

## RESEARCH ARTICLE SUMMARY

## FOREST FIRES

## Global rise in forest fire emissions linked to climate change in the extratropics

Matthew W. Jones\*, Sander Veraverbeke, Niels Andela, Stefan H. Doerr, Crystal Kolden, Guilherme Mataveli, M. Lucrecia Pettinari, Corinne Le Quéré, Thais M. Rosan, Guido R. van der Werf, Dave van Wees, John T. Abatzoglou

**INTRODUCTION:** Forest fires are a natural disturbance mechanism made more likely by climate change, with major impacts on global forest ecosystems and carbon (C) storage. Recent trends show a worrying increase in forest fire activity, particularly in extratropical regions. This study aims to disentangle the factors driving the recent increases in fire activity by analyzing global forest fire extent and emissions and their relationship with climatic, human, and vegetation controls. Using machine learning, we grouped global forest ecoregions into 12 distinct pyromes in which forest fire extent depends on similar sets of controls.

**RATIONALE:** Understanding the drivers of fires in distinct pyromes is essential for developing targeted strategies to predict and manage fire risks. By grouping forest ecoregions into pyromes with distinct fire controls, we aimed to better understand the regional variations in fire dynamics and their sensitivity to climate change. This approach allows us to isolate the effects of climate change from other influencing factors such as land use and vegetation productivity.

**RESULTS:** Our analysis revealed that extratropical forest fire emissions have increased substantially under climate change. Fire emissions in one extratropical pyrome spanning boreal forests in Eurasia and North America nearly tripled between 2001 and 2023. This increase was linked to a rise in fire-favorable weather conditions, reduced soil moisture, and increased vegetation productivity. By contrast, tropical pyromes showed a decline in fire emissions linked to reduced deforestation fires in moist tropical forests and increased fragmentation of dry tropical forests with agriculture and other land uses. Overall, forest fire C emissions increased by 60% globally during the study period, with the most substantial contributions coming from extratropical regions. The increase in extratropical fire activity highlights the strong influence of climatic factors compared with human activities, which play a more dominant role in tropical regions. The increases in forest fire C emissions were explained both by changes in fire extent and by changes in fire severity (measured in terms of the C emitted per unit area burned by fire). In the extratropical forest pyromes, we observed major increases in fire

severity alongside expansion of areas affected by fire. This finding shows that the intensity and severity of fires is increasing in extratropical forests, which is consistent with fires affecting drier, more flammable stocks of vegetation fuels as the climate warms and as droughts become more frequent.

**CONCLUSION:** The steep trend toward greater extratropical forest fire emissions is a warning of the growing vulnerability of forest C stocks to climate change. This poses a major challenge for global targets to tackle climate change, with fire reducing the capacity of forests to act as C sinks. Effective forest management and policies aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions are essential to mitigate these risks. Our study underscores the importance of considering regional distinctions in the controls on fire when developing strategies to manage fire and protect forest ecosystems. Proactive measures such as monitoring changes in vegetation and productivity can guide the prioritization of areas for forest management in the extratropics. In tropical pyromes, reducing ignitions during extreme fire-favorable weather and preventing forest fragmentation should protect forests and enhance C retention. In regions with substantial fire suppression history, shifting focus to managed, ecologically beneficial fires may prevent C sink-to-source conversion. Addressing the primary causes of climate change, particularly fossil fuel emissions, is central to minimizing future risks of forest fires globally and securing resilient forests for the future. In addition, our work supports growing calls for more comprehensive reporting of forest fire emissions to the United Nations as part of national reporting of anthropogenic C fluxes. The present norm of counting forest fire emissions fluxes as natural, on both managed and unmanaged land, is increasingly at odds with the observed growth in fire emission fluxes tied to anthropogenic climate change. This contributes to emerging gaps between the anthropogenic C budgets that are officially reported to the United Nations and the budgets constructed based on models and observations of terrestrial C stocks or atmospheric concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>. Finally, we highlight the potential for major overestimation of C storage (and therefore C credits) by reforestation schemes in extratropical forests if the growing risk of fire disturbance is not appropriately factored into accreditation protocols. ■



**Wildfire engulfs a boreal forest stand in Canada, 2016.** During the historic fire season of 2023, nine times more C was emitted by fires in Canadian boreal forest than in recent decades.

The list of author affiliations is available in the full article online.  
\*Corresponding author. Email: matthew.w.jones@uea.ac.uk  
Cite this article as M. W. Jones *et al.*, *Science* **386**, ead15889 (2024). DOI: 10.1126/science.ad15889

**S READ THE FULL ARTICLE AT**  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ad15889>

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

## FOREST FIRES

## Global rise in forest fire emissions linked to climate change in the extratropics

Matthew W. Jones<sup>1\*</sup>, Sander Veraverbeke<sup>1,2</sup>, Niels Andela<sup>3</sup>, Stefan H. Doerr<sup>4</sup>, Crystal Kolden<sup>5</sup>, Guilherme Mataveli<sup>1,6</sup>, M. Lucrecia Pettinari<sup>7</sup>, Corinne Le Quéré<sup>1</sup>, Thais M. Rosan<sup>8</sup>, Guido R. van der Werf<sup>9</sup>, Dave van Wees<sup>2,3</sup>, John T. Abatzoglou<sup>5</sup>

Climate change increases fire-favorable weather in forests, but fire trends are also affected by multiple other controlling factors that are difficult to untangle. We use machine learning to systematically group forest ecoregions into 12 global forest pyromes, with each showing distinct sensitivities to climatic, human, and vegetation controls. This delineation revealed that rapidly increasing forest fire emissions in extratropical pyromes, linked to climate change, offset declining emissions in tropical pyromes during 2001 to 2023. Annual emissions tripled in one extratropical pyrome due to increases in fire-favorable weather, compounded by increased forest cover and productivity. This contributed to a 60% increase in forest fire carbon emissions from forest ecoregions globally. Our results highlight the increasing vulnerability of forests and their carbon stocks to fire disturbance under climate change.

Fire is a natural ecosystem disturbance that has shaped the global distribution of Earth's forests and controlled carbon (C) storage in vegetation and soils over geological time (1–3). Nonetheless, anthropogenic climate change has contributed to an increase in fire-favorable weather conditions globally (4–7) and these enhanced risks have translated into increased burned area (BA) and fire C emissions in some forested regions during the past two decades or longer (6–12). Expanding land use or historic fire management policies have variably interacted with the effects of climate change to amplify or moderate forest fire activity and emissions (13, 14). The increases in forest fire C emissions observed regionally contrast with declines in the global savannahs (8, 15).

A series of highly anomalous episodes of extreme forest fire C emissions have recently punctuated longer-term trends (11, 16–19). During the 2019 to 2020 bushfire season in Australia, the area burned by fires was more than double the previous record since 1930, and fire C emissions were also greater than in any other year since 2003 (9, 17). In 2021, a new record was set for panboreal fire C emissions amidst a

water deficit spanning both Eurasia and North America (16). In the 2023 fire season, fire C emissions from Canadian boreal forests were more than nine times the 2001 to 2022 average (19).

The increased occurrence of fire, particularly extreme fires, threatens the functioning and resilience of some forests as well as their ecosystem services, including C storage (13, 20, 21). The recovery of C stocks in vegetation and organic soils following forest fires can take decades to centuries, and so increases in annual fire C emissions and extreme emissions events lead to a lasting deficit of terrestrial C storage (8, 22–24). Increased fire C emissions can thus reduce the capacity of global forests to absorb C from the atmosphere, posing a challenge for achieving climate targets. For example, increased fire activity in boreal North America alone is projected to result in net C losses equivalent to 0.3 to 3% of the remaining C budget necessary to limit global warming to 1.5°C (25).

Beyond their effects on C storage, extreme wildfires also cause major disruption or irreversible loss to society, including deaths, evacuations, reduced air quality, pressures on health care systems, and economic losses (26–30). Further, major declines in biodiversity have also been recorded in the wake of several extreme fire events and many of Earth's most threatened species are afflicted by an altered fire regime (1, 20). Recent extreme wildfire seasons across the globe have demonstrated the power of extreme wildfires to affect both the environment and society.

One of the drivers of change in forest fire potential is anthropogenic climate change, which is causing more frequent and extreme periods of drought and fire-favorable weather, often referred to as fire weather (4, 6, 31). In-

creased hot and dry conditions create periods of low fuel moisture, promoting wildfire potential in ecosystems where ample stocks of fuels (vegetation biomass and organic soils) are available, notably in forests (4, 10, 31). Increased lightning frequency under climate change has also exacerbated the ignition of forest fires in some locations, particularly in ignition-limited forests of the high latitudes (32–34). Increased atmospheric instability has been linked to more erratic and extreme wildfire behavior that enhances fire spread and intensity and challenges the potential for firefighters to suppress fire (35, 36). Several attribution studies have shown that climate change raised the likelihood of extreme fire weather conditions during a range of recent extreme wildfire seasons (5, 19, 37, 38).


Alongside climatic factors, forest fire extent is controlled by various in situ human activities and by the ecological traits and productivity of vegetation (6, 39–42). People influence patterns of forest fire in numerous ways, such as by using fire for forest clearing and land use (43), causing unwanted ignition (accidental or arson) (44), suppressing wildfires through fire-fighting (45), managing stocks of fuel on the landscape (46, 47), increasing forest edge length through fragmentation (48, 49), or inadvertently amplifying fuel stocks by excluding fire from forests where it is a central element of a functioning ecosystem (14, 50). The composition of forest ecosystems with species that have developed fire-adapted evolutionary traits, such as canopy structure, self-pruning, and leaf waxiness, also influence fire dynamics (e.g., crowning potential) and rates of spread (51, 52). In addition, the productivity of vegetation during the growing season influences fuel availability during subsequent dry seasons (40, 53, 54).

Although climatic, human, and vegetation factors all affect patterns of fire in forests, the prominence of each control varies regionally (6, 40, 55, 56). The relationships between climate and fire are generally modulated by non-climatic factors, and likewise non-climatic drivers of fire often depend on the episodes of fire-favorable weather. Hence, it has been challenging to identify the forest regions where fires are most sensitive to climate change or other facets of environmental change (39, 55, 56). To identify the world regions where responses to future climate change or other environmental stressors are comparatively strong or weak, further study of the temporal and spatial relationships between fire and a comprehensive set of fire controls is required.

We used the *k*-means clustering algorithm to group 414 forest ecoregions of the world (57) into 12 forest pyromes (Fig. 1), within which forest BA (58) shares a common set of relationships with climatic, vegetation, and human controls (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2; also see Materials and methods). Having isolated the pyromes

<sup>1</sup>Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia (UEA), Norwich, UK. <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands. <sup>3</sup>BeZero Carbon Ltd., London, UK. <sup>4</sup>Centre for Wildfire Research, Swansea University, Swansea, UK. <sup>5</sup>Department of Management of Complex Systems, University of California, Merced, Merced, California, CA USA. <sup>6</sup>Earth Observation and Geoinformatics Division, National Institute for Space Research (INPE), São José dos Campos, Brazil. <sup>7</sup>Department of Geology, Geography and the Environment, Universidad de Alcalá, Madrid, Spain. <sup>8</sup>Faculty of Environment, Science and Economy, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. <sup>9</sup>Department of Meteorology and Air Quality, Environmental Sciences Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, Netherlands.

\*Corresponding author. Email: matthew.w.jones@uea.ac.uk



**Fig. 1. World map of the 12 forest pyromes and a summary of their tendencies to associate with biomes and ecoregion types.** 414 forest ecoregions are attributed to one pyrome using *k*-means clustering, which identifies ecoregions sharing a similar set of correlations between burned area (BA) and 14 predictor variables (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). Gray areas are not included in the analysis, either because they are not within forest biomes (light gray) or because fire is


extremely rare (the mean annual fraction of forest area burned by fire is below 0.01%; dark gray). Fig. S21 shows an alternative mapping of the pyromes for the ecoregions that were clustered most ambiguously. The table shows the most common biome associations for each pyrome and the most common text substrings (n-grams, up to three words) that appear in the ecoregion descriptions, based on the ecoregion descriptions in the Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World dataset (57).

with a distinctive strong sensitivity to climatic controls, we analyzed trends in annual forest BA (58) and fire C emissions (59) during the period 2001 to 2023 and evaluated their connection with trends in key climate variables.

We used a comprehensive set of fire controls to distinguish the pyromes. The climatic controls included fire weather (4, 60, 61), soil moisture (62), atmospheric instability (represented by the continuous Haines index) (35, 36),

and lightning frequency (34, 63). The vegetation controls included potential fuel stocks related to land cover (52), vegetation productivity during the growing season (represented by the normalized difference vegetation index)





**Fig. 2. Variation in the relationship between forest BA and nine predictors across the global forest pyromes.** The violins plot the kernel density distribution of correlations values (Spearman's  $\rho$ ) for each predictor among the constituent ecoregions of each pyrome. White dots mark the median correlation value for the ecoregions of a pyrome, black line ranges mark the interquartile range, and open diamonds mark the mean value. See Materials and methods for a description of all correlation analyses and the motivation for including each predictor. Distributions are shown for all predictor variables in fig. S1. Correlations are mapped for each forest ecoregion in fig. S2.

(64, 65), and forest continuity (represented by forest area density) (49). The human controls included population density (15, 66), cropland and pasture cover (15, 67, 68), and road density (69). Terrain roughness (70) is also included for its potential to affect fire behavior (36). These variables have each shown power to explain spatial or temporal variability in BA in at least some world regions (see Materials and methods).

The concept of the pyrome was first introduced by Archibald *et al.* (71) as a pyrogeographical counterpart to the biogeographical concept of the biome. Biomes are defined not

only by their observable biological characteristics but also by climatic and other environmental controls that cause particular biological characteristics to arise. In past work, pyromes have been characterized only by observable fire characteristics such as size, duration, intensity, and frequency (71–74). Here, we expand the pyrome concept to include a systematic grouping of ecoregions based on the strength of climatic and other environmental controls on fire. This approach enriches the pyrome concept with a dimension that mirrors the complexity inherent in the study of biomes while also providing

critical insights into the varying sensitivity of pyromes to different facets of global change. Delineating the global forest pyromes revealed a rapid increase in emissions from extratropical forest pyromes that exceeded declining emissions from tropical forest pyromes during 2001 to 2023. This increase demonstrates that climatic controls on forest fire are overwhelming human controls in global-scale fire emissions trends.

## Results

Twelve global forest pyromes emerged from the clustering analysis (Fig. 1), and this grouping



revealed large increases in forest fire C emissions in extratropical forest pyromes. By contrast, forest fire C emissions declined in tropical and subtropical forest pyromes.

### Geography and traits of the pyromes

To characterize the key controls on fire in each pyrome, we examined the correlations between forest BA and each variable representing the fire controls among the constituent ecoregions of the pyromes (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). We consider the mean correlations within each pyrome to indicate sensitivity of the forest BA response to each control and consider these relationships to be a trait of a pyrome when at least 75 percent of the constituent ecoregions display a correlation of the same sign (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). Significant differences in correlation were observed in 58% of pairwise comparisons, indicating a robust grouping of the ecoregions into pyromes with distinctive fire controls (see Materials and methods). A more complete description of pyrome characteristics is provided in supplementary text 2.

### Pyromes in extratropical forests

Pyromes ExTropF1 and ExTropF2 encompass the North American and Eurasian boreal forests, as well as some temperate and high-altitude tropical forests (Fig. 1). Forest BA in these pyromes correlates positively with fire weather and atmospheric instability, negatively with seasonal soil moisture, and shows no correlation with population density, agricultural land cover, and road density (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). ExTropF1, more common in North America, has BA strongly correlated with lightning flash density, indicating lightning as a key ignition source (33, 34). In ExTropF2, more common in Eurasia, BA correlates with normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) from the prior growing season, suggesting that previous climatic conditions affecting vegetation growth and the production of fine fuels bear an influence on subsequent fire extent (75, 76). Forest fire extent in pyromes ExTropF1 and ExTropF2 is governed by different combinations of climatic factors affecting fuel moisture, fuel growth, and natural ignition.

Pyromes ExTropF3 and ExTropF4 include forests of Scandinavia, western Russia, and certain areas of North America, Europe, and China (Fig. 1). Although the BA in these pyromes correlates with fire weather, the strength of correlations is lower than that in ExTropF1 or ExTropF2 and is especially weak in ExTropF4 (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). Additionally, in ExTropF4, no correlation with soil moisture further indicates that fires are also relatively insensitive to water deficits (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). Weak correlations with most variables in ExTropF3 and ExTropF4 likely relate to infrequent burning in these stable humid climates (fig. S8 and table S1), which challenges

diagnoses of controls on fire over a two-decade time period.

### Pyromes in tropical forests

TropF1 and TropF2 are widespread in the tropical deforestation zones of Amazonia, Congo, and equatorial southeast Asia (Fig. 1). Forest BA correlates positively with population density, road density, agricultural land cover, and fire weather, and negatively with forest continuity and soil moisture (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). These traits characterize a region with widespread deforestation and degradation fires that, particularly in TropF2, are facilitated by dry conditions (48, 77, 78). TropF1, primarily in Amazonia and the Congo, shows a strong correlation with pasture cover (fig. S1), reflecting cattle ranching-driven deforestation (79, 80). TropF2, found in Sumatra, Kalimantan, Borneo, Guianas, and southeast Russia, has stronger correlations with soil moisture and weaker correlations with population, roads, and pasture cover than TropF1, highlighting the particularly prominent role of drought in facilitating peak fire activity (78, 81, 82). Several forest ecoregions in southeast Russia, a global hotspot of extratropical forest loss through fire linked to forestry operations (82), are also grouped with TropF2 (Fig. 1).

TropF3 characteristically maps to older, heavily fragmented deforestation frontiers in Brazil, Mexico, West Africa, and some southeast Asian islands (Fig. 1) (83, 84). In these areas, forest BA correlates positively with fire weather and negatively with soil moisture but not with population or agriculture density, most likely caused by saturation of ignition sources in these highly populated regions during fire-favorable weather conditions.

### Pyromes in subtropical forests

SubTropF1, SubTropF2, and SubTropF3 span subtropical or dry tropical forest ecoregions in regions such as northern Colombia, Madagascar, northeast India, southeast Asia, Sri Lanka, East Africa, and drier parts of the Brazilian Atlantic forests (Fig. 1). BA consistently correlates with forest continuity and fuel stocks in these pyromes, in addition to fire weather (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). This indicates a tendency for greater fire extent when meteorological conditions allow, in locations where fuel production is greater or flammable natural landscapes are less fragmented (15, 49). In SubTropF1 and SubTropF2, negative correlations with population density, cropland cover, and road density—particularly strong in SubTropF2—suggest reduced fire activity in the areas most fragmented by human activity. Lightning frequency often correlates with BA in SubTropF2, pointing toward a greater frequency of natural ignitions.

In contrast to SubTropF1 and SubTropF2, BA in SubTropF3 shows no consistent correlation with population density, cropland cover, or road

density, indicating that natural factors (e.g., topographic and hydrological) are more important controls on fuel loads and continuity than human factors. SubTropF3 also lacks strong correlations between BA and soil moisture, indicating sensitivity to short-term, fire-prone weather rather than seasonal moisture deficits (15, 49).


### Pyromes in zones of fire suppression

The final two pyromes, SupZoF1 and SupZoF2, span tropical, subtropical, and temperate forest ecoregions and are common in regions with substantial fire management efforts, such as the southeast US, western US, southeast and western Australia, and parts of Iberia (Fig. 1). In these pyromes, forest BA negatively correlates with population density, road density, and agriculture, indicating reduced fire extent in proximity to human activities (46, 85). Positive correlations with forest continuity and fire spread suggests that continuous forests facilitate fire spread, especially in topographically complex areas with fewer human activities (46, 86).

Fire suppression, fuel load management, and community programs are in place to reduce fire extent in these areas (46, 87). Despite these efforts, fires can still occur during fire-prone weather (37, 88), and stronger positive correlations with fire weather and negative correlations with soil moisture in SupZoF2 suggest that climatic factors bear stronger influence on forest BA than in SupZoF1 (Fig. 2). In SupZoF1, forest BA often (but inconsistently) correlates with lightning frequency, highlighting the role of natural ignitions, an effect that is seen most strongly in southeast Australia (89) (fig. S2). Additionally, SupZoF1 shows a correlation between forest BA and vegetation productivity from the prior growing season, emphasizing the role of fuel production as a driver of fire extent (9, 42, 90).


### Increased fire emissions in extratropical forest pyromes

Forest fire C emissions increased in several of the pyromes between 2001 and 2023 (Fig. 3); however, the most notable trend was a 194% increase in fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF2 (+116 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup>; table S1). This large increase in fire C emissions was driven by a 167% increase in forest BA (+35 thousand km<sup>2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) and a 58% increase in C combustion rate (C emissions per unit BA; Fig. 3 and table S1). Increased forest BA was a widespread feature of the ecoregions in pyrome ExTropF2, with over half showing significant increases and fewer than 5% showing significant decreases (Fig. 4 and fig. S11). Consequently, the increases in forest fire C emissions were also widespread. For example, forest fire C emissions increased significantly in parts of Russia (east and northeast Siberian taiga), Europe (e.g., Balkan mixed forests, Pindus



**Fig. 3. Changes in BA in forests and carbon (C) emissions from forest fires during 2001 to 2023.** By row, the panels show (A) to (C) forest BA, (D) to (F) fire C emissions per unit burned area of forest, (G) to (I) C emissions from forest fires, and (J) to (L) the forest fraction of total (forest plus non-forest) fire C emissions. By column the panels show (A), (D), (G), and (J) show annual data (solid lines) and trendlines (dashed lines) for each pyrome, (B), (E), (H), and (K) absolute changes during the data period, and (C), (F), (I), and (L) relative changes (%) for the same period. Trendlines are fitted using Theil-Sen regression. Fire C emissions are extrapolated for 2001 and 2023

based on the trend in C combustion rate during 2002 to 2020 and the observed annual BA in 2001 and 2023. Absolute changes are calculated as the difference between the trendline values at the start and end of the period, and relative changes are calculated conservatively as the absolute change divided by the period mean. Figures S3 to S5 present various aspects of forest and total (forest plus nonforest) fire trends, including changes in burned area, C emissions, and combustion rates. Figures S6 to S12 show mapped trends for individual forest ecoregions and the distribution of these values across the ecoregions of each pyrome.



**Fig. 4. Changes in bioclimatic variables and fire observations at ecoregion level.** The panels show relative changes in four bioclimatic variables used to distinguish pyromes (A) to (D), forest burned area (BA) (E), forest burned area fraction ( $\text{km}^2$  burned  $\text{km}^2$  forest) (F), forest fire carbon (C) emissions (G) and the forest fire C combustion rate ( $\text{g C km}^{-2}$  burned) during the period 2001 to 2023 (2010 to 2021 for lightning flash density), mapped to forest ecoregions. The climate variables are (a) days during the fire season with 95th percentile fire weather index (FWI) values relative to all days in the period 1980 to 2009, (B) average soil moisture content during the fire season, (C) mean normalized

difference vegetation index (NDVI) during the prior growing season, and (D) lightning flash density during the fire season. The strength of the relationships between forest BA and fire weather, soil moisture, vegetation growth, and lightning varies across pyromes (Fig. 2) and there is lesser variability within the constituent ecoregions of each pyrome (figs. S1 and S2). Changes in forest fire C emissions (G) relate to changes in forest burned area (E) as well and emissions per unit BA (H). Figs. S6 to S17 additionally show the mapped mean values of these variables for individual ecoregions and the distribution of trends across the ecoregions of each pyrome.



and Dinaric mountains mixed forests), western North America (e.g., Sierra Nevada forests, North-Central Rockies forests, Muskwa-Slave lake forests, Fraser Plateau and Basin complex, and Northwest Territories taiga), Chile (Valdivian temperate forests), and China (Northeast China Plain deciduous forests and Hengduan Mountains conifer forests; Fig. 4).

The increases in forest BA and fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF2 align with changes in the variables that control temporal variability in forest BA. During 2001 to 2023, the annual number of extreme fire weather days increased by 5 days per year on average across the ecoregions of the pyrome (Fig. 4, fig. S14, and table S2). The average soil moisture content during the fire season decreased by around 3% on average, in contrast to other extratropical pyromes where soil moisture either increased or remained level (Fig. 4, fig. S15, and table S2). Mean NDVI during the growing season also increased at a rate comparable to the other extratropical pyromes (Fig. 4, fig. S16, and table S2). These trends were also widespread and consistent. For example, over half of the ecoregions in pyrome ExTropF2 synchronously experienced an increase in extreme fire weather days, increased NDVI, and reduced soil moisture, with over one-quarter of ecoregions showing significant changes for all three variables. This evidence suggests that the trends in forest BA and fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF2 were driven by changes in the climate of the fire season, which led to reduced fuel moisture, combined with changes in the climate of the growing season, which in turn led to increased vegetation growth and fuel production.

The increase in forest productivity during the growing season in pyrome ExTropF2 also corresponds with a 30% increase in forest area in the pyrome (+1 million km<sup>2</sup>; fig. S3) during 2001 to 2023. This notable rate of forest expansion is consistent with reported rates exceeding 1% per year in some of these regions during 2001 and 2019 based on MODIS observations (91) and with the accumulating evidence for increased vegetation greenness and biomass stocks in the high latitudes (76, 92, 93). On the other hand, such a large increase in forest area has not been seen in Landsat-based estimates of change in forest cover, likely due to differences in resolution (see further discussion in Materials and methods) (94–96). Dual increases in forest area and productivity highlight how a warming climate and CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization have enhanced forest growth at higher latitudes and contributed to both a greater forest area available to burn and greater rates of fuel production (97, 98). Nonetheless, growth in forest BA has outpaced growth in forest area, as indicated by a 158% increase in the fraction of forest area that burned annually during 2001 to 2023 (i.e., the forest BA fraction; table S1 and fig. S3).

Pyrome ExTropF1 also showed large and significant increases in forest BA (+30%, or 6000 km<sup>2</sup> per year<sup>-1</sup>) and fire C emissions (+65%, or 30 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup>) during 2001 to 2023, though these trends were not quite as pronounced as in pyrome ExTropF2 (Fig. 3 and table S1). Trends in forest BA were also more mixed among the ecoregions of pyrome ExTropF1, with around one-third showing a significant increase in forest BA and around 15% showing a significant decrease (Fig. 4, fig. S11 and table S1). The varied trends in forest BA can be explained by mixed trends in fire weather and soil moisture across the pyrome. The annual number of extreme fire weather days increased significantly in around 35% of the ecoregions of pyrome ExTropF1 but also decreased in 15%, whereas very few ecoregions experienced a significant increase in soil moisture (Fig. 4, figs. S14 and S15, and table S2). Only around 10% of ecoregions in pyrome ExTropF1 showed synchronous significant increases in extreme fire weather, soil moisture, and lightning density, which are the three key controls on fire activity that emerged from our clustering analysis in this pyrome (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2).

#### **Increased fire emissions in pyromes with fire suppression**

In pyromes SupZoF1 and SupZoF2, forest fire C emissions increased by 43 to 44% during 2001 to 2023 (Fig. 3 and table S1). In both pyromes SupZoF1 and SupZoF2, the increased fire C emissions were driven primarily by significant 37 to 79% increases in the C combustion rate, combined with smaller nonsignificant increases in forest BA of 8 to 18% (Fig. 3 and table S1). Within pyromes SupZoF1 and SupZoF2, significant increases in fire C emissions were spatially concentrated in forest ecoregions of Australia (e.g., Blue Mountains forests, Naracoorte woodlands, Jarrah-Karri forests), southern Europe (e.g., Southwest Iberian Mediterranean sclerophyllous forests, Northwest Iberian montane forests, and Aegean and Western Turkey sclerophyllous forests), the western USA (Klamath-Siskiyou and coastal forests and California interior chaparral and woodlands), and Madagascar (subhumid and lowland forests; Fig. 4). The large upticks in emissions from forests in the western US and eastern Australia during 2019 and 2020 (17, 18) are clearly visible in the emission time series for pyromes SupZoF1 and SupZoF2 and influence the slope of the trends in these pyromes (Fig. 3).

#### **Reduced fire emissions in tropical forests**

Forest fire C emissions showed opposing trends in the pyromes occupying the tropical deforestation zones, with a 96% decline (–26 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup>) in forest fire C emissions in pyrome TropF2 outweighing 56% increases (+24 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup>) in forest fire C emissions in pyrome

TropF1 (Fig. 3). In pyrome TropF1, the increase in fire C emissions was caused by an increase in forest fire C combustion rate combined with a 19% increase in forest BA (Fig. 3 and table S1). Increased forest BA was widespread throughout the pyrome, with around two-thirds of the constituent ecoregions of pyrome TropF1 showing an increase during 2001 to 2023 (Fig. 4 and table S1). In pyrome TropF2, the decline in forest fire C emissions was predominantly driven by a 56% reduction in forest BA (Fig. 3 and table S1). The reductions in fire C emissions were consistent across the ecoregions of pyrome TropF2, with around 80% of the constituent ecoregions of the pyrome showing a decrease during 2001 to 2023 (Fig. 4, fig. S11, and table S1).

#### **Discussion**

Our mapping of pyromes has revealed variation in the controls on forest fire extent across the world's forest ecoregions. The pyrome boundaries tend to align with the boundaries of climate zones or biomes (Fig. 1), though not precisely due to significant variation in the drivers of fire within those zones. The expected first-order patterns of macro-scale pyrogeography are apparent in the distinctive traits of fire control that emerge from the clustering analysis (Fig. 2 and figs. S1 and S2). For example, human controls on fire emerge as a stronger trait of the tropical pyromes than of the extratropical pyromes, consistent with the expectation that the tropical fire regime is dominated by human activities (2, 99, 100).

In the largest extratropical pyromes (ExTropF1 and ExTropF2), forest fires are influenced by climatic factors affecting fuel moisture during the fire season and variably by the production of vegetation fuels in the growing season or by opportunities for lightning ignition. The near tripling of fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF2 can be explained by pervasive increases in fire-favorable weather during the fire season, increased vegetation productivity in the growing season, and expanding forest cover. Increased forest extent and productivity at higher latitudes have been linked to climate changes that are favorable for vegetation growth and CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization (97), and our results show that these trends have coupled with reduced fuel moisture to drive an increase in forest BA and fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF2. The weaker increases in fire C emissions in pyrome ExTropF1 can be attributed to less consistent trends in fire-favorable weather across the pyrome.

During 2001 to 2023, forest fire C emissions grew by 60% across all forest ecoregions globally, principally driven by trends in the extratropical pyromes (Fig. 3 and table S1). Forest BA and fire C emissions were redistributed from tropical and subtropical pyromes to extratropical pyromes (Fig. 5). Amidst these geographical shifts, the C combustion rate of forest fires also increased by 47% across all forest ecoregions



**Fig. 5. Geographical shifts in forest BA and fire carbon (C) emissions from the tropics to the extratropics during 2001 to 2023.** The plot shows contributions of groups of forest pyromes in the tropics, subtropics, extratropics and zones of suppression to (A) and (B) forest BA in all forest ecoregions globally and (C) and (D) the fire C emissions in all forest ecoregions globally. By column the panels show (A) and (C) annual data (solid lines) and trendlines (dashed lines) for each pyrome,

(B) and (D) relative changes during 2001 to 2023. Trendlines are fitted using Theil-Sen regression. Fire C emissions are extrapolated for 2001 and 2023 based on the trend in C combustion rate during 2002 to 2020 and the observed annual BA in 2001 and 2023. Absolute changes are calculated as the difference between the trendline values at the start and end of the period, and relative changes are calculated conservatively as the absolute change divided by the period mean.

globally, reflecting greater fuel consumption per unit of forest BA (Fig. 3 and table S1). Extreme examples of C combustion per unit area have been recorded during recent extreme wildfire episodes and tied to extremes in fire-favorable weather (8, 11, 16, 17, 101), whereas our findings support a more general trend toward increases in fuel consumption in forests. In addition, the

contribution of forest fires to total (forest plus nonforest) BA and fire C emissions has also increased globally and in most forest pyromes, with the exception of the subtropical forest pyromes (Fig. 3 and table S1), signaling that the increased susceptibility of forests to fire has generally outpaced that of nonforest environments experiencing similar environmental changes.

Our mapping of the pyromes enabled us to link rising fire C emissions in extratropical forests to climate change. For example, without distinguishing pyrome ExTropF2 and the climatic factors that influence its forest BA, the increase in fire emissions that has occurred there could be overlooked or masked. The emissions trend in pyrome ExTropF2 potentially

signals that a step change in the fire regime and a destabilization of forest C stocks is underway in some extratropical ecoregions. Recent studies have identified a rise in forest productivity and fire-favorable weather as compounding drivers of increased fire C emissions in Siberia (16, 102–104), whereas our results indicate that similar dynamics are leading to increased fire C emissions more broadly across the ecoregions of pyrome ExTropF2.

Even in the pyromes where nonclimatic factors, particularly in situ human activities, exert significant control on forest BA, climatic factors remain a key enabler of fire. Increased fire weather under climate change can be expected to increase the windows of opportunity for fires to occur even in regions with significant fire suppression (31, 105, 106). For example, the uptick in the forest BA and fire C emissions in the pyromes SupZoF1 and SupZoF2, which encompass many zones of aggressive fire suppression and management, are consistent with warnings that the effectiveness of wildfire suppression is waning in a warming climate (107, 108). These findings highlight a potential for the relationships between climate and fire to strengthen in future climates.

Forest ecoregions with the most ambiguous cluster assignment (as measured by silhouette width statistics), are scattered globally with little tendency to concentrate in particular world regions (fig. S21), suggesting that the pyromes arising from our clustering procedure were largely free of regional bias (supplementary text 1). One exception is the Iberian Peninsula, where almost all ecoregions showed low silhouette widths, indicating a relatively low parity with other world regions. Among pyromes, clustering ambiguity was highest in SubTropF3, SupZoF1, and SupZoF2, with the most common alternative assignments to pyromes ExTropF1, ExTropF2, ExTropF3, ExTropF4, and SubTropF3, indicating a higher level of confusion between various climate-sensitive and extratropical pyromes (supplementary text 1).

Overall, we have contributed a new geographical mapping of forest pyromes based on distinctive fire drivers and discovered significant increases in forest BA and fire C emissions in some of the pyromes where they are most expected. Our work complements previous studies that used machine learning to disentangle the effect of multiple fire controls on global patterns or trends in BA (7, 40, 55, 56). For example, prior studies also indicated that increased vegetation productivity and fire-favorable weather both contributed to increased BA in boreal Eurasia during 2001 to 2014 (7, 40). Our explicit focus on forest BA and fire C emissions has also provided insights. For example, we find strong spatial contrasts in the effect of human activities on forest BA across different tropical and subtropical pyromes, whereas prior work

indicated that human activities reduce total BA more uniformly across the tropics (7, 40).

Our work complements prior endeavors to define pyromes based on observable fire characteristics (72–75). While a novel and insightful aspect of our study is its focus on grouping regions with similar fire drivers, by doing so, we concentrated exclusively on BA as a target variable, foregoing information about other observable fire traits that vary geographically and are important aspects of the fire regime. Future work could aim to integrate geographical distinctions in both fire traits and fire drivers to provide a more holistic definition of the pyrome. This approach would further enhance the analogy with the term “biome,” which encapsulates both the biological properties and physical presentation of grouped ecosystems, as well as the climatic and other environmental factors that cause those properties to emerge.

Looking forward, our pyrome classification could play a key role in the development of global fire models to better represent observed fire dynamics by creating opportunities to tailor model parameters in regions with distinct fire drivers. For example, parameters that represent the influence of people on fire processes could be optimized by pyrome in dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs) to better represent the distinct relationships between human activities and fire across pyromes, in a manner akin to optimizing biological processes across plant functional types. Moreover, the pyrome layer also serves to highlight priority areas for the study of changes in fire weather, drought or vegetation productivity, since some pyromes are distinctly more sensitive to changes in these factors than others.

A caveat of our approach is that it provides a global zonation of fire controls at the macro-scale—a scale that is particularly suited to questions concerning global environmental change, including differential responses to climate change. We do not suggest that all areas within an ecoregion are uniformly sensitive to the same fire controls. For example, differences in land use and management approaches across landowner types can be expected to produce varying relationships between fire and human factors within an ecoregion, as seen between protected areas, Indigenous areas, and private land (109, 110). Hence, our analysis identifies the dominant controls that emerge at the ecoregion scale but omits the local effects associated with specific actors at subecoregion level. The application of similar techniques to smaller (or larger) world regions would provide a finer (or coarser) geography of fire controls to which a different set of environmental questions may apply. In addition, our mapping of pyromes should not be viewed as fixed in time. For example, regional changes in policy, land use or population dynamics or ongoing shifts in climate or vegetation types could all lead to

the reallocation of an ecoregion to a different pyrome in the future (74).

Relatedly, although our analysis provides valuable insights into the impacts of climate change on fire dynamics over a two-decade period, it is important to recognize the limitations inherent in using relatively short datasets to interpret fire regimes that operate over much longer intervals. Many forest ecosystems are subject to fire return intervals spanning decades to centuries, which can obscure the detection of longer-term trends. This is particularly the case in pyromes ExTropF3 and ExTropF4, where long fire return intervals (~1000 years; figure S7 and table S1) likely contributed to low correlations between BA and all explanatory variables and challenged the identification of fire drivers by clustering. Therefore, while our findings indicate significant trends such as the increase in emissions in the extratropics, increased combustion rates, and a shift from savannas and grasslands to forests as major fire emissions sources, these must be interpreted with some caution. Future studies extending beyond the 20-year time frame are essential to fully understand the long-term fire regimes and validate the persistence of such trends (9, 111).

Both observations and models suggest that extratropical forests are greening and becoming more productive due to a combination of climate change and CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization (97, 98, 112). DGVMs also generally project that C storage will continue to increase in the future in high latitude forests, although some variability is seen across models and climate scenarios (113, 114). Nonetheless, DGVMs currently show a limited capacity to reproduce historical trends and contemporary spatial patterns of fire (6, 115), raising concerns as to whether future change in fire disturbance is reliably captured in projections of future vegetation distribution and C storage. Additional uncertainty in future C storage stems from the potential for post-fire ecosystem shifts to occur due to increased fire severity not captured by models (116, 117). Our finding of increased forest fire C emissions lends further support to previous warnings that fire could offset projected gains in C storage in extratropical forests (118–120).

As forest fire C emissions grow, so does their relevance to carbon accounting, including the greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories submitted to the United Nations (UN). For example, C emissions from wildfires in Canada during 2023 alone are likely to have overturned a significant portion of the C sink to Canadian forests that accumulated over the prior decade (19, 121, 122). Wildfires in Canada are not free of anthropogenic influence and are becoming more likely due to anthropogenic climate change (19), yet they are designated as natural disturbances in Canada's national emissions inventory and thus their influence is largely



omitted from UN records (121, 122). Prior work has advocated for more comprehensive reporting of fire emissions on both managed and unmanaged land, to facilitate routine assessments of how fires impact national and global inventories of anthropogenic emissions (121). Our work further highlights the importance of this comprehensive reporting by revealing the growing role that forest fire C emissions play in the carbon budget of boreal forests.

Relatedly, enhancing C storage in forests using forestry practices is viewed as a promising strategy for C dioxide removal (CDR) from the atmosphere to offset anthropogenic C emissions (123, 124). One recent study estimated that an additional 60 Pg C could be stored on extratropical land that is highly suitable for forestry (125), or 600 to 3000 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup> when annualized over a period of 20 to 100 years representing the time taken for potential C stocks to accumulate (126). The estimates of potential C storage from (125) derive from relationships fitted to the C stocks held in current intact forests, yet these forests were established in historical fire regimes inferring that potential C storage is overestimated in forests where fire regime shifts are underway. For a crude comparison, we estimate that forest fire C emissions grew by 146 Tg C year<sup>-1</sup> across all extratropical pyromes between 2001 and 2023 (table S1). We suggest that a continued increase in forest BA and fire C emissions could reduce the potential for CDR in extratropical forests by a nontrivial margin, particularly in the absence of effective fuel and fire management.

Although climatic factors show a varying strength of control on the extent of forest fires across pyromes, their effects are nonetheless pervasive. This result emphasizes the need to address the primary causes of climate change, by reducing emissions from fossil and land use sources, to mitigate the increased fire-related risks to C sinks (127, 128). Moreover, our findings inform forest management and Net Zero policies by identifying pyromes where specific human actions can support forest C sinks by reducing C emissions from fires. In tropical pyromes, where fire shows a strong dependence on human ignition patterns, reducing ignitions during extreme fire-favorable weather and preventing forest fragmentation should enhance C retention (30, 129). In pyromes with a history of aggressive wildfire suppression, shifting focus and funds from active fire suppression to managed, ecologically beneficial fires may prevent C sink-to-source conversion (7, 30, 130). In extratropical pyromes where climatic factors have the most direct and unmodulated control on fire extent, monitoring changes in vegetation and productivity can guide the prioritization of areas for forest management (7, 30, 130). In all pyromes, substantial financing is required to support strategic programs of forest management, stakeholder en-

gagement, and public education, all of which represent a meaningful shift of fire management strategy from largely reactive to increasingly proactive (7, 30, 130). Overall, global forest C sinks could be undermined by wildfire without action to address the leading causes of climate change, while forest management strategies for mitigating the problem are likely to be most effective when tailored to pyromes. Irrespective of mitigation and adaptation measures, cutting anthropogenic emissions is central to securing resilient forests for the future.

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. L. T. Kelly *et al.*, Fire and biodiversity in the Anthropocene. *Science* **370**, eabb0355 (2020). doi: [10.1126/science.abb0355](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb0355); pmid: [33214246](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33214246/)
2. D. M. J. S. Bowman *et al.*, Fire in the Earth system. *Science* **324**, 481–484 (2009). doi: [10.1126/science.1163886](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1163886); pmid: [19390038](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19390038/)
3. G. Lasslop *et al.*, Global ecosystems and fire: Multi-model assessment of fire-induced tree-cover and carbon storage reduction. *Glob. Change Biol.* **26**, 5027–5041 (2020). doi: [10.1111/gcb.15160](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15160); pmid: [32407565](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32407565/)
4. W. M. Jolly *et al.*, Climate-induced variations in global wildfire danger from 1979 to 2013. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7537 (2015). doi: [10.1038/ncomms8537](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8537); pmid: [26172867](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26172867/)
5. J. T. Abatzoglou, A. P. Williams, Impact of anthropogenic climate change on wildfire across western US forests. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 11770–11775 (2016). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1607171113](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607171113); pmid: [27791053](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27791053/)
6. M. W. Jones *et al.*, Global and Regional Trends and Drivers of Fire Under Climate Change. *Reviews of Geophysics* **60**, e2020RG000726 (2022). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1607171113](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607171113); pmid: [27791053](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27791053/)
7. United Nations Environment Programme, “Spreading like Wildfire – The Rising Threat of Extraordinary Landscape Fires” (UNEP, 2022); <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/spreading-wildfire-rising-threat-extraordinary-landscape-fires>.
8. B. Zheng *et al.*, Increasing forest fire emissions despite the decline in global burned area. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabh2646 (2021). doi: [10.1126/sciadv.abb2646](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb2646); pmid: [34559570](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34559570/)
9. J. G. Canadell *et al.*, Multi-decadal increase of forest burned area in Australia is linked to climate change. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 6921 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41467-021-27225-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27225-4); pmid: [34836974](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34836974/)
10. A. P. Williams *et al.*, Observed Impacts of Anthropogenic Climate Change on Wildfire in California. *Earth's Futur.* **7**, 892–910 (2019). doi: [10.1029/2019EF001210](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001210)
11. E. Ponomarev, N. Yakimov, T. Ponomareva, O. Yakubailik, S. G. Conard, Current Trend of Carbon Emissions from Wildfires in Siberia. *Atmosphere* **12**, 559 (2021). doi: [10.3390/atmos12050559](https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12050559)
12. S. A. Parks, J. T. Abatzoglou, Warmer and Drier Fire Seasons Contribute to Increases in Area Burned at High Severity in Western US Forests From 1985 to 2017. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **47**, e2020GL089858 (2020). doi: [10.1029/2020GL089858](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL089858)
13. L. V. Gatti *et al.*, Amazonia as a carbon source linked to deforestation and climate change. *Nature* **595**, 388–393 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41586-021-03629-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03629-6); pmid: [34262208](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34262208/)
14. J. R. Marlon *et al.*, Long-term perspective on wildfires in the western USA. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, E535–E543 (2012). doi: [10.1073/pnas.112839109](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.112839109); pmid: [22334650](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22334650/)
15. N. Andela *et al.*, A human-driven decline in global burned area. *Science* **356**, 1356–1362 (2017). doi: [10.1126/science.124108](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.124108); pmid: [28663495](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28663495/)
16. B. Zheng *et al.*, Record-high CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from boreal fires in 2021. *Science* **379**, 912–917 (2023). doi: [10.1126/science.ade0805](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade0805); pmid: [36862792](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36862792/)
17. I. R. van der Velde *et al.*, Vast CO<sub>2</sub> release from Australian fires in 2019–2020 constrained by satellite. *Nature* **597**, 366–369 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41586-021-03712-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03712-y); pmid: [34526704](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34526704/)
18. P. E. Higuera, J. T. Abatzoglou, Record-setting climate enabled the extraordinary 2020 fire season in the western United States. *Glob. Change Biol.* **27**, 1–2 (2021). doi: [10.1111/gcb.15388](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15388); pmid: [33048429](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33048429/)
19. M. W. Jones *et al.*, State of Wildfires 2023–2024. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **16**, 3601–3685 (2024). doi: [10.5194/essd-16-3601-2024](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-16-3601-2024)
20. M. Ward *et al.*, Impact of 2019–2020 mega-fires on Australian fauna habitat. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 1321–1326 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s41559-020-1251-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1251-1); pmid: [32690905](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32690905/)
21. D. B. Lindenmayer, C. Taylor, New spatial analyses of Australian wildfires highlight the need for new fire, resource, and conservation policies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 12481–12485 (2020). doi: [10.1073/pnas.2002269117](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2002269117); pmid: [32424092](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32424092/)
22. C. Yue *et al.*, How have past fire disturbances contributed to the current carbon balance of boreal ecosystems? *Biogeosciences* **13**, 675–690 (2016). doi: [10.5194/bg-13-675-2016](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-675-2016)
23. S. P. Harrison *et al.*, The biomass burning contribution to climate–carbon-cycle feedback. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **9**, 663–677 (2018). doi: [10.5194/esd-9-663-2018](https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-9-663-2018)
24. D. M. J. S. Bowman, G. J. Williamson, O. F. Price, M. N. Ndalila, R. A. Bradstock, Australian forests, megafires and the risk of dwindling carbon stocks. *Plant Cell Environ.* **44**, 347–355 (2021). doi: [10.1111/pce.13916](https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13916); pmid: [33068312](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33068312/)
25. C. A. Phillips *et al.*, Escalating carbon emissions from North American boreal forest wildfires and the climate mitigation potential of fire management. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabl7161 (2022). doi: [10.1126/sciadv.abl7161](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abl7161); pmid: [35476444](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35476444/)
26. D. M. J. S. Bowman *et al.*, Human exposure and sensitivity to globally extreme wildfire events. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 0058 (2017). doi: [10.1126/sciadv.abl7161](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abl7161); pmid: [35476444](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35476444/)
27. D. Wang *et al.*, Economic footprint of California wildfires in 2018. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 252–260 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41893-020-00646-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00646-7)
28. F. H. Johnston *et al.*, Unprecedented health costs of smoke-related PM<sub>2.5</sub> from the 2019–20 Australian megafires. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 42–47 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41893-020-00610-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00610-5)
29. H. Clarke *et al.*, Forest fire threatens global carbon sinks and population centres under rising atmospheric water demand. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 7161 (2022). doi: [10.1038/s41467-022-34966-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34966-3); pmid: [36418312](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36418312/)
30. World Bank Group, “World Bank Policy Note: Managing Wildfires in a Changing Climate” (WBG, 2020); [https://www.profor.info/sites/default/files/PROFOR\\_ManagingWildfires\\_2020\\_final.pdf](https://www.profor.info/sites/default/files/PROFOR_ManagingWildfires_2020_final.pdf)
31. J. T. Abatzoglou, A. P. Williams, R. Barbero, Global Emergence of Anthropogenic Climate Change in Fire Weather Indices. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **46**, 326–336 (2019). doi: [10.1029/2018GL080959](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080959)
32. J. T. Abatzoglou, C. A. Kolden, J. K. Balch, B. A. Bradley, Controls on interannual variability in lightning-caused fire activity in the western US. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11**, 045005 (2016). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/045005](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/045005)
33. S. Veraverbeke *et al.*, Lightning as a major driver of recent large fire years in North American boreal forests. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **7**, 529–534 (2017). doi: [10.1038/nclimate3329](https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3329)
34. T. A. J. Janssen *et al.*, Extratropical forests increasingly at risk due to lightning fires. *Nat. Geosci.* **16**, 1136–1144 (2023). doi: [10.1038/s41561-023-01322-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-023-01322-z)
35. G. A. Mills, W. L. McCaw, Centre for Australian Weather and Climate Research, “Atmospheric Stability Environments and Fire Weather in Australia: Extending the Haines Index” (CAWCR Technical report no. 20, 2010).
36. G. Di Virgilio *et al.*, Climate Change Increases the Potential for Extreme Wildfires. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **46**, 8517–8526 (2019). doi: [10.1029/2019GL083699](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083699)
37. G. J. van Oldenborgh *et al.*, Attribution of the Australian bushfire risk to anthropogenic climate change. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* **21**, 941–960 (2021). doi: [10.5194/nhess-21-941-2021](https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-941-2021)
38. M. C. Kirchmeier-Young, F. W. Zwiers, N. P. Gillett, A. J. Cannon, Attributing extreme fire risk in Western Canada to human emissions. *Clim. Change* **144**, 365–379 (2017). doi: [10.1007/s10584-017-2030-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-2030-0); pmid: [32009687](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32009687/)
39. J. G. Pausas, J. E. Keeley, Wildfires and global change. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **19**, 387–395 (2021). doi: [10.1002/fee.2359](https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2359)
40. D. I. Kelley *et al.*, How contemporary bioclimatic and human controls change global fire regimes. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **9**, 690–696 (2019). doi: [10.1038/s41558-019-0540-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0540-7)
41. D. M. J. S. Bowman *et al.*, Vegetation fires in the Anthropocene. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **1**, 500–515 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s43017-020-0085-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0085-3)
42. N. J. Abram *et al.*, Connections of climate change and variability to large and extreme forest fires in southeast Australia. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **2**, 8 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s43247-020-00065-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-020-00065-8)
43. L. E. O. C. Aragão *et al.*, 21st Century drought-related fires counteract the decline of Amazon deforestation carbon

- emissions. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 536 (2018). doi: [10.1038/s41467-017-02771-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02771-y); pmid: [29440640](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29440640/)
44. J. K. Balch *et al.*, Human-started wildfires expand the fire niche across the United States. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, 2946–2951 (2017). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1617394114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1617394114); pmid: [28242690](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28242690/)
  45. P. M. Fernandes, A. P. Pacheco, R. Almeida, J. Claro, The role of fire-suppression force in limiting the spread of extremely large forest fires in Portugal. *Eur. J. For. Res.* **135**, 253–262 (2016). doi: [10.1007/s10342-015-0933-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-015-0933-8)
  46. F. Moreira *et al.*, Wildfire management in Mediterranean-type regions: Paradigm change needed. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **15**, 011001 (2020). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/ab541e](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab541e)
  47. R. A. Bradstock *et al.*, Modelling the potential for prescribed burning to mitigate carbon emissions from wildfires in fire-prone forests of Australia. *Int. J. Wildland Fire* **21**, 629–639 (2012). doi: [10.1071/WF11023](https://doi.org/10.1071/WF11023)
  48. C. H. L. Silva Junior *et al.*, Persistent collapse of biomass in Amazonian forest edges following deforestation leads to unaccounted carbon losses. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaz8360 (2020). doi: [10.1126/sciadv.aaz8360](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz8360); pmid: [32998890](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32998890/)
  49. T. M. Rosan *et al.*, Fragmentation-Driven Divergent Trends in Burned Area in Amazonia and Cerrado. *Front. For. Glob. Change* **5**, 801408 (2022). doi: [10.3389/ffgc.2022.801408](https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2022.801408)
  50. M.-A. Parisien *et al.*, Fire deficit increases wildfire risk for many communities in the Canadian boreal forest. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2121 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s41467-020-15961-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15961-y); pmid: [32358496](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32358496/)
  51. B. M. Rogers, A. J. Soja, M. L. Goulden, J. T. Randerson, Influence of tree species on continental differences in boreal fires and climate feedbacks. *Nat. Geosci.* **8**, 228–234 (2015). doi: [10.1038/ngeo2352](https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2352)
  52. M. L. Pettinari, E. Chuvieco, Generation of a global fuel data set using the Fuel Characteristic Classification System. *Biogeosciences* **13**, 2061–2076 (2016). doi: [10.5194/bg-13-2061-2016](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-2061-2016)
  53. M. Forkel *et al.*, Emergent relationships with respect to burned area in global satellite observations and fire-enabled vegetation models. *Biogeosciences* **16**, 57–76 (2019). doi: [10.5194/bg-16-57-2019](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-57-2019)
  54. J. T. Abatzoglou, A. P. Williams, L. Boschetti, M. Zubkova, C. A. Kolden, Global patterns of interannual climate-fire relationships. *Glob. Change Biol.* **24**, 5164–5175 (2018). doi: [10.1111/gcb.14405](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14405); pmid: [30047195](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30047195/)
  55. M. Forkel *et al.*, A data-driven approach to identify controls on global fire activity from satellite and climate observations (SOFIA V1). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **10**, 4443–4476 (2017). doi: [10.5194/gmd-10-4443-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-4443-2017)
  56. E. Chuvieco *et al.*, Human and climate drivers of global biomass burning variability. *Sci. Total Environ.* **779**, 146361 (2021). doi: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146361](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146361); pmid: [34030254](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34030254/)
  57. D. M. Olson *et al.*, Terrestrial Ecoregions of the World: A New Map of Life on Earth. *Bioscience* **51**, 933 (2001). doi: [10.1641/0006-3568\(2001\)051\[0933:TEOTWA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2001)051[0933:TEOTWA]2.0.CO;2)
  58. L. Giglio, L. Boschetti, D. P. Roy, M. L. Humber, C. O. Justice, The Collection 6 MODIS burned area mapping algorithm and product. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **217**, 72–85 (2018). doi: [10.1016/j.rse.2018.08.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.08.005); pmid: [30220740](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30220740/)
  59. D. van Wees *et al.*, Global biomass burning fuel consumption and emissions at 500 m spatial resolution based on the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED). *Geosci. Model Dev.* **15**, 8411–8437 (2022). doi: [10.5194/gmd-15-8411-2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-8411-2022)
  60. C. E. Van Wagner, “Development and Structure of the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System” (Canadian Forestry Service, Forestry Technical Report 351987, 1987); <https://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/443/publications?id=19927>.
  61. C. Vitolo *et al.*, ERA5-based global meteorological wildfire danger maps. *Sci. Data* **7**, 216 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s41597-020-0554-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0554-z); pmid: [32636392](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32636392/)
  62. J. Muñoz-Sabater *et al.*, ERA5-Land: A state-of-the-art global reanalysis dataset for land applications. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **13**, 4349–4383 (2021). doi: [10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021)
  63. R. H. Holzworth *et al.*, Lightning in the Arctic. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **48**, e2020GL091366 (2021). doi: [10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021)
  64. A. Huete *et al.*, Overview of the radiometric and biophysical performance of the MODros. Inf. Serv. vegetation indices. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **83**, 195–213 (2002). doi: [10.1016/S0034-4257\(02\)00096-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00096-2)
  65. K. Didan, MOD13A3 - MODIS/Terra Vegetation Indices Monthly L3 Global 1km SIN Grid, NASA LP DAAC (2021); <http://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MOD13A3.006>
  66. J. E. Dobson, E. A. Bright, P. R. Coleman, R. C. Durfee, B. A. Worley, LandScan: A global population database for estimating populations at risk. *Photogramm. Eng. Remote Sensing* **66**, 849–857 (2000).
  67. M. Friedl, D. Sulla-Menashe, MCD12Q1 - MODIS/Terra+Aqua Land Cover Type Yearly L3 Global 500m SIN Grid, NASA LP DAAC (2019); <http://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MCD12Q1.006>
  68. T. P. Robinson *et al.*, Mapping the global distribution of livestock. *PLOS ONE* **9**, e96084 (2014). doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0096084](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0096084); pmid: [24875496](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24875496/)
  69. J. R. Meijer, M. A. J. Huijbregts, K. C. G. J. Schotten, A. M. Schipper, Global patterns of current and future road infrastructure. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13**, 064006 (2018). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/aab442](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aab442)
  70. G. Amati, D. McInerney, T. Sethi, P. Strobl, S. Domisch, Geomorpho90m, empirical evaluation and accuracy assessment of global high-resolution geomorphometric layers. *Sci. Data* **7**, 162 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s41597-020-0479-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0479-6); pmid: [32467582](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32467582/)
  71. S. Archibald, C. E. R. Lehmann, J. L. Gómez-Dans, R. A. Bradstock, Defining pyromes and global syndromes of fire regimes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 6442–6447 (2013). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1211466110](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211466110); pmid: [23559374](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23559374/)
  72. M. E. Cattau, A. L. Mahood, J. K. Balch, C. A. Wessman, Modern Pyromes: Biogeographical Patterns of Fire Characteristics across the Contiguous United States. *Fire* **5**, 95 (2022). doi: [10.3390/fire5040095](https://doi.org/10.3390/fire5040095)
  73. M. García *et al.*, Characterizing Global Fire Regimes from Satellite-Derived Products. *Forests* **13**, 699 (2022). doi: [10.3390/f13050699](https://doi.org/10.3390/f13050699)
  74. C. X. Cunningham *et al.*, Pyrogeography in flux: Reorganization of Australian fire regimes in a hotter world. *Glob. Change Biol.* **30**, e17130 (2024). doi: [10.1111/gcb.17130](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.17130); pmid: [38273509](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38273509/)
  75. M. Forkel *et al.*, Extreme fire events are related to previous-year surface moisture conditions in permafrost-underlain larch forests of Siberia. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **7**, 044021 (2012). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044021](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044021)
  76. V. I. Kharuk, M. L. Dvinskaya, S. T. Im, A. S. Golyukov, K. T. Smith, Wildfires in the Siberian Arctic. *Fire (Basel)* **5**, 106 (2022). doi: [10.3390/fire5040106](https://doi.org/10.3390/fire5040106)
  77. P. M. Brando *et al.*, Droughts, Wildfires, and Forest Carbon Cycling: A Pan-tropical Synthesis. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **47**, 555–581 (2019). doi: [10.1146/annurev-earth-082517-010235](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-082517-010235)
  78. T. Nikonovs, A. Spessa, S. H. Doerr, G. D. Clay, S. Mezbahuddin, Near-complete loss of fire-resistant primary tropical forest cover in Sumatra and Kalimantan. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **1**, 1–8 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s43247-020-00069-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-020-00069-4)
  79. J. Barlow, E. Berenguer, R. Carmentia, F. França, Clarifying Amazonia's burning crisis. *Glob. Change Biol.* **26**, 319–321 (2020). doi: [10.1111/gcb.14872](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14872); pmid: [31729092](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31729092/)
  80. V. R. Pivello, The Use of Fire in the Cerrado and Amazonian Rainforests of Brazil: Past and Present. *Fire Ecol* **7**, 24–39 (2011). doi: [10.1111/gcb.14872](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14872); pmid: [31729092](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31729092/)
  81. R. D. Field, G. R. van der Werf, S. S. P. Shen, Human amplification of drought-induced biomass burning in Indonesia since 1960. *Nat. Geosci.* **2**, 185–188 (2009). doi: [10.1038/ngeo443](https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo443)
  82. P. G. Curtis, C. M. Slay, N. L. Harris, A. Tyukavina, M. C. Hansen, Classifying drivers of global forest loss. *Science* **361**, 1108–1111 (2018). doi: [10.1126/science.aau3445](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau3445); pmid: [30213911](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30213911/)
  83. M. R. Rosa *et al.*, Hidden destruction of older forests threatens Brazil's Atlantic Forest and challenges restoration programs. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabc4547 (2021). doi: [10.1126/sciadv.abc4547](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc4547); pmid: [33523918](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33523918/)
  84. J. C. Aleman, M. A. Jarzyńska, A. C. Staver, Forest extent and deforestation in tropical Africa since 1900. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 26–33 (2018). doi: [10.1038/s41559-017-0406-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0406-1); pmid: [29230024](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29230024/)
  85. Y. Le Page, D. Oom, J. M. N. Silva, P. Jönsson, J. M. C. Pereira, Seasonality of vegetation fires as modified by human action: Observing the deviation from eco-climatic fire regimes. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **19**, 575–588 (2010). doi: [10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00525.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00525.x)
  86. M. Castellnou *et al.*, Empowering strategic decision-making for wildfire management: avoiding the fear trap and creating a resilient landscape. *Fire Ecol* **15**, 31 (2019). doi: [10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00525.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00525.x)
  87. H. Hessel, Wildland Fire Prevention: A Review. *Curr. For. Rep.* **4**, 178–190 (2018). doi: [10.1007/s40725-018-0083-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40725-018-0083-6)
  88. J. T. Abatzoglou *et al.*, Projected increases in western US forest fire despite growing fuel constraints. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **2**, 1–8 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s43247-021-00299-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-021-00299-0)
  89. H. Clarke, R. Gibson, B. Cirulis, R. A. Bradstock, T. D. Penman, Developing and testing models of the drivers of anthropogenic and lightning-caused wildfire ignitions in south-eastern Australia. *J. Environ. Manage.* **235**, 34–41 (2019). doi: [10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.01.055](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.01.055); pmid: [30669091](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30669091/)
  90. R. A. Bradstock, A biogeographic model of fire regimes in Australia: current and future implications: A biogeographic model of fire in Australia. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **19**, 145–158 (2010). doi: [10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00512.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00512.x)
  91. R. Rotbarth *et al.*, Northern expansion is not compensating for southern declines in North American boreal forests. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 3373 (2023). doi: [10.1038/s41467-023-39092-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-39092-2); pmid: [37291123](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37291123/)
  92. L. T. Berner, S. J. Goetz, Satellite observations document trends consistent with a boreal forest biome shift. *Glob. Change Biol.* **28**, 3275–3292 (2022). doi: [10.1111/gcb.16121](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16121); pmid: [35199413](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35199413/)
  93. H. Yang *et al.*, Global increase in biomass carbon stock dominated by growth of northern young forests over past decade. *Nat. Geosci.* **16**, 886–892 (2023). doi: [10.1038/s41561-023-01274-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-023-01274-4)
  94. Y. Li *et al.*, Inconsistent estimates of forest cover change in China between 2000 and 2013 from multiple datasets: Differences in parameters, spatial resolution, and definitions. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 8748 (2017). doi: [10.1038/s41598-017-07732-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07732-5); pmid: [28821759](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28821759/)
  95. H. Yin, A. Khamzina, D. Pflugmacher, C. Martius, Forest cover mapping in post-Soviet Central Asia using multi-resolution remote sensing imagery. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 1375 (2017). doi: [10.1038/s41598-017-01582-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-01582-x); pmid: [28465582](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28465582/)
  96. X. Wei *et al.*, Monitoring forest dynamics in Africa during 2000–2020 using a remotely sensed fractional tree cover dataset. *Int. J. Digit. Earth* **16**, 2212–2232 (2023). doi: [10.1080/17538947.2023.2220613](https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2023.2220613)
  97. S. Piao *et al.*, Characteristics, drivers and feedbacks of global greening. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **1**, 14–27 (2020). doi: [10.1038/s43017-019-0001-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-019-0001-x)
  98. Y. He *et al.*, CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization contributed more than half of the observed forest biomass increase in northern extra-tropical land. *Glob. Change Biol.* **29**, 4313–4326 (2023). doi: [10.1111/gcb.16806](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16806); pmid: [37277951](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37277951/)
  99. S. L. Lewis, D. P. Edwards, D. Galbraith, Increasing human dominance of tropical forests. *Science* **349**, 827–832 (2015). doi: [10.1126/science.aaa9932](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa9932); pmid: [26293955](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26293955/)
  100. S. Archibald, Managing the human component of fire regimes: Lessons from Africa. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **371**, 20150346 (2016). doi: [10.1098/rstb.2015.0346](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0346); pmid: [27161616](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27161616/)
  101. Q. Xu *et al.*, Wildfire burn severity and emissions inventory: An example implementation over California. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **17**, 085008 (2022). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/ac8000](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac8000)
  102. E. A. Kukavskaya, E. G. Shvetsov, L. V. Buryak, P. D. Tretyakov, P. Y. Groisman, Increasing Fuel Loads, Fire Hazard, and Carbon Emissions from Fires in Central Siberia. *Fire (Basel)* **6**, 63 (2023). doi: [10.3390/fire6020063](https://doi.org/10.3390/fire6020063)
  103. R. C. Scholten, D. Coumou, F. Luo, S. Veraverbeke, Early snowmelt and polar jet dynamics co-influence recent extreme Siberian fire seasons. *Science* **378**, 1005–1009 (2022). doi: [10.1126/science.abn4419](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4419); pmid: [36454839](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36454839/)
  104. E. I. Ponomarev, A. N. Zabrodin, E. G. Shvetsov, T. V. Ponomareva, Wildfire Intensity and Fire Emissions in Siberia. *Fire (Basel)* **6**, 246 (2023). doi: [10.3390/fire6070246](https://doi.org/10.3390/fire6070246)
  105. T. D. Hessilt *et al.*, Future increases in lightning ignition efficiency and wildfire occurrence expected from drier fuels in boreal forest ecosystems of western North America. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **17**, 054008 (2022). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/ac6311](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac6311)
  106. J. K. Shuman *et al.*, Reimagine fire science for the anthropocene. *PNAS Nexus* **1**, pgac115 (2022). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/ac6311](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac6311); pmid: [36741468](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36741468/)
  107. M. A. Cochrane, D. M. J. S. Bowman, Manage fire regimes, not fires. *Nat. Geosci.* **14**, 455–457 (2021). doi: [10.1038/s41561-021-00791-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00791-4)
  108. S. Bloem, A. C. Cullen, L. O. Mearns, J. T. Abatzoglou, The Role of International Resource Sharing Arrangements in Managing Fire in the Face of Climate Change. *Fire* **5**, 88 (2022). doi: [10.3390/fire5040088](https://doi.org/10.3390/fire5040088)
  109. C. F. Starrs, V. Butsic, C. Stephens, W. Stewart, The impact of land ownership, firefighting, and reserve status on fire probability in California. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13**, 034025 (2018). doi: [10.1088/1748-9326/aaad1](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaad1)

110. A. C. M. Pessôa *et al.*, Protected areas are effective on curbing fires in the Amazon. *Ecol. Econ.* **214**, 107983 (2023). doi: [10.1016/j.ecolecon.2023.107983](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2023.107983)
111. C. C. Hanes *et al.*, Fire-regime changes in Canada over the last half century. *Can. J. For. Res.* **49**, 256–269 (2019). doi: [10.1139/cjfr-2018-0293](https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2018-0293)
112. P. Friedlingstein *et al.*, Global Carbon Budget 2023. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **15**, 5301–5369 (2023). doi: [10.5194/essd-15-5301-2023](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-5301-2023)
113. S. Sith *et al.*, Evaluation of the terrestrial carbon cycle, future plant geography and climate-carbon cycle feedbacks using five Dynamic Global Vegetation Models (DGVMs). *Glob. Change Biol.* **14**, 2015–2039 (2008). doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01626.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01626.x)
114. C.-E. Yang *et al.*, Uncertainty Quantification of Extratropical Forest Biomass in CMIP5 Models over the Northern Hemisphere. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 10962 (2018). doi: [10.1038/s41598-018-29227-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29227-7); pmid: 30026558
115. S. Kloster, G. Lasslop, Historical and future fire occurrence (1850 to 2100) simulated in CMIP5 Earth System Models. *Global Planet. Change* **150**, 58–69 (2017). doi: [10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.12.017)
116. M. C. Mack *et al.*, Carbon loss from boreal forest wildfires offset by increased dominance of deciduous trees. *Science* **372**, 280–283 (2021). doi: [10.1126/science.abf3903](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf3903); pmid: 33859032
117. J. L. Baltzer *et al.*, Increasing fire and the decline of fire adapted black spruce in the boreal forest. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **118**, e2024872118 (2021). doi: [10.1073/pnas.2024872118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2024872118); pmid: 34697246
118. M. S. Balshi *et al.*, Vulnerability of carbon storage in North American boreal forests to wildfires during the 21st century. *Glob. Change Biol.* **15**, 1491–1510 (2009). doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01877.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01877.x)
119. S. Schaphoff, C. P. O. Reyner, D. Schepaschenko, D. Gerten, A. Shvidenko, Tamm Review: Observed and projected climate change impacts on Russia's forests and its carbon balance. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **361**, 432–444 (2016). doi: [10.1016/j.foreco.2015.11.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.11.043)
120. M. R. Turetsky *et al.*, Recent acceleration of biomass burning and carbon losses in Alaskan forests and peatlands. *Nat. Geosci.* **4**, 27–31 (2011). doi: [10.1038/ngeo1027](https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1027)
121. J. MacCarthy, A. Tyukavina, M. J. Weisse, N. Harris, E. Glen, Extreme wildfires in Canada and their contribution to global loss in tree cover and carbon emissions in 2023. *Glob. Change Biol.* **30**, e17392 (2024). doi: [10.1111/gcb.17392](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.17392); pmid: 38934256
122. Government of Canada, "National inventory report: greenhouse gas sources and sinks in Canada" (2024); [publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9506002&sl=0](https://publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9506002&sl=0)
123. B. W. Griscom *et al.*, Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, 11645–11650 (2017). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1710465114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1710465114); pmid: 29078344
124. H. B. Smith, N. E. Vaughan, J. Forster, Long-term national climate strategies bet on forests and soils to reach net-zero. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **3**, 1–12 (2022). doi: [10.1038/s43247-022-00636-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00636-x)
125. W. S. Walker *et al.*, The global potential for increased storage of carbon on land. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **119**, e2111312119 (2022). doi: [10.1073/pnas.2111312119](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2111312119); pmid: 35639697
126. B. K. Haya *et al.*, Comprehensive review of carbon quantification by improved forest management offset protocols. *Front. For. Glob. Change* **6**, 2023 | (2023). doi: [10.3389/ffgc.2023.958879](https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2023.958879)
127. IPCC, "Summary for Policymakers" in Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, V. Masson-Delmotte *et al.*, Eds. (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2021), pp. 3–32.
128. S. Smith *et al.*, "The state of carbon dioxide removal" (University of Oxford's Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment, 2024); <https://osf.io/w3b4z/>
129. J. Barlow *et al.*, The critical importance of considering fire in REDD+ programs. *Biol. Conserv.* **154**, 1–8 (2012). doi: [10.1016/j.biocon.2012.03.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.03.034)
130. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Taming Wildfires in the Context of Climate Change" (OECD, 2023); [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/environment/taming-wildfires-in-the-context-of-climate-change\\_dd00c367-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/environment/taming-wildfires-in-the-context-of-climate-change_dd00c367-en).
131. M. W. Jones, Supplementary Data: Global rise in forest fire emissions linked to climate change in the extratropics, Zenodo (2024); <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10036942>.
132. D. van Wees *et al.*, "Global biomass burning fuel consumption and emissions at 500-m spatial resolution based on the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED)," version v2, Zenodo (2024); <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12670427>.
133. G. R. van der Werf *et al.*, Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **9**, 697–720 (2017). doi: [10.5194/essd-9-697-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-697-2017)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank H. Smith (UEA) for his guidance on the commitment periods of forestry-related CDR. The authors thank the TRopical Ecosystems and Environmental Sciences (TREES) lab at the Brazilian Institute for Space Research (INPE) for their feedback on the inclusion of predictor variables relevant to tropical forest ecoregions. **Funding:** This work was funded by the following: UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) grant NE/V01417X/1 (M.W.J.); European Commission (E.C.) Horizon 2020 (H2020) project VERIFY grant 776810 (M.W.J.); São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) grants 2019/25701-8, 2020/15230-5 and 2023/03206-0 (G.M.); EC H2020 project FirEURisk grant no. 101003890 (S.H.D., M.L.P.); NERC project UK-FDRS grant NE/T003553/1 (S.H.D.); European Space Agency (ESA) Climate Change Initiative (CCI) FireCCI project contract no. 4000126706/19/I-NB (MLP); Royal Society grant RP\R1\I91063 (C.L.Q.); National Science Foundation grant OAI-2019762 (JTA). **Author contributions:** Conceptualization: M.W.J. Methodology: M.W.J., S.V., J.T.A. Resources/Software: N.A., M.L.P., T.R., D.v.W., G.R.v.d.W. Investigation/Formal analysis: M.J.W. Visualization: M.W.J., J.T.A. Writing—original draft: M.W.J. Writing—review and editing: All co-authors. **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests. **Data and materials availability:** Pyromes are provided in three geospatial formats at Zenodo ([131](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131)); shapefiles; 0.25° grids; and 0.05° grids. Gridded correlations for all variables are also available at Zenodo ([131](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131)). The R code used for clustering forest ecoregions into pyromes is also archived at Zenodo ([131](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131)). The raw data representing burned area, carbon emissions, and all predictor variables in our analysis are publicly available ([49](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [58](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [59](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [61](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [62](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [67–70](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131), [132](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131)), except for the lightning flash data from the WWLLN ([63](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.131)), which are subject to a commercial agreement but can be provided in a gridded and coarsened form upon request. **License information:** Copyright © 2024 the authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original US government works. <https://www.science.org/content/page/science-licenses-journal-article-reuse>

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

[science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adf5889](https://science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adf5889)  
Materials and Methods  
Supplementary Texts 1 and 2  
Figs. S1 to S22  
Tables S1 to S2  
References ([134–180](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adf5889))

Submitted 26 October 2023; accepted 21 August 2024  
[10.1126/science.adf5889](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adf5889)