Author's response to the Reviewers' comments

Please refer to the detailed itemized responses below. Our responses are indicated in blue text and the edits are highlighted in red text.

Reviewer #1

[Comment #1] The study uses a new version of the ORCHIDEE model to study elevated CO2 impact on forest growth and mortality in the Amazon in the past decades. The model was previously calibrated at several Amazon sites and was applied at regional scale with and without historical CO2 increase. The simulations with elevated CO2 can better reproduce the temporal trend of C gain and C loss estimated from long-term field plots. Comparison between the simulations with and without CO2 effects show that elevated CO2 increased both growth and mortality while the latter is caused by increased competition and elevated CO2 reduced drought-induced mortality. Further spatial analysis reveals that the CO2 effect is stronger in drier regions.

Overall, it is neat to use a model to separate the processes (CIM and DIM) over the Amazon. The manuscript is clear and well written. I feel the mortality response makes sense but I am not sure how much we should trust simulated growth responses to eCO2 as outlined below.

Response #1:

We thank the Reviewer for the time and effort to thoroughly evaluate our study and appreciate the Reviewer's constructive comments. We have added comparisons to existing studies on eCO_2 and expanded the discussion on the uncertainties associated with eCO_2. We believe we have effectively addressed the concerns raised by the Reviewer.

[Comment #2] I am concerned that models overestimated average carbon gain and carbon loss by ~30% or more (3.0-3.5 Mg/ha/yr vs observed 2-2.5 Mg/ha/yr, Fig.3) in simulation A2 but not in A1. To me, this means simulations with elevated CO2 greatly overestimated baseline growth (and thus mortality), suggesting the CO2 fertilization effect might be overestimated. It would be important to explain this difference in baseline values.

Response #2:

The overestimated baseline growth (and mortality) likely results from nutrient limitations that are not modeled or other model structural errors. In particular, uncertainties in carbon allocation may contribute to differences in baseline values compared to inventory. In the ORCHIDEE model, carbon allocation among biomass components follows the 'pipe model' theory, which determines the relationship between leaf area, sapwood area and fine root area (Sitch et al., 2003). However, the carbon allocation process is relatively unconstrained and requires further observation for benchmarking. Given that nutrient availability influences productivity and carbon allocation adjustments, a nutrient-enabled version of the model would help better elucidate ecosystem responses to eCO_2.

The explanation on the possible overestimation of baseline growth rates can be found as follows.

> In addition to the absence of downregulation due to nutrient availability, uncertainties in carbon allocation could also contribute to differences in baseline values compared to inventory data. In the ORCHIDEE model, carbon allocation among biomass components adheres to the 'pipe model' theory, which dictates the relationship between leaf area, sapwood area and fine root area (Sitch et al., 2003). However, the carbon allocation process remains relatively unconstrained and requires further observation data for benchmarking

purposes. Given that nutrient availability influences productivity and adjustments in carbon allocation, a nutrient-enabled version of the model would help elucidate ecosystem responses to eCO_2. Therefore, estimating the strength and persistence of the CO_2 fertilization effect under future climate scenarios remains challenging (Nolte et al., 2023). Additional observations are imperative, and the AmazonFACE project will be a robust observational constraint on our knowledge of the rainforest's response to eCO_2 (Lapola and Norby, 2014).

[Comment #3] In addition, the positive trend of carbon gains in observation is mainly due to increase from 1980s to early 1990s. I believe the trend is much weaker after 1990s and in the same Hubau et al. study, there was not growth trend in Africa, suggesting CO2 fertilization effect on growth is quite uncertain. For instance, van der Sleen et al. 2014 reported no growth simulation by CO2 from tropical tree rings. More recently, Jiang et al. 2020 reported eCO2 increased GPP but not woody NPP in an Eucalyptus woodland. Such allocation changes are briefly mentioned in Discussion (line 415 - 425) while I think it should be highlighted as one of the major limitation/uncertainty of the study. For example, how would your conclusion change if the CO2 effect on growth is overestimated by 50% - 100%?

Response #3:

In Hubau et al (2020), the observed positive trend of carbon gains is indeed higher in the earlier period of inventory (before 1993: 0.029 MgC ha^{-1} yr^{-1}) compared to the later stage (after 1993: 0.009 MgC ha^{-1} yr^{-1}), although the relatively smaller number of monitored plots in the earlier period may also contribute to this difference. We acknowledge that the eCO_2 fertilization effect remains subject to large uncertainties. Particularly, the impact of eCO_2 on woody NPP is influenced by both nutrient limitation and carbon allocation strategies.

For growth response to eCO_2, we summarized existing studies on the eCO_2 effects below (Table R1), including process-based model approaches, analytical solutions and ecological optimality theory. In our simulations, the effect of eCO_2 on carbon gains (AGB gains before mortality) is estimated to be approximately 5% per decade. The increasing trend in carbon gains derived from inventory data is calculated to be 0.014 MgC ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, which equates to an increase of almost 6.2% per decade. This trend reflects contributions from various factors, including the effects of eCO_2, climate change, nutrient limitation and other factors. Disturbance recovery is probably not important for the plot data as they are undisturbed forests. Therefore, if negative climate effects are assumed, the 'intrinsic' eCO_2 effect should be slightly higher than the 6.2% value derived from inventory data. Hence, our model estimate of 5% per decade, falling within the upper range of the existing trend distribution, is not unreasonable.

We made revisions in the Results to describe the comparison with other existing eCO_2 studies. Please see the text as follows.

> Our model simulation thus implies that the CO_2 fertilization effect plays a dominant role in augmenting forest aboveground productivity (carbon gains) and to a lesser extent biomass loss rates from mortality. Our estimate falls within the upper range of trend distribution, which is consistent with existing studies on the effects of eCO_2, including those employing process-based models, analytical solutions and ecological optimality theory (Table S1).

We made revisions in the Discussion to highlight that the eCO_2 effects embedding in our model could subject to overestimation given the non-explicit consideration of nutrient limitations and uncertainties associated with biomass carbon allocation.

> The lack of downregulation on fertilization in the model could lead to an overestimation of eCO_2 effects. In addition to the absence of downregulation due to nutrient availability, uncertainties in carbon allocation could also contribute to differences in baseline values compared to inventory data. In the ORCHIDEE model, carbon allocation among biomass components adheres to the 'pipe model' theory, which dictates the relationship between leaf area, sapwood area and fine root area (Sitch et al., 2003). However, the carbon allocation process remains relatively unconstrained and requires further observation data for benchmarking purposes. Given that nutrient availability influences productivity and adjustments in carbon allocation, a nutrient-enabled version of the model would help elucidate ecosystem responses to eCO_2. Therefore, estimating the strength and persistence of the CO_2 fertilization effect under future climate scenarios remains challenging (Nolte et al., 2023). Additional observations are imperative, and the AmazonFACE project will be a robust observational constraint on our knowledge of the rainforest's response to eCO_2 (Lapola and Norby, 2014).

Table R1 Summary of eCO_2 fertilization effects.

Time period	Term	Magnitude	Method	Reference
1980-2019	AGB gain (DBH>10cm)	Amazon rainforest: 5% per decade	ORCHIDEE model with climate impacts on growth and mortality, CO_2, stand level demography	This study
2001-2016	GPP	Global 4.1% per decade EBF: 4.8% per decade	Analytical approach	Chen et al (2022)
2001-2016	GPP	EBF: 1.61-5.78% per decade	TRENDY models (S1)	Chen et al (2022)
1981-2020	GPP	Global: 3.4% per decade	Remote sensing + ecological optimality theory	Keenan et al (2023)
1982-2011	NPP	Tropical: 2.7% per decade	CMIP5	Smith et al (2016)
1980-2016	GPP	Tropical: 3.7% per decade	CABLE model	Haverd et al (2020)

[Comment #4] Finally, since AmazonFACE is mentioned, it would be interesting to provide results from some short-term (e.g. 5-10 years, single site) simulation results using similar magnitude of CO2 increase. This can serve as a priori estimate of AmazonFACE results (not necessarily correct).

Response #4

Thanks for your suggestions. We agree with the importance of having a prior estimate for such a FACE experiment. The AmazonFACE experiment is situated in the Amazon rainforest near Manaus, Brazil. We conducted a short-term simulation focusing on the Manaus site, where CO_2 will be artificially elevated by 200 ppm above ambient levels. The simulations were conducted for the period from 2010 to 2020, considering two scenarios: one forced by ambient CO_2 concentration and the other forced by elevated CO_2 concentration (ambient + 200 ppm).

The discussion section has been revised as follows.

> Additional observations are imperative, and the AmazonFACE project will be a robust observational constraint on our knowledge of the rainforest's response to eCO_2 (Lapola and Norby, 2014). We have also provided estimates of carbon gain and carbon loss in response to the planned CO_2 increase (i.e. 200 ppm above ambient levels) at this forest for the period from 2010 to 2020. Our simulations indicate an enhancement of ~34% in GPP and ~55% in woody NPP (DBH>10cm) throughout the simulation period. These values are higher compared to simulations conducted with nutrient cycle-enabled models as reported by Fleischer et al (2019). Obtaining more experimental data to illustrate the interactions between water and nutrient availability and their impacts on the CO_2 fertilization effect would aid in constraining model responses, thus enabling more accurate predictions of the Amazon rainforest's response to future climate change.

References

Chen, C., Riley, W. J., Prentice, I. C., & Keenan, T. F. (2022). CO2 fertilization of terrestrial photosynthesis inferred from site to global scales. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(10), e2115627119.

Fleischer, K., Rammig, A., De Kauwe, M. G., Walker, A. P., Domingues, T. F., Fuchslueger, L., ... & Lapola, D. M. (2019). Amazon forest response to CO2 fertilization dependent on plant phosphorus acquisition. *Nature Geoscience*, *12*(9), 736-741.

Haverd, V., Smith, B., Canadell, J. G., Cuntz, M., Mikaloff-Fletcher, S., Farquhar, G., ... & Trudinger, C. M. (2020). Higher than expected CO2 fertilization inferred from leaf to global observations. *Global Change Biology*, *26*(4), 2390-2402.

Keenan, T. F., Luo, X., Stocker, B. D., De Kauwe, M. G., Medlyn, B. E., Prentice, I. C., ... & Zhou, S. (2023). A constraint on historic growth in global photosynthesis due to rising CO2. *Nature Climate Change*, *13*(12), 1376-1381.

Kolby Smith, W., Reed, S. C., Cleveland, C. C., Ballantyne, A. P., Anderegg, W. R., Wieder, W. R., ... & Running, S. W. (2016). Large divergence of satellite and Earth system model estimates of global terrestrial CO2 fertilization. *Nature Climate Change*, *6*(3), 306-310.

Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., ... & Venevsky, S. (2003). Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model. *Global Change Biology*, *9*(2), 161-185.