Mycorrhizal association as a primary control of the CO2 fertilization effect
— Source link ⧉

César Terrer, Sara Vicca, Bruce A. Hungate, Richard P. Phillips ...+2 more authors

Institutions: Imperial College London, University of Antwerp, Northern Arizona University, Indiana University ...+1 more institutions

Related papers:

- The mycorrhizal-associated nutrient economy: a new framework for predicting carbon-nutrient couplings in temperate forests.

- Mycorrhiza-mediated competition between plants and decomposers drives soil carbon storage

- Mycorrhizas and nutrient cycling in ecosystems – a journey towards relevance?

- What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO2 enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and plant production to rising CO2.

- Ecosystem responses to elevated CO2 governed by plant–soil interactions and the cost of nitrogen acquisition

Share this paper: 𝐟 🐦 in ✉

View more about this paper here: https://typeset.io/papers/mycorrhizal-association-as-a-primary-control-of-the-co2-a7bfw58zh0

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Mycorrhizal association as a primary control of the CO_2 fertilization effect

Title: Mycorrhizal Association as a Primary Control of the CO_2 Fertilization Effect.

Authors: César Terrer[1*], Sara Vicca[2], Bruce A. Hungate[3,4], Richard P. Phillips[5], I. Colin Prentice[1,6]

Affiliations:

[1]AXA Chair Programme in Biosphere and Climate Impacts, Department of Life Sciences, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot, Imperial College London, UK

[2]Centre of Excellence PLECO (Plant and Vegetation Ecology), Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium.

[3]Center for Ecosystem Science and Society, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA.

[4]Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA.

[5]Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington IN 47405, USA.

[6]Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, North Ryde, New South Wales 2109, Australia.

*Correspondence to: c.terrer@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract: Plants buffer increasing atmospheric CO_2 concentrations through enhanced growth, but the question whether nitrogen availability constrains the magnitude of this ecosystem service remains unresolved. Synthesizing experiments from around the world, we show that CO_2 fertilization is best explained by a simple interaction between nitrogen availability and mycorrhizal association. Plant species that associate with ectomycorrhizal fungi show a strong biomass increase ($30 \pm 3\%$, $P<0.001$) in response to elevated CO_2 regardless of nitrogen availability, whereas low nitrogen availability limits CO_2 fertilization ($0 \pm 5\%$, $P=0.946$) in plants that associate with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. The incorporation of mycorrhizae in global carbon cycle models is feasible, and crucial if we are to accurately project ecosystem responses and feedbacks to climate change.

One Sentence Summary: Only plants that associate with ectomycorrhizal fungi can overcome nitrogen limitation, and thus take full advantage of the CO_2 fertilization effect.

Main Text: Terrestrial ecosystems sequester annually about a quarter of anthropogenic CO_2 emissions (*1*), slowing climate change. Will this effect persist? Two contradictory hypotheses have been offered: the first is that CO_2 will continue to enhance plant growth, partially mitigating anthropogenic CO_2 emissions (*1*, *2*), while the second is that nitrogen (N) availability will limit the CO_2 fertilization effect (*3*, *4*), reducing future CO_2 uptake by the terrestrial biosphere (*5-7*). Plants experimentally exposed to elevated levels of CO_2 (eCO_2) show a range of responses in biomass, from large and persistent (*8*, *9*) to transient (*6*), to non-existent (*10*), leaving the question of CO_2 fertilization open. Differences might be driven by different levels of plant N availability across experiments (*11*), but N availability alone cannot explain contrasting results based on available evidence (*7*, *12*). For instance, among two of the most studied free-air CO_2

enrichment (FACE) experiments with trees, eCO_2 enhanced biomass production only during the first few years at ORNL-FACE (*6*), whereas trees in the Duke FACE experiment showed a sustained enhancement during the course of the experiment (*8*), despite N limitation. In addition to N limitation, other factors have been suggested as potential drivers of the response of plant biomass to eCO_2: age of the vegetation (*13*), water limitation (*14*), temperature (*15*), type of vegetation (*12*), or even the eCO_2 fumigation technology used (*11*). Although these factors may explain some observations, none has been found to be general, explaining the range of observations globally.

About 94% of plant species form associations with mycorrhizal fungi, an ancient mutualism thought to have facilitated the colonization of land by early plants (*16*). In this mutualism, the fungus transfers nutrients and water to the plant in exchange for carbohydrates, necessary for fungal growth. Mycorrhizal fungi are critical for terrestrial C cycling (*17*), are known to influence plant growth (*18*), nutrient cycling (*19*, *20*), and soil carbon storage (*21*), and respond strongly to elevated CO_2 (*22*, *23*). Yet, their impact on the N-dependence of the CO_2 fertilization effect has not been tested, despite the increasing evidence that N limitation constrains the CO_2 fertilization effect (*5*). Arbuscular mycorrhizae (AM) and ectomycorrhizae (ECM) are, by far, the most widespread types of mycorrhizae (*24*): AM-plants predominate in deserts, grasslands, shrublands and tropical forest ecosystems, whereas ECM-fungi predominate in boreal and many temperate forests (e.g., those dominated by *Pinus*). ECM can transfer N to the host plant under eCO_2 to sustain CO_2 fertilization (*25*), whereas the symbiotic effects of AM fungi in N-limited systems can range from beneficial to parasitic (*19*). Hence, the association of *Liquidambar styraciflua* with AM-fungi at ORNL, and *Pinus taeda* with ECM-fungi at Duke, might explain why only trees in the latter could increase N-uptake and take advantage of eCO_2 to grow faster for a sustained period (*20*, *25*). Here, we tested the hypothesis that the differences in the nutrient economies of ECM and AM fungi influence global patterns of the magnitude of plant biomass responses to elevated CO_2.

We synthesized data (overview in Table S1) on total plant biomass (g m^{-2}) from 83 eCO_2 experiments (Fig. S1), separating responses into aboveground biomass (n=83, Fig. S2) and belowground biomass (n=82, Fig. S3) in a mixed effects meta-analysis. As potential drivers of the plant biomass response, we considered the increase in atmospheric CO_2 concentration (ΔCO_2), mean annual precipitation (MAP), mean annual temperature (MAT), age of the vegetation at the start of the experiment, vegetation type (e.g. grassland, forest), CO_2 fumigation technology (e.g. FACE, growth chamber), length of the study (years), dominant mycorrhizal type (AM or ECM), and N-status (high or low N availability, considering soil characteristics and occasional fertilizer treatments, following the approach by Vicca *et al.* (*17*) and assigning all experiments with indications for some degree of N limitation to the "low N" class and experiments that were unlikely N limited to the "high N" class; Materials and Methods, Table S2).

Model selection analysis, based on corrected Akaike Information Criterion (AICc), showed that the most parsimonious model within 2 AICc units included N-status, mycorrhizal type and ΔCO_2 (*P*<0.001). The relative importance of the predictors (Fig. 1) supported the removal of climate variables, length of the experiment, age of the vegetation, fumigation technology and system type. Some predictors reduced the CO_2 effect on biomass (e.g. age of the vegetation), whereas others were associated with an increased CO_2 effect (e.g. ECM, ΔCO_2, high N availability) (Fig. S4).

The response of total biomass to an increase of CO_2 from 400 to 650 μmol mol^{-1} was larger ($P<0.001$) in ECM (30 $\pm$ 3%, $P<0.001$) than in AM-dominated (7 $\pm$ 4%, $P=0.089$) ecosystems (mean $\pm$ SE, mixed effects meta-regression). The overall response of total biomass was 20 $\pm$ 3% ($P<0.001$), similar to previous meta-analyses (e.g., *15*), with a larger effect under high (27 $\pm$ 4%, $P<0.001$) than low N availability (15 $\pm$ 4%, $P<0.001$), as expected (*5, 7, 11*). Furthermore, we found a strong interaction between mycorrhizal type and N-status ($P<0.001$): under low N availability, eCO$_2$ had no effect on total biomass of AM-dominated species (0 $\pm$ 5%, $P=0.946$) but increased biomass by 28 $\pm$ 5% in ECM-dominated species ($P<0.001$) (Fig. 2A). Under high N availability, the CO_2 effect on total biomass in both AM- and ECM-dominated species was significant: 20 $\pm$ 6% ($P=0.002$) for AM and 33 $\pm$ 4% ($P<0.001$) for ECM (Fig. 2A), with no significant differences between the two groups ($P=0.139$). Hence, high N availability significantly increased the CO_2 effect in AM (Post-hoc, Tukey's HSD: adj-$P=0.038$) but not in ECM-associated species (adj-$P=0.999$).

The patterns observed for total biomass were reflected in both aboveground and belowground biomass. Under low N availability, eCO$_2$ stimulated aboveground biomass significantly in ECM plants ($P<0.001$), with no effect in AM plants ($P=0.584$) (Fig. 2B). Similarly, eCO$_2$ enhanced belowground biomass in ECM plants at low N ($P=0.003$), but not in AM plants ($P=0.907$) (Fig. 2C).

We conducted a sensitivity analysis to ensure the findings were robust. First, we added an intermediate level of N availability (Table S2) by assigning some ecosystems that were initially classified as "low" to a "medium" class (e.g. Duke, Aspen, ORNL) (Figure S5). This enabled testing whether the large CO_2 stimulation in ECM plants was driven by experiments with intermediate N availability. Second, we weighted individual experiments by the inverse of the mixed-model variance (Figure S6), to ensure that the weights of the meta-analysis did not affect the outcome. Third, we ran a separate meta-analysis with the subset of experiments with trees only (Figure S7). Previous meta-analysis have reported that trees are more responsive to eCO$_2$ than grasslands (*12*); as such, our findings could reflect differences of plant growth form rather than mycorrhizal association *per se*. Since trees are the only type of vegetation that can associate with ECM and AM (or both), an analysis of tree responses to eCO$_2$ can thus be used to isolate the influence of mycorrhizal type from that of vegetation growth form. These three sensitivity analyses confirmed that the CO_2 stimulation of total and aboveground plant biomass was significant and large in ECM plants regardless of N availability, whereas the effect was not significant in AM plants under low N availability. The trend was consistent for belowground biomass in ECM plants, although with high variance and low sample size, the effect was not significant ($P=0.244$) under low N when the "medium" class was included.

Plant N uptake can be enhanced through mycorrhizal associations, or through associations with N fixing microbes. Some of the CO_2 experiments in our study contained N-fixing species, which might have increased N availability (Table S3). eCO$_2$ stimulated aboveground biomass in AM species under low N by 8 $\pm$ 3% ($P=0.019$) in this subgroup of experiments that included N-fixing species, whereas the remaining AM experiments under low N availability showed no biomass response to eCO$_2$ (1 $\pm$ 10%, $P=0.893$). But even with the additional N input from N$_2$ fixation, the 8% biomass increase in AM plants under low N was considerably smaller than the 28 $\pm$ 5% increase found for ECM plants.

Most CO_2 experiments have been carried out in the Northern Hemisphere (Fig. S8, where N, rather than phosphorus (P), is limiting. AM fungi transfer large quantities of P to the plant, and

hence are more likely mutualistic in P-limited ecosystems (*19*). Tropical forests are typically associated with P limitations and dominated by AM-fungi, and could potentially show enhanced biomass under eCO_2. The role of nutrients on the CO_2 fertilization effect in these P-limited forests has yet to be explored (*26*).

Responses of plants to rising CO_2 are thus well explained by a simple interaction between nitrogen (N) and microbial mutualists: when N availability is limited, only plant species that associate with ECM-fungi show an overall biomass increase due to eCO_2. Several mechanisms could explain these responses. First, ECM-associated plants typically allocate more C to support mycorrhizae than AM plants, particularly under eCO_2 (*23*). Moreover, because ECM fungi, unlike AM fungi, produce extracellular enzymes that degrade organic N compounds (*27*), increased allocation to ECM fungi under eCO_2 may supply host plants with the N needed to sustain their growth response to eCO_2. This may explain why eCO_2 often stimulates priming effects in ECM-dominated ecosystems (*28*, *29*). Second, differences in litter quality between ECM and AM plants may influence how much N is available to be primed or decomposed. Several studies have reported that AM plants produce litters that decompose faster than ECM plants (*20*, *30*). Given emerging evidence that fast decomposing litters promote the formation of stable mineral-associated organic matter (*31*, *32*), much of the organic N in AM-dominated ecosystems may be inaccessible to AM plants or their associated mycorrhizae (*20*). And while slow-degrading ECM litters may reduce N availability in the short-term, most of the N exists in particulate forms, which should be accessible to most microbes (including ECM fungi). Therefore, AM fungi are equipped with less specialized enzymes for N acquisition than ECM and occur in soils were N is more tightly protected. Both factors would presumably limit the enhancement of AM plant growth in response to eCO_2.

Mycorrhizal symbioses are not accounted for in most global vegetation models (but see ref. *24*). Thus, the projected CO_2 fertilization effect by "carbon-only models" (*1*) is likely overestimated for AM-dominated ecosystems, which cover ~65% of the global vegetated area (*24*), albeit only when N limited. On the other hand, global models that consider N limitation to constrain the CO_2 fertilization effect (*4*) likely underestimate responses of ECM plants to eCO_2, an area that encompasses ~35% of the vegetated area of the earth (*24*), most of which is considered N limited by these models. Our framework reconciles the apparent discrepancy between widespread N limitation (*3*) assumed to limit C sequestration on land (*4*), and the observed increase over time of the terrestrial C sink (*1*, *2*), thought to be driven primarily by CO_2 fertilization (*33*). These results may also partly explain past findings that forests (commonly ECM) show stronger responses to eCO_2 compared to grasslands (AM) (*12*). We propose that the CO_2 fertilization effect be quantified based on mycorrhizal type and soil nitrogen status, and that large-scale ecosystem models incorporate mycorrhizal types to account for the differences in biomass enhancement by eCO_2. Mycorrhizae are ubiquitous, and sort predictably with plant functional type (*24*, *34*), making feasible their inclusion in models to capture this microbial influence on global biogeochemistry. Accounting for the influence of mycorrhizae will improve representation of the CO_2 fertilization effect in vegetation models, critical for projecting ecosystem responses and feedbacks to climate change.

References and Notes:

1. P. Ciais *et al.*, in *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, T. F. Stocker et al., Eds. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013), pp. 465–570.

2. C. L. Quéré *et al.*, Global Carbon Budget 2015. *Earth System Science Data*. **7**, 349–396 (2015).

3. B. A. Hungate, J. S. Dukes, M. R. Shaw, Y. Luo, C. B. Field, Nitrogen and climate change. *Science*. **302**, 1512–1513 (2003).

4. W. R. Wieder, C. C. Cleveland, W. K. Smith, K. Todd-Brown, Future productivity and carbon storage limited by terrestrial nutrient availability. *Nature Geosci*. **8**, 441–444 (2015).

5. P. B. Reich, P. B. Reich, S. E. Hobbie, S. E. Hobbie, Decade-long soil nitrogen constraint on the CO_2 fertilization of plant biomass. *Nature Climate change*. **3**, 278–282 (2013).

6. R. J. Norby, J. M. Warren, C. M. Iversen, B. E. Medlyn, R. E. McMurtrie, CO_2 enhancement of forest productivity constrained by limited nitrogen availability. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. **107**, 19368–19373 (2010).

7. P. B. Reich, B. A. Hungate, Y. Luo, Carbon-Nitrogen Interactions in Terrestrial Ecosystems in Response to Rising Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **37**, 611–636 (2006).

8. H. R. McCarthy *et al.*, Re-assessment of plant carbon dynamics at the Duke free-air CO_2 enrichment site: interactions of atmospheric [CO_2] with nitrogen and water availability over stand development. *New Phytol*. **185**, 514–528 (2010).

9. A. F. Talhelm *et al.*, Elevated carbon dioxide and ozone alter productivity and ecosystem carbon content in northern temperate forests. *Global Change Biology*. **20**, 2492–2504 (2014).

10. B. A. Newingham *et al.*, No cumulative effect of 10 years of elevated [CO_2] on perennial plant biomass components in the Mojave Desert. *Global Change Biology*. **19**, 2168–2181 (2013).

11. M.-A. de Graaff, K. J. van Groenigen, J. Six, B. Hungate, C. van Kessel, Interactions between plant growth and soil nutrient cycling under elevated CO_2: a meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*. **12**, 2077–2091 (2006).

12. E. A. Ainsworth, S. P. Long, What have we learned from 15 years of free-air CO_2 enrichment (FACE)? A meta-analytic review of the responses of photosynthesis, canopy properties and plant production to rising CO_2. *New Phytol*. **165**, 351–372 (2005).

13. C. Körner *et al.*, Carbon flux and growth in mature deciduous forest trees exposed to elevated CO_2. *Science*. **309**, 1360–1362 (2005).

14. M. J. Hovenden, P. C. D. Newton, K. E. Wills, Seasonal not annual rainfall determines grassland biomass response to carbon dioxide. *Nature*. **511**, 583–586 (2014).

15. S. Baig, B. E. Medlyn, L. M. Mercado, S. Zaehle, Does the growth response of woody plants to elevated CO_2 increase with temperature? A model-oriented meta-analysis. *Global Change Biology*. **21**, 4303–4319 (2015).

16. M. C. Brundrett, Coevolution of roots and mycorrhizas of land plants. *New Phytol*. **154**, 275–304 (2002).

17. S. Vicca *et al.*, Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently. *Ecol Lett*. **15**, 520–526 (2012).

18. M. G. A. van der Heijden *et al.*, Mycorrhizal fungal diversity determines plant biodiversity, ecosystem variability and productivity. *Nature*. **396**, 69–72 (1998).

19. N. C. Johnson, G. W. T. Wilson, J. A. Wilson, R. M. Miller, M. A. Bowker, Mycorrhizal phenotypes and the Law of the Minimum. *New Phytol*. **205**, 1473–1484 (2015).

20. R. P. Phillips, E. Brzostek, M. G. Midgley, The mycorrhizal-associated nutrient economy: a new framework for predicting carbon–nutrient couplings in temperate forests. *New Phytol*. **199**, 41–51 (2013).

21. C. Averill, B. L. Turner, A. C. Finzi, Mycorrhiza-mediated competition between plants and decomposers drives soil carbon storage. *Nature*. **505**, 543–545 (2015).

22. K. K. Treseder, A meta-analysis of mycorrhizal responses to nitrogen, phosphorus, and atmospheric CO_2 in field studies. *New Phytol*. **164**, 347–355 (2004).

23. O. Alberton, T. W. Kuyper, A. Gorissen, Taking mycocentrism seriously: mycorrhizal fungal and plant responses to elevated CO_2. *New Phytol*. **167**, 859–868 (2005).

24. M. Shi, J. B. Fisher, E. R. Brzostek, R. P. Phillips, Carbon cost of plant nitrogen acquisition: global carbon cycle impact from an improved plant nitrogen cycle in the Community Land Model. *Global Change Biology*. **22**, 1299–1314 (2016).

25. J. E. Drake *et al.*, Increases in the flux of carbon belowground stimulate nitrogen uptake and sustain the long-term enhancement of forest productivity under elevated CO_2. *Ecol Lett*. **14**, 349–357 (2011).

26. R. J. Norby *et al.*, Model-data synthesis for the next generation of forest free-air CO_2 enrichment (FACE) experiments. *New Phytol*. **209**, 17–28 (2015).

27. J. Perez-Moreno, D. J. Read, Mobilization and transfer of nutrients from litter to tree seedlings via the vegetative mycelium of ectomycorrhizal plants. *New Phytol*. **145**, 301–

309 (2000).

28. R. P. Phillips, A. C. Finzi, E. S. Bernhardt, Enhanced root exudation induces microbial feedbacks to N cycling in a pine forest under long-term CO_2 fumigation. *Ecol Lett*. **14**, 187–194 (2011).

29. B. A. Hungate *et al.*, Fire, hurricane and carbon dioxide: effects on net primary production of a subtropical woodland. *New Phytol*. **200**, 767–777 (2013).

30. J. Cornelissen, R. Aerts, B. Cerabolini, M. Werger, M. van der Heijden, Carbon cycling traits of plant species are linked with mycorrhizal strategy. *Oecologia*. **129**, 611–619 (2001).

31. M. F. Cotrufo *et al.*, Formation of soil organic matter via biochemical and physical pathways of litter mass loss. *Nature Geosci*. **8**, 776–779 (2015).

32. B. N. Sulman, R. P. Phillips, A. C. Oishi, E. Shevliakova, S. W. Pacala, Microbe-driven turnover offsets mineral-mediated storage of soil carbon under elevated CO_2. *Nature Climate change*. **4**, 1099–1102 (2014).

33. Z. Zhu *et al.*, Greening of the Earth and its drivers. *Nature Climate change*, advance online publication (2016), doi:10.1038/nclimate3004.

34. V. B. Chaudhary *et al.*, MycoDB, a global database of plant response to mycorrhizal fungi. *Sci. Data*. **3**, 160028 (2016).

35. W. I. J. Dieleman *et al.*, Simple additive effects are rare: a quantitative review of plant biomass and soil process responses to combined manipulations of CO_2 and temperature. *Global Change Biology*. **18**, 2681–2693 (2012).

36. M. Fernández-Martínez *et al.*, Nutrient availability as the key regulator of global forest carbon balance. *Nature Climate change*. **4**, 471–476 (2014).

37. M. Campioli *et al.*, Biomass production efficiency controlled by management in temperate and boreal ecosystems. *Nature Geosci*. **8**, 843–846 (2015).

38. R. G. McLaren, K. C. Cameron, *Soil science: an introduction to the properties and management of New Zealand soils* (Oxford University Press, Auckland, N.Z., 1990).

39. B. Wang, Y. L. Qiu, Phylogenetic distribution and evolution of mycorrhizas in land plants. *Mycorrhiza*. **16**, 299–363 (2006).

40. K. E. Mueller, S. E. Hobbie, D. Tilman, P. B. Reich, Effects of plant diversity, N fertilization, and elevated carbon dioxide on grassland soil N cycling in a long-term experiment. *Global Change Biology*. **19**, 1249–1261 (2013).

41. R. J. Hijmans, S. E. Cameron, J. L. Parra, P. G. Jones, A. Jarvis, Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol*. **25**, 1965–1978 (2005).

42. L. V. Hedges, J. Gurevitch, P. S. Curtis, The meta-analysis of response ratios in experimental ecology. *Ecology*. **80**, 1150 (1999).

43. W. Viechtbauer, Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*. **36** (2010).

44. M. Borenstein, L. V. Hedges, J. P. T. Higgins, H. R. Rothstein, in *Introduction to Meta-Analysis* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK, 2009), pp. 225–238.

45. C. W. Osenberg, O. Sarnelle, S. D. Cooper, R. D. Holt, Resolving ecological questions through meta-analysis: goals, metrics, and models. *Ecology*. **80**, 1105–1117 (1999).

46. B. A. Hungate, R. B. Jackson, C. B. Field, F. S. Chapin III, Detecting changes in soil carbon in CO_2 enrichment experiments. *Plant Soil*. **187**, 135–145 (1996).

47. K. J. van Groenigen *et al.*, Element interactions limit soil carbon storage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. **103**, 6571–6574 (2006).

48. G. Knapp, J. Hartung, Improved tests for a random effects meta-regression with a single covariate. *Statistics in Medicine*. **22**, 2693–2710 (2003).

49. W. Viechtbauer, J. A. López-López, J. Sánchez-Meca, F. Marín-Martínez, A comparison of procedures to test for moderators in mixed-effects meta-regression models. *Psychological Methods*. **20**, 360–374 (2015).

50. V. Calcagno, C. de Mazancourt, glmulti: an R package for easy automated model selection with (generalized) linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software*. **34** (2010).

51. G. J. O'Leary *et al.*, Response of wheat growth, grain yield and water use to elevated CO_2 under a Free-Air CO_2 Enrichment (FACE) experiment and modelling in a semi-arid environment. *Global Change Biology*. **21**, 2670–2686 (2015).

52. B. Hoorens, R. Aerts, M. Stroetenga, Is there a trade-off between the plant's growth response to elevated CO_2 and subsequent litter decomposability? *Oikos*. **103**, 17–30 (2003).

53. I. A. Janssens *et al.*, Carbon budget of Pinus sylvestris saplings after four years of exposure to elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. *Tree Physiol*. **25**, 325–337 (2005).

54. A. R. Smith *et al.*, Elevated CO_2 enrichment induces a differential biomass response in a mixed species temperate forest plantation. *New Phytol*. **198**, 156–168 (2013).

55. S. Hättenschwiler, C. Körner, Biomass allocation and canopy development in spruce model ecosystems under elevated CO_2 and increased N deposition. *Oecologia*. **113**, 104–114 (1998).

56. C. Körner, J. A. Arnone III, Responses to Elevated Carbon Dioxide in Artificial Tropical

Ecosystems. *Science*. **257**, 1672–1675 (1992).

57. J. A. Arnone III, C. Körner, Soil and biomass carbon pools in model communities of tropical plants under elevated CO_2. *Oecologia*. **104**, 61–71 (1995).

58. D. Spinnler, P. Egli, C. Körner, Four-year growth dynamics of beech-spruce model ecosystems under CO_2 enrichment on two different forest soils. *Trees*. **16**, 423–436 (2002).

59. L. C. Andresen, A. Michelsen, S. Jonasson, C. Beier, P. Ambus, Glycine uptake in heath plants and soil microbes responds to elevated temperature, CO_2 and drought. *Acta Oecologica*. **35**, 786–796 (2009).

60. T. Kou, J. Zhu, Z. Xie, T. Hasegawa, K. Heiduk, Effect of elevated atmospheric CO_2 concentration on soil and root respiration in winter wheat by using a respiration partitioning chamber. *Plant Soil*. **299**, 237–249 (2007).

61. A. Larigauderie, J. F. Reynolds, B. R. Strain, Root response to CO_2 enrichment and nitrogen supply in loblolly pine. *Plant Soil*. **165**, 21–32 (1994).

62. J. S. King, R. B. Thomas, B. R. Strain, Growth and carbon accumulation in root systems of Pinus taeda and Pinus ponderosa seedlings as affected by varying CO_2, temperature and nitrogen. *Tree Physiol*. **16**, 635–642 (1996).

63. P. Ineson, M. F. Cotrufo, R. Bol, D. D. Harkness, H. Blum, Quantification of soil carbon inputs under elevated CO_2: C3 plants in a C4 soil. *Plant Soil*. **187**, 345–350 (1996).

64. M. Liberloo *et al.*, Woody biomass production during the second rotation of a bio-energy Populus plantation increases in a future high CO_2 world. *Global Change Biology*. **12**, 1094–1106 (2006).

65. K. Kostiainen *et al.*, Stem wood properties of mature Norway spruce after 3 years of continuous exposure to elevated [CO_2] and temperature. *Global Change Biology*. **15**, 368–379 (2009).

66. J. Kongstad *et al.*, High Resilience in Heathland Plants to Changes in Temperature, Drought, and CO_2 in Combination: Results from the CLIMAITE Experiment. *Ecosystems*. **15**, 269–283 (2011).

67. A. Volder, R. M. Gifford, J. R. Evans, Effects of elevated atmospheric CO_2, cutting frequency, and differential day/night atmospheric warming on root growth and turnover of Phalaris swards. *Global Change Biology*. **13**, 1040–1052 (2007).

68. P. G. Jarvis, A. M. Aitken, *European Forests and Global Change* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).

69. J. N. Klironomos, M. Ursic, M. Rillig, M. F. Allen, Interspecific differences in the response of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi to Artemisia tridentata grown under elevated

atmospheric CO_2. *New Phytol*. **138**, 599–605 (1998).

70. F. A. Bazzaz, S. L. Miao, Successional Status, Seed Size, and Responses of Tree Seedlings to CO_2, Light, and Nutrients. *Ecology*. **74**, 104 (1993).

71. G. M. Berntson, P. M. Wayne, F. A. Bazzaz, Below-ground architectural and mycorrhizal responses to elevated CO_2 in Betula alleghaniensis populations. *Functional Ecology*. **11**, 684–695 (1997).

72. M. S. J. Broadmeadow, S. B. Jackson, Growth responses of Quercus petraea, Fraxinus excelsior and Pinus sylvestris to elevated carbon dioxide, ozone and water supply. *New Phytol*. **146**, 437–451 (2000).

73. P. Högy, M. Keck, K. Niehaus, J. Franzaring, A. Fangmeier, Effects of atmospheric CO_2 enrichment on biomass, yield and low molecular weight metabolites in wheat grain. *Journal of Cereal Science*. **52**, 215–220 (2010).

74. J. Dukes *et al.*, Responses of Grassland Production to Single and Multiple Global Environmental Changes. *PLoS Biology*. **3**, e319 (2005).

75. B. A. Hungate *et al.*, The fate of carbon in grasslands under carbon dioxide enrichment. *Nature*. **388**, 576–579 (1997).

76. P. A. T. Higgins, R. B. Jackson, J. M. Des Rosiers, C. B. Field, Root production and demography in a california annual grassland under elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Global Change Biology*. **8**, 841–850 (2002).

77. C. B. Field, F. S. Chapin III, N. R. Chiariello, E. A. Holland, H. A. Mooney, in *Carbon Dioxide and Terrestrial Ecosystems* (Academic Press, San Diego CA, 1996), pp. 121–145.

78. N. R. Chiariello, C. B. Field, in *Carbon Dioxide, Populations, and Communities* (Elsevier, 1996), pp. 139–157.

79. J. Heath *et al.*, Rising atmospheric CO_2 reduces sequestration of root-derived soil carbon. *Science*. **309**, 1711–1713 (2005).

80. B. A. Hungate *et al.*, Cumulative response of ecosystem carbon and nitrogen stocks to chronic CO_2 exposure in a subtropical oak woodland. *New Phytol*. **200**, 753–766 (2013).

81. R. D. Evans *et al.*, Greater ecosystem carbon in the Mojave Desert after ten years exposure to elevated CO_2. *Nature Climate change*. **4**, 394–397 (2014).

82. P. Newton, M. Lieffering, W. Bowatte, S. C. Brock, The rate of progression and stability of progressive nitrogen limitation at elevated atmospheric CO_2 in a grazed grassland over 11 years of Free Air CO_2 enrichment. *Plant Soil*. **336**, 433–441 (2010).

83. V. Allard *et al.*, Increased Quantity and Quality of Coarse Soil Organic Matter Fraction at Elevated CO_2 in a Grazed Grassland are a Consequence of Enhanced Root Growth Rate

and Turnover. *Plant Soil*. **276**, 49–60 (2005).

84. R. J. Norby, C. A. Gunderson, S. D. Wullschleger, E. G. O'neill, Productivity and compensatory responses of yellow-poplar trees in elevated CO_2. *Nature*. **357**, 322–324 (1992).

85. S. Wan, R. J. Norby, K. S. Pregitzer, J. Ledford, E. G. O'Neill, CO_2 enrichment and warming of the atmosphere enhance both productivity and mortality of maple tree fine roots. *New Phytol*. **162**, 437–446 (2004).

86. R. J. Norby, S. D. Wullschleger, C. A. Gunderson, C. T. Nietch, Increased growth efficiency of Quercus alba trees in a CO_2-enriched atmosphere. *New Phytol*. **131**, 91–97 (1995).

87. P. Kardol *et al.*, Climate change effects on plant biomass alter dominance patterns and community evenness in an experimental old-field ecosystem. *Global Change Biology*. **16**, 2676–2687 (2010).

88. C. M. Iversen, J. K. Keller, C. T. Garten Jr, R. J. Norby, Soil carbon and nitrogen cycling and storage throughout the soil profile in a sweetgum plantation after 11 years of CO_2-enrichment. *Global Change Biology*. **18**, 1684–1697 (2012).

89. J. A. Morgan *et al.*, C4 grasses prosper as carbon dioxide eliminates desiccation in warmed semi-arid grassland. *Nature*. **476**, 202–205 (2011).

90. F. A. Dijkstra *et al.*, Contrasting effects of elevated CO_2 and warming on nitrogen cycling in a semiarid grassland. *New Phytol*. **187**, 426–437 (2010).

91. B. Gielen *et al.*, Net carbon storage in a poplar plantation (POPFACE) after three years of free-air CO_2 enrichment. *Tree Physiol*. **25**, 1399–1408 (2005).

92. O. Ghannoum *et al.*, Exposure to preindustrial, current and future atmospheric CO_2 and temperature differentially affects growth and photosynthesis in Eucalyptus. *Global Change Biology*. **16**, 303–319 (2010).

93. M. E. Gavito, P. Schweiger, I. Jakobsen, P uptake by arbuscular mycorrhizal hyphae: effect of soil temperature and atmospheric CO_2 enrichment. *Global Change Biology*. **9**, 106–116 (2003).

94. Q. Deng *et al.*, Responses of soil respiration to elevated carbon dioxide and nitrogen addition in young subtropical forest ecosystems in China. *Biogeosciences*. **7**, 315–328 (2010).

95. J. Riikonen *et al.*, Silver birch and climate change: variable growth and carbon allocation responses to elevated concentrations of carbon dioxide and ozone. *Tree Physiol*. **24**, 1227–1237 (2004).

96. A. Kasurinen *et al.*, Below-ground responses of silver birch trees exposed to elevated CO_2

and O_3 levels during three growing seasons. *Global Change Biology*. **11**, 1167–1179 (2005).

97. B. Schäppi, C. Körner, Growth responses of an alpine grassland to elevated CO_2. *Oecologia*. **105**, 43–52 (1996).

98. S. Bazot, L. Ulff, H. Blum, C. Nguyen, C. Robin, Effects of elevated CO_2 concentration on rhizodeposition from Lolium perenne grown on soil exposed to 9 years of CO_2 enrichment. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*. **38**, 729–736 (2006).

99. M. K. Schneider *et al.*, Ten years of free-air CO_2 enrichment altered the mobilization of N from soil in Lolium perenne L. swards. *Global Change Biology*. **10**, 1377–1388 (2004).

100. P. A. Niklaus, C. Körner, Synthesis of a six-year study of calcareous grassland responses to in situ CO_2 enrichment. *Ecological Monographs*. **74**, 491–511 (2004).

101. P. W. Leadley, P. A. Niklaus, R. Stocker, C. Körner, A field study of the effects of elevated CO_2 on plant biomass and community structure in a calcareous grassland. *Oecologia*. **118**, 39–49 (1999).

102. E. Pendall, Y. Osanai, A. L. Williams, M. J. Hovenden, Soil carbon storage under simulated climate change is mediated by plant functional type. *Global Change Biology*. **17**, 505–514 (2011).

103. K. S. Pregitzer *et al.*, Atmospheric CO_2, soil nitrogen and turnover of fine roots. *New Phytol*. **129**, 579–585 (1995).

104. D. R. Zak *et al.*, Elevated atmospheric CO_2 and feedback between carbon and nitrogen cycles. *Plant Soil*. **151**, 105–117 (1993).

105. C. J. Mikan, D. R. Zak, M. E. Kubiske, K. S. Pregitzer, Combined effects of atmospheric CO_2 and N availability on the belowground carbon and nitrogen dynamics of aspen mesocosms. *Oecologia*. **124**, 432–445 (2000).

106. C. S. Vogel, P. S. Curtis, R. B. Thomas, Growth and nitrogen accretion of dinitrogen-fixing Alnus glutinosa (L.) Gaertn. under elevated carbon dioxide. *Plant Ecology*. **130**, 63–70 (1997).

107. B. A. Kimball, S. B. Idso, S. Johnson, M. C. Rillig, Seventeen years of carbon dioxide enrichment of sour orange trees: final results. *Global Change Biology*. **13**, 2171–2183 (2007).

108. S. A. Prior, G. B. Runion, H. A. Torbert, S. B. Idso, B. A. Kimball, Sour orange fine root distribution after seventeen years of atmospheric CO_2 enrichment. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*. **162-163**, 85–90 (2012).

109. R. F. Walker, D. R. Geisinger, D. W. Johnson, J. T. Ball, Elevated atmospheric CO_2 and soil N fertility effects on growth, mycorrhizal colonization, and xylem water potential of

juvenile ponderosa pine in a field soil. *Plant Soil*. **195**, 25–36 (1997).

110. D. M. Olszyk *et al.*, Whole-seedling biomass allocation, leaf area, and tissue chemistry for Douglas-fir exposed to elevated CO_2 and temperature for 4 years. *Can. J. For. Res.* **33**, 269–278 (2003).

111. A. R. Smith, M. Lukac, M. Bambrick, F. Miglietta, D. L. Godbold, Tree species diversity interacts with elevated CO_2 to induce a greater root system response. *Global Change Biology*. **19**, 217–228 (2013).

112. A. Antoninka, P. B. Reich, N. C. Johnson, Seven years of carbon dioxide enrichment, nitrogen fertilization and plant diversity influence arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in a grassland ecosystem. *New Phytol*. **192**, 200–214 (2011).

113. F. Hagedorn, D. Spinnler, M. Bundt, P. Blaser, R. Siegwolf, The input and fate of new C in two forest soils under elevated CO_2. *Global Change Biology*. **9**, 862–872 (2003).

114. D. R. Zak, W. E. Holmes, A. C. Finzi, R. J. Norby, W. H. Schlesinger, Soil nitrogen cycling under elevated CO_2: a synthesis of forest face experiments. *Ecological Applications*. **13**, 1508–1514 (2003).

115. R. E. Dickson *et al.*, Forest atmosphere carbon transfer and storage (FACTS-II) the aspen Free-air CO_2 and O_3 Enrichment (FACE) project: an overview. General Technical Report NC-214. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station (2000).

116. H. J. Jäger *et al.*, The University of Giessen free-air carbon dioxide enrichment study: description of the experimental site and of a new enrichment system. *Journal of Applied Botany*. **77**, 117–127 (2003).

117. V. M. Temperton *et al.*, Effects of elevated carbon dioxide concentration on growth and nitrogen fixation in Alnus glutinosa in a long-term field experiment. *Tree Physiol*. **23**, 1051–1059 (2003).

118. L. F. Huenneke, S. P. Hamburg, R. Koide, H. A. Mooney, P. M. Vitousek, Effects of Soil Resources on Plant Invasion and Community Structure in Californian Serpentine Grassland. *Ecology*. **71**, 478–491 (1990).

119. P. Dijkstra *et al.*, Elevated atmospheric CO_2 stimulates aboveground biomass in a fire-regenerated scrub-oak ecosystem. *Global Change Biology*. **8**, 90–103 (2002).

120. D. N. Jordan *et al.*, Biotic, abiotic and performance aspects of the Nevada Desert Free-Air CO_2 Enrichment (FACE) Facility. *Global Change Biology*. **5**, 659–668 (1999).

121. T. Rütting, T. J. Clough, C. Müller, M. Lieffering, P. C. D. Newton, Ten years of elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide alters soil nitrogen transformations in a sheep-grazed pasture. *Global Change Biology*. **16**, 2530–2542 (2010).

122. M. E. Gavito, P. S. Curtis, T. N. Mikkelsen, I. Jakobsen, Atmospheric CO_2 and mycorrhiza effects on biomass allocation and nutrient uptake of nodulated pea (Pisum sativum L.) plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. **51**, 1931–1938 (2000).

123. A. Kasurinen, P. Kokko Gonzales, J. Riikonen, E. Vapaavuori, T. Holopainen, Soil CO_2 efflux of two silver birch clones exposed to elevated CO_2 and O_3 levels during three growing seasons. *Global Change Biology*. **10**, 1654–1665 (2004).

124. T. Hebeisen *et al.*, Growth response of Trifolium repens L. and Lolium perenne L. as monocultures and bi-species mixture to free air CO_2 enrichment and management. *Global Change Biology*. **3**, 149–160 (1997).

125. P. A. Niklaus, M. Wohlfender, R. Siegwolf, C. Körner, Effects of six years atmospheric CO_2 enrichment on plant, soil, and soil microbial C of a calcareous grassland. *Plant Soil*. **233**, 189–202 (2001).

126. M. J. Hovenden *et al.*, Warming prevents the elevated CO_2-induced reduction in available soil nitrogen in a temperate, perennial grassland. *Global Change Biology*. **14**, 1018–1024 (2008).

127. J. Lussenhop, A. Treonis, P. S. Curtis, J. A. Teeri, C. S. Vogel, Response of soil biota to elevated atmospheric CO_2 in poplar model systems. *Oecologia*. **113**, 247–251 (1998).

128. P. Reich *et al.*, Nitrogen limitation constrains sustainability of ecosystem response to CO_2. *Nature*. **440**, 922–925 (2006).

129. R. Oren *et al.*, Soil fertility limits carbon sequestration by forest ecosystems in a CO_2-enriched atmosphere. *Nature*. **411**, 469–472 (2001).

130. C. Körner, Plant CO_2 responses: an issue of definition, time and resource supply. *New Phytol*. **172**, 393–411 (2006).

131. P. Jarvis, S. Linder, Botany: Constraints to growth of boreal forests. *Nature*. **405**, 904–905 (2000).

132. P. S. Curtis *et al.*, Biometric and eddy-covariance based estimates of annual carbon storage in five eastern North American deciduous forests. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*. **113**, 3–19 (2002).

133. S. N. Turitzin, Nutrient Limitations to Plant Growth in a California Serpentine Grassland. *American Midland Naturalist*. **107**, 95 (1982).

134. T. Rütting, L. C. Andresen, Nitrogen cycle responses to elevated CO_2 depend on ecosystem nutrient status. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst*. **101**, 285–294 (2015).

135. R. J. Norby, D. R. Zak, Ecological lessons from free-air CO_2 enrichment (FACE) experiments. *Annual Review of Ecology*. **42**, 181–203 (2011).

136. A. P. Walker *et al.*, Predicting long-term carbon sequestration in response to CO_2 enrichment: How and why do current ecosystem models differ? *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*. **29**, 476–495 (2015).

137. D. Nyfeler *et al.*, Strong mixture effects among four species in fertilized agricultural grassland led to persistent and consistent transgressive overyielding. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. **46**, 683–691 (2009).

138. D. Nyfeler, O. Huguenin-Elie, M. Suter, E. Frossard, A. Lüscher, Grass-legume mixtures can yield more nitrogen than legume pure stands due to mutual stimulation of nitrogen uptake from symbiotic and non-symbiotic sources. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*. **140**, 155–163 (2011).

139. P. C. D. Newton *et al.*, Selective grazing modifies previously anticipated responses of plant community composition to elevated CO_2 in a temperate grassland. *Global Change Biology*. **20**, 158–169 (2014).

Fig. 1. Model-averaged importance of the predictors of the CO_2 fertilization effect on total biomass. The importance is based on the sum of Akaike weights derived from model selection using AICc (Akaike's Information Criteria corrected for small samples). Cutoff set at 0.8 (dashed line) to differentiate among the most important predictors.

Fig. 2. Overall effects of CO_2 on plant biomass. Effects on **(A)** total, **(B)** aboveground, and **(C)** belowground biomass for two types of mycorrhizal plants species (AM: arbuscular mycorrhizae and ECM: ectomycorrhizae) in N limited experiments (low N) or experiments that are unlikely N limited (high N). Overall means and 95% confidence intervals are given; we interpret CO_2 effects when the zero line is not crossed.

Supplementary Materials:

Materials and Methods

Figures S1-S8

Tables S1-S4

References (35-139)