer, Netherlands	52.029	5.068	-2	797	9.8	2004-2006	H. Dolman	T
Jokioinen, Finland	60.899	23.514	104	581	3.9	2002	A. Lohila, T. Laurila	L
Lacombe, Canada	52.436	-113.808	871	446	2.1	2003	V.S. Baron J.-F. Soussana, V. Allard	L
Laqueuille, France	45.643	2.736	1040	1013	8.6	2002-2006		L
Lelystad, The Netherlands	52.500	5.500	0	780	10.0	2004	A. Hensen	L
Lille Valby, Denmark	55.700	12.117	15	1119	8.5	2004-2006	E. Dellwik C. Ammann; J. Fuhrer	L
Oensingen, Switzerland	47.283	7.733	450	1100	9.0	2002-2006		L
Shrublands and savanna								
Burns, OR, USA	43.483	-119.717	1380	283	7.6	1995-2001	T. Svejcar N. Saliendra, D.A. Johnson	L
Dubois, ID, USA	44.267	-112.133	1700	302	6.2	1996-2001		L
Howard Springs, Australia	-12.329	131.000	38	1824	25.9	2002-2005	J. Berringer M. Dourikov, N. Saliendra, D.A. Johnson	L
Karrykul, Turkmenistan	38.600	58.400	90	148	15.6	1998-2000		L
Kubuqi, China	40.381	108.549	1160	180	7.5	2006	Shiping Chen	L
Santa Rita, AZ, USA	31.821	-110.866	1120	330	17.6	2004-2006	R. Scott	T
Sao Paulo, Brazil	-21.619	-47.650	N/A	953	N/A	2001-2002	H. da Rocha	T
Skukuza, South Africa	-24.983	31.600	263	561	21.6	2001-2003	N. Hanan	L
Sky Oaks, CA, USA, old stand	33.374	-116.623	1394	491	12.2	1997-2006	W. Oechel	L
Sky Oaks, CA, USA, young stand	33.377	-116.623	1429	491	12.2	1997-2001	W. Oechel	T
Tonzi Ranch, CA, USA	38.432	-120.966	177	559	15.4	2002-2006	D. Baldocchi	T
Wetlands								
Cherskii, Russia	68.615	161.339	4	200	-12.5	2003-2004	C. Corradi	T
CzechWet, Czech Republic	49.025	14.772	420	740	7.2	2006	M. Marek; D. Janous Bin Zhao; Guo	T
Dongtan marsh-1, China	31.517	121.961	31	2192	15.7	2005	Haiquang	T
Dongtan marsh-2,	31.585	121.903	31	2074	15.7	2005	Bin Zhao; Guo	T

China							Haiquang	
Dongtan marsh-3, China	31.517	121.972	31	1957	15.5	2005	Bin Zhao; Guo Haiquang	T
Kaamanen wetland, Finland	69.141	27.295	155	395	-1.3	2000-2006	T. Laurila; M. Aurela	T
PolWet, Poland	52.762	16.309	54	550	8.1	2004	J. Olejnik	T
Siikaneva, Finland	61.833	24.193	N/A	713	3.0	2004-2006	M. Aurela	T
Tadham Moore, UK	51.207	-2.829	3	750	11.1	2001	R. Harding	T

1
2 * Method on net flux partitioning into photosynthesis and respiration: L – light-response
3 function analysis; T – nighttime temperature dependence.

4

5

6 Table 2. Parameters α , A_{max} , r_d , and θ from the nonrectangular hyperbolic light-response

7 function $F_C(Q) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\alpha Q + A_{max} - \sqrt{(\alpha Q + A_{max})^2 - 4\alpha A_{max} \theta Q} \right) - r_d$, for representative

8 days at the Bondville, Rosemount, Lacombe, and Brookings flux tower stations.

9

Statistical characteristics	Parameters			
	Slope, α mg CO ₂ μmol^{-1}	Plateau, A_{max} mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Respiration, r_d mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Convexity, θ dimensionless
A. Corn crop, Bondville, IL, USA, 1999, day 188 $R^2 = 0.98$; SE = 0.158 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹				
Estimate	0.0014	3.2	0.1936	1.0
Standard Error	0.0001	-	0.0423	0.0012
Student's t	19.92	-	4.58	84.20
p -level	0.0000	-	0.0000	0.0000
Soybeans, Rosemount, MN, USA, 2004, day 207 $R^2 = 0.98$; SE = 0.045 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹				
Estimate	0.0009	0.9930	0.2002	0.6947
Standard Error	0.0002	0.1899	0.0221	0.3329
Student's t	4.77	5.23	9.07	2.09
p -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0243
Sown pasture, Lacombe, Alberta, Canada, 2003, day 151 $R^2 = 0.94$; SE = 0.061 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹				

Estimate	0.0026	0.8321	0.3413	0.0
Standard Error	0.0009	0.0969	0.0273	-
Student's <i>t</i>	2.98	8.58	12.50	-
<i>p</i> -level	0.0023	0.0000	0.0000	-

Floodplain meadow, Cherskii, East Siberia, Russia, 2003, day 214

$R^2 = 0.93$; SE = 0.033 mg CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹

Estimate	0.0006	0.2987	0.1038	0.9333
Standard Error	0.0001	0.0252	0.090	0.090
Student's <i>t</i>	5.31	11.85	11.58	10.38
<i>p</i> -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

1

2

3 Table 3. Parameters α , A_{max} , r_0 , k_T and θ from the modified nonrectangular hyperbolic

4 light-temperature response function

$$5 \quad F_c(Q, T_s) = \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\alpha Q + A_{max} - \sqrt{(\alpha Q + A_{max})^2 - 4\alpha A_{max}\theta Q} \right) - r_0 e^{k_T T_s}, \text{ for}$$

6 representative days at Douulun, Brookings, Howard, and Rondonia sites.

7

Statistical characteristics	Parameters				
	Slope, α mg CO ₂ μmol^{-1}	Plateau, A_{max} mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Respiration, r_0 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Temperature coefficient, k_T , (°C) ⁻¹	Convexity, θ dimensionless
A. Steppe, Douulun, China, 2006, day 218					
$R^2 = 0.98$; SE = 0.037 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹					
Estimate	0.0009	0.5542	0.0377	0.0671	0.9644
Standard Error	0.00001	0.0241	0.0102	0.0116	0.0408
Student's <i>t</i>	9.08	22.98	3.68	5.78	23.64
<i>p</i> -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000
B. Sown pasture, Brookings, SD, USA, 2005, day 190					
$R^2 = 0.99$; SE = 0.032 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹					
Estimate	0.0014	1.0867	0.0631	0.0614	0.0000
Standard Error	0.0001	0.0498	0.0141	0.0094	0.0000
Student's <i>t</i>	13.87	21.81	4.48	6.53	-
<i>p</i> -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-
C. Wet-dry savanna, Howard, Australia, 2002, day 34					
$R^2 = 0.97$; SE = 0.074 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹					
Estimate	0.0017	1.147	0.0278	0.0690	0.8376
Standard Error	0.0003	0.1019	0.0167	0.0186	0.1529
Student's <i>t</i>	5.83	11.25	1.67	3.71	5.48

<i>p</i> -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0522	0.0004	0.0000
D. Tropical grassland, Rondonia, Brazil, 1999, day 270					
$R^2 = 0.97$; SE = 0.052 mg CO ₂ m ⁻² s ⁻¹					
Estimate	0.0008	0.8048	0.0339	0.0760	0.9902
Standard Error	0.0001	0.0721	0.0183	0.0217	0.0230
Student's <i>t</i>	9.38	11.16	1.85	3.50	43.04
<i>p</i> -level	0.0000	0.0000	0.0408	0.0014	0.0000

1 * Not significantly different from zero

2

3 Table 4. Statistical characteristics of annual gross primary production (*GPP*), total
 4 ecosystem respiration (*RE*), and net ecosystem exchange (*NEE*) for major groups within
 5 nonforest terrestrial ecosystems.

6

Statistical characteristics	Ecosystem group				
	Grasslands extensively managed	Grasslands intensively managed	Shrublands and savanna	Wetlands	Croplands
Gross primary production, <i>GPP</i> (g CO ₂ m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)					
Number of site-years	179	34	28	48	66
Mean	2708	5767	2949	2328	4521
Standard deviation	1842	1144	1950	1836	1365
Minimum	95	3141	645	749	1376
Maximum	8600	7720	6836	5643	6774
Total ecosystem respiration, <i>RE</i> (g CO ₂ m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)					
Number of site-years	169	34	27	18	66
Mean	2535	4990	2537	1824	3588
Standard deviation	1689	1024	1396	1373	909
Minimum	112	3186	756	665	1052
Maximum	7880	7003	5094	4751	5905
Net Ecosystem Exchange, <i>NEE</i> (g CO ₂ m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)					
Number of site-years	169	36	27	18	66
Mean	239	848	493	504	933
Standard deviation	521	658	740	719	814
Minimum	-1342	-961	-585	-40	-770
Maximum	1762	2934	2254	2226	2382

7

8

9 Table 5. Maximum values of daytime gross primary productivity, $P_{g,max}$, and annual net
 10 primary production, *GPP*, estimated for nonforest and forest flux-tower sites

Site	Year	$P_{g,max}$	Site	Year	<i>GPP</i>
------	------	-------------	------	------	------------

		$\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$			$\text{g CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$
A. Grasslands extensively managed					
Neustift, Austria	2004	76.2	Rondonia, Brazil	1999	8600
Jornada, NM, USA	2000	63.1	Neustift, Austria	2006	7415
Rannels Ranch, KS, USA	1998	60.8	Goodwin Creek, MS, USA	2004	6391
Batavia Prairie Site, IL, USA	2006	59.9	Grillenburg, Germany	2005	6299
Grillenburg, Germany	2005	57.34	Duke grassland, NC, USA	2003	6039
Monte Bondone, Italy	2006	56.9	Laqueuille, France, extensive	2006	5943
Shidler, OK, USA	1999	56.9	Neal Smith, IA, USA	2005	5756
Temple, TX, USA	1999	56.2	Batavia Prairie Site, IL, USA	2006	5435
Oensingen, Switzerland	2003	53.6	Oensingen, Switzerland	2003	5326
Neal Smith, IA, USA	2005	52.7	Laqueuille, France, extensive	2004	5322
Laqueuille, France, extensive	2004	51.7	Rigi-Seebodenalp, Switzerland	2003	5320
Goodwin Creek, MS, USA	2003	51.4	Shidler, OK, USA	1997	5208
B. Grasslands intensively managed					
Cabauw- extension. The Netherlands	2005	76.3	Oensingen, Switzerland	2004	7720
Easter Bush, UK	2003	63.6	Dripsey-grass, Ireland	2004	7388
Oensingen, Switzerland	2004	63.5	Haastrect, Netherlands	2003	7267
Lille Valby, Denmark	2006	63.4	Lille Valby, Denmark	2004	6873
Haastrect, Netherlands	2003	63.1	Laqueuille, France, intensive	2004	6838
Laqueuille, France, intensive	2006	59.0	Carlow-grassland, Ireland	2003	6807
Carlow-grassland, Ireland	2003	57.9	Easter Bush, UK	2003	6793
Haarweg, The Netherlands	2002	57.5	Cabauw- extension. The Netherlands	2005	6785
Dripsey-grass, Ireland	2003	54.7	Haarweg, The Netherlands	2002	5915
Lacombe, Alberta, Canada	2003	53	Hegihátsál, Hungary	1999	5867
Haller, State College, PA, USA	2004	52.2	Cabauw, The Netherlands	2004	5837
Cabauw, The Netherlands	2004	47.9	Horstermeer, Netherlands	2006	5337
C. Shrubs and savannas					
Howard Springs, Australia	2005	54.2	Sao Paulo cerrado, Brazil	2002	6836
Sao Paulo cerrado, Brazil	2002	42.7	Howard Springs, Australia	2002	5874
Tonzi Ranch, California	2005	38.6	Skukuza, South Africa	2001	3947
Skukuza, South Africa	2001	34.6	Tonzi Ranch, CA, USA	2005	3837

Tonzi Ranch, California	2003	34.1	Sky Oaks Old stand, CA, USA	1997	2682
Sky Oaks Young stand, CA, USA	1998	22.7	Sky Oaks Young stand, CA, USA	1998	2021
Sky Oaks Old stand, CA, USA	1997	21.0	Skukuza, South Africa	2003	1873
Santa Rita mesquite, AZ, USA	2005	19.8	Santa Rita mesquite, AZ, USA	2005	1125
Kubuqi, shrubland, China	2006	12.8	Kubuqi, shrubland, China	2006	1021
Karrykul, Turkmenistan	2000	7.79	Karrykul, Turkmenistan	2000	769

D. Wetlands

Dongtan marsh-2, China	2005	70.1	Dongtan marsh-2, China	2005	5643
CzechWet, Czech Republic	2006	56.9	CzechWet, Czech Republic	2006	5368
Dongtan marsh-1, China	2005	51.9	Dongtan marsh-1, China	2005	5150
Dongtan marsh-3, China	2005	43.3	Tadham Moore, UK	2001	4767
Tadham Moore, UK	2001	41.1	Dongtan marsh-3, China	2005	3662
PolWet, Poland	2005	41.1	PolWet, Poland	2005	3393
Cherskii, Russia	2003	20.1	Siikaneva, Finland	2005	1359
Kaamanen wetland, Finland	2005	19.8	Kaamanen wetland, Finland	2005	1210
Siikaneva, Finland	2004	19.8	Cherskii, Russia	2003	834

E. Croplands

Mead, corn rot. irrigated, NE, USA	2001	116.1	Langerak-crop, France	2005	6774
Mead, maize cont. irrigated, NE, USA	2001	107.8	Mead, rot. corn irrigated, NE, USA	2003	6720
Bondville, corn, IL, USA	1999	99.9	Borgo Cioffi-crop, Italy	2005	6513
Batavia-agro, IL, USA	2006	99.0	Mead, cont. corn irrigated, NE, USA	2001	6437
Bondville, corn, IL, USA	1999	94.1	Borgo Cioffi-crop, Italy	2006	6393
Borgo Cioffi-crop, Italy	2006	93.1	Mead, maize rotation irrigated	2001	6316
Mead, corn rainfed, NE, USA	2003	87.6	Lonzee, Belgium, sugar beet	2005	6313
Langerak-crop, France	2006	87.5	Oensingen-crop, Switzerland	2005	6295
Bondville-companion, IL, USA	2006	83.03	Mead corn rainfed, NE, USA	2001	5834
Grignon-crop, France	2005	81.3	Bondville, corn, IL, USA	1999	5602
Lonzee, winter wheat, Belgium	2005	80.5	Bondville, soybeans, IL, USA	2005	5582
Bondville, soybeans, IL, USA	2005	80.1	Risbyholm, Denmark, crop	2004	5525


F. Forests and plantations

Duke Forest Loblolly Pine, NC, USA	2001	99.0	French Guyana	2004	14339
Campbell River, British Columbia, Canada	1998	86.6	Vanuatu - CocoFlux	2002	13057
Hampshire Forest, UK	2004	73.9	Rondonia forest, Brazil	2002	12727
Duke Forest Loblolly Pine	2005	69.0	Palangkaraya, Indonesia	2003	12236

Vanuatu - CocoFlux	2003	68.2	Santarem km67 primary forest, Brazil	2003	11703
Duke Forest Hardwood, NC, USA	2003	67.6	Caxiuana Forest-Almeirim, Brasil	2002	11436
French Guyana	2005	64.21	Santarem km67 primary forest, Brazil	2002	11271
Rondonia forest, Brazil	2002	60.8	Loblolly Pine plantation, NC, USA	2006	10173
Campbell River, British Columbia, Canada	2000	60.1	Donaldson Slash Pine Plantation, FL, USA	1999	9249
Loblolly Pine plantation, NC, USA	2006	59.7	Campbell River, British Columbia, Canada	2005	9162
Duke Forest Hardwood, NC, USA	2004	57.5	Duke Forest Loblolly Pine, NC, USA	2002	9067
Donaldson Slash Pine Plantation, FL, USA	1999	54.6	Duke Forest Hardwood, NC, USA	2003	8892


1

2



1


2 **Figure 1.**



3


4 **Figure 2.**

5




1

2 **Figure 3.**



1

2 **Figure 4.**




1


2 **Figure 5.**

3

A. Cherskii, floodplain meadow, 2003




B. Cottonwood, mixed prairie, 2006




1

C. Gudmundsen, mixed prairie, 2006




D. Fort Reno, tallgrass prairie, 2005




2

3

E. Howard, wet-dry savanna, 2002




F. Rondonia, tropical grassland, 1999




1

G. Lonze, sugar beet, 2004




H. Bondville, corn, 1999




2

3 **Figure 6.**






1



1


2 **Figure 7.**



1


2 **Figure 8.**

3



1

2 **Figure 9.**



1


2 **Figure 10.**

3

4

5

6




1

2 **Figure 11**

3

4


5



1


2 **Figure 12**

3



4

5 **Figure 13**



1

2 **Figure 14.**

3