

Abstract

Isoprene is important in atmospheric chemistry, but its seasonal emission pattern – especially in the tropics, where most isoprene is emitted – is incompletely understood. We set out to discover general, biome-independent relationships between large-scale isoprene emission and a series of potential predictor variables, including both observed and model-estimated variables related to gross primary production (GPP) and canopy temperature. To this end we used remotely sensed atmospheric concentrations of formaldehyde, an intermediate oxidation product of isoprene, as a proxy for isoprene emission in 22 regions selected to span high to low latitudes, to sample major biomes, and to minimize interference from pyrogenic sources of volatile organic compounds that could interfere with the isoprene signal. Formaldehyde concentrations showed the highest average seasonal correlations with remotely sensed ($r = 0.85$) and model-estimated ($r = 0.80$) canopy temperatures. Both variables predicted formaldehyde concentrations better than air temperature ($r = 0.56$) and a “reference” isoprene model that includes both temperature and GPP ($r = 0.49$), and far better than either remotely sensed green vegetation cover ($r = 0.25$) or model-estimated GPP ($r = 0.14$). GPP in tropical regions was anti-correlated with formaldehyde concentration ($r = -0.30$), which peaks during the dry season. We conjecture that the positive correlations of isoprene emission with primary production, and with air temperature, found in temperate forest regions arise simply because all three peak during the relatively short growing season. In most tropical regions, where the seasonal cycles of GPP and canopy temperature are very different, isoprene emission is revealed to depend on canopy temperature but not at all on GPP. The lack of a general correlation between GPP and formaldehyde concentration is consistent with experimental evidence that isoprene emission is decoupled from photosynthesis, and with the likely adaptive significance of isoprene emission in protecting leaves against heat damage and oxidative stress. In contrast, the high correlation between canopy temperature and formaldehyde concentration indicates the importance of including canopy temperature explicitly in large-scale models.

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



1 Introduction

Plants expend energy to emit remarkable amounts of isoprene (Sharkey et al., 2008), which in turn influences both atmospheric chemistry and the terrestrial carbon balance. The need to understand the regulation of oxidant (hydroxyl radical) concentration in the troposphere (Collins et al., 2001) has led to efforts to predict isoprene emission rates in a changing environment. Isoprene emission levels by plants show a steep temperature dependence, and early modelling studies predicted that 21st century climate change would greatly increase isoprene emission: with knock-on effects including elevated concentrations of ozone, a phytotoxin and a powerful greenhouse gas (Laothawornkitkul et al., 2009; Peñuelas and Staudt, 2010). But experimental studies have found that high CO₂ concentrations inhibit isoprene emission, counteracting this effect of increasing temperature (Possell et al., 2005; Arneth et al., 2007; Heald et al., 2009). The combined effect of climate and CO₂ change on global isoprene emission is still unclear. Current models arrive at similar contemporary global isoprene emissions but diverge in their predictions for past or future times (Young et al., 2009). This and many more open questions remain as to the controls of isoprene emission over large regions and long (seasonal to multi-annual) time scales. In the work presented here, we address these controls empirically, using the seasonal cycle of remotely sensed formaldehyde concentration as a large-scale proxy for isoprene emission, and analysing its relationship to environmental predictors across a globally representative set of regions.

Attempts have been made, and some success achieved, in modelling the environmental controls of isoprene emission, especially in the temperate zone. Two main strategies have been adopted. “Empirical” models are based on experimentally observed dependences of isoprene emission on temperature, photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and other predictors (Guenther et al., 1993, 2006). “Process-based” models relate isoprene emission somehow to photosynthetic electron transport; but empirical modifiers have been used to account for further temperature and CO₂ concentration effects (Arneth et al., 2007). On monthly and longer timescales, both of

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

these techniques are linked to primary production, directly in the modelling studies and indirectly in the empirical models via PAR, which is proportional to production on these timescales (Ruimy et al., 1995). Current models capture the seasonal patterns of emission in temperate ecosystems quite well (Pacifico et al., 2011). For example, using remotely sensed formaldehyde concentrations and a chemistry-transport model to track the oxidation of isoprene to formaldehyde, Palmer et al. (2006) found that 75 % of the seasonal cycle of isoprene emission in the warm-temperate southeastern USA could be explained by its temperature dependence as represented in Guenther and colleague's MEGAN model (Guenther et al., 2006). A lower correlation ($r = 0.41$) between formaldehyde concentration and MEGAN model predictions was found in the tropical western Amazon region (Barkley et al., 2008), however, and several other studies have concluded that the seasonal variation of isoprene in the tropics cannot be explained by air temperature and PAR alone (Serca et al., 2001; Kuhn et al., 2004). This is a critical point for global modelling as most isoprene emission occurs in the tropics. The relatively weak predictive capability of current models in the tropics may have arisen in part because these models were developed based primarily on observations at temperate sites (Guenther et al., 2006; Sharkey et al., 2008; Pacifico et al., 2011).

Most tests of isoprene emission models has been carried out at the leaf level and on diurnal or shorter timescales (Monson et al., 2007, 2012; Guenther et al., 2006; Arneth et al., 2007). For global applications, it is also important to test models at larger spatial and temporal scales, but this cannot be done by direct measurement. Several studies have used modelled isoprene fluxes as input to global chemistry-transport models, and compared the results with remotely sensed formaldehyde concentrations (Palmer et al., 2003, 2006; Abbot et al., 2003; Fu et al., 2007; Shim et al., 2005; Barkley et al., 2008). These studies have established that formaldehyde concentration over the continents records the seasonal pattern of emissions of non-methane volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which in turn is dominated by isoprene and pyrogenic VOCs. Building on these findings, we use satellite observations of formaldehyde concentration (deSmedt et al., 2008) here as a direct proxy for the seasonal cycle of isoprene emissions in fire-free

regions. This approach, which greatly simplifies analysis of the remotely sensed data, is supported by an investigation of the controls on formaldehyde concentration in the TM5 chemistry-transport model (see Methods). We show that atmospheric chemistry alone is very unlikely to account for the observed seasonal patterns of formaldehyde concentration, which are thus inferred to reflect seasonal variations in the emission of isoprene rather than downstream chemical reactions.

The objective of this study was to discover possible empirical relationships between isoprene emission and potential environmental predictors that would apply globally in all biomes, including the tropics, on larger spatial scales and on longer (seasonal) time scales than can be considered in short-term experiments or based on point measurements. To this end, we carried out a comprehensive analysis of the correlations between the mean seasonal cycle of formaldehyde concentration, considered as a proxy for isoprene emission, and a series of potential predictors related to canopy temperature and primary production, as well as with a “reference” isoprene emission model that combines both elements. We focused on 22 fire-free regions spanning a broad range of latitudes and sampling all biomes in the land classification scheme of deFries and Townsend (1994). We introduce canopy temperature as a predictor variable, using both remotely sensed land surface temperature and model-estimated values based on energy balance, showing that the two approaches (a) yield consistent results and (b) outperform air temperature as a predictor of isoprene emission. We also quantify the predictive power of remotely sensed green vegetation cover (a key indicator of the seasonal cycle of primary production) and modelled GPP. This set of variables collectively represents the major controls of isoprene emission as expressed in both empirical and process-based models.

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

2 Methods

2.1 Comparing seasonal cycles

We compared regional-average monthly means of formaldehyde concentration with similarly averaged values of potential predictor variables, using data for each month during 1997–2006 (or 2000–2006 for observed canopy temperature) to derive a mean seasonal cycle for each variable in each region, as summarized in Fig. 1. The selected regions are shown in Fig. 2. The predictor variables, selected on the basis of previous work (e.g. Guenther et al., 2006; Niinemets et al., 1999; Palmer et al., 2006; Barkley et al., 2008), comprise three measures of temperature (T_{AIR} , $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ and $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$, being air temperature, remotely sensed canopy temperature, and modelled canopy temperature, respectively); two measures related to total ecosystem photosynthesis (remotely sensed fPAR – the fraction of incident PAR absorbed by green vegetation – and modelled GPP), and a “reference” isoprene emission model (I_{REF}) which is a joint function of temperature, GPP and c_i , the CO_2 concentration inside the leaf.

2.2 Formaldehyde as a proxy for isoprene emission

The seasonal cycle of formaldehyde over land could in principle be influenced by variations in the efficiency of the net chemical production or loss of formaldehyde, independently of isoprene emission rates. This is why previous analyses have provided isoprene emission estimates to chemistry-transport models, which then predict atmospheric formaldehyde concentrations, which are finally compared with remotely sensed observations of formaldehyde (Palmer et al., 2006; Barkley et al., 2008; Stavroakou et al., 2009; Marais et al., 2012). The following equation describes the atmospheric content of formaldehyde, C :

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \frac{fI_{\text{total}} + P - C}{\tau} \quad (1)$$

where t is time, f is the efficiency of formaldehyde production per unit isoprene emission, I_{total} is the isoprene emission rate, P is the formaldehyde production rate from precursors other than isoprene, and τ is the lifetime of formaldehyde in the atmosphere. We assumed that the rate of change of C is much smaller than the production rate.

5 We ignored the production of formaldehyde from non-isoprene sources as it is at least an order of magnitude smaller than the isoprene source (Lathièrè et al., 2006). With these assumptions, $C = f\tau I_{\text{total}}$ or equivalently, $C = AI_{\text{total}}$ where A is the net chemical modulation of isoprene conversion into formaldehyde. We estimated the seasonal cycle of A using the state-of-the-art chemistry-transport model TM5 (Williams et al., 10 2012; Huijnen et al., 2010), which includes the CBM-4 chemical mechanism with 16 production and 4 destruction reactions for formaldehyde, including photolysis reactions (Table 3 of Huijnen et al., 2010). Supplement Fig. S1 shows the seasonal variation in A in three latitude bands as modelled with TM5. In the tropics, A shows a weak seasonal cycle that is distinct from the observed seasonal cycle of formaldehyde concentration 15 (Fig. 3). In mid-latitudes, A is lowest and formaldehyde's chemical lifetime is shortest in the summer, when observed formaldehyde concentration peaks (Fig. 3). In other words, atmospheric chemistry processes alone produce formaldehyde variations qualitatively different from (and frequently opposite to) those observed in both tropical and temperate latitudes. This reasoning justifies our identification of seasonal patterns in 20 formaldehyde concentration to indicate seasonal patterns of isoprene emission. Note however that we focus our comparison strictly on the phase of the seasonal cycle and not on absolute concentration values, whose relationship to isoprene emission is expected to vary with latitude as shown in Supplement Fig. S1.

2.3 Formaldehyde concentration data

25 Formaldehyde concentration has been observed from space by the GOME and SCIAMACHY instruments. De Smedt et al. (2008) derived a coherent record combining the two satellite products. The data are total formaldehyde concentrations viewed along slanted atmospheric columns. De Smedt et al. (2008) analysed systematic and ran-

19577

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



dom errors in these measurements. Systematic errors include uncertainties in absorption cross sections and instrumental effects: these are unlikely to influence our results as we consider only seasonal variations in a region, not absolute values at a point. The effects of random errors are minimized by taking regional averages. The maximum error in the column estimates is about 45 % at high latitudes, falling to 20 % in tropical regions (de Smedt et al., 2008). In the Supporting Online Material, we present a discussion of the standard deviation of the formaldehyde (and other) data.

2.4 Choice of regions for analysis

The selected regions (Fig. 2) represent a compromise: they should be large enough to ensure minimal signal pollution from outside the region, but small enough to display a coherent seasonal cycle. As formaldehyde concentrations are elevated by biomass burning (Stavrakou et al., 2009), we selected regions outside areas with high biomass burning, defined here as being regions with a mean annual burnt fraction (van der Werf et al., 2010) less than 1 %. We relaxed this criterion for the tropical savannah sites so as to allow the inclusion of multiple savannahs in our analysis. The mean burnt fraction for these sites was 1 % (Nord), 7 % (IC1) and 9 % (IC2).

Transport from adjacent regions can also influence the formaldehyde signal. Palmer et al. (2003) estimated the formaldehyde smearing length (over which any signal is attenuated by a factor $1/e$) to be ~ 50 km. We used the smearing length to place a lower limit on region size, so that at least 50 % of the signal should originate within the region. We assume that two smearing lengths is adequate to dampen the external signal (attenuation by $1/e^2$) and furthermore that wind transports the external signal from only two sides of the region. It is then necessary for region be > 4.8 times the smearing length, or 240 km, in order to satisfy the constraint that 50 % of the signal originate from within the region. All our regions are larger than this.

The regions were selected to sample the major biomes including tundra (Can1, NSib), evergreen conifer (Eur), high latitude deciduous forest (SSib), temperate grasslands (NAm), various combinations of mixed forest, crops and wooded grasslands

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



(Can2, USA1, USA2, Chi), tropical grasslands or savannas (Nord, IC1, IC2), shrubs (Aus1, Aus2) and evergreen broadleaf forests (Amz 1-4, San1, San2, Con1, Con2). Broadleaf deciduous forests are included in USA1, but we could not find any region where they dominate that also satisfied all our other criteria. We grouped the regions for further analysis into boreal regions (NSib, SSib, Can1 and Eur), temperate regions (Can2, NAm, USA1, USA2, Aus1, Aus2 and Chi), tropical savannas (Nord, IC1 and IC2), and tropical forests (Amz 1-4, San1, San2, Con1, Con2).

2.5 Observed predictor variables

Isoprene emission has been observed to track air temperature in both short- and long-term experiments, but air temperature does not always predict well the field-measured seasonal cycle of isoprene emission in the tropics (Simon et al., 2005; Serca et al., 2001; Kuhn et al., 2004). Here we consider the air temperature, T_{AIR} , and two measures of canopy temperature, $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ (observed) and $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ (modelled). Gridded T_{AIR} data were obtained from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) TS3.0 data set (<http://badc.nerc.ac.uk/browse/badc/cru>, Mitchell and Jones, 2005). The CRU data were also used for the mean seasonal cycle of precipitation, which is not considered as a candidate predictor variable but is helpful in explaining the inability of the standard variables to predict isoprene emission. $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ is a remotely sensed “land-surface” temperature that records canopy temperature in densely vegetated regions (Wan, 2010). MODIS land-surface temperature data were obtained from NASA Earth Observations, <http://neo.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov> where they are referred to as the Mod11C3 product. While MODIS temperatures are generally within 1 °C of in-situ temperature measures, uncertainties in emissivities in arid and semi-arid regions may lead to larger errors in $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ (Wan et al., 2010). fPAR represents the “greenness” of the land surface, i.e. absorption of (mainly red) light by chlorophyll. Its seasonal cycle at any latitude is therefore closely related to GPP. Remotely sensed fPAR measurements were obtained from the SeaWiFS satellite data archive (<http://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/SeaWiFS/>, Gobron et al., 2006).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2.6 Model-estimated predictor variables

The Lund–Potsdam–Jena (LPJ) dynamic global vegetation model (Sitch et al., 2003; Gerten et al., 2004; Wania et al., 2009) was used to derive GPP, $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ and I_{REF} . Observed (gridded) monthly air temperature (T_{AIR}), precipitation and fractional sunshine hours data, needed to drive LPJ, were obtained from the CRU TS3.0 data set. GPP for each plant functional type (PFT) is calculated in LPJ using a theoretically derived light-use efficiency formula based on the Collatz et al. (1991) version of the Farquhar et al. (1980) photosynthesis model, under the assumption of optimal nitrogen allocation through the canopy (Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996). Transpiration (required to estimate evaporative cooling) is calculated as the lesser of two rates: an energy-limited rate corresponding to atmospheric “demand”, and a water-limited rate representing “supply” – a plant-dependent maximum rate, reduced in proportion to soil moisture depletion. Canopy temperature for each PFT ($T_{\text{CAN-PFT}}$) was calculated from the energy balance equation:

$$T_{\text{CAN-PFT}} = T_{\text{AIR}} + \frac{\text{DRS}(1 - \alpha) - \lambda E}{\rho c_p / r_{b,h} + 4\sigma T_{\text{AIR}}^3} \quad (2)$$

where T_{AIR} is the mean air temperature; DRS is the mean downwelling shortwave radiation at the top of the canopy, estimated from insolation and fractional sunshine hours; $\alpha = 0.36$ is the sum of the average broadband albedo and transmittance of leaves; λ is the latent heat of vaporization of water; E is modelled transpiration plus interception; ρ is the density and c_p the specific heat capacity of air; $r_{b,h}$ is the boundary layer resistance to heat (set to 0.20 s m^{-1} for needle leaves and 0.025 s m^{-1} for other types of leaves, Kelliher et al., 1993); σ is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant. Values of $T_{\text{CAN-PFT}}$ were averaged, weighted by their relative importance as indexed by each PFT’s share of annual GPP, to determine the modelled canopy temperature, $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$. Thus more productive plant functional types influenced the composite $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ more than less pro-

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

ductive ones, but the seasonal cycle of GPP does not influence the seasonal cycle of $T_{CAN-LPJ}$.

2.7 Reference isoprene model

We used a representative “process-based” isoprene emission model to calculate I_{REF} (see Supplementary Online Material). This model follows Arneth et al.’s (2007) implementation and is based on the assumption that isoprene emission is a fixed fraction of photosynthetic electron transport (Niinemets et al., 1999), multiplied by factors representing an inverse relationship to the leaf’s internal CO_2 concentration, c_i , and an exponential dependence on the modelled canopy temperature (called leaf temperature in Arneth et al., 2007).

2.8 Statistics and graphics

Mean seasonal cycles of formaldehyde are shown for the 22 regions (Fig. 3) in four groups: boreal regions, temperate regions, tropical forests, and tropical savannas. Normalized formaldehyde concentration in each region (red stars) is compared with the reference model (I_{REF}) in the first set of columns, with measures related to photosynthesis (fPAR and GPP) in the second set of columns, with temperature measures (T_{AIR} , $T_{CAN-OBS}$ and $T_{CAN-LPJ}$) in the third set of columns and precipitation in the final column. Correlations (r) based on these plots are presented in Supplement Table S1 and Fig. 4. The Supplement presents statistical analyses of the data testing the robustness of our findings, including analyses of regions that did not follow the general trends, and analyses considering inter-annual variability.

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



3 Results

3.1 Observed vs. modelled canopy temperatures

Canopy and air temperature differ due to the balance of radiative heating, which is mainly driven by net radiation, and evaporative cooling. We compared the offsets between T_{AIR} and (modelled) $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ in winter and summer with the offsets between T_{AIR} and (observed) $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ (Supplement Fig. S2). Both observed and modelled canopy temperatures are commonly higher than air temperature, although evaporative cooling can dominate in some regions and seasons (e.g. in the USA2 region, and in boreal regions in winter). The large-scale patterns and magnitudes of the offsets are strikingly similar, although the remote-sensing data indicate greater cooling over the tropical rainforests.

3.2 Performance of environmental predictors

The reference model (I_{REF}) was successful in reproducing the seasonality of formaldehyde concentration at high latitudes ($r = 0.91$ averaged over the boreal regions, $r = 0.74$ over temperate regions), but not at low latitudes ($r = 0.31$ over tropical forests, -0.16 over tropical savannas). GPP was strongly and positively correlated with formaldehyde concentration at high latitudes, but the correlation declined with decreasing latitude, reaching negative values in seven of the eleven tropical regions. All three temperature variables (T_{AIR} , $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ and $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$) were well correlated with formaldehyde concentration in high latitudes, but the correlations diverge at lower latitudes.

On average across all regions, $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ ($r = 0.80$) and $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ ($r = 0.85$) provide much better predictive capability than air temperature ($r = 0.56$) and the reference model ($r = 0.49$), while GPP ($r = 0.14$) and fPAR ($r = 0.25$) have no predictive power. Only the observed and measured canopy temperatures showed significant relationships ($P < 0.05$) to the seasonal cycle of formaldehyde concentration at all latitudes.

3.2.1 Boreal regions

I_{REF} , GPP and $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ all appear to predict the timing of maximum formaldehyde concentrations in boreal regions (Fig. 3, Supplement Table S1). But $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ ($r = 0.87$) captured this timing better than T_{AIR} ($r = 0.73$), peaking earlier in the season. $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ also correlated highly with formaldehyde concentration ($r = 0.95$) in the boreal regions. The seasonal timings of canopy and air temperature in boreal regions differ because canopy temperature is related to the energy balance at the leaf surface and thus to insolation, which peaks in June. Air temperature does not peak until August, after a few months of summer sunshine have warmed the ground. GPP and the reference model show seasonal patterns closer to canopy temperature because GPP depends strongly on insolation and less strongly on air temperature.

3.2.2 Temperate regions

Five of the seven temperate regions analysed showed similar patterns to the boreal regions. Can2, NAM, USA1, USA2 and Chi showed strong correlations with formaldehyde for GPP, I_{REF} and the three temperatures variables, averaging $r = 0.75$ (T_{AIR}), 0.85 (GPP), 0.85 (I_{REF}), 0.92 ($T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$) and 0.94 ($T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$). For these regions temperature (air or canopy), GPP or the reference model all provide reasonable predictive power for isoprene emission, as was concluded by Palmer et al. (2006) for North America. However, even in these temperate locations, canopy temperature (whether observed or modelled) predicts isoprene emission better than air temperature, GPP or the reference model.

By contrast, in the temperate dry grassland and shrubland regions of Australia, Aus1 and Aus2, GPP was negatively correlated ($r = -0.84$, -0.89 respectively), while canopy (r observed = 0.87, 0.86; modelled = 0.88, 0.88) and air temperatures ($r = 0.85$ and 0.93), were positively correlated, with formaldehyde concentration. Unlike in the other temperate regions and the boreal regions, the seasonality of GPP in these dry mid-latitude ecosystems is not in synchrony with the temperature cycle, allowing distinct

responses of isoprene emission to GPP and temperature. The temperature effect wins. This finding suggests that the success of GPP in predicting isoprene emission at boreal sites and wetter temperate sites may be solely due to coincidence in the timing of peaks in leaf temperature and photosynthetic rates.

3.2.3 Tropical regions

In the tropical regions GPP entirely failed to predict the seasonal cycle of formaldehyde concentration. The mean correlation coefficient for GPP vs. formaldehyde concentration in the tropical forest regions was $r = -0.25$. The reference model ($r = 0.31$) and T_{AIR} ($r = 0.27$) performed better, and across the four Amazon sites, the reference model achieved $r = 0.71$. This is larger than found by Barkley et al. (2008) over Amazonia using a similar model ($r = 0.41$) (perhaps because we used canopy temperature rather than air temperature in our reference model). Nonetheless, observed and modelled canopy temperature were once again the best predictors: $r = 0.80$ for $T_{\text{CAN-OBS}}$ in forests and $r = 0.85$ in savannas; $r = 0.68$ for $T_{\text{CAN-LPJ}}$ in forests and $r = 0.74$ in savannas. Other predictors performed poorly: $r = 0.31$ for the reference model across all tropical forests and $r = -0.16$ for savannas; $r = 0.27$ for T_{AIR} in forests and $r = 0.58$ in savannas; $r = -0.25$ for GPP in forests and $r = -0.43$ in savannas. See below for a discussion of how the fPAR results strengthen these conclusions.

In all of the tropical regions studied, formaldehyde concentration peaks during the season of lowest precipitation (Fig. 3), with the exception of the second dry season in the Congo basin. This is opposite to the pattern of GPP. GPP is especially low during long periods of drought as in Santarem (San1) and the Ivory Coast (IC1 and IC2). Isoprene emissions peak coincident with rising canopy temperatures, not falling photosynthesis rates. During the dry season stomata are closed and GPP is reduced, but leaf temperatures are correspondingly high as evaporative cooling is suppressed. We infer that isoprene emissions in the tropics represents a response to high leaf temperatures and not GPP.

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

3.3 Global summary

Average correlations between observed canopy temperature and formaldehyde concentration are relatively high through all ecological zones (0.95, 0.91, 0.80, 0.75 for boreal, temperate, tropical forest and savanna regions). Correlations for modelled canopy temperature are also relatively high (0.87, 0.93, 0.68, 0.74). Correlations for both observed and modelled canopy temperature exceed those for air temperature (0.73, 0.80, 0.27, 0.58). The steep fall in the average correlation of GPP with formaldehyde concentration from high to low latitudes (0.92, 0.41, 0.08, -0.56) suggests that GPP is not a control on isoprene emission but that the correlation in boreal forest is caused by the similar seasonality in GPP and air temperature, both peaking in August in the Northern Hemisphere.

For completeness, we also include the correlation of formaldehyde with precipitation, which has never been presented as a driver of isoprene emission. In the tropical forests, lack of rainfall ($r = -0.81$) was found to predict isoprene emission as well as observed canopy temperature ($r = 0.80$). Weak positive correlations are found in temperate and boreal regions.

To exclude the possibility that the poor performance of GPP and the reference model as predictors of formaldehyde concentration in the tropics is caused by possibly errors in the model, we explored the correlation of a directly observed variable (fPAR) whose close relationship to GPP is commonly exploited in satellite-based modeling of primary production (e.g. Zhao and Running, 2010). Figure 3 shows close correspondence between the seasonal cycles of observed fPAR and modelled GPP, with a few exceptions among tropical forests (e.g. Amz4 and San1). But neither GPP nor fPAR consistently tracks formaldehyde concentration. The average correlation between fPAR and formaldehyde concentration is only 0.08 in tropical forests. In the tropical savannas (IC1, IC2) and temperate grasslands (Aus1, Aus2) GPP and fPAR have similar seasonal cycles, and both have negative correlations with formaldehyde. Only in the temperate and boreal regions do GPP and fPAR achieve $r > 0.75$ and even in these

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

regions, the mean correlation of $T_{CAN-OBS}$ with formaldehyde concentration is greater than the correlation of GPP or fPAR with formaldehyde concentration in eight out of eleven regions. The same holds for $T_{CAN-LPJ}$ in seven out of eleven regions.

We present these results graphically in Fig. 4, where each column represents the correlation of the mean seasonal cycle of the relevant variable vs. formaldehyde at all the regions. Correlations are stacked vertically, so that if all regions showed perfect agreement ($r = 1$) the stack would reach a height of 22 units. Figure 4 highlights the lack of a consistent relationship between GPP (or fPAR) and formaldehyde concentration. High formaldehyde concentrations are associated with low rainfall in the tropics, but not in temperate regions. In contrast, the modelled and observed canopy temperatures capture the seasonality of formaldehyde concentration (average $r = 0.80$ and 0.85 respectively) at all latitudes. These findings strongly suggest that isoprene emission varies over the seasonal cycle in response to seasonal variations in canopy temperature, independently of canopy photosynthesis.

4 Discussion and conclusions

Experimental evidence is accumulating that isoprene emission protects leaves against both oxidative damage and high temperatures (Sharkey and Yeh, 2001; Sasaki et al., 2007; Sharkey et al., 2008; Vickers et al., 2009; Behnke et al., 2010). It has been argued that these two processes are not unrelated – protection against heat stress requires protection against reactive oxygen species, which are released in response to heat damage (Jardine et al., 2011; Vickers et al., 2009; Velikova and Loreto, 2005). Other studies have shown that isoprene emissions increase the thermal stability of thylakoids at high temperatures (Siwko et al., 2007; Velikova et al., 2011). It is to be expected that the environmental controls of isoprene emission would relate to its adaptive significance. For example an effect of temperature on isoprene synthase transcription might promote thermoprotection at high temperatures, by allowing a steeper response to temperature than would be expected solely due to the kinetics of the synthesis path-

BDG

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

way (Li et al., 2011). These arguments suggest that we might expect isoprene emission under natural conditions to be finely tuned to leaf temperature.

Furthermore, although isoprene biosynthesis requires a supply of carbon chains that must be derived from photosynthesis, a recent analysis of the various known environmental dependences of isoprene emission points to a common mechanism whereby the rate of emission is proportional to the difference between the rate at which reducing power is generated by PhotoSystem II, and the ability of the chloroplasts to utilize this reducing power for carbon fixation (Morfopoulos et al., 2013). According to this mechanism, we would not expect a close coupling between GPP and isoprene emission. Indeed, under some circumstances, such as drought or low ambient CO₂ concentration, this mechanism predicts that isoprene emission should increase as GPP declines. Previous observations on leaves (Sharkey et al., 1999; Pétron et al., 2001) and canopies (Fuentes et al., 1999; Fuentes and Wang, 1999) have also shown that long-term isoprene emission tracks growth temperature. Positive effects of high temperature may include enzyme kinetic responses, effective immediately, and further effects on the transcript level of key enzymes (Li et al., 2011; Harrison et al., 2013), which remain to be systematically explored. Thus, our empirical findings are consistent with current understanding of the controls of isoprene biosynthesis, and suggest possible avenues for the exploration of how field-scale emissions could be predicted from a unified approach to isoprene modelling.

All current large-scale models for isoprene emission recognize the dependence of isoprene synthesis on photosynthetic electron transport – either explicitly, or implicitly through light-response functions. Current models also all include temperature effects, and some explicitly include antecedent temperature conditioning as well (Guenther et al., 1999). Our results however suggest that current models are unlikely to capture the over-riding dominance of canopy temperature as a predictor of the seasonal cycle of isoprene emission, especially in the tropics. Our results also imply that the explicit modelling of canopy temperature will be an important component of next-generation models. Remotely sensed observations provide a bridge between the global scale of

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

interest in the relationship between atmospheric chemistry and climate, and the more local scale of direct emissions measurements. Thus, they provide a rich source of empirical information for the development, improvement and evaluation of models. The clear empirical relationship we have shown between canopy temperature and isoprene emission should represent a benchmark to be met by models. Our results also suggest that some assumptions in current models, notably the link between isoprene emission and GPP as implemented in our reference model, may be in need of revision.

Supplementary material related to this article is available online at
**[http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/19571/2013/
bgd-10-19571-2013-supplement.pdf](http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/19571/2013/bgd-10-19571-2013-supplement.pdf)**.

Acknowledgements. We thank Josh Fisher for supplying the fPAR data. C. M. has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7 2007-2013) under grant agreement 238366 (GREENCYCLES II).

References

- Abbot, D. S., Palmer, P. I., Martin, R. V., Chance, K. V., Jacob, D. J., and Guenther, A.: Seasonal and interannual variability of North American isoprene emissions as determined by formaldehyde column measurements from space, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1886, doi:10.1029/2003GL017336, 2003
- Alton, P. B.: Reduced carbon sequestration in terrestrial ecosystems under overcast skies compared to clear skies, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 148, 1641–1653, 2008.
- Arneth, A., Niinemets, Ü., Pressley, S., Bäck, J., Hari, P., Karl, T., Noe, S., Prentice, I. C., Serça, D., Hickler, T., Wolf, A., and Smith, B.: Process-based estimates of terrestrial ecosystem isoprene emissions: incorporating the effects of a direct CO₂-isoprene interaction, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 31–53, doi:10.5194/acp-7-31-2007, 2007.
- Barkley, M. P., Palmer, P. I., Kuhn, U., Kesselmeier, J., Chance, K., Kurosu, T. P., Martin, R. V., Helmig, D., and Guenther, A.: Net ecosystem fluxes of isoprene over tropical South America

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

inferred from Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment (GOME) observations of formaldehyde columns, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D20304, doi:10.1029/2008JD009863, 2008.

Behnke, K., Loivamäki, M., Zimmer, I., Rennenberg, H., Schnitzler, J.-P., and Louis, S.: Isoprene emission protects photosynthesis in sunfleck exposed Grey poplar, *Photosynth. Res.*, 104, 5–17, 2010.

Collatz, G. J., Ball, J. T., Grivet, C., and Barry, F. A.: Physiological and environmental regulation of stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration: a model that includes a laminar boundary layer, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 54, 107–136, 1991.

Collins, W. J., Derwent, R. G., Johnson, C. E., and Stevenson, D. S.: The oxidation of organic compounds in the troposphere and their global warming potential, *Climatic Change*, 52, 453–479, 2001.

deFries, R. S. and Townshend, J. R. G.: NDVI-derived land cover classifications at a global scale, *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, 15, 3567–3586, 1994

De Smedt, I., Müller, J.-F., Stavrou, T., van der A, R., Eskes, H., and Van Roozendaal, M.: Twelve years of global observations of formaldehyde in the troposphere using GOME and SCIAMACHY sensors, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 4947–4963, doi:10.5194/acp-8-4947-2008, 2008.

Farquhar, G. D., von Caemmerer, S., and Berry, J. A.: Modelling of photosynthetic response to environmental conditions, in: *Physiological Plant Ecology II: Water Relations and Carbon Assimilation*, edited by: Nobel, P. S., Osmond, C. B., and Ziegler, H., Springer, Berlin, 549–587, 1980.

Fu, T.-M., Jacob, D. J., Palmer, P. I., Chance, K., Wang, Y. X., Barletta, B., Blake, D. R., Stanton, J. C., and Pilling, M. J.: Space-based formaldehyde measurements as constraints on volatile organic compound emissions in East and South Asia, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D06312, doi:10.1029/2006JD007853, 2007.

Fuentes, J. D. and Wang, D.: On the seasonality of isoprene emission from a mixed temperate forest, *Ecol. Appl.*, 9, 1118–1131, 1999.

Fuentes, J. D., Wang, D., and Gu, L.: Seasonality variations in isoprene emissions from a boreal aspen forest, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 38, 855–869, 1999.

Gerten, D., Schaphoff, S., Haberlandt, U., Lucht, W., and Sitch, S.: Terrestrial vegetation and water balance – hydrological evaluation of a dynamic global vegetation model, *J. Hydrol.*, 286, 249–270, 2004.

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

- Gobron, N., Pinty, B., Aussedat, O., Chen, J. M., Cohen, W. B., Fensholt, R., Gond, V., Huemmrich, K. F., Lavergne, T., Mélin, F., Privette, J. L., Sandholt, I., Taberner, M., Turner, D. P., Verstraete, M. M., and Widlowski, J.-L.: Evaluation of fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation products for different canopy radiation transfer regimes: methodology and results using Joint Research Center products derived from SeaWiFS against ground-based estimations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D13110, doi:10.1029/2005JD006511, 2006.
- Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P. R., Harley, P. C., Monson, R. K., and Fall, R.: Isoprene and monoterpene emission rate variability: model evaluations and sensitivity analyses, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 12609–12617, 1993.
- Guenther, A., Baugh, B., Brasseur, G., Greenburg, J., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Serça, D., and Vierling, L.: Isoprene emission estimates and uncertainties for the Central African EXPRESSO study domain, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 30625–30639, 1999.
- Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P. I., and Geron, C.: Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 3181–3210, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3181-2006, 2006.
- Harrison, S. P., Morfopoulos, C., Srikanta Dani, K. G., Prentice, I. C., Arneeth, A., Atwell, B. J., Barkley, M. P., Leishman, M. R., Loreto, F., Medlyn, B. E., Niinemets, Ü., Possell, M., Peñuelas, J., and Wright, I. J.: Volatile isoprenoid emissions from plastid to planet, *New Phytol.*, 197, 49–57, 2013.
- Haxeltine, A. and Prentice, I. C.: A general model for the light-use efficiency of primary production, *Funct. Ecol.*, 10, 551–561, 1996.
- Heald, C. L., Henze, D. K., Horowitz, L. W., Feddema, J., Lamrque, J.-F., Guenther, A., Hess, P. G., Vitt, F., Seinfeld, J. F., Goldstein, A. H., and Fung, I.: Predicted change in global secondary organic aerosol concentrations in response to future climate, emissions and land use change, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, 1127–1140, 2009.
- Huijnen, V., Williams, J., van Weele, M., van Noije, T., Krol, M., Dentener, F., Segers, A., Houweling, S., Peters, W., de Laat, J., Boersma, F., Bergamaschi, P., van Velthoven, P., Le Sager, P., Eskes, H., Alkemade, F., Scheele, R., Nédélec, P., and Pätz, H.-W.: The global chemistry transport model TM5: description and evaluation of the tropospheric chemistry version 3.0, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 445–473, doi:10.5194/gmd-3-445-2010, 2010.
- Jardine, K. J., Monson, R. K., Abrell, L., Saleska, S. R., Arneeth, A., Jardine, A., Ishida, A. Y., Serrano, A. M. Y., Artaxo, P., Karl, T., Fares, S., Goldstein, A., Loreto, F., and Huxman, T. T.:

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

Within-plant isoprene oxidation confirmed by direct emissions of oxidation products methyl vinyl ketone and methacrolein, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 18, 973–984, 2011.

Kelliher, F. M., Leuning, R., and Schulze, D.: Evaporation and canopy characteristics of coniferous forests and grasslands, *Oecologia*, 93, 153–163, 1993.

5 Kuhn, U., Rottenberger, S., Biesenthal, T., Wolf, A., Schebeske, G., Ciccioli, P., Brancaleoni, E., Frattoni, M., Tavares, T. M., and Kesselmeier, J.: Seasonal differences in isoprene and light-dependent monoterpene emission by Amazonian tree species, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 10, 663–682, 2004.

10 Lathièrè, J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Friend, A. D., De Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Viovy, N., and Folberth, G. A.: Impact of climate variability and land use changes on global biogenic volatile organic compound emissions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 2129–2146, doi:10.5194/acp-6-2129-2006, 2006.

Laothawornkitkul, J., Taylor, J. E., Paul, N. D., and Hewitt, C. N.: Biogenic volatile organic compounds in the Earth system, *New Phytol.*, 183, 27–51, 2009.

15 Li, Z., Ratliff, E. A., and Sharkey, T. D.: Effect of temperature on postillumination isoprene emission in oak and poplar, *Plant Physiol.*, 155, 1037–1046, 2011.

Tilmes, S., Lamarque, J.-F., Emmons, L. K., Conley, A., Schultz, M. G., Saunio, M., Thouret, V., Thompson, A. M., Oltmans, S. J., Johnson, B., and Tarasick, D.: Technical Note: Ozonesonde climatology between 1995 and 2011: description, evaluation and applications, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 7475–7497, doi:10.5194/acp-12-7475-2012, 2012.

20 Millet, D. B., Jacob, D. J., Boersma, K. F., Fu, T.-M., Kurosu, T. P., Change, K., Heald, C. L., and Guenther, A.: Spatial distribution of isoprene emissions from North America derived from formaldehyde column measurements by the OMI satellite sensor, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D02307, doi:10.1029/2007JD008950, 2008.

25 Mitchell, T. and Jones, C. D.: An improved method of constructing a database of monthly climate observations and associated high-resolution grid, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 25, 693–712, 2005.

Monson, R. K., Trahan, N., Rosentiel, T. N., Veres, P., Moore, D., Wilkinson, M., Norby, R. J., Volder, A., Tjoelker, M. G., Broske, D. D., Karnosky, D. F., and Fall, R.: Isoprene emission from terrestrial ecosystems in response to global change: minding the gap between models and observations, *Philos. T. R. Soc. A*, 365, 1677–1695, 2007.

30 Monson, R. K., Grote, R., Niinemets, Ü., and Schnitzler, J.-P.: Modeling the isoprene emission rate from leaves, *New Phytol.*, 195, 541–559, 2012.

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

- Morfopoulos, C., Prentice, I. C., Keenan, T. R., Friedlingstein, P., Medlyn, B. E., and Possell, M.: A unifying conceptual model for the environmental responses of isoprene emission by plants, *Ann. Bot.-London*, 112, 1223–1238, doi:10.1093/aob/mct206, 2013.
- Niinemets, Ü., Tenhunen, J. D., Harley, P. C., and Steinbrecher, R.: A model of isoprene emission based on energetic requirements for isoprene synthesis and leaf photosynthetic properties for *Liquidamber* and *Quercus*, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 22, 1319–1335, 1999.
- Pacifico, F., Harrison, S. P., Jones, C. D., Arneth, A., Sitch, S., Weedon, G. P., Barkley, M. P., Palmer, P. I., Serça, D., Potosnak, M., Fu, T.-M., Goldstein, A., Bai, J., and Schurgers, G.: Evaluation of a photosynthesis-based biogenic isoprene emission scheme in JULES and simulation of isoprene emissions under present-day climate conditions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 4371–4389, doi:10.5194/acp-11-4371-2011, 2011.
- Palmer, P. I., Jacob, D. J., Fiore, A. M., and Martin, R. V.: Mapping isoprene emissions over North America using formaldehyde column observations from space, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 1–47, 2003.
- Palmer, P. I., Abbot, D. S., Fu, T.-M., Jacob, D. J., Chance, K., Kurosu, T. P., Guenther, A., Wiedinmyer, C., Stanton, J. C., Pilling, M. J., Pressley, S. N., Lame, B., and Sumner, B. L.: Quantifying the seasonal and interannual variability of North American isoprene emissions using satellite observations of the formaldehyde column, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D12315, doi:10.1029/2005JD006689, 2006.
- Peñuelas, J. and Staudt, M.: BVOCs and global change, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 15, 133–144, 2010.
- Pétron, G., Harley, P., Greenberg, J., and Guenther, A.: Seasonal temperature variations influence isoprene emission, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28, 1707–1710, 2001.
- Possell, M., Nichol, C., and Beerling, D. J.: The effects of glacial atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and climate on isoprene emissions by vascular plants, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 11, 60–69, 2005.
- Ruimy, A., Jarvis, P. G., Baldocchi, D. D., Saugier, B., and Valentini, R.: CO₂ fluxes over plant canopies: a review, *Adv. Ecol. Res.*, 26, 2–68, 1995.
- Sasaki, K., Saito, T., Lämsä, M., Oksman-Caldentey, K.-M., Suzuki, M., Ohyama, K., Muranaka, T., Ohara, K., and Yazaki, K.: Plants utilize isoprene emission as a thermotolerance mechanism, *Plant Cell Physiol.*, 48, 1254–1262, 2007.
- Serça, D., Guenther, A., Klinger, L., Vierling, L., Harley, P., Druihet, A., Greenberg, J., Baker, B., Baugh, W., Bouka-Biona, C., and Loemba-Ndembu, J.: EXPRESSO flux measurements at upland and lowland Congo tropical forest site, *Tellus B*, 53, 220–234, 2001.

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Sharkey, T. D. and Yeh, S.: Isoprene emission from plants, *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, 52, 407–436, 2001.
- Sharkey, T. D., Singsaas, E. L., Lerdau, M. T., and Geron, C.: Weather effects on isoprene emission capacity and applications in emissions algorithms, *Ecol. Appl.*, 9, 1132–1137, 1999.
- 5 Sharkey, T. D., Wiberley, A. E., and Donohue, A. R.: Isoprene emission from plants: why and how, *Ann. Bot.-London*, 101, 5–18, 2008.
- Shim, C., Wang, Y., Choi, Y., Palmer, P. I., Abbot, D. S., and Chance, K.: Constraining global isoprene emissions with Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment (GOME) formaldehyde column measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D24301, doi:10.1029/2004JD005629, 2005.
- 10 Simon, E., Kuhn, U., Rottenberger, S., Meixner, F. X., and Kesselmeier, J.: Coupling isoprene and monoterpene emissions from Amazonian tree species with physiological and environmental parameters using a neural network approach, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 28, 287–301, 2005.
- Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., Kaplan, J. O., Levis, S., Lucht, W., Sykes, M. T., Thonicke, K., and Venevsky, S.: Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 9, 161–185, 2003.
- 15 Siwko, M. E., Marrink, S. J., de Vries, A. H., Kozubek, A., Uiterkamp, A. J. M. S., and Mark, A. E.: Does isoprene protect plant membranes from thermal shock? A molecular dynamics study, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1768, 198–206, 2007.
- 20 Stavrakou, T., Müller, J.-F., De Smedt, I., Van Roozendaal, M., van der Werf, G. R., Giglio, L., and Guenther, A.: Evaluating the performance of pyrogenic and biogenic emission inventories against one decade of space-based formaldehyde columns, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 1037–1060, doi:10.5194/acp-9-1037-2009, 2009.
- van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., Mu, M., Kasibhatla, P. S., Morton, D. C., DeFries, R. S., Jin, Y., and van Leeuwen, T. T.: Global fire emissions and the contribution of deforestation, savanna, forest, agricultural, and peat fires (1997–2009), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 11707–11735, doi:10.5194/acp-10-11707-2010, 2010.
- 25 Velikova, V. and Loreto, F.: On the relationship between isoprene emission and thermotolerance in *Phragmites australis* leaves exposed to high temperatures and during the recovery from a heat stress, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 28, 318–327, 2005.
- 30 Velikova, V., Várkonyi, Z., Szabó, M., Maslenkova, L., Nogues, I., Kovács, L., Peeva, V., Buseva, M., Garab, G., Sharkey, T., and Loreto, F.: Increased thermostability of thylakoid mem-

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

branes in isoprene-emitting leaves probed with three biophysical techniques, *Plant Physiol.*, 157, 905–916, 2011.

Vickers, C. E., Possell, M., Cojocariu, C. I., Velikova, C. B., Laothawornkitkul, J., Ryan, A., Mullineaux, P. M., and Hewitt, N. C.: Isoprene synthesis protects transgenic tobacco plants from oxidative stress, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 32, 520–531, 2009.

Wan, Z.: New refinements and validation of the MODIS land-surface temperature/emissivity products, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 112, 59–74, 2010.

Wania, R., Ross, I., and Prentice, I. C.: Integrating peatlands and permafrost into a dynamic global vegetation model: 2. Evaluation and sensitivity of vegetation and carbon cycle processes, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 23, GB3015, doi:10.1029/2008GB003413, 2009.

Williams, J. E., Strunk, A., Huijnen, V., and van Weele, M.: The application of the Modified Band Approach for the calculation of on-line photodissociation rate constants in TM5: implications for oxidative capacity, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 15–35, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-15-2012, 2012.

Young, P. J., Arneth, A., Schurgers, G., Zeng, G., and Pyle, J. A.: The CO₂ inhibition of terrestrial isoprene emission significantly affects future ozone projections, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 2793–2803, doi:10.5194/acp-9-2793-2009, 2009.

Zhao, M. and Running, S. W.: Drought-induced reduction in global terrestrial net primary production from 2000 through 2009, *Science*, 329, 940–943, 2010.

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 1. Schematic of the analysis. The blue boxes show variables averaged over selected regions and years to produce a mean seasonal cycle. The mean seasonal cycles of the observed and modelled variables are statistically compared with the mean seasonal cycle of satellite observations of formaldehyde – a direct proxy for plant isoprene emissions – shown in the blue circle.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

BGD

10, 19571–19601, 2013

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 2. Geographic distribution of the regions analysed, overlain on burnt area and biomes. Average burnt fraction (1997–2005) from version 3 of the Global Fire Emissions Database (van der Werf et al., 2010) is shown in the top panel. The bottom panel shows the land classification, following deFries and Townsend (1994).

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 3a. Boreal regions. Mean seasonal cycles (1997–2006) for formaldehyde concentrations and potential environmental predictors. Regional and monthly averages of the regions are grouped into four panels: boreal regions, temperate regions, tropical forests and tropical savannas. In the first column, the mean seasonal cycle of the reference isoprene model, I_{REF} , is shown as the solid line scaled to the maximum emission in that region; the mean seasonal cycle of the formaldehyde data is scaled to I_{REF} , and plotted as red stars. Below each graph is shown the seasonal pattern of the difference between the formaldehyde data and I_{REF} (Δ) to indicate potential seasonal biases. The second column shows the normalized mean seasonal GPP. The formaldehyde seasonal cycle is scaled to GPP and plotted as red stars. The mean seasonal cycle of fPAR is also shown (green dashed line). In the third column, the mean seasonal cycle of modelled canopy temperature ($T_{CAN-LPJ}$, °C) and the formaldehyde data are shown as the solid line and red stars. The dashed blue line shows the observed air temperature. The panel below shows the difference between the formaldehyde cycle and the modelled canopy temperature as the solid line and formaldehyde minus T_{AIR} as the dashed blue line. The last column shows the mean seasonal cycle of regionally averaged precipitation, with an inverted y-axis.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 3b. Temperate regions.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#) [Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#) [References](#)

[Tables](#) [Figures](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[Back](#) [Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 3c. Tropical forests.

[Title Page](#)

Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures

◀
▶

◀
▶

[Back](#)
[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Isoprene emissions track the seasonal cycle of canopy temperature, not PP

P. N. Foster et al.




Fig. 3d. Tropical savannas.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion




Fig. 4. Correlations of the mean seasonal cycle of formaldehyde concentration with potential environmental predictors, shown as stacks of boxes, with one box for each region. If each region had $r = 1$ the bar would reach a height of 22. The boxes are colour-coded by ecological zone: boreal = light blue, temperate = dark blue, tropical forests = green, tropical savannas = orange. The first column represents the correlation between the mean seasonal cycle of formaldehyde and the mean seasonal cycle of the reference model, I_{REF} . Subsequent columns show the correlation of the mean seasonal cycle of formaldehyde with the mean seasonal cycles of gross primary production (GPP) from the LPJ model, the fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (fPAR) from SeaWiFS satellite data, precipitation (Prec) and air temperature (T_{AIR}) from CRU data, canopy temperature ($T_{CAN-LPJ}$) modelled using LPJ and canopy temperature ($T_{CAN-OBS}$) from the MODIS land-surface temperature observations.