Nonlinear Increase of Vegetation Carbon Storage in Aging Forests and Its Implications for Earth System Models
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Abstract Vegetation carbon stock (Cveg) in global forests, which is important for C cycle-climate feedbacks, commonly increases with forest age. Due to the allometric growth of plants, the nonlinear increase in Cveg with woody fraction (fw) is expected across space. However, it remains unclear whether such a nonlinear relationship between Cveg and fw can be constrained by observations and further used to benchmark Earth system models (ESMs). Here, based on the in situ measurements at 1,145 forest sites, we found that the nonlinear relationship between Cveg and fw followed an exponential equation (i.e., $C_{veg} = be^{aw}$). Then, we showed that such an exponential dependence of Cveg on fw also exists in ESMs of CMIP5 and CMIP6 (all P < 0.01), even though age-dependent processes have not been incorporated in most models. However, the exponential Cveg-fw relationship varied greatly among the models, and the coefficient b was systematically lower in the ESMs (0.08 ± 0.11; mean ± SD) than the observations (0.28). Based on a compiled forest age data set, we further found that the observed nonlinear increase of Cveg with forest age across the Northern Hemisphere (>30°N) was not captured by ESMs. These findings reveal a high disagreement on the spatially nonlinear relationship between vegetation carbon stock and woody fraction in current ESMs. The exponential relationship based on observations provides one useful benchmark for ESMs when they implement the age-dependent processes in the future.

Plain Language Summary Forest age plays an important role in vegetation carbon stock (Cveg) predictions. This study detects a nonlinear increase of Cveg with woody fraction (fw) in aging forests across 1,145 in situ observations. The nonlinear Cveg-fw relationship was then used to benchmark the age impacts on Cveg predictions in Earth system models (ESMs). Combined with a global forest age data set, we show that current ESMs divergently represent the relationship between Cveg and forest age. Our study suggests that the Cveg-fw relationship could be one useful benchmark for evaluating ESMs.

1. Introduction

The dynamics of vegetation carbon storage (Cveg) in northern temperate forests vary threefold among current Earth system models (ESMs) (Jiang et al., 2015; Xia et al., 2017). One potential reason for such uncertainty is that most ESMs typically averaged across all age classes and have poorly represented the age-dependent biogeochemical and ecological processes (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2013). The important role of forest age in simulating vegetation carbon (C) storage has been validated by both big-leaf and tile-based models which have incorporated the age-related processes (Bayer et al., 2017; Shevliakova et al., 2009; Yue et al., 2018; Zaehle et al., 2006). For example, Zaehle et al. (2006) have incorporated the plant size-dependent C allocation in a big-leaf model (i.e., the Lund-Potsdam-Jena model), which then can better reproduce the observed present-day forest age structure and Cveg on the regional scale. The subgrid forest age structures have been implemented into some tile-based models, such as ORCHIDEE-MICT (Yue et al., 2018), LM3 (Shevliakova et al., 2009), JSBACH (Reick et al., 2013), and ISAM (Yang et al., 2015), allowing for the regional and global simulations of forest dynamics under land use changes. Recently, observations based on eddy flux towers have also shown that net CO2 uptake of forest ecosystems is more controlled by forest age than climate (Bensard et al., 2018; Gao et al., 2016). As a result, the important role of forest age in determining vegetation C accumulation has been increasingly emphasized by both observational (Gough et al., 2016) and modeling...
(Williams et al., 2012) studies. However, it remains unexamined that whether and how the simulation uncertainty or biases of $C_{\text{veg}}$ in current ESMs are contributed from the inconsideration of forest age.

The ignorance of forest age impacts may lead to the biased modeling of $C_{\text{veg}}$ in contrasting directions. On the one hand, numerous studies have reported that leaf area peaks at the early stage of forest development and followed by a reduction of photosynthesis in mature and old forests (Goulden et al., 2011; Gower et al., 1996; Law et al., 2003). Thus, one can expect an overestimation of $C_{\text{veg}}$ in mature or old forests by models because of the lack of the age-related reduction in photosynthesis. Models can also underestimate the $C_{\text{veg}}$ in young forests if the photosynthesis rates of mature or old forests are adopted. On the other hand, the allocation of net primary production to wood could increase with the forest age (Davidson et al., 2002; Peichl & Arain, 2006). Due to the longer C residence time in wood than other plant tissues (Bloom et al., 2016), ESMs could underestimate $C_{\text{veg}}$ in mature and old forests if they incorrectly represent the age-related increase in woody C allocation. Current ESMs have simulated the dynamics of C allocation simply based on different indicators, such as NPP (e.g., NorESM1; Oleson et al., 2010) and tree height (e.g., GFDL; Shenvlaikova et al., 2009) or empirically by some allocation schemes, such as allometric scaling relationships (e.g., HadGEM2-CC; Clark et al., 2011) and resource availability (e.g., CanESM; Arora & Boer, 2005; IPSL; Krinner et al., 2005; MIROC; Sato et al., 2007). However, most of these allocation schemes have not explicitly represented the age impacts on C allocation. Thus, developing effective benchmarks for simulating the age impact on vegetation carbon stocks is urgently needed.

In recent years, the rapid development of new technology in Earth system science has promoted the benchmarking analyses on modeled C processes using observations (Collier et al., 2018; Luo et al., 2012; Reichstein et al., 2019). Some previous benchmarking analyses have shown that the ensemble mean of multiple ESMs can well capture the dynamics of gross primary production in global data products (Anav et al., 2013; Xia et al., 2020; Yan et al., 2014). However, benchmarking the performance of $C_{\text{veg}}$ prediction in aging forests is still difficult because the C allocation scheme varies among models and different allocation schemes would cause large variability of predicted $C_{\text{veg}}$ (Friedlingstein et al., 1999; Ise et al., 2010; Malhi et al., 2011). In mature and old forests, if the ESMs correctly simulate ecosystem productivity without considering the age impacts, one can hypothesize an underestimation of $C_{\text{veg}}$ in these models. Because ESMs commonly lack the age-related increase in woody C allocation, we further hypothesize that current ESMs have led to a lower woody fraction ($f_w$) associated with the underestimated $C_{\text{veg}}$ in mature and old forests. Thus, the relationship between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ could be a useful benchmark for evaluating the simulations of age impact on forest $C_{\text{veg}}$ in the ESMs.

Here we explored the age-dependent increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ using in situ observations at 1,145 forest sites in northern temperature forests. Due to the allometric growth of trees (Niklas, 1995, 2004), the relationship between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ must be nonlinear (Poorter et al., 2015; Sheil et al., 2017; Sillett et al., 2010; Stephenson et al., 2014). Thus, we first explored whether the relationship between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ can be constrained by the observations. Then, we examined whether such a nonlinear relationship between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ also exits in current ESMs involved in the phases 5 and 6 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5 and CMIP6). Combined with a new global forest age database (Poorter et al., 2015), we further evaluated the age-related changes in $C_{\text{veg}}$ in current ESMs against the observations. This study aims to (1) verify the relationship between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ in aging forests based on observations, (2) examine whether current two generations of ESMs capture the observed $C_{\text{veg}}$-$f_w$ relationship, and (3) evaluate the effects of forest age on ESMs’ performance in vegetation carbon predictions.

### 2. Methods

#### 2.1. Data Sets

The allocations of the biomass of main tree compartments (leaves, stems, and roots) and total biomass data in this study were compiled from different data sources (Luo et al., 2014; Michaletz et al., 2014; Schepaschenko et al., 2017). We restricted our data selection to only those reported the forest age and biomass in the main tree compartments (leaves, stems, and roots). A complete list of data source references is provided in the Source Data file. Data were compiled for woody plants with latitude, longitude, and stand age as well as dry biomass of leaf, wood, root, and vegetation. Note that the stand age used in this study refers
to the mean age of trees within the stand. The field data of China's forest biomass were collected from the Luo data set (Luo et al., 2014). That data set provides a wide range of survey data including 1,607 entries for 348 forest sites. We selected the records which reported the biomass of leaves, stems, roots, and vegetation. The Shvidenko data set (Schepaschenko et al., 2017) includes 10,351 records of sample plots for the periods of 1960–2014 in Eurasia. That data set reported the biomass of living trees as the stem, bark, branches, foliage, and roots, so the woody biomass was calculated by summing the stem, bark, and branches biomass. In the Shvidenko data set, we selected sites published after 1985 in each country that excluded China. The Michaletz data set was compiled from multiple data sources covering 1,247 stands and data records in boreal and temperate forests that are involved in our analyses (excluding China). Vegetation carbon storage was calculated as the total dry mass of stem, bark, branch, root and foliage components in the above three data sets. It should be noted that both natural and planted forests are included in these data sources. Because some data were measured from continuous forest inventory, there would be multiple records of different years in one region, and we treated these data as different stands. Finally, we got a total of 1,145 stands of northern temperate forests across Asia, Europe, and North America (Figure 1).

The forest age data were obtained from the global forest age data set (GFAD) (Poorter et al., 2015) with a resolution of $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ represents the 2000–2010 era. The GFAD data set was derived from the country-level forest inventory in most temperate and boreal regions and climate-specific stand age-biomass curves in the tropical areas. The original data were unified to 15 age classes defined in 10-yr intervals of forest type fractions: needleleaf evergreen, needleleaf deciduous, broadleaf evergreen, and broadleaf deciduous. The information on the fraction of forest within an age class in each grid cell is also provided by the GFAD data set. In each land grid cell, we first calculated the sum of the four forest type fractions. At each age class, we take the median of the age range and multiply the forest type fractions of each grid. We finally obtained the map of global forest age and extracted the ages of grid cells with the forest cover >50% across the Northern Hemisphere (>30°N).

The simulated biomass and vegetation carbon data from CMIP5 and CMIP6 ESMs were used to compared with in situ observations (Tables 1 and 2). In each modeling center, we only selected one model because the outputs from the same model center are very similar. Finally, eight ESMs from CMIP5 and seven ESMs from CMIP6 were used in this study. In ESMs, the total biomass and the biomass in leaves, stems, and roots are represented by cVeg, cLeaf, cWood, and cRoot. The monthly model outputs at the end of each year were extracted from historical runs during 2000–2005, which were then aggregated up to $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ resolution using the nearest neighbor interpolation. The ESMs data were restricted to the grid cells with the forest cover >50% across the Northern Hemisphere (>30°N).

### 2.2. Grouping of Forest Age Data

The forest age data were obtained from plot-level observations and grid-scale GFAD data set. The observation-based forest age data were binned into increments of 10 yr in the range of 0–130 yr in Figure 2a, then the observation-based $C_{veg}$ were averaged in each forest age bin. The forest age data extracted from GFAD were binned into increments of 10 yr in the range of 0–130 yr in Figure 4. The values of forest age
larger than 13 yr in observations and GFAD were binned into one group because the number of samples is relatively small. The bin size ensured that each bin size contains more than five samples. In each age group, the $C_{veg}$ of each of the 15 models in two CMIPs was also averaged. Linear or nonlinear regression was applied to detect the dependence of $C_{veg}$ on binned forest age in observations and ESMs, respectively.

To reduce the uncertainty from scale mismatch between the plot-level observations and gridded products, the in situ measurements were weighted based on the fraction of the forest provided by the GFAD dataset to match grid cells. So the in situ measurements of biomass data were averaged to 15 age classes defined in 10-yr intervals, from 1–10 up to a class greater than 150 years old. Then the weighted biomass of each grid cell was calculated based on the averaged biomass data of each age class and the proportion of forest at each grid cell. The relationship between the weighted $C_{veg}$ and the gridded forest age data was plotted in Figure 2a.

### Table 1
**Information of CMIP5 ESMs Used in This Study**

| Model name | Modeling group | Land model | Allocation scheme | LUC | Original resolution | References |
|------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|-----|---------------------|------------|
| CanESM2    | Canadian Center for Climate Modeling and Analysis | CTEM CLASS | Resource limitation | Yes | $2.81^\circ \times 2.81^\circ$ | Arora & Boer (2010) |
| IPSL-CM5A-LR | Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace Meteorological Research Institute | ORCHIDEE HAL | Resource limitation | Yes | $1.88^\circ \times 3.75^\circ$ | Dufresne et al. (2013) |
| MRI-ESM 1 | Norwegian Climate Center | CLM 4.0 | Dynamic functions of NPP | Yes | $1.88^\circ \times 2.50^\circ$ | Tjiputra et al. (2013) |
| Nor-ESM 1-M | National Center for Atmospheric Research | CLM 5.0 | Dynamic functions of NPP | Yes | $1.25^\circ \times 0.94^\circ$ | Gent et al. (2011) |
| GFDL-ESM 2G | NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory | LM 3.0 | Tree height | Yes | $1.99^\circ \times 2.48^\circ$ | Dunne et al. (2013) |
| HadGEM2-CC | Met Office Hadley Center (additional HadGEM2-ES realizations contributed by Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais) | JULES TRIFFID | Allometric relationship based on leaf area index | Yes | $1.24^\circ \times 1.88^\circ$ | Collins et al. (2011) |
| MIROC-ESM | Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute (The Institute for Environmental Studies University of Tokyo), and National | MATSIRO SEIB-DGVM | Environmental conditions at tree level | Yes | $2.81^\circ \times 2.81^\circ$ | Watanabe et al. (2011) |

**Note.** LUC = land use change.

### Table 2
**Information of CMIP6 ESMs Used in This Study**

| Model name | Modeling group | Land model | Allocation scheme | LUC | Original resolution | References |
|------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|-----|---------------------|------------|
| CanESM5    | Canadian Center for Climate Modeling and Analysis | CTEM CLASS | Resource limitation | Yes | $2.81^\circ \times 2.81^\circ$ | Swart et al. (2019) |
| IPSL-CM6A-LR | Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace Meteorological Research Institute | ORCHIDEE HAL | Resource limitation | Yes | $1.88^\circ \times 3.75^\circ$ | Boucher et al. (2020) |
| MRI-ESM 2-0 | Norwegian Climate Center | CLM 5.0 | Fixed coefficient | Yes | $1.88^\circ \times 2.50^\circ$ | Seland et al. (2020) |
| NorESM2-LM | National Center for Atmospheric Research | CLM 5.0 | Fixed coefficient | Yes | $0.94^\circ \times 1.25^\circ$ | Lawrence et al. (2019) |
| ACCESS-ESM 1-5 | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization | CABLE2.4 | Fixed coefficient | No | $1.875^\circ \times 1.25^\circ$ | Law et al. (2017) |
| CNRM-ESM 2 | National Center for Meteorological Research, Météo-France and CNRS laboratory | ISBA-CTRIP | Related with plant N decline model | Yes | $1.4^\circ \times 1.4^\circ$ | Séférian et al. (2019) |

**Note.** LUC = land use change.
3. Results

3.1. Age-Dependent Nonlinear Increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ in Observations

By plotting the observation-based vegetation carbon stocks with forest age, we found that $C_{\text{veg}}$ increased nonlinearly with forest age across all 1,145 forest sites ($R^2 = 0.94, P < 0.01$; Figure 2a). The biomass allocated to wood increased in young forests and then gradually saturated in old forests (Figure 2b). The partitioning of leaf biomass rapidly reduced in the young forest and then slowly reduced in old forests (Figure 2b). The biomass allocated to roots declined at the early stage and raised when the forests were older than ~100 years old (Figure 2b). Across the 1,145 forest sites, trees kept accumulating carbon in wood as they age, and the $C_{\text{veg}}$ exponentially increased with $f_w$ ($R^2 = 0.26, P < 0.01$; Figure 3).

3.2. The Nonlinear Relationship Between $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ in Earth System Models

Spatially, areas with high $f_w$ fractions corresponded to large $C_{\text{veg}}$ (Figure 4). The evolution of models from CMIP5 to CMIP6 has resulted in larger carbon stock and higher $f_w$ in northern Canada, Eastern United States, Northeast Europe, and Western Siberia (Figures 4a, 4c, 4e, and 4g). However, the increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ and $f_w$ did not add uncertainty in these regions except in the Eastern United States (Figures 4b, 4d, 4f, and 4h). Although all eight ESMs in CMIP5 and seven ESMs in CMIP6 captured the exponential dependence of $C_{\text{veg}}$ on $f_w$ (all $P < 0.01$; Figures 5a and 5b and Table 3), the parameters in the exponential relationship (i.e., $C_{\text{veg}} = b e^{a f_w}$) between woody biomass fraction and vegetation carbon varied greatly among models. The coefficient $a$ in the exponential function estimated for observations was smaller than that in all ESMs except IPSL-CM5A-LR, ACCESS-ESM 1-5, and CNRM-ESM 2 (Table 3). The coefficients $b$ estimated for all ESMs ranged from $0.42 \times 10^{-6}$ to 0.32, which were smaller than that from the observations except ACCESS-ESM 1-5 (Table 3). The five models that participated in both CMIPs also show divergent $C_{\text{veg}}f_w$ relationship in CMIP5 and CMIP6.
3.3. Relationships of Modeled $C_{\text{veg}}$ to Age

Although the forest age has not been explicitly considered in ESMs, we examined whether they captured the observed age-dependent nonlinear increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ by plotting the modeled $C_{\text{veg}}$ against the GFAD forest age. We found that the CMIP5 and CMIP6 models captured few the nonlinear increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ with forest age in grid cells across the forest region of the Northern Hemisphere (Figure 6). In many cases, the modeled $C_{\text{veg}}$ in CMIP5 and CMIP6 tended to be saturated with forest age (Figures 6a and 6b). Some models showed an increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ at the early stage and then significantly decreased with forest age (Figures 6a and 6b). On the contrary, MIROC-ESM exhibited a linear increase of $C_{\text{veg}}$ with forest age (Figure 6a).

3.4. Comparison of Biomass Allocation Among ESMs

We presented the allocation fractions of biomass in leaves, wood, and roots for each model over 2000–2005 (Figure 7). The results showed large model-to-model differences in wood biomass allocation (from 0.62 in IPSL-CM6A-LR to 0.88 in CNRM-ESM 2), leaf biomass allocation (from 0.008 in CNRM-ESM 2 to 0.13 in NorESM1-M), and root biomass allocation (from 0.06 in IPSL-CM5A-LR to 0.37 in MRI-ESM 1). The four (IPSL-CM5A-LR, MRI-ESM 1, NorESM1-M, and CCSM4) out of five models that participated in both CMIPs show a large disagreement on the woody biomass allocation between the two CMIPs. The CanESM2 in CMIP5 and CanESM5 in CMIP6 showed very similar biomass allocation in leaves, wood, and roots.

4. Discussions

4.1. The Emergent $C_{\text{veg}}f_{\text{w}}$ Relationship in Observations and ESMs

This study detects an age-dependent increase in both of $f_{\text{w}}$ and $C_{\text{veg}}$ (Figure 2) and then constrains an exponential relationship between $f_{\text{w}}$ and $C_{\text{veg}}$ based on the in situ observations (Figure 3). This relationship is different from a previous study which has shown an $S$-type nonlinear correlation between $f_{\text{w}}$ and $C_{\text{veg}}$ based on observations of tree seedlings (Poorter et al., 2015). The exponential relationship found in this study could be partially explained by the changes in biomass allocation at different growth stages (Figure 2b). At the early stage of tree growth, trees increase in size and height to maintain structural support and other physical...
requirements (Niklas, 2004; West et al., 1999). After establishment, wood biomass allocation would continue to increase to support the diameter growth and the more complex crown structures (Phillips et al., 2008; Sillett et al., 2010; Van Pelt & Sillett, 2008). Thus, the exponential increase of $C_{veg}$ with $f_w$ validated in this study is an emergent property driven by multiple mechanisms of C accumulation during forest development. Even without age‐related processes, the ESMs can produce the exponential relationship between $f_w$ and $C_{veg}$. However, such an exponential relationship is divergent among the 15 ESMs (Figure 5). It means that the coefficients of the exponential equation based on observations can be useful in diagnosing the model performance on forest $C_{veg}$. For example, the coefficient $b$ is lower in all ESMs except ACCESS‐ESM‐1‐5 than the observations (Figure 5 inset), indicating that the models systematically underestimated the $C_{veg}$ in low $f_w$. On the contrary, the coefficient $a$ in most ESMs is larger than the observations (Table 3). A higher coefficient $a$ means the rapid increase of $C_{veg}$ with $f_w$ at a specific range of $C_{veg}$. These findings suggest that the exponential relationship between $f_w$ and $C_{veg}$ across space provides an important benchmark for evaluating ESMs in forest carbon cycle.

4.2. The Evaluation on the Simulations of Age Impacts on $C_{veg}$ in ESMs

Based on a compiled forest age data set, either linear or nonlinear relationship between $C_{veg}$ and forest age is detected in the ESMs (Figure 6). The linear increase of $C_{veg}$ with age is simulated by MIROC, which adopts an individual‐based approach to simulate trees establish, competition, and mortality, and enables the large trees to persist for a long time under favorable sunlight conditions (Sato et al., 2007). The nonlinear relationship between $C_{veg}$ and forest age varies among different models (Figures 6a and 6b). The majority of ESMs simulate a saturation of $C_{veg}$ with forest age, while some ESMs simulate a rapid decline of $C_{veg}$ after the early stage of forest development. The observed nonlinear increasing trend of $C_{veg}$ with forest age in this study (Figure 2a) is in line with the new idea in

Table 3

Parameters in the Relationship Between Woody Biomass Fraction and Vegetation Carbon for 14 ESMs and In Situ Observations

|       | $a$            | $b$            | $p$      | $R^2$ |
|-------|----------------|----------------|----------|-------|
| OBS   | 0.05119        | 0.27635        | <0.01    | 0.26  |

CMIP5

| ESM              | $a$            | $b$            | $p$      | $R^2$ |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|-------|
| CanESM2          | 0.0717         | 0.0208         | <0.01    | 0.23  |
| IPSL‐CM5A‐LR     | 0.04353        | 0.11024        | <0.01    | 0.68  |
| MRI‐ESM 1       | 0.15446        | $3.9 \times 10^{-5}$ | <0.01    | 0.89  |
| NorESM1‐M       | 0.13488        | 0.00119        | <0.01    | 0.75  |
| CCSM4           | 0.11733        | $2.8 \times 10^{-3}$ | <0.01    | 0.76  |
| GFDL‐ESM 2G     | 0.1068         | 0.0047         | <0.01    | 0.36  |
| HadGEM‐CC       | 0.07663        | 0.00536        | <0.01    | 0.83  |
| MIROC‐ESM       | 0.22523        | $4.2 \times 10^{-6}$ | <0.01    | 0.85  |

CMIP6

| ESM              | $a$            | $b$            | $p$      | $R^2$ |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|-------|
| CanESM5          | 0.15469        | $2.6 \times 10^{-4}$ | <0.01    | 0.72  |
| IPSL‐CM6A‐LR     | 0.15996        | $2.4 \times 10^{-5}$ | <0.01    | 0.89  |
| MRI‐ESM 2-0      | 0.11876        | $7.8 \times 10^{-4}$ | <0.01    | 0.72  |
| NorESM2‐M        | 0.13272        | $7.6 \times 10^{-3}$ | <0.01    | 0.65  |
| CESM2            | 0.10432        | $6.8 \times 10^{-3}$ | <0.01    | 0.66  |
| ACCESS‐ESM 1‐5   | 0.0447         | 0.3243         | <0.01    | 0.4   |
| CNRM‐ESM 2       | 0.0476         | 0.1133         | <0.01    | 0.1   |
ecology that aging forests keep accumulating carbon (Curtis & Gough, 2018; Stephenson et al., 2014). In addition, the nonlinear relationship between $C_{veg}$ and forest age in some models substantially changes from CMIP5 to CMIP6 (Figures 6a and 6b). For example, the $C_{veg}$ increases at the early stage then rapidly decreases with forest age in MRI-ESM 1 but keeps a relatively low value and saturated with forest age in MRI-ESM 2-0, which could be due to the incorporation of land use changes in MRI-ESM 2-0.

The saturated or decreasing trend in $C_{veg}$ with forest age in ESMs could result from two apparent reasons. First, the vegetation C residence time in most CMIP5 models is shorter than 15 yr at the global scale (Jiang et al., 2015) and is rarely longer than 50 yr in forest regions (Wu et al., 2018). The short vegetation C residence time mainly results from the biased parameterizations of C age in different plant tissues (Cui et al., 2019). Second, the biomass allocation to wood is low in some models (Figure 7), which limits the C storage capacity of vegetation in the models.

4.3. The Important Role of Biomass Allocation in the $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ Relationship

Many allocation schemes have been developed to model the dynamics of C allocation in plants in the past two decades (Franklin et al., 2012). The various allocation schemes have produced widespread biomass allocation fractions among leaves, wood, and roots in current ESMs (Figure 7). In those C allocation schemes, the models use an allometric approach (MRI-ESM 1 and MRI-ESM 2-0; Sitch et al., 2003) and dynamic function of annual NPP (CCSM4 and NorESM1-M; Oleson et al., 2010) that usually simulate less biomass allocation to wood (Figure 7). The modeled low $f_w$ would correspond to a significant declining trend of $C_{veg}$ in the aging forest in CCSM4, MRI-ESM 1, and NorESM1-M (Figure 6a). In contrast, the models based on resource limitations approach (CanESM2 and CanESM5; Arora & Boer, 2005; IPSL-CM5A-LR and IPSL-CM6A-LR, Krinner et al., 2005), plant N decline model (CNRM-ESM 2; Gibelin et al., 2006), and leaf area index (HadGEM2-CC; Clark et al., 2011) can allocate more biomass to the woods (Figure 7). However, a saturation rather than an increase of $C_{veg}$ in aging forest was captured by these models (Figure 6). Such a saturation pattern is consistent with the modeling results in a recent study, which found that the allocations ratios among leaves, woods, and roots only change in young forests (Xia et al., 2019). It also should be noted that some vegetation processes and environmental factors can influence the C allocation patterns. For example, the wood C fraction modeled by IPSL-CM5A-LR in CMIP5 was 0.88 but decreased to 0.62 by IPSL-CM6A-LR in CMIP6, the latter of which has taken consideration.
of the annual evolution of the plant functional type maps (Boucher et al., 2020). The reduced $f_w$ partially explains the different relationships between $C_{veg}$ and forest age in IPSL-CM5A-LR and IPSL-CM6A-LR (Figures 6a and 6b). The environmental factors such as high temperature and drought stress would force a reduction of wood allocation (Zhu et al., 2020).

Although the majority of ESMs have not explicitly represented the age-dependent biomass allocation in their vegetation model, rapid developments have been achieved recently in the offline land-surface models. In vegetation demographic models, the subgrid forest age structure is inherently provided at individual or cohort levels. For example, the CLM (ED) (Fisher et al., 2015), the LPJ-GUESS (Smith, 2001), and the SEIB-DGVM (Sato et al., 2007) have represented the spatial variability of the individual age or individual trees with the same age. In big-leaf or tile-based models, there are two approaches to introduce the subgrid forest age. The first approach is to incorporate a vegetation demographic model, such as the CABLE-POP model (Haverd et al., 2018) by coupling a vegetation demographic model (i.e., POP) to a big-leaf model (i.e., CABLE). The other approach is to increase the number of tiles to represent age structures of different subgrids. For example, the LM3V model uses multiple tiles within each land grid cell to capture the age distribution of vegetation (Shevliakova et al., 2009). A recent version of the ORCHIDEE model (i.e., ORCHIDEE-MICT; Yue et al., 2018) has represented vegetation age structure based on multiple subgrid patches.

### 4.4. Uncertainty and Limitations

Several limitations of this study should be noticed. First, the observations are based on the plot inventories from different studies, so they have inevitable uncertainty from sampling selections, measurement errors, and allometric growth fitting (Cunia, 1965). Second, the distribution of the data used in this study concentrated on China (Figure 1), which may impact the $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ relationship. The forest age for Chinese forests is relatively young (Zhang et al., 2017); thus, only a small proportion of the observations are from old forests (e.g., >140 yr; McDowell et al., 2020) (Figure 2a). Adding more observations from old forests could alter the parameters in the exponential relationship between $C_{veg}$ and $f_w$ as found in this study (i.e., $C_{veg} = be^{a \cdot f_w}$). Third, the historical land use change has been incorporated in most ESMs (Table 1) but natural disturbances are rarely considered. It should be expected to result in smaller forest biomass in ESMs outputs because of the underestimation of C uptake in regrowth forests without considering natural disturbances (Pugh et al., 2019). Ignoring the increased frequency and severity of nature disturbances (e.g., large wildfires and bark beetles) can also lead to an overestimation of vegetation carbon (Seidl et al., 2014). Lastly, it should be noted that the spatial scale mismatch adds uncertainty to the data-model comparison in this study. To reduce such uncertainty, we further weighted the observations to match grid cells. The pattern between the weighted $C_{veg}$ and the gridded forest age data was the same as that of the observation-based (Figure 2a).

### 5. Conclusions

In summary, this study detects an age-dependent nonlinear increase in $C_{veg}$ and $f_w$, and reveals an exponential $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ relationship in observations. The $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ relationship exists but varies greatly in ESMs which participated in CMIP5 and CMIP6. Further analyses provide some important recommendations to ESMs. First, current ESMs need to better capture the observed nonlinear increase of $C_{veg}$ with forest age. Second, the efforts of improving vegetation C allocation in ESMs (De Kauwe et al., 2014; Negrón-Juárez et al., 2015; Song et al., 2017) should take forest age into consideration. Third, global data products of forest age and vegetation C allocation are helpful to constrain the $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ relationship on the global scale. Overall, this study highlights the important role of forest age in estimating vegetation carbon storage and provides an observation-derived $C_{veg}$-$f_w$ relationship to benchmark forest carbon stocks in Earth system models.
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