

# Understanding the effect of disturbance on the carbon dynamics of a managed woodland

Ewan M. Pinnington<sup>1</sup>, Eric Casella<sup>3</sup>, Sarah L. Dance<sup>1,2</sup>, Amos S. Lawless<sup>1,2,4</sup>, James I. L.  
Morison<sup>3</sup>, Nancy K. Nichols<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Matthew Wilkinson<sup>3</sup>, Tristan L. Quaife<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Reading, Reading, UK

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Sustainable Forestry and Climate Change, Forest Research, Alice Holt, Farnham, UK

<sup>4</sup>National Centre for Earth Observation, University of Reading, Reading, UK

## Key Points:

- No change was found in NEE after selective felling
- Data assimilation was used to investigate the effect of this disturbance
- Concurrent reductions in respiration and GPP allow for unchanged NEE

---

Corresponding author: Ewan M. Pinnington, [e.m.pinnington@pgr.reading.ac.uk](mailto:e.m.pinnington@pgr.reading.ac.uk)

## Abstract

The response of forests and terrestrial ecosystems to disturbance is an important process in the global carbon cycle in the context of a changing climate. (1) This study focuses on the effect of selective felling (thinning) at a managed forest site. Previous statistical analyses of eddy covariance data at the study site had found that disturbance from thinning resulted in no significant change to the net carbon uptake of the ecosystem. In order to better understand possible explanations for this observation we use the mathematical technique of data assimilation to combine a diverse set of data with a mathematical model of ecosystem carbon balance. Data assimilation provides a compelling alternative to more common statistical analyses of flux data as it allows for the combination of many different sources of data to find an improved estimate to the state of a system. We develop new observation operators allowing for the assimilation of daytime and nighttime net ecosystem exchange observations with a daily time-step model, increasing observations available by a factor of 4.25. These techniques allow us to estimate the effect of step-changes in ecosystem composition on the parameter and state variables in a modeled estimate of forest carbon balance. These techniques are applicable to other ecosystem models and data assimilation schemes.

Our results support previous analyses, with a predicted net ecosystem carbon uptake for the year 2015 of  $426 \pm 116 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  for the unthinned forest and  $420 \pm 78 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  for the thinned forest despite a model-predicted reduction in gross primary productivity of  $337 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$ . We show that this is likely due to reduced ecosystem respiration post-disturbance compensating for a reduction in gross primary productivity. This supports the theory of an upper limit of forest net carbon uptake due to the magnitude of ecosystem respiration scaling with gross primary productivity.

## 1 Introduction

The response of forests and terrestrial ecosystems to disturbance (e.g. felling, fire, or insect outbreaks) is one of the least understood components in the global carbon cycle [Ciais *et al.*, 2014]. Current land surface models fail to represent the effect of disturbances on long-term carbon dynamics [Running, 2008], although these disturbances could have a significant effect on net land surface carbon uptake. Indeed, there could be significant variations in the effect as the range of forest disturbance can be wide: from stand-replacing disturbance (where tree mortality is close to 100%) to non-stand-replacing dis-

turbance, (where only a proportion of trees are lost). This paper uses data assimilation to improve the modelling of the non-stand-replacing disturbance of selective felling (thinning) on forest carbon dynamics.

Thinning is a silvicultural practice used to improve ecosystem services or the quality of a final tree crop and is globally widespread. The effect of thinning on carbon budgets has largely been ignored [Liu *et al.*, 2011]. Thinning has been shown to increase the basal growth increment of remaining trees due to increased light and water availability [Bréda *et al.*, 1995; Martín-Benito *et al.*, 2010]. Misson *et al.* [2005] found that the immediate effect of thinning can change an ecosystem from a sink to a source of CO<sub>2</sub>, due to reduced gross primary productivity (GPP) following a reduction in total leaf area and unchanged or heightened ecosystem respiration. However, other studies, analysing flux-tower eddy covariance records, find no significant change in the observed net ecosystem exchange (NEE) of CO<sub>2</sub> after thinning [Vesala *et al.*, 2005; Moreaux *et al.*, 2011; Dore *et al.*, 2012; Saunders *et al.*, 2012; Wilkinson *et al.*, 2015]. These studies suggest this is due to increased light availability and reduced competition allowing ground vegetation to display increased GPP and compensate for an increase in heterotrophic respiration post-disturbance.

Other studies have shown a significant reduction in the carbon content of rhizosphere soils following tree felling [Hernesmaa *et al.*, 2005]. It has been shown that tree roots provide a rhizosphere priming effect, greatly increasing the rate of soil organic carbon decomposition [Dijkstra and Cheng, 2007]. This is consistent with previous work carried out at the study site in this paper, where it has been shown that the magnitude of ecosystem respiration is strongly coupled to the magnitude of GPP [Heinemeyer *et al.*, 2012]. Predictions made by Kurz *et al.* [2008] about the impacts of mountain pine beetle outbreaks in Northern American forests suggested a switch from sink to source of carbon following this disturbance. However, the analysis of a diverse set of observations for an area with approximately 70% infested trees by Moore *et al.* [2013] revealed little change in net CO<sub>2</sub> flux, due to concurrent reductions in GPP and ecosystem respiration. Similar results were also found from large scale tree girdling experiments [Högberg *et al.*, 2001], where 1-2 months after girdling a 54% decrease in soil respiration was observed.

Here we used data assimilation, which is a mathematical technique for combining observations with prior model predictions in order to find the best estimate of a dynamical

cal system. Functional ecology models have been combined with many different observations relevant to the carbon balance of forests [Quaife *et al.*, 2008; Fox *et al.*, 2009; Zobitz *et al.*, 2011; Richardson *et al.*, 2010; Zobitz *et al.*, 2014; Niu *et al.*, 2014; Pinnington *et al.*, 2016], leading to improved estimates of model parameter and state variables and reduced uncertainty in model predictions. There have been many efforts to model the effect of disturbance on forest ecosystems [Thornton *et al.*, 2002; Seidl *et al.*, 2011], with a growing number of dynamic global vegetation models [Sitch *et al.*, 2008]. However, the use of data assimilation has been limited to a few examples, all of which used satellite data [Hilker *et al.*, 2009; Kantzas *et al.*, 2015]. The authors are not aware of any studies assimilating site level data to quantify disturbance effects. By assimilating observations relevant to post-disturbance ecosystem carbon dynamics with prior model predictions of ecosystem behaviour, we can analyse the retrieved parameters after data assimilation to find the model predicted effects of disturbance.

In this paper we investigate the effect of thinning on the carbon dynamics of the Alice Holt flux site [Wilkinson *et al.*, 2012], a deciduous managed woodland, following an event in 2014, when one side of the site was thinned and the other side left unmanaged. We present new methods for the assimilation of daytime and nighttime NEE observations with a daily time-step model, in this case the Data Assimilation Linked Ecosystem Carbon (DALEC2) model [Bloom and Williams, 2015]. These methods require no model modification. We combine all available observations for 2015 with prior model predictions to find two sets of optimised model parameter and initial state values, corresponding to thinned and unthinned sides of the forest. We then use these two versions of the model to seek to explain why the net uptake of carbon remains unchanged even after removing a large proportion of the trees from one side. We find a net ecosystem carbon uptake for the year 2015 of  $426 \pm 116 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  for the unthinned forest and  $420 \pm 78 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  for the thinned forest, despite a reduction in GPP of  $337 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  for the thinned forest when compared to the unthinned forest. We find that reduced ecosystem respiration for the thinned forest allows for this unchanged net carbon uptake. The data assimilation techniques presented in this paper could be applied for similar analyses at other sites and provide a novel method to help elucidate the reasons behind ecosystem responses.

## 2 Observation and data assimilation methods

### 2.1 Alice Holt research forest

Alice Holt Forest is a research forest area managed by the UK Forestry Commission located in Hampshire, SE England. Forest Research has been operating a CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurement tower in a portion of the forest, the Straits Inclosure, continuously since 1998. The Straits Inclosure is a 90 ha area of deciduous broadleaved plantation woodland located on a surface water gley soil and has been managed for the past 80 years. The majority of the canopy trees are oak (*Quercus robur* L.), with an understory of hazel (*Corylus avellana* L.) and hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna* Jacq.), but there is a small area of conifers (*Pinus nigra* ssp. *laricio* (Maire) and *P. sylvestris* L.) within the tower measurement footprint area depending on wind direction. Further details of the Straits Inclosure site and the measurement procedures are given in *Wilkinson et al.* [2012], together with analysis of stand-scale 30 minute average net CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (NEE) from 1998-2011.

As part of the management regime, the Straits Inclosure is subject to thinning, whereby a proportion of trees are removed from the canopy in order to reduce competition and improve the quality of the final tree crop. At the Straits an intermediate thinning method is used with a portion of both subdominant and dominant trees being removed from the stand to stimulate the growth of remaining dominant trees [Kerr and Haufe, 2011]. The whole of the stand was thinned in 1995. Subsequently the eastern side of the Straits was thinned in 2007 and then the western side in 2014. The flux tower at the site is situated on the boundary between these two sides. This allows for the use of a footprint model to split the flux record and thus analyse the effect of this disturbance on carbon fluxes at the site. In *Wilkinson et al.* [2015] a statistical analysis of the eddy covariance flux record found that there was no significant effect on the net carbon uptake of the eastern side after thinning in 2007. In this paper we focus on the effect of disturbance on the western side after thinning in 2014. We therefore refer to the western side as “thinned” forest and the eastern side as “unthinned” forest, although the “unthinned” forest was previously thinned in 2007 and so will have a different structure to a completely unmanaged forest.

### 2.2 Observations

In order to assess the effect the 2014 thinning had on the Straits Inclosure, an intensive field campaign was undertaken by the lead author in 2015 to measure leaf area index

and also to estimate standing woody biomass. From the site we also have a long record of flux data, as discussed in section 2.1. These observations span both the thinned and unthinned sides of the forest.


### 2.2.1 Leaf area index

To assess the impact of the 2014 thinning, three transects were established in the Straits Inclosure for intensive sampling during 2015. A total of 435 sampling points were marked at 10 m apart, using a GPS and fluorescent tree spray paint. Measurements of peak LAI (July 2015 - September 2015) were made using both a ceptometer and hemispherical photography. The transects were walked twice with the ceptometer taking readings at every sampling point, giving 870 readings in total. Hemispherical photographs were taken every 50 m as shown in Figure 1, giving 89 photographs in total.

We measured below-canopy Photosynthetically Active Radiation (PAR) using the ceptometer while logging above-canopy PAR using a data logger and PAR sensor positioned outside the canopy. We then estimated LAI using the above-canopy and below-canopy PAR readings [Fassnacht *et al.*, 1994]. For the hemispherical photographs, we used the HemiView software [Rich *et al.*, 1999] which calculates the proportion of visible sky as a function of sky direction (gap fraction) which it then uses to calculate LAI [Jonckheere *et al.*, 2004].

Six litter traps were also established at points along the transects (positions shown in Figure 1) allowing for comparison with the other methods. These were sampled throughout the leaf-fall season in 2015. We found the LAI derived from the litter traps was always greater than LAI estimated from optical methods, as expected [Bréda, 2003]. From the sampling of the litter traps we also have estimates of leaf mass per leaf area for use in data assimilation. As the 6 litter traps are not enough to describe the LAI for the research site [Kimmings, 1973], we used estimates from the ceptometer and hemispherical photographs for data assimilation. We took the weighted average (dependent on number of observations taken of each type) of the hemispherical photograph and ceptometer estimated LAI and derived an LAI of 4.42 with a standard error of 0.07 for the eastern unthinned forest, and an LAI of 3.06 with a standard error of 0.07 for the western thinned forest. We assimilated the mean of 299 LAI observations in the unthinned and 225 in the thinned section of forest. Consequently the appropriate representation of error for data as-

simulation is the standard error of the mean. From our litter trap observations we find a leaf mass per area of  $29 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$  free soluble carbohydrates for both sides of the forest.



**Figure 1.** LAI derived from hemispherical photographs for the Straits Inclosure at 50m intervals along three transects.

### 2.2.2 Woody biomass

The method of Point-Centred Quarters (PCQ) was used to conduct a biomass survey as specified in *Dahdouh-Guebas and Koedam* [2006]. Along the three transects 114 points were sampled measuring the Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) and the density of trees. We then used allometric relationships between DBH and total above ground biomass and coarse root biomass, found in work carried out by Forest Research and in *McKay et al.* [2003], to find an estimate of total woody and coarse root carbon (referred to as  $C_{woo}$  in the DALEC2 model). These observations are shown in table 1.

Forest Research have carried out their own mensuration studies at the site. One such study of the western thinned forest (at a similar time to our own PCQ measurements) found a tree density of  $225 \text{ ha}^{-1}$  and an average DBH of 32 cm, which are in close agreement to the estimates in table 1. This gives us confidence that earlier measurements taken by Forest Research before the thinning are representative of the methods we have used. Measurements of the same section of forest from 2009 found a tree density of  $418 \text{ ha}^{-1}$

and an average DBH of 28 cm. This suggests that approximately 46% of trees have been removed during the 2014 thinning. From these estimates we can also see the effect thinning has on the type of trees found at the site. The trees per hectare has dropped dramatically after thinning but the mean DBH has increased, because the smaller subdominant trees have been removed. The greater mean DBH of the eastern unthinned section, 34 cm, indicates that the thinning that took place in 2007 has allowed the dominant trees to grow as a result of reduced competition.

**Table 1.** Point-centred quarter method observations for 2015.

Sector	Tree density (ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean DBH (cm)	Estimated woody biomass and coarse root carbon (g C m <sup>-2</sup> )
Unthinned (E)	272	34.12	13130
Thinned (W)	225	32.85	9908

### 2.2.3 Flux tower eddy covariance

The Straits Inclosure flux tower provides half-hourly observations from January 1999 to December 2015. These consist of the NEE fluxes and meteorological driving data of temperature, irradiance and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration for use in the DALEC2 model. The NEE data was subject to  $u^*$  filtering (with a value of 0.2 m s<sup>-1</sup>), where data corresponding to low friction velocity values were removed from the data set, and quality control procedures as described by *Papale et al.* [2006], but was not gap-filled. The resultant half-hourly NEE dataset was then split between observations corresponding to the western thinned and eastern unthinned sides of the site using a flux-footprint model. This model is dependent on wind speed and direction to calculate the location that the flux tower is sampling. Partitioning the NEE data set in this way reduces the total number of available NEE observations, see *Wilkinson et al.* [2015] for more details.

To match the time-step of our model we computed daily NEE observations by taking the mean over the 48 measurements made each day, selecting only days where there is no missing data. As we have been strict on the quality control of the flux record and not used any gap filling, this presented a problem in terms of the number of daily NEE



observations available. By further splitting the flux record between two sides we retrieved very few total daily observations of NEE for either side. In order to address this we computed day and nighttime NEE fluxes ( $NEE_{day}$  and  $NEE_{night}$  respectively) for use in data assimilation. We used a solar model to define whether NEE measurements were made at daytime or nighttime. We then took the mean over the half-hourly day or nighttime measurements, again only taking periods where there were no gaps in the data so that we were only considering true observations. This provided us with many more observations of NEE for assimilation, as seen in table 2. Because we are averaging over shorter time periods we have a smaller probability of gaps and erroneous data. We see that we have more daytime NEE observations than nighttime, as we tend to have much more turbulent air mixing in daylight hours. In section 2.3.2 we give details of how we relate these twice daily observations of NEE to a daily time-step model.

**Table 2.** Number of observations of NEE,  $NEE_{day}$  and  $NEE_{night}$  for East and West sides of the Straits Inclosure for the year 2015.

Sector	NEE	$NEE_{day}$	$NEE_{night}$
Unthinned (E)	22	60	42
Thinned (W)	26	54	48


The errors in observations of daily NEE were assumed to be constant and set at  $0.5 \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$  by *Williams et al.* [2005], whereas *Braswell et al.* [2005] found these errors to be closer to  $1 \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$ . A more recent study finds a mean value of  $0.8 \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$  for NEE flux errors [Post et al., 2015]. However, *Richardson et al.* [2008] show that flux errors are heteroscedastic. To account for the heteroscedastic nature of NEE errors we define an error function that scales between  $0.5$  to  $1 \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$  based on the magnitude of the observation. This function is defined as  $0.5 + 0.04|NEE_{day}^i| \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$ , where  $|NEE_{day}^i|$  is the magnitude of the daytime NEE observation, this function is derived by considering the maximum and minimum  $|NEE_{day}^i|$  values. *Raupach et al.* [2005] comment that nighttime measurements of NEE are much more uncertain than daytime measurements. This is difficult to quantify, but here we assume that nighttime flux errors are 3 times the magnitude of daytime errors. We therefore have the error function of  $1.5 + 0.12|NEE_{night}^i| \text{ g C m}^{-2}\text{day}^{-1}$ , where  $|NEE_{night}^i|$  is the magnitude of the nighttime

NEE observation. We also include correlations in time between the errors in our observations of NEE, as discussed in *Pinnington et al.* [2016].

## 2.3 Model and data assimilation

### 2.3.1 DALEC2 ecosystem carbon model

The DALEC2 model is a simple process-based model describing the carbon dynamics of a forest ecosystem [Bloom and Williams, 2015]. The model is constructed of six carbon pools (labile ( $C_{lab}$ ), foliage ( $C_{fol}$ ), fine roots ( $C_{roo}$ ), woody stems and coarse roots ( $C_{woo}$ ), fresh leaf and fine root litter ( $C_{lit}$ ) and soil organic matter and coarse woody debris ( $C_{som}$ )) linked via fluxes. The aggregated canopy model (ACM) [Williams et al., 1997] is used to calculate daily gross primary production ( $GPP$ ) of the forest, taking meteorological driving data and the modeled leaf area index (a function of  $C_{fol}$ ) as arguments. Figure 2 shows a schematic of how the carbon pools are linked in DALEC2; full model equations can be found in the appendix, section A.1.



**Figure 2.** Representation of the fluxes in the DALEC2 carbon balance model. Green arrows represent C allocation, purple arrows represent litter fall and decomposition fluxes, blue arrows represent respiration fluxes and the red arrow represents the influence of leaf area index in the  $GPP$  function.

### 2.3.2 Data assimilation

We implement Four-Dimensional Variational data assimilation (4D-Var) with the DALEC2 model for joint parameter and state estimation [Navon, 1998]. In 4D-Var we aim to find the parameter and initial state values such that the model trajectory best fits the data over some time window, given some prior information about the system. This prior

information takes the form of an initial estimate of the parameter and state variables of the model,  $\mathbf{x}^b$ , valid at the initial time. This prior is assumed to have unbiased, Gaussian errors with known covariance matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ . Adding the prior term ensures that our problem is well posed and that we can find a locally unique solution [Tremolet, 2006]. We aim to find the parameter and initial state values that minimise the weighted squared distance to the prior and the weighted squared distance of the model trajectory to the observations, over a time window of length  $N$ , with individual time points  $t_0, \dots, t_N$ . We do this by finding the state  $\mathbf{x}^a$  at time  $t_0$  that minimises the cost function

$$J(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^b)^T \mathbf{B}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^b) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^N (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{h}_i(\mathbf{x}_i))^T \mathbf{R}_i^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{h}_i(\mathbf{x}_i)), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is the vector of parameter and initial state values to be optimised,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the vector of model variables at time  $t_i$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_i$  is the observation operator mapping the parameter and state values to the observations,  $\mathbf{y}_i$  is the vector of observations at time  $t_i$  and  $\mathbf{R}_i$  is the observation error covariance matrix. The time step,  $i$ , is 1 day in this case. Further details of the implemented data assimilation scheme and specification of prior and observational errors can be found in Pinnington *et al.* [2016].

In this paper we assimilate day and nighttime NEE in order to increase the number of observations available to us and also better partition our modeled estimate of GPP and total ecosystem respiration. As the DALEC2 model runs at a daily time step, this requires us to relate the daily parameter and state values from the model to the twice-daily observations of NEE. We do this by writing two new observation operators, one relating the model state and parameters to daytime NEE, and the other to nighttime NEE. The NEE of  $\text{CO}_2$  at any given time is the difference between GPP and ecosystem respiration. For an observation of total daily NEE on day  $i$  we have,

$$NEE^i = -GPP^i(C_{fol}^i, \Psi) + f_{auto}GPP^i(C_{fol}^i, \Psi) + \theta_{lit}C_{lit}^i e^{\Theta T^i} + \theta_{som}C_{som}^i e^{\Theta T^i}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Psi$  represents meteorological driving data used in the calculation of GPP,  $f_{auto}$  is the fraction of autotrophic respiration,  $\theta_{lit}$  is the litter carbon turnover rate,  $\theta_{som}$  is the soil and organic carbon turnover rate,  $\Theta$  is the temperature dependence exponent factor and  $T^i$  is the mean temperature over 24 hours. Further description can be found in the appendix section A.1. The first term in equation (2) represents gross primary productivity, the second autotrophic respiration and the third and fourth terms heterotrophic respiration.

For total daytime NEE we have,

$$NEE_{day}^i = -GPP^i(C_{fol}^i, \Psi) + \delta_{day} f_{auto} GPP^i(C_{fol}^i, \Psi) + \delta_{day} \theta_{lit} C_{lit}^i e^{\Theta T_{day}^i} + \delta_{day} \theta_{som} C_{som}^i e^{\Theta T_{day}^i} \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta_{day}$  is  $\frac{\text{number of daylight hours}}{24}$ , and  $T_{day}^i$  is the mean temperature over daylight hours. Here we still have the same term for GPP as in equation (2) as all photosynthesis occurs during daylight hours. We have made the assumption that respiration is spread uniformly in time; therefore the respiration terms are scaled by the fraction of daylight hours. For nighttime NEE we have,

$$NEE_{night}^i = \delta_{night} f_{auto} GPP^i(C_{fol}^i, \Psi) + \delta_{night} \theta_{lit} C_{lit}^i e^{\Theta T_{night}^i} + \delta_{night} \theta_{som} C_{som}^i e^{\Theta T_{night}^i} \quad (4)$$

where  $\delta_{night}$  is  $\frac{\text{number of night hours}}{24}$ , and  $T_{night}^i$  is the mean nighttime temperature. In equation (2) we do not have a term for GPP as no GPP will occur during the night. The respiration is here scaled by the fraction of nighttime hours. The length of day and night are calculated using a solar model.

These new observation operators allow for assimilation of day/nighttime NEE without the need for altering the model and can be applied to other ecosystem models to allow for the assimilation of eddy covariance data at a finer temporal resolution.

## 2.4 Experimental setup

In order to assess the information content of the three available data streams (described in section 2.2) and their impact on the effect of disturbance as predicted by the model, we conducted a data denial procedure. This involved assimilating different combinations of observations, in three experiments, as shown in table 3. In our first experiment we used only the eddy covariance data, as this is the data type most commonly used in data assimilation studies. In the second we added the observations relating to leaf mass and area and finally in the third experiment we added the observations of woody biomass, as NEE observations have been shown to be unable to constrain this [Fox *et al.*, 2009]. In each experiment we used the prior model as specified in the appendix in table A.1. This prior model was found by assimilating daytime and nighttime NEE, leaf mass per area and LAI observations from 2012 and 2013 before the thinning occurred. More information on the methods used to find this prior model can be found in Pinnington *et al.* [2016].

In each experiment we ran the assimilation for both the thinned forest and the unthinned forest, using the distinct data for each side. This allowed us to retrieve a unique set of parameter and initial state values for each section of forest. We analysed the optimised parameter and initial state values for the thinned and unthinned forest and also the model predictions of different variables for each side post-disturbance. This allowed us to judge the effect the thinning in 2014 had on the carbon dynamics of the forest in 2015.

**Table 3.** Combination of observations used in data assimilation experiments.

Experiment	NEE	LAI & leaf mass per area	$C_{woo}$
A	×		
B	×	×	
C	×	×	×

It would be expected that we will retrieve different estimates for each of the experiments outlined in table 3, with our most confident estimate being when all observations types are assimilated together in experiment C. This would allow us to see how much information each data stream provides and assess whether NEE data alone is enough to understand the effect of disturbance.

### 3 Results

In Figure 3 and 4 we show the observations and model trajectories after assimilation for the thinned and unthinned forest for experiments A and C respectively. We can see that the model fits all the assimilated observations well after assimilation for both experiments. [This can also be seen by the reductions in root-mean-square error compared to the prior in table 4.](#) We have confidence in our results as we have demonstrated previously that assimilating a single year of data can accurately forecast the carbon uptake of the site for a long time period (15 years) [Pinnington *et al.*, 2016]. From Figure 3a and 3b we see that the modified observation operators presented in section 2.3.2 have allowed our model to represent both daytime and nighttime NEE well.


In experiment A we have only assimilated NEE observations. From table 4 we can see that we improve the fit to the assimilated observations for both the unthinned and

thinned forest when compared to the prior model. The root-mean-square error (RMSE) is within the specified observation error for both daytime and nighttime NEE after assimilation. By only assimilating observations of NEE we have not been able to accurately predict LAI. Although we have improved the fit of the model to LAI after assimilation for the thinned forest (see table 4), we have significantly degraded the fit of the model to LAI for the unthinned forest. Partitioning the NEE dataset between the thinned and unthinned forest (as described in section 2.2.3) has resulted in a gap in the observations for the unthinned forest during the period of greatest carbon uptake (June 2015 - August 2015), see Figure 3a. This is due to the prevailing wind in this period being from the south-west. The gap in the NEE dataset when observations would have been of highest magnitude causes our model to under-predict the carbon uptake for the unthinned forest. This bias introduced into the NEE dataset for the unthinned forest results in a [significant](#) under-prediction of LAI, as seen in Figure 3c. From Figure 3d and table 4 we can see that NEE observations alone do not give us enough information to recover a value of  $C_{wo}$  with the DALEC2 model. This is also found in previous work [*Fox et al.*, 2009].

In experiment B we have assimilated observations of NEE, LAI and leaf mass per area. From table 4 we see that including the extra observations have allowed the model to fit LAI well for both the unthinned and thinned forest, and although the fit of the model to the NEE observations is slightly degraded [compared to experiment A](#), it is still well within the specified observation error from section 2.2.3. We also see that including these extra observations still does not allow us to recover an accurate value of  $C_{wo}$ .


In experiment C we assimilate all available observations. This gives us very similar results as in experiment B, except that including the observations of  $C_{wo}$  in the assimilation allows the model to fit this observation well, as seen in table 4. We see from Figure 4a and 4c that including observations of LAI in the assimilation removes the bias introduced from the partitioning of the NEE observations between the unthinned and thinned forest. The distinct difference in stand structure is now clear in Figure 4, with reduced LAI and woody carbon for the thinned forest. For experiment C the time of senescence in LAI predicted by the model is consistent with phenocam observations made by Forest Research at the site, as shown in the supplementary material (Figure S12). However, the time of green-up in LAI predicted by the model is later than the phenocam observations. We hypothesise that this is due to the model predicting the photosynthetically effective LAI implicitly rather than the LAI related to canopy green index measured by the pheno-

cam, which will show present LAI before new leaves become competent at photosynthesis  
[Reich *et al.*, 1991; Morecroft *et al.*, 2003].



**Figure 3.** Experiment A: 2015 unthinned and thinned forest observations and model trajectories after assimilation. Blue line: model trajectory after assimilation of unthinned data, blue shading: uncertainty in model trajectory after assimilation ( $\pm 1$  standard deviation), blue dots: unthinned observations with error bars, orange line: model trajectory after assimilation of thinned data, orange shading: uncertainty in model trajectory after assimilation ( $\pm 1$  standard deviation), orange dots: thinned observations with error bars.

Table 5 shows the cumulative annual fluxes for the year 2015 for the three experiments. In all three experiments there is no significant difference between the net carbon uptake for the thinned and unthinned forest. We can see that both experiments B and C predict very similar cumulative fluxes, suggesting that the assimilated observations of  $C_{woo}$  have not had much impact on the model carbon dynamics for this time period. Because the rate parameters controlling this pool are relatively slow it is likely that observations of  $C_{woo}$  will become much more important over longer time-scales. Here we have only assimilated a single observation of  $C_{woo}$  for either side of the forest; if multiple observations of  $C_{woo}$  were available throughout time this would give us an estimate of the rate of woody biomass accumulation, providing an important constraint on the carbon as-



**Figure 4.** Experiment C: 2015 unthinned and thinned forest observations and model trajectories after as-  
simulation. Colour, lines and dots have the same meaning as described in Figure 3. Figure c) and d) now also  
include observations of LAI and  $C_{woo}$  (dots).

simulation of the forest. Experiments A and C both predict no significant difference in the net ecosystem carbon uptake between the thinned and unthinned forest. However, the partitioning of this carbon uptake between GPP and total ecosystem respiration (TER) is significantly different, with experiment A predicting increased TER and GPP after thinning and experiment C predicting reduced TER and GPP after thinning. This can be seen more clearly in Figure 5. The difference between the results of experiment A and C highlights the issue that NEE is the difference between two large fluxes ( $NEE = -GPP + TER$ ) and we can therefore find an accurate prediction of NEE despite under/overestimating both GPP and TER. Therefore, care should be taken when interpreting model results based solely on NEE data, especially in this case, as we have seen that the partitioning of the NEE data between the thinned and unthinned forest has introduced a bias into our dataset. If we were to base our analysis on experiment A we would assume that the thinning had caused an increase in ecosystem respiration and that this had been compensated for by an



**Table 4.** Root-mean-square error of model fit to observations for the prior model and all experiments after data assimilation.

Unthinned forest				
Exp.	NEE <sub>day</sub>	NEE <sub>night</sub>	LAI	C <sub>woo</sub>
Prior	1.25 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	1.02 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.43	5507 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
A	0.61 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.83 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	2.16	6361 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
B	0.75 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.93 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.04	5987 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
C	0.75 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.93 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.04	0.16 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
Thinned forest				
Exp.	NEE <sub>day</sub>	NEE <sub>night</sub>	LAI	C <sub>woo</sub>
Prior	1.05 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.61 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	1.79	2285 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
A	0.63 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.54 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.55	2505 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
B	0.63 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.56 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.04	2241 g C m <sup>-2</sup>
C	0.63 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.56 g C m <sup>-2</sup> day <sup>-1</sup>	0.04	0.07 g C m <sup>-2</sup>

increase in GPP. This is the opposite conclusion to the one we find in experiment C when we include observations relating to the structure of the forest.


In Figure 6 we show the partitioning of cumulative ecosystem respiration for the year 2015 between total autotrophic respiration and heterotrophic respiration from litter and soil for both the unthinned and thinned forest in experiment C. Here we can see the strong dependence of autotrophic respiration on GPP with the growth rate being much greater between June 2015 - September 2015 (when GPP will be of greater magnitude). For heterotrophic respiration the growth rate is more constant throughout the whole year. Total ecosystem respiration is reduced by 331 g C m<sup>-2</sup> for the thinned forest when compared to the unthinned forest, with reductions in both heterotrophic and autotrophic respiration of 169 g C m<sup>-2</sup> and 162 g C m<sup>-2</sup> respectively.

Figure 7 shows the change in parameter and initial state values for the thinned and unthinned forest after assimilating all observations in experiment C. It is important to note

**Table 5.** Total annual fluxes and standard deviations for 2015 after assimilation ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ ).


Unthinned forest			
Flux	Experiment A	Experiment B	Experiment C
NEE	$-379 \pm 99$	$-425 \pm 113$	$-426 \pm 116$
GPP	$1648 \pm 159$	$2191 \pm 87$	$2193 \pm 83$
TER	$1267 \pm 150$	$1766 \pm 146$	$1767 \pm 146$
Thinned forest			
Flux	Experiment A	Experiment B	Experiment C
NEE	$-394 \pm 81$	$-421 \pm 73$	$-420 \pm 78$
GPP	$1976 \pm 112$	$1855 \pm 75$	$1856 \pm 80$
TER	$1582 \pm 134$	$1435 \pm 100$	$1436 \pm 109$

that this is the difference when compared to our prior model estimate, which was found by assimilating only eddy covariance, LAI and leaf mass per area observations from 2012 and 2013. We therefore expect changes in parameter and state values for both the thinned and unthinned forest, as we are assimilating new data streams. This is particularly noticeable in the carbon pool state variables in Figure 7. Constraints on the carbon pool state variables are provided by the assimilated observations of woody biomass and coarse roots ( $C_{woo}$ ), LAI and leaf mass per area ( $c_{lma}$ ). LAI and  $c_{lma}$  give us a constraint on foliar carbon ( $C_{fol}$ ) as  $\text{LAI} = \frac{C_{fol}}{c_{lma}}$ . We can see the values for the model predicted carbon pools are as we might expect with the thinned forest having less carbon in all pools when compared to the unthinned forest. For litter carbon ( $C_{lit}$ ) we expect a reduction in input of leaf litter for the thinned forest and, although there might be increased woody debris after thinning, this is much less readily decomposed and so possibly has little impact in the year after thinning [Wilkinson *et al.*, 2016]. The difference in predicted soil carbon content ( $C_{som}$ ) between the thinned and unthinned forest is consistent with studies analysing soil carbon contents after felling [Hernesmaa *et al.*, 2005]. For the parameters the biggest changes appear to be in the litter carbon turnover rate parameter ( $\theta_{lit}$ ), with the retrieved parameter being significantly reduced for the unthinned forest when com-




**Figure 5.** Experiment A & C: 2015 unthinned and thinned forest model trajectories for cumulative fluxes after assimilation. Solid line: cumulative NEE, dotted line: cumulative ecosystem respiration, dashed line: cumulative GPP. Colour and shading has the same meaning as in Figure 3.

pared to the thinned. However, we still see reduced total litter respiration in Figure 6 for the thinned forest compared to the unthinned forest. This is due to the significant difference in litter carbon content ( $C_{lit}$ ) for both sides, with the unthinned forest having a much higher litter carbon content than the thinned forest. The large change in the  $\theta_{lit}$  parameter between the two sides is therefore compensating for an overestimated difference in litter carbon content between the two sides.



**Figure 6.** Experiment C: 2015 unthinned and thinned forest model trajectory for cumulative total ecosystem respiration after assimilation and its partitioning between total autotrophic respiration and heterotrophic respiration from litter and soil.



**Figure 7.** Experiment C: normalised change in parameter and state variables after data assimilation ( $\frac{(\mathbf{x}^a(j) - \mathbf{x}^b(j))}{\mathbf{x}^b(j)}$ ) for the unthinned and thinned forest. Explanation of parameter and state variable symbols in table A.1.

## 4 Discussion

In this paper we have investigated the possible explanations for the observation that a thinning event, where approximately 46% of trees were removed from the study site, had no impact on net ecosystem carbon uptake. We used data assimilation to combine observations and prior model predictions of ecosystem carbon balance in order to understand how the state of an ecosystem might be altered after a disturbance event. We conducted three experiments assimilating different combinations of available data streams. For all experiments we find no significant change in net carbon uptake for the studied ecosystem following stand thinning. This is consistent with other studies of ecosystem carbon dynamics following thinning [Vesala *et al.*, 2005; Moreaux *et al.*, 2011; Dore *et al.*, 2012; Wilkinson *et al.*, 2016]. We find different reasons for this unchanged carbon uptake dependent on which data streams are assimilated. When only assimilating NEE observations we find increased ecosystem respiration and increased GPP post-disturbance. These results are unreliable due to bias introduced into the NEE dataset from partitioning between the thinned and unthinned forest. From our most confident estimate, where all available observations are assimilated, the model shows that reductions in GPP, following a decrease in total leaf area post-thinning, are being offset by simultaneous reductions in ecosystem respiration. This is in contrast to current suggestions that reduced canopy photosynthesis is compensated for by increased GPP by ground vegetation post-thinning [Vesala *et al.*, 2005; Moreaux *et al.*, 2011; Dore *et al.*, 2012; Wilkinson *et al.*, 2016].

Our results show a decrease in both autotrophic and heterotrophic respirations following thinning. We follow the definition of Heinemeyer *et al.* [2012] and characterise below ground autotrophic respiration as respiration from roots, mycorrhizal fungi and other micro-organisms dependent on the priming of soils with labile carbon compounds from roots. Heterotrophic respiration is respiration by microbes not directly dependent on autotrophic substrate; however, the largest fraction of heterotrophic respiration is based on the decomposition of young organic matter (e.g. leaves and fine roots) whose availability also depends on the GPP of an ecosystem [Janssens *et al.*, 2001]. We find similar decreases in both heterotrophic and autotrophic respiration for the thinned forest when compared with the unthinned forest. While it has been shown that heterotrophic respiration can decrease after disturbance events [Bhupinderpal *et al.*, 2003], it is possible we overestimate the reduction in heterotrophic respiration and underestimate the reduction in autotrophic respiration. This is understandable as we have assimilated no data on this

partitioning. Also our model description of autotrophic respiration is simple (described as a constant fraction of GPP) and therefore the heterotrophic respiration component of the model might compensate and in this instance describe the behaviour of mycorrhizal fungi and other microbes commonly categorised in the autotrophic component of respiration.

In a study measuring soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes over 4 years at the Straits Inclosure (the study site in this paper) *Heinemeyer et al.* [2012] showed a large 56% contribution of autotrophic respiration (characterised as root and mycorrhizal respiration) to total measured soil respiration. *Heinemeyer et al.* [2012] also suggested that mycorrhizal fungi play a role in priming the turnover of soil organic carbon by other microbes, with evidence from *Talbot et al.* [2008]. *Högberg and Read* [2006] find similar figures for the autotrophic contribution to total soil respiration, with around half or more of all soil respiration being driven by recent photosynthesis. *Heinemeyer et al.* [2012] discuss the possibility of this tight coupling between GPP and ecosystem respiration leading to an upper limit for forest CO<sub>2</sub> uptake due to increased GPP leading to increased respiration, which is also discussed by *Heath et al.* [2005]. Our results support this hypothesis, as ecosystem respiration scales with GPP after approximately 46% of trees are removed from the study site, meaning that we find no significant change in net ecosystem carbon uptake after thinning.

Studies analysing eddy covariance flux records also find no significant change in the net ecosystem exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> after thinning [*Vesala et al.*, 2005; *Moreaux et al.*, 2011; *Dore et al.*, 2012; *Wilkinson et al.*, 2016]. (4) *Vesala et al.* [2005] used a model of light interception and ground vegetation photosynthesis to show that the unchanged NEE was due to increased GPP by ground vegetation (following increased light availability and reduced competition) compensating for increases in heterotrophic respiration and reduced canopy photosynthesis post-thinning. Similar conclusions are drawn in *Moreaux et al.* [2011] by destructively sampling ground vegetation and showing an increase in biomass post-thinning. We do not find evidence to support such conclusions and instead suggest that reduced ecosystem respiration is the most important component for the unchanged NEE of the forest following thinning. However, it is important to note that our measurements of LAI are made at approximately 1 m above the forest floor, which means that our measurements of LAI do not account for ground vegetation. Therefore, any effect of this ground vegetation is not simulated by our model. Despite this, observations made during multiple walks of the three established transects find no evidence of increased ground vegetation in the year after thinning. In fact much of the ground vegetation and subcanopy

was removed during thinning and did not appear to have recovered in the following year. At longer time-scales re-growth of the subcanopy and ground vegetation will play an important role in increased productivity. Our results suggest that this increased productivity would also be met with subsequent increases in ecosystem respiration.

Data assimilation provides a valuable alternative to more common statistical analyses of flux data records to calculate constituent ecosystem carbon fluxes, as it allows for the combination of many distinct data streams and the dynamics of a physically meaningful model to construct our solution. We have shown that basing our results on a single data stream (NEE) can give us much different conclusions than when all data streams are assimilated. In this work we have been strict on the quality control procedures for NEE data, and have allowed no gap filling, to ensure we base our results on only the best quality true observations. This and the partitioning of the NEE data set between the thinned and unthinned areas of forest has resulted in a distinct data gap during the growing season for the thinned site NEE, as discussed in section 3. From the data assimilation experiments conducted we have shown that the combination of multiple distinct data streams has helped to reduce the impact of this data gap on assimilation results.

The effect of disturbance is poorly characterised in current land surface and global climate models [Running, 2008]; it is important to better understand how parameters and carbon pools might change following disturbance. DALEC2 and many other ecosystem models assume that respiration rates are proportional to carbon pool size. It has been suggested that although this assumption works well in equilibrium conditions it may not allow such models to predict ecosystem carbon dynamics following disturbance [Schimel and Weintraub, 2003]. The data assimilation techniques in this paper present a way for these simple models to cope with step changes in ecosystem behaviour, by allowing parameters and carbon pools to be updated following disturbance events.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work we have presented novel methods for understanding ecosystem responses to disturbance by using data assimilation. Assimilating all available data streams after an event of disturbance with a prior model prediction allows us to assess changes to model parameter and state variables due to this disturbance. We have also created modified observation operators to allow for the assimilation of daytime and nighttime NEE

observations with a daily time-step model. This negated the need for model modification and increased the number of observations by a factor of 4.25.

Our modeled estimates show no significant change in net ecosystem carbon uptake after a thinning event in 2014 where approximately 46% of trees were removed from the studied area. Similar results were also found following a thinning activity in 2007 [Wilkinson *et al.*, 2016]. From our optimised model we find that reduced ecosystem respiration is the main reason for this unchanged net ecosystem carbon uptake. Therefore, even for a decrease in GPP following thinning, there is no significant change in NEE. We hypothesise this reduction in ecosystem respiration is due to reduced input of autotrophic substrate following thinning, meaning both autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration are reduced. These results support work suggesting that GPP is the dominant driver for ecosystem respiration [Janssens *et al.*, 2001; Bhupinderpal *et al.*, 2003; Höglberg and Read, 2006; Heinemeyer *et al.*, 2012; Moore *et al.*, 2013]. This has implications for future predictions of land surface carbon uptake and whether forests will continue to sequester atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> at similar rates, or if they will be limited by increased GPP leading to increased respiration.

## A: Appendix

### A.1 DALEC2 equations

The model equations for the carbon pools at day  $i$  are as follows:

$$GPP^i = ACM(C_{fol}^{i-1}, c_{lma}, c_{eff}, \Psi) \quad (A.1)$$

$$C_{lab}^i = C_{lab}^{i-1} + (1 - f_{auto})(1 - f_{fol})f_{lab}GPP^i - \Phi_{on}C_{lab}^{i-1}, \quad (A.2)$$

$$C_{fol}^i = C_{fol}^{i-1} + \Phi_{on}C_{lab}^{i-1} + (1 - f_{auto})f_{fol}GPP^i - \Phi_{off}C_{fol}^{i-1}, \quad (A.3)$$

$$C_{roo}^i = C_{roo}^{i-1} + (1 - f_{auto})(1 - f_{fol})(1 - f_{lab})f_{roo}GPP^i - \theta_{roo}C_{roo}^{i-1}, \quad (A.4)$$

$$C_{woo}^i = C_{woo}^{i-1} + (1 - f_{auto})(1 - f_{fol})(1 - f_{lab})(1 - f_{roo})GPP^i - \theta_{woo}C_{woo}^{i-1}, \quad (A.5)$$

$$C_{lit}^i = C_{lit}^{i-1} + \theta_{roo}C_{roo}^{i-1} + \Phi_{off}C_{fol}^{i-1} - (\theta_{lit} + \theta_{min})e^{\Theta T^{i-1}}C_{lit}^{i-1}, \quad (A.6)$$

$$C_{som}^i = C_{som}^{i-1} + \theta_{woo}C_{woo}^{i-1} + \theta_{min}e^{\Theta T^{i-1}}C_{lit}^{i-1} - \theta_{som}e^{\Theta T^{i-1}}C_{som}^{i-1}, \quad (A.7)$$

where  $T^{i-1}$  is the daily mean temperature,  $\Psi$  represents the meteorological driving data used in the  $GPP$  function and  $\Phi_{on}/\Phi_{off}$  are functions controlling leaf-on and leaf-off. Descriptions for each model parameter used in equations (A.1) to (A.7) are included in table A.1. DALEC2 can be parameterised for both deciduous and evergreen sites with  $\Phi_{on}$



and  $\Phi_{off}$  being able to reproduce the phenology of either type of site. The full details of this version of DALEC can be found in *Bloom and Williams* [2015].

**Table A.1.** Parameter values and standard deviations for prior vector used in experiments.

Parameter	Description	Prior estimate ( $\mathbf{x}^p$ )	Standard deviation	Range
$\theta_{min}$	Litter mineralisation rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$5.471 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.828 \times 10^{-7}$	$10^{-5} - 10^{-2}$
$f_{auto}$	Autotrophic respiration fraction	$4.492 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.814 \times 10^{-4}$	0.3 – 0.7
$f_{fol}$	Fraction of GPP allocated to foliage	$4.091 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.211 \times 10^{-4}$	0.01 – 0.5
$f_{roo}$	Fraction of GPP allocated to fine roots	$3.700 \times 10^{-1}$	$3.389 \times 10^{-3}$	0.01 – 0.5
$c_{lspan}$	Determines annual leaf loss fraction	$1.089 \times 10^0$	$2.777 \times 10^{-3}$	1.0001 – 10
$\theta_{woo}$	Woody carbon turnover rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$1.012 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.040 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-5} - 10^{-3}$
$\theta_{roo}$	Fine root carbon turnover rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$5.411 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.353 \times 10^{-6}$	$10^{-4} - 10^{-2}$
$\theta_{lit}$	Litter carbon turnover rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$4.387 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.825 \times 10^{-6}$	$10^{-4} - 10^{-2}$
$\theta_{som}$	Soil and organic carbon turnover rate ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$1.311 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.705 \times 10^{-9}$	$10^{-7} - 10^{-3}$
$\Theta$	Temperature dependance exponent factor	$9.354 \times 10^{-2}$	$6.810 \times 10^{-5}$	0.018 – 0.08
$c_{eff}$	Canopy efficiency parameter	$5.618 \times 10^1$	$6.676 \times 10^0$	10 – 100
$d_{onset}$	Leaf onset day (day)	$1.584 \times 10^2$	$1.370 \times 10^1$	1 – 365
$f_{lab}$	Fraction of GPP allocated to labile carbon pool	$7.927 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.491 \times 10^{-4}$	0.01 – 0.5
$c_{ronset}$	Labile carbon release period (days)	$1.891 \times 10^1$	$6.011 \times 10^1$	10 – 100
$d_{fall}$	Leaf fall day (day)	$3.049 \times 10^2$	$1.046 \times 10^2$	1 – 365
$c_{rfall}$	Leaf-fall period (days)	$5.447 \times 10^1$	$1.502 \times 10^2$	10 – 100
$c_{lma}$	Leaf mass per area ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$2.929 \times 10^1$	$7.099 \times 10^2$	10 – 400
$C_{lab}$	Labile carbon pool ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$7.309 \times 10^1$	$1.672 \times 10^3$	10 – 1000
$C_{fol}$	Foliar carbon pool ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$1.313 \times 10^1$	$6.707 \times 10^2$	10 – 1000
$C_{roo}$	Fine root carbon pool ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$2.103 \times 10^2$	$2.024 \times 10^4$	10 – 1000
$C_{woo}$	Above and below ground woody carbon pool ( $\text{gCm}^{-2}$ )	$7.182 \times 10^3$	$2.019 \times 10^7$	100 – $10^5$
$C_{lit}$	Litter carbon pool ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$1.697 \times 10^2$	$4.958 \times 10^4$	10 – 1000
$C_{som}$	Soil and organic carbon pool ( $\text{g C m}^{-2}$ )	$1.950 \times 10^3$	$8.344 \times 10^5$	100 – $2 \times 10^5$

## Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NE/K00705X/1) with a CASE award from the UK Forestry Commission. This work was also partly funded by the National Centre for Earth Observation. We are grateful to Ian Craig for providing Forest Research mensuration estimates.

Code and data available at: [https://github.com/dalec-reading/4dvar\\_dalec\\_alice\\_holt](https://github.com/dalec-reading/4dvar_dalec_alice_holt)

## References

- Bhupinderpal, S., A. Nordgren, M. Ottosson Löfvenius, M. N. Högberg, P. E. Mellander, and P. Högberg (2003), Tree root and soil heterotrophic respiration as revealed by girdling of boreal scots pine forest: extending observations beyond the first year, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 26(8), 1287–1296, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.2003.01053.x.
- Bloom, A. A., and M. Williams (2015), Constraining ecosystem carbon dynamics in a data-limited world: integrating ecological “common sense” in a model data fusion framework, *Biogeosciences*, 12(5), 1299–1315, doi:10.5194/bg-12-1299-2015.
- Braswell, B. H., W. J. Sacks, E. Linder, and D. S. Schimel (2005), Estimating diurnal to annual ecosystem parameters by synthesis of a carbon flux model with eddy covariance net ecosystem exchange observations, *Global Change Biology*, 11(2), 335–355.
- Bréda, N. J. (2003), Ground-based measurements of leaf area index: a review of methods, instruments and current controversies, *Journal of experimental botany*, 54(392), 2403–2417.
- Bréda, N., A. Granier, and G. Aussenac (1995), Effects of thinning on soil and tree water relations, transpiration and growth in an oak forest (*quercus petraea* (matt.) Liebl.), *Tree Physiology*, 15(5), 295, doi:10.1093/treephys/15.5.295.
- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, J. Canadell, A. Chhabra, R. DeFries, J. Galloway, M. Heimann, et al. (2014), Carbon and other biogeochemical cycles, in *Climate change 2013: the physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, pp. 465–570, Cambridge University Press.
- Dahdouh-Guebas, F., and N. Koedam (2006), Empirical estimate of the reliability of the use of the point-centred quarter method (pcqm): Solutions to ambiguous field situations and description of the pcqm+ protocol, *Forest Ecology and management*, 228(1), 1–18.
- Dijkstra, F. A., and W. Cheng (2007), Interactions between soil and tree roots accelerate long-term soil carbon decomposition, *Ecology Letters*, 10(11), 1046–1053, doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01095.x.
- Dore, S., M. Montes-Helu, S. C. Hart, B. A. Hungate, G. W. Koch, J. B. Moon, A. J. Finkral, and T. E. Kolb (2012), Recovery of ponderosa pine ecosystem carbon and water fluxes from thinning and stand-replacing fire, *Global change biology*, 18(10), 3171–3185.

- 615 Fassnacht, K. S., S. T. Gower, J. M. Norman, and R. E. McMurtric (1994), A comparison of optical and direct methods for estimating foliage surface area index in forests,  
616  
617 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *71*(1), 183–207.
- 618 Fox, A., M. Williams, A. D. Richardson, D. Cameron, J. H. Gove, T. Quaife, D. Ricciuto,  
619 M. Reichstein, E. Tomelleri, C. M. Trudinger, et al. (2009), The reflex project: comparing different algorithms and implementations for the inversion of a terrestrial ecosystem model against eddy covariance data, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *149*(10),  
620  
621 1597–1615.
- 622  
623 Heath, J., E. Ayres, M. Possell, R. D. Bardgett, H. I. Black, H. Grant, P. Ineson, and  
624 G. Kerstiens (2005), Rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> reduces sequestration of root-derived soil  
625 carbon, *Science*, *309*(5741), 1711–1713.
- 626 Heinemeyer, A., M. Wilkinson, R. Vargas, J.-A. Subke, E. Casella, J. I. Morison, and  
627 P. Ineson (2012), Exploring the “overflow tap” theory: linking forest soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes  
628 and individual mycorrhizosphere components to photosynthesis, *Biogeosciences*, *9*(1),  
629 79–95.
- 630 Hernesmaa, A., K. Björklöf, O. Kiikkilä, H. Fritze, K. Haahtela, and M. Romantschuk (2005), Structure and function of microbial communities in the rhizosphere  
631 of scots pine after tree-felling, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *37*(4), 777 – 785, doi:  
632 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.10.010>.
- 633  
634 Hilker, T., M. A. Wulder, N. C. Coops, J. Linke, G. McDermid, J. G. Masek, F. Gao, and  
635 J. C. White (2009), A new data fusion model for high spatial-and temporal-resolution  
636 mapping of forest disturbance based on landsat and modis, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *113*(8), 1613–1627.
- 637  
638 Högberg, P., and D. J. Read (2006), Towards a more plant physiological perspective on  
639 soil ecology, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *21*(10), 548–554.
- 640 Högberg, P., A. Nordgren, N. Buchmann, A. F. Taylor, A. Ekblad, M. N. Högberg, G. Nyberg, M. Ottosson-Löfvenius, and D. J. Read (2001), Large-scale forest girdling shows  
641 that current photosynthesis drives soil respiration, *Nature*, *411*(6839), 789–792.
- 642  
643 Janssens, I. A., H. Lankreijer, G. Matteucci, A. S. Kowalski, N. Buchmann, D. Epron,  
644 K. Pilegaard, W. Kutsch, B. Longdoz, T. Grünwald, L. Montagnani, S. Dore, C. Rebmann, E. J. Moors, A. Grelle, Ü. Rannik, K. Morgenstern, S. Oltchev, R. Clement,  
645 J. Guðmundsson, S. Minerbi, P. Berbigier, A. Ibrom, J. Moncrieff, M. Aubinet, C. Bernhofer, N. O. Jensen, T. Vesala, A. Granier, E. D. Schulze, A. Lindroth, A. J. Dolman,  
646  
647

- 648 P. G. Jarvis, R. Ceulemans, and R. Valentini (2001), Productivity overshadows tem-  
 649 perature in determining soil and ecosystem respiration across european forests, *Global*  
 650 *Change Biology*, 7(3), 269–278, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.2001.00412.x.
- 651 Jonckheere, I., S. Fleck, K. Nackaerts, B. Muys, P. Coppin, M. Weiss, and F. Baret  
 652 (2004), Review of methods for in situ leaf area index determination Part I. Theories,  
 653 sensors and hemispherical photography, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 121(1-2),  
 654 19–35, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2003.08.027.
- 655 Kantzas, E., S. Quegan, and M. Lomas (2015), Improving the representation of fire distur-  
 656 bance in dynamic vegetation models by assimilating satellite data: a case study over the  
 657 arctic, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8(8), 2597–2609.
- 658 Kerr, G., and J. Haufe (2011), Thinning practice: A silvicultural guide, *Forestry Commis-*  
 659 *sion*, p. 54.
- 660 Kimmins, J. (1973), Some statistical aspects of sampling throughfall precipitation in nutri-  
 661 ent cycling studies in british columbian coastal forests, *Ecology*, pp. 1008–1019.
- 662 Kurz, W. A., C. Dymond, G. Stinson, G. Rampley, E. Neilson, A. Carroll, T. Ebata,  
 663 and L. Safranyik (2008), Mountain pine beetle and forest carbon feedback to climate  
 664 change, *Nature*, 452(7190), 987–990.
- 665 Liu, S., B. Bond-Lamberty, J. A. Hicke, R. Vargas, S. Zhao, J. Chen, S. L. Edburg, Y. Hu,  
 666 J. Liu, A. D. McGuire, J. Xiao, R. Keane, W. Yuan, J. Tang, Y. Luo, C. Potter, and  
 667 J. Oeding (2011), Simulating the impacts of disturbances on forest carbon cycling in  
 668 north america: Processes, data, models, and challenges, *Journal of Geophysical Re-*  
 669 *search: Biogeosciences*, 116(G4), n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2010JG001585, g00K08.
- 670 Martín-Benito, D., M. Del Río, I. Heinrich, G. Helle, and I. Canellas (2010), Response  
 671 of climate-growth relationships and water use efficiency to thinning in a pinus nigra  
 672 afforestation, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 259(5), 967–975.
- 673 McKay, H., J. Hudson, and R. Hudson (2003), Woodfuel resource in britain, *Forestry*  
 674 *Commission Report*.
- 675 Misson, L., J. Tang, M. Xu, M. McKay, and A. Goldstein (2005), Influences of recovery  
 676 from clear-cut, climate variability, and thinning on the carbon balance of a young pon-  
 677 derosa pine plantation, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 130(3&4), 207 – 222,  
 678 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.04.001.
- 679 Moore, D. J. P., N. A. Trahan, P. Wilkes, T. Quaife, B. B. Stephens, K. Elder, A. R. De-  
 680 sai, J. Negron, and R. K. Monson (2013), Persistent reduced ecosystem respiration af-

ter insect disturbance in high elevation forests, *Ecology Letters*, 16(6), 731–737, doi:  
10.1111/ele.12097.

Moreaux, V., É. Lamaud, A. Bosc, J.-M. Bonnefond, B. E. Medlyn, and D. Loustau  
(2011), Paired comparison of water, energy and carbon exchanges over two young mar-  
itime pine stands (*pinus pinaster* ait.): effects of thinning and weeding in the early stage  
of tree growth, *Tree physiology*, p. tpr048.

Morecroft, M. D., V. J. Stokes, and J. I. L. Morison (2003), Seasonal changes in the pho-  
tosynthetic capacity of canopy oak (*quercus robur*) leaves: the impact of slow develop-  
ment on annual carbon uptake, *International Journal of Biometeorology*, 47(4), 221–226,  
doi:10.1007/s00484-003-0173-3.

Navon, I. (1998), Practical and theoretical aspects of adjoint parameter estimation and  
identifiability in meteorology and oceanography, *Dynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans*,  
27(1), 55–79.

Niu, S., Y. Luo, M. C. Dietze, T. F. Keenan, Z. Shi, J. Li, and F. S. C. Iii (2014), The role  
of data assimilation in predictive ecology, *Ecosphere*, 5(5), art65, doi:10.1890/ES13-  
00273.1.

Papale, D., M. Reichstein, M. Aubinet, E. Canfora, C. Bernhofer, W. Kutsch, B. Longdoz,  
S. Rambal, R. Valentini, T. Vesala, et al. (2006), Towards a standardized processing  
of net ecosystem exchange measured with eddy covariance technique: algorithms and  
uncertainty estimation, *Biogeosciences*, 3(4), 571–583.

Pinnington, E. M., E. Casella, S. L. Dance, A. S. Lawless, J. I. Morison, N. K. Nichols,  
M. Wilkinson, and T. L. Quaife (2016), Investigating the role of prior and observa-  
tion error correlations in improving a model forecast of forest carbon balance using  
four-dimensional variational data assimilation, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,  
228–229, 299 – 314, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.07.006.

Post, H., H. J. Hendricks Franssen, A. Graf, M. Schmidt, and H. Vereecken (2015), Un-  
certainty analysis of eddy covariance CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements for different ec tower dis-  
tances using an extended two-tower approach, *Biogeosciences*, 12(4), 1205–1221, doi:  
10.5194/bg-12-1205-2015.

Quaife, T., P. Lewis, M. De Kauwe, M. Williams, B. E. Law, M. Disney, and P. Bowyer  
(2008), Assimilating canopy reflectance data into an ecosystem model with an En-  
semble Kalman Filter, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112(4), 1347–1364, doi:  
10.1016/j.rse.2007.05.020.

- 714 Raupach, M., P. Rayner, D. Barrett, R. DeFries, M. Heimann, D. Ojima, S. Quegan, and  
715 C. Schmullius (2005), Model–data synthesis in terrestrial carbon observation: methods,  
716 data requirements and data uncertainty specifications, *Global Change Biology*, *11*(3),  
717 378–397.
- 718 Reich, P. B., M. B. Walters, and D. S. Ellsworth (1991), Leaf age and season influ-  
719 ence the relationships between leaf nitrogen, leaf mass per area and photosynthesis in  
720 maple and oak trees, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, *14*(3), 251–259, doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
721 3040.1991.tb01499.x.
- 722 Rich, P. M., J. Wood, D. Vieglais, K. Burek, and N. Webb (1999), Hemiview user manual,  
723 version 2.1, *Delta-T Devices Ltd., Cambridge, UK*, 79.
- 724 Richardson, A. D., M. D. Mahecha, E. Falge, J. Kattge, A. M. Moffat, D. Papale, M. Re-  
725 ichstein, V. J. Stauch, B. H. Braswell, G. Churkina, B. Kruijt, and D. Y. Hollinger  
726 (2008), Statistical properties of random CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurement uncertainty inferred  
727 from model residuals, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *148*(1), 38 – 50, doi:  
728 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.09.001>.
- 729 Richardson, A. D., M. Williams, D. Y. Hollinger, D. J. Moore, D. B. Dail, E. A. David-  
730 son, N. A. Scott, R. S. Evans, H. Hughes, J. T. Lee, et al. (2010), Estimating param-  
731 eters of a forest ecosystem c model with measurements of stocks and fluxes as joint  
732 constraints, *Oecologia*, *164*(1), 25–40.
- 733 Running, S. W. (2008), Ecosystem disturbance, carbon, and climate, *Science*, *321*(5889),  
734 652–653.
- 735 Saunders, M., B. Tobin, K. Black, M. Gioria, M. Nieuwenhuis, and B. Osborne (2012),  
736 Thinning effects on the net ecosystem carbon exchange of a sitka spruce forest  
737 are temperature-dependent, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *157*, 1 – 10, doi:  
738 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.01.008>.
- 739 Schimel, J. P., and M. N. Weintraub (2003), The implications of exoenzyme activity on  
740 microbial carbon and nitrogen limitation in soil: a theoretical model, *Soil Biology and*  
741 *Biochemistry*, *35*(4), 549–563.
- 742 Seidl, R., P. M. Fernandes, T. F. Fonseca, F. Gillet, A. M. Jönsson, K. Merganičová,  
743 S. Netherer, A. Arpaci, J.-D. Bontemps, H. Bugmann, et al. (2011), Modelling natural  
744 disturbances in forest ecosystems: a review, *Ecological Modelling*, *222*(4), 903–924.
- 745 Sitch, S., C. Huntingford, N. Gedney, P. Levy, M. Lomas, S. Piao, R. Betts, P. Ciais,  
746 P. Cox, P. Friedlingstein, et al. (2008), Evaluation of the terrestrial carbon cycle, future

- 747 plant geography and climate-carbon cycle feedbacks using five dynamic global vegeta-  
748 tion models (dgvms), *Global Change Biology*, 14(9), 2015–2039.
- 749 Talbot, J., S. Allison, and K. Treseder (2008), Decomposers in disguise: mycorrhizal fungi  
750 as regulators of soil c dynamics in ecosystems under global change, *Functional ecology*,  
751 22(6), 955–963.
- 752 Thornton, P., B. Law, H. L. Gholz, K. L. Clark, E. Falge, D. Ellsworth, A. Goldstein,  
753 R. Monson, D. Hollinger, M. Falk, et al. (2002), Modeling and measuring the effects  
754 of disturbance history and climate on carbon and water budgets in evergreen needleleaf  
755 forests, *Agricultural and forest meteorology*, 113(1), 185–222.
- 756 Tremolet, Y. (2006), Accounting for an imperfect model in 4D-Var, *Quarterly Journal of*  
757 *the Royal Meteorological Society*, 132(621), 2483–2504, doi:10.1256/qj.05.224.
- 758 Vesala, T., T. Suni, Ü. Rannik, P. Keronen, T. Markkanen, S. Sevanto, T. Grönholm,  
759 S. Smolander, M. Kulmala, H. Ilvesniemi, et al. (2005), Effect of thinning on surface  
760 fluxes in a boreal forest, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19(2).
- 761 Wilkinson, M., E. Eaton, M. Broadmeadow, and J. Morison (2012), Inter-annual varia-  
762 tion of carbon uptake by a plantation oak woodland in south-eastern england, *Biogeo-*  
763 *sciences*, 9(12), 5373–5389.
- 764 Wilkinson, M., P. Crow, E. Eaton, and J. Morison (2015), Effects of management thin-  
765 ning on CO<sub>2</sub> exchange by a plantation oak woodland in south-eastern england., *Biogeo-*  
766 *sciences Discussions*, 12(19).
- 767 Wilkinson, M., P. Crow, E. L. Eaton, and J. I. L. Morison (2016), Effects of management  
768 thinning on CO<sub>2</sub> exchange by a plantation oak woodland in south-eastern england, *Bio-*  
769 *geosciences*, 13(8), 2367–2378, doi:10.5194/bg-13-2367-2016.
- 770 Williams, M., E. B. Rastetter, D. N. Fernandes, M. L. Goulden, G. R. Shaver, and L. C.  
771 Johnson (1997), Predicting gross primary productivity in terrestrial ecosystems, *Ecologi-*  
772 *cal Applications*, 7(3), 882–894.
- 773 Williams, M., P. A. Schwarz, B. E. Law, J. Irvine, and M. R. Kurpius (2005), An im-  
774 proved analysis of forest carbon dynamics using data assimilation, *Global Change Bi-*  
775 *ology*, 11(1), 89–105.
- 776 Zobitz, J., A. Desai, D. Moore, and M. Chadwick (2011), A primer for data assimilation  
777 with ecological models using markov chain monte carlo (mcmc), *Oecologia*, 167(3),  
778 599–611.

779 Zobitz, J. M., D. J. P. Moore, T. Quaife, B. H. Braswell, A. Bergeson, J. a. An-  
780 thony, and R. K. Monson (2014), Joint data assimilation of satellite reflectance  
781 and net ecosystem exchange data constrains ecosystem carbon fluxes at a high-  
782 elevation subalpine forest, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 195-196, 73–88, doi:  
783 10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.04.011.