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Decadal trends in photosynthetic capacity and leaf area index inferred from satellite remote sensing for global vegetation types
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1 Abstract

In the face of a mounting diversity of experimental, satellite and ground-based observations, it is becoming necessary to simulate all changes associated with vegetation (phenological, structural, physiological and biochemical) and to understand the links between them. In this respect, global land-surface models are an indispensable tool. These models require, above all, a temporally and spatially explicit parameterisation of light- and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity in order to simulate photosynthesis accurately. The current study carries out a novel retrieval of these quantities by combining the standard satellite products of Leaf Area Index (LAI), from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS), with a hyperspectral index of total canopy chlorophyll concentration from the MEdium Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MERIS). Monthly values of photosynthetic capacity are retrieved for the period 2002-2012 for global 0.5° landpoints and made available to the community. We examine the decadal trends in both photosynthetic capacity and LAI in order to ascertain biochemical and structural responses of vegetation to environmental change. The main conclusion is that these trends, if sustained, are of a sufficient magnitude to vie in importance with other environmental factors which affect vegetation productivity and carbon uptake (e.g. CO₂ fertilisation and climate). The decadal trends for Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity, which tend to be negative, depend more on plant functional type than latitude, suggesting that biochemical change, like physiological response (e.g. owing to CO₂ fertilisation), might best be monitored in terms of vegetation type rather than climate zone. We record an LAI trend which, globally, is flat (-0.2±0.4% per decade) and, for the (mid-)northern latitudes, is much smaller (1.5-2.7% per decade) than that inferred by previous authors for Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) during the 1980s (9-13%).
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2 Introduction

Several landmark measurements reveal that the productivity of global vegetation is changing, although many details of the mechanisms remain elusive:

1. Remotely sensed NDVI (see Table 1 for acronyms used frequently in the text) reveals for the 1980s both an advancing spring (phenological change) and an increasing peak in productivity for northern latitudes (latt > 40°) (Myneni et al. 1997). The latter change is generally attributed to structural change (e.g., increased leaf area) but biochemical change (e.g., greater absorption of sunlight through leaf pigment change) cannot be excluded.

2. An increasing amplitude in the seasonal global atmospheric CO\(_2\) concentration ([CO\(_2\)]; Keeling et al. 1996). This is generally interpreted as enhanced primary productivity in the high northern latitudes (Graven et al. 2013; Forkel et al. 2016), although an increase in carbon release during the dormant season as respiration cannot be totally excluded (Prentice et al. 2000; Graven et al. 2013).

3. An increase in both net leaf carbon uptake and ecosystem net primary productivity owing to increasing [CO\(_2\)] in Free-air CO\(_2\) enrichment (FACE) experiments (Ainsworth & Long 2005; IPCC 2013). This “CO\(_2\) fertilisation” appears, however, to vary according to Plant Function Type (PFT), with forests affected most (Norby et al. 2005; Luo et al. 2006). Furthermore, it is unclear whether the enhancement is sustained, given that nitrogen (N) is often limiting, even in temperate zones of high anthropogenic N-deposition (Townsend et al. 1996; Nadelhoffer et al. 1999; Cleveland et al. 2013; but see Lloyd 1999). Paradoxically, there is also an expectation that active leaf-N (Rubisco and chlorophyll) may actually decline owing to acclimation to higher [CO\(_2\)] and diversion of plant-N to enhanced root growth (Prentice et al. 2000; Ainsworth & Long 2005; Leakey et al. 2009).

In the face of these observations, it is becoming necessary to understand and simulate all changes associated with vegetation (phenological, structural, physiological and biochemical) as well as the interactions among them.

Global land-surface models, when supported by increasing field and satellite observations, are an invaluable tool in this respect and some of the latest models even couple the carbon and N cycles, so that changes in active leaf-N, for example, influence carbon assimilation (Zaehle et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2014). Above all, most land-surface and carbon models require a temporally and spatially explicit parameterisation of both light- and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity in order to simulate photosynthesis accurately (Dang et al. 1998; Bonan et al. 2011). The advent of airborne and satellite hyperspectral instruments make this possible via remote sensing (Grace et al. 2007). However, many hyperspectral vegetation studies have hitherto focussed primarily on sun-induced fluorescence (which relates to chlorophyll) in agricultural areas (Zhang et al. 2014; Guanter et al. 2014) or the correlation of multiple optical and near-infrared wavelengths to leaf chemistry at regional level (Smith et al. 2002; Serbin et al. 2012; Ollinger et al. 2013). A more comprehensive study is called for, covering both natural and anthropogenic (e.g., agricultural) global PFTs, where N-limitations may differ.

The main purpose of the present study is to produce temporally resolved global maps of light- and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity (J\(_{\text{max}}^{25}\) and V\(_{\text{cmax}}^{25}\), respectively, for a standard leaf temperature of 25°C), which are suitable for land-surface model parameterisation, as well as revealing spatial and temporal trends in active leaf-N. This is achieved by the novel step of combining LAI, inferred from MODIS broadband reflectance, with a hyperspectral index sensitive to ground chlorophyll concentration, derived from MERIS (operational period 2002-2012). Both datasets are satellite-based and quasi-global. The photosynthetic capacity (biochemical) trend will be compared with structural (LAI) change. Studies of remotely sensed LAI trend are fairly scant (Mao et al. 2013; Zhu et al. 2016), although the strongly related Normalised Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) has been subject to trend analysis (Myneni et al. 1997; Zhou et al. 2001; Zhang et
Specific objectives of the current study are as follows:

1. To determine the magnitude and sign of biochemical (photosynthetic capacity) and structural (LAI) decadal trends and to compare them with the impact of CO₂ fertilisation on vegetation productivity.

2. To ascertain whether these trends correlate more strongly with latitude (as a proxy for climate) rather than with vegetation type.

3. To test whether the large increases in NDVI recorded during the 1980s (Myneni et al 1997) are sustained and manifest themselves in LAI increases for the period 2002-2012.

4. To relate the spatial distribution of photosynthetic capacity to both vegetation type and latitude, comparing the retrieved global range with recent field-based compilations such as TRY (Kattge et al 2009).

5. To make monthly 0.5° global maps of light- and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity available to the community and thus considerably improve the land-surface model parameterisation for two of the most influential parameters determining carbon-exchange at the land-surface. The current parameterisation, based on general time-invariant values, is inadequate and often inconsistent (Rogers 2014).

3 Material and Methods

The methodology is introduced below in the following sequence:

1. conceptual background to the retrieval (§3.1);
2. input satellite datasets (MTCI from MERIS and LAI from MODIS)(§3.2);  
3. protocol for retrieval (§3.3);  
4. sensitivity analysis (§3.4);

3.1 Conceptual Background

The retrieval combines the following 4 steps (see Alton 2017 for detailed equations and a schematic overview):

1. Leaf measurements (discussed below) indicate a linear or saturating relationship between maximum electron transport for the light reaction \(J_{\text{max}}^{25}\) and leaf chlorophyll content \(\text{Chl}\);

2. The sum of \(\text{Chl}\) integrated over canopy LAI (i.e. chlorophyll concentration per unit ground) is detected with the hyperspectral index MTCI which has recently been calibrated against ground measurements of chlorophyll (Dash et al 2010; Vuolo et al 2012).

3. A fairly tight near-linear empirical relationship is observed between \(J_{\text{max}}^{25}\) and \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25}\), consistent with the optimisation of active leaf-N over a diverse range of C₃ plants (e.g. Wullschleger 1993; Meir et al 2002; Walker et al 2014).
4. Thus, the chlorophyll concentration per unit ground, derived from remote sensing in step 2 above, can be related to Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity summed vertically over the canopy. Equivalently, using the observed exponential vertical decline in active leaf-N (Carswell et al 2000; Lewis et al 2000; Meir et al 2002), we can retrieve \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25, \text{toc}} \) at the canopy top (\( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \)) from known values of MTCI and canopy LAI.

The above 4 steps yield:

\[
a_{\text{mtci}}\text{MTCI} - b_{\text{mtci}} = \int_{0}^{\text{LAI}} \frac{a_{\text{wll}}}{a_{\text{chl}}} [1 - \frac{b_{\text{chl}}}{a_{\text{wll}}} - \exp(-\frac{V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25, \text{toc}} \exp(k_{\text{rub}}L)}{b_{\text{wll}}})]dL
\]

where input satellite quantities have been highlighted in bold. Integration takes place over cumulative leaf area (\( L \)) from the canopy top to a depth into the canopy. Active leaf-N (chlorophyll and Rubisco) declines exponentially with \( L \) according to a vertical N-allocation parameter, \( k_{\text{rub}} \) (Hirose & Weger 1987), which is assigned an average observed value of 0.15 (Carswell et al 2000; Lewis et al 2000; Meir et al 2002). The other terms in Eq. 1 are coefficients in the biochemical relations summarised in steps 1-3 above (Tab. 2). Thus, the terms \( a_{\text{wll}} \) and \( b_{\text{wll}} \) follow from a least-squares fit between \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) and \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) using numerous observations compiled by Wullschleger (1993). The coefficients \( a_{\text{mtci}} \) and \( b_{\text{mtci}} \), which relate MTCI to chlorophyll concentration per unit ground, are calibrated by ground measurements (Dash et al 2010).

The coefficients \( a_{\text{chl}} \) and \( b_{\text{chl}} \) in Eq.1, which relate \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) to leaf chlorophyll content (Tab. 2), were originally assigned values of 240 \( \mu \text{mol s}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1} \) and 24 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), respectively, in a pioneer retrieval of \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25, \text{toc}} \) at FLUXNET sites (Alton 2017). This corresponded to a best-fit between only 6 measurements of \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) and \( \text{Chl} \) and by pooling several PFTs. The current study extends this method by fitting each PFT separately and incorporating more data, though \( \text{Chl} \) is now inferred rather than measured. Thus, paired measurements of \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) and leaf-N are extracted from the database of Walker et al (2014; n=254). Leaf-N is converted to leaf chlorophyll content using a ratio which is conservative over most PFTs viz. leaf-N/\( \text{Chl} = 4.12 \pm 0.32 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ [g m}^{-2}]^{-1} \) (Evans 1989). To bolster these data, paired measurements of \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) and leaf-N are taken from the TRY database (Kattge et al 2009; n=536). Although \( J_{c_{\text{max}}} \) within TRY is not necessarily at the standard temperature of 25°C, where these data overlap with Walker et al (e.g. for non-tropical broadleaf forest), the relationship is not significantly different (p<0.05). The fitting of \( a_{\text{chl}} \) and \( b_{\text{chl}} \) is conducted separately for \( \text{Chl} \leq 0.4 \) and \( \text{Chl} > 0.4 \). For \( \text{Chl} \leq 0.4 \), the best fit line is forced through the origin \( (b_{\text{chl}}=0) \), under the assumption that electron transport is zero when chlorophyll is absent (Fig. 1 and Tab. 3).

Given the division of the \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} - \text{Chl} \) relation into two linear functions, Eq. 1 is integrated in two parts, according to the cumulative leaf area at which \( \text{Chl} \) falls below 0.4 g m\(^{-2}\) (active leaf-N declines with depth through the canopy). We favour a bimodal linear fit to \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} - \text{Chl} \), over a hyperbolic or exponential function, to render Eq. 1 tractable. Substituting best-fit values for \( a_{\text{wll}}, b_{\text{wll}}, a_{\text{mtci}} \) and \( b_{\text{mtci}} \) into Eq. 1 yields:

\[
0.616 \text{MTCI} - 0.700 = \int_{0}^{\text{LAI}} \frac{428}{a_{\text{chl}}(\text{PFT})[1 - \frac{b_{\text{chl}}(\text{PFT})}{428} - \exp(-\frac{V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25, \text{toc}} \exp(-0.15L)}{158})]dL
\]

where the best-fit values for \( a_{\text{chl}} \) and \( b_{\text{chl}} \) are given in Tab. 3 according to PFT.

Eq. 1 only applies to PFTs with a \( \text{C}_3 \) photosynthetic pathway because the relationship \( J_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} - V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) is undocumented for \( \text{C}_4 \) vegetation. However, numerous leaf-based observations (e.g. Wullschleger 1993; Meir et al 2002; Walker et al 2014) suggest an optimisation of active leaf-N for \( \text{C}_3 \) vegetation between maximum electron transport (relating to chlorophyll) and Rubisco-limited reduction. We assume this optimisation holds for \( \text{C}_4 \) vegetation so that \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25} \) assumes values which are appropriate to match electron transport in full light. The presence of bundle sheath chloroplasts in \( \text{C}_4 \) leaves leads to an efficiency enhancement in CO\(_2\) reduction, with respect to the \( \text{C}_3 \) pathway, by inhibiting photorespiration (Jones 1992). From equations C1
and C2 in Sellers et al (1996), based on a Farquhar-type leaf photosynthesis model (Farquhar et al 1980),
this efficiency factor ($F_{\text{photosp}}$) follows as:

$$F_{\text{photosp}} = \frac{C_i + K_c (1 + \frac{O_2}{K_o})}{C_i - C_p}$$

(3)

where $C_i$ is the leaf-internal CO$_2$ pressure, $O_2$ is the leaf-internal oxygen pressure, $K_c$ and $K_o$ are the
Michaelis-Menten constants, and $C_p$ is the compensation point (all for C$_3$ vegetation). For $C_i = 25$-28
Pa (Wong et al 1979; Collatz et al 1992; Campbell & Norman 1998) and $C_p = 4$ Pa (Collatz et al 1991),
$F_{\text{photosp}} = 3.62 \pm 0.33$. For C$_4$ leaves, therefore, we assume that $V_{25}^{cmax}$ is reduced by a factor 3.62 compared
to C$_3$ leaves with the same capacity for electron transport (as expressed by $J_{25}^{max}$). Measurements confirm
that the Rubisco content is several times lower in C$_4$ leaves compared to C$_3$ leaves for the same levels of
chlorophyll (Sage et al 1987; Evans 1989). Our modification for C$_4$ leaves is implemented by reducing $b_{wull}$
in Eq. 2 from 158 to 44.

Our retrieval method is subject to quite a few uncertainties, particularly for C$_4$ vegetation where the
relationship between $J_{25}^{max}$ and $V_{25}^{cmax}$ is not measured. Therefore, we check against Houborg et al (2013)
who exploit empirical relationships between active and total foliar N, recorded for both C$_3$ and C$_4$ crops, in
order to derive $V_{25}^{cmax}$ from leaf chlorophyll content. Thus:

$$V_{25}^{cmax(houb)} = \frac{a_{houb}(0.114 \times \text{MTCI} - 0.158) + 0.15b_{houb} \text{LAI}}{1 - \exp(-0.15 \text{LAI})}$$

(4)

where the empirical constants $a_{houb}$ and $b_{houb}$ are 253 and -27, respectively, for C$_3$ crops and 98.8 and -8.6,
respectively, for C$_4$ crops (see Appendix A for detail).

### 3.2 Input Datasets for Retrieval

#### 3.2.1 MTCI from MERIS

The steep gradient in spectral reflectance between the red and near-infrared domains (690-750 nm), known
as the red edge derivative, provides a strong probe of foliar chemistry and in particular chlorophyll content
(Middleton et al 2003). This is exploited in the MERIS Terrestrial Chlorophyll Index (MTCI):

$$\text{MTCI} = \frac{R_{753.75} - R_{708.75}}{R_{708.75} - R_{681.25}}$$

(5)

where $R$ is reflectance at the subscript wavelength given in nanometres (Curran et al 2007). The filters are
narrow (Fig.2) to quantify the gradient in the red-edge which is known to correlate strongly ($R^2=0.6-0.8$)
with canopy chlorophyll concentration over crops and the chlorophyll content of broadleaves and needle-
leaves (Dash & Curran (2007); Dash et al (2010)).

We access the standard MTCI product (Curran et al 2007) from the NERC Earth Observation Data Centre
(NEODC) which provides monthly values at a spatial resolution of 0.04° for the global ice-free land-surface
over a 10 yr MERIS operational period (6/2002-3/2012). Pixels are mean-averaged to the spatial resolution
of the MODIS global LAI maps (0.5°) introduced below.

Note that the LAI retrieved by MODIS and other satellite detectors (e.g. AVHRR and SPOT) is based
on broadband optical and near-infrared reflectance rather than the narrowband filters used by MTCI to
quantify the gradient in the red-edge. The two sets of filters (MERIS and MODIS) are independent although
the inference of both chlorophyll concentration and LAI relies on the relatively high reflectance in
the near-infrared compared to the optical domain (Fig. 2). Note that the MTCI derived from broadleaf and
needleleaf laboratory spectra correlates strongly ($R^2$=0.6-0.8) with measured chlorophyll content (Dash & Curran 2007). Furthermore, for both crops and non-tropical broadleaf forest, the chlorophyll concentration per unit ground, sampled within the MERIS footprint, correlates strongly ($R^2$=0.74–0.80) with MTCI (Dash et al 2010; Vuolo et al 2012). Several authors demonstrate a linear response of MTCI to high chlorophyll concentration per unit ground and, therefore, the index is sensitive to dense foliage ($\leq 4.5$ g m$^{-2}$; Peng et al 2017).

### 3.2.2 LAI from MODIS

Global LAI maps at 0.5° resolution (typically used in land-surface and climate modelling) are created for the MTCI-available period (2002-2012) by extracting and mean averaging 0.5 km pixels in the standard 8-day MCD15A2H (C6) MODIS product. The latest C6 LAI product corrects for long-term detector degradation present in previous (e.g. C4 and C5) releases (Yan et al 2016; Zhang et al 2017). Only pixels of good quality are selected i.e. main algorithm, no significant cloud and >50% detectors working (Yang et al 2006). To minimise noise in the phenology timeseries to be created (De Kauwe et al 2011), the global 0.5° maps are averaged temporally using a median 32-day moving window, except for the tropics where persistent cloud (Zhao et al 2005) necessitates selection of the maximum LAI value over a moving 48-day window (Ryu et al 2011). We require a monthly value of LAI, synchronised with MTCI, in order to retrieve $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$. Therefore, for each 0.5° global location, LAI is extracted via bilinear interpolation from the two temporally averaged global 8-day images which straddle the middle of the month in question.

### 3.3 Retrieval Protocol

We derive monthly global 0.5° $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ using Eq. 2 with modification for $C_4$ vegetation as indicated in §3.1. Owing to the double exponential on the right side of this equation, $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ is solved by forward-modelling. Thus, prior to retrieval, we create a PFT-specific look-up table for the right side of Eq. 2 for narrowly separated values of LAI ($\Delta$LAI = 0.01 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$) and $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ ($\Delta V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ = 1 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$). For each global pixel, observed monthly MTCI is substituted into the left of Eq. 2 and the resulting value is matched against integrals in the look-up table according to the LAI for that month. This yields $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$. The monthly retrieval is carried out for the entire MERIS operational period (June 2002 to March 2012). Top-of-canopy light-limited photosynthetic capacity ($J_{cmax}^{25,toc}$) is derived from $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ using the empirical fit between $J_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$, with substitution of $a_{wall}$ and $b_{wall}$ (Tab. 2). Note, however, that our results will focus on $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$, given the near-proportional relationship between $J_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$.

For thin or sparse vegetation, MTCI has greater sensitivity to the background (soil) reflectance, which increases the error in retrieved $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$. This is particularly noticeable for LAI $<0.5$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ and the retrieval is only undertaken for monthly LAI greater than this threshold. Furthermore, for LAI $\geq 1.5$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$, more than half the downwelling shortwave radiation is incident on leaves rather than the ground, assuming a turbid leaf canopy with a spherical leaf angular distribution (Campbell & Norman 1998: p249). Thus, monthly retrievals where LAI $\geq 1.5$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ are considered high quality and we check the impact of quality (high/low) on our results. As described below, our spatial analysis focuses on the distribution of maximum growing season $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$. This quantity can be determined for 90% of the vegetated global land-surface when implementing the aforementioned LAI $\geq 0.5$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ filter.

The PFT dependency of Eq. 2 requires knowledge of global land cover. Thus, the dominant landcover in each 0.5° grid cell is taken from the map of Goldwijk et al (2011) for the year 1990 and each cell assigned to one of the PFTs in Tab. 3. The adopted PFTs are based on the land-surface model JULES-SF (Alton 2016; Alton 2017, given that the long-term goal is to assimilate global $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ derived in this study into the carbon calculation of this model. Various sources for landcover are available (e.g. Loveland et al 2000;
Hansen & Reed 2000) but Goldwijk et al distinguishes carefully between natural and anthropogenic (pasture and cultivation) landcover, which could be important in terms of N-availability and biochemical change. To distinguish cells dominated by C3 grasses/crops from those dominated by C4 grasses/crops, we use the global map of Still et al (2003) which quantifies the fraction of C4 vegetation in each grid-cell. Although each grid-cell is attributed to a single dominant PFT, the value of $b_{wul}$ adopted in Eq. 2 differs greatly according to the photosynthetic pathway (§3.1). Therefore, the retrieval of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ from the look-up table associated with Eq. 2 is conducted separately for the C3 and C4 fractions of each 0.5° cell. The final retrieved $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ for the grid-cell is the weighted mean of these two components. For dominant (assigned) PFTs with a C3 pathway, the C4 fraction is assumed to be C4 grass, except for C3 crop where C4 crop is assumed for the C4 fraction. For cells assigned as C4 crop (C4 grass), the C3 fraction is assumed to be C3 crop (C3 grass).

The retrieved values of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ are examined both spatially and temporally. For the spatial analysis, monthly retrievals for each 0.5° landpoint, where available, are pooled and the three highest values from each complete year (2003-2011) extracted. The pool of extracted values is median averaged to produce a maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity for each 0.5° location ($V_{cmax}^{25,toc}(grow)$). Median-, rather than mean-, averaging is adopted since measured plant parameters such as $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ often possess a skewed frequency distribution (Wright et al 2005; Kattge et al 2009; Alton 2017). The global distribution of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}(grow)$ is assessed in terms of latitude and dominant PFT. For the temporal analysis, we determine the decadal trend in both monthly $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and monthly LAI to contrast the biochemical and structural change in vegetation. This analysis is organised by latitude (zones are affected differentially by environmental change) and by landcover (vegetation types respond differently to environmental change).

Given that our long-term goal is to provide spatially and temporally parameters for land-surface and carbon models, we make the global maps of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}(grow)$ and the corresponding $J_{max}^{25,toc}(grow)$ available via the internet and ftp server. Similarly, monthly global 0.5° maps of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$, $J_{max}^{25,toc}$ and the corresponding LAI, are also provided (see Appendix B).

### 3.4 Sensitivity Analysis

Retrieval of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ for FLUXNET sites (Alton 2017) revealed, via Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis, that systematic errors (owing to input LAI and parameterisation of the biochemical relations) dominate over random errors associated with the remotely sensed variables (LAI and MTCI). Such systematic errors are best investigated using a series of 3 sensitivity analysis experiments:

1. The conversion of MTCI to ground chlorophyll concentration is based on ground truthing over primarily grass and crops (Dash et al 2010). A ground calibration over a landscape dominated by non-tropical broadleaf forest (Vuolo et al 2012) yields a slightly different relation ($a_{mcci}=0.469$ and $b_{mcci}=-0.484$; c.f. Tab. 2). This alternative calibration is implemented to test sensitivity to the relation between MTCI and ground chlorophyll concentration.

2. Even though we have formulated the $J_{max}^{25}$-Chl relation as PFT-dependent, field-based data exhibit a large dispersion even for the same vegetation type (Fig. 3). Furthermore, the relation is unknown for C4 grass and C4 crops. The PFT-dependent relations we adopt in the retrieval are arguably sufficient for 0.5° grid cells, where the responses of individual species average out. However, we test general sensitivity to the $J_{max}^{25}$-Chl relation by treating all PFTs with the same relation and observing the impact on the results. Given that non-tropical broadleaf forest is best defined by observations in Fig. 1, we adopt this PFT for the "universal" relation. We eschew a sensitivity test of the relation $J_{max}^{25} - V_{cmax}^{25}$ (Tab. 2), which is conservative across PFTs (Wullschleger 1993; Kattge et al 2009; Walker et al 2014) compared to the $J_{max}^{25}$-Chl relation.
3. Sensitivity to input LAI is tested using a recalibration based on field measurements. Alton (2017) achieves this by extracting MODIS LAI for the 7×7 cells (49 km²) surrounding well-studied FLUXNET locations and comparing against ground measurements in the FLUXNET ancillary database (Agarwal 2012). However, although the sample size is large (n=234), the single-point FLUXNET field measurements do not account for landscape heterogeneity across the MODIS footprint. Though the sample size is smaller (n=38), a more accurate recalibration is obtained by comparing MODIS LAI against the BELMANIP field sites (Garrigues et al 2008) for which satellite high resolution maps have been used to scale up multiple LAI sampling to the MODIS footprint. This elaborate approach produces a more linear relationship between MODIS LAI and site LAI (Fig. 4), which can then be used to recalibrate MODIS LAI so that it is consistent with ground measurements. Note that input MODIS LAI is recalibrated using this relationship for each monthly timestep.

4 Results & Discussion

4.1 Retrieved \( V_{c_{\text{max}}(\text{grow})}^{25,\text{toc}} \): Validation and Range

To examine the range (this section) and the global distribution (next section) of the retrieval, we focus on the maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity retrieved across the 10 yr MERIS period (\( V_{c_{\text{max}}(\text{grow})}^{25,\text{toc}} \)). Monthly retrievals are examined in the temporal analysis below (§4.3).

Given the complexity and uncertainties of the current method, \( V_{c_{\text{max}}(\text{grow})}^{25,\text{toc}} \) retrieved for global land points shows fair agreement with field-based compilations of photosynthetic capacity for the upper canopy (Tab. 4).

Thus, the Root Mean Square (RMS) difference between the retrieved median per PFT and the mean average of field compilations (columns 2 and 3 of Tab. 4) is 25 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) (20 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), when omitting savanna for which the discrepancy is quite large). Retrievals are generally somewhat smaller than field values. Thus, mean averaging across all PFTs, where a comparison is possible, the retrieval median is 2/3 the field average (33 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) and 53 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), respectively). Note that field values are also subject to considerable uncertainty and often contain location sampling biases (e.g. under-representation of Asia in Wright et al (2005)). Furthermore, the majority are inferred from \( A - c_{i} \) curves, rather than measured directly (\( A \) is net leaf photosynthesis and \( c_{i} \) is intercellular CO\(_2\) concentration). They also depend on both the precise formulation adopted for the Farquhar photosynthesis model, which relates \( V_{c_{\text{max}}(\text{grow})}^{25,\text{toc}} \) to \( A \), and the conditions of measurement (e.g. correction for both plant water stress and sub-optimal leaf temperatures).

The retrieval possesses a narrower range than field-based compilations. However, the latter also show considerable disparities amongst themselves for the same PFT (Fig. 5). The dispersion and disparities that characterise field-based values might arise in part from methodological differences. For example, Wullschleger (1993) does not take explicit account of either the temperature nor the assimilation compensation point of the leaf in his adopted Farquhar model. In their method, Beerling & Quick (1995) use maximum leaf photosynthetic rate for individual PFTs and the long-term \( c_{i} \) inferred from the leaf isotope ratio \( \delta^{13} \text{C} \). For the retrieval, several aspects may explain the narrow range for each PFT. First, the 0.5° retrieval cells contain PFTs other than the dominant (ascribed) PFT and they average across many species even for the same PFT. This averaging tends to remove the extremes captured by field-based values. Second, the observed \( J_{c_{\text{max}}-\text{Chl}}^{25} \) relation differs for species of the same PFT (Fig. 3) and this dispersion is unaccounted for in our adopted PFT-dependent relation. Any future improvement would have to take account of accessory pigments and other non-chlorophyll molecules contributing to light-harvesting and the efficiency of electron transport (Evans 1989; Mauseth 1998; Gurevitch et al 2006). In this respect, optical and near-infrared hyperspectra may offer potential, owing to their apparent sensitivity to a range of leaf molecules and properties (Smith et al 2002; Serbin et al 2012).

Field-based values consistently reveal that C₃ crops have higher photosynthetic capacity than other PFTs
(Wullschleger 1993; Kattge et al 2009) and this is corroborated by our retrievals (Tab. 4). We retrieve lower $V_{cmax}^{25}$ (grow) for C4 crops compared to C3 crops owing to the higher efficiency of the C4 photosynthetic pathway. An alternative retrieval, based on total-to-active N ratio (Houborg et al 2013; Appendix A), yields medians of 72 and 37 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively, for C3 and C4 crops. These values are within 9% of the corresponding medians in Tab. 4 (73 and 34 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively).

4.2 Global Distribution of $V_{cmax}^{25}$ (grow) and $J_{max}^{25}$ (grow)

Highest global values in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ (grow) (55-60 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) and $J_{max}^{25}$ (grow) (130-140 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) occur in the mid-northern and mid-southern zones i.e. latitude (lat) at ±38°). This coincides with a preponderance of C3 crops and C3 grass, including pasture (Fig. 6). In particular, highest retrieved values are concentrated within the USA grain belt, European pasture/cropland, the Ukraine bread basket and the Indian sub-continent (Figs. 7 and 8). Crops and many grasslands are dominated by annuals which invest a large fraction of available N in the photosynthetic apparatus in order to maximize growth over a single year (Hikosaka 2004).

4.3 Trends in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ and LAI

We follow previous authors in monitoring change by latitude (often considered a proxy for climate). However, we also analyse by PFT since biochemical change, like physiological response to CO2 fertilisation (Norby et al 2005; Luo et al 2006), may vary according to vegetation type and growth form.

Timeseries and significant (p<0.05) trends for monthly $V_{cmax}^{25}$ and LAI, averaging across different latitude zones, are depicted in Figs. 9 and 10. Apart from the mid-northern zone (lat=15-45°), $V_{cmax}^{25}$ exhibits a decrease between -3.0±0.5% per decade and -6.8±1.8% per decade (Tab. 5). LAI trends are positive in the northern (lat=45–90°) and mid-northern zones (+2.7±1.0% per decade and +1.5±0.5% per decade, respectively). However, for latitudes between -45° and -15° (mid-southern zone), there is a significant decrease (-2.8±0.7% per decade). In the northern zone, the trends are noisy owing to a reduced number of 0.5° cells for averaging. This reduction is due to incomplete satellite coverage at high latitudes and the removal of low LAI (background-dominated) cells from the retrieval. To first order, $V_{cmax}^{25}$ ~ MTCI/LAI. Therefore, in part, the more pronounced decrease in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ in the northern zone may be attributable to the concomitant increase in LAI. However, a comparable decrease in the mid-southern zone is coincident with a decrease, rather than an increase, in LAI.

The change in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ is more pronounced when analysed by PFT rather than by latitudinal zone (Fig. 11 and Tab. 6). Indeed, the strong and varied PFT-responses cancel to some extent when averaging over zones which comprise several vegetation types. The PFT-trend is also fairly consistent across zones (R$^2$=0.48; p<0.01; Fig. 12). Thus, it is vegetation type and not just latitude (and by implication climate) which determines the change in photosynthetic capacity. For LAI, the PFT-trend does not exhibit consistency between zones (Fig. 12). Note that the correlation for $V_{cmax}^{25}$ in Fig. 12 depends strongly on the pronounced negative trends for C4 grass and non-tundra shrub. Therefore, this result should be viewed with caution.

Trends in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ for mixed forest, non-tropical broadleaf forest and C3 crops (Tab. 6) are not significantly different from zero (Tab. 6). The predominance of these PFTs in mid-northern latitudes explains the insignificant change in this zone, which contrasts with the decline in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ in the remaining zones. Interestingly, positive and negative trends do not cluster according to growth form. Thus, while C4 grass exhibits a substantial decline (-9.0±1.4% per decade), the decrease for C3 grass is much less substantial (-2.4±0.7% per decade). Potentially, photosynthetic pathway may account for the different responses of C3 and C4 grasses. The C3 pathway is more Rubisco-limited (Prentice et al 2000) and any decrease in $V_{cmax}^{25}$ is likely to have
an adverse impact on primary productivity. However, the responses for the tree growth form, which are all C3 pathway, vary greatly too (e.g. compare needleleaf and non-tropical broadleaf in Tab. 6).

The (near-) zero $V_{cmax}^{25,loc}$ trends for a mixture of PFTs and growth forms in the mid-northern zone (mixed forest and C3 crops) might best be explained by a regional influence such as N-deposition within the industrial countries of North America and Europe. However, this would not account for the consistency in PFT-trend between zones (Fig. 12). Focussing on anthropogenic PFTs, where N might be less limiting, C3 crops have the highest positive trend amongst all the PFTs (0.7±0.6% per decade). However, the trend is significantly negative for C4 crops (-2.4±0.7% per decade) and it lies in the middle of the distribution for PFT-trends (Tab. 6).

Results from FACE predict a small decrease in Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity owing to acclimation to rising [CO2] (Ainsworth & Long 2005; Leakey et al 2009). The response is expected to depend on growth form or functional group, with trees being less affected (-6%) than grasses/crops (-17%). Indeed, our own results reveal a decrease in $V_{cmax}^{25,loc}$ but, as discussed above, the magnitude of the response does not group strongly according to life form.

For structural change, NDVI, rather than LAI, has been chiefly monitored in the past. However, we can make a valid comparison between the two quantities because both are based on broadband red and near-infrared reflectance. Indeed, LAI is often derived from NDVI assuming a non-linear (saturating) relationship (Los et al 2000). Analysing AVHRR satellite data for 1980s, Myneni et al (1997) measure a 13% increase per decade in NDVI seasonal amplitude for the northern zone and a 9% increase per decade for the mid-northern zone. The increase can best be explained by a larger seasonal amplitude in LAI (although a change in leaf biochemistry and pigment composition cannot be excluded). Combining both AVHRR and MODIS data for the period 1982-2011, Los (2013) confirms a steep increase for global NDVI for the 1980s but a levelling off from about 2000. Likewise, although Zhou et al (2001) detect an NDVI increase similar to Myneni et al for the 1980s, their AVHRR data reveal a flattening or even declining global trend for the 1990s. Analysis of LAI, from AVHRR, reveals a global trend (<1% per decade) over the baseline 1982-2009 (Zhu et al 2016), which is an order of magnitude smaller that that detected by Myneni et al for NDVI during the 1980s. This is partly due to a zero trend for 2001-2009. For the relatively late period of the current study (2002-2012), we record a zero (flat) trend in global LAI based on MODIS data (-0.2±0.4% per decade; Tab. 5).

Studies of AVHRR NDVI over multiple decades (e.g. 1982-2005) suggest large (50%) differences in regional trends according to continent or latitude (Zhou et al 2001; Zhang et al 2007). In some cases, even decreasing trends are apparent. Mao et al (2013) detect greater positive multidecadal LAI trends at high northern latitudes (+3.6% per decade) using both AVHRR and MODIS data over the period 1982-2009. They attribute this finding to asymmetric south-to-north land surface warming. This tendency is corroborated to some extent in the current study with the most positive LAI trend in the northern zone (Tab. 5).

Taking these results together, we cannot exclude the possibility of acclimation of LAI to environmental change or indeed a trend-reversal. Nevertheless, we are cautious about inferring long-term trends from the short (~10 yr) timescales used in this study. Low frequency variations associated with natural climate oscillations (e.g. ENSO) or episodic volcanic aerosol may convolute long-term trends (Myneni et al 1997). For example, both $V_{cmax}^{25,loc}$ and LAI appear to undergo a ~6 yr oscillation in Fig. 10 for the tropics (lat= -15° to 15°). Furthermore, part of the strongly negative trends for C4 grass and non-tundra shrub (-9.0±1.4% per decade and -13.1±1.6%, respectively) can be attributed to a pronounced decline in $V_{cmax}^{25,loc}$ at the end of the timeseries (2010-2012). This is also apparent in the mid-southern zone, where these PFTs contribute strongly to the land-cover (panel (b) of Fig. 10). A further consideration is that consistent sampling of LAI (and NDVI) across our satellite period (2002-2012) is rendered difficult by interannual variability in snow cover, sensitivity to soil background at the vegetation line and incomplete satellite coverage at lat>50°.
during winter. Indeed, we believe that the purported increase in NDVI owing to earlier snowmelt (Myneni et al 1997), would be difficult to detect using remote sensing. Thicker snow cover in one year would actually bias measurements towards lower latitudes where mean LAI is higher. Our filter LAI<0.5 m²m⁻², intended to reduce the influence of soil background, also precludes detection of a change at the northern boundary of vegetation cover.

What do field measurements reveal about LAI trend? Using the FLUXNET ancillary database (Agarwal 2012), for those few sites with regular long-term field measurements (approximately spanning 1997-2010), we obtain increases in LAI monthly anomaly for both non-tropical broadleaf trees (10±3.0% per decade) and needleleaf trees (4.0±2.5% per decade). Within Tab. 6, the latter agrees quite closely (2.4±1.5% per decade) but our increase for non-tropical broadleaf forest is an order of magnitude less (1.5±0.8% per decade). We note, however, that many FLUXNET sites are secondary and recovering from disturbance (Law et al 2002; Friend et al 2007). As such, they may represent rather poorly the average structural change across the 15-90º zone over which they are scattered.

### 4.4 Sensitivity Analysis & Limitations of Methodology

The following results follow from the sensitivity analysis:

1. Implementing alternative parameterisations for the biochemical relations, i.e. MTCI versus ground chlorophyll concentration (experiment 1) and \(J_{\text{max}}^{25} \text{Chl} \) (experiment 2), produces no significant change in the main results. Thus, the inferred zonal trends in \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) and LAI change only modestly (±0.5% per decade) compared to uncertainties in the original trends (±0.8% per decade (RMS); Tab. 5). Furthermore, the PFT trends in \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) (Fig. 12) still correlate fairly well between zones (\(R^2=0.45-0.47 \) versus \(R^2=0.48 \) in the original retrieval; \(p<0.02\)).

2. Our results are more sensitive to the systematic (calibration) uncertainty in input LAI (experiment 3). Thus the RMS difference between the two retrievals of \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) (grow) (with and without recalibration to site LAI) is 7 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\). However, this represents a moderate (20%) change (column 2 of Tab. 4). The impact is less than the RMS difference between the original (unrecalibrated) retrieval and the field average (25 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\)). The LAI recalibration also changes the inferred zonal trends for \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) and LAI by a moderate amount (0.8% per decade) compared to the original uncertainties (0.6-1.0% per decade). The decadal declines for zonal \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) remain statistically significant but the increases in LAI for the northern and mid-northern zones are somewhat reduced compared to the original retrieval (from 0.2-1.6% per decade to 1.5-2.7% per decade). With recalibration, the PFT trends in \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) still correlate to some extent between zones (\(R^2=0.46; \ p<0.02\)). We note that our inferred trends in both LAI and \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) depend on the accuracy and reliability of updates to the MODIS LAI product. Thus, the C6 release, adopted in the current study, corrects a long-term detector deterioration in the Terra instrument which spuriously generated negative LAI trends in previous releases (Yan et al 2016; Zhang et al 2017).

3. Our main results for LAI are robust when only accepting high quality retrievals which are less sensitive to soil background (i.e. LAI≥ 1.5 m²m⁻²; §3.3). However, zonal trends in \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) change more than the original uncertainties. This is because the temporal response of those PFTs comprising the zone varies according to LAI category. An extreme case is C3 grass within the mid-northern zone which possesses a decadal trend of -3.8±1.8% per decade for LAI< 1.5 m²m⁻² but +4.5±1.1% per decade for LAI≥ 1.5 m²m⁻². The dichotomy stems from a substantial and non-spurious difference in decadal change of MTCI between both LAI categories. It does not arise from increased sensitivity to soil background, for which the uncertainty is much smaller than the decadal change in MTCI. In conclusion, our original results for \(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}} \) trend should be viewed with the caveat that temporal response varies greatly according to both PFT (Tab. 6) and canopy density (low and high LAI).
In summary of our sensitivity tests, the accuracy of the input satellite LAI ultimately limits the accuracy with which we can derive global $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and determine the decadal trend in both LAI and $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$. In comparison, incomplete empirical knowledge of biochemical relations (e.g., $J_{max}^{25,Chl}$) for some PFTs (e.g., C$_4$ grass) appears less problematic.

4.5 Environmental Change, Vegetation Productivity and the Carbon Cycle

Are the trends we infer for $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and LAI important in the context of other environmental changes that can have an impact on carbon uptake? The IPCC (2013) identifies increasing [CO$_2$] as probably the most influential factor on vegetation productivity through CO$_2$ fertilisation. Indeed, numerous FACE experiments measure a $\pm$30% increase in both diurnal and light-saturated carbon uptake when leaves are subjected to a 50% (160 ppm) increase in [CO$_2$]. For the observed rate of increasing [CO$_2$] (Keeling et al 1996), this corresponds to a 2-3% increase in productivity per decade. Increases in observed net primary productivity follow a similar trend, or about half ($\pm$1% per decade) for non-woody vegetation (Norby et al 2005).

Climate-driven trends are more difficult to quantify. The C4IMP modelling exercise predicts a -1.3$\pm$2.6% change in global net primary productivity per 1K rise in average air temperature, with models possessing varied responses to both increased temperature and reduced soil moisture availability (Friedlingstein et al 2006). For the observed rate of increasing temperature (Keeling et al 1996), this corresponds to a trend of -0.2$\pm$0.4% per decade in global net primary productivity. CMIP5 trends for the recent (satellite) period 1982-2011 yield -0.6$\pm$0.8% per decade (Smith et al 2016). Therefore, the trends we infer for zonal $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ are of a similar magnitude as those associated with CO$_2$ fertilisation and even larger than climate-related trends. However, we recognise that changes in $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and gross productivity are unlikely to be proportional, given that photosynthesis is often constrained by factors other than Rubisco concentration (e.g., temperature and water).

As discussed above, FACE predicts a 6-17% decrease in $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ under rising [CO$_2$], equivalent to -1.0$\pm$0.5% per decade (Keeling et al 1996). Our derived PFT trends are up to an order of magnitude greater (Tab. 6). We speculate, therefore, that the expected long-term [CO$_2$] acclimation is masked by a shorter term response to other environmental factors, such as a multi-annual climate cycles (e.g., ENSO) or anthropogenic N emissions.

Structural change, such as LAI, may also have a non-proportional impact on gross productivity, although the 9-13% increase in NDVI, recorded by Myneni et al (1997) for the 1980s, is probably as least as important as CO$_2$ fertilisation over this period. The LAI decadal trends that we record for the mid-northern and northern zones (1.5-2.7% increase per decade; Tab. 5) are smaller in magnitude than the NDVI trend for the 1980s. This suggests that structural and biochemical trends may diminish (or even reverse) in time, perhaps owing to acclimation.

5 Summary and Conclusions

We employ a novel retrieval of top-of-canopy Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity (i.e. maximum carboxylation rate, $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$) from remote sensing inputs of MODIS LAI and the MERIS terrestrial chlorophyll index (MTCI). Monthly values of $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and light-limited photosynthetic capacity ($J_{max}^{25,toc}$) are retrieved for the period 2002-2012 for global 0.5° landpoints. The retrieved ranges of maximum growing season $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ are analysed spatially in terms of global PFTs and compared against compilations of field-based values. We examine the decadal trend in both $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ and LAI in order to ascertain biochemical and structural responses of vegetation to environmental change. The main conclusion is that both biochemical and structural trends are important, if sustained, when compared against other environmental factors which affect vegetation.
productivity and carbon uptake (e.g. CO₂ fertilisation and climate).

Specific findings are as follows:

1. Highest global values in maximum growing season \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25,\text{toc}} \) (55-60 µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) and \( J_{\text{max}}^{25,\text{toc}} \) (130-140 µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) occur in the mid-northern and mid-southern zones (lat=±38°), especially where C₃ crops dominate (i.e. the grain belts and breadbaskets of Europe, the USA, the Ukraine and India).

2. Analysed by PFT, the retrieved global values of maximum growing season Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity are somewhat lower, and possess a narrower range, than compilations of field-based values. Future improvement of the retrieval could take account of species differences in electron transport (e.g. accessory pigments) by assimilating hyperspectra or a greater number of narrow-band indices (Serbin et al 2015).

3. We detect a general temporal decline in \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25,\text{toc}} \) (between -0.3% per decade and -6.8% per decade, depending on latitude) for the period 2002-2012. However, the decadal trends for \( V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25,\text{toc}} \) depend more on PFT than latitude, suggesting that biochemical change, like physiological response (e.g. owing to CO₂ fertilisation; Norby et al 2005; Ainsworth & Long 2005), might best be monitored in terms of vegetation type rather than climate zone.

4. The greatest uncertainty in the retrieval stems from systematic errors in LAI but our main results appear to be robust even when recalibrating MODIS to upscaled ground measurements.

5. We record a zero (flat) trend in global LAI during 2002-2012 (-0.2±0.4% per decade). Furthermore, our LAI trends over this period for mid-northern (+1.5±0.5% per decade; lat=15-45°) and northern (+2.7±1.0% per decade; lat>45°) zones are much smaller than the substantial increases recorded in NDVI for the 1980s (9-13%; Myneni et al (1997)). Our results tentatively corroborate the finding that LAI trends are more positive towards higher northern latitudes (Mao et al 2013).
Appendix A: alternative retrieval of $V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$ for C$_3$ and C$_4$ crops based on Houborg et al (2013)

In their Table 2, Houborg et al (2013) provide an empirical relation between leaf chlorophyll content ($\text{Chl}$; g m$^{-2}$) and the maximum carboxylation rate at 25°C ($V_{25}^{cmax}$; µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) for C$_3$ and C$_4$ crops. This is based on the observed ratio between total and active leaf-N. Thus:

$$\frac{V_{25}^{cmax}(L) - b_{houb}}{a_{houb}} = \text{Chl}(L)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

for a leaf located at a cumulative (i.e. from the canopy top) LAI equal to $L$. For C$_3$ leaves, the empirical constants $a_{houb}$ and $b_{houb}$ are 253 and -27, respectively. For C$_4$ leaves, $a_{houb}$ and $b_{houb}$ are 98.8 and -8.6, respectively.

Several authors measure an exponential decrease in active foliar N according to leaf position (expressed as cumulative LAI), such that:

$$V_{25}^{cmax}(L) = V_{25,toc}^{cmax} \exp(-k_{rub}L)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$ is $V_{25}^{cmax}(L)$ at the canopy top and $k_{rub}$ is the vertical N allocation parameter (Hirose & Werger 1987), for which we adopt an observationally based value of 0.15 (Carswell et al 2000; Lewis et al 2000; Meir et al 2002).

We substitute Eq. 7 into the left side of Eq. 6 and integrate both sides. Thus:

$$\int_0^{LAI} \frac{V_{25,toc}^{cmax} \exp(-0.15L) - b_{houb}}{a_{houb}} dL = \int_0^{LAI} \text{Chl}(L) dL$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

Leaf chlorophyll content, summed over the LAI of the canopy, yields the chlorophyll concentration per unit ground which is detected by the hyperspectral satellite index MTCI. Thus:

$$\int_0^{LAI} \text{Chl}(L) dL = (0.758 \times \text{MTCI}) - 1.05$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

based on the calibration of MTCI when ground sampling vegetation across the MERIS footprint (Dash et al 2010).

We substitute Eq. 9 into the right side of Eq. 8 and evaluate the integral on the left side. Rearranging, this yields:

$$V_{25,toc}^{cmax} = \frac{a_{houb}(0.114 \times \text{MTCI} - 0.158) + 0.15b_{houb}LAI}{1 - \exp(-0.15LAI)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where negative values of $V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$, occurring at low MTCI (<1.39), are set to zero.
Appendix B: photosynthetic capacity database

Global maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity and monthly global maps of both photosynthetic capacity and LAI are all available at 0.5° resolution via the internet address:

http://ggluck.swansea.ac.uk/ftp/apaul/vcmax

For bulk download, they can also be obtained via anonymous ftp as follows:

1. ftp ggluck.swansea.ac.uk (set both name and password to ‘anonymous’)
2. cd apaul/vcmax/global

Maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity is available in the file calc_vcmax_global_grow.out. Columns are as follows: (1) \( \text{lat}[^\circ] \), (2) \( \text{longitude}[^\circ] \), (3) \( V^{25,\text{toc}}_{cmax}(\text{grow}) \) [\( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)] and (4) \( J^{25,\text{toc}}_{max}(\text{grow}) \) [\( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)]. Monthly maps are available in subdirectories organised according to year. For example, maps for 2002 can be accessed via:

3. cd 2002
4. prompt
5. mget *
6. quit

Within each subdirectory, files are named calc_vcmax_global_<month>.out where <month> is between 1 and 12 for January to December. Columns are as follows: (1) \( \text{lat}[^\circ] \), (2) \( \text{longitude}[^\circ] \), (3) \( V^{25,\text{toc}}_{cmax} \) [\( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)], (4) \( J^{25,\text{toc}}_{max} \) [\( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)] and (5) LAI [\( \text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2} \)]. For both the monthly maps and the maximum growing season map, water bodies and unavailable land points are filled with values of -9999 and -999, respectively.
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Table 1: An alphabetical list of acronyms, abbreviations and quantities used frequently in the main text. Units are given where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO(_2)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J_{\text{max}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J_{\text{max}}^{25})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J_{\text{cmax}}^{25})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_{\text{cmax}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,toc})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Main steps and equations associated with the conceptual methodology. The corresponding step is enumerated and explained at the beginning of §3.1. Definition of the quantities and assignment of the best-fit coefficients are discussed in the main text. Note that \(b_{\text{wull}}\) differs according to the C\(_3\) or C\(_4\) photosynthetic pathway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Best-fit Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(J_{\text{max}}^{25}(L) = a_{\text{chl}} \times Chl(L) + b_{\text{chl}})</td>
<td>PFT-dependent (a_{\text{chl}}) &amp; (b_{\text{chl}}) (see text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\int_0^{\text{LAI}} Chl(L) dL = a_{\text{mtci}} \times MTCI + b_{\text{mtci}})</td>
<td>(a_{\text{mtci}}=0.616) g m(^{-2}); (b_{\text{mtci}}=-0.700) g m(^{-2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(J_{\text{max}}^{25}(L) = a_{\text{wull}}(1 - \exp(-V_{\text{cmax}}^{25}(L)/b_{\text{wull}})))</td>
<td>(a_{\text{wull}}=428) µmol m(^{-2}) s(^{-1}) (C(_3) &amp; C(<em>4)); (b</em>{\text{wull}}=158) µmol m(^{-2}) s(^{-1}) (C(<em>3)); (b</em>{\text{wull}}=44) µmol m(^{-2}) s(^{-1}) (C(_4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(V_{\text{cmax}}^{25}(L) = V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,toc} \exp(-k_{\text{rub}}L))</td>
<td>(k_{\text{rub}}=0.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Optimised coefficients for $a_{chl}$ and $b_{chl}$, which relate $J_{25}^{\text{max}}$ to leaf chlorophyll content ($Chl$; step 1 of Table 2), according to Plant Functional Type (PFT). PFT-design. is the abbreviated designation adopted for PFTs in subsequent tables and figures. Least-squares fitting is conducted separately for $Chl \leq 0.4 \, \text{g m}^{-2}$ and for $Chl > 0.4 \, \text{g m}^{-2}$ by varying $a_{chl}$. For $Chl \leq 0.4 \, \text{g m}^{-2}$, $b_{chl}$ is set to zero to intercept the origin. For $Chl > 0.4 \, \text{g m}^{-2}$, $b_{chl}$ is already constrained by the condition that both best-fit lines meet at $Chl = 0$. SE and $n$ are, respectively, the standard error and the total number of data used to optimise the fit. For tundra shrub and C$_3$ grass, where data are scarce or highly dispersive, we fit only for $a_{chl}$ across the whole $Chl$ range. For C$_4$ grass and C$_4$ crops (no data), we adopt the same relation as C$_3$ grass and C$_3$ crops, respectively. $J_{25}^{\text{max}} - Chl$ measurements are only available for “pure” leaf types rather than mixed types. Therefore, for savanna and mixed forest, we adopt the mean coefficients of, respectively, C$_4$ grass and non-tundra shrub, and non-tropical broadleaf forest and needleleaf forest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFT</th>
<th>PFT-design</th>
<th>$Chl \leq 0.4 , \text{g m}^{-2}$</th>
<th>$Chl &gt; 0.4 , \text{g m}^{-2}$</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$a_{chl}$ (µmol s$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$a_{chl}$ (µmol s$^{-1}$ g$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$b_{chl}$ (µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tropical Broadleaf Forest</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needleleaf Forest</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$ crop</td>
<td>Cr3</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_4$ crop</td>
<td>Cr4</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tundra Shrub</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Forest</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Broadleaf Forest</td>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$ grass</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_4$ grass</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tundra Shrub</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savanna</td>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The median of maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity ($V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25,\text{toc}}(\text{grow})$) retrieved for global land points compared to a field-based average of $V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25}$ (Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity measured in the upper canopy). The field-based average uses the compilations of Kattge et al (2009), Wright et al (2005), Wullschleger (1993) and Beerling & Quick (1995) and mean averages the central value (mean or median) given by each compilation for that Plant Functional Type (PFT). PFTs are abbreviated according to Tab. 3. SD(field) is the standard deviation of the field-based mean from the central value of each compilation. The retrieved median, after recalibration to site LAI, is given in parentheses and is discussed in §4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFT</th>
<th>Retrieved $V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25,\text{toc}}(\text{grow})$ median [µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>Field $V_{c_{\text{max}}}^{25}$ mean [µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>SD(field) [µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>54(59)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>24(32)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3</td>
<td>73(82)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr4</td>
<td>34(36)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>8(14)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>46(54)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>30(28)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>38(49)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>15(19)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>26(33)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>16(19)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Decadal trend in monthly anomalies of $V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$ and LAI according to latitude zones. For each anomaly, the least-squares gradient ($a$) and intercept ($b$) are shown for a linear fit across the MERIS period 2002-2012. The equivalent decadal trend and its uncertainty are shown as $\Delta$ and $d\Delta$, respectively. Where trends are significant ($p<0.05$), they are flagged by an asterisk. For all fits, the coefficient of correlation is given by $R^2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Latitudes</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$\Delta \pm d\Delta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$\Delta \pm d\Delta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$</td>
<td>$V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$</td>
<td>(µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(%)/decade</td>
<td>(m$^2$ m$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>(%)/decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>+45 – +90</td>
<td>-0.25782</td>
<td>517.53349</td>
<td>-6.8±1.8(*)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.003194</td>
<td>-6.4111</td>
<td>2.7±1.0(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-North</td>
<td>+15 – +45</td>
<td>-0.01319</td>
<td>26.46981</td>
<td>-0.3±0.8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.002817</td>
<td>-5.6541</td>
<td>1.5±0.5(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropics</td>
<td>-15 – +15</td>
<td>-0.06655</td>
<td>133.58858</td>
<td>-3.0±0.5(*)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.000468</td>
<td>-0.9398</td>
<td>0.1±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-South</td>
<td>-45 – -15</td>
<td>-0.14382</td>
<td>288.70834</td>
<td>-5.4±1.0(*)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.004960</td>
<td>9.9570</td>
<td>-2.8±0.7(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>-90 – +90</td>
<td>-0.10039</td>
<td>201.51710</td>
<td>-3.5±0.5(*)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.000571</td>
<td>1.1471</td>
<td>-0.2±0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: As Tab. 5 but according to Plant Functional Type (PFT). PFTs are abbreviated according to Tab. 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFT</th>
<th>(a) ((\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}[\text{yr}^{-1}]))</th>
<th>(b) ((\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}))</th>
<th>(\Delta \pm d\Delta) ((%$/\text{decade}$))</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(a) ((\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}[\text{yr}^{-1}]))</th>
<th>(b) ((\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}))</th>
<th>(\Delta \pm d\Delta) ((%$/\text{decade}$))</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>-0.07355</td>
<td>147.64468</td>
<td>-1.9(\pm)1.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.002962</td>
<td>-5.9465</td>
<td>1.5(\pm)0.8</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>-0.35398</td>
<td>710.57144</td>
<td>-11.6(\pm)2.3((*))</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.002979</td>
<td>-5.9796</td>
<td>2.4(\pm)1.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3</td>
<td>0.04426</td>
<td>-88.84431</td>
<td>0.7(\pm)0.6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.005337</td>
<td>-10.7132</td>
<td>3.1(\pm)0.8((*))</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr4</td>
<td>-0.07038</td>
<td>141.27366</td>
<td>-2.4(\pm)0.7((*))</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.006775</td>
<td>-13.5997</td>
<td>3.4(\pm)0.6((*))</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>-0.14710</td>
<td>295.28796</td>
<td>-10.9(\pm)4.2((*))</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.001736</td>
<td>-3.4845</td>
<td>2.0(\pm)1.7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>-0.00828</td>
<td>16.61265</td>
<td>-0.2(\pm)0.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.005977</td>
<td>-11.9979</td>
<td>2.6(\pm)0.9((*))</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>-0.09307</td>
<td>186.81759</td>
<td>-3.7(\pm)0.5((*))</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.001813</td>
<td>3.6397</td>
<td>-0.4(\pm)0.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-0.07668</td>
<td>153.93081</td>
<td>-2.4(\pm)0.7((*))</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.000910</td>
<td>-1.8267</td>
<td>0.5(\pm)0.5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-0.11590</td>
<td>232.64553</td>
<td>-9.0(\pm)1.4((*))</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.002165</td>
<td>4.3469</td>
<td>-1.5(\pm)0.7((*))</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>-0.32235</td>
<td>647.06955</td>
<td>-13.1(\pm)1.6((*))</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.006663</td>
<td>-13.3750</td>
<td>5.6(\pm)1.1((*))</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>-0.05397</td>
<td>108.32904</td>
<td>-4.0(\pm)0.7((*))</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.002000</td>
<td>-4.0142</td>
<td>0.8(\pm)0.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Captions:

Fig.1: Measured maximum electron transport for the light reaction against leaf chlorophyll content (Chl), the latter inferred from measured leaf-N. Measurements from Walker et al (2014) are for a standard leaf temperature of 25°C ($J_{\text{max}}^{25}$), whilst measurements from the TRY database (Kattge et al 2009) are for an unspecified temperature ($J_{\text{max}}$). The solid and dashed lines represent a least-square linear fit for, respectively, $\text{Chl} \leq 0.4 \text{ g m}^{-2}$ and $\text{Chl} > 0.4 \text{ g m}^{-2}$. Fits and abbreviations for each PFT are given in Tab. 3.

Fig.2: Hyperspectral MERIS filters (doubled hashed area), used for the MTCI index, compared against the broadband MODIS filters used for LAI (single hashed area; Shabanov et al 2005). Both sets of filter are compared to the laboratory-based spectral reflectance of a maple leaf (Acer sp.; Clark et al 1993). The steep increase in reflectance between the optical and near infrared domains, known as the red-edge, arises from strong chlorophyll absorption at 690 nm and high reflectance by leaf mesophyll cells at 750 nm.

Fig.3: Measured maximum electron transport for the light reaction ($J_{\text{max}}^{25}$) against leaf chlorophyll content (Chl) for two species of non-tropical broadleaf forest. The corresponding fit for this PFT is superimposed (see panel (a) of Fig. 1). For $0.4 \leq \text{Chl} \leq 0.6$, mean $J_{\text{max}}^{25}$ is 185 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for Eucalyptus globulus and 97 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for Liquidambar styraciflua (Sweetgum) i.e. 43% above and 25% below, respectively, the general PFT relation (solid and dashed lines).

Fig.4: Leaf Area Index (LAI) measured by MODIS plotted against single-point field measurements (FLUXNET; lower panel) and against multiple scaled ground measurements (BELMANIP; upper panel). MODIS LAI corresponds to a 7 km $\times$ 7 km area coincident with the site and extracted for the date of the field measurement. In both panels, markers vary according to PFT (abbreviated according to Tab. 3). Least-square best fits are shown using the function $\sigma=a(1-\exp(-x/b))$, where $a=4.482$, $b=1.968$ for FLUXNET ($\sigma(\text{flux})$) and $a=7.531$, $b=4.828$ for BELMANIP ($\sigma(\text{bel})$). The inverse of $\sigma(\text{bel})$ is used to recalibrate monthly MODIS LAI in a sensitivity test of input LAI on the $V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}}$ retrieval ($\S$3.4). FLUXNET and BELMANIP ground measurements are taken, respectively, from Agarwal (2012) and Garrigues et al (2008).

Fig.5: Barcharts comparing the interquartile range of retrieved $V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}}(\text{grow})$, designated as “retrieval” in the legend, with the corresponding field-based range for the upper canopy. The retrieval is for global land points whereas the field-based ranges are based on extensive compilations by Kattge et al (2009), Wright et al (2005) and Wullschleger (1993). Beerling & Quick (1995; BQ) is based on a single estimate per PFT. Values are grouped according to PFT. Note that the retrieved range for C$_4$ crops is shown with C$_3$ crops (no field measurements are available for C$_4$ crops).

Fig.6: Zonal profile of retrieved maximum growing season light-limited and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity ($J_{\text{max}}^{\text{loc}}(\text{grow})$ and $V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}}(\text{grow})$, respectively; lower panel) compared against land cover (upper panel). Land cover is represented as the percentage of total vegetation at each latitude and is compressed to basic life-forms (tree, grass/crop and shrub) for clarity.

Fig.7: Maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity ($V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}}(\text{grow})$; µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) retrieved for 0.5° global grid-squares. Note that for locations of sparse vegetation (LAI<0.5 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$), a retrieval is not possible (black). This figure is reproduced in colour in the online version of this article.

Fig.8: Global PFTs based on Goldwijk et al (2011) with modification according to the distribution of C$_4$ vegetation (Still et al 2003). Grid-squares are at 0.5° resolution. Land without vegetation is black. This figure is reproduced in colour in the online version of this article.

Fig.9: Trend in monthly $V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{loc}}$ (solid) and LAI (dashed) anomalies for the period 2002-2012 for the northern
(panel a) and mid-northern (panel b) latitudinal zones. Significant trends, where present, are fitted with a solid ($V_{cmax}^{25, toc}$) and a dashed (LAI) straight line (Tab. 5). Mean values averaged across the 2002-2012 period are shown as $< V_{cmax}^{25, toc} >$ and $< LAI >$. Note that LAI anomalies are in units of 0.1 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ but $< LAI >$ is in units of m$^2$m$^{-2}$. The y-axis range (LAI) for the northern zone is twice that of the mid-northern zone.

Fig.10: As Fig. 9 but for the tropics (panel a) and for the mid-southern zone (panel b).

Fig.11: Decadal trends in monthly anomalies of $V_{cmax}^{25, toc}$ (squares with solid errorbars) and LAI (squares with dashed errorbars), shown separately according to global plant functional type. Plant functional types are abbreviated according to Tab. 3. Errorbars represent the standard error.

Fig.12: The decadal trend for the mid-northern (+15° to +45°) zone plotted against that for the combined tropics and mid-southern zone (-45° to +15°). The trend is defined for monthly anomalies in $V_{cmax}^{25, toc}$ (panel a) and LAI (panel b), expressed as a percentage of the mean value over the period 2002-2012. Each marker denotes a different plant functional type. Outliers are labelled using the abbreviations in Tab. 3. The y=x line and significant best fit ($V_{cmax}^{25, toc}$ only) are represented, respectively, by dashed and solid lines.
Figure 1: Measured maximum electron transport for the light reaction against leaf chlorophyll content ($Chl$), the latter inferred from measured leaf-N. Measurements from Walker et al (2014) are for a standard leaf temperature of 25°C ($J_{25}^{max}$), whilst measurements from the TRY database (Kattge et al 2009) are for an unspecified temperature ($J_{max}$). The solid and dashed lines represent a least-square linear fit for, respectively, $Chl \leq 0.4$ g m$^{-2}$ and $Chl > 0.4$ g m$^{-2}$. Fits and abbreviations for each PFT are given in Tab. 3.
Figure 2: Hyperspectral MERIS filters (doubled hashed area), used for the MTCI index, compared against the broadband MODIS filters used for LAI (single hashed area; Shabanov et al 2005). Both sets of filter are compared to the laboratory-based spectral reflectance of a maple leaf (Acer sp.; Clark et al 1993). The steep increase in reflectance between the optical and near infrared domains, known as the red-edge, arises from strong chlorophyll absorption at 690 nm and high reflectance by leaf mesophyll cells at 750 nm.
Figure 3: Measured maximum electron transport for the light reaction ($J_{25}^{\text{max}}$) against leaf chlorophyll content (Chl) for two species of non-tropical broadleaf forest. The corresponding fit for this PFT is superimposed (see panel (a) of Fig. 1). For $0.4 \geq \text{Chl} \geq 0.6$, mean $J_{25}^{\text{max}}$ is 185 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for Eucalyptus globulus and 97 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ for Liquidambar styraciflua (Sweetgum) i.e. 43% above and 25% below, respectively, the general PFT relation (solid and dashed lines).
Figure 4: Leaf Area Index (LAI) measured by MODIS plotted against single-point field measurements (FLUXNET; lower panel) and against multiple scaled ground measurements (BELMANIP; upper panel). MODIS LAI corresponds to a 7 km × 7 km area coincident with the site and extracted for the date of the field measurement. In both panels, markers vary according to PFT (abbreviated according to Tab. 3). Least-square best fits are shown using the function $\sigma = a(1-\exp(-x/b))$, where $a=4.482$, $b=1.968$ for FLUXNET ($\sigma$(flux)) and $a=7.531$, $b=4.828$ for BELMANIP ($\sigma$(bel)). The inverse of $\sigma$(bel) is used to recalibrate monthly MODIS LAI in a sensitivity test of input LAI on the $V_{25,loc}$ retrieval (§3.4). FLUXNET and BELMANIP ground measurements are taken, respectively, from Agarwal (2012) and Garrigues et al (2008).
Figure 5: Barcharts comparing the interquartile range of retrieved $V^{25,\text{toc}}_{\text{cmax}}(\text{grow})$, designated as “retrieval” in the legend, with the corresponding field-based range for the upper canopy. The retrieval is for global land points whereas the field-based ranges are based on extensive compilations by Kattge et al (2009), Wright et al (2005) and Wullschleger (1993). Beerling & Quick (1995; BQ) is based on a single estimate per PFT. Values are grouped according to PFT. Note that the retrieved range for C$_4$ crops is shown with C$_3$ crops (no field measurements are available for C$_4$ crops).
Figure 6: Zonal profile of retrieved maximum growing season light-limited and Rubisco-limited photosynthetic capacity ($J_{\text{max}}^{25,\text{toc}}(\text{grow})$ and $V_{\text{cmax}}^{25,\text{toc}}(\text{grow})$, respectively; lower panel) compared against land cover (upper panel). Land cover is represented as the percentage of total vegetation at each latitude and is compressed to basic life-forms (tree, grass/crop and shrub) for clarity.
Figure 7: Maximum growing season photosynthetic capacity ($V_{25,\text{toc}}^{\text{cmax}}(\text{grow})$; $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) retrieved for 0.5° global grid-squares. Note that for locations of sparse vegetation (LAI<0.5 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$), a retrieval is not possible (black). This figure is reproduced in colour in the online version of this article.

Figure 8: Global PFTs based on Goldwijk et al (2011) with modification according to the distribution of C$_4$ vegetation (Still et al 2003). Grid-squares are at 0.5° resolution. Land without vegetation is black. This figure is reproduced in colour in the online version of this article.
Figure 9: Trend in monthly $V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$ (solid) and LAI (dashed) anomalies for the period 2002-2012 for the northern (panel a) and mid-northern (panel b) latitudinal zones. Significant trends, where present, are fitted with a solid ($V_{25,toc}^{cmax}$) and a dashed (LAI) straight line (Tab. 5). Mean values averaged across the 2002-2012 period are shown as $<V_{cmax}^{25,toc}>$ and $<LAI>$. Note that LAI anomalies are in units of 0.1 m² m⁻² but $<LAI>$ is in units of m² m⁻². The y-axis range (LAI) for the northern zone is twice that of the mid-northern zone.
Figure 10: As Fig. 9 but for the tropics (panel a) and for the mid-southern zone (panel b).

(a) 15°S - 15°N

<\text{\textbf{V}^{25, toc}_{cmax}}> = 22, \text{<LAI>}=3.7

(b) 45°S - 15°S

<\text{\textbf{V}^{25, toc}_{cmax}}> = 27, \text{<LAI>}=1.8
Figure 11: Decadal trends in monthly anomalies of $V_{25, toc}^{cmax}$ (squares with solid errorbars) and LAI (squares with dashed errorbars), shown separately according to global plant functional type. Plant functional types are abbreviated according to Tab. 3. Errorbars represent the standard error.
Figure 12: The decadal trend for the mid-northern (+15° to +45°) zone plotted against that for the combined tropics and mid-southern zone (-45° to +15°). The trend is defined for monthly anomalies in $V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ (panel a) and LAI (panel b), expressed as a percentage of the mean value over the period 2002-2012. Each marker denotes a different plant functional type. Outliers are labelled using the abbreviations in Tab. 3. The y=x line and significant best fit ($V_{cmax}^{25,toc}$ only) are represented, respectively, by dashed and solid lines.
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