Using research networks to create the comprehensive datasets needed to assess nutrient availability as a key determinant of terrestrial carbon cycling

To cite this article before publication: Sara Vicca *et al* 2018 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaeae7

Manuscript type: Focus issue letter

Using research networks to create the comprehensive datasets needed to assess nutrient availability as a key determinant of terrestrial carbon cycling

Sara Vicca[1*], Benjamin D Stocker[2, 3*], Sasha Reed[4], William R Wieder[5,6], Michael Bahn[7], Philip A Fay[8], Ivan A Janssens[1], Hans Lambers[9], Josep Peñuelas[2, 3], Shilong Piao[10], Karin T Rebel[11], Jordi Sardans[2, 3], Bjarni D Sigurdsson[2,3,12], Kevin Van Sundert[1], Ying-Ping Wang[13], Sönke Zaehle[14], Philippe Ciais[15]

[*] both authors contributed equally to this work

Affiliations

1 Centre of Excellence PLECO (Plants and Ecosystems), Biology Department, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium
2 CSIC, Global Ecology Unit, CREAF-CEAB-CSIC-UAB, Bellaterra, Barcelona, Catalonia 08193, Spain
3 CREAF, Cerdanyola del Valles, Barcelona, Catalonia 08193, Spain
4 U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Moab, UT 84532, United States
5 Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA
6 Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA
7 Institute of Ecology, University of Innsbruck, Sternwartestrasse 15, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria
8 USDA-ARS Grassland, Soil, and Water Research Lab, Temple, Texas 76502 USA
9 School of Biological Sciences, University of Western Australia, Crawley (Perth), WA6009, Australia
10 Sino-French Institute for Earth System Science, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
11 Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Environmental Sciences, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands
12 Agricultural University of Iceland, Hvanneyri, IS-311 Borgarnes, Iceland
13 CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria 3195 Australia
14 Biogeochemical Integration Department, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena
15 Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Gif sur Yvette, France

Abstract

A wide range of research shows that nutrient availability strongly influences terrestrial carbon (C) cycling and shapes ecosystem responses to environmental changes and hence terrestrial feedbacks to climate. Nonetheless, our understanding of nutrient controls remains far from complete and poorly quantified, at least partly due to a lack of informative, comparable, and accessible datasets at regional-to-global scales. A growing research infrastructure of multi-site networks are providing valuable data on C fluxes and stocks and are monitoring their responses to global environmental change and measuring responses to experimental treatments. These networks thus provide an opportunity for improving our understanding of C-nutrient cycle interactions and our ability to model them. However, coherent information on how nutrient cycling interacts with observed C cycle

patterns is still generally lacking. Here, we argue that complementing available C-cycle measurements from monitoring and experimental sites with data characterizing nutrient availability will greatly enhance their power and will improve our capacity to forecast future trajectories of terrestrial C cycling and climate. Therefore, we propose a set of complementary measurements that are relatively easy to conduct routinely at any site or experiment and that, in combination with C cycle observations, can provide a robust characterization of the effects of nutrient availability across sites. In addition, we discuss the power of different observable variables for informing the formulation of models and constraining their predictions. Most widely available measurements of nutrient availability often do not align well with current modelling needs. This highlights the importance to foster the interaction between the empirical and modelling communities for setting future research priorities.

Abbreviations of and weblinks to research infrastructures and networks mentioned in the text:

Research Infrastructures

ANAEE: Analysis and experimentation on ecosystems (https://www.anaee.com/)
ICOS: Integrated carbon observation system (https://www.icos-ri.eu/)
LTER: Long term ecological research (https://lternet.edu/)
NEON: National ecological observatory network (https://www.neonscience.org/)
CZO: Critical zone observatory (http://criticalzone.org/national/)

Research networks

ClimMani: Climate change manipulation experiments in terrestrial ecosystems: networking and outreach (http://climmani.org/)
DroughtNet: Network of drought experiments (http://drought-net.colostate.edu/)
Fluxnet: Global network of meteorological sensors measuring atmospheric state variables, like temperature, humidity, wind speed, rainfall, and atmospheric carbon dioxide.
INTERFACE: An integrated network for terrestrial ecosystem research on feedbacks to the atmosphere and climate (https://www.bio.purdue.edu/INTERFACE/experiments.php)
LIDET: Long-term inter-site decomposition experiment team (https://andrewsforest.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/lter/pubs/webdocs/reports/lidet.htm)
NutNet: Nutrient Network (http://www.nutnet.umn.edu/)
TERN: Australia's land ecosystem observatory http://www.tern.org.au/
INCyTE: Investigating Nutrient Cycling in Terrestrial Ecosystems (NSF network)

1. Introduction

More than a century of research has shown that nutrient availability, such as nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P), is a key determinant of ecosystem community composition, diversity, architecture, and functioning (Borer *et al* 2014, Chapin 1980, Elser *et al* 2000, Peñuelas *et al* 2013, von Liebig 1841).

Nutrient availability can influence, plant activity and growth (Fay *et al* 2015, Vitousek *et al* 2010a, Verlinden *et al* 2018), as well as microbial activity (Janssens *et al* 2010, and consequently has a strong influence on terrestrial carbon (C) cycling (De Vries *et al* 2009). Nutrient availability is also an important modulator of the effect of environmental changes on terrestrial ecosystems, and hence the terrestrial feedback to anthropogenic climate change (Melillo *et al* 2011, Sardans and Peñuelas 2012). For example, nutrient availability has been shown to have a fundamental control over plant responses to elevated CO_2 (De Graaff and Van Groenigen 2006). Despite the critical role of nutrients in terrestrial C cycling, however, we still lack comprehensive, comparable datasets to fully unravel the influence of nutrients and the varied mechanisms through which they interact with environmental change to influence ecosystem functioning (Box 1). The lack of coordinated assessments of multiple elements in concert not only limits our fundamental understanding of the role of nutrients, but also hinders model evaluation and development.

The strong evidence for nutrient effects on C cycling in terrestrial ecosystems has motivated their explicit representation in process-based terrestrial biogeochemistry (BGC) models, (Medvigy *et al* 2009, Parton *et al* 2010, Reed *et al* 2015, Smith *et al* 2014, Thornton *et al* 2007, Wang *et al* 2010, Zaehle and Friend 2010). . Taking nutrient limitations into account, these models generally simulate a reduced sensitivity of plant growth to increasing CO_2 and strongly reduced C uptake by the terrestrial biosphere under future climate and atmospheric CO_2 concentration scenarios (Achat *et al* 2016, Peñuelas *et al* 2013, Thornton *et al* 2007, Wang *et al* 2015, Wieder *et al* 2015a, Zaehle and Dalmonech 2011). This is in line with evidence from manipulation experiments and remote sensing results, which imply that allowable emissions to keep global warming below a given target are much lower than emission estimates from models without C-nutrient interactions (Ciais *et al* 2013, Smith *et al* 2015, Zaehle *et al* 2010, 2014a, Zhang *et al* 2014). However, detailed comparisons of models with interactive C and N cycles against field experiments revealed that key mechanisms determining the uptake and recycling of nutrients are poorly simulated by the current generation of BGC models (Medlyn *et al* 2015, Piao *et al* 2013, Zaehle *et al* 2014b) and the uncertainty arising from missing empirical data and poor process understanding remains a serious limitation for model projections (Thomas *et al* 2013, Meyerholt and Zaehle 2015, Meyerholt *et al* 2016). Information on soil properties, nutrient availability, allocation and plant stoichiometry, along with site-level terrestrial C cycle data, is therefore critical to inform the formulation of models and to establish new benchmarks.

A range of large scale research infrastructures (e.g. ICOS, ANAEE, NEON, LTER, TERN, CZO) and research networks (e.g., Fluxnet, ClimMani, INCyTE, INTERFACE, LIDET, NutNet, DroughtNet, TERN) have been initiated to collect empirical data from terrestrial ecosystem monitoring and manipulation experiments with a focus on characterising the cycling of C and its response to environmental change (Hinckley *et al* 2016, Richter *et al* 2018). While ample data are commonly available for accompanying measurements of meteorological variables, background climate, vegetation cover, and soil moisture, an assessment of how nutrient cycling may modulate terrestrial C cycling across networks and in experiments is often missing. Here, we argue that the additional provision of coherent and comprehensive observations of nutrient availability, soil properties, and plant stoichiometry would greatly enhance the power of these networks and experiments to generate mechanistic insights for understanding how and why nutrient availability interacts with ecosystem functioning and structure to shape their response to global environmental change.

To support the coupling of nutrient cycling measurements with those being made for C in large scale cross-site infrastructures and global change experiments, we highlight research gaps and the types of measurements that could be particularly valuable for: (1) Developing a solid empirical basis and identifying general patterns of how nutrient availability interacts with C cycling; and (2) Parameterizing and evaluating BGC models, especially their representation of mechanisms by which nutrients affect C cycling and ecosystem feedbacks to climate and environmental change. We first focus on how to characterize and compare the nutrient status and propose combining a set of complementary measurements to assess nutrient availability among sites and experiments. Subsequently, we discuss the power of different variables of ecosystem nutrient cycling to inform and evaluate process-based BGC models. The primary aims of this work are to raise awareness about the need for comparable nutrient cycling measurements. To facilitate a wide implementation, we focus on common biogeochemical measurements that are relatively easy to make and interpret. We focus on N and P as nutrients shown to strongly affect C cycling (although we recognize other nutrients have poorly represented importance as well (Kaspari and Powers 2016)).

BOX 1: A need for a coordinated assessment of coupled biogeochemical cycles

Targeted measurements of specific nutrient pools and fluxes performed across a range of locations can directly inform a unified understanding of how variation in nutrients helps dictate ecosystem structure and function. Yet, relatively few synthesis studies on terrestrial C cycling have taken nutrient availability into account, and those that exist, have typically focused on N - the element often considered most limiting for plant growth outside the tropics (Augusto *et al* 2017, LeBauer and Treseder 2008) - using a single indicator for N availability (e.g., N addition in van Groenigen *et al* (2006), C:N ratio in Alberti *et al* (2015), or total N stock in Stevens *et al* (2015)). In an attempt to create a more comprehensive understanding of the role of nutrient availability in mediating ecosystem carbon cycling and its responses to environmental perturbations, a coarse classification was developed based on the sparsely available data and on expert knowledge (Alberti *et al* 2015, Campioli *et al* 2015, Fernandez-Martinez *et al* 2014, Terrer *et al* 2016, Vicca *et al* 2012). These data syntheses provided powerful insight into the ways nutrients influence ecosystem responses to environmental changes, but they also revealed that our understanding of the role that nutrients play in the terrestrial C cycle is hampered by the limited comparability of datasets where soil nutrient information was provided. While carbon cycle data are increasingly becoming available, and the comparability of these data among sites and networks is improving, standardized assessment of ecosystem nutrient dynamics are less common (Fig. 1). These data gaps hinder inter-site comparison of the influence of nutrient availability on ecosystem processes and their responses to environmental change.

	n
Sand%	81
Silt%	81
Clay%	89
BD	56
SOM	26
Soil N	96
Soil C:N	90
Soil pH	36
CEC	42
TEB	38
Olsen P	5
Bray P	2
Total P	17



Figure 1: The availability of data for 13 soil variables in a global dataset of 125 forests and a Venn diagram showing the overlap for four soil measurements of these variables. These four variables were chosen because of their complementary information regarding nutrient availability and because they are among the most commonly measured soil properties in the database. The number of sites providing any single variable is shown by n, some combination of two of these variables is shown by n where two polygons overlap, and the combination of all four is shown in bold text. Abbreviations are for bulk density (BD), soil organic matter (SOM), cation exchange capacity (CEC), and total exchangeable bases (TEB). For SOM, n includes also sites that provided soil organic carbon (SOC) instead of SOM, and pH includes measurements performed using H_2O, $CaCl_2$ or KCl solutions. For both SOM and pH, the variable of interest can be obtained through conversion (Ahern et al 1995, Pribyl 2010). All data are provided in Table S1.

2. Integrated assessment of nutrient availability

Comparing nutrient availability among sites remains challenging due to the large variability in edaphic properties that modify nutrient availability (e.g. soil pH) and due to varying plant strategies of nutrient acquisition (e.g. cluster roots, mycorrhizal fungi). This complicates the interpretation of chemical assays used to assess N and P availability (Binkley and Hart 1989, Darch *et al* 2016, DeLuca *et al* 2015, Holford 1997, Inselsbacher and Näsholm 2012, Neyroud and Lischer 2003). Nonetheless, characterizing and comparing nutrient availability within and among sites can be accomplished by combining key soil properties with indicators of N and P availability. The simultaneous measurement of multiple aspects of nutrient cycling can help reduce the caveats associated with any single measurement. Such integrated metrics could provide a broad indication of site nutrient availability an provide new insights into how it influences C cycling.

Qualitative proxies of nutrient availability among sites can be made using relatively common metrics. This integrative approach was applied in a few synthesis studies that used a nutrient availability classification (Vicca *et al* 2012, Campioli *et al* 2015, Fernandez-Martinez *et al* 2014) and could help bring quantitative capacity to coupled biogeochemical perspectives. However, large data gaps persist. For example, Figure 1 shows the availability and overlap of a few of the most commonly measured soil variables that are available for a set of 125 forest sites, including sites that are part of networks such as Fluxnet and LTER (Luyssaert *et al* 2007, Campioli *et al* 2015, Vicca *et al* 2012). Here, we used all forests for which aboveground primary production data were available (Table S1). Although some soil data (especially texture and soil C:N ratio) were available for the majority of the sites, overlap in the combination of soil variables providing complementary information was very limited. Using these sparse data (see Fig. 1), Vicca et al (2012) developed a nutrient availability classification based on information such as soil texture, soil organic matter (SOM), pH, C:N ratio, and cation exchange capacity (CEC). This categorical classification explained significant differences in biomass production efficiency and ecosystem carbon use efficiency across forests (Fernandez-Martinez *et al* 2014, Vicca *et al* 2012). Hence, integrated assessments of ecosystem nutrient availability could provide a means to assess nutrient effects on broad differences in ecosystem function and productivity. Such classifications would become more accurate and powerful if more comprehensive and comparable datasets were available, such that the same set of variables can be considered for all sites.

Adding to this qualitative approach, quantitative metrics that integrate information about key soil properties and nutrients can be used in inter-site comparisons. For example, Van Sundert *et al* (2018) and Fischer *et al* (2012) developed site fertility indices from commonly used measurements to broadly assess nutrient availability. Briefly, these metrics consider three or four soil factors that influence nutrient availability (attributes like SOM, pH, texture, C:N ratio, total exchangeable bases (TEB, i.e., the sum of K, Ca, Mg and Na)). Each attribute included in the metric received a rating that decreases as it diverges from a predefined optimal range. Thus, nonlinear relationships and interactions among attributes are taken into account. For example, at low pH, differences in N availability may be less influential than at optimal pH because at pH < 4.5 plant growth is commonly limited by Al toxicity and/or P deficiency (Chapin 2002, Cross and Schlesinger 1995). This approach requires further investigation, development, and testing, as its potential for wider applications requires the establishment of comprehensive datasets of soil properties and nutrients (Van Sundert *et al* 2018). In future availability of a larger number of data for multiple edaphic factors and nutrient availability

measurements, along with C cycle variables, may enable machine learning-based approaches to identify such patterns from the data alone.

As illustrated by the variables included in both the nutrient availability classification and in quantitative nutrient metrics, some soil characteristics seem consistently indicative of site nutrient status and can help to estimate ecosystem nutrient availability (Andrianarisoa *et al* 2009, Van Sundert *et al* 2018). These include SOM, CEC and TEB, texture, bulk density, and pH. SOM is a source of nutrients and both organic matter and clay colloids are important exchange sites for nutrients (Roy *et al* 2006, Schroeder 1984). CEC represents the capacity of soil to avoid leaching of essential nutrients, including N (Robertson *et al* 1999). Bulk density indicates the porosity of the soil and is particularly relevant where gravel and stones reduce the 'fine earth' volume from which plants acquire essential nutrients. Bulk density is also necessary to convert concentration data into stocks. Soil pH is a critical determinant of nutrient availability, especially for P, and also has strong relationships with soil microbial communities (Fierer and Jackson 2006). Thus, these relatively straightforward soil assays are useful for developing proxies of nutrient availability across sites (see also box 1).

Pairing these simple assays of soil characteristics with direct, targeted measurements of ecosystem N and P availability provides additional information about nutrient-carbon cycle interactions from monitoring programs, networks, and global change experiments. An indicator of N availability that is comparable across a wide range of environmental conditions is the soil C:N ratio (e.g. Alberti *et al* 2015, Andrianarisoa *et al* 2009, Wang *et al* 2014). The soil C:N ratio has the advantage of being fairly straightforward to determine and it does not change on short temporal scales, thus the timing of measurements is less influential. This variable was also included in the metric developed by Van Sundert *et al* (2018). A high soil C:N ratio indicates a relatively low N availability, and several studies have reported a significantly negative relationship between soil C:N ratio and N mineralization rates (Andrianarisoa *et al* 2009, Yan *et al* 2012), plant biomass (Grau *et al* 2017), organic matter decomposition, and plant productivity (Van Sundert *et al* 2018, Yan *et al* 2012). Similarly, assessment of foliar N and P stoichiometry suggests broad scale indicators of relative nutrient limitation in plants (McGroddy *et al* 2004, Reich and Oleksyn 2004, Vitousek 1984). Although caution in inferring nutrient limitation from stoichiometry is warranted (e.g., because of a strong phylogeny effects; Asner *et al* 2014, Sardans *et al* 2015, Townsend *et al* 2007, Zechmeister-Boltenstern *et al* 2015), we contend that these metrics offer powerful indicators of ecosystem nutrient availability, especially when paired with other measurements.

Ecosystem P status regulates productivity and ecosystem function at multiple spatial and temporal scales (Cleveland *et al* 2011, Peñuelas *et al* 2013, Vitousek *et al* 2010b). Despite the central role of coupled C-N-P dynamics, a reliable, widely applicable indicator for P availability for inter-site comparisons is challenging to suggest, as the accuracy of different indicators of P availability depends strongly on soil properties (especially pH) and on the dominant P acquisition strategy (e.g. carboxylate-releasing cluster roots, roots releasing phosphatase enzymes, or mycorrhizal fungi; Raven *et al* 2018, Zemunik *et al* 2018). We therefore advocate that inter-site comparisons (e.g., in meta-analyses) and models should always take the P-acquisition strategy of plants into account, and combine this with data on total soil P and the most suited extraction methods for the study soils (Olsen P, Bray P, Colwell P (Colwell 1963), Resin P (Turner and Romero 2009)) (Table 1). These extraction methods have been widely applied (Bolland 1997, Colwell 1963, Dalling *et al* 2016, Turner *et al*

2018a,b). While Olsen P is considered to best reflect P extractability in soils of alkaline to neutral pH (Olsen *et al* 1954), Bray P and Colwell P provide a more accurate estimate of extractable P at lower pH (Wolf and Baker 1985). We recommend prioritizing the Resin-P extraction method, as it measures P that is in solution, independent of soil pH. P in the soil solution is available for all plants, but because species with P-mining strategies have access to a greater pool (Lambers *et al* 2018), we advise measuring also other P indicators most relevant to the system (e.g., total P, Olsen P, Bray P).

Except for the P extraction methods, the measurements of soil properties and indicators of N and P availability suggested above are all relatively stable at short time scales. While this is advantageous for a nutrient availability characterization of different sites (avoiding confounding effects of the time of sampling), these measurements may miss short-term responses to natural or imposed environmental changes. A particularly useful method that can be added to capture short-term dynamics are resin membranes, with which the availability of a suite of nutrients that can be estimated in an integrated fashion through time. Resin membranes (or bags) absorb anions and/or cations that are in the soil solution, and hence provide an estimate of the relative availabilities ("supply rates") of various ions during the time resins are in the soil (Qian and Schoenau 2002). These membranes also provide unique information about the relative abundance of different elements in soil solution, a measure that is comparable among study sites. Nonetheless, the potential for comparing changes in nutrient availability among sites and in response to environmental perturbation is challenging, in part because supply rates depend on soil moisture and temperature (Qian and Schoenau 2002), and the units (e.g. $\mu g\ N\ cm^{-2}\ membrane^{-1}\ burial\ time^{-1}$) differ from those of fluxes actually occurring in the ecosystem. Nevertheless, relative differences in measured supply rates among treatments or sites provide valuable information, useful for interpreting observations (Dijkstra *et al* 2010, 2012) and for informing models. Overall, ion exchange resins can offer a good additional measurement for comparing nutrient availability among treatments within a site, as well as the elemental ratios among sites, and for indicating strong differences in individual nutrient availabilities among sites.

In Table 1, we summarize the measurements that we consider of primary relevance for inter-site comparison - in addition to (already available) data on major C pools and fluxes of ecosystems (e.g., net C exchange fluxes, plant and soil C stocks, microbial respiration). We focus on measurements that are comparable across a wide range of environmental conditions, that provide complementary information, and that are relatively simple to make. We suggest that, for the aim of inter-site comparison, variables with low seasonal variability are preferred over variables that exhibit considerable variability at short temporal and spatial scales, as the latter require high spatial and temporal resolution of measurements or spatial and seasonal integrations, and would substantially complicate robust comparisons across biomes and climatic regions. Of course, the measurements in Table 1 can be complemented by other measurements that help advance process understanding of nutrient cycling or fit specific project goals.

Table 1: List of suggested soil measurements to characterize sites in terms of nutrient availability and additional data needs for model development and evaluation. Foliar stoichiometry refers to the ratios of the elements: C, N, P, Ca, Mg, K, Zn, Fe, Mn, S.

		Primary advantage
Edaphic soil properties	pH Texture Bulk density Organic matter concentration Cation exchange capacity	Generalist and integrative indicators of soil nutrient availability
Targeting specific plant and soil nutrients	Total N C:N ratio Total P P extraction* Total exchangeable bases (K, Ca, Mg, Na)	Indicative of the stock size and availability of nutrients
	Resin membranes Foliar stoichiometry	Ability to capture short-term changes
Additional model data needs	Belowground C allocation Plant nutrient uptake rates N fixation Nutrient resorption coefficients Inorganic nutrient pools (NO_3^-, NH_4^+, PO_4^{3-})	Essential for mechanistic understanding of nutrient cycling and its relationship with C cycling

** P extraction refers to Resin P, Olsen P, Bray P, Colwell P, etc. depending on the soil condition (see text)*

This article focusses on the type of data that are needed, without providing or discussing specific protocols for sample timing, depth or spatial representation. However, standardized measurement protocols are critical for enabling comparability of data across sites. Concerted research within multi-site networks offers an opportunity for designing and disseminating common protocols. This has been put into practice within some networks (see e.g., NutNet http://www.nutnet.org/methods and NEON https://www.neonscience.org/data-collection/protocols-standardized-methods). In future, more effort should be made to adopt standard protocols more widely and harmonize them across networks. In addition, publicly accessible and usable datasets from monitoring and experimental sites and networks is needed to greatly enhance the power of data synthesis as well as model development and evaluation.

3. Data and process understanding for model development and evaluation

Data from research networks and experimental manipulations are already critical for developing and evaluating BGC models (Hinckley *et al* 2016, Luo *et al* 2012, Schaefer *et al* 2012, Zaehle *et al* 2014b). Expanded measurements that facilitate the characterization and comparison of nutrient status among different sites would also enable additional insights into the representation of nutrient controls on biogeochemical cycles in models. BGC models provide process-based representations of biogeochemistry and vegetation dynamics and are the primary tool for integrating knowledge about

the functioning of the terrestrial C cycle and its interaction with nutrient cycles. Here we provide a brief overview of the development of C-nutrient interactions in BGC models and summarize data-model linkages that would be enabled by systematic, targeted data collection across existing research infrastructures. An overview of the interplay of relevant processes and fluxes is given in Fig. 2.

3.1 Carbon-nutrient relationships in terrestrial biogeochemistry models

While the explicit representation of C and N interactions is becoming common in BGC models, and recent developments have been aimed at explicitly simulating P cycling (Achat *et al* 2016, Goll *et al* 2017, Wang *et al* 2010, Yang *et al* 2014), other nutrients and additional soil properties that modulate nutrient availability to plants (e.g, pH, CEC, texture) remain largely ignored by the suite of models available today. This historical legacy resulted from the origin of these models, which were developed and applied mainly with the aim of simulating C cycle changes and their feedbacks with climate. The motivation for including effects of nutrients has primarily been to increase confidence in model projections of future C cycle trajectories in response to environmental change (Hungate *et al* 2003, Wieder *et al* 2015a, Zaehle *et al* 2014a). However, substantial uncertainties remain in how to adequately represent ecological processes that determine C-nutrient cycle interactions in global-scale models (Brovkin and Goll 2015, Meyerholt and Zaehle 2015, Wieder *et al* 2015b,c). This challenge also presents new opportunities to test alternative hypotheses and refine ecological understanding of how nutrients shape the C cycle at centennial time scales and across the globe (Fowler *et al* 2015, Medlyn *et al* 2015, Tian *et al* 2018).

The key mechanistic relationships between C and nutrient cycles represented in models are related to allocation and stoichiometry. Allocation defines the partitioning of assimilated C into different plant organs and functions. Key for simulating C-nutrient interactions in BGC models is the partitioning into above- and belowground biomass pools (foliage and wood vs. roots). The size of these pools is related to the efficiency at which above- and belowground resources are acquired. Stoichiometric relationships in models define particular C:nutrient ratios in simulated ecosystem pools. Despite widespread observational evidence for adaptive flexibility in plant C allocation and stoichiometry in response to nutrient availability and environmental manipulations, appropriately simulating these changes remains a significant challenge (Ghimire *et al* 2016, Terrer *et al* 2018, Vicca *et al* 2012, Zaehle *et al* 2014b).This challenge is particularly acute for belowground processes, where allocation and stoichiometry affect root function and plant-soil interactions that control nutrient uptake (Fig. 2). While many BGC models only have a rudimentary representation of functional relationship between roots and nutrient uptake, recent model developments have been aimed at better resolving this process (Iversen *et al* 2017, McMurtrie and Näsholm 2018). Despite this progress, significant knowledge and data gaps persist.



Figure 2: Schematic representation of the link between carbon and nutrient cycles as considered in biogeochemistry models. 'Belowground C allocation' subsumes different components and functions, including fine root production, fine root respiration, export to mycorrhizae and symbiotic bacteria (e.g. rhizobium for N fixation), and exudation of labile C compounds into the rhizosphere. The thickness of arrows approximately indicate the relative magnitudes of the fluxes. Blue arrows indicate nutrient fluxes, green arrows indicate carbon fluxes. Fluxes specific to nitrogen are given by arrows with a dashed outline. Boxes indicate pools.

3.2 Data-model linkages

To address knowledge and data gaps, we call on existing research infrastructure and networks to collect data that help to clarify and quantify key functional relationships between allocation, stoichiometry and ecological function that are to be represented in models. Broadly, measurements are needed : (1) to reveal insights into allometric and stoichiometric changes and how they vary across ecosystems, over time, and under experimental manipulations; and (2) to link observed plant adaptations with observed variations in nutrient availability. We acknowledge a significant disconnect between suggested measurements for characterization of the nutrient status (Section 2) and modelling needs (below), which underscores opportunities to better align future research activities. Below we briefly summarize the approach commonly taken to simulate nutrient limitations in global models and discuss the power of different observable variables for informing and evaluating modelled relationships.

Belowground C allocation is directly affected by nutrient availability and the balance between above- (light, CO_2) and belowground (water, nutrients) resource availabilities (Poorter *et al* 2012). The magnitude of belowground C allocation indicates how much of the assimilated C is spent on nutrient

and water acquisition. Without explicitly resolving how much C is allocated to different nutrient uptake mechanisms and plant-soil interactions, total belowground C allocation is the most relevant quantity for providing information on overall C costs of nutrient uptake (Gill and Finzi 2016) and can directly be related to variables simulated in BGC models (Shi *et al* 2016). Therefore, we highly recommend a strengthened focus on measuring belowground C pools and its change under experimental treatments and along environmental gradients (Iversen *et al* 2017). In the field, belowground C allocation is commonly estimated by subtracting litterfall and the changes in soil organic matter pool from the soil CO_2 efflux (Davidson *et al* 2002, Litton *et al* 2007). Direct estimates of root production are rarely available since they are highly labour-intensive. However, root mass estimates can be more easily obtained by soil core sampling, and may be used as alternative total belowground C allocation under some simplifying assumptions. Instead of relying on absolute estimates of root mass, relative differences across sites and experimental manipulations may be a useful constraint on the model sensitivity of root allocation to environmental conditions (see Terrer *et al* 2018). Interpretation of relationships between belowground C allocation and nutrients has to take into account that belowground C allocation and root biomass are affected by water availability, especially where deep rooting is a common plant strategy to access water stored in deep layers during prolonged dry periods.

Plant tissue stoichiometry and its response to nutrient availability is critical for the degree to which nutrient uptake limits plant growth. Particularly critical is to appropriately simulate the flexibility in leaf stoichiometry in response to environmental change. Current N-enabled BGC models explicitly resolve the C:N stoichiometry in plant tissue (Ghimire *et al* 2016). An evaluation by (Zaehle *et al* 2014b) showed that available models generally overestimate the flexibility in tissue stoichiometry in response to elevated CO_2. This ensemble of models also simulated a feedback of increased foliar C:N under elevated CO_2 which (erroneously) tended to induce a progressively enhanced N limitation effect on plant growth due to greater N immobilisation at high C:N ratios of litter inputs. Empirical data documenting how stoichiometry varies with experimental treatments and across environmental gradients is therefore important as a constraint for models and model-data evaluations should be extended to investigate P-related stoichiometry.

Soil C:N is typically prescribed in models for different SOM compartments (e.g., slow and fast turnover SOM). Hence, it is treated as constant in time and independent of environmental factors. Therefore, although soil C:N emerges as a good indicator for explaining variations in C cycling in observational datasets (see Section 2), it cannot be used as a direct observational constraint on simulated nutrient dynamics in models. Furthermore, prescribed soil C:N ratios do not directly determine N availability in models. Until the complex nature of soil C:N as both a predictor and result of coupled ecosystem C and N cycling is accurately simulated by a next generation of models, its use for constraining current BGC models remains limited.

Plant nutrient uptake rates from the soil are useful for quantifying the "return" on a given "investment" of belowground C allocation (Terrer *et al* 2018). While these fluxes cannot directly be observed, field data can be obtained indirectly, based on litterfall, biomass increment, and tissue nutrient concentration data (Finzi *et al* 2007). Hence, the power of such data and the usefulness as an independent model benchmarking variable is limited. Nevertheless, comparing modelled and observation-derived nutrient uptake rates may serve as a practical way for model evaluation and has previously generated valuable insights (Zaehle *et al* 2014b).

Net mineralisation rates represent the balance between gross mineralization from organic matter and the simultaneous immobilization in microbial biomass. While gross mineralisation and immobilisation are usually simulated separately by models, these are not readily measurable quantities in the field (Schimel and Bennett 2004). Net mineralisation rates quantify the total nutrient "throughput" through the system (Fig. 2) and are used to estimate nutrient availability for plants in the field (Gill and Finzi 2016). However, the use and interpretability of net mineralization data is not straightforward due to large seasonal variations, requiring repeated measurements, and due to the varying importance of nutrient losses (leakage and gaseous N loss) in confounding the relationship between net mineralisation rates and nutrient availability. The value of net mineralisation data for models therefore lies primarily in constraining simulated nutrient cycling rates and, in combination with estimates of nutrient inputs or losses and resorption, they can indicate the openness of nutrient cycling (Cleveland *et al* 2013).

N fixation is an important component of the ecosystem N balance and provides information about the degree of biological control on N availability and therefore on the potential of plants and the ecosystem as a whole to relieve limiting effects of low N availability, especially in global change scenarios (Menge *et al* 2014, Meyerholt *et al* 2016, Wieder *et al* 2015c). N fixation is increasingly recognised as a key variable that should be modelled based on the balance between N availability in the soil and plant demand (Medlyn *et al* 2015). Reliable measurements are therefore crucial for constraining models, but extrapolations based on field measurements and isotopic data produce varied estimates of global N fixation rates that still lack spatial or temporal resolution (Vitousek *et al* 2013). While estimates of ecosystem-level N fixation rates are difficult to achieve, especially where contributions from diverse N-fixing processes are substantial (e.g. free-living microbes, bryophytes; Reed *et al* 2011), information about relative differences in fixation rates or the fraction of N in biomass derived from N fixation (Schneider *et al* 2004) can also be used as a valuable constraint for models.

Resorption coefficients are typically prescribed and constant parameters in models (but see Shi *et al* 2016). Since they are thus not internally predicted, they cannot directly be used as an observational constraint. Nonetheless, a wider availability of observational data can provide a solid empirical basis for how resorption coefficients vary along environmental gradients (Reed *et al* 2012) and are therefore important for robust model parameterisations and as a target for future modelling efforts, where resorption coefficients may be treated as an internally predicted quantity.

Atmospheric deposition of nutrients is a key quantity that determines ecosystem nutrient balances and the degree to which nutrients limit or support additional C sequestration (De Vries *et al* 2009). CN-models commonly use prescribed spatial data of atmospheric deposition derived from large-scale atmospheric chemistry and transport models (Lamarque *et al* 2011, 2013, Mahowald *et al* 2008). However, these global datasets have a relatively coarse resolution spatially and temporally, may not resolve all local processes affecting deposition velocities, and comparisons to local measurements indicate a tendency for underestimated rates in global datasets (Sutton *et al* 2011), at least partly owing to challenges in estimating dry N deposition rates. This underlines the value of using specific measurements of deposition rates for interpreting results in empirical studies and as model forcing for site-level simulations.

The sizes of inorganic soil nutrient pools (NO_3^-, NH_4^+, PO_4^{3-}) are often simulated explicitly in models and typically determine plant uptake and loss rates. The temporal dynamics of inorganic nutrient pools are

highly variable and subject to different biotic and abiotic factors. Hence, reliable model-data comparisons require frequently repeated sampling and standardised measurement protocols. However, the response of these pools to experimental manipulations and environmental changes yield insights into how nutrient pools, and therefore nutrient availability, change and how these changes relate to C cycling. More robust and accurate measurements, integrated over relevant timescales may be obtained from resin membrane methods (see above). These methods are particularly useful for assessing relative differences among sites or experiments that can be highly informative for network syntheses and for model-data comparisons. Field estimates typically quantify the inorganic pool size per unit soil volume or mass. In contrast, pool size per unit surface area is typically, but not always (Koven *et al* 2013), simulated in models. Quantities integrated over the entire soil profile are generally difficult to measure, suggesting that an explicit representation of the vertical distribution of SOM dynamics in models will contribute to a better capacity to evaluate models. Due to the key role of triggering plant responses and its explicit treatment and equally central role in models, we highly encourage the wide application of measurements of the size and availability of inorganic nutrient pools, and recommend methods that provide temporally integrated information (e.g., resin membranes).

Additional edaphic factors for modelling, including several soil properties (pH, CEC, texture, etc.) influence soil chemistry and nutrient availability and can explain substantial additional variability of terrestrial C cycling across sites (Fernandez-Martinez *et al* 2014, Vicca *et al* 2012). These empirically based studies established the utility of using multiple edaphic factors to develop qualitative or quantitative metrics as proxies to understand ecosystem C responses across fertility gradients (Section 2). Applying a similar methodology in models may help simulate cross-site variation in C cycle responses to environmental change, or the efficiency by which assimilated C is converted to biomass (Vicca *et al* 2012). To our knowledge, such a "phenomenological" approach that accounts for multiple indicators of soil nutrient availability remains untested in BGC models. Alternatively, soil properties may serve as covariates in functions describing nutrient transformations and fluxes. For example, soil texture and pH modify transfer coefficients and C turnover times in several soil biogeochemical models, although recent analyses call in the question the underlying assumptions applied in these models (Rasmussen *et al* 2018, Rowley *et al* 2017). Moreover, although it is tempting to explicitly represent fine scale soil processes and nuances, attention should be given to the main application of BGC models' to predicting large-scale biosphere dynamics and fluxes, especially under global change scenarios. The aim of using edaphic properties in conjunction with models should be to identify robust patterns in these relationships and will be important to guide future model developments to account for additional edaphic factors. Simultaneously, these efforts should identify additional data needs or availability to better constrain novel model formulations.

The imperfect overlap between field measurement options (Section 2, Table 1) and current model representations (Section 3) speaks to the challenges and opportunities for incorporating empirical data into models, as well as for using models to help inform our understanding of terrestrial processes that are difficult to measure. For example, many of the processes central to regulating nutrient cycling in models are not easy to gather data for in the field (e.g., belowground C allocation, gross mineralization). Moreover, many of the field measurements are not straightforward to incorporate into our existing models (e.g., spatial variation in site nutrient availability). Cross-site evaluations and global change manipulations offer strong possibilities to address the lack of overlap in what is measured empirically and what is represented numerically. In particular, the physical edaphic

characteristics discussed above may be a common ground where increased data collection and incorporation into models could improve both approaches and our overall understanding. Further, components of models that are difficult but not impossible to measure well in the field could be collected across sites or treatments in an organized way, knowing the data would be critical for model evaluation. Improved knowledge of coupled C and nutrient cycles from separated empirical and modelling approaches will advance understanding, but joining these approaches through data collection, analysis, and interpretation would be the strongest way forward.

Supplementary files

Table S1: Dataset of forest sites with aboveground primary production data (ANPP), taken from the database presented in Luyssaert *et al* (2007) and updated in Vicca *et al* (2012) and Campioli *et al* (2015). For the purpose of illustrating availability of soil data, this dataset was updated with the available soil variables listed in Fig. 1. Abbreviations are listed in the legend of Fig. 1.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge support of the European Research Council grant ERC-SyG-610028 IMBALANCE-P and the ClimMani COST Action (ES1308). SV is a postdoctoral fellow and KVS a PhD fellow of the Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders (FWO). BDS was funded by ERC H2020-MSCA-IF-2015, FIBER, grant number 701329. SCR was supported by the U.S. Geological Survey and the U.S. Department of Energy (DE-SC-0011806). WRW was supported by the US Department of Agriculture NIFA Award number 2015-67003-23485, NASA Interdisciplinary Science Program award number NNX17AK19G, and U.S. National Science Foundation grant DEB 1637686 to the Niwot Ridge LTER. Any use of firm, product, or trade names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. MB was supported by Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project no P28572 and the Austrian Academy of Sciences (project ClimLUC). SZ was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (QUINCY; grant no. 647204).

References

Achat D L, Augusto L, Gallet-Budynek A and Loustau D 2016 Future challenges in coupled C–N–P cycle models for terrestrial ecosystems under global change: a review *Biogeochemistry* **131** 173–202

Ahern C R, Baker D E and Aitken R L 1995 Models for relating pH measurements in water and calcium chloride for a wide range of pH, soil types and depths *Plant-Soil Interactions at Low pH: Principles and Management: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Plant-Soil Interactions at Low pH, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, 12–16 September 1993* ed R A Date, N J Grundon, G E Rayment and M E

Probert (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands) pp 99–104

Alberti G, Vicca S, Inglima I, Belelli-Marchesini L, Genesio L, Miglietta F, Marjanovic H, Martinez C, Matteucci G, D'Andrea E, Peressotti A, Petrella F, Rodeghiero M and Cotrufo M F 2015 Soil C:N stoichiometry controls carbon sink partitioning between above-ground tree biomass and soil organic matter in high fertility forests *iForest* **8** 195–206

Andrianarisoa K S, Zeller B, Dupouey J L and Dambrine E 2009 Comparing indicators of N status of 50 beech stands (*Fagus sylvatica L.*) in northeastern France *For. Ecol. Manage.* **257** 2241–53

Asner G P, Martin R E, Tupayachi R, Anderson C B, Sinca F, Carranza-Jiménez L and Martinez P 2014 Amazonian functional diversity from forest canopy chemical assembly *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **111** 5604–9

Augusto L, Achat D L, Jonard M, Vidal D and Ringeval B 2017 Soil parent material—a major driver of plant nutrient limitations in terrestrial ecosystems *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **23** 3808–24

Binkley D and Hart S C 1989 The Components of Nitrogen Availability Assessments in Forest Soils *Advances in Soil Science* ed B A Stewart (New York, NY: Springer New York) pp 57–112

Bolland M D A 1997 Comparative phosphorus requirements of five annual medics *J. Plant Nutr.* **20** 1029–43

Borer E T, Seabloom E W, Mitchell C E and Cronin J P 2014 Multiple nutrients and herbivores interact to govern diversity, productivity, composition, and infection in a successional grassland *Oikos* **123** 214–24

Brovkin V and Goll D 2015 Land unlikely to become large carbon source *Nat. Geosci.* **8** 893–893

Campioli M, Vicca S, Luyssaert S, Bilcke J, Ceschia E, Chapin F S III, Ciais P, Fernández-Martínez M, Malhi Y, Obersteiner M, Olefeldt D, Papale D, Piao S L, Peñuelas J, Sullivan P F, Wang X, Zenone T and Janssens I A 2015 Biomass production efficiency controlled by management in temperate and boreal ecosystems *Nat. Geosci.* **8** 843-46

Chapin F S III, Matson PA, Mooney H A 2002 Principles of terrestrial ecosystem ecology (New York, Springer-Verlag)

Chapin F S 1980 The Mineral Nutrition of Wild Plants *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **11** 233–60

Ciais P, Sabine C, Bala G, Bopp L, Brovkin V, Canadell J, A. C, DeFries R, J. G, Heimann M, Jones C, Le Quéré C, Myneni R, S. P and Thornton P 2013 Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed T F Stocker, D Qin, G-K Plattner, M Tignor, S K Allen, J Boschung, A

Nauels, Y Xia, V Bex and P M Midgley (Cambridge University Press) pp 571–658

Cleveland C C, Houlton B Z, Smith W K, Marklein A R, Reed S C, Parton W, Del Grosso S J and Running S W 2013 Patterns of new versus recycled primary production in the terrestrial biosphere *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110** 12733–7

Cleveland C C, Townsend A R, Taylor P, Alvarez-Clare S, Bustamante M M C, Chuyong G, Dobrowski S Z, Grierson P, Harms K E, Houlton B Z and Others 2011 Relationships among net primary productivity, nutrients and climate in tropical rain forest: a pan-tropical analysis *Ecol. Lett.* **14** 939–47

Colwell J D 1963 The estimation of the phosphorus fertilizer requirements of wheat in southern New South Wales by soil analysis *Aust. J. Exp. Agric. Anim Husb.* **3** 190-197

Cross A F and Schlesinger W H 1995 A literature review and evaluation of the. Hedley fractionation: Applications to the biogeochemical cycle of soil phosphorus in natural ecosystems *Geoderma* **64** 197–214

Dalling J W, Heineman K, Lopez O R, Wright S J and Turner B L 2016 Nutrient Availability in Tropical Rain Forests: The Paradigm of Phosphorus Limitation *Tropical Tree Physiology: Adaptations and Responses in a Changing Environment* ed G Goldstein and L S Santiago (Cham: Springer International Publishing) pp 261–73

Darch T, Blackwell M S A, Chadwick D, Haygarth P M, Hawkins J M B and Turner B L 2016 Assessment of bioavailable organic phosphorus in tropical forest soils by organic acid extraction and phosphatase hydrolysis *Geoderma* **284** 93–102

Davidson E A, Savage K, Bolstad P, Clark D A, Curtis P S, Ellsworth D S, Hanson P J, Law B E, Luo Y, Pregitzer K S, Randolph J C and Zak D 2002 Belowground carbon allocation in forests estimated from litterfall and IRGA-based soil respiration measurements *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **113** 39–51

De Graaff M A and Van Groenigen K 2006 Interactions between plant growth and soil nutrient cycling under elevated CO2: A meta-analysis *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **12** 2077-2091

DeLuca T H, Glanville H C, Harris M, Emmett B A, Pingree M R A, de Sosa L L, Cerdá-Moreno C and Jones D L 2015 A novel biologically-based approach to evaluating soil phosphorus availability across complex landscapes *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **88** 110–9

De Vries W, Solberg S, Dobbertin M, Sterba H, Laubhann D, van Oijen M, Evans C, Gundersen P, Kros J, Wamelink G W W, Reinds G J and Sutton M A 2009 The impact of nitrogen deposition on carbon sequestration by European forests and heathlands *For. Ecol. Manage.* **258** 1814–23

Dijkstra F A, Blumenthal D, Morgan J A, Pendall E, Carrillo Y and Follett R F 2010 Contrasting effects of elevated CO2 and warming on nitrogen cycling in a semiarid grassland *New Phytol.* **187** 426–37

Dijkstra F A, Pendall E, Morgan J A, Blumenthal D M, Carrillo Y, LeCain D R, Follett R F and

Williams D G 2012 Climate change alters stoichiometry of phosphorus and nitrogen in a semiarid grassland *New Phytol.* **196** 807–15

Elser J J, Fagan W F, Denno R F, Dobberfuhl D R, Folarin A, Huberty A, Interlandi S, Kilham S S, McCauley E, Schulz K L, Siemann E H and Sterner R W 2000 Nutritional constraints in terrestrial and freshwater food webs *Nature* **408** 578–80

Fay P A, Prober S M, Harpole W S, Knops J M H, Bakker J D, Borer E T, Lind E M, MacDougall A S, Seabloom E W, Wragg P D, Adler P B, Blumenthal D M, Buckley Y M, Chu C, Cleland E E, Collins S L, Davies K F, Du G, Feng X, Firn J, Gruner D S, Hagenah N, Hautier Y, Heckman R W, Jin V L, Kirkman K P, Klein J, Ladwig L M, Li Q, McCulley R L, Melbourne B A, Mitchell C E, Moore J L, Morgan J W, Risch A C, Schütz M, Stevens C J, Wedin D A and Yang L H 2015 Grassland productivity limited by multiple nutrients *Nat Plants* **1** 15080

Fernandez-Martinez M, Vicca S, Janssens I A, Sardans J, Luyssaert S, Campioli M, Iii F, Ciais P, Malhi Y, Obersteiner M, Papale D, Piao S L, Reichstein M, Roda F and Penuelas J 2014 Nutrient availability as the key regulator of global forest carbon balance, *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **4** 471-76

Fierer N and Jackson R B 2006 The diversity and biogeography of soil bacterial communities *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103** 626–31

Finzi A C, Norby, R J, Calfapietra C, Gallet-Budynek A, Gielen B, Holmes W E, Hoosbeek M R, Iversen C M, Jackson R B, Kubiske M E, Ledford J, Liberloo M, Oren R, Polle A, Pritchard S, Zak D R, Schlesinger W H and Ceulemans R 2007 Increases in nitrogen uptake rather than nitrogen-use efficiency support higher rates of temperate forest productivity under elevated CO_2. *Proc. Nat. Ac. Sci. USA* **104** 14014-14019.

Fischer G, Nachtergaele F O, Prieler S, Teixeira E, Tóth G, Van Velthuizen H, Verelst L and Wiberg D 2012 *Global Agro-ecological Zones (GAEZ v3.0).* (IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria and FAO, Rome, Italy).

Fowler D, Steadman C E, Stevenson D, Coyle M, Rees R M, Skiba U M, Sutton M A, Cape J N, Dore A J, Vieno M, Simpson D, Zaehle S, Stocker B D, Rinaldi M, Facchini M C, Flechard C R, Nemitz E, Twigg M, Erisman J W, Butterbach-Bahl K and Galloway J N 2015 Effects of global change during the 21st century on the nitrogen cycle *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **15** 13849–93

Ghimire B, Riley W J, Koven C D, Mu M and Randerson J T 2016 Representing leaf and root physiological traits in CLM improves global carbon and nitrogen cycling predictions *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* **8** 598–613

Gill A L and Finzi A C 2016 Belowground carbon flux links biogeochemical cycles and resource-use efficiency at the global scale *Ecol. Lett.* **19** 1419–28

Goll D S, Vuichard N, Maignan F, Jornet-Puig A, Sardans J, Violette A, Peng S, Sun Y, Kvakic M, Guimberteau M, Guenet B, Zaehle S, Penuelas J, Janssens I and Ciais P 2017 A representation of the phosphorus cycle for ORCHIDEE (revision 4520) *Geoscientific*

Model Development **10** 3745–70

Grau O, Peñuelas J, Ferry B, Freycon V, Blanc L, Desprez M, Baraloto C, Chave J, Descroix L, Dourdain A, Guitet S, Janssens I A, Sardans J and Hérault B 2017 Nutrient-cycling mechanisms other than the direct absorption from soil may control forest structure and dynamics in poor Amazonian soils *Sci. Rep.* **7** 45017

Hinckley E-L S, Anderson S P, Baron J S, Blanken P D, Bonan G B, Bowman W D, Elmendorf S C, Fierer N, Fox A M, Goodman K J, Jones K D, Lombardozzi D L, Lunch C K, Neff J C, SanClements M D, Suding K N and Wieder W R 2016 Optimizing Available Network Resources to Address Questions in Environmental Biogeochemistry *Bioscience* **66** 317–26

Holford I C R 1997 Soil phosphorus: its measurement, and its uptake by plants *Soil Res.* **35** 227–40

Hungate B A, Dukes J S, Shaw M R, Luo Y and Field C B 2003 Atmospheric science. Nitrogen and climate change *Science* **302** 1512–3

Inselsbacher E and Näsholm T 2012 The below-ground perspective of forest plants: soil provides mainly organic nitrogen for plants and mycorrhizal fungi *New Phytol.* **195** 329–34

Iversen C M, McCormack M L, Powell A S, Blackwood C B, Freschet G T, Kattge J, Roumet C, Stover D B, Soudzilovskaia N A, Valverde-Barrantes O J, van Bodegom P M and Violle C 2017 A global Fine-Root Ecology Database to address below-ground challenges in plant ecology *New Phytol.* **215** 15–26

Janssens I A, Dieleman W, Luyssaert S, Subke J-A, Reichstein M, Ceulemans R, Ciais P, Dolman A J, Grace J, Matteucci G, Papale D, Piao S L, Schulze E-D, Tang J and Law B E 2010 Reduction of forest soil respiration in response to nitrogen deposition *Nat. Geosci.* **3** 315

Kaspari M and Powers J S 2016 Biogeochemistry and Geographical Ecology: Embracing All Twenty-Five Elements Required to Build Organisms *Am. Nat.* **188 Suppl 1** S62–73

Koven C D, Riley W J, Subin Z M, Tang J Y, Torn M S, Collins W D, Bonan G B, Lawrence D M and Swenson S C 2013 The effect of vertically resolved soil biogeochemistry and alternate soil C and N models on C dynamics of CLM4 *Biogeosciences* **10** 7109–31

Lamarque J-F, Dentener F, McConnell J, Ro C U, Shaw M, Vet R, Bergmann D, Cameron-Smith P, Dalsoren S, Doherty R and Others 2013 Multi-model mean nitrogen and sulfur deposition from the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP): evaluation of historical and projected future *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **13** 7997-8018

Lamarque J-F, Page Kyle G, Meinshausen M, Riahi K, Smith S J, van Vuuren D P, Conley A J and Vitt F 2011 Global and regional evolution of short-lived radiatively-active gases and aerosols in the Representative Concentration Pathways *Clim. Change* **109** 191–212

Lambers H, Albornoz F, Kotula L, Laliberté E, Ranathunge K, Teste F P and Zemunik G 2018 How belowground interactions contribute to the coexistence of mycorrhizal and non-mycorrhizal species in severely phosphorus-impoverished hyperdiverse ecosystems *Plant Soil* **424** 11–33

LeBauer D S and Treseder K K 2008 Nitrogen limitation of net primary productivity in terrestrial ecosystems is globally distributed *Ecology* **89** 371–9

Litton C M, Raich J W and Ryan M G 2007 Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **13** 2089–109

Luo Y Q, Randerson J T, Abramowitz G, Bacour C, Blyth E, Carvalhais N, Ciais P, Dalmonech D, Fisher J B, Fisher R, Friedlingstein P, Hibbard K, Hoffman F, Huntzinger D, Jones C D, Koven C, Lawrence D, Li D J, Mahecha M, Niu S L, Norby R, Piao S L, Qi X, Peylin P, Prentice I C, Riley W, Reichstein M, Schwalm C, Wang Y P, Xia J Y, Zaehle S and Zhou X H 2012 A framework for benchmarking land models *Biogeosciences* **9** 3857–74

Luyssaert S, Inglima I, Jung M, Richardson A D, Reichstein M, Papale D, Piao S L, Schulze E-D, Wingate L, Matteucci G and Others 2007 CO2 balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical forests derived from a global database *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **13** 2509–37

Mahowald N, Jickells T D, Baker A R, Artaxo P, Benitez-Nelson C R, Bergametti G, Bond T C, Chen Y, Cohen D D, Herut B, Kubilay N, Losno R, Luo C, Maenhaut W, McGee K A, Okin G S, Siefert R L and Tsukuda S 2008 Global distribution of atmospheric phosphorus sources, concentrations and deposition rates, and anthropogenic impacts *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **22** Online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008gb003240

McGroddy M E, Daufresne T and Hedin L O 2004 Scaling of C:N:P stoichiometry in forests worldwide: implications of terrestrial redfield-type ratios *Ecology* **85** 2390–401

McMurtrie R E and Näsholm T 2018 Quantifying the contribution of mass flow to nitrogen acquisition by an individual plant root *New Phytol.* **218** 119–30

Medlyn B E, Zaehle S, De Kauwe M G, Walker A P, Dietze M C, Hanson P J, Hickler T, Jain A K, Luo Y, Parton W, Colin Prentice I, Thornton P E, Wang S, Wang Y-P, Weng E, Iversen C M, McCarthy H R, Warren J M, Oren R and Norby R J 2015 Using ecosystem experiments to improve vegetation models *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **5** 528–34

Medvigy D, Wofsy S C, Munger J W, Hollinger D Y and Moorcroft P R 2009 Mechanistic scaling of ecosystem function and dynamics in space and time: Ecosystem Demography model version 2 *J. Geophys. Res.* **114** G01002

Melillo J M, Butler S, Johnson J, Mohan J, Steudler P, Lux H, Burrows E, Bowles F, Smith R, Scott L, Vario C, Hill T, Burton A, Zhou Y-M and Tang J 2011 Soil warming, carbon–nitrogen interactions, and forest carbon budgets *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108** 9508–12

Menge D N L, Lichstein J W and Angeles-Pérez G 2014 Nitrogen fixation strategies can explain the latitudinal shift in nitrogen-fixing tree abundance *Ecology* **95** 2236–45

Meyerholt J and Zaehle S 2015 The role of stoichiometric flexibility in modelling forest ecosystem responses to nitrogen fertilization *New Phytol.* **208** 1042–55

Meyerholt J, Zaehle S and Smith M J 2016 Variability of projected terrestrial biosphere responses to elevated levels of atmospheric CO_2 due to uncertainty in biological nitrogen fixation *Biogeosciences* **13** 1491–518

Neyroud J-A and Lischer P 2003 Do different methods used to estimate soil phosphorus availability across Europe give comparable results? *Z. Pflanzenernähr. Bodenk.* **166** 422–31

Olsen S R 1954 *Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate* (United States Department Of Agriculture; Washington)

Olsen S R, Watanabe F S, Cosper H R, Larson W E and Nelson L B 1954 Residual phosphorus availability in long-time rotations on calcareous soils *Soil Sci.* **78** 141

Parton W J, Hanson P J, Swanston C, Torn M, Trumbore S E, Riley W and Kelly R 2010 ForCent model development and testing using the Enriched Background Isotope Study experiment *J. Geophys. Res.* **115** G04001

Peñuelas J, Poulter B, Sardans J, Ciais P, van der Velde M, Bopp L, Boucher O, Godderis Y, Hinsinger P, Llusia J, Nardin E, Vicca S, Obersteiner M and Janssens I A 2013 Human-induced nitrogen–phosphorus imbalances alter natural and managed ecosystems across the globe *Nat. Commun.* **4** 2934

Piao S, Sitch S, Ciais P, Friedlingstein P, Peylin P, Wang X, Ahlström A, Anav A, Canadell J G, Cong N, Huntingford C, Jung M, Levis S, Levy P E, Li J, Lin X, Lomas M R, Lu M, Luo Y, Ma Y, Myneni R B, Poulter B, Sun Z, Wang T, Viovy N, Zaehle S and Zeng N 2013 Evaluation of terrestrial carbon cycle models for their response to climate variability and to CO_2 trends *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **19** 2117–32

Poorter H, Niklas K J, Reich P B, Oleksyn J, Poot P and Mommer L 2012 Biomass allocation to leaves, stems and roots: meta-analyses of interspecific variation and environmental control *New Phytol.* **193** 30–50

Pribyl D W 2010 A critical review of the conventional SOC to SOM conversion factor *Geoderma* **156** 75–83

Qian P and Schoenau J J 2002 Practical applications of ion exchange resins in agricultural and environmental soil research. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* **82** 9-21.

Rasmussen C, Heckman K, Wieder W R, Keiluweit M, Lawrence C R, Berhe A A, Blankinship J C, Crow S E, Druhan J L, Hicks Pries C E, Marin-Spiotta E, Plante A F, Schädel C, Schimel J P, Sierra C A, Thompson A and Wagai R 2018 Beyond clay: towards an improved set of variables for predicting soil organic matter content *Biogeochemistry* **137** 297–306

Raven J A, Lambers H, Smith S E and Westoby M 2018 Costs of acquiring phosphorus by vascular land plants: patterns and implications for plant coexistence *New Phytol.* **217**

1420–7

Reed S C, Cleveland C C and Townsend A R 2011 Functional Ecology of Free-Living Nitrogen Fixation: A Contemporary Perspective *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **42** 489–512

Reed S C, Townsend A R, Davidson E A and Cleveland C C 2012 Stoichiometric patterns in foliar nutrient resorption across multiple scales *New Phytol.* **196** 173–80

Reed S C, Yang X and Thornton P E 2015 Incorporating phosphorus cycling into global modeling efforts: a worthwhile, tractable endeavor *New Phytol.* **208** 324–9

Reich P B and Oleksyn J 2004 Global patterns of plant leaf N and P in relation to temperature and latitude *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **101** 11001–6

Richter D D, Billings S A, Groffman P M, Kelly E F, Lohse K A, McDowell W H, White T S, Anderson S, Baldocchi D D, Banwart S, Brantley S, Braun J J, Brecheisen Z S, Cook C W, Hartnett H E, Hobbie S E, Gaillardet J, Jobbagy E, Jungkunst H F, Kazanski C E, Krishnaswamy J, Markewitz D, O'Neill K, Riebe C S, Schroeder P, Siebe C, Silver W L, Thompson A, Verhoef A and Zhang G 2018 Ideas and perspectives: Strengthening the biogeosciences in environmental research networks *Biogeosciences* **15** 4815–32

Robertson G P, Sollins P, Ellis B G and Lajtha K 1999 Exchangeable ions, pH, and cation exchange capacity *Standard soil methods for long-term ecological research.* (Oxford University Press, New York) 106–14

Rowley M C, Grand S and Verrecchia É P 2017 Calcium-mediated stabilisation of soil organic carbon *Biogeochemistry* **137** 27–49

Roy R N, Finck A, Blair G J and Tandon H 2006 Plant nutrition for food security *A guide for integrated nutrient management. FAO Fertilizer and Plant Nutrition Bulletin* **16** 368

Sardans J, Janssens I A and Alonso R 2015 Foliar elemental composition of European forest tree species associated with evolutionary traits and present environmental and competitive conditions *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **24** 240-55

Sardans J and Peñuelas J 2012 The role of plants in the effects of global change on nutrient availability and stoichiometry in the plant-soil system *Plant Physiol.* **160** 1741–61

Schaefer K, Schwalm C R, Williams C, Arain M A, Barr A, Chen J M, Davis K J, Dimitrov D, Hilton T W, Hollinger D Y and Others 2012 A model-data comparison of gross primary productivity: Results from the North American Carbon Program site synthesis *J. Geophys. Res.* **117** G03010

Schimel J P and Bennett J 2004 Nitrogen mineralization: challenges of a changing paradigm *Ecology* **85** 591–602

Schneider M K, Lüscher A, Richter M, Aeschlimann U, Hartwig U A, Blum H, Frossard E and Nösberger J 2004 Ten years of free-air CO_2 enrichment altered the mobilization of N from soil in Lolium perenne L. swards *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **10** 1377–88

Schroeder D 1984 *Soils-facts and concepts* International Potash Institute - , CH-3048 Worblaufen/Bern, pp. 140.

Shi M, Fisher J B, Brzostek E R and Phillips R P 2016 Carbon cost of plant nitrogen acquisition: global carbon cycle impact from an improved plant nitrogen cycle in the Community Land Model *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **22** 1299–314

Smith B, Wårlind D, Arneth A, Hickler T, Leadley P, Siltberg J and Zaehle S 2014 Implications of incorporating N cycling and N limitations on primary production in an individual-based dynamic vegetation model *Biogeosciences* **11** 2027–54

Smith W, Reed S C, Cleveland C C, Ballantyne A P, Anderegg W R L, Wieder W R, Liu Y Y and Running S W 2015 Large divergence of satellite and Earth system model estimates of global terrestrial CO2 fertilization *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **6** 306

Stevens C J, Lind E M, Hautier Y and Harpole W S 2015 Anthropogenic nitrogen deposition predicts local grassland primary production worldwide *Ecology* **96** 1459-1465

Sutton M A, Howard C M, Erisman J W, Billen G, Bleeker A, Grennfelt P, van Grinsven H and Grizzetti B 2011 *The European Nitrogen Assessment: Sources, Effects and Policy Perspectives* (Cambridge University Press)

Terrer C, Vicca S, Hungate B A, Phillips R P and Prentice I C 2016 Mycorrhizal association as a primary control of the CO_2 fertilization effect *Science* **353** 72–4

Terrer C, Vicca S, Stocker B D, Hungate B A, Phillips R P, Reich P B, Finzi A C and Prentice I C 2018 Ecosystem responses to elevated CO_2 governed by plant-soil interactions and the cost of nitrogen acquisition *New Phytol.* **217** 507–22

Thomas R Q, Zaehle S, Templer P H and Goodale C L 2013 Global patterns of nitrogen limitation: confronting two global biogeochemical models with observations *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **19** 2986–98

Thornton P E, Lamarque J-F, Rosenbloom N A and Mahowald N M 2007 Influence of carbon-nitrogen cycle coupling on land model response to CO_2 fertilization and climate variability *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **21** GB4018

Tian H, Yang J, Lu C, Xu R, Canadell J G, Jackson R, Arneth A, Chang J, Chen G, Ciais P, Gerber S, Ito A, Huang Y, Joos F, Lienert S, Messina P, Olin S, Pan S, Peng C, Saikawa E, Thompson R L, Vuichard N, Winiwarter W, Zaehle S, Zhang B, Zhang K and Zhu Q 2018 The global N_2O Model Intercomparison Project (NMIP): Objectives, Simulation Protocol and Expected Products *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **99** 1231–1251

Townsend A R, Cleveland C C, Asner G P and Bustamante M M C 2007 Controls over foliar N:P ratios in tropical rain forests *Ecology* **88** 107–18

Turner B L, Brenes-Arguedas T and Condit R 2018a Pervasive phosphorus limitation of tree species but not communities in tropical forests *Nature* **559** 367

Turner B L, Hayes P E and Laliberté E 2018b A climosequence of chronosequences in southwestern Australia *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* **69** 69–85

Turner B L and Romero T E 2009 Short-term changes in extractable inorganic nutrients during storage of tropical rain forest soils *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **73** 1972–9

van Groenigen K-J, Six J, Hungate B A, de Graaff M-A, van Breemen N and van Kessel C 2006 Element interactions limit soil carbon storage *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103** 6571–4

Van Sundert K, Horemans J A, Stendahl J and Vicca S 2018 The influence of soil properties and nutrients on conifer forest growth in Sweden, and the first steps in developing a nutrient availability metric *Biogeosciences* **15** 3475-3496

Verlinden M, Ven A, Verbruggen E, Janssens IA, Wallander H and Vicca S 2018 Favorable effect of mycorrhizae on biomass production efficiency exceeds their carbon cost in a fertilization experiment *Ecology* in press. DOI: 10.1002/ecy.2502

Vicca S, Luyssaert S, Peñuelas J, Campioli M, Chapin F S 3rd, Ciais P, Heinemeyer A, Högberg P, Kutsch W L, Law B E, Malhi Y, Papale D, Piao S L, Reichstein M, Schulze E D and Janssens I A 2012 Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently *Ecol. Lett.* **15** 520–6

Vitousek P M 1984 Litterfall, Nutrient Cycling, and Nutrient Limitation in Tropical Forests *Ecology* **65** 285–98

Vitousek P M, Menge D N L, Reed S C and Cleveland C C 2013 Biological nitrogen fixation: rates, patterns and ecological controls in terrestrial ecosystems *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **368** 20130119

Vitousek P M, Porder S, Houlton B Z and Chadwick O A 2010a Terrestrial phosphorus limitation: mechanisms, implications, and nitrogen–phosphorus interactions *Ecol. Appl.* **20** 5–15

Vitousek P M, Porder S, Houlton B Z and Chadwick O A 2010b Terrestrial phosphorus limitation: mechanisms, implications, and nitrogen-phosphorus interactions *Ecol. Appl.* **20** 5–15

von Liebig J 1841 *Die organische Chemie in ihrer Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie / von Justus Liebig* (Braunschweig : F. Vieweg)

Wang C, Wang X, Liu D, Wu H, Lü X, Fang Y, Cheng W, Luo W, Jiang P, Shi J, Yin H, Zhou J, Han X and Bai E 2014 Aridity threshold in controlling ecosystem nitrogen cycling in arid and semi-arid grasslands *Nat. Commun.* **5** 4799

Wang Y P, Law R M and Pak B 2010 A global model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycles for the terrestrial biosphere *Biogeosciences* **7** 2261–82

Wang Y-P, Zhang Q, Pitman A J and Dai Y 2015 Nitrogen and phosphorous limitation reduces the effects of land use change on land carbon uptake or emission *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10** 014001

Wieder W R, Cleveland C C, Kolby Smith W and Todd-Brown K 2015a Future productivity and carbon storage limited by terrestrial nutrient availability *Nat. Geosci.* **8** 441–4

Wieder W R, Cleveland C C, Kolby Smith W and Todd-Brown K 2015b Reply to "Land unlikely to become large carbon source" *Nat. Geosci.* **8** 893–4

Wieder W R, Cleveland C C, Lawrence D M and Bonan G B 2015c Effects of model structural uncertainty on carbon cycle projections: biological nitrogen fixation as a case study *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10** 044016

Wolf A M and Baker D E 1985 Comparisons of soil test phosphorus by Olsen, Bray P1, Mehlich I and Mehlich III methods *Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* **16** 467–84

Yan E-R, Hu Y-L, Salifu F, Tan X, Chen Z C and Chang S X 2012 Effectiveness of soil N availability indices in predicting site productivity in the oil sands region of Alberta *Plant Soil* **359** 215–31

Yang X, Thornton P E, Ricciuto D M and W. M. Post 2014 The role of phosphorus dynamics in tropical forests – a modeling study using CLM-CNP *Biogeosciences* **11** 1667-81

Zaehle S and Dalmonech D 2011 Carbon–nitrogen interactions on land at global scales: current understanding in modelling climate biosphere feedbacks *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* **3** 311–20

Zaehle S and Friend A D 2010 Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter estimates *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **24** GB1005

Zaehle S, Friend A D, Friedlingstein P, Dentener F, Peylin P and Schulz M 2010 Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface model: 2. Role of the nitrogen cycle in the historical terrestrial carbon balance *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **24** GB1006

Zaehle S, Jones C D, Houlton B, Lamarque J-F and Robertson E 2014a Nitrogen Availability Reduces CMIP5 Projections of Twenty-First-Century Land Carbon Uptake *J. Clim.* **28** 2494–511

Zaehle S, Medlyn B E, De Kauwe M G, Walker A P, Dietze M C, Hickler T, Luo Y, Wang Y-P, El-Masri B, Thornton P, Jain A, Wang S, Warlind D, Weng E, Parton W, Iversen C M, Gallet-Budynek A, McCarthy H, Finzi A, Hanson P J, Prentice I C, Oren R and Norby R J 2014b Evaluation of 11 terrestrial carbon-nitrogen cycle models against observations from two temperate Free-Air CO2 Enrichment studies *New Phytol.* **202** 803–22

Zechmeister-Boltenstern S, Keiblinger K M, Mooshammer M, Peñuelas J, Richter A, Sardans J and Wanek W 2015 The application of ecological stoichiometry to plant–microbial–soil organic matter transformations *Ecol. Monogr.* **85** 133–55

Zemunik G, Lambers H, Turner B L, Laliberté E and Oliveira R S 2018 High abundance of non-mycorrhizal plant species in severely phosphorus-impoverished Brazilian campos rupestres *Plant Soil* **424** 255–71

Zhang Q, Wang Y P and Matear R J 2014 Nitrogen and phosphorous limitations significantly reduce future allowable CO2 emissions *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **41** 632-7