This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: **Growth enhancements of elevated atmospheric [CO2] are reduced under drought**‐**like conditions in temperate eucalypts**

Journal title; **Functional Ecology** First published**: 04 Apr 2022**

which has been published in final form at

<https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2435.14046>

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited.

- Paul Rymer, Josh Sharp-Hewitt, Robert Peprah, Chris Long, Gavin McKenzie, Andrew
- Gherlenda, Greening Australia, Ozzie Seed Supplies. The authors declare that they have no
- conflict of interest, financial or otherwise, that could have influenced this paper.
-
-

Author contributions:

- *Design of the research:* E. Bendall (22.5%); R. Bradstock (22.5%); A. Leigh (22.5%); L.
- Collins (22.5%) M. Boer (10%)
- *Performance of the research:* E. Bendall (90%); R. Bradstock (2.5%); A. Leigh (2.5%); L.
- Collins (2.5%); M. Boer (2.5%)
- *Data analysis:* E. Bendall (35%); R. Bradstock (20%); L. Collins (10%); M. Bedward (35%)
- *Interpretation:* E. Bendall (25%); R. Bradstock (25%); A. Leigh (10%); L. Collins (10%) M.
- Boer (5%); M. Bedward (20%); H. Clarke (5%)
- *Writing the manuscript:* E. Bendall (50%); R. Bradstock (15%); A. Leigh (10%); L. Collins
- (15%); M. Boer (2.5%); M. Bedward (5%); H. Clarke (2.5%)
-
- All authors contributed critically to the draft manuscript and gave final approval for publication
- **Author emails:**
- Eli Bendall: eli.r.bendall@gmail.com
- Ross Bradstock: rossb@uow.edu.au
- Luke Collins: l.collins3@latrobe.edu.au
- Andrea Leigh: Andrea.Leigh@uts.edu.au
- Matthias Boer: M.Boer@westernsydney.edu.au
- Michael Bedward: mbedward@uow.edu.au
- Hamish Clarke: hamishc@uow.edu.au
-
- All data and code used to produce the results in the manuscript are available in the GitHub
- repository:<https://github.com/erb418/EB.Ch4.scripts>
-

Abstract

ecosystems (Liu *et al.* 2019). Elevated CO² is hypothesised to lead, directly, to

 changes in ecosystem structure and function by favouring some plant taxa over others (Bond 2000; Macinnis-Ng *et al.* 2011; Buitenwerf *et al.* 2012). However, 36 there is still uncertainty around the interactive effects of $eCO₂$ and changes in climate, e.g. antagonistic effects may limit eCO2 effects on plants (Duursma *et al.* 2011; Franks *et al.* 2013; Duan *et al.* 2014; Zeppel *et al.* 2015; Walker *et al.* 39 2021). While there has been substantial work regarding $[CO_2]$ effects or drought and temperature effects on contrasting species (Drake *et al.* 2017; Resco de Dios *et al.* 2018; Blackman *et al.* 2019), most work investigating CO₂-climate interactions has focused on just one or a few species, usually those of commercial interest (e.g. Duursma *et al.* 2011; Lewis *et al.* 2013; Duan *et al*. 2018a; Duan *et al.* 2019). Hence, there is a need for experiments to address the effects of $eCO₂$ climate interactions among contrasting vegetation communities found in natural landscapes, so that predictions can be made about vegetation responses to global change (Ghannoum *et al.* 2010; Franks *et al.* 2013). Elevated CO² has been identified as a key driver of landscape greening and increased woody biomass across a range of ecosystems globally over the past few decades (Andela *et al.* 2013; Donohue *et al.* 2013; Zhu *et al.* 2016). Elevated CO² may increase the growth of woody plants via the direct enhancement of photosynthesis in C³ species (i.e. CO² fertilisation; Roden & Ball 1996; Atwell *et al.* 2007; Eamus & Palmer 2007) or indirectly by increasing plant water use 54 efficiency (Polley *et al.* 1997). Many studies investigating the effects of eCO₂ show strong positive responses such as significant increases in growth rate (Hovenden & Williams 2010) and biomass (e.g. 41–108%, Roden & Ball 1996; Poorter & Nagel 2000; Atwell *et al.* 2007, Walker *et al.* 2021). Enhanced growth 58 of seedlings and saplings under $eCO₂$ may lead to faster establishment and increase the chances of plants reaching maturity, thereby facilitating population growth (Bond 2000). Increased allocation of non-structural carbohydrates (NSC) 61 is a key physiological response to $eCO₂$ (Du *et al.* 2020). Non-structural carbohydrates are utilised by plants to grow new foliage following disturbance

63 such as drought or fire (Hoffmann 2000). Elevated $CO₂$ may accelerate investment

in NSC storage organs such as lignotubers (woody mass at the base of the stem

- 65 containing growth buds) and coarse roots (structural roots >2 mm diameter,
- Zhang & Wang 2015), increasing the capacity of young plants to draw on reserves

 depleted after disturbance-related damage (Hoffman *et al.* 2000; Bond & Midgley 2012).

 Increases in drought and fire have been linked with elevated plant mortality and demographic shifts in forests around the globe (Allen *et al.* 2010; Brando *et al.* 2014; Cobb *et al.* 2017; Fairman, Bennett & Nitschke 2019). It is predicted that climate change and associated changes to disturbance regimes may lead to the conversion of forest to non-forest biomes (Bowman *et al.* 2013). Forests typically considered resilient to change, such as resprouter-type eucalypt forests, may be vulnerable to severe drought, e.g. through loss of canopy cover and increased mortality (Matusick *et al.* 2013). Plants have a range of physiological mechanisms and traits that enable them to cope with drought, with species from more xeric environments likely to have more highly developed drought adaptations than species from more mesic environments (Merchant *et al.* 2006; Merchant *et al.* 2007). Adaptation to xeric environments include increased root to shoot mass ratio (RMR) to maximise water uptake while decreasing water loss (Brunner *et al.* 2015) and increased leaf mass per unit area (LMA) to conserve resources and reduce wilting (Poorter *et al.* 2009). Low-LMA species are generally associated with faster growth and resource acquisition (e.g. higher productivity, mesic environments), while high-LMA species are generally associated with more conservative growth and persistence (e.g. lower 87 productivity, xeric environments; Poorter *et al.* 2009). Elevated CO₂ may alleviate drought stress by allowing sufficient gas exchange to continue during drought via reduced stomatal conductance and increased water use efficiency (Atwell *et al.* 90 2007; Lewis *et al.* 2013). Whereas eCO₂ may increase leaf water potential in some species (Atwell *et al.* 2007), water limitation can also increase LMA (Roden & Ball 1996), assisting survival during drought through limiting transpirational water loss. The response of different vegetation types to the fertilisation effect of \degree eCO₂ in conjunction with detrimental effects of drought remains uncertain, with variable results evident across a range of biomes (Duan *et al.* 2014; Souza *et al.* 2019). In Australia, eucalypts (the sub-genera *Corymbia*, *Angophora* and

 Eucalyptus) dominate most fire-prone forest and woodland communities (Nicolle 2006). Eucalypts inhabit a diverse range of climates (e.g. semi-arid, moist, alpine, 100 Keith 2004), have diverse physiological responses to $eCO₂$ and drought (Merchant *et al.* 2006; Merchant *et al.* 2007), well-developed storage organs used for post- disturbance resprouting (Burrows 2013) and are highly resilient to major structural changes under extreme disturbance regimes (Collins 2020). Most eucalypts are 'resprouters', able to produce new foliage from the canopy or main stem via epicormic buds beneath the bark and/or from the base of the stem via below-ground lignotuber buds (Nicolle 2006; Burrows 2013). Plants such as eucalypts typically inhabit fire-prone environment and seedlings must capture and store resources in order to survive drought and fire (Lawes & Clarke 2011; Burrows 2013; Pausas *et al.* 2018), as juvenile stems are vulnerable to mortality until other resistance traits such as tall canopies and thick bark are developed later in life (Prior, Murphy & Russell-Smith 2009; Clarke *et al.* 2013; Nolan *et al.* 2020).

 Eucalypts from xeric communities more effectively maintain osmotic balance (Merchant *et al.* 2006) and higher stomatal conductance under water- stress than mesic eucalypts (Ngugi *et al.* 2004). Thus, such species may be able to 116 more effectively take advantage of $eCO₂$ under drought conditions by maintaining 117 higher relative growth rates. Elevated $CO₂$ may facilitate greater allocation of non-structural carbohydrates to storage organs such as lignotubers and roots, which can be utilised to grow new foliage following disturbance (Hoffman *et al.* 2000). Plants with larger lignotubers are more likely to successfully resprout (Walters, Bell & Read 2005; Wigley, Cramer & Bond 2009; Borzak, Potts & O'Reilly-Wapstra 2016). Thus, understanding changes in biomass, resource 123 acquisition and storage traits to $eCO₂$ among species from a range of environments and the degree to which these responses are modified by drought- like conditions, is important to gain insights into potential future changes across a range of eucalypt-dominated plant communities. This study investigated the responses of seedlings of nine common *Eucalyptus* species when grown under two levels of $[CO₂]$ (elevated versus ambient) in combination with two levels of moisture availability (well-watered versus drought-like conditions). To gain insight into community-level responses to future climate change, we compared indicative species of several widespread,

- contrasting southeastern Australian vegetation types: wet sclerophyll forest
- (WSF), a mesic type; dry sclerophyll forest (DSF), a moderately xeric type; and
- 134 grassy woodland (GW), a strongly xeric type. Generally, we expected that $eCO₂$

 would enhance growth of biomass including storage organs (e.g. Hovenden & Williams 2010; Walker *et al.* 2021), that drought would increase LMA and RMR (e.g. Poorter & Nagel 2000; Poorter *et al.* 2009; Brunner *et al.* 2015). We also 138 expected that drought would result in potential reductions in the $CO₂$ fertilisation effect (e.g. see Duan *et al.* 2013; Duan *et al.* 2018b) and that such reductions may differ between vegetation types, due to inherent variability in drought adaptation (e.g. see Merchant *et al.* 2007; Cernusak *et al.* 2011; Lewis *et al.* 2011). 142 Specifically, we asked whether $eCO₂$ has a fertilisation effect on the biomass components indicative of successful growth and establishment (e.g. above- ground, below-ground), resource acquisition traits indicative of adaptation to 145 environmental conditions (e.g. LMA, RMR). We also asked whether $eCO₂$ has a fertilisation effect on the storage capacity of resprouting organs indicative of resilience to disturbance (e.g. lignotuber size), and whether any such fertilisation effect is modified by drought-like conditions at the community-level.

Materials and Methods

Study Area

 The vegetation types examined in this study dominate the southeastern portion of New South Wales, Australia (approximate centre = 36°3'10" S; 149°39'4" E). The topography is heterogeneous and consists of coastal plains, undulating hinterland, coastal escarpments and tablelands west of the escarpment. Elevation ranges from sea level to over 1200 m in the mountains and tablelands. Soils are mainly of low to moderate fertility, derived from a range of parent material including sandstone, granite, metasediments and basalt (DPI 2017). Temperature and rainfall vary across the region as function of both altitude and distance from coast. The mean minimum 160 temperature of the coolest month ranges from -3 to 7^oC in DSF, -3 to 6^oC in WSF 161 and -3 to 1°C in GW. The mean maximum temperature of the warmest month ranges from 21–31°C in DSF, 21–26°C in WSF and 21–28°C in GW. Mean annual precipitation is lower in areas dominated by DSF (886 mm) and GW (892 mm) than in areas dominated by WSF (989 mm, all values derived from BioClim 2022). Dry Sclerophyll Forest tends to dominate drier, nutrient-limited areas where water drains away, whilst WSF tends to dominate moist microclimates (e.g. gullies) and areas of higher rainfall. Grassy Woodland tends to dominate where soil nutrients

 are higher in coastal rainshadow valleys and on cooler, drier tablelands west of the coastal escarpment (Keith 2004). Fire regimes in DSF and WSF communities consists of a combination of mixed severity wildfires and low to moderate severity prescribed burns, whilst in GW fires tend to be low to moderate severity grass or litter fires (NPWS 2004; Bradstock *et al.* 2010; Murphy *et al.* 2013; Collins *et al.* 2021). Typical fire intervals range between 5–20 years in DSF and 20–100 years in WSF and GW (Murphy *et al.* 2013). The data and R scripts used to generate the climatic envelope of the study region and vegetation types are provided online in a data repository [\(https://github.com/erb418/EB.Ch4.scripts\)](https://github.com/erb418/EB.Ch4.scripts).

Experimental design

 Indicative species of the three widespread southeastern Australian forest types (Keith 2004) were chosen for the experiment, with *Eucalyptus viminalis* Labill., *Eucalyptus fastigata* H.Deane & Maiden and *Corymbia maculata* K.D.Hill & L.A.S.Johnson representing WSF; *Eucalyptus sieberi* F.Muell, *Eucalyptus pilularis* Sm. and *Corymbia gummifera* K.D.Hill & L.A.S.Johnson representing DSF; and *Eucalyptus melliodora* A.Cunn ex Schauer, *Eucalyptus blakelyi* Maiden and *Eucalyptus bridgesiana* R.T.Baker representing GW. Each species chosen was common and widespread within their respective vegetation types and capable of epicormic resprouting (see Brooker & Kleinig 1999; Boland et al. 2006). Seedlings were raised as standard tube stock by Greening Australia (Western Sydney University, Hawkesbury Campus) from wild-collected seed acquired from the coast, ranges and tablelands of southeastern Australia. Seedlings were initially 191 grown in low-light conditions (poly tunnel/shade house) under ambient $[CO₂]$ $(aCO₂, i.e. 400 ppm)$ and well-watered conditions for three months commencing 18 July 2017. Following this establishment period, seedlings were transplanted into PVC pots (diameter of 150 mm, height of 400 mm), each of which contained 10 kg of free-draining alluvial topsoil, with drainage holes to allow water free passage through the pots and plastic mesh to prevent soil loss through drainage holes. The experiment was conducted over 18 weeks (28 October 2016 to 9 March 2017) during the regional growing-season at Western Sydney University,

Richmond NSW (33°36'40" S; 150°44'26.5"E). Twelve seedlings from each

 species were assigned to each of four adjacent sun-lit, climate-controlled 202 glasshouse chambers (width 3.0 m \times length 5.0 m \times height 3.5 m each). Daily air temperature in the chambers was customised to suit the 30-year growing season average of the study region, changing four times over a 24 hour period to simulate 205 a daily cycle, and ranging from a minimum of 15° C to a maximum of 25° C 206 (Aspinwall *et al.* 2019). Two chambers were set at $aCO₂$ level (400 ppm), while 207 two chambers were set at $eCO₂$ level (640 ppm), the latter representing a projected moderate 2100 climate change scenario, i.e. between Representative Concentration Pathways 4.5 and 6 (IPCC 2021). Seedlings were given a single dose of slow-release native fertiliser (Osmocote ®) when initially transplanted to the pots and watered to field capacity every two to three days to provide two months of optimal growth conditions prior to imposing drought-like conditions. The CO² treatments began immediately after seedlings were transplanted into the pots and placed in the glasshouse. Throughout the experiment, plants were rotated between and within chambers fortnightly to minimise chamber-related effects on 216 plant growth. $[CO_2]$ was changed with each rotation so that plants remained in the designated treatment as they moved to a new chamber.

Drought treatment

 At 75 days after planting, water limitation was imposed on half of the plants 221 within each species ($n = 24$), by reducing water supply by half to simulate 222 drought-like conditions. Four pots were randomly selected for each species ($n =$ 48 in total) and weighed in the morning (between 08:00–10:00) every 2–4 days to measure water loss between glasshouse visits. In the well-watered treatment plants were re-watered to field capacity regardless of species or vegetation type, while in the water-limited treatment plants received an amount of water equal to 50% of total weight lost between each measurement, thereby incrementally reducing available water until the onset of wilting. After the first instance of wilting, water-limited plants were maintained slightly above the threshold of wilting for the duration of the experiment. Plants in the well-watered treatment were re-watered to field capacity every 3–4 days. Measurements of pre-dawn leaf 232 water potential (\varPsi_{pd}) were carried out twice a week over four weeks to determine plant water status and ensure that plants in the water-limited treatment were

 water-stressed. Water-use efficiency can be variable among eucalypts in a glasshouse setting, particularly where both mesic and xeric species are used (Lewis *et al.* 2013; Kelly *et al.* 2016; Zhou, Medlyn & Prentice 2016). Hence, three individuals of each species in each treatment group within each glasshouse 238 chamber were selected for \mathcal{Y}_{pd} measurements, with different individuals used on 239 each occasion to minimise the effects of leaf excision on plant health. φ_{pd} was measured using a pressure-chamber (Scholander-type, PMS Instruments, 241 Corvallis, Oregon). See Supporting Information Fig. **S1** for Ψ_{pd} monitoring data.

Harvest

 Plant height was measured with a long ruler from the soil surface to the leading edge of the uppermost canopy leaf. The longest axis of the canopy was measured along with the perpendicular axis, which was then calculated as an ellipse as a proxy for projected crown area. Watering stopped for all plants (dry-down) 10 days prior to harvest (Chick 2016). At 133 days after planting, all plants were clipped at 50 mm above the soil surface and shoot biomass was weighed, bagged 250 and placed in an oven to dry for a minimum of 72 hours at 70° C, before dry weight was recorded. Leaf area was measured using a LI-COR leaf area meter (LI-3100C, Lincoln, Nebraska). Finally, all soil was removed by tipping pots upside down and using pressurised water to loosen the soil. Large 3 mm sieves were used to collect root material. Once bulk soil was removed, plant material was gently washed to remove residual soil before fresh biomass was recorded. Lignotuber presence was recorded and roots separated from lignotubers. Roots and lignotubers were weighed and lignotuber dimensions recorded before all plant material was bagged and placed in an oven to dry for a minimum of 72 hours at 70°C, before dry weight was recorded.

Data analysis

We compared plant responses under each of the 12 treatment combinations (3

263 vegetation types X 2 levels of $CO₂$ X 2 watering regimes) by fitting a Bayesian

cell means model for each measured attribute. This is equivalent to fitting a

conventional 3-way analysis of variance, in that the same main effects and

 interactions are being modelled. However, it has the advantage that estimates of the difference in response between treatment combinations can be quantified by directly querying the fitted model without the need to perform additional post-hoc procedures. The Bayesian approach also naturally allows for minor differences in replication between treatment combinations as this is reflected in the bounds of 271 the model estimates.

 Community-level responses (i.e. DSF, WSF, GW) were of primary interest, thus data for each species was pooled within each vegetation type for analyses. However, additional modelling of species-specific responses suggested that the majority of species within each vegetation type responded similarly (see Fig. **1,2,3** for species modelling). The measured attributes consisted of three biomass components (total; above-ground; below-ground), four resource acquisition traits (plant height; crown area; leaf mass per unit area; root to shoot mass ratio); and two biomass components associated with storage (lignotuber biomass; coarse root biomass, i.e. structural roots >2 mm diameter). Cell means models were fitted using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) as implemented in the 'rjags' package for R version 3.5.0 (Plummer *et al.* 2019; R Core Team 2020). 283 Each model considered 12 cells, representing all combinations $CO₂$ level, watering treatment and vegetation type. All measured attributes other than RMR were modelled as Gamma-distributed variables, with cell means based on vague Normal prior distributions. The right-tailed nature of the Gamma distribution sometimes resulted in the mean lying some distance from the mode, toward the tail of the distribution. Variances were allowed to vary between cells and were based on a uniform distribution. The RMR measure was modelled as Beta- distributed (see Niekerk *et al.* 2019) using a parameterisation based on cell mean and dispersion, with means drawn from a t-distribution to help account for outlier values within some cells. For each model, we sampled three Markov chains, each consisting of 10,000 model iterations. We assessed model convergence using the Gelman-Rubin diagnostic (Gelman & Rubin 1992) and checked for acceptable levels of serial autocorrelation. Separate Markov chains for each model were then combined into a matrix of samples from the joint posterior distribution of model parameters, which we subsequently used to derive predictions for the value of each measured attribute within each treatment (Kruschke 2015; Suzuki 2019).

 For each vegetation type, we quantified the extent to which drought-like conditions modified the effects of eCO₂ on each measured attribute using a two- step difference calculation: (i) the posterior sample of values for the attribute in the aCO₂ treatment were subtracted from those in the eCO₂ treatment, generating a distribution of $CO₂$ fertilisation magnitudes (performed separately for the values corresponding to well-watered and drought-like conditions); (ii) the set of magnitudes for well-watered conditions was subtracted from the set for drought- like conditions, resulting in a distribution of drought-reduction values. Credible intervals were calculated as highest posterior density intervals (HPDI), in order to display the central 50% of model predictions and lower/upper 95% bounds of model predictions. The data and R scripts used to generate the results are provided online in a data repository [\(https://github.com/erb418/EB.Ch4.scripts\)](https://github.com/erb418/EB.Ch4.scripts) and secondary results summaries can be found in Supporting Information **Table S1– S10**.

Results

Biomass: species-level

316 We analysed species-specific responses to $eCO₂$ and drought-like conditions to investigate how variability at the community-level was influenced by species, in order to confirm the appropriateness of our experimental design (Fig. **1,2,3**). The modelling approach was similar to that described in the *Data Analysis* section but with adjusted model parameters to account for species-level responses. The majority of species responded similary within each vegetation type, with the exception of one species in both DSF (*C. gummifera*) and WSF (*E. fastigata*), which did not respond as strongly as the other species within their respective vegetation types.

Treatment combination

Treatment combination

 Fig 2. Observed (points) and predicted (box and whiskers) above-ground biomass for plants subjected to four combinations of CO₂ and watering treatments (elevated CO₂ + well-watered = eCO₂ + W; ambient CO₂ + well-watered = aCO₂ + W; elevated CO₂ + drought = $eCO_2 + D$; ambient $CO_2 + d$ rought = $aCO_2 + D$; bottom x-axis) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF; grassy woodland = GW). Coloured 346 points are raw data and colours correspond to species within each vegetation type; black shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals at the group-level and black shaded whiskers represent 95% intervals at the group-level, independent of the species-level responses. Coloured shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals at the species-level and coloured shaded whiskers represent 95% intervals at the species-level, independent of the group-level response.

Treatment combination

 Fig 3. Observed (points) and predicted (box and whiskers) below-ground biomass for plants subjected to four combinations of CO₂ and watering treatments (elevated CO₂ + well-watered = eCO₂ + W; ambient CO₂ + well-watered = aCO₂ + W; elevated CO₂ + drought = $eCO_2 + D$; ambient $CO_2 + d$ rought = $aCO_2 + D$; bottom x-axis) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF; grassy woodland = GW). Coloured points are raw data and colours correspond to species within each vegetation type; black shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals at the group-level and black shaded whiskers represent 95% intervals at the group-level, independent of the species-level responses. Coloured shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals at the species-level and coloured shaded whiskers represent 95% intervals at the species-level, independent of the group-level response.

 Fig 4. Observed (jittered points) and predicted (boxes) total biomass (TB; panels **a–c**), above-ground biomass (AGB; panels **d–f**) and below-ground biomass (BGB; panels **g–i**) 396 for plants subjected to four combinations of $CO₂$ and watering treatments (elevated $CO₂$ + well-watered = eCO₂ + W; ambient CO₂ + well-watered = aCO₂ + W; elevated CO₂ + drought = $eCO₂ + D$; ambient $CO₂ + d$ rought = $aCO₂ + D$; bottom x-axis) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF, panels **a,d,g**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e,h**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f,i**). Jittered points are raw data and colours correspond to treatment combinations; shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers

represent 95% intervals. The y-axis has been rescaled (square root) to ensure all data

- Plant height was greater under well-watered conditions than drought-like
- conditions for all vegetation types (Fig. **6a–c**). There were only minor differences
- 421 between $CO₂$ treatments within either watering treatment for both WSF and GW 422 (mean values: $0.75-4.19$ g; Fig. $6a$,c). DSF plants grown under $eCO₂$ were 423 slightly taller (by 5–8 cm) compared to aCO_2 (Fig. **6b**). Differences in the CO_2 424 fertilisation effect between drought and well-watered conditions were negligible 425 (<5% difference in means; Fig. **7a–c**). 426 Crown area was highest in the well-watered treatment (Fig. **6d–f**) and 427 lowest in the drought treatment across all vegetation types. WSF consistently had 428 the largest crown area, while both DSF and GW were similar (Fig. **6d–f**). The 429 effect of eCO₂ on crown area was negligible (mean values: 0.02–0.18 m²; Fig. 6d– 430 **f**). Drought-like conditions increased the eCO₂ fertilisation effect on crown area 431 by 9.16% for WSF, 12.7% for DSF and decreased it by 2.69% for GW (Fig. **7d–** 432 f), although these changes represented an increase/decrease of < 0.1 m², e.g.
- 433 minimal change in crown area (Fig. **7d–f**).

435 **Fig 6.** Observed (jittered points) and predicted (boxes) height (panels **a–c**) and crown

- 436 area (panels **d–f**) for plants subjected to four combinations of CO₂ and watering
- 437 treatments (elevated CO_2 + well-watered = eCO₂ + W; ambient CO_2 + well-watered =
- 438 aCO₂ + W; elevated CO₂ + drought = eCO₂ + D; ambient CO₂ + drought = aCO₂ + D;

bottom x-axis) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped

into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF, panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll

forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**). Jittered points are raw

data and colours correspond to treatment combinations; shaded boxes represent 50%

credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals. The y-axis has been

rescaled (square root) to ensure all data points are visible in the plot.

 Fig 7. Predicted change (i.e. distribution of differences) in the CO² fertilisation effect on plant height (panels **a–c**) and crown area (panels **d–f**) under drought versus well-watered conditions in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF, panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**). Negative values represent a lower, or stronger negative CO² fertilisation effect under drought-like compared to well-watered conditions, while positive values represent a greater effect. Colours correspond to vegetation type; shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals. Annotations indicate mean magnitude of change expressed as percentage. See Methods and Materials for calculation details.

457 For all vegetation types LMA was highest under $D + eCO_2$ (Fig. 8a–c). 458 LMA was lowest under $W + aCO_2$ (Fig. 8a–c). WSF had lower LMA under drought-like conditions than DSF or GW (Fig. **8a–c**). For all vegetation types LMA was 1–2 mg/cm² higher under eCO2 than aCO² (Fig. **8a–c**). LMA response

 to eCO² was reduced by 8.61–9.79% across the vegetation types (Fig. **9a–c**), i.e. all vegetation types experienced similar reductions in LMA. CO₂ or watering treatment had only a minor effect on root mass ratio for both WSF and DSF (e.g. 0.02 difference) where values averaged between 0.08– 465 0.10 (Fig. **8d,e**). For GW, root mass ratio was highest under aCO₂ and around 0.04 466 lower under $eCO₂$ (Fig. **8f**). Root mass ratio was reduced by $eCO₂$ by 1.77% for WSF, 0.01% for DSF and 3.58% for GW, i.e. there was a minor change in root mass ratio for DSF and WSF and relatively larger change for GW (Fig. **9d–f**).

Fig 8. Observed (jittered points) and predicted (boxes) leaf mass per unit area (LMA;

panels **a–c**), and root mass ratio (RMR; panels **d–f**) for plants subjected to four

472 combinations of CO_2 and watering treatments (elevated CO_2 + well-watered = eCO_2 + W;

473 ambient CO_2 + well-watered = aCO_2 + W; elevated CO_2 + drought = eCO_2 + D; ambient

CO₂ + drought = $aCO₂ + D$; bottom x-axis) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine

- eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF,
- panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**).
- Jittered points are raw data and colours correspond to treatment combinations; shaded

boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals.

The y-axis has been rescaled (square root) to ensure all data points are visible in the plot.

 Fig 9. Predicted change (i.e. distribution of differences) in the CO² fertilisation effect on leaf mass per unit area (LMA; panels **a–c**) and root mass ratio (RMR; panels **d–f**) under drought versus well-watered conditions in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF, panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**). Negative values represent a lower, or stronger negative $CO₂$ fertilisation effect under drought-like compared to well-watered conditions, while positive values represent a greater effect. Colours correspond to vegetation type; shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals. Annotations indicate mean magnitude of change expressed as percentage. See Methods and Materials for calculation details.

Storage organs

494 Lignotuber biomass was highest under $W + eCO₂$ and lowest under $D + aCO₂$

- (Fig. **10a–c**) for all vegetation types. Lignotuber biomass was slightly higher
- 496 under $D + eCO_2$ than $D + aCO_2$ (mean increase: 0.05–0.17 g; Fig. 10a–c), i.e.
- eCO₂ had a positive effect on lignotuber biomass regardless of watering treatment.
- 498 Drought-like conditions reduced the $eCO₂$ fertilisation effect on lignotuber
- biomass by 43.29% for WSF, increased it by 22.2% for DSF and decreased it by
- 6.35% for GW (Fig. **11a–c**), i.e. WSF experienced substantially larger reductions
- in lignotuber biomass than either DSF or GW. For DSF, very wide bounds reflect
- uncertainty around this result (Fig. **11b**).

Coarse-root biomass showed little response to **[**CO2] and watering

- treatment across the vegetation types (e.g. <0.3 g difference; Fig. **10d–f**). Coarse-
- root biomass was highest for GW and lowest for DSF, while WSF had
- intermediate coarse-root biomass (Fig. **10d–f**). Drought-like conditions reduced
- the eCO2 fertilisation effect on coarse-root biomass by 7.82% for WSF, 4.40% for
- DSF and 7.09% for GW (Fig. **11d–f**). WSF and GWD experienced slightly larger
- reductions in coarse-root biomass than DSF (e.g. 2.7–3.4% larger; Fig. **11d–f**).

Treatment

- panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**).
- Jittered points are raw data and colours correspond to treatment combinations; shaded

boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals.

The y-axis has been rescaled (square root) to ensure all data points are visible in the plot.

Fig 11. Predicted change (i.e. distribution of differences) in the CO₂ fertilisation effect under drought versus well-watered conditions for lignotuber biomass (LB; panels **a–c**) and coarse-root biomass (CRB; panels **d–f**) in a glasshouse experiment consisting of nine eucalypt species grouped into three vegetation types (wet sclerophyll forest = WSF, panels **a,d**; dry sclerophyll forest = DSF, panels **b,e**; grassy woodland = GW, panels **c,f**). Negative values represent a lower, or stronger negative $CO₂$ fertilisation effect under drought-like compared to well-watered conditions, while positive values represent a greater effect. Colours correspond to vegetation type; shaded boxes represent 50% credible intervals and whiskers represent 95% credible intervals. Annotations indicate mean magnitude of change expressed as percentage. See Methods and Materials for calculation details.

Discussion

- 535 In temperate, eucalypt-dominated vegetation types, the effects of $eCO₂$
- fertilisation on biomass accumulation and storage organs were effectively negated
- by drought, though some typical drought-stress responses, such as increased LMA
- and RMR, were reduced under eCO2. Physical dimensions of eucalypt seedlings,
- 539 such as height and crown area, were essentially unaffected by $eCO₂$. In the
- absence of drought, however, eucalypt species may experience faster seedling
- 541 growth, establishment and enhanced resprouting capacity due to $eCO₂$.

Plant biomass

544 When water was not limited, eucalypt seedlings responded to $eCO₂$ by increasing biomass by more than 30% (Fig. **1,4a–c**), which is comparable to increases found in the majority of global studies on non-eucalypt woody species (e.g. 48%, Poorter & Nagel 2000) and in similar studies of eucalypts (e.g. 41–108%, Roden & Ball 1996; 44–74%, Ghannoum *et al.* 2010). This result suggests there is potential for increased seedling establishment in temperate woody ecosystems in regions or during periods where rainfall is adequate, as has been suggested elsewhere (Ghannoum *et al.* 2010). Seedlings that accumulate biomass more quickly are more likely to escape fire-related mortality by reaching fire-tolerant size-classes (Hoffmann & Solbrig 2003; Clarke *et al.* 2013) and thus transition 554 faster to maturity, supporting the idea that $eCO₂$ may facilitate woody thickening in temperate woody ecosystems. While some studies have demonstrated that trees 556 in regenerating forests may also increase biomass in response to $eCO₂(e.g. by 20-$ 30%, Norby *et al.* 2001; Kim *et al.* 2019; Walker *et al.* 2019), this enhanced growth is typically reported in the earlier stages of tree growth, with most studies 559 of established mature trees suggesting that $eCO₂$ has little effect on biomass accumulation (Jiang *et al.* 2020; Walker *et al.* 2021). Competitive interactions with grasses (Manea & Leishman 2015), herbivory (Collins *et al.* 2018a) and nutrient limitation (Norby *et al.* 2010; Ellsworth *et al.* 2017) may limit the 563 potential for increased carbon sequestration in natural ecosystems under $eCO₂$. 564 In our study, the effect of $CO₂$ fertilisation on biomass was reduced by drought-like conditions, as found in other studies (Duan *et al.* 2013; Duan *et al.* 2018b). We did not find a doubling of biomass under drought-like conditions + eCO² as in Atwell *et al.* (2007). Of our nine species, wet sclerophyll species showed the greatest reduction in total, above-ground and below-ground biomass (Fig. **1,2,3,4**), although reductions did occur across all vegetation types. Thus, drought-like conditions placed limitations on growth regardless of species or $CO₂$ level. Relative to the forest species, grassy woodland species invested substantially more resources into roots under drought-like conditions (Fig. **3,4g– i**), although the same pattern occurred under well-watered conditions, suggesting that high below-ground biomass investment is typical for grassy woodland

 systems. Indeed, larger, deeper root systems are characteristic of species adapted to drier climates (Brunner *et al.* 2015).

 Eucalypts from more mesic environments have been reported to experience reduced biomass accumulation when water is limited (e.g. >80%; Duan *et al.* 2014), with smaller reductions reported in xeric species (e.g. >50%, Susiluoto & Berninger 2007). We found species from wet sclerophyll forest to be relatively more sensitive to drought. For example, the 16.38% reduction in biomass between well-watered and water-stressed wet sclerophyll species was larger than either grassy woodland (4.3%) or dry sclerophyll species (5.26%; Fig. **5**). This suggests that, under drier future climates, trees of wet sclerophyll environments may experience sharper decreases in productivity than those in drier wooded landscapes; for example, through reducing seedling success.

Resource acquisition traits

 Under climate change, seedling success and ongoing competitive advantage of a given species depends on how resource acquisition is balanced with water conservation, e.g. low-LMA species adapted to high productivity, mesic environments may have greater success under normal rainfall conditions while high-LMA species adapted to lower productivity, xeric environments may have greater success when rainfall declines (Poorter *et al.* 2009). In our study, LMA was highest under drought-like conditions for species of the drier habitats (Fig. **8b–c**), which suggests that such species are more effectively able to cope with drought-like conditions than those of wet sclerophyll forests. This pattern is consistent with trends elsewhere, showing that LMA can vary according to positions along rainfall gradients (Cernusak *et al.* 2011) and eucalypts from xeric environments may have higher LMA than those from mesic environments (Lewis *et al.* 2011). Increasing LMA is a strategy plants employ to conserve resources and reduce wilting (Poorter *et al.* 2009). We found that the LMA increase with eCO₂ was only 8–10% smaller under drought-like conditions compared to well- watered conditions (Fig. **9a–c**), suggesting that eCO² may help some species cope with drought (e.g. by developing tougher leaves to reduce water loss). Increasing the proportion of biomass allocated to roots maximises water uptake while limiting water loss (Brunner *et al.* 2015). In this study there was

 evidence that $eCO₂$ decreased the root-to-shoot mass ratio under drought conditions, representing a 1–4% ameliorative effect for some species (Fig. **9d–f**). This result was consistent with both general patterns (Poorter & Nagel 2000; Schall *et al.* 2012; Brunner *et al.* 2015) and some studies of eucalypts (e.g. Barton and Montagu 2006; Thomas 2009), though other studies have found little or no difference in RMR under varying watering regimes (Osório *et al.* 1998; Merchant *et al.* 2006; Merchant *et al.* 2007). Our results suggest that $eCO₂$ fertilisation may reduce drought stress for some species. Root-to-shoot mass ratio was highest for grassy woodland species, around twice that of species in the forest categories. Overall our results were broadly comparable (e.g. ~0.1 for WSF spp., DSF spp.; ~0.2% for GW spp.; Fig. **8d–f**) with global trends in root-to-shoot mass ratio across varying habitats and water availability: e.g. 0.2 at 3000 mm cf. 0.4 at 500 mm mean annual rainfall (Brunner *et al.* 2015). The comparatively high LMA and RMR of the more xeric species in our study and the magnitude of increase in these variables due to drought, suggests that these taxa are more capable of withstanding and responding to drought.

624 Changes to plant height due to $eCO₂$ in our study were generally small 625 (e.g. $\langle 5\% \rangle$, with moderate increases in crown area ($\langle 12\% \rangle$). Hence, the eCO₂- related biomass gains observed in our study may be due to increases in tissue density, stem diameter, branch number, leaf number and rooting architecture (Atwell *et al.* 2007; Ghannoum *et al.* 2010). This suggests that, for the study species, additional carbon was allocated to biomass and, to some extent, crown area, rather than height.

Storage organs

 Elevated CO² may facilitate greater allocation of non-structural carbohydrates to storage organs such as lignotubers and roots, which resprouting species such as eucalypts utilise following disturbance (Hoffman *et al.* 2000). In our study we 636 found that when sufficient water was available, $eCO₂$ increased the size of lignotubers by 5–33% for species from wet sclerophyll forests and 21–58% for

-
- those native to drier environments (Fig. **10,11a–c**), consistent with results of other
- glasshouse studies (Hoffman *et al.* 2000; Bond & Midgley 2012). In contrast,
- 640 Collins *et al.* (2018b) found no effect of $eCO₂$ on lignotuber growth in eucalypts

 in a field experiment, probably due to competition with grasses, herbivory and 642 nutrient limitation. Elevated $CO₂$ may increase the biomass and vigour of resprouting stems and increase the size of coarse roots, which contain resources needed for resprouting (Hoffman *et al.* 2000; Bond & Midgley 2012). The trends in above and below ground biomass (e.g. increased shoot biomass and increased 646 storage capacity under $eCO₂$) in the study species, described above, may therefore 647 have potential to enhance resprouting capacity as atmospheric $CO₂$ levels increase. However, our result that drought-like conditions imposed severe restrictions on lignotuber growth for some species and thereby reduced the effect of eCO² fertilisation, suggests that enhanced resprouting would be limited to periods of adequate rainfall (Fig. **10,11a–c**). Nonetheless, there remained substantial uncertainty in the results for dry sclerophyll species due to the failure of many plants to produce a lignotuber during the experiment.

Future climate and potential ecosystem change

656 Further rapid and substantial increases in atmospheric $[CO₂]$ are predicted globally, along with increases in global mean air temperature, with changes to rainfall patterns likely to be more diverse and harder to predict (IPCC 2021). Drought has been identified as a factor that may negatively impact resprouting success across many ecosystems, including Australian forests (Rosas *et al.* 2013; Nolan *et al.* 2021). There is also evidence that some eucalypt forests can undergo state-changes, for example a shift toward smaller, multi-stemmed trees, during severe drought conditions (Matusick *et al.* 2016). Climate change-driven increases in fire frequency could potentially result in higher mortality and decreased complexity in resprouting eucalypt woodlands (Fairman *et al.* 2017). One 666 possibility could be that future forested landscapes experience $eCO₂$ -enhanced growth during periods of adequate rainfall, but the coupled effects of more extreme droughts and fires may equate to zero net-change over the long term. Our results indicate that drought offsets the effect of $eCO₂$ fertilisation on biomass accumulation and lignotuber size in seedlings. Species from drier habitats may have a physiological advantage over those in mesic forests in the seedling 672 phase in a high- $CO₂$ world where drought pervades landscapes. There may be potential for reduced seedling survival in vulnerable areas within wet sclerophyll

- forests, e.g. climatically marginal ridgetops, plateaus or ecotones. Species from
- dry sclerophyll or grassy woodlands that are more effectively able to cope with
- drought and short-interval fires could potentially encroach into such areas, leading
- to reductions in the extent of wet sclerophyll forests. However, our study only
- examined seedlings grown under controlled conditions for a short period of time,
- so it is not clear how these effects may translate to natural forest ecosystems.
- Thus, future scenarios of coupled changes to climate and disturbance regime
- could lead to major shifts in vegetation composition, structure and function,
- potentially reducing carbon storage within forests, which may accelerate climate
- change and result in further changes to vegetation.
-

References

- Allen, C.D., Macalady, A.K., Chenchouni, H., Bachelet, D., McDowell, N., Vennetier, M., Kitzberger, T., Rigling, A., Breshears, D.D., Hogg, E.H., Gonzalez, P., Fensham, R., Zhang, Z., Castro, J., Demidova, N., Lim, J.-H., Allard, G., Running, S.W., Semerci, A. & Cobb, N. (2010) A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **259,** 660-684.
- Andela, N., Liu, Y.Y., van Dijk, A.I.J.M., de Jeu, R.A.M. & McVicar, T.R. (2013) Global changes in dryland vegetation dynamics (1988-2008) assessed by satellite remote sensing: comparing a new passive microwave vegetation density record with reflective greenness data. *Biogeosciences,* **10,** 6657- 6676.
- Aspinwall, M.J., Pfautsch, S., Tjoelker, M.G., Varhammar, A., Possell, M., Drake, J.E., Reich, P.B., Tissue, D.T., Atkin, O.K., Rymer, P.D., Dennison, S. & Van Sluyter, S.C. (2019) Range size and growth temperature influence Eucalyptus species responses to an experimental heatwave. *Glob Chang Biol,* **25,** 1665-1684.
- Atwell, B.J., Henery, M.L., Rogers, G.S., Seneweera, S.P., Treadwell, M. & Conroy, J.P. (2007) Canopy development and hydraulic function in Eucalyptus tereticornis grown in drought in CO2-enriched atmospheres. *Functional Plant Biology,* **34,** 1137.
- Barton, C.V.M. & Montagu, K.D. (2006) Effect of spacing and water availability on root:shoot ratio in *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **221,** 52-62.
- BioClim (2022) WorldClim Global Climate Data.
- Blackman, C.J., Creek, D., Maier, C., Aspinwall, M.J., Drake, J.E., Pfautsch, S., O'Grady, A., Delzon, S., Medlyn, B.E., Tissue, D.T. & Choat, B. (2019) Drought response strategies and hydraulic traits contribute to mechanistic understanding of plant dry-down to hydraulic failure. *Tree Physiol,* **39,** 910- 924.

 Resco de Dios, V., Loik, M., Smith, R. & Tissue, D. (2018) Effects of a Heat Wave on Nocturnal Stomatal Conductance in Eucalyptus camaldulensis. *Forests,* **9**. Roden, J.S. & Ball, M.C. (1996) Growth and photosynthesis of two eucalypt species during high temperature stress under ambient and elevated [CO2] *Glob Chang Biol,* **2,** 115-128. Rosas, T., Galiano, L., Ogaya, R., Penuelas, J. & Martinez-Vilalta, J. (2013) Dynamics of non-structural carbohydrates in three Mediterranean woody species following long-term experimental drought. *Front Plant Sci,* **4,** 400. Schall, P., Lödige, C., Beck, M. & Ammer, C. (2012) Biomass allocation to roots and shoots is more sensitive to shade and drought in European beech than in Norway spruce seedlings. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **266,** 246- 253. Souza, J.P., Melo, N.M.J., Halfeld, A.D., Vieira, K.I.C. & Rosa, B.L. (2019) Elevated atmospheric CO2 concentration improves water use efficiency and growth of a widespread Cerrado tree species even under soil water deficit. *Acta Botanica Brasilica,* **33,** 425-436. Susiluoto, S. & Berninger, F. (2007) Interactions between morphological and physiological drought responses in *Eucalyptus microtheca*. *Silva Fennica,* **41**. Suzuki, M. (2019) Bayesian modeling of volatile organic compound emissions from three softwoods in Hokkaido, Japan. *Journal of Wood Science,* **65**. Team, R.C. (2020) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Thomas, D.S. (2009) Survival and growth of drought hardened *Eucalyptus pilularis* Sm. seedlings and vegetative cuttings. *New Forests,* **38,** 245-259. Walker, A.P., De Kauwe, M.G., Bastos, A., Belmecheri, S., Georgiou, K., Keeling, R.F., McMahon, S.M., Medlyn, B.E., Moore, D.J.P., Norby, R.J., Zaehle, S., Anderson-Teixeira, K.J., Battipaglia, G., Brienen, R.J.W., Cabugao, K.G., Cailleret, M., Campbell, E., Canadell, J.G., Ciais, P., Craig, M.E., Ellsworth, D.S., Farquhar, G.D., Fatichi, S., Fisher, J.B., Frank, D.C., Graven, H., Gu, L., Haverd, V., Heilman, K., Heimann, M., Hungate, B.A., Iversen, C.M., Joos, F., Jiang, M., Keenan, T.F., Knauer, J., Korner, C., Leshyk, V.O., Leuzinger, S., Liu, Y., MacBean, N., Malhi, Y., McVicar, T.R., Penuelas, J., Pongratz, J., Powell, A.S., Riutta, T., Sabot, M.E.B., Schleucher, J., Sitch, S., Smith, W.K., Sulman, B., Taylor, B., Terrer, C., Torn, M.S., Treseder, K.K., Trugman, A.T., Trumbore, S.E., van Mantgem, P.J., Voelker, S.L., Whelan, M.E. & Zuidema, P.A. (2021) Integrating the evidence for a terrestrial carbon sink caused by increasing atmospheric CO2. *New Phytol,* **229,** 2413-2445. Walker, A.P., De Kauwe, M.G., Medlyn, B.E., Zaehle, S., Iversen, C.M., Asao, S., Guenet, B., Harper, A., Hickler, T., Hungate, B.A., Jain, A.K., Luo, Y., Lu, X., Lu, M., Luus, K., Megonigal, J.P., Oren, R., Ryan, E., Shu, S., Talhelm, A., Wang, Y.P., Warren, J.M., Werner, C., Xia, J., Yang, B., Zak, D.R. & Norby, R.J. (2019) Decadal biomass increment in early secondary succession woody ecosystems is increased by CO2 enrichment. *Nat Commun,* **10,** 454. Walters, J.R., Bell, T.L. & Read, S. (2005) Intra-specific variation in carbohydrate reserves and sprouting ability in *Eucalyptus obliqua* seedlings. *Australian Journal of Botany,* **53,** 195.

- Wigley, B.J., Cramer, M.D. & Bond, W.J. (2009) Sapling survival in a frequently burnt savanna: mobilisation of carbon reserves in *Acacia karroo*. *Plant Ecology,* **203,** 1-11.
- Zeppel, M.J.B., Harrison, S.P., Adams, H.D., Kelley, D.I., Li, G., Tissue, D.T., Dawson, T.E., Fensham, R., Medlyn, B.E., Palmer, A., West, A.G. & McDowell, N.G. (2015) Drought and resprouting plants. *New Phytologist,* **206,** 583-589.
- Zhang, X. & Wang, W. (2015) The decomposition of fine and coarse roots: their global patterns and controlling factors. *Scientific Reports,* **5**.
- Zhou, S.X., Medlyn, B.E. & Prentice, I.C. (2016) Long-term water stress leads to acclimation of drought sensitivity of photosynthetic capacity in xeric but not riparian *Eucalyptus* species. *Ann Bot,* **117,** 133-144.
- Zhu, Z., Piao, S., Myneni, R.B., Huang, M., Zeng, Z., Canadell, J.G., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., Friedlingstein, P., Arneth, A., Cao, C., Cheng, L., Kato, E., Koven, C., Li, Y., Lian, X., Liu, Y., Liu, R., Mao, J., Pan, Y., Peng, S., Peñuelas,
- J., Poulter, B., Pugh, T.A.M., Stocker, B.D., Viovy, N., Wang, X., Wang,
- Y., Xiao, Z., Yang, H., Zaehle, S. & Zeng, N. (2016) Greening of the Earth
- and its drivers. *Nature Climate Change,* **6,** 791-795.