LETTER

Allometry of fine roots in forest ecosystems

Guangshui Chen,[1]* Sarah E. Hobbie,[2] Peter B. Reich,[3,4] Yusheng Yang,[1]* and David Robinson[5]

Abstract

Theoretical predictions regarding fine root production are needed in many ecosystem models but are lacking. Here, we expand the classic pipe model to fine roots and predict isometric scaling relationships between leaf and fine root biomass and among all major biomass production components of individual trees. We also predict that fine root production scales more slowly against increases in leaf production across global forest ecosystems at the stand level. Using meta-analysis, we show fine root biomass scales isometrically against leaf biomass both at the individual tree and stand level. However, despite isometric scaling between stem and coarse root production, fine root production scales against leaf production with a slope of about 0.8 at the stand level, which probably results from more rapid increase of turnover rate in leaves than in fine roots. These analyses help to improve our understandings of allometric theory and controls of belowground C processes.

Keywords

Allometric scaling, carbon allocation, carbon cycle, fine roots, forest ecosystems, net primary production, pipe model.

Ecology Letters (2019) **22**: 322–331

INTRODUCTION

Fine roots are traditionally defined as being ≤ 2 mm in diameter, short-lived, non-woody and functionally distinct from coarse roots. Although more nuanced views of fine root classifications exist (McCormack *et al.* 2015b), global data for the historically defined 'fine root' category are far more abundant and remain useful for evaluating fundamental questions about resource allocation among plant tissues. Along with the hyphae of mycorrhiza-forming fungi that usually colonise them, fine roots are responsible for water and nutrient uptake by plants. Annually, between 10 and 60% of net primary productivity and gross primary productivity (NPP, GPP; for abbreviations, see Table S1 in Supporting Information) (Jackson *et al.* 1997; Silver & Miya 2001; Ruess *et al.* 2003; Chen *et al.* 2013; McCormack *et al.* 2015b) in terrestrial ecosystems can be cycled through fine roots. Fine-root turnover represents a major pathway of carbon (C) and nutrient flow from plants to soil and is fundamental to both forest NPP and soil C sequestration (Strand *et al.* 2008).

It is essential to accurately simulate fine root production in ecosystem models such as CBM-CFS2 (Li *et al.* 2003) and BGC (Pietsch *et al.* 2005). Such models are hindered by incomplete understanding of fine root dynamics and use simplifications of this critical belowground flux (Jackson *et al.* 2000; Woodward & Osborne 2000; Chapin *et al.* 2009; Iversen 2010; McCormack *et al.* 2013, 2015b; Chen *et al.* 2014). Uncertainty about these fluxes (Lu *et al.* 2012; McCormack *et al.* 2015a) clouds our ability to detect possible positive

feedbacks between the soil C cycle and planetary warming (Cox *et al.* 2000; Friedlingstein *et al.* 2006; Bond-Lamberty & Thomson 2010).

Such a knowledge gap is partly attributable to the labour-intensive nature and methodological difficulty in quantifying fine root variables (e.g. biomass, production and turnover). Interest is growing in developing indirect methods to allow fine root variables to be estimated using data on easily measurable stand and site variables. Large data compilations allow development of allometric equations relating the proportionality of standing biomass and C fluxes to leaves, stem and roots (Reich *et al.* 2014a; Falster *et al.* 2015; Poorter *et al.* 2015; Paul *et al.* 2016). Although a relationship between the surface areas of roots and leaves has been hypothesised based on hydraulic architecture (Davi *et al.* 2009), fine roots are largely neglected by allometric scaling studies. Theoretically explicit allometries of fine roots have yet to be developed.

Forest NPP has been extensively quantified at the stand level; practically, fine root production, and sometimes leaf production, can be estimated in the field only at that level. But, studies on allometric scaling among NPP components have focused primarily on individual trees (e.g. Niklas & Enquist 2001, 2002a,b; Wolf *et al.* 2010), and only a few at the stand level (Litton *et al.* 2007; Malhi *et al.* 2011; Chen *et al.* 2013; Jenkins & Pierce 2017). Yet, allometric scaling relationships at the stand level could be useful for better understanding forest C cycling. For example, operational monitoring of site-level NPP is now underway using imagery from the satellite-borne techniques across large regions

[1]*Key Laboratory for Subtropical Mountain Ecology, Ministry of Science and Technology and Fujian Province Funded, School of Geographical Sciences, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou 350007, China*

[2]*Department of Ecology, Evolution & Behavior, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA*

[3]*Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA*

[4]*Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Penrith, New South Wales 2753, Australia*

[5]*Institute of Biological & Environmental Sciences, School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3UU, UK*

Correspondence: E-mails: gschen@fjnu.edu.cn and geoyys@fjnu.edu.cn

(Turner *et al.* 2005), from which estimates of NPP components could be derived if there were predictable allometric relationships among forest NPP components.

In this study, we first establish theoretical scaling relationships among major components of individual tree NPP based on the classical pipe model (Shinozaki *et al.* 1964); then we explain how these scaling relationships would be expected to change when scaled up to the stand level. Finally, we tested these scaling relationships by assembling several datasets on fine root biomass and production across global forests.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Theoretical allometric scaling at the individual tree level

The pipe model (Shinozaki *et al.* 1964) was devised to explain consistent linear relationships between the mass of tree leaves and non-photosynthetic tissues with tree height. Such relationships would arise if units of foliage are supported by a certain number of identical units of conductive tissue, or pipes. This geometrical analogy can, in principle, also be extended to roots. In an individual tree, stems, branches and roots can be considered as assemblages of unit pipes (Fig. 1), connected to terminal organs aboveground (leaves) and belowground (fine root modules), with the numbers of pipes decreasing at each branching level. An individual leaf or fine root module is each assumed to be supplied by an equal number of xylem tubes, and is size-invariant in individual traits (i.e. surface area, mass of an individual leaf or fine root module are assumed not to vary with plant size). A fine root module is a dynamic, ephemeral root terminal structure responsible for uptake of soil nutrients and water. Unlike leaves, which are distinct organs, fine root modules here can be defined on a root diameter basis (e.g. < 2 mm in diameter), or on a root function basis (e.g. the first two or three root orders), and may also include mycorrhizal fungi and root exudates, in both of which plants invest resources in exchange for nutrients (McCormack *et al.* 2015b). This model should apply both to angiosperms (with xylem vessels) and gymnosperm (with tracheids).

As water is transported through roots to leaves via the tubes, we can assume that, for an individual tree, the number of leaves (n_{fl}) scales isometrically against the number of fine root modules (n_{fr}) to ensure conservation of mass flow through plants spanning a wide range of sizes, such that:

$$n_{fl} \propto n_{fr} \qquad (1)$$

The total surface areas of leaves and fine root modules of an individual tree (i.e. sa_{fl} and sa_{fr}), and the total masses of leaves and fine root modules of an individual tree (i.e. m_{fl} and m_{fr}) can be calculated as follows:

$$sa_{fl} = la_{fl}n_{fl} \qquad (2)$$
$$sa_{fr} = ra_{fr}n_{fr} \qquad (3)$$
$$m_{fl} = lw_{fl}n_{fl} \qquad (4)$$
$$m_{fl} = rw_{fr}n_{fr} \qquad (5)$$

where la_{fl} and lw_{fl} are the surface area and mass of an individual leaf, and ra_{fr} and rw_{fr} represent the surface area and mass of an individual fine root module respectively.


Figure 1 Symbolic representation of branch vascular structure in stems and branches, that end with photosynthetic organs (leaves); and in roots, that end with fine root modules. The lines denote xylem tubes. An individual leaf or an individual fine root module each is assumed supplied by an equal number of xylem tubes, and is size-invariant in individual traits (i.e. surface area, mass). A fine root module is a dynamic, ephemeral terminal root segment responsible for uptake of soil resources, which can be defined on a root diameter basis (e.g. < 2 mm in diameter) or a root function basis (e.g. the first two or three root orders), and may also include mycorrhizal fungi and root exudates.

If traits of an individual leaf or an individual fine root module (i.e. la_{fl} and lw_{fl}, and ra_{fr} and rw_{fr}) are assumed size-invariant, then:

$$n_{fl} \propto sa_{fl} \propto m_{fl} \qquad (6)$$
$$n_{fr} \propto sa_{fr} \propto m_{fr} \qquad (7)$$

By combining eqns 1–7, we can predict the following isometric scaling relationships between leaves and fine-roots:

$$sa_{fl} \propto sa_{fr} \qquad (8)$$
$$m_{fl} \propto m_{fr} \qquad (9)$$

The annual leaf and fine root production of an individual plant ($iNPP_{fl}$ and $iNPP_{fr}$) can be written as follows:

$$iNPP_{fl} = m_{fl}k_{fl} \qquad (10)$$
$$iNPP_{fr} = m_{fr}k_{fr} \qquad (11)$$

where k_{fl} and k_{fr} are annual leaf and fine-root turnover rates respectively.

If we further assume both k_{fl} and k_{fr} are also size-invariant, by combining eqns 9–11, we can predict isometric scaling between leaf and fine-root production by an individual tree:

$$iNPP_{fl} \propto iNPP_{fr} \qquad (12)$$

According to Niklas & Enquist (2002a,b) the following scaling relationships hold:

$$iNPP_{st} \propto iNPP_{cr} \propto iNPP_{fl} \quad\quad (13)$$
$$iTNPP \propto iNPP_{fl} \quad\quad (14)$$

and

$$iNPP_{nl} \propto iNPP_{fl} \quad\quad (15)$$

where $iNPP_{st}$, $iNPP_{cr}$, $iTNPP$ and $iNPP_{nl}$, are the stem production, coarse root production, total production and non-leaf production respectively, by an individual tree. Here, we assume root growth rate in Niklas & Enquist (2002a,b) is equivalent to coarse root production.

Therefore, along a tree size gradient across species (evolutionary scales), we predict the following isometric scaling relationships among all plant organs:

$$iNPP_{fr} \propto iNPP_{fl} \propto iNPP_{st} \propto iNPP_{cr} \propto NPP_{nl} \quad\quad (16)$$

Allometric scaling at the stand level

Besides plant size, a series of factors, including phylogeny, ontogeny, resource availability, competition and climate, can affect partitioning of NPP (Clark *et al.* 2001; Gower *et al.* 2001; Litton *et al.* 2007; Chen *et al.* 2013; Malhi *et al.* 2016), and influence relationships among NPP components (i.e. the slopes of the arrows in Fig. 2) and how they deviate from those driven by variation in size.

The predominant drivers of variation in NPP may differ between the individual tree level and the stand level. This difference could affect the partitioning of NPP and generate different scaling relationships among NPP components between the


Figure 2 Conceptual diagram showing different allometric scaling relationships between two log-transformed individual tree net primary productivity (NPP) components *i* and *j*. The ellipses denote the scatter of data points which represents a sample of forest trees (either within a stand or across stands), and the three grey arrows show the linear regressions of those data. Besides plant size, a series of factors, including ontogeny, competition, resource availabilities and climate, could affect partitioning of NPP, and force the slope of the relationship between the two individual tree NPP components to deviate from that caused by variation in size (for purposes of illustration, the changes in the direction of this slope caused by these factors shown here are arbitrary).

individual tree level and the stand level (Fig. 3). The variation in total NPP of an individual tree (iTNPP) and its components are predominantly controlled by plant size (Fig. 3a,c), which can vary > 10-orders of magnitude in terms of biomass (Poorter *et al.* 2015) and > 8-orders of magnitude in terms of annual growth rates (Niklas & Enquist 2002b). As a consequence of such large variation, the effects of factors such as resource supply likely are relatively small. At the individual level, the partitioning of iTNPP among components (or the slope of the log-log bivariate plot) is then expected to be determined predominantly by size-related scaling relationships (Fig. 3a).

In forest stands, stem density generally decreases with increasing tree size; the effects of stem density and tree size on total NPP of a stand (TNPP) should therefore counteract each other, making TNPP less dependent on tree size. By contrast, TNPP might be controlled more by other factors such as resource availability and climate (Fig. 3b). Thus, the partitioning of TNPP among components (or slopes of the log-log bivariate plots) at the stand level is likely to be determined predominantly by resource- or climate-related scaling relationships (Fig. 3b). If one standardises tree size (in the section above about individual tree scaling), the same predictions would occur.

From tropical to boreal forests, we expect a general trend of increasing partitioning of TNPP belowground with the decreasing ratio of available N: phosphorous (P) in soil across that biogeographical gradient. This is because the C cost of N acquisition in boreal forests is 13 times greater than in tropical forests, while the C cost of P acquisition in tropical forests is only twice that in boreal forests (Gill & Finzi 2016). We posit non-isometric scaling relationships between fine roots and leaves (more specifically, with a slope less than unity) in terms of stand biomass or production across global forests, in contrast to the prediction of isometric scaling at the individual level. However, such adjustments in partitioning might be only slight among structural components (i.e. stems and coarse roots) (Fig. 3c,d), due to biomechanical constraints (e.g. trees need to maintain their mechanical balance above- and belowground and require relatively conserved proportions between stems and coarse roots) (Niklas & Spatz 2006). Accordingly, we would expect isometric scaling between stems and coarse roots both at the individual tree and stand level.

Data sets

To estimate the allometric scaling relationships between leaf and fine root biomass at the individual tree level, we extracted data for biomass of fine roots (m_{fr}) and leaves (m_{fl}) of individual trees from the BAAD data set (*n* = 1669) (Falster *et al.* 2015)(Table S2). The BAAD is suitable for analysis at the individual level in the present study, because measurements were made explicitly on individuals rather than derived as averages using stem density, and biomass was estimated directly rather than by allometric equations (Falster *et al.* 2015) (Table S3). The BAAD data cover a diverse taxa (94 species, 43 family), with tree height of 0.01–32.4 m, diameter of stem at base of 0.05–27.4 cm and total tree mass of 0.000024–1369 kg. However, they come from only 16 studies and are skewed toward seedlings: 80% of the total plant mass data (*n* = 1328) are less than 0.161 kg.

Figure 3 Conceptual diagrams showing different allometric scaling relationships between log-transformed components of biomass or production: between fine root and leaf biomass at the individual tree level (a) and the stand level (b); and between coarse roots and stems at the individual tree level (c) and the stand level (d). The slopes of the grey arrows show the separate effects attributable to size or resources/climate (i.e. temperature and precipitation) on overall partitioning of biomass or production. The ellipses denote the data scatter of a sample of forest sites, and the double-headed red arrows show the linear regressions of these data, with its length showing the order of variation in magnitude. At the individual tree level, the variations in biomass or production components are dominated by the size effect. At the stand level, the variations are caused predominantly by resource availability or climate (temperature and precipitation), etc. There could then be different exponents for the log-log allometric scaling relationships (i.e. the slopes of the double-headed red arrows) between the individual tree and the stand level. Compared with structural organs (i.e. coarse roots and stems), the partitioning of biomass or production between short-lived resource-acquisitive components (i.e. leaves and fine roots) might be more responsive to variations in resource availability or climate, that is the intersection angles between the two grey arrows is wider in (a) and (b) than in (c) and (d). Thus, the discrepancy in the scaling slopes of fine roots vs. leaves from the individual tree level to the stand level is predicted to be much larger than that of coarse roots vs. stems.

There were three data sources for analysis of scaling relationships at the stand level (Dataset listed in Table S4). The FLUXNET database (Luyssaert *et al.* 2007) is the main source of NPP and biomass data used in this analysis, including fine root (M_{fr}) and leaf mass (M_{fl}), fine root (NPP_{fr}), leaf (NPP_{fl}), stem (NPP_{st}), coarse root (NPP_{cr}) and woody production (NPP_{wd}), and total production (TNPP) of a stand. Boreal and especially temperate forests are well represented in this database, but tropical forests relatively underrepresented. For this reason we added data on tropical forest NPP components and biomass from Malhi *et al.* (2011) and from the TropForC-db (Anderson-Teixeira *et al.* 2016). The final dataset included 232 forest sites, where at least one of the following data pairs was available: M_{fr} vs. M_{fl}, M_{fr} vs. NPP_{fr} and NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl}. It covers wide geographic and climatic range: mean annual temperature (MAT) varied from −9.0 to 28.2 °C and mean annual precipitation (MAP) from 271 to 4500 mm (Table S4).

Total belowground C flux (TBCF) is calculated based on belowground C balance (Ryan *et al.* 2004; Litton *et al.* 2007), that is soil CO_2 efflux minus C inputs from aboveground litterfall plus any changes in C stored in roots, litter, and soil C pools, and so is independent of NPP_{fr} estimates. TBCF

includes production and respiration of fine and coarse roots, root exudates and mycorrhizae, and can serve as the theoretical upper limit of NPP_{fr} (Nadelhoffer & Raich 1992). TBCF data and the accompanied NPP_{fl} data were extracted from Litton *et al.* (2007). Only TBCF estimates calculated based on the belowground C balance method were selected.

Data analyses

Because NPP_{fr} is usually estimated at the stand level, we did not intend to test the isometric scaling relationships between fine root production and other NPP components at the individual tree level directly, in order to avoid the problem of spurious correlation arising from averaging (i.e. if individual attributes are determined by dividing stand variables by stem density). Instead, only scaling relationships between fine root and leaf biomass both at the individual tree and stand level, and among NPP components at the stand level, were tested in the present study.

All data were log_{10}-transformed to ensure normality and to allow nonlinearity. Because functional rather than predictive relationships were sought for the associations between fine root

and leaf biomass and among NPP components, the reduced major axis (RMA; Model Type II) regression was conducted using the form: $\log(y) = \log(a) + \beta \log(x)$, where y and x represent biomass or an NPP component, α is a constant and β the scaling exponent. Differences in RMA slopes were evaluated by likelihood ratio tests (Warton *et al.* 2006). For the BAAD data, the RMA slopes between m_{fr} and m_{fl} were further tested for the combinations of tree species and growing conditions in each study (each study has just one root diameter definition), so that various confounding factors potentially affecting the scaling relationships are assessed (Table S5). Various techniques were used to estimate NPP_{fr} in the compiled dataset (Table S6). In practice NPP_{fr} is likely underestimated because of methodological limitations (Robinson 2004). To assess how this underestimation might impact on allometric scaling, we also compared the slopes of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} regression with TBCF vs. NPP_{fl} regression. A lower slope of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} than that of TBCF vs. NPP_{fl} would be consistent with an increasing underestimation of NPP_{fr} in more productive stands.

As direct estimates of k_{fr} and k_{fl} are lacking in these data sets, we calculated the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} and NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratios as respective surrogates for k_{fr} and k_{fl}. The outliers, defined as any datum > 1.5 interquartile ranges below the first quartile or above the third quartile, were discarded. The NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} and NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratios were then linearly regressed against TNPP, MAT and MAP to reflect relative changes in leaf and fine root turnover rates across global forests. Differences in the regression between leaves and fine roots were examined by a common slope test.

All the RMA regressions and the common slope tests were performed using SMATR version 2.0 (Warton *et al.* 2006). All the other analyses were done in SPSS 17.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL).

RESULTS

As both m_{fl} and m_{fr} in the BAAD data range in magnitude by nearly eight orders of magnitude (Fig. 4a), variations in m_{fl} and m_{fr} are undoubtedly predominantly controlled by tree size. The RMA regressions show that there is isometric scaling between m_{fl} and m_{fr} along this size gradient (Fig. 4a; Table S7). Of the 16 combinations of species and growing conditions with significant RMA slopes ($P < 0.05$, $n \geq 20$) (Table S5), 10 have RMA slopes indistinguishable from unity. Of the seven combinations comprising seedlings, six have RMA slopes indistinguishable from unity, and the other one has a near-isometric slope (slope = 0.9109) (Table S5). Since the fine root mass of seedlings can probably be estimated more accurately than for mature trees, these results indicated that leaf mass scales isometrically or near-isometrically against fine root mass within a specie at the individual tree level, at least in seedlings. Interestingly, fine root biomass also scales isometrically with leaf biomass at the stand level (Fig. 4b; Table S7), indicating that the isometric scaling between leaf and fine root biomass is quite conservative both at the individual and stand levels. At the stand level, NPP_{fr} scales against NPP_{fl} with a slope (0.794) significantly below unity (Fig. 5a; Table S8); there is, however, isometric scaling between NPP_{cr} and NPP_{st} (Fig. 5b; Table S8). This indicates

a shift in partitioning from fine roots to leaves, with increasing TNPP. The non-leaf production of a stand (NPP_{nl}) also scales against NPP_{fl} with a slope significantly less than unity (Fig. 5c; Table S8), indicating a decreasing return of biomass production with increasing investment in leaves.

Total belowground C flux scales against NPP_{fl} with a slope of 0.793, not significantly different from the slope of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} (Fig. 5a; Table S8). As TBCF serves as an upper limit for NPP_{fr}, the similarity in slope between these two regressions implies that the lower-than-unity scaling of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} is unlikely to be an artifact of greater underestimation of NPP_{fr} with increasing TNPP. The comparison of scaling slopes of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} and M_{fr} vs. M_{fl} implies that the slower-than-unity scaling of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl} is also unlikely to be caused by the increasing underestimation of fine root biomass with increasing individual tree size.

For evergreen forests, the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} and NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratios, as respective indicators of leaf and fine root turnover rates, both show significant and positive relations with MAT (Fig. 6a,b; Table S9), but only the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} ratio has positive relationships with MAP and TNPP (Fig. 6c; Table S9). For deciduous forests, both the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} and NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratios have positive relationships with TNPP, but only the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} ratio increases with increasing MAT (Fig. 6a; Table S9). In evergreen forests, the NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} ratio tends to increase more rapidly than the NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratio with increasing MAP (marginally significant; $P = 0.109$). This indicates a more rapid increase in leaf turnover rate than in fine root turnover rate, which might be the main cause of the slower-than-unity scaling of NPP_{fr} vs. NPP_{fl}.

DISCUSSION

Scaling relationship between fine root and leaf biomass

The isometric scaling relationships between leaf and fine root biomass both at the individual tree and the stand levels validate our prediction of the extended pipe model. It indicates that trees are constrained to maintain a common hydraulic architecture and functions, that is a hydraulic continuum from fine roots to leaves (Shinozaki *et al.* 1964; Magnani *et al.* 2000). Some studies have also reported a linear relationship between fine root and leaf biomass for several coniferous species, for example Santantonio (1989) and Vanninen & Makela (1999). Fine root biomass was also positively correlated with stand basal area (Vanninen & Makela 1999; Helmisaari *et al.* 2007; Finér *et al.* 2011b; Lehtonen *et al.* 2016). In a study by Cermak & Nadezhdina (2011), absorbing root surface area was related linearly to the basal area of individuals across almost 500 trees of 11 woody species of different ages, sizes and growing conditions. As basal area is predicted to be proportional to leaf area (Shinozaki *et al.* 1964; West *et al.* 1999), this also implies linear relationships between absorbing root surface area and leaf area of an individual. These results suggest that the pipe model can be successfully extended to fine roots.

The core assumption of our extended pipe model is that both the above- and belowground terminal units of this tube structure are size-invariant. However, the belowground structural analog to the leaf is still under debate (Pregitzer 2008).

Figure 4 Reduced major axis regressions of $\log_{10}$ of fine root vs. foliage biomass (a) at the individual level (m_{fr} vs. m_{fl}), and (b) at the stand level (M_{fr} vs. M_{fl}).

Traditionally, fine roots have been defined as those < 2 mm in diameter; in some cases smaller (e.g. 1.0 mm or even 0.5 mm) or larger (e.g. 5.0 mm) diameter cutoffs are also used (Helmisaari *et al.* 2009; Finér *et al.* 2011b; McCormack *et al.* 2015b). However, this approach has been criticised for not accounting for the heterogeneity in both the forms and functions of fine roots (Pregitzer *et al.* 2002; Guo *et al.* 2008). New definitions of fine roots are emerging based on their functional heterogeneity, by which fine roots are grouped into individual root orders or separated into shorter-lived fibrous roots and longer-lived transport roots (Guo *et al.* 2008; McCormack *et al.* 2015b). However, the diameter-based definition was used in most of the current data on fine roots (Finér *et al.* 2011a; Yuan & Chen 2012a). We argue that this definition does not undermine our assumption that individual fine root units are size-invariant: as seen in Table S5, there was no systematic difference in RMA slopes among different root diameter definitions. This assumption would be reasonable for deriving predictions, provided that the size-dependence for total fine root mass is large relative to size-dependent changes in individual fine root traits. Indeed, the branch architecture, morphology, anatomy, and physiology of the fine root systems seem to be relatively conserved within a species (Pregitzer *et al.* 2002; Kembel & Cahill 2005; Guo *et al.* 2008). In future, however, it will be valuable to have estimates based on an explicit definition of fine roots in terms of function (McCormack *et al.* 2015b) to further verify scaling relationships described here.

Although our extended pipe model predicts scaling relationships between fine roots and leaves based primarily on hydraulic architecture, it is sufficiently flexible to include adaptive responses of roots to nutrient availability, by accounting for variations in construction (e.g. rw_{fr}) and maintenance (e.g. k_{fr}) costs associated with an individual fine root module (Yuan & Chen 2010, 2012a).

Scaling relationships among NPP components at the stand level

Although isometric scaling relationships among all NPP components are predicted at the individual level (eqn 16), a test of

this prediction awaits the compilation of enough data on fine root production estimated explicitly at the individual level. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to explore allometric scaling relationships among NPP components across global forest ecosystems at the stand level. Such relationships could help to better constrain estimates of forest C balance across broad spatial scales.

At the stand level, we found NPP_{fr} lags behind NPP_{fl} with a slope lower than unity, which echoes previous syntheses, for example Litton *et al.* (2007) who found that partitioning of GPP to TBCF decreased with increasing GPP across 34 forest sites; and Yuan & Chen (2012a) who reported that the average increases in fine root production are generally smaller than those of aboveground NPP with greater soil nutrients along global nutrient gradients or in nutrient addition experiments. These results show that above- and belowground productivities are coupled across climatic or nutrient gradients, but production shifts from belowground to aboveground with increasing productivity. The highest productivity sites in our synthesis came from low latitude sites. This supports the hypothesis proposed by Gill & Finzi (2016) that the main limitation on forest productivity changes from belowground at high latitudes to aboveground at low latitudes.

Isometric scaling between woody components (i.e. NPP_{st} and NPP_{cr}) at the stand level is consistent with patterns seen at the individual scale (Niklas & Enquist 2002a,b). This may be due to the need for structural organs to maintain mechanical stability, for example wind-induced bending moments exerted at the stem base are balanced by a counter-resisting moment generated by the root system to prevent windfall (Niklas & Spatz 2006). Hence, partitioning between structural organs would be less affected by resource availability or climate.

Some studies have shown that NPP_{fl} (or litterfall, a proxy of NPP_{fl}) is a fixed proportion or log-linearly related to TNPP among stands across a specific biome (Clark *et al.* 2001; Malhi *et al.* 2011). However, we show that there is lower-than-unity slope for NPP_{nl} vs. NPP_{fl} scaling at the stand level across global forests, which is different from the isometric scaling between iTNPP vs. $iNPP_{fl}$ or between $iNPP_{nl}$ vs.

Figure 5 Reduced major axis (RMA) regressions of $\log_{10}$ components of net primary production of a stand (NPP, in g C m^{-2} year^{-1}) across global forests: (a) fine root production (NPP$_{fr}$) vs. foliage production (NPP$_{fl}$); (b) coarse root production (NPP$_{cr}$) vs. stem production (NPP$_{st}$); and (c) non-leaf production (NPP$_{nl}$) vs. NPP$_{fl}$. RMA regression of $\log_{10}$ total belowground carbon flux (TBCF) vs. NPP$_{fl}$ was also plotted in (a) for comparison with that of NPP$_{fr}$ vs. NPP$_{fl}$.

iNPP$_{fl}$ at the individual level (Niklas & Enquist 2002b). This probably indicates a reduced return of woody biomass production on increasing leaf investment at higher NPP sites

due to increased light competition. However, this does not exclude the possibility that greater efficiency of production per unit leaf would occur at higher NPP when in fertile sites, good climate, and or with fast-producing species. However, allometric scaling cannot allow us to distinguish between those two mechanistic possibilities. Nevertheless, our results imply that NPP$_{fl}$ cannot be used reliably as an invariant proportion of TNPP across global forests.

Why does NPP$_{fr}$ lag behind NPP$_{fl}$?

Net primary productivity components depend not only on biomass, but also on turnover rates. Because M$_{fr}$ scales isometrically with M$_{fl}$, the lower-than-unity slope for NPP$_{fr}$ vs. NPP$_{fl}$ at the stand level would arise from either increasing underestimation of NPP$_{fr}$ in higher NPP contexts, or more rapid increase in the turnover rate of leaves than fine roots with increasing stand productivity.

Unlike fine root biomass, which can be quantified relatively well by the coring method if sample size is sufficient to overcome high spatial heterogeneity (Vogt *et al.* 1998; Park *et al.* 2007), estimating fine root production is more challenging (Finér *et al.* 2011b). Both direct (minirhizotrons, ingrowth cores, sequential soil coring) and indirect methods (C and N budgets, isotopic approaches) have been used, each with its respective advantages and disadvantages (Vogt *et al.* 1998; Majdi *et al.* 2005; Hendricks *et al.* 2006; Withington *et al.* 2006; Strand *et al.* 2008; Yuan & Chen 2012b). NPP$_{fr}$ estimates differ significantly among methods when used at the same sites (Hendricks *et al.* 2006; Withington *et al.* 2006; Yuan & Chen 2012b), and no single method is superior. TBCF calculated by soil C balance is currently the 'gold standard' that provides the most reliable estimates of total root C allocation (Giardina & Ryan 2002; Litton *et al.* 2007) and which can serve as the upper-limit constraint on NPP$_{fr}$ (Nadelhoffer & Raich 1992). Comparing the difference in intercepts of TBCF and NPP$_{fr}$ scaling against NPP$_{fl}$ indicates that on average nearly 20% of TBCF goes to fine root production globally, which is lower than the estimate (1/3 of TBCF) suggested by Nadelhoffer & Raich (1992) based on N budgets. However, the similarity of the two slopes indicates that underestimation of NPP$_{fr}$ may occur, but probably affects only the intercept of the regression rather than the slope. The most plausible explanation for the lower-than-unity slope for NPP$_{fr}$ vs. NPP$_{fl}$ is that leaf and fine root turnover change at different rates with increasing NPP. Although we assume that both k$_{fr}$ and k$_{fl}$ are size-invariant, it is likely that k$_{fr}$ and k$_{fl}$ both vary along global environmental gradients (Reich *et al.* 2014a).

For evergreen forests, both the NPP$_{fl}$/M$_{fl}$ and NPP$_{fr}$/M$_{fr}$ ratios, and for deciduous forests, the NPP$_{fl}$/M$_{fl}$ ratio, increased with MAT, as found in some previous studies (Gill & Jackson 2000; Yuan & Chen 2010; Finér *et al.* 2011b; Reich *et al.* 2014b). For example, using a database of 190 studies, Gill & Jackson (2000) found fine root turnover rates increased exponentially with MAT for grasslands and forests. Reich *et al.* (2014b) reported that across 127 sites along a 2160-km gradient in North America, needle lifespans of four dominant evergreen conifers increased with decreasing MAT.

Figure 6 Ordinary least-squares linear regressions of $\log_{10}$ of the production/biomass ratio of leaves (NPP_{fl}/M_{fl}) and fine roots (NPP_{fr}/M_{fr}) of a stand against $\log_{10}$ of mean annual temperature (MAT) (a, b), and $\log_{10}$ of mean annual precipitation (MAP) (c, d) across the global forests. The parameters of these regressions see Table S9.

Increases in tissue maintenance cost, N mineralisation, and the pathogen and herbivore pressures associated with warmer and wetter conditions are possible causes of these relationships (Eissenstat *et al.* 2000; Gill & Jackson 2000; Finér *et al.* 2011b).

So far, however, no study has compared the relative changes in k_{fr} and k_{fl} along environmental gradients. We found that, for evergreen forests, the slope of NPP_{fl}/M_{fl} ratio vs. MAP was higher than that of NPP_{fr}/M_{fr} ratio vs. MAP ($P = 0.109$), indicating that leaf turnover rates probably increase more rapidly than fine root turnover rates along the MAP gradient. This might arise if increases in annual precipitation cause more green leaf litter production and increase leaf turnover aboveground, with no corresponding effects belowground.

Why is there an isometric scaling relationship between M_{fl} and M_{fr} and between m_{fl} and m_{fr}, but a non-isometric scaling relationship between NPP_{fl} and NPP_{fr}? An explanation is that plants may regulate biomass distribution between leaves and fine roots simply on the basis of the proportion of leaves and fine roots required to maintain current functions, as predicted by the extended pipe model, while the allocation of C is adjusted to maintain this proportionality between leaves and fine roots, given differences in turnover rates. This mechanism is consistent with pruning experiments demonstrating that both leaves and roots of herbs quickly recovered to their original biomass fractions after the leaf or root mass was halved (Brouwer 1963; Poorter & Nagel 2000).

In conclusion, we have expanded the pipe model to fine roots, and showed how scaling exponents change from the individual tree to the stand level. These results help advance understanding of allometry theory, and provide new insights into the patterns and controls of belowground C processes, which are largely neglected by existing C allocation studies. The allometric relationships between fine roots and other components revealed here may serve as robust constraints on, or validations of, future measurements and models, and provide new model parameterisations. Future allometry studies should integrate the internal size-driven allometric partitioning process with those driven by the external factors (resources, climate, competition, etc.), and focus greater attention at the stand level. More data are also needed to understand the allometry and variation in fine roots among forest stands at the global scale, especially comparing results obtained using functionally defined vs. size-based classification of fine roots.

regional flux networks (Afriflux, AmeriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, CarboEurope-IP, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux, TCOS-Siberia, USCCC), and the Fluxnet project, for support in obtaining these measurements. We also thank two reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31422012 and 31830014).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors designed the study. GC assembled and collected the data. GC and DR conducted data analysis. GC wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to revisions.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

All data used in this analysis are tabulated in the Supporting Information.

REFERENCES

Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., Wang, M.M.H., McGarvey, J.C. & LeBauer, D.S. (2016). Carbon dynamics of mature and regrowth tropical forests derived from a pantropical database (TropForC-db). *Glob. Change Biol.*, 22, 1690.

Bond-Lamberty, B. & Thomson, A. (2010). Temperature-associated increases in the global soil respiration record. *Nature*, 464, 579–582.

Brouwer, R. (1963). Some aspects of the equilibrium between overground and underground plant parts. *Jaarboek van het Instituut voor Biologisch en Scheikundig onderzoek aan Landbouwgewassen*, 1963, 31–39.

Cermak, J. & Nadezhdina, N. (2011). Field studies of whole-tree leaf and root distribution and water relations in several European forests. In: *Forest Management and the Water Cycle* (eds Bredemeier, M., Cohen, S., Godbold, D.L., Lode, E., Pichler, V. & Schleppi, P.). Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 65–88.

Chapin, F.S., McFarland, J., McGuire, A.D., Euskirchen, E.S., Ruess, R.W. & Kielland, K. (2009). The changing global carbon cycle: linking plant-soil carbon dynamics to global consequences. *J. Ecol.*, 97, 840–850.

Chen, G., Yang, Y. & Robinson, D. (2013). Allocation of gross primary production in forest ecosystems: allometric constraints and environmental responses. *New Phytol.*, 200, 1176–1186.

Chen, G., Yang, Y. & Robinson, D. (2014). Allometric constraints on, and trade-offs in, belowground carbon allocation and their control of soil respiration across global forest ecosystems. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 20, 1674–1684.

Clark, D.A., Brown, S., Kicklighter, D.W., Chambers, J.Q., Thomlinson, J.R., Ni, J. *et al.* (2001). Net primary production in tropical forests: an evaluation and synthesis of existing field data. *Ecol. Appl.*, 11, 371–384.

Cox, P.M., Betts, R.A., Jones, C.D., Spall, S.A. & Totterdell, I.J. (2000). Acceleration of global warming due to carbon-cycle feedbacks in a coupled climate model. *Nature*, 408, 184–187.

Davi, H., Barbaroux, C., Francois, C. & Dufrêne, E. (2009). The fundamental role of reserves and hydraulic constraints in predicting LAI and carbon allocation in forests. *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 149, 349–361.

Eissenstat, D.M., Wells, C.E., Yanai, R.D. & Whitbeck, J.L. (2000). Building roots in a changing environment: implications for root longevity. *New Phytol.*, 147, 33–42.

Falster, D.S., Duursma, R.A., Ishihara, M.I., Barneche, D.R., FitzJohn, R.G., Vårhammar, A. *et al.* (2015). BAAD: a biomass and allometry database for woody plants. *Ecology*, 96, 1445–1445.

Finér, L., Ohashi, M., Noguchi, K. & Hirano, Y. (2011a). Factors causing variation in fine root biomass in forest ecosystems. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 261, 265–277.

Finér, L., Ohashi, M., Noguchi, K. & Hirano, Y. (2011b). Fine root production and turnover in forest ecosystems in relation to stand and environmental characteristics. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 262, 2008–2023.

Friedlingstein, P., Cox, P., Betts, R., Bopp, L., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V. *et al.* (2006). Climate–carbon cycle feedback analysis: results from the C4MIP model intercomparison. *J. Clim.*, 19, 3337–3353.

Giardina, C.P. & Ryan, M.G. (2002). Total belowground carbon allocation in a fast-growing *Eucalyptus* plantation estimated using a carbon balance approach. *Ecosystems*, 5, 487–499.

Gill, A.L. & Finzi, A.C. (2016). Belowground carbon flux links biogeochemical cycles and resource-use efficiency at the global scale. *Ecol. Lett.*, 19, 1419–1428.

Gill, R.A. & Jackson, J.A. (2000). Global patterns of root turnover for terrestrial ecosystems. *New Phytol.*, 147, 13–31.

Gower, S.T., Krankina, O., Olson, R.J., Apps, M., Linder, S. & Wang, C. (2001). Net primary production and carbon allocation patterns of boreal forest ecosystems. *Ecol. Appl.*, 11, 1395–1411.

Guo, D., Xia, M., Wei, X., Chang, W., Liu, Y. & Wang, Z. (2008). Anatomical traits associated with absorption and mycorrhizal colonization are linked to root branch order in twenty-three Chinese temperate tree species. *New Phytol.*, 180, 673–683.

Helmisaari, H.S., Derome, J., Nojd, P. & Kukkola, M. (2007). Fine root biomass in relation to site and stand characteristics in Norway spruce and Scots pine stands. *Tree Physiol.*, 27, 1493–1504.

Helmisaari, H.-S., Ostonen, I., Lõhmus, K., Derome, J., Lindroos, A.-J., Merilä, P. *et al.* (2009). Ectomycorrhizal root tips in relation to site and stand characteristics in Norway spruce and Scots pine stands in boreal forests. *Tree Physiol.*, 29, 445–456.

Hendricks, J.J., Hendrick, R.L., Wilson, C.A., Mitchell, R.J., Pecot, S.D. & Guo, D. (2006). Assessing the patterns and controls of fine root dynamics: an empirical test and methodological review. *J. Ecol.*, 94, 40–57.

Iversen, C.M. (2010). Digging deeper: fine-root responses to rising atmospheric CO2 concentration in forested ecosystems. *New Phytol.*, 186, 346–357.

Jackson, R.B., Mooney, H.A. & Schulzes, E.-D. (1997). A global budget for fine root biomass, surface area, and nutrient contents. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 94, 7362–7366.

Jackson, R.B., Schenk, H., Jobbagy, E., Canadell, J., Colello, G., Dickinson, R. *et al.* (2000). Belowground consequences of vegetation change and their treatment in models. *Ecol. Appl.*, 10, 470–483.

Jenkins, D.G. & Pierce, S. (2017). General allometric scaling of net primary production agrees with plant adaptive strategy theory and has tipping points. *J. Ecol.*, 105, 1094–1104.

Kembel, S.W. & Cahill, J.F. (2005). Plant phenotypic plasticity belowground: a phylogenetic perspective on root foraging trade-offs. *Am. Nat.*, 166, 216–230.

Lehtonen, A., Palviainen, M., Ojanen, P., Kalliokoski, T., Nöjd, P., Kukkola, M. *et al.* (2016). Modelling fine root biomass of boreal tree stands using site and stand variables. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 359, 361–369.

Li, Z., Kurz, W.A., Apps, M.J. & Beukema, S.J. (2003). Belowground biomass dynamics in the Carbon Budget Model of the Canadian Forest Sector: recent improvements and implications for the estimation of NPP and NEP. *Can. J. For. Res.*, 33, 126–136.

Litton, C.M., Raich, J.W. & Ryan, M.G. (2007). Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 13, 2089–2109.

Lu, M., Zhou, X., Yang, Q., Li, H., Luo, Y., Fang, C. *et al.* (2012). Responses of ecosystem carbon cycle to experimental warming: a meta-analysis. *Ecology*, 94, 726–738.

Luyssaert, S., Inglima, I., Jung, M., Richardson, A.D., Reichstein, M., Papale, D. *et al.* (2007). CO2 balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical forests derived from a global database. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 13, 2509–2537.

Magnani, F., Mencuccini, M. & Grace, J. (2000). Age-related decline in stand productivity: the role of structural acclimation under hydraulic constraints. *Plant Cell Environ.*, 23, 251–263.

Majdi, H., Pregitzer, K., Moren, A.S., Nylund, J.E. & Agren, G.I. (2005). Measuring fine root turnover in forest ecosystems. *Plant Soil*, 276, 1–8.

Malhi, Y., Doughty, C. & Galbraith, D. (2011). The allocation of ecosystem net primary productivity in tropical forests. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.*, 366, 3225–3245.

Malhi, Y., Girardin, C., Goldsmith, G., Doughty, C., Salinas, N., Metcalfe, D. *et al.* (2016). The variation of productivity and its allocation along a tropical elevation gradient: a whole carbon budget perspective. *New Phytol.*, 214, 1019–1032.

McCormack, M.L., Eissenstat, D.M., Prasad, A.M. & Smithwick, E.A.H. (2013). Regional scale patterns of fine root lifespan and turnover under current and future climate. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 19, 1697–1708.

McCormack, M.L., Crisfield, E., Raczka, B., Schnekenburger, F., Eissenstat, D.M. & Smithwick, E.A.H. (2015a). Sensitivity of four ecological models to adjustments in fine root turnover rate. *Ecol. Model.*, 297, 107–117.

McCormack, M.L., Dickie, I.A., Eissenstat, D.M., Fahey, T.J., Fernandez, C.W., Guo, D. *et al.* (2015b). Redefining fine roots improves understanding of below-ground contributions to terrestrial biosphere processes. *New Phytol.*, 207, 505–518.

Nadelhoffer, K.J. & Raich, J.W. (1992). Fine root production estimates and belowground carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Ecology*, 73, 1139–1147.

Niklas, K.J. & Enquist, B.J. (2001). Invariant scaling relationships for interspecific plant biomass production rates and body size. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.*, 98, 2922–2927.

Niklas, K.J. & Enquist, B.J. (2002a). Canonical rules for plant organ biomass partitioning and annual allocation. *Am. J. Bot.*, 89, 812–819.

Niklas, K.J. & Enquist, B.J. (2002b). On the vegetative biomass partitioning of seed pant leaves, stems, and roots. *Anglais*, 159, 482–497.

Niklas, K.J. & Spatz, H.-C. (2006). Allometric theory and the mechanical stability of large trees: proof and conjecture. *Am. J. Bot.*, 93, 824–828.

Park, B.B., Yanai, R.D., Vadeboncoeur, M.A. & Hamburg, S.P. (2007). Estimating root biomass in rocky soils using pits, cores, and allometric equations abbreviations: dbh, diameter at breast height. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 71, 206–213.

Paul, K.I., Roxburgh, S.H., Chave, J., England, J.R., Zerihun, A., Specht, A. *et al.* (2016). Testing the generality of above-ground biomass allometry across plant functional types at the continent scale. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 22, 2106–2124.

Pietsch, S.A., Hasenauer, H. & Thornton, P.E. (2005). BGC-model parameters for tree species growing in central European forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 211, 264–295.

Poorter, H. & Nagel, O. (2000). The role of biomass allocation in the growth response of plants to different levels of light, CO_2 nutrients and water: a quantitative review. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, 27, 595–607.

Poorter, H., Jagodzinski, A.M., Ruiz-Peinado, R., Kuyah, S., Luo, Y., Oleksyn, J. *et al.* (2015). How does biomass distribution change with size and differ among species? An analysis for 1200 plant species from five continents. *New Phytol.*, 208, 736–749.

Pregitzer, K.S. (2008). Tree root architecture – form and function. *New Phytol.*, 180, 562–564.

Pregitzer, K.S., DeForest, J.L., Burton, A.J., Allen, M.F., Ruess, R.W. & Hendrick, R.L. (2002). Fine root architecture of nine North American trees. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 72, 293–309.

Reich, P.B., Luo, Y., Bradford, J.B., Poorter, H., Perry, C.H. & Oleksyn, J. (2014a). Temperature drives global patterns in forest biomass distribution in leaves, stems, and roots. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.*, 111, 13721–13726.

Reich, P.B., Rich, Roy.L., Lu, X., Wang, Y.-P. & Oleksyn, J. (2014b). Biogeographic variation in evergreen conifer needle longevity and impacts on boreal forest carbon cycle projections. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 111, 13703–13708.

Robinson, D. (2004). Scaling the depths: below-ground allocation in plants, forests and biomes. *Funct. Ecol.*, 18, 290–295.

Ruess, R.W., Hendrick, R.L., Burton, A.J., Pregitzer, K.S., Sveinbjornsson, B., Allen, M.E. *et al.* (2003). Coupling fine root

dynamics with ecosystem carbon cycling in black spruce forests of interior Alaska. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 73, 643–662.

Ryan, M.G., Binkley, D., Fownes, J.H., Giardina, C.P. & Senock, R.S. (2004). An experimental test of the causes of forest growth decline with stand age. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 74, 393–414.

Santantonio, D. (1989). Dry-matter partitioning and fine-root production in forests – new approaches to a difficult problem. In: *Biomass Production by Fast-Growing Trees* (eds Pereira, J.S. & Landsberg, J.J.). Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp. 57–72.

Shinozaki, K., Yoda, K., Hozumi, K. & Kira, T. (1964). A quantitative analysis of plant form – the pipe model theory. I. Basic analysis. *Jpn. J. Ecol.*, 14, 97–105.

Silver, W.L. & Miya, R.K. (2001). Global patterns in root decomposition: comparisons of climate and litter quality effects. *Oecologia*, 129, 407–419.

Strand, A.E., Pritchard, S.G., McCormack, M.L., Davis, M.A. & Oren, R. (2008). Irreconcilable differences: fine-root life spans and soil carbon persistence. *Science*, 319, 456–458.

Turner, D.P., Ritts, W.D., Cohen, W.B., Maeirsperger, T.K., Gower, S.T., Kirschbaum, A.A. *et al.* (2005). Site-level evaluation of satellite-based global terrestrial gross primary production and net primary production monitoring. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 11, 666–684.

Vanninen, P. & Makela, A. (1999). Fine root biomass of Scots pine stands differing in age and soil fertility in southern Finland. *Tree Physiol.*, 19, 823–830.

Vogt, K.A., Vogt, D.J. & Bloomfield, J. (1998). Analysis of some direct and indirect methods for estimating root biomass and production of forests at an ecosystem level. *Plant Soil*, 200, 71–89.

Warton, D.I., Wright, I.J., Falster, D.S. & Westoby, M. (2006). Bivariate line-fitting methods for allometry. *Biol. Rev.*, 81, 259–291.

West, G.B., Brown, J.H. & Enquist, B.J. (1999). A general model for the structure and allometry of plant vascular systems. *Nature*, 400, 664–667.

Withington, J.M., Reich, P.B., Oleksyn, J. & Eissenstat, D.M. (2006). Comparisons of structure and life span in roots and leaves among temperate trees. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 76, 381–397.

Wolf, A., Field, C.B. & Berry, J.A. (2010). Allometric growth and allocation in forests: a perspective from FLUXNET. *Ecol. Appl.*, 21, 1546–1556.

Woodward, F. & Osborne, C. (2000). The representation of root processes in models addressing the responses of vegetation to global change. *New Phytol.*, 147, 223–232.

Yuan, Z.Y. & Chen, H.Y.H. (2010). Fine root biomass, production, turnover rates, and nutrient contents in boreal forest ecosystems in relation to species, climate, fertility, and stand age: literature review and meta-analyses. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*, 29, 204–221.

Yuan, Z.Y. & Chen, H.Y.H. (2012a). A global analysis of fine root production as affected by soil nitrogen and phosphorus. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.*, 279, 3796–3802.

Yuan, Z.Y. & Chen, H.Y.H. (2012b). Indirect methods produce higher estimates of fine root production and turnover rates than direct methods. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e48989.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.