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Abstract

Recent observed shifts in Arctic tundra shrub cover have uncertain impacts on 21st century net ecosystem carbon exchanges. Here we applied a well-tested ecosystem model, ecosy, to examine the effects of North America Arctic tundra plant dynamics on ecosystem carbon balances from 1980–2100 under the RCP8.5 scenario. Tundra productivity was modeled to increase from enhanced carbon fixation and N mineralization under recent and future climates. Between 1982 and 2100 and averaged across the region, predicted increases in relative dominance of woody versus non-woody plants increased ecosystem annual net primary productivity by 244 g C m⁻² that offset concurrent increases in annual heterotrophic respiration (139 g C m⁻²), resulting in an increasing net carbon sink over the 21st century. However, smaller increases in seasonal carbon uptake during winter (1 g C m⁻²) and autumn (22 g C m⁻²) and greater increases in ecosystem respiration (winter (23 g C m⁻²) and autumn (47 g C m⁻²)) by 2100 versus 1982 resulted in larger carbon losses during these seasons that completely offset the gains in spring (13 g C m⁻²) and 25% of the gains in summer (140 g C m⁻²). Modeled soil temperatures were predicted to increase more slowly than air temperatures (∼0.6 °C for every 1 °C increase in air temperature over the 21st century). This slower soil versus air warming, and thus greater increases in CO₂ fixation versus soil respiration rates, also contributed to the tundra remaining a carbon sink through 2100. However, these higher gains versus losses of carbon may be a transient response and not sustainable under further soil warming beyond 2100. Our modeling analysis allows us to extend beyond results from short-term warming experiments, which cannot characterize effects associated with decadal-scale changes in plant communities.

1. Introduction

Climate change in northern ecosystems will affect the rate and duration of carbon fixation and ecosystem respiration (Rₑ) (Albert et al. 2011, Klady et al. 2011). The extent to which future climate change affects the net carbon exchange of these ecosystems is uncertain (McGuire et al. 2009). Several warming experiments (Hill and Henry 2011, Hollister et al. 2005, Klady et al. 2011, Oberbauer et al. 2007, Sisla et al. 2013, Walker et al. 2006) reported increases in productivity from enhanced nitrogen (N) mineralization (DeMarco et al. 2014, Salmon et al. 2015). Increases in ecosystem productivity from extended growing season length in the northern ecosystems were also reported by several studies (McManus et al. 2012, Myneni et al. 1997, Olthof et al. 2008, Tucker et al. 2001, Verbyla 2008, Zhang et al. 2008).

Concurrently with overall increases in ecosystem productivity, warming in higher latitudes increased permafrost thaw (Jorgenson et al. 2001, Lantz and Kokej 2008, Lawrence et al. 2008, Nowinski et al. 2010, Schuur et al. 2008) that expose frozen organic carbon to microbial decomposition and enhanced carbon release (Davidson and Fanseens 2006, Dutta et al. 2006, Harden et al. 2008, Koven et al. 2015).
Oechel et al. 1993, Schuur et al. 2008). Land surface models have reported contrasting responses of northern ecosystems to warming (e.g. Zhuang et al. 2006) and Qian et al. 2010 predicted these ecosystems to be a net source and sink, respectively attributed to differences in the rates of carbon gains versus respiration losses.

In a meta-analysis of 61 tundra sites experimentally warmed for up to 20 years, Elmendorf et al. 2012 showed that the responses of tundra plants to warming varied with site conditions such as soil moisture and plant functional types (PFTs). In a nine year warming experiment in three high Arctic tundra ecosystems, Welker et al. 2004 observed contrasting responses of increasing carbon uptake versus ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) among sites with different soil moisture and soil organic matter stocks. In a meta-analysis of 22 northern ecosystem experiments with two–nine years of warming, Rustad et al. 2001 found contrasting responses of net ecosystem C exchanges that varied with site conditions. A meta-analysis of International Tundra Experiment (ITEX) warming experiments (Bouskill et al. 2014) indicated concurrent increases in carbon uptake and soil respiration with warming, and showed that two Earth System Model (ESM) land models were unable to accurately represent these responses.

Although these tundra warming experiments provide valuable warming scenarios, they were limited in numbers and time (Hollister et al. 2005, Rustad et al. 2001). The responses of these experiments were largely dependent on site conditions, thus the long-term responses across the broader spatial domain of Arctic tundra may not be captured (Arft et al. 1999, Hollister et al. 2005, Lamb et al. 2011). In particular, these experiments cannot fully represent the warming effects associated with relatively slower changes in species composition and abundance (Rustad et al. 2001, Shaver et al. 2000). Several studies have shown recent increases in shrub growth and abundance in the Arctic tundra from repeated photography (Tape et al. 2006, Tremblay et al. 2012) and long-term plot based warming experiments (Chapin et al. 1995, Cornelissen et al. 2001, Wahren et al. 2005, Walker et al. 2006). These increases in shrub growth may further enhance the ecosystem carbon sink due to increasing woody carbon stocks (Leffler et al. 2016, Sistla et al. 2013) with higher carbon to nitrogen (C:N) ratios and longer turnover times, which can result in greater carbon gains per N invested.

To characterize these complex interactions, which is difficult with experimental manipulations and observations alone, and predict future trajectories of North America Arctic tundra net ecosystem carbon exchange, we applied a well-tested ecosystem model, ecosys (Grant 2014, Grant et al. 2015), to examine the effects of North America Arctic tundra plant dynamics on ecosystem carbon balances from 1980–2100 under the RCP 8.5 scenario. The model mechanistically represents key biological, physical, and chemical processes that control long-term carbon cycle dynamics such as internal resource allocation and remobilization; soil thermal and hydrological dynamics; and microbial soil carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus transformations.

2. Data and methods

2.1. Model description

Ecosys is an hourly time-step model with fully coupled carbon, energy, water, and nutrient cycles (Grant 2001, 2014, Grant et al. 2015). A detailed description of inputs, parameters, and algorithms used in ecosys can be found in the supplement I available at stacks.iop.org/ERL/13/054029/mmedia. We briefly review here the processes important for controlling terrestrial gross primary productivity, ecosystem respiration, and PFT dynamics in tundra ecosystems.

2.1.1. Gross primary productivity (GPP)

The CO$_2$ fixation rate is controlled by coupled schemes for gaseous diffusion and biochemical fixation as affected by plant water and nutrient status. The total CO$_2$ fixation from each leaf surface in the model results in GPP of each plant population. GPP is controlled by plant water status calculated from convergence solutions that equilibrate total root water uptake with transpiration (Grant et al. 1999). Carboxylation is directly affected by canopy temperature ($T_c$) modeled through the Arrhenius functions for light and dark reactions (Grant et al. 2007). The model uses parameters for temperature sensitivity of key CO$_2$ fixation processes from Bernacchi et al. (2003) for temperatures from 10°C–40°C and additional parameters for low and high temperatures inactivation by Kolari et al. (2007). Carbon uptake is also strongly controlled by plant N and phosphorus (P) content. Increased soil temperature ($T_s$) enhances plant productivity by increasing soil N and P mineralization and root and mycorrhizal active uptake (Grant 2014). Changes in air temperature and precipitation affect GPP directly through its effects on carboxylation, oxygenation and indirectly thought its effect on soil-water-atmosphere water relations (Grant et al. 2007). Leaf onset (leafout in deciduous, dehardening in evergreen) and termination (leaffall in deciduous, hardening in evergreen) was modeled from number of hours of canopy temperatures accumulated above or below set values during lengthening or shortening photoperiods, respectively.

2.1.2. Ecosystem respiration ($R_e$)

Ecosystem respiration is calculated from autotrophic ($R_a$) and heterotrophic ($R_h$) sources. Canopy and soil temperature and water contents are calculated from surface energy and water exchanges coupled with soil heat and water transfers through atmosphere-canopy-snow-surface residue-soil profiles (Grant et al. 2012).
Temperature-dependent oxidation of non-structural products of CO$_2$ fixation ($R_c$) drives $R_m$ by all branches, roots, and mycorrhizae. $R_c$ is first used to meet maintenance respiration requirements ($R_m$). Excess $R_c$ over $R_m$ is expended as growth respiration $R_g$, constrained by branch, root, or mycorrhizal turgor potential. When $R_m$ exceeds $R_c$, the shortfall is met by the respiration of remobilizable C and translocation of associated N and P in leaves and twigs or roots and mycorrhizae and the loss of associated non-remobilizable (i.e. structural) C, N, and P as litterfall.

$R_m$ of each organic-matter-microbe complex (coarse woody litter, fine non-woody litter, manure, particulate organic matter and humus) represented in *ecosys* is determined by the active biomass ($M$) of heterotrophic microbial populations and the substrate concentration (Grant et al 2006a). $R_m$ is controlled by $T_s$ through an Arrhenius function and by soil water content through its effect on aqueous microbial concentrations [$M$]. Decomposition generates dissolved organic carbon (DOC) that drives microbial growth. $R_m$ is also controlled by microbial N and P concentrations, DOC, $T_s$, available O$_2$, and soil water potential. Concentrations of C, N, and P in roots and mycorrhizae drive exudation of nonstructural C, N, and P to DOC, dissolved organic N (DON), and dissolved organic P (DOP) in soil. $R_m$ drives CO$_2$ emission from soil through diffusion and volatilization in aqueous and gaseous phases (Grant et al 2012). Changes in soil ice content are used to calculate active layer depth (ALD, defined as maximum annual thaw depth), modeled from the general heat flux equation driven by surface energy exchange and subsurface heat transfer (Grant and Pattey 1999). Net ecosystem productivity (NEP) is determined from the difference in ecosystem net primary productivity (NPP = GPP − $R_m$) and $R_m$.

### 2.1.3. PFT competition and dynamics

*Ecosys* represents multiple canopy and soil layers. The vertical profiles of canopy leaf area and root lengths are prognosed from allocations of plant nonstructural C, N, and P to each organ of each PFT (Grant 1994, Grant and Hesketh 1992, Grant et al 1989). Thus, each PFT competes for irradiance, water, and nutrients within each canopy and rooted soil layer depending on leaf area and root length. Light interception of incoming direct and diffuse radiation and back scattering is resolved across each canopy layer. Each PFT competes for nutrient and water uptake from common nutrient and water stocks held across multilayer soil profiles, calculated from algorithms for transformations and transfers of soil C, N, and P, and for transfers of soil water (Grant 2016, Grant et al 2003, Grant et al 2007). Nutrient and water uptake of each PFT depends on root length and density of primary and secondary root axes, driven by the allocation of non-structural C, N, and P to each axis (Grant 1993, Grant et al 1989). Allocation rates are determined by non-structural C, N, and P concentration gradients within each PFT arising from leaf CO$_2$ fixation, and by root N and P uptake versus consumption by $R_m$ in each axis determined by its nutrient and water status.

Modeled differences in PFT functional traits determine the strategy of resource acquisition and allocation that drive growth, resource remobilization, and litterfall, and therefore each PFT’s dynamic competitive capacity under changing growing conditions. There are several *ecosys* PFT-specific functional traits important for predicting high-latitude vegetation competition under a changing climate (i.e. CO$_2$ fixation kinetics, leaf optical properties, phenology, morphology, and root traits). These differences in plant traits result in emergent PFT variation in phenology, irradiance, CO$_2$ fixation rate, and water uptake and thereby each PFT’s competitive ability.

### 2.2. Simulation design and testing

Plant establishment occurs from prescribed initial seed densities for coexisting PFTs (deciduous shrubs, evergreen shrubs, sedge, moss, lichen) across the simulation spatial domain. The model was initialized with soil attributes including layer depth, clay and sand fraction, pH, cation exchange capacity, bulk density, and soil organic carbon stocks (Hugelius et al 2013, Liu et al 2013) with 0.25° × 0.25° spatial resolution. The simulations were forced with dynamic climate, atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations (Meinhausen et al 2011) (supplement II, figure 1), and nitrogen deposition (Dentener 2006) from 1900–2100. For the historical period, climate forcing from 1979–1988 was taken from the North American Regional Reanalysis (NARR) (Wei et al 2014) and cycled through 1900–1978. The real time NARR data was used for 1979–2010. RCP 8.5 scenario ensemble projections, downscaled and averaged across 15 CMIP5 models (Wang et al 2016), were used to drive the changes in climate over the 21st century (supplement II, figure 2). We compared spatial patterns of modeled long-term annual average GPP with GPP upscaled from a network of eddy covariance (EC) observations (Jung et al 2011).

In earlier studies using *ecosys*, modeled and measured ALD, CO$_2$, and energy fluxes in many northern ecosystems had good agreement: e.g. microtopography, temperature, and precipitation effects on ALD in 2016 ($R^2 = 0.61$) (Grant et al 2017b) and carbon dynamics ($0.7 < R^2 < 0.9$) (Grant et al 2017a) in polygonal tundra; responses of seasonal CO$_2$ exchange in mesic Arctic tundra under varying growing season conditions from 2004–2007 (0.69 < $R^2 < 0.78$) (Grant et al 2011), CO$_2$ exchange as affected by hydrology in landscapes underlain by permafrost in Arctic mixed tundra and a fenn from 2005–2009 (0.71 < $R^2 < 0.83$) (Grant 2015, Grant et al 2015), and CO$_2$ exchange in temperate and boreal forests under variable weather, across nine eddy EC sites from 1998–2006 (0.60 < $R^2 < 0.87$) (Grant et al 2009, 2006b).
3. Results and discussion

3.1. Changes in tundra ecosystem productivity

The predicted spatial pattern of long-term mean annual (1982–2010) GPP agreed well with EC-upscaled values (Geographically weighed regression, $R^2 = 0.78$; figure 1), although we caution that the EC upscaling is based on very few observations in this region (Jung et al 2011). In particular, both the modeled and EC-upscaled tundra GPP have larger values in the south and southwest and smaller values in the high Arctic and Arctic cordillera in the northeast. Long-term (1982–2010) mean annual modeled GPP was 0.41 Pg C, similar to the estimates from EC-upscaled GPP with 0.44 Pg C.

GPP, NPP, $R_h$, and NEP of the North America Arctic tundra were all modeled to increase with climate change (figure 2). These increases in tundra carbon uptake were modeled from more rapid carboxylation kinetics (Bernacchi et al 2001) due to higher temperature sensitivity at lower temperatures (Sjögersten and Wookey 2002) and facilitated by enhanced N uptake from soils due to increasing ALD and more
rapid N mineralization (Grant et al 2011, Yu et al 2009). The modeled recent increases in tundra productivity are consistent with experimental warming experiments (Hill and Henry 2011, Klady et al 2011, Oberbauer et al 2007) that reported increases in northern ecosystem productivity. The modeled changes in NPP and NEP to recent warming were spatially heterogeneous. The spatial average modeled NPP increased by 27% and NEP by 62% from 1982–2010. Observations from long-term plots and experimental warming were also shown to have diverse and contrasting responses depending on the moisture regime and PFTs (Oberbauer et al 2007, Walker et al 2006). However, similar to our modeled results, most tundra plot based experiments have shown overall increases in productivity. For instance long-term biomass measurements from long-term plots in a Canadian High Arctic tundra site indicated 158% aboveground and 67% root biomass increase between 2005 and the 1980s (Hill and Henry 2011). Results from long-term (1981–2008) experimental plots at Ellesmere Island, Nunavut, Canada (Hudson and Henry 2009) have also shown that aboveground biomass increased by ~160%. Similarly, in a meta-analysis of 23 sites warned from 2°C–5°C in green house warming experiments across the Arctic, Dormann and Woodin (2002) reported 120% average increases in biomass compared to the control plots.

Over the 21st century, the modeled growing season extended by ~60 d, spatially averaged across the tundra and primarily in the spring, resulting in increased NEP (figure 3). Although increases in $R_e$ were also modeled with warming (figure 2), the carbon uptake rate was greater than the losses, resulting in an overall carbon sink in the North American Arctic tundra (figure 2).

Changes in modeled annual NEP in recent decades (1982–2010) varied spatially, with greater increases in much of the low Arctic and Alaska, despite localized declines in a few parts of the high Arctic and southwest Alaska (figure 4(a)). Consistent with these results, Sitch et al (2007), using a land surface model and atmospheric inversions, reported that the Arctic tundra has been a carbon sink in recent decades. Modeled annual NEP continued to rise over the 21st century, resulting in much of the North America tundra remaining a net carbon sink (greater in the low Arctic versus high Arctic; figure 4(b)).

Predicted 21st century northern ecosystem responses to climate change vary widely among land surface models. Consistent with our result, Qian et al (2010) predicted that northern ecosystems (above 60° N) will be a carbon sink through the 21st century based on 10 models from the Coupled Carbon Cycle Climate Model Intercomparison Project. However, these 10 models had a wide range of prediction of carbon fluxes (e.g. NEP range from ~0.2 to 1.0 Pg C yr$^{-1}$ by 2100). In another carbon-nitrogen modeling study, Koven et al (2015) predicated that the permafrost regions of northern ecosystems will remain a carbon sink through 2100. On the other hand, Zhuang et al (2006) used a process based model and predicted that the northern ecosystem (above 50° N) will become a carbon source by 2100.

3.2. Changes in tundra woodiness and C uptake

Modeled tundra woodiness increased as climate change progressed over the 21st century (figure 5(a)). The relative dominance (i.e. proportion of total ecosystem NPP) of woody shrubs increased from ~40% in 1980 to ~75% by 2100 (figure 5(a)). Non-woody tundra plants (graminoids and non-vascular plants)
experienced a comparable decline in relative dominance (from ~60% to ~25%). The increased modeled tundra woodiness is consistent with a long-term (1991–2008) warming experiment in a tundra site in Alaska (Sistla et al 2013) that reported increased N availability that resulted in increased dominance of woody plants. Greater increases in woodiness were modeled in the tundra regions with higher ambient air temperature such as the Alaska and the tundra-boreal ecotone.

The increase in woody shrub NPP was modeled to be the largest factor contributing to enhanced net ecosystem carbon uptake by 2100 (figure 5(a)). Non-woody plants were modeled to remain the dominant PFT over woody plants until ~2045, after which woody plants dominated through 2100. The spatially averaged NPP:R<sub>p</sub> ratio of non-woody plants was greater than that of woody plants in recent decades and through ~2045. The modeled gains in non-woody plant NPP offset ~65% of R<sub>p</sub> from 1980–2045 (figure 5(b)), suggesting that gains in non-woody plant carbon uptake were insufficient to offset increasing R<sub>p</sub> when the tundra was mainly dominated by non-woody plants. The non-woody plant NPP:R<sub>p</sub> ratio diminished to ~0.35 by 2100 (figure 5(b)). In contrast, woody plant NPP attained greater relative dominance after 2045, offsetting all R<sub>p</sub> carbon losses by 2085; the woody plant NPP:R<sub>p</sub> ratio increased by a factor of ~3 from 1980–2100.

The modeled change in tundra woodiness (figure 5(b)) is an important ecosystem response to climate change that will have large impacts on the tundra carbon cycle. Consistent with this model result, Sistla et al (2013) reported that a two decades warming experiment in Arctic tundra ecosystem in Alaska resulted in increased woodiness and net ecosystem carbon storage. In another warming experiment in Toolik Lake, a low Arctic site in Alaska, Leffler et al (2016) reported increased shrub growth that enhanced ecosystem net carbon uptake. As an N limited ecosystem, the higher C:N ratio of woody versus non-woody plants is an important functional trait that enhances ecosystem carbon uptake from greater gains of carbon per N invested and longer turnover times. Woody carbon stocks with higher C:N ratios also decompose more slowly than non-woody plants (Weintraub and Schimel 2005), which sustains nutrient availability and slows carbon losses from heterotrophic decomposition. Cornelissen et al (2007) compared decomposition rates of leaf litter from species in 33 northern biomes in an incubation experiment and reported that herbaceous plant litter decomposes 40% faster than shrub litter, from which they concluded that woody shrub expansion could result in a negative feedback to global warming.

The effect of warming on NPP was shown to vary with PFT composition in several manipulative experiments (Arft et al 1999, Cornelissen et al 1999, Elmendorf et al 2012, Hollister et al 2005). However, our predictions of changes in tundra woodiness and the resulting net carbon exchanges may be different than those inferred from warming experiments because ecosystem responses vary with warming experiment duration (Henry and Molau 1997, Hollister et al 2005). Most warming experiments have been relatively short-term, implying that relatively slower tundra PFT changes that occur over decades (e.g. from progressive warming over 21st century) may not have been captured (Rustad et al 2001).
Figure 4. Changes in modeled annual net primary productivity across North America Arctic tundra under (a) recent (2010–1982) and (b) future (2100–2010) climates.

Figure 5. Long-term (1980–2100) spatial average changes in modeled annual (a) relative NPP-based dominance and (b) NPP/$R_g$ ratio of shrubs to non-woody (graminoids + non-vascular plants) plants of the North America Arctic tundra.
3.3. Annual and seasonal trends in tundra net carbon exchange

Between 1982 and 2100, annual NPP increased by 244 g C m$^{-2}$ while $R_n$ increased by 139 g C m$^{-2}$, resulting in the tundra ecosystem becoming a greater net carbon sink (106 g C m$^{-2}$) (table 1). The magnitude and trend of tundra carbon dynamics were modeled to vary across seasons (table 1). Despite GPP increases in all seasons, the relative gains in carbon uptake were greater during spring and summer from enhanced carbon fixation rates and extended growing seasons (figure 3). The spring and summer uptake were modeled to offset the annual $R_n$ carbon losses, resulting in a net increase of the tundra carbon sink over recent decades and through the 21st century (table 1; figure 3). However, smaller increases in carbon uptake during autumn (22 g C m$^{-2}$) and greater increases in $R_n$ (winter = 23 g C m$^{-2}$; Autumn = 47 g C m$^{-2}$) resulted in larger carbon losses during these seasons by 2100 versus 1982. Increases in total net ecosystem carbon lost during autumn and winter (48 g C m$^{-2}$) offset the net carbon gains in spring (13 g C m$^{-2}$) and 25% of the gains in summer (141 g C m$^{-2}$). These predictions of greater increases in carbon loss during winter and autumn with permafrost thaw suggest that the increase in North America Arctic tundra net carbon sink may not persist much past 2100. The modeled net carbon losses in autumn was consistent with Piao et al (2008), who used long-term atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations and EC flux data to estimate greater autumn carbon losses versus gains, offsetting 90% of the carbon gains in spring in northern ecosystems.

The modeled increase in carbon loss during non-growing seasons (table 1) is an important ecosystem process that may control the future tundra carbon cycle. In a warming experiment in the northern foothills of the Alaska Range, Natali et al (2012) reported that carbon loss from enhanced respiration during winter completely offset gains in net ecosystem carbon uptake during the growing season. Although this warming experiment only represents selected sites and could not capture the impacts of decadal-scale changes in plant communities, the implied importance of non-growing season carbon losses on the tundra carbon cycle was consistent with our modeled result. Carbon losses from winter soil warming was also shown in a long-term snow fence warming experiment (Walker et al 1999) in Toolik Lake, Alaska. Increases in snow depth at the Toolik Lake site were also shown to enhance CH$_4$ production from soil warming that increased soil wetness that reduced soil O$_2$ concentration and thaw depth (Blanc-Betes et al 2016). Increases in graminoids at the site were shown to enhance transport of CH$_4$ fluxes out of the soil, implying the importance of PFTs in carbon flux transport mechanisms in Arctic moist tussock tundra.

Changes in tundra net carbon exchange may also depend on the relative changes in air and soil temperatures, which affects changes in modeled NPP and $R_n$ (figure 3) by 2100. In ecosys, increasing $T_a$ causes greater ALD and soil aeration and hence O$_2$ uptake by microbes, thereby increasing $R_n$ (Grant et al 2015). Despite substantial increases in air temperature by 2100 (supplement II, figure 2), which resulted in GPP gains (table 1) from enhanced CO$_2$ fixation, soil temperature increased at a much slower rate (figure 6). Soil temperature increased in all seasons, albeit with a slower rate during the growing season versus winter. The slower increase in soil versus air temperature during the

![Figure 6. Daily maximum air versus modeled soil temperature, averaged during (a) 2006–2010 (b) 2096–2100 across the North American tundra.](image)

Table 1. Changes in annual and seasonal modeled carbon fluxes (g C m$^{-2}$) of the North America Arctic tundra over the 21st century (average (1982–1986) subtracted from average (2096–2100)). Positive values indicate gains, negative values losses.

| Season | $\Delta$GPP | $\Delta$NPP | $\Delta R_n$ | $\Delta R_s$ | $\Delta$NEP |
|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Winter | 1           | –16         | 7           | 23          | –22         |
| Spring | 42          | –17         | 4           | 29          | 13          |
| Summer | 489         | 251         | 110         | 319         | 141         |
| Autumn | 22          | –8          | 18          | 47          | –26         |
| Annual | 524         | 244         | 139         | 418         | 106         |

* Winter = December–February, Spring = March–May, Summer = June–August, Autumn = September–November.
growing season is attributed to increased GPP, thus leaf expansion that increased canopy shading of the soil surface. Increased insulation from the soil surface litter layer during the non-growing season resulted in higher soil versus air temperature (figure 6). Overall, spatially averaged 0–15 cm soil temperature increased by ~0.6 °C for every 1 °C increase in air temperature over the 21st century. This slower soil versus air warming, and thus greater effects on CO₂ fixation rate versus \( R_{d} \), contributed to the tundra remaining a carbon sink by 2100. However, these higher gains versus losses of carbon may not be sustainable under further soil warming beyond 2100.

The modeled results were affected by increases in atmospheric CO₂, precipitation, N deposition, and N₂ fixation. Other processes beyond those considered here need to be included in land modeling assessments of future tundra carbon cycling. For example, shrub expansion may increase snowpack depth locally, which can insulate the soil and increase winter soil temperatures (Sturm et al 2005), although effects on shrub productivity vary (Myers-Smith and Hik 2013). Warming and associated atmospheric feedbacks from albedo changes (Bonfils et al 2012, Chapin et al 2005) and earlier snowmelt could further warm the soil, thereby amplifying carbon losses (Cahoon et al 2012) from \( R_{d} \). Fine-scale (0.1–1 km) spatial heterogeneity can affect vegetation dynamics (Jorgenson et al 2013); our ~25 km resolution simulations did not resolve these spatial scales. Mechanisms of surface and sub-surface flows of water, nutrients, and energy from differences in topography can affect the simulation of the carbon cycle in Arctic ecosystems (Grant et al 2017a). Arctic CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes associated with formation of thaw lakes (Sturtevant and Oechel 2013), are important processes that affect modeling Arctic ecosystems. Finally, projected increases in tundra fires can amplify carbon losses (Mack et al 2011), and much work remains to develop accurate fire models for tundra systems.

4. Conclusions

Extended growing seasons and enhanced N mineralization and plant uptake were modeled to increase carbon fixation rates in recent decades and over the 21st century across North America tundra. Tundra shrub expansion and woodiness increased carbon uptake and retention sufficiently to offset the large concurrent increases in heterotrophic respiration, resulting in a predicted net North American tundra carbon sink by 2100. However, by 2100, increases in autumn and winter heterotrophic respiration were increasing rapidly and offset the spring and 25% of summer carbon uptake. Slower soil versus air warming resulted in greater increases in CO₂ fixation rates versus respiration, which may be unsustainable under further soil warming beyond 2100.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research of the US Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory as part of the Next-Generation Ecosystem Experiments in the Arctic (NGEE Arctic) project. Data products in this study are archived at http://ngee-arctic.ornl.gov.

ORCID iDs

Zelalem A Mekonnen @ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2647-0671

References

Albert K R, Mikkelsen T N, Michelsen A, Ro-Poulsen H and van der Linden I 2011 Interactive effects of drought, elevated CO₂ and warming on photosynthetic capacity and photosystem performance in temperate heath plants J. Plant Physiol. 168 1530–61

Arft A M et al 1999 Responses of tundra plants to experimental warming: Meta-analysis of the international tundra experiment Ecol. Manage. 69 491–511

Bernacchi C, Pimentel C and Long S 2003 In vivo temperature response functions of parameters required to model RuBP-limited photosynthesis Plant. Cell Environ. 26 1419–30

Bonfils C, Sangeas F, Pimentel C, Portis Jr A and Long S 2001 Improved temperature response functions for models of Rubisco-limited photosynthesis Plant. Cell Environ. 24 253–9

Cahoon S M, Sullivan P F, Shaver G R, Welker J M and Post E 2012 Fine-scale (0.1–1 km) spatial heterogeneity can affect vegetation dynamics (Jorgenson et al 2013); our ~25 km resolution simulations did not resolve these spatial scales. Mechanisms of surface and sub-surface flows of water, nutrients, and energy from differences in topography can affect the simulation of the carbon cycle in Arctic ecosystems (Grant et al 2017a). Arctic CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes associated with formation of thaw lakes (Sturtevant and Oechel 2013), are important processes that affect modeling Arctic ecosystems. Finally, projected increases in tundra fires can amplify carbon losses (Mack et al 2011), and much work remains to develop accurate fire models for tundra systems.

4. Conclusions

Extended growing seasons and enhanced N mineralization and plant uptake were modeled to increase carbon fixation rates in recent decades and over the 21st century across North America tundra. Tundra shrub expansion and woodiness increased carbon uptake and retention sufficiently to offset the large concurrent increases in heterotrophic respiration, resulting in a predicted net North American tundra carbon sink by 2100. However, by 2100, increases in autumn and winter heterotrophic respiration were increasing rapidly and offset the spring and 25% of summer carbon uptake. Slower soil versus air warming resulted in greater increases in CO₂ fixation rates versus respiration, which may be unsustainable under further soil warming beyond 2100.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research of the US Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory as part of the Next-Generation Ecosystem Experiments in the Arctic (NGEE Arctic) project. Data products in this study are archived at http://ngee-arctic.ornl.gov.

ORCID iDs

Zelalem A Mekonnen @ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2647-0671

References

Albert K R, Mikkelsen T N, Michelsen A, Ro-Poulsen H and van der Linden I 2011 Interactive effects of drought, elevated CO₂ and warming on photosynthetic capacity and photosystem performance in temperate heath plants J. Plant Physiol. 168 1530–61

Arft A M et al 1999 Responses of tundra plants to experimental warming: Meta-analysis of the international tundra experiment Ecol. Manage. 69 491–511

Bernacchi C, Pimentel C and Long S 2003 In vivo temperature response functions of parameters required to model RuBP-limited photosynthesis Plant. Cell Environ. 26 1419–30

Bonfils C, Sangeas F, Pimentel C, Portis Jr A and Long S 2001 Improved temperature response functions for models of Rubisco-limited photosynthesis Plant. Cell Environ. 24 253–9

Blanc-Betes E, Welker J M, Sturchio N C, Chanton J P and Gonzalez-Meler M A 2016 Winter precipitation and snow accumulation drive the methane sink or source strength of Arctic tussock tundra Glob. Change Biol. 22 2818–33

Bonfils C, Phillips T, Lawrence D, Cameron-Smith P, Riley W and Subin Z M 2012 On the influence of shrub height and expansion on northern high latitude climate Environ. Res. Lett. 7 015003

Bouskill N, Riley W and Tang J 2014 Meta-analysis of high-latitude nitrogen-addition and warming studies implies ecological mechanisms overlooked by land models Biogeosciences 11 6969

Cahoon S M, Sullivan P F, Shaver G R, Welker J M and Post E 2012 Interactions among shrub cover and the soil microclimate may determine future Arctic carbon budgets Ecol. Lett. 15 1415–22

Chapin F S, Shaver G R, Gilbin A F, Nadelhoffer K J and Laundre J A 1993 Responses of arctic tundra to experimental and observed changes in climate Ecology 76 694–711

Chapin F S, Sturm M, Serreze M, McFadden J, Key J, Lloyd A, McGuire A, Rupp T, Lynch A and Schimel J 2005 Role of land-surface changes in Arctic summer warming Science 310 657–60

Cornelissen J H, Pérez-harguindeguy N, Diaz S, Grime J P, Marzano B, Cabido M, Vendramini F and Cerabolini B 1999 Leaf structure and defence control litter decomposition rate across species and life forms in regional floras on two continents New Phytol. 143 191–200

Cornelissen J H, Callaghan T V, Alatalo J, Michelsen A, Graglia E, Hartley A, Hik D, Hobbie S, Press M and Robinson C H 2001 Global change and arctic ecosystems: is lichen decline a function of increases in vascular plant biomass? J. Ecol. 89 984–91

Cornelissen J H, Van Bodegom P M, Aerts R, Callaghan T V, Van Logtestijn R S, Alatalo J, Stuart Chapin F, Gerold R, Gudmundsson J and Gwynn-Jones D 2007 Global negative vegetation feedback to climate warming responses of leaf litter decomposition rates in cold biomes Ecol. Lett. 10 619–27
Environ. Res. Lett. 13 (2018) 054029

Davidson E A and Janssens I A 2006 Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon decomposition and feedbacks to climate change Nature 440 163–73
DeMarco J, Mack M C, Bret-Harte M S, Burton M and Shaver G R 2014 Long-term experimental warming and nutrient additions increase productivity in tall deciduous shrub tundra Ecosphere 5 1–22
Dentener F 2006 Global maps of atmospheric nitrogen deposition, 1860, 1993, and 2050 Data Set (Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center)
Dormann C and Woodin S J 2002 Climate change in the Arctic: using plant functional types in a meta-analysis of field experiments Funct. Ecol. 16 4–17
Dutta K, Schuur E, Neff J and Zimov S 2006 Potential carbon release from permafrost soils of Northeastern Siberia Glob. Change Biol. 12 2336–51
Elmendorf S. C. et al 2012 Global assessment of experimental climate warming on tundra vegetation: heterogeneity over space and time Ecol. Lett. 15 164–75
Grant R F 1993 Simulation model of soil compaction and root growth. I. Model structure Plant Soil 150 1–1
Grant R F 1994 Simulation of competition between barley and wild oats under different managements and climates Ecol. Model. 71 269–87
Grant R F 2001 A review of the Canadian ecosystem model ecosys Modeling Carbon and Nitrogen Dynamics for Soil Management (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press) pp 173–264
Grant R F 2014 Nitrogen mineralization drives the response of forest productivity to soil warming: modelling in ecosys versus measurements from the Harvard soil heating experiment Ecol. Model. 288 38–46
Grant R F 2015 Ecosystem CO2 and CH4 exchange in a mixed tundra and a fen within a hydrologically diverse Arctic landscape: 2. Modeled impacts of climate change J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 120 1388–406
Grant R F 2016 Ecological controls on N2O emission in surface litter and near-surface soil of a managed grassland: modelling and measurements Biogeosciences 13 3549
Grant R F and Hesketh J 1992 Canopy structure of maize (Zea mays L.) at different populations: simulation and experimental verification Biotronics 21 11–24
Grant R F and Pattle E 1999 Mathematical modeling of nitrous oxide emissions from an agricultural field during spring thaw Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles 13 679–94
Grant R F, Oechel W C and Ping C L 2003 Modelling carbon balances of coastal arctic tundra under changing climate Glob. Change Biol. 9 16–38
Grant R F, Baldocchi D D and Ma S S 2012 Ecological controls on net ecosystem productivity of a seasonally dry annual grassland, under current and future climates: modelling with ecosys Agric. Forest Meteorol. 152 189–200
Grant R F, Humphreys E R and Lalaur P M 2015 Ecosystem CO2 and CH4 exchange in a mixed tundra and a fen within a hydrologically diverse Arctic landscape: I. Modeling versus measurements J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 120 1366–87
Grant R F, Frederick J, Hesketh J and Huck M 1989 Simulation of growth and morphological development of maize under contrasting water regimes Can. J. Plant Sci. 69 401–18
Grant R F, Humphreys E R, Lalaur P M and Dimitrov D D 2011 Ecological controls on net ecosystem productivity of a mesic arctic tundra under current and future climates J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 116 G03013
Grant R F, Mekonnen Z A, Riley W J, Arora B and Torn M S 2017a 2. Microtopography determines how CO2 and CH4 exchange responds to changes in temperature and precipitation at an Arctic polygonal tundra site: mathematical modelling with ecosys J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 122 3174–87
Grant R F, Mekonnen Z A, Riley W J, Wainwright H M, Graham D and Torn M S 2017b I: microtopography determines how active layer depths respond to changes in temperature and precipitation at an Arctic polygonal tundra site: mathematical modelling with ecosys J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 122 3161–73
Grant R F, Woll G, Kimball R, Frumau K, Hunsucker D Jr and Lamorte R 1999 Crop water relations under different CO2 and irrigation: testing of ecosys with the free air CO2 enrichment (FACE) experiment Agric. Forest Meteorol. 95 27–51
Grant R F, Black T A, Gaumont-Guay D, Kluin N, Barr A G, Morgenstern K and Nesis Z 2006a Net ecosystem productivity of boreal aspen forests under drought and climate change: mathematical modelling with Ecosys Agric. Forest Meteorol. 140 152–70
Grant R F et al 2006b Intercomparison of techniques to model water stress effects on CO2 and energy exchange in temperate and boreal deciduous forests Ecol. Model. 196 289–312
Grant R F, Arkebauer T J, Dobbermann A, Hubbard K G, Schimelleng T T, Suyker A E, Verma S B and Walters D T 2007 Net biome productivity of irrigated and rainfed maize–soybean rotations: modeling versus measurements Agron. J. 99 1404
Grant R F, Barr A G, Black T A, Margolis H A, Dunn A L, Metsaranta J, Wang S, McLaughey J H and Bourque C A 2009 Interannual variation in net ecosystem productivity of Canadian forests as affected by regional weather patterns—A Fluxnet-Canada synthesis Agric. Forest Meteorol. 149 2092–99
Harden J W, Fuller C C, Wilming M, Meyers-Smith J, Trumbore S E and Buiber J 2008 The fate of terrestrial carbon following permafrost degradation: detecting changes over recent decades, paper presented at Proc. 9th Int. Conf. on Permafrost
Henry G and Molau U 1997 Tundra plants and climate change: the international tundra experiment (ITEX) Glob. Change Biol. 3 1–9
Hill G B and Henry G H R 2011 Responses of High Arctic wet season tundra to climate warming since 1980 Glob. Change Biol. 17 276–87
Hollister R D, Webber P J and Tweedie C E 2005 The response of Alaskan arctic tundra to experimental warming: differences between short- and long-term responses Glob. Change Biol. 11 525–36
Hudson J M G and Henry G H R 2009 Increased plant biomass in a High Arctic heath community from 1981–2008 Ecology 90 2657–63
Hugelius G et al 2013 A new data set for estimating organic carbon storage to 3 m depth in soils of the northern circumpolar permafrost region Earth Syst. Sci. Data 5 393–402
Jorgenson M T, Harden J, Kanevski M, O’Donnell J, Wicklund K, Ewing S, Manies K, Zhuang Q, Shur Y and Striegl R 2013 Reorganization of vegetation, hydrology and soil carbon after permafrost degradation across heterogeneous boreal landscapes Environ. Res. Lett. 8 035017
Jorgenson M T, Racine C H, Walters J C and Osterkamp T E 2001 Permafrost degradation and ecological changes associated with a warming climate in central Alaska Clim. Change 48 551–79
Jung M, Reichstein M, Margolis H A, Cescatti A, Richardson A D, Arair M A, Arneth A, Bernhofer C, Bonal D and Chen J 2011 Global patterns of land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon dioxide, latent heat, and sensible heat derived from eddy covariance, satellite, and meteorological observations J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 116 G03017
Kladky R A, Henry G H R and Lemay V 2011 Changes in high arctic tundra plant reproduction in response to long-term experimental warming Glob. Change Biol. 17 1611–24
Kolari P, Lappalainen H K, Hänninen H and Hari P 2007 Relationship between temperature and the seasonal course of photosynthesis in Scots pine at northern timberline and in southern boreal zone Tellus B 59 542–52
Koven C D, Lawrence D M and Riley W J 2015 Permafrost carbon-climate feedback is sensitive to deep soil carbon decomposability but not deep soil nitrogen dynamics Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. 112 3752–7
Lamb E G, Han S, Lanoil B D, Henry G H, Brumme M E, Banerjee S and Siciliano S D 2011 A High Arctic soil ecosystem resists long-term environmental manipulations Glob. Change Biol. 17 3187–94
Lantz T C and Kokelj S V 2008 Increasing rates of retrogressive thaw slump activity in the Mackenzie Delta region, NWT, Canada Geophys. Res. Lett. 35 L06502
Lawrence D M, Slater A G, Tomas R A, Holland M M and Deser C 2008 Accelerated Arctic land warming and permafrost degradation during rapid sea ice loss Geophys. Res. Lett. 35 L11506
Leffler A J, Klein E S, Oberbauer S F and Welker J M 2016 Coupled long-term summer warming and deeper snow alters species composition and stimulates gross primary productivity in tussock tundra Oecologia 181 287–97
Liu S, Wei Y, Post W M, Cook R B, Schafer K and Thornton M M 2013 TheUnified North American Soil Map and its implication on the soil organic carbon stock in North America Biogeosciences 10 2915–30
Mack M C, Bret-Harte M S, Hollingsworth T N, Jandt R R, Schuur E A, Shaver G R and Verbyla D L 2011 Carbon loss from an unprecedented Arctic tundra wildfire Nature 475 489–92
McGuire A D, Anderson L G, Christensen T R, Dallimore S, Guo L, Hayes D J, Heimann M, Lennorraine T D, Macdonald R W and Roulet N 2009 Sensitivity of the carbon cycle in the Arctic to climate change Ecol. Monogr. 79 523–55
McManus k M, Morton D C, Masek J G, Wang D, Sexton J O, Nagol Nowinski N S, Taneva L, Trumbore S E and Welker J M 2010 The test of tundra snow–shrub interactions Ecol. Evol. 3 785–92
Oberbauer S F, Twedde C E, Welker J M, Fahnestock J T, Henry G H, R, Webber P J, Hollister R D, Walker M D, Kuchy A and Elmore E 2007 Tundra CO2 fluxes in response to experimental warming across latitudinal and moisture gradients Ecol. Monogr. 77 3 688–700
Nyfors R B, Keeling C, Tucker C, Asrar G and Nemani R 1997 Increased plant growth in the northern high latitudes from 1981–1991 Nature 386 698–702
Natural M S, Shuur E A G and Rubin R L 2012 Increased plant productivity in Alaskan tundra as a result of experimental warming of soil and permafrost J. Ecol. 100 488–98
Nowinski N S, Taneya L, Trumbore S E and Welker J M 2010 Decomposition of old organic matter as a result of deeper active layers in a snow depth manipulation experiment Oecologia 163 785–92
Oberbauer S F, Twedde C E, Welker J M, Fahnestock J T, Henry G H, R, Webber P J, Hollister R D, Walker M D, Kuchy A and Elmore E 2007 Tundra CO2 fluxes in response to experimental warming across latitudinal and moisture gradients Ecol. Monogr. 77 221–38
Oechel W C, Hastings S J, Pourtraits G, Jenkins M, Riechers G and Gruelke N 1993 Recent change of Arctic tundra ecosystems in response to autumn warming Nature 361 1986–2006 vegetation–specific NDVI trends in Northern Canada from satellite data Arctic 61 381–94
Piao S et al 2008 Net carbon dioxide losses of northern ecosystems in response to autum warming Nature 451 49–52
Qian H, Joseph R and Zeng N 2010 Enhanced terrestrial carbon uptake in the Northern high latitudes in the 21st century from the coupled carbon cycle climate model intercomparison project model projections Glob. Change Biol. 16 641–56
Rustad L, Campbell J, Marion G, Norby R, Mitchell M, Hartley M, Cornelissen J and Gurevitch J 2001 A meta-analysis of the responses of soil respiration, net nitrogen mineralization, and aboveground plant growth to experimental ecosystem warming Oecologia 126 543–62
Salmon V G, Soucy P, Mauritz M, Celsis G, Natali S M, Mack M C and Shuur E A 2015 Nitrogen availability increases in a tundra ecosystem during five years of experimental permafrost thaw Glob. Change Biol. 22 1927–41
Schuur E A, Bockheim J, Canadel J G, Euskirchen E, Fiedl C B, Goryachkin S V, Hagemann S, Kuhry P, Lallem P M and Lee H 2008 Vulnerability of permafrost carbon to climate change: implications for the global carbon cycle Bioscience 58 701–14
Shaver G R et al 2000 Global warming and terrestrial ecosystems: a conceptual framework for analysis Bioscience 50 871–82
Sistla S A, Moore J C, Simpson R T, Gough L, Shaver G R and Schimel J P 2013 Long-term warming restructures Arctic ecosystems without changing net soil carbon storage Nature 497 615
Sitch S, McGuire A D, Kimball J, Genyon N, Gammie J, Engstrom R, Wolf A, Zehang Q, Klein J and McDonald K C 2007 Assessing the carbon balance of circumpolar Arctic tundra using remote sensing and process modeling Ecol. App. 17 213–34
Sjögersten S and Wookoy P A 2002 Climatic and resource quality controls on soil respiration across a forest–tundra ecotone in Swedish Lapland Soil Biol. Biochem. 34 1633–46
Sturm M, Schimel J, Michaelson G, Welker J M, Oberbauer S F, Liston G E, Fahnestock J and Romanovsky V E 2005 Winter biological processes could help convert arctic tundra to shrubland Bioscience 55 17–26
Sturtevant C S and Oechel W C 2013 Spatial variation in landscape-level CO2 and CH4 fluxes from arctic coastal tundra: influence from vegetation, wetness, and the thaw lake cycle Glob. Change Biol. 19 2853–66
Tape K, Sturm M and Racine C 2006 The effect for shrub expansion in northern Alaska and the Pan-Arctic Glob. Change Biol. 12 686–702
Tremblay B, Lévesque E and Boudreau S 2012 Recent expansion of ever shrubs in the Low Arctic: evidence from Eastern Nunavik Environ. Res. Lett. 7 035001
Tucker C J, Skelly D A, Pinzon J E, Los S O, Myneni R B and Taylor M G 2001 Higher northern latitude normalized difference vegetation index and growing season trends from 1982 to 1999 Int. J. Biometeorol. 45 184–90
Verbyla D 2008 The greening and browning of Alaska based on 1982–2003 satellite data Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 17 547–55
Wahlen C H, Walker M and Bret-Harte M 2005 Vegetation responses in Alaskan arctic tundra after 8 years of a summer warming and winter snow manipulation experiment Glob. Change Biol. 11 537–52
Walker M, Walker D, Welker J, Atft A, Bardey T, Brooks P, Fahnestock J, Jones M, Losleben M and Parsons A 1999 Long-term experimental manipulation of winter snow regime and summer temperature in arctic and alpine tundra Hydrol. Process. 13 2315–30
Walker M D, Wahlen C H, Hollister R D, Henry G H, Ahlquist L E, Alatalo J M, Bret-Harte M S, Cale M P, Callaghan V T and Carréll B 2004 Plant community responses to experimental warming across the tundra biome Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. 103 1342–6
West A, Tamam M, Aitipaleh D and Carroll C 2016 Locally downscaled and spatially customizable climate data for historical and future periods for North America PLoS ONE 11 e0156720
Wei Y, Liu S, Huntzinger D, Michalak A, Viovy N, Post W, Schwalm C, Schaefer K, Jacobson A and Liu C 2014 NACP MxTMIIP: global and North American driver data for multi-model intercomparion Data Set (Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center)
Weintraub M N and Schimel J P 2005 Nitrogen cycling and the spread of shrubs control changes in the carbon balance of arctic tundra ecosystems Bioscience 55 408–15
Welker J M, Fahnestock J T, Henry G H, O’Dea K W and Chinner R A 2004 CO2 exchange in three Canadian High Arctic ecosystems: response to long-term experimental warming Glob. Change Biol. 10 1981–95
Yu Q, Epstein H and Walker D 2009 Simulating the effects of soil organic nitrogen and grazing on arctic tundra vegetation dynamics on the Yamal Peninsula, Russia Environ. Res. Lett. 4 045027
Zhang K, Kimball J S, Hogg E H, Zhao M, Oechel W C, Cassano J J and Running S W 2008 Satellite-based model detection of recent climate-driven changes in northern high-latitude vegetation productivity J. Geophys. Res. 113 G03033

Zhuang Q, Melillo J M, Sarofim M C, Kicklighter D W, McGuire A D, Felzer B S, Sokolov A, Prinn R G, Steudler P A and Hu S 2006 CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ exchanges between land ecosystems and the atmosphere in northern high latitudes over the 21st century Geophys. Res. Lett. 33 L17403