# UC San Diego UC San Diego Previously Published Works

# Title

Belowground Biomass Response to Nutrient Enrichment Depends on Light Limitation Across Globally Distributed Grasslands

Permalink https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3bz520gj

**Journal** Ecosystems, 22(7)

**ISSN** 1432-9840

# **Authors**

Cleland, Elsa E Lind, Eric M DeCrappeo, Nicole M <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date

2019-11-01

# DOI

10.1007/s10021-019-00350-4

Peer reviewed

**Title:** Belowground biomass response to nutrient enrichment depends on light-limitation across

2
2
5
4
5
6
7
8
0
2
10
11
12
13
14
15
10
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
∠∠ วว
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
25
22
36
37
38
39
40
<u>4</u> 1
40
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
40
49 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
56
57
58
59

1

1

2

3

9
10 4 Running title: Root response to nutrients depends on light
11
12
13
5

globally distributed grasslands

6 Authors: Elsa E. Cleland<sup>1</sup>, Eric M. Lind<sup>2</sup>, Nicole M. DeCrappeo<sup>3</sup>, Elizabeth DeLorenze<sup>3</sup>, Rachel

7 Abbott Wilkins<sup>4</sup>, Peter B. Adler<sup>5</sup>, Jonathan D. Bakker<sup>6</sup>, Cynthia S. Brown<sup>7</sup>, Kendi F. Davies<sup>8</sup>,

8 Ellen Esch<sup>9</sup>, Jennifer Firn<sup>10</sup>, Scott Gressard<sup>1</sup>, Daniel S. Gruner<sup>11</sup>, Nicole Hagenah<sup>12</sup>, W. Stanley

9 Harpole<sup>13,14,15</sup>, Yann Hautier<sup>16</sup>, Sarah E. Hobbie<sup>2</sup>, Kirsten S. Hofmockel<sup>17,18</sup>, Kevin Kirkman<sup>19</sup>,

10 Johannes Knops<sup>20</sup>, Christopher W. Kopp<sup>21</sup>, Kimberly J. La Pierre<sup>22</sup>, Andrew MacDougall<sup>9</sup>,

11 McCulley, Rebecca L.<sup>23</sup>, Brett A. Melbourne<sup>8</sup>, Joslin L. Moore<sup>24</sup>, Suzanne M. Prober<sup>25</sup>, Charlotte

12 Riggs<sup>2</sup>, Anita C. Risch<sup>26</sup>, Martin Schuetz<sup>26</sup>, Carly Stevens<sup>27</sup>, Peter D. Wragg<sup>28</sup>, Justin Wright<sup>29</sup>,

13 Elizabeth T. Borer<sup>2</sup>, Eric W. Seabloom<sup>2</sup>

14

15 **Author Affiliations:** 

16 <sup>1</sup> Ecology, Behavior & Evolution Section, University of California San Diego, La Jolla CA

0 17 92093

18 <sup>2</sup> Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, University of Minnesota, St. Paul MN,

5 19 55108, USA

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center, Corvallis, OR 97331
 <sup>4</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA
 <sup>5</sup> Department of Wildland Resources and the Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, UT

4 23 84103

60

1		
2 3 4	24	<sup>6</sup> School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, University of Washington, Box 354115, Seattle
5 6	25	WA 98195-4115
7 8 9	26	<sup>7</sup> Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management, Graduate Degree Program in
10 11	27	Ecology, 1177 Campus Delivery, Colorado State University, Fort Collins CO 80523 USA
12 13	28	<sup>8</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, UCB 334 University of Colorado, Boulder,
14 15 16	29	CO 80309 USA
10 17 18	30	<sup>9</sup> University of Guelph, Department of Integrative Biology, Guelph, Ontario Canada N1G 2W1
19 20	31	<sup>10</sup> Queensland University of Technology, School of Earth, Environmental and Biological
21 22	32	Sciences, Brisbane, Australia
23 24 25	33	<sup>11</sup> Department of Entomology, University of Maryland, 4112 Plant Sciences Bldg, College Park,
26 27	34	MD 20742 USA
28 29	35	<sup>12</sup> Mammal Research Institute, Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of Pretoria,
30 31 32	36	Pretoria, South Africa
33 34	37	<sup>13</sup> Department of Physiological Diversity, Helmholtz Center for Environmental Research – UFZ,
35 36	38	Permoserstrasse 15, Leipzig 04318, Germany
37 38 30	39	<sup>14</sup> German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research iDiv. Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher
40 41	40	Platz 5e, Leipzig 04103, Germany
42 43	41	<sup>15</sup> Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle- Wittenberg, Am Kirchtor 1, Halle Saale.
44 45	42	06108, Germany
40 47 48	43	<sup>16</sup> Ecology and Biodiversity Group, Department of Biology, Utrecht University, Padualaan 8,
49 50	44	3584 CH Utrecht, Netherlands
51 52	45	<sup>17</sup> Department of Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames
53 54 55	46	Iowa, USA
56 57		
58 59		2
49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	44 45 46	3584 CH Utrecht, Netherlands <sup>17</sup> Department of Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames Iowa, USA 2

1 2

3 4	47	<sup>18</sup> Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,
5 6 7	48	Richland WA, USA
7 8 9	49	<sup>19</sup> School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Scottsville, South Africa
10 11	50	<sup>20</sup> School of Biological Sciences, University of Nebraska, Manter Hall 402, Lincoln, NE 68588
12 13	51	USA
14 15 16	52	<sup>21</sup> Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T1Z4 Canada
17 18	53	<sup>22</sup> Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, 647 Contees Wharf Road
19 20	54	Edgewater, MD 21037 USA
21 22 22	55	<sup>23</sup> Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40546 USA
23 24 25	56	<sup>24</sup> School of Biological Sciences, Monash University VIC 3800 Australia
26 27	57	<sup>25</sup> CSIRO Land and Water, Underwood Avenue, Floreat WA 6014 Australia
28 29	58	<sup>26</sup> Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research, Zuercherstrasse 111, 8903
30 31 32	59	Birmensdorf Switzerland
33 34	60	<sup>27</sup> Lancaster Environment Center, Lancaster University, Lancaster U.K. LA14YQ
35 36	61	<sup>28</sup> Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN 55108
37 38 39	62	<sup>29</sup> Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham NC 27708 USA
40 41	63	
42 43	64	<b>Corresponding author:</b> Elsa E. Cleland; University of California San Diego, 9500 Gilman Dr.
44 45	65	#0116, La Jolla CA 92093-0116 USA; 8582460509; ecleland@ucsd.edu
40 47 48	66	
49 50	67	Author contributions:
51 52	68	EEC analyzed the data and wrote the paper with input from all co-authors. All co-authors
53 54 55	69	contributed to data collection.
56 57		
58 59 60		3

# Ecosystems

2		
3 4	70	
5 6	71	Abstract:
7 8 9	72	Anthropogenic activities are increasing nutrient inputs to ecosystems worldwide, with
10 11	73	consequences for global carbon and nutrient cycles. Recent meta-analyses show that
12 13	74	aboveground primary production is often co-limited by multiple nutrients, however little is
14 15 16	75	known about how root production responds to changes in nutrient availability. At twenty-nine
17 18	76	grassland sites on four continents, we quantified shallow root biomass responses to nitrogen (N),
19 20 21	77	phosphorus (P) and potassium plus micronutrient enrichment and compared below- and
21 22 23	78	aboveground responses. We hypothesized that optimal allocation theory would predict context
24 25	79	dependence in root biomass responses to nutrient enrichment, given variation among sites in the
26 27	80	resources limiting to plant growth (specifically light versus nutrients). Consistent with the
28 29 30	81	predictions of optimal allocation theory, the <i>proportion</i> of total biomass belowground declined
31 32	82	with N or P addition, due to increased biomass aboveground (for N and P) and decreased
33 34	83	biomass belowground (N, particularly in sites with low canopy light penetration). Absolute root
35 36 37	84	biomass increased with N addition where light was abundant at the soil surface, but declined in
38 39	85	sites where the grassland canopy intercepted a large proportion of incoming light. These results
40 41	86	demonstrate that belowground responses to changes in resource supply can differ strongly from
42 43 44	87	aboveground responses, which could significantly modify predictions of future rates of nutrient
44 45 46	88	cycling and carbon sequestration. Our results also highlight how optimal allocation theory
47 48	89	developed for individual plants may help predict belowground biomass responses to nutrient
49 50	90	enrichment at the ecosystem scale across wide climatic and environmental gradients.
51 52 53	91	
54 55		

92 Keywords: belowground biomass, fertilization, nitrogen, Nutrient Network, optimal allocation,

- 93 phosphorus, roots
  - Manuscript highlights
    - Both N and P addition reduced the proportion of total biomass in shallow roots
    - N addition decreased roots most where there was low light beneath the canopy
      - These results show plant allocation to roots vs shoots depends on limiting resources

### 99 Introduction

Grasslands and other herbaceous plant communities cover 20 - 40% of the terrestrial land surface (Leith, 1978), provide critical ecosystem services such as rangeland forage, and play an important role in the global carbon (C) cycle, with grassland soils containing up to 30% of the world's soil C (Anderson, 1991). Across the world's biomes, grasslands have some of the highest fractions of total biomass as roots (Poorter and others, 2012). There is large variation in partitioning of biomass and productivity across sites, however; for instance, Sims and Singh (1978) estimated between 24% and 87% of net primary production was belowground across ten North American grassland sites, and Hui and Jackson (2006) found similar levels of variation across grasslands worldwide (40-86%). This variation in the proportion of growth allocated belowground is important not only for regional estimates of primary production and C sequestration (Scurlock & Hall, 1998, Mokany and others, 2006) but also for understanding ecosystem responses to global change (Friedlingstein and others, 1999, Jackson and others, 2000).

Anthropogenic activities are increasing global nutrient availability, with effects on net
primary production (Elser and others, 2007), plant allocation above- and belowground (Poorter

Page 7 of 36

# Ecosystems

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
4/	
48	
49 50	
50 51	
51	
52	
ک⊂ ∡	
54 57	
55 56	
00 57	
5/	
20	
29	
bυ	

115	and others, 2012), and net ecosystem C balance (Mack and others, 2004). Fossil fuel combustion
116	and agricultural intensification have doubled annual nitrogen (N) inputs into terrestrial
117	ecosystems and have increased phosphorous (P) inputs more than fourfold (Falkowski and
118	others, 2000). Shifts in C balance resulting from nutrient enrichment could depend on allocation
119	above- versus belowground (Friedlingstein and others, 1999, Smithwick and others, 2014). High
120	proportional allocation to root biomass increases the potential for ecosystem C sequestration
121	because root-derived C is more likely to enter long-lasting soil organic C pools than C from
122	aboveground tissues (Rasse and others, 2005), and roots can promote physical stabilization of
123	soil organic matter via soil aggregate formation (Jastrow, 1996).
124	Optimal allocation theory, developed for individual plants, predicts that plant allocation
125	belowground should depend on the identity of the most growth-limiting resource (Thornley,
126	1972, Bloom and others, 1985, Wilson, 1988). Specifically, proportional root allocation should
127	decline when plant growth is limited by aboveground resources (e.g. light) and increase when
128	plant growth is limited by belowground resources such as water and nutrients (Gleeson &
129	Tilman, 1992). A recent meta-analysis summarizing the results of nearly 800 experimental
130	manipulations of resource availability found strong support for optimal allocation theory; the
131	proportion of biomass allocated to roots was higher under water or nutrient limitation, and lower
132	under light limitation (Poorter and others, 2012). Most of these studies were focused at the
133	species level, and if there is significant interspecific variation in allocation responses to
134	environmental change (Craine and others, 2003), then the predictions of optimal allocation
135	theory might not explain community-level variation in root allocation. However, patterns
136	observed across environmental gradients also support the hypothesis that community-level
137	allocation to roots declines as belowground resources increase. For instance, proportional root

2		
3 4	138	allocation in g
5 6	139	xeric regions v
7 8	140	Mokany and o
9 10 11	141	While
12 13	142	environmental
14 15 16	143	simultaneously
16 17 18	144	limited by mul
19 20	145	others, 2007, H
21 22 22	146	multiple aspec
23 24 25	147	experiments (N
26 27	148	understanding
28 29	149	Smithwick and
30 31 32	150	the absolute qu
33 34	151	to global chang
35 36	152	primary produ
37 38 39	153	others, 1999, V
40 41	154	these estimates
42 43	155	biomass alloca
44 45 46	156	others, 2014).
40 47 48	157	To eva
49 50	158	local experime
51 52	159	network of gra
55 55	160	the Nutrient N
56 57		
58		
59		

60

1

rasslands is inversely correlated with mean annual precipitation and is highest in where water is the predominant factor limiting plant growth (Hui & Jackson, 2006, thers, 2006).

many studies have evaluated how allocation responds to variation in individual factors, few have evaluated how allocation responds when multiple factors change y. This is a critical knowledge gap because primary production is frequently coltiple resources as opposed to single resources (Hooper & Johnson, 1999, Elser and Harpole and others, 2011, Fay and others, 2015) and ecosystem responses to ts of global change often deviate from predictions based on single factor Norby & Luo, 2004). The importance of community-scale biomass partitioning for regional and global C budgets (Scurlock & Hall, 1998, Jackson and others, 2000, d others, 2014) underscores the need for a framework that effectively predicts both uantities as well as proportion of biomass above- versus belowground, in response ges such as eutrophication. Further, while regional and global estimates of total net ction generally rely on modeled estimates of root allocation (Friedlingstein and Woodward & Osborne, 2000, Gill and others, 2002, Michaletz and others, 2014), s are rarely validated because continental and global relationships between ation and climate and soil variables remain poorly characterized (Smithwick and

luate how community-scale root biomass production and allocation respond to ental nutrient enrichment across environmental gradients, we leveraged a global assland sites where nutrient availability was manipulated using common protocols, etwork (Borer and others, 2014a). By using this experimental network that spans a

Page 9 of 36

#### Ecosystems

broad range of climates and grassland soils, we characterized both global trends in allocation patterns in response to eutrophication as well as regional contingencies in this response. Prior efforts from this network have demonstrated that aboveground primary production across these sites is frequently co-limited by multiple nutrients (Fay and others, 2015), and that the impact of soil nutrients on species richness depends on light limitation (Borer and others, 2014b); however belowground biomass responses to multiple nutrient enrichment have not yet been evaluated. Here we refer to "biomass allocation" as reflecting static pools of biomass, distinct from efforts aimed at identifying the dynamic partitioning of new photosynthates (sensu Poorter and others, 2012, also discussed in Reich 2002, and alternatively referred to as "biomass distribution in Reich and others, 2014). We focus on root responses near the soil surface (top 10 cm), because 80-90% of root biomass in grasslands is concentrated near the surface, in the top 30 cm (Jackson

172 and others, 1996). Surface roots play a disproportionate role in nutrient acquisition because the

173 greatest concentrations of N, P, and K are found high in soil profiles (Sposito, 1989, Jobbagy &

surface. Furthermore, grasslands store the greatest proportion of soil C near the soil surface

<sup>3</sup> 174 Jackson, 2001), and both experimental and anthropogenic nutrient inputs occur at the soil

(Jobbagy & Jackson, 2000), contributing to greater microbial biomass (Blume and others, 2002,
Eilers and others, 2012) and fueling greater microbial activity in surface versus subsurface soils.
Hence, C pools with potential for high turnover and release to the atmosphere are likely most
sensitive to fertilization at shallow depths. Accordingly, a meta-analysis of 257 studies across a
variety of ecosystems found that N addition tended to reduce carbon stocks in shallow but not
deep soil layers, correlated with a decline in root allocation in shallow soil layers (Lu and others
2011).

2		
3 4	183	Across the Nutrient Network sites, we hypothesized that 1) absolute belowground
5 6	184	biomass would respond positively and synergistically to the addition of multiple nutrients,
7 8	185	consistent with patterns of multiple nutrient limitation of aboveground plant biomass observed
9 10 11	186	across these sites (Fay and others, 2015). We expected that <i>relative</i> biomass allocation to roots
12 13	187	(root biomass as a proportion of total biomass) would 2) decline with increasing light limitation
14 15	188	(associated with low light availability below the grassland canopy, e.g. Gleeson & Tilman,
16 17 18	189	1992), 3) increase with increasing water limitation (in more arid sites, e.g. Hui & Jackson, 2006),
19 20	190	and 4) decrease with nutrient enrichment particularly when multiple nutrients are added together
21 22	191	(Yuan & Chen, 2012), as predicted by optimal allocation theory. Finally, we expected that 5)
23 24 25	192	there might be statistical interactions among the factors predicting belowground biomass and
25 26 27	193	allocation, due to the importance of environmental context in determining community responses
28 29	194	to resource enrichment (Cleland & Harpole, 2010). Specifically, we expected that root biomass
30 31 22	195	responses to nutrient enrichment would be constrained in sites where plant growth was limited
32 33 34	196	by water (more arid sites), and that root biomass might even decline with nutrient addition at
35 36	197	sites where there is strong competition for light, in favor of increased allocation to aboveground
37 38	198	biomass.
39 40 41	199	
42 43	200	Methods
44 45	201	This research was conducted within the Nutrient Network, a globally replicated network
46 47 48	202	of sites manipulating nutrients (nitrogen – N, phosphorus – P, and potassium plus
49 50	203	micronutrients– $K_{\mu}$ ) and vertebrate herbivore exclusion (Borer and others, 2014a). The
51 52	204	micronutrients were only added in year one, and included Ca, Mg, B, Cu, Fe, Mn, Mo, and Zn.
53 54	205	For the effort described here, we analyzed data from 29 sites where the experimental treatments
55 56 57 58 59		9
60		

Page 11 of 36

#### Ecosystems

had been applied for 3-5 years. At most sites plots were arranged in three blocks, each block containing the ten focal treatments: control unfenced & unfertilized, +N, +P,  $+K_{\mu}$ , +NP,  $+NK_{\mu}$ , +  $PK_{u}$ , + $NPK_{u}$ , fenced & unfertilized, and fenced + $NPK_{u}$ . At each site, 30 plots (each 5 x 5 m) were sampled, except where noted in Supplementary Material, resulting in 874 plots sampled in total. For this manuscript, only data from the factorial nutrient addition treatments were analyzed (i.e. all fenced plots were excluded). The sites span four continents and, more importantly, wide environmental gradients in mean annual precipitation (274-2314 mm/year, summarized in Table S1). All sites are dominated by herbaceous vegetation but vary in the relative abundance of graminoids versus other functional types (Table S1). Vegetation types included, for instance, alpine meadows, prairie, pasture, savannah, and steppe, but we refer to these sites as grasslands for brevity.

Above- and belowground biomass were collected at the time of peak biomass in either 2011 (Northern Hemisphere) or early 2012 (Southern Hemisphere). According to Nutrient Network protocols (Borer and others, 2014a), aboveground biomass was destructively harvested in two 1 m x 0.1 m strips per experimental plot, sorted to separate the current year's production from litter, dried to constant mass, and weighed to the nearest 0.01 g. Immediately following the aboveground biomass harvest, five soil cores were taken to a depth of 10 cm in the harvest area. Root cores were collected using standard corers or sharpened PVC tubes with an inside diameter of 2.5 cm, for a total ground area of 24.5 cm<sup>2</sup>. Exceptions to this protocol are noted in the Supplementary Material. All cores from each plot were combined in one sealed plastic bag, packed into coolers with cold packs, and sent via next day air to a central processing lab (USGS at Corvallis, Oregon, USA).

1 2		
3 4	228	Total soil weights for each bulked sample were recorded, and a homogenized subsample
5 6	229	comprising 1/5 <sup>th</sup> of the total soil weight (20-150 grams) was weighed and sent to the University
7 8 0	230	of California, San Diego for root extraction. Soil sub-samples were kept cool with icepacks
) 10 11	231	throughout transit and refrigerated while in the lab until processing.
12 13	232	Live root biomass was estimated using a modification of the standard Long Term
14 15 16	233	Ecological Research method for measuring standing fine root biomass in soil cores (Bledsoe and
10 17 18	234	others, 1999). Soil subsamples were immersed in water; live roots were light in color and floated
19 20	235	to the surface, while dead roots and organic matter were darker in color. Live roots were
21 22	236	extracted with tweezers, rinsed to remove residual mineral soil, dried to a constant mass, and
23 24 25	237	weighed to the nearest 0.001 g. Above- and belowground (to 10 cm) biomass estimates were
25 26 27	238	expressed on a common scale (g/m <sup>2</sup> ). Our key metric of proportional biomass allocation is the
28 29	239	root mass fraction (RMF) following the method in Reich (2002). The RMF was calculated as the
30 31	240	root biomass divided by the sum of root and aboveground live biomass on an equal area basis.
32 33 34	241	Detailed methods are provided in Supplementary Material.
35 36	242	Our estimates of belowground biomass are based on one-time destructive harvests at the
37 38	243	time of peak biomass; while this reflects a reasonable estimate of aboveground production, this is
39 40 41	244	an underestimate of belowground production (Gill and others, 2002). Hence, we proceed with the
42 43	245	caveat that this effort documents comparable patterns of shallow root biomass and allocation
44 45	246	across plots and sites, but additional estimates of root turnover and deep root biomass would be
46 47 49	247	needed to estimate total belowground production and allocation of net primary production.
49 50	248	However, a survey of published and unpublished data on the distribution of root biomass at our
51 52	249	sites shows that the majority of root biomass is captured by shallow root sampling efforts, such
53 54 55	250	as ours (Table S2).
56 57 58 59		11

Page 13 of 36

#### Ecosystems

We assembled site-level metrics of water limitation and light availability at the soil surface, for inclusion as co-variates in our analyses. We extracted measures of the Global Aridity Index (CGIAR-CSI Global-Aridity and Global-PET Database, Zomer and others, 2008), based on data from the WorldClim database (Hijmans and others, 2005). Hereafter referred to as GAI, this index is calculated as mean annual precipitation divided by mean annual potential evapotranspiration, and hence accounts for both precipitation inputs and soil water loss due to high temperature, solar radiation, and wind. Low GAI indicates more arid sites with low soil water availability (low inputs and/or high rates of water loss). Using a linear multi-sensor light meter, we measured the proportional decrease in photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) from above the canopy to below the canopy as a proxy of light limitation. The proportion of PAR reaching the soil surface was calculated as the average of two PAR measurements taken at the soil surface perpendicular to one another in a  $1 m^2$  undisturbed subplot, divided by PAR measured above the canopy immediately afterwards, under full light conditions. We averaged the proportion of PAR reaching the soil surface across all years of measurement in the control plots from each site (unfenced, unfertilized) as a site-level metric of the degree of light-limitation. This metric is abbreviated hereafter as "light". Resource depletion is the key mechanism by which plants compete with neighbors (Goldberg 1990), and hence we use "light" is a proxy for community-level light depletion.

The fractions of the community comprised by graminoids and by perennial species were calculated as two additional site-level metrics of species composition, based on visual percent cover estimates collected in 1 x 1 m plots adjacent to the biomass harvests described above. These values were calculated only from control plots at each site (unfenced, unfertilized).

2 3	274	Statistical analysis
4 5 6	275	Data analysis was performed in R version 3.3.3 (R Core Team, 2017). Pearson
7 8	276	correlations were performed to evaluate associations among site-level parameters: aridity, light,
9 10 11	277	live aboveground biomass (AGB), live belowground root biomass to 10 cm depth (BGB), RMF,
12 13	278	graminoid fraction, and perennial fraction. Each data point in the correlation analysis was a site-
14 15	279	level mean for each parameter, calculated for the control plots only.
16 17 18	280	Examination of the BGB data with Quantile-Quantile plots showed these data were
19 20	281	lognormally distributed (Figure S2), as is common with ecological datasets involving measures
21 22	282	of growth (Bolker, 2008), and hence the BGB data were natural-log transformed prior to
23 24 25	283	analysis. The RMF data were continuous proportions bounded by 0 and 1 and, as expected,
26 27	284	initial inspection with Quantile-Quantile plots indicated the data were non-normally distributed
28 29	285	(Figure S3). Following the recommendation of Warton and Hui (2011) the RMF data were logit
30 31 32	286	transformed. After transformation, BGB and RMF had normally distributed errors and were
33 34	287	analyzed with a general linear mixed model using the lme call in the package nlme (Pinheiro and
35 36	288	others, 2013).
37 38 39	289	To evaluate the responses of BGB and RMF to the addition of individual nutrients and
40 41	290	their combinations, N, P and $K_{\mu}$ were each included as factorial fixed factors, site was treated as
42 43	291	a random factor, and light and aridity were included as site-level covariates. As described above,
44 45 46	292	our metric of light availability was based on site-level mean light penetration of the grassland
47 48	293	canopy only in control plots, and hence was independent from aboveground biomass responses
49 50	294	to nutrient enrichment (and resulting effects on light penetration through the canopy).
51 52 53	295	Significance for each factor was evaluated with Type II Wald chi-square tests using the Anova
54 55		
56 57		10
58 59 60		13

# Ecosystems

1 2		
2 3 4	296	function in the car package (Fox & Weisberg, 2011). Supplementary Information contains the R
5 6 7	297	code for all tests.
7 8 9	298	
10 11	299	Results
12 13 14	300	We found wide variation across sites in root biomass (BGB, 60-1675 $g/m^2$ ) and
14 15 16	301	proportional allocation of biomass to roots from 0-10 cm depth (RMF, 7-90%), as summarized in
17 18	302	Table S1 in Supplementary Material. When considering mean values in control plots (unfenced,
19 20 21	303	unfertilized) at each of the 29 sites across four continents, there were a number of correlations
21 22 23	304	among response and predictor variables (correlation coefficients in Table 1). Aridity (GAI ) was
24 25	305	positively correlated with the proportion of perennial cover ( $p = 0.03$ , meaning annuals were
26 27 28	306	more common in drier sites). At the site level, the proportion of PAR reaching the soil surface
28 29 30	307	(light) was negatively correlated with AGB ( $p = 0.001$ ), but was not associated with community
31 32	308	composition (proportion of graminoid or perennial cover in control plots). AGB and BGB were
33 34	309	not correlated, however both variables were positively correlated with RMF (as expected,
35 36 37	310	because AGB and BGB are used in the calculation of RMF). There was low RMF in sites with
38 39	311	low light beneath the grass canopy ( $p = 0.02$ , as expected, because of the negative correlation
40 41	312	between AGB and RMF), but RMF was not correlated with GAI or community composition.
42 43 44	313	When analyzing the full data set (treatment plots as well as controls), both light and GAI
45 46	314	were significant site-level covariates in the analysis (statistics in Table 2, parameter estimates for
47 48	315	significant factors in in Figure 1). GAI and light were both positive predictors of BGB, while
49 50 51	316	only light was a significant predictor of RMF.
52 53	317	Previously, a synergistic increase in aboveground biomass with N and P addition was
54 55 56	318	observed across the Nutrient Network sites (i.e. significant N x P interaction, Fay and others
57 58 59		14

2015). In contrast, N, P, and  $K_{\mu}$  each had an overall negative effect on BGB (parameter estimates for all terms shown in Table 2 and Figure S4). Only N addition had a statistically significant effect on BGB with the response characterized by a N x light interaction (Table 2); in sites with high light at the soil surface, N addition increased root biomass, but in sites where light competition likely limited growth (low light at the soil surface), N addition reduced root biomass (Figure 2).

Mean values calculated across sites for RMF in each of the Nutrient Network treatments are shown in Figure 3. Addition of N and P each significantly reduced RMF, with no interaction. As with BGB, there was a significant N x light interaction, where the reduction in RMF with N addition was greatest in sites where a lower proportion of incoming light reached the soil surface under control conditions (statistics in Table 2, significant parameter estimates in Figure 1).

331 Discussion

Across grasslands on four continents, N enrichment quickly (within 3-5 years) influenced community belowground biomass and allocation, and light availability at ground level was a key predictor of the response of belowground biomass allocation to N addition, despite significant variation among sites in plant community composition, climate, and soils. Interestingly, no other nutrient treatment positively affected absolute root biomass, and nutrient enrichment tended to lower proportional biomass allocation to roots. The findings of this analysis are consistent with the predictions of optimal allocation theory, demonstrating that allocation patterns predicted for individual plants scale to the community level, with total belowground allocation jointly influenced by nutrient enrichment and light-limitation predictably across wide climatic and environmental gradients.

1		
2 3	242	
4	342	
5 6 7	343	Variation in root biomass and root mass fraction across sites
7 8 9	344	Similar to prior regional studies (i.e. Sims & Singh, 1978, Scurlock and others, 2002, Hui
10 11	345	& Jackson, 2006), this global study documents wide variation across sites in plant allocation to
12 13	346	belowground biomass. Based on prior syntheses we expected that root biomass and allocation
14 15 16	347	would vary with soil water supply (Hui & Jackson, 2006, Mokany and others, 2006, but see
10 17 18	348	Yang and others, 2009, Reich and others, 2014). Root biomass increased with increasing soil
19 20	349	water availability (high GAI), but the relationship with RMF was only marginally significant.
21 22	350	While most root production in grasslands occurs in shallow soil layers (Jackson and others,
23 24 25	351	1996), total belowground allocation was under-sampled in this study since we restricted our
26 27	352	sampling to the top 10 cm of soil, possibly contributing to the lack of a relationship between site
28 29	353	aridity and RMF. Under-sampling may have been relatively greater in dry sites; a global analysis
30 31 32	354	of rooting depths found that arid sites were more likely to have a greater proportion of roots
33 34	355	found at deeper depths (Schenk & Jackson, 2002).
35 36	356	Past studies have found that variation among species could contribute to variation in the
37 38 39	357	proportion of biomass allocated belowground (Craine and others, 2003). For instance, eudicots
40 41	358	had higher fractional allocation aboveground compared with monocots in a comprehensive meta-
42 43	359	analysis (Poorter and others, 2012), and perennial species in some systems allocate more to roots
44 45 46	360	than annuals (Reynolds & D'Antonio, 1996). Functional composition of the grasslands in this
40 47 48	361	study varied widely; however, neither the fraction of perennial species nor the fraction of
49 50	362	graminoids present in control plots was correlated with RMF, suggesting these coarse metrics of
51 52	363	community composition did not contribute in a predictable way to the variation in RMF observed
55 55	364	across sites.
56		
57 58		16
59		
60		

2	
3	
5	
4	
5	
6	
-	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
27	
25	
26	
27	
27	
28	
29	
30	
50	
31	
32	
22	
55	
34	
35	
36	
50	
37	
38	
20	
59	
40	
41	
42	
42	
43	
44	
45	
т.) АС	
46	
47	
48	
10	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
58	
59	
<i>co</i>	
60	

1

365 Across the wide range of site conditions, canopy light depletion was the aspect of 366 environmental context most important for predicting variation in RMF; we observed higher 367 proportional allocation aboveground (low RMF) in sites with low light availability beneath the 368 grassland canopy. This effect was driven by AGB, which was negatively correlated with RMF 369 (BGB and AGB were not correlated). This pattern is consistent with a shift from light limitation 370 in highly productive sites to limitation by belowground resources (nutrients, water) in low-371 productivity sites (Gleeson & Tilman 1992), thus providing a new empirical lens into the 372 context-dependence of root allocation. 373 374 Root biomass responses to nutrient addition 375 Across the Nutrient Network sites, aboveground net primary production (estimated by 376 peak aboveground live biomass) responded positively and synergistically to the additions of N 377 and P in approximately 75% of the sites examined (Fay and others 2015), and hence we expected 378 that while *absolute* root biomass (BGB) would also increase in response to additions of these 379 nutrients, root biomass as a *fraction* of total biomass (RMF) would decline with nutrient 380 addition. Instead, our analysis shows an average decline in BGB with N addition, although the 381 direction and magnitude of the BGB response depended on light availability (N x light 382 interaction), with the greatest declines in BGB observed at sites with lower average light 383 availability beneath the grassland canopy. These results are still consistent with the expectations 384 of optimal allocation theory, whereby plants would be expected to allocate to roots when 385 limitation by aboveground ground resources (e.g. light) is small relative to limitation by 386 belowground resources (nutrients). Importantly, increasing nutrient supply reduced the absolute

Page 19 of 36

#### Ecosystems

biomass of shallow roots, with important implications for carbon and nutrient cycling in grasslands (Sposito, 1989, Jobbagy & Jackson, 2001).

While other recent experiments in both temperate (Bardgett and others, 2009) and semi-arid (Zeng and others, 2010) grasslands have documented declining root biomass in response to N addition, our findings are in direct contrast to recent meta-analyses finding no response (Liu & Greaver, 2010), or positive responses of fine root biomass to N addition (Xia & Wang, 2008). Some of this variation may reflect different expectations for effects of fertilization on standing pools of biomass versus on productivity. Nadelhoffer and others (1985) showed that forest communities with high rates of N mineralization (high N supply) had low standing pools of fine root biomass, but high rates of annual root production, due to higher rates of root turnover in the more fertile sites. A recent meta-analysis of fine root productivity based on root ingrowth cores found positive and synergistic influences of N and P addition on fine root production (Yuan & Chen, 2012). Because their root production responses were smaller in magnitude than the response of aboveground productivity, their analysis found lower proportional allocation belowground with N and P addition. Therefore, while we document an average decline in standing root biomass with N addition dependent on light, we recognize this is a static measurement, and that additional measures of root longevity and turnover would be required to predict the responses of ecosystem productivity across these sites.

Our results show that variation in root biomass response to N addition (but not P or K) was predictable based on light-limitation at the site level. This finding is consistent with prior studies demonstrating that light becomes increasingly limiting to growth as nutrient limitation is alleviated through fertilization (Hautier and others, 2009). It also demonstrates how community and ecosystem responses to nutrients are context dependent. Other studies within the Nutrient

2
3
1
- -
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
12
15
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
21
31
32
33
34
25
55
36
37
38
30
29
40
41
42
43
11
44
45
46
47
10
40
49
50
51
52
52
22
54
55
56
57
5/
58
59
60

1

410 Network have also highlighted the role of context-dependence; for instance, Borer and others 411 (2014b) found greater diversity loss with nutrient enrichment at sites with low light penetration 412 below the canopy, and Fay and others (2015) found that aboveground biomass did not respond to 413 nutrient addition in 25% of the sites included in their analysis, which they suggested was 414 potentially due to water-limitation. 415 416 Root mass fraction response to nutrient addition 417 When considering relative root biomass allocation (RMF), our results were consistent 418 with the predictions of optimal allocation theory (Thornley, 1972, Wilson, 1988), with additions 419 of both N and P reducing RMF. As with BGB, there was an interaction between N and Light, 420 where the greatest reduction in RMF with N addition occurred in sites with low light penetration 421 through the canopy. Because there was not a significant impact of P addition on BGB we infer 422 that the reduction in RMF with P addition was caused by an increase in aboveground biomass 423 (Fay and others, 2015). Together these results suggest that the predictions of optimal allocation 424 theory with respect to N limitation are robust across wide environmental gradients, but 425 interestingly, that allocation responses to P limitation are not as strong. Given the high – and 426 increasing – rates of N and P fertilization of Earth's ecosystems (Falkowski and others, 2000), 427 the mechanisms underlying these differences are worthy of further investigation. 428 429 Potential mechanisms underlying belowground responses to nutrient enrichment 430 In addition to the plastic allocation responses already discussed, allocation to roots, stem 431 and leaves can also vary with the size of an individual according to allometric scaling theory 432 (Weiner 2004). An analysis of a global forest biomass dataset found intraspecific variation in

Page 21 of 36

1

#### Ecosystems

י ר	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, o	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
11	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
12	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
20	
59	

60

allocation along environmental gradients consistent with optimal allocation theory, but not
intraspecific variation in allocation, and suggested that allometric changes with individual plant
size could be responsible for unexplained variation in allocation (McCarthy and Enquist 2007).
With respect to our analysis, allometric scaling rules associated with increasing plant size could
potentially explain the proportional decline in RMF with N enrichment, but could not explain the
absolute decline in root biomass.

439 Shifts in species diversity and composition could also alter community-level allocation of 440 belowground biomass as a result of nutrient enrichment, particularly at the multi-year timescales 441 considered in this study (Olff, 1992, Dybzinski & McNickle, 2013, Mueller and others, 2013). 442 Species with high root allocation tend to grow slowly but are often competitively dominant 443 (Gurevitch, and others, 1990, Aerts and others, 1991), particularly under low resource supply, 444 due to their ability to draw down levels of soil water and nutrients (Tilman & Wedin, 1991). 445 With nutrient enrichment and a shift towards light limitation, species with lower allocation to roots but a capacity for faster aboveground growth are likely to shade and competitively suppress 446 447 slower growing, lower-statured species (Grime and others, 1991).

Nutrient enrichment often reduces species richness (Suding and others, 2005, Bobbink 448 449 and others, 2010). Across the Nutrient Network, local loss of species diversity in response to N 450 addition was increased by light-limitation (Borer and others, 2014b), and individual species 451 responses to nutrient enrichment were predictable based on a trade-off in growth-defense 452 strategy (Lind and others, 2013). This suggests that species composition shifts contributed to the 453 belowground biomass and allocation responses to N enrichment and light-limitation documented 454 here, but without monocultures to supplement our naturally assembled diverse communities, it is 455 not possible to quantify the relative contribution of intra-specific (plastic) versus inter-specific

Page 22 of 36

2	
3	156
4	450
5	457
6	457
7	
8	458
9	
10	459
11	т))
12	100
13	460
14	
15	461
16	
17	167
12	402
10	
19	463
20	
21	161
22	404
23	
24	465
25	
26	466
27	100
28	107
29	46/
30	
31	468
32	
33	469
34	707
35	470
36	4/0
37	
38	471
39	
40	172
41	4/2
12	
72 //2	473
45	
44	474
45	• / •
46	4775
47	4/5
48	
49	476
50	-
51	$\Lambda 77$
52	4//
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

1

456 responses to the observed shifts in allocation at the community level. Future work should aim to 457 evaluate the influence of shifting species composition in community-level biomass allocation 458 and resulting feedbacks to ecosystem function.

460 Conclusions: ramifications for understanding ecosystem responses to global change 461 Ecosystem responses to global environmental change have the potential to either dampen 462 or intensify the magnitude of future climate change through C-cycle feedbacks (Field and others, 463 2007). Despite the importance of grasslands to the terrestrial C sink (Scurlock & Hall, 1998, 464 Follett & Reed, 2010), belowground responses to environmental changes are often not 465 considered in synthesis efforts (e.g. Elser and others, 2007, LeBauer & Treseder, 2007, Lee and 466 others, 2010). Recent database efforts are aiming to address this need, for instance with the 467 creation of the Fine Root Ecology Database (Iversen and others, 2017). This study demonstrates 468 that global changes interact with the local environment to influence allocation above- versus belowground, that shallow roots respond in predictable ways to globally pervasive changes, and 469 470 that measurements of allocation, root production, and turnover will be necessary to accurately 471 predict the ramifications for ecosystem-level processes. 472 473 **Supplementary Material** 

474 Supplementary material includes additional methods, tables, detailed statistical analyses and R 475 code, as well as a table of author contributions.

60

477 Acknowledgements

Page 23 of 36

# Ecosystems

1 2	
2 3 4	Z
5 6	Z
7 8	Z
9 10	Z
11 12	Z
13 14 15	Z
15 16 17	
18 19	_
20 21	2
22 23	Ζ
24 25	Z
26 27	Ζ
28 29	Z
30 31 22	Z
52 33 34	Z
35 36	Z
37 38	Z
39 40	Z
41 42	Z
43 44	_
45 46 47	_
47 48 49	2
50 51	2
52 53	Z
54 55	5
56 57	
58 59	

478	This work was generated using data from the Nutrient Network ( <u>http://www.nutnet.org</u> )
479	experiment, funded at the site-scale by individual researchers. Coordination and data
480	management have been supported by funding to E. Borer and E. Seabloom from the National
481	Science Foundation Research Coordination Network (NSF-DEB-1042132) and Long Term
482	Ecological Research (NSF-DEB-1234162 to Cedar Creek LTER) programs, and the Institute on
483	the Environment (DG-0001-13). We also thank the Minnesota Supercomputer Institute for
484	hosting project data and the Institute on the Environment for hosting Network meetings. Any use
485	of trade, product or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement
486	by the U.S. Government.
487	
488	References
489	Aerts RR, Boog GA, Van Der Aart PJM. 1991. The relation between above- and belowground
490	biomass allocation patterns and competitive ability. Oecologia 87: 551-559.
491	Anderson JM. 1991. The effects of climate change on decomposition processes in grassland and
492	coniferous forests. Ecological Applications 1: 326–347.
493	Bardgett RD, Mawdsley JL, Edwards S, Hobbs PJ, Rodwell JS, Davies WJ. 1999. Plant species
494	and nitrogen effects on soil biological properties of temperate upland grasslands.
495	Functional Ecology 13: 650-60.
496	Bledsoe CS, Fahey TJ, Day FP, Ruess RW. 1999. Measurement of static root parameters:
497	biomass, length, and distribution in the soil profile. In: Soils Methods for Long-Term
498	Ecological Research. New York, New York, USA, Oxford University Press. pp 413-436.
499	Bloom AJ, Chapin FS, Mooney HA. 1985. Resource limitation in plantsan economic analogy.
500	Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 16: 363-392.
	22

2		
3 4	501	Blume E, Bischoff M, Reichert JM, Moorman T, Konopka A, Turco RF. 2002. Surface and
5 6	502	subsurface microbial biomass, community structure and metabolic activity as a function
/ 8 9	503	of soil depth and season. Applied Soil Ecology 20: 171-181.
10 11	504	Bobbink R, Hicks K, Galloway J, Spranger T, Alkemade R, Ashmore M, Bustamante M,
12 13	505	Cinderby S, Davidson E, Dentener F, Emmett B. 2010. Global assessment of nitrogen
14 15 16	506	deposition effects on terrestrial plant diversity: a synthesis. Ecological Applications 20:
17 18	507	30-59.
19 20	508	Bolker B. 2008. Chapter 4: Distributions, in: Ecological Models and Data in R. Princeton
21 22 22	509	University Press, pp 103-146.
23 24 25	510	Borer ET, Harpole WS, Adler PB, Lind EM, Orrock JL, Seabloom EW, Smith MD. 2014a.
26 27	511	Finding generality in ecology: a model for globally distributed experiments. Methods in
28 29	512	Ecology and Evolution 5: 65–73.
30 31 32	513	Borer ET, Seabloom EW, Gruner DS, Harpole WS, Hillebrand H, Lind EM, Adler PB, Alberti J,
33 34	514	Anderson TM, Bakker JD, Biederman L, Blumenthal D, Brown CS, Brudvig LA,
35 36	515	Buckley YM, Cadotte M, Chu C, Cleland EE, Crawley MJ, Daleo P, Damschen EI,
37 38 30	516	Davies KF, DeCrappeo NM, Du G, Firn J, Hautier Y, Heckman RW, Hector A,
40 41	517	HilleRisLambers J, Iribarne O, Klein JA, Knops JMH, La Pierre KJ, Leakey ADB, Li W,
42 43	518	MacDougall AS, McCulley RL, Melbourne BA, Mitchell CE, Moore JL, Mortensen B,
44 45 46	519	O'Halloran LR, Orrock JL, Pascual J, Prober SM, Pyke DA, Risch AC, Schuetz M, Smith
40 47 48	520	MD, Stevens CJ, Sullivan LL, Williams RJ, Wragg PD, Wright JP, Yang LH. 2014b.
49 50	521	Herbivores and nutrients control grassland plant diversity via light limitation. Nature 508:
51 52	522	517-520.
53 54 55		
56 57		
58 59		23

Page 25 of 36

# Ecosystems

1 2		
3 4	523	Cleland EE, Harpole WS. 2010. Nitrogen enrichment and plant communities. Annals of the New
5 6	524	York Academy of Sciences 1195: 46-61.
7 8 9	525	Craine JM, Wedin DA, Chapin FS, Reich PB. 2003. Relationship between the structure of root
9 10 11	526	systems and resource use for 11 North American grassland plants. Plant Ecology 165: 85-
12 13	527	100.
14 15	528	Dybzinski R, Mcnickle G. 2013. Game theory and plant ecology. Ecology Letters, 16, 545-555.
16 17 18	529	Eilers KG, Debenport S, Anderson S, Fierer N. 2012. Digging deeper to find unique microbial
19 20	530	communities: The strong effect of depth on the structure of bacterial and archaeal
21 22	531	communities in soil. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 50: 58-65.
23 24 25	532	Elser JJ, Bracken ME, Cleland EE, Gruner DS, Harpole WS, Hillebrand H, Ngai JT, Seabloom
23 26 27	533	EW, Shurin JB, Smith JE. 2007. Global analysis of nitrogen and phosphorus limitation of
28 29	534	primary producers in freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. Ecology Letters 10:
30 31 32	535	1115-1211.
32 33 34	536	Falkowski P, Scholes R, Boyle E, Canadell J, Canfield D, Elser J, Gruber N, Hibbard K,
35 36	537	Högberg P, Linder S, Mackenzie FT. 2000. The global carbon cycle: a test of our
37 38	538	knowledge of earth as a system. Science 290: 291-296.
39 40 41	539	Fay PA, Prober SM, Harpole WS, Knops JMH, Bakker JD, Borer ET, Lind EM, MacDougall
41 42 43	540	AS, Seabloom EW, Wragg PD, Adler P, Blumenthal DM, Buckley YM, Chu C, Cleland
44 45	541	EE, Collins SL, Davies KF, Du G, Feng X, Firn J, Gruner DS, Hagenah N, Hautier Y,
46 47 48	542	Heckman RW, Jin VL, Kirkman KP, Klein J, Ladwig LM, Li Q, McCulley RL,
48 49 50	543	Melbourne BA, Mitchell CE, Moore JL, Morgan JW, Risch AC, Schütz M, Stevens CJ,
51 52	544	Wedin DA, Yang YH. 2015. Grassland productivity limited by multiple nutrients. Nature
53 54	545	Plants 1: 15080.
55 56 57 58		24
59 60		

3 4	546	Field CB, Lobell DB, Peters HA, Chiariello NR. 2007. Feedbacks of terrestrial ecosystems to
5 6	547	climate change. Annual Review of Environment and Resources 32: 1-29.
7 8 9	548	Follett R, Reed D 2010. Soil carbon sequestration in grazing lands: societal benefits and policy
) 10 11	549	implications. Rangeland Ecology Management 63: 4–15.
12 13	550	Fox J, Weisberg S 2011. An R Companion to Applied Regression, Second Edition. Thousand
14 15 16	551	Oaks, California.
17 18	552	Friedlingstein P, Joel G, Field CB, Fung IY. 1999. Toward an allocation scheme for global
19 20	553	terrestrial carbon models. Global Change Biology 5: 755-770.
21 22 23	554	Gill RA, Kelly RH, Parton WJ, Day KA, Jackson RB, Morgan JA, Scurlock JMO, Tieszen LL,
24 25	555	Castle JV, Ojima DS, Zhang XS. 2002. Using simple environmental variables to
26 27	556	estimate belowground productivity in grasslands. Global Ecology and Biogeography 11:
28 29 30	557	79–86.
31 32	558	Gleeson SK, Tilman D. 1992. Plant allocation and the multiple limitation hypothesis. American
33 34	559	Naturalist 139: 1322-1343.
35 36 37	560	Goldberg, DE. 1990. Components of resource competition in plant communities. In: Perspectives
38 39	561	on plant competition, pp. 27-49.
40 41	562	Grime JP, Campbell BD, Mackey JMI, Crick JC. 1991. Root plasticity, nitrogen capture and
42 43	563	competitive ability. In: Plant Root Growth: an Ecological Perspective. In: Atkinson D. ed.
44 45 46	564	Oxford, Blackwell Scientific Publications.
47 48	565	Gurevitch J, Wilson P, Stone JL, Tees P, Stoutenburgh RJ. 1990. Competition among old-field
49 50	566	perennials at different levels of soil fertility and available space. Journal of Ecology 78:
51 52 53	567	727-744.
54 55 56		
57 58		25
59		

Page 27 of 36

# Ecosystems

568	Harpole WS, Ngai JT, Cleland EE, Seabloom EW, Borer ET, Bracken MES, Elser JJ, Gruner
569	DS, Hillebrand H, Shurin JB, Smith JE. 2011. Nutrient co-limitation of primary producer
570	communities. Ecology Letters 14: 852-862.
571	Hautier Y, Niklaus PA, Hector A. 2009. Competition for light causes plant biodiversity loss after
572	eutrophication. Science, 324, 636-638.
573	Hijmans RJ, Cameron SE, Parra JL, Jones PG, Jarvis A. 2005. Very high resolution interpolated
574	climate surfaces for global land areas. International Journal of Climatology 25: 1965-
575	1978.
576	Hooper DU, Johnson L. 1999. Nitrogen limitation in dryland ecosystems: responses to
577	geographical and temporal variation in precipitation. Biogeochemistry 46: 247 – 293.
578	Hui DF, Jackson RB. 2006. Geographical and interannual variability in biomass partitioning in
579	grassland ecosystems: a synthesis of field data. New Phytologist 169: 85–93.
580	Iversen CM, McCormack ML, Powell AS, Blackwood CB, Freschet GT, Kattge J, Roumet C,
581	Stover DB, Soudzilovskaia NA, Valverde - Barrantes OJ, Bodegom PM. 2017. A global
582	Fine-Root Ecology Database to address belowground challenges in plant ecology. New
583	Phytologist 215: 15-26.
584	Jackson RB, Canadell J, Ehleringer JR, Mooney HA, Sala OE, Schulze ED. 1996. A global
585	analysis of root distributions for terrestrial biomes. Oecologia 108: 389-411.
586	Jackson RB, Schenk HJ, Jobbágy EG, Canadell J, Colello GD, Dickinson RE, Field CB,
587	Friedlingstein P, Heimann M, Hibbard K, Kicklighter DW. 2000. Belowground
588	consequences of vegetation change and their treatment in models. Ecological
589	Applications 10: 470-483.
	26
	568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 585

2		
3 4	590	Jastrow JD. 1996. Soil aggregate formation and the accrual of particulate and mineral-associated
5 6 7	591	organic matter. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 28: 665-676.
/ 8 9	592	Jobbagy EG, Jackson RB. 2000. The vertical distribution of soil organic carbon and its relation
) 10 11	593	to climate and vegetation. Ecological Applications 10: 423-436.
12 13	594	Jobbagy EG, Jackson RB. 2001. The distribution of soil nutrients with depth: Global patterns and
14 15	595	the imprint of plants. Biogeochemistry 53: 51-77.
16 17 18	596	LeBauer DS, Treseder KK. 2008. Nitrogen limitation of net primary productivity in terrestrial
19 20	597	ecosystems is globally distributed. Ecology 89: 371–379.
21 22	598	Lee M, Manning P, Rist J, Power SA, Marsh C. 2010. A global comparison of grassland biomass
23 24 25	599	responses to CO <sub>2</sub> and nitrogen enrichment. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
25 26 27	600	Society of London B: Biological Sciences 365: 2047-2056.
28 29	601	Leith HHF. 1978. Primary productivity in ecosystems: Comparative analysis of global patterns.
30 31	602	In: Leith HFH, ed. Patterns of primary production in the biosphere. Stroudberg, PA
32 33 34	603	USA., Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross. pp. 342
35 36	604	Lind EM, Borer E, Seabloom E, Adler P, Bakker JD, Blumenthal DM, Crawley M, Davies K,
37 38	605	Firn J, Gruner DS, Harpole WS. 2013. Life-history constraints in grassland plant species:
39 40 41	606	a growth-defence trade-off is the norm. Ecology Letters 16: 513-521.
41 42 43	607	Liu L, Greaver TL. 2010. A global perspective on belowground carbon dynamics under nitrogen
44 45	608	enrichment. Ecology Letters 13: 819-28.
46 47 49	609	Lu M, Zhou X, Luo Y, Yang Y, Fang C, Chen J, Li B. 2011. Minor stimulation of soil carbon
40 49 50	610	storage by nitrogen addition: a meta-analysis. Agriculture, Ecosystems &
51 52	611	Environment 140: 234-244.
53 54		
55 56 57		
58 59		27

60

Page 29 of 36

# Ecosystems

1 2		
2 3 4	612	Mack MC, Schuur EA, Bret-Harte MS, Shaver GR, Chapin FS. 2004. Ecosystem carbon storage
5 6	613	in arctic tundra reduced by long-term nutrient fertilization. Nature 431: 440-443.
7 8 0	614	McCarthy MC, Enquist BJ. 2007. Consistency between an allometric approach and optimal
9 10 11	615	partitioning theory in global patterns of plant biomass allocation. Functional Ecology 21:
12 13	616	713-720.
14 15	617	Mueller KE, Hobbie SE, Tilman D, Reich PB. 2013. Effects of plant diversity, N fertilization,
16 17 18	618	and elevated carbon dioxide on grassland soil N cycling in a long - term experiment.
19 20	619	Global Change Biology 19: 1249-1261.
21 22 22	620	Michaletz ST, Cheng D, Kerkhoff AJ, Enquist BJ. 2014. Convergence of terrestrial plant
23 24 25	621	production across global climate gradients. Nature 512: 39-43.
26 27	622	Mokany K, Raison RJ, Prokushkin AS. 2006. Critical analysis of root : shoot ratios in terrestrial
28 29 20	623	biomes. Global Change Biology 12: 84–96.
30 31 32	624	Nadelhoffer KJ, Aber JD, Melillo JM. 1985. Fine roots, net primary production, and soil nitrogen
33 34	625	availability: a new hypothesis. Ecology 66: 1377–1390
35 36 27	626	Norby RJ, Luo Y. 2004. Evaluating ecosystem responses to rising atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> and global
37 38 39	627	warming in a multi-factor world. New Phytologist 162: 281-293.
40 41	628	Olff H 1992. Effects of light and nutrient availability on dry matter and N allocation in six
42 43	629	successional grassland species. Oecologia 89: 412-421.
44 45 46	630	Pinheiro J, Bates D, Debroy S, Sarkar D, R Core Development Team. 2013. nlme: Linear and
40 47 48	631	Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 3.1
49 50	632	Poorter H, Niklas KJ, Reich PB, Oleksyn J, Poot P, Mommer L. 2012. Biomass allocation to
51 52	633	leaves, stems and roots: meta-analyses of interspecific variation and environmental
55 55	634	control. New Phytologist 193: 30-50.
56 57 58 59 60		28

3 4	635	R Core Team 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria, R							
5 6 7	636	Foundation for Statistical Computing.							
7 8 9	637	Rasse DP, Rumpel C, Dignac MF. 2005. Is soil carbon mostly root carbon? Mechanisms for a							
10 11	638	specific stabilisation. Plant and Soil 269: 341–356.							
12 13	639	Reynolds HL, D'Antonio C. 1996. The ecological significance of plasticity in root weight ratio							
14 15 16	640	in response to nitrogen: Opinion. Plant and Soil 185: 75-97.							
17 18	641	Reich PB. 2002. Root-shoot relations: optimality in acclimation and adaptation or the 'Emperor's							
19 20	642	New Clothes'. In: Plant Roots: The Hidden Half, pp. 205-220.							
21 22 23	643	Reich PB, Luo Y, Bradford JB, Poorter H, Perry CH, Oleksyn J. 2014. Temperature drives							
24 25	644	global patterns in forest biomass distribution in leaves, stems, and roots. Proceedings of							
26 27	645	the National Academy of Sciences 111: 13721-13726.							
28 29 30	646	Schenk HJ, Jackson RB. 2002. The global biogeography of roots. Ecological Monographs 72:							
31 32	647	311-328.							
33 34	648	Scurlock JMO, Hall DO. 1998. The global carbon sink: a grassland perspective. Global Change							
35 36 37	649	Biology 4: 229–233.							
37 38 39	650	Scurlock JMO, Johnson K, Olson RJ. 2002. Estimating net primary productivity from grassland							
40 41	651	biomass dynamics measurements. Global Change Biology 8: 736-753.							
42 43	652	Sims PL, Singh JS. 1978. The structure and function of ten western North American grasslands:							
44 45 46	653	III. Net primary production, turnover and efficiencies of energy capture and water use.							
47 48	654	Journal of Ecology 66: 573-597.							
49 50	655	Smithwick EA, Lucash MS, Mccormack ML, Sivandran G. 2014. Improving the representation							
51 52 53	656	of roots in terrestrial models. Ecological Modelling 291: 193-204.							
54 55	657	Sposito G. 1989. The chemistry of soils, New York, New York U.S.A., Oxford University Press.							
56 57 58		20							
58 59		29							

Page 31 of 36

# Ecosystems

1 2										
3 4	658	Suding KN, Collins SL, Gough L, Clark C, Cleland EE, Gross KL, Milchunas DG, Pennings S.								
5 6	659	2005. Functional-and abundance-based mechanisms explain diversity loss due to N								
7 8 9	660	fertilization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of								
10 11	661	America 102: 4387-4392.								
12 13	662	Thornley JHM. 1972. A balanced quantitative model for root: shoot ratios in vegetative plants.								
14 15	663	Annals of Botany 36: 431-441.								
16 17 18	664	Tilman D, Wedin D. 1991. Plant traits and resource reduction for five grasses growing on a								
19 20	665	nitrogen gradient. Ecology 72: 685-700.								
21 22	666	Warton DI, Hui FK. 2011. The arcsine is asinine: the analysis of proportions in ecology.								
23 24 25	667	Ecology, 92, 3-10.								
25 26 27	668	Weiner, J. 2004. Allocation, plasticity and allometry in plants. Perspectives in Plant Ecology,								
28 29	669	Evolution and Systematics 6: 207-215.								
30 31	670	Wilson JB 1988. A review of evidence on the control of shoot: root ratio, in relation to models.								
32 33 34	671	Annals of Botany 61: 433-449.								
35 36	672	Woodward FI, Osborne CP. 2000. The representation of root processes in models addressing the								
37 38	673	responses of vegetation to global change. New Phytologist 147: 223–232.								
39 40 41	674	Xia J, Wan S. 2008. Global response patterns of terrestrial plant species to nitrogen addition.								
41 42 43	675	New Phytologist 179: 428-439.								
44 45	676	Yang Y, Fang J, Ji C, Han W. 2009. Above- and belowground biomass allocation in Tibetan								
46 47	677	grasslands. Journal of Vegetation Science 20: 177-184.								
48 49 50	678	Yuan ZY, Chen HYH. 2012. A global analysis of fine root production as affected by soil								
51 52	679	nitrogen and phosphorus. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological								
53 54	680 Sciences 279: 3796-3802.									
55 56 57										
57 58 59		30								
60										

1 2

3 4	681	Zeng DH, Li LJ, Fahey TJ, Yu ZY, Fan ZP, Chen FS. 2010. Effects of nitrogen addition on					
5 6	682	vegetation and ecosystem carbon in a semi-arid grassland. Biogeochemistry 98: 185-93.					
7 8	683	Zomer RJ, Trabucco A, Bossio DA, van Straaten O, Verchot LV. 2008. Climate change					
9 10 11 12 13	684	mitigation: A spatial analysis of global land suitability for Clean Development					
	685	Mechanism afforestation and reforestation. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 126:					
14 15	686	67-80.					
16 17							
18 19							
20 21							
22 23							
24 25							
26 27							
28 29							
30 31							
32 33							
34 35							
36 37							
38 39							
40 41							
42 43							
44 45							
40 47 49							
40 49 50							
50 51 52							
52 53							
54 55 56							
50 57		21					
59 60		51					
00							

Table 1. Correlations among site-level values of aridity (GAI, see Methods), the proportion of photosynthetically-active radiation passing through the grassland canopy to reach the soil surface (Light), the proportion of community cover comprised by graminoids/monocots (gram.frac), the proportion of community cover comprised by perennial species (per.frac), the average root mass fraction (RMF), live aboveground biomass (AGB) and belowground biomass (BGB). Site-level mean values were used in this analysis, for control plots only (unfenced, unfertilized). Values are Pearson correlation coefficients with significant values in bold. Asterisks indicate level of statistical significance (\*=p<0.05, \*\*=p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001). Aridity RMF Light gram.frac per.frac ABG Light -0.16 gram.frac 0.05 -0.14 per.frac 0.40 \* -0.24 0.35 0.43 \* 0.01 0.01 RMF 0.18 0.17 -0.57 \*\* -0.02 0.32 AGB -0.61 \*\*\* 0.28 -0.14 0.19 0.15 0.70 \*\*\* BGB -0.07Zicz 

Table 2. Analysis of deviance table (Type II tests) showing the regression parameter estimate (Est),  $\chi^2$  test statistic and p-value for each term in the mixed effects models described in the Methods. This analysis evaluated how factorial nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P) and potassium plus micronutrient  $(K_{\mu})$  enrichment influenced the proportion of biomass allocated to roots (RMF), and root biomass  $(g/m^2)$ . Aridity and light (mean proportion of PAR reaching the soil surface) were included as site-level covariates, including their interactions with experimental treatments. Significant terms highlighted in bold.

	RMF			roc	root biomass (g/m <sup>2</sup> )		
Model term	Est	$\chi^2$	p p	Est	$\chi^2$	р	
Light	2.09	13.3	< 0.001	0.28	1.43	0.23	
Aridity	0.66	2.55	0.11	0.61	6.03	0.014	
Ν	-0.38	26.31	<0.001	-0.53	2.11	0.15	
Р	-0.05	6.96	0.008	-0.07	0.69	0.41	
Κμ	0.11	0.84	0.36	-0.21	0.04	0.84	
Light:N	0.45	4.89	0.03	0.63	8.66	0.0032	
Light:P	0.24	1.45	0.23	0.25	0.02	0.88	
N:P	-0.27	0.01	0.98	0.36	0.03	0.86	
Light:Kµ	-0.12	0.19	0.66	0.07	0.02	0.90	
N:Kµ	-0.15	0.84	0.36	0.34	0.08	0.77	
Ρ:Κμ	-0.27	0.00	0.95	0.12	0.46	0.50	
N:Aridity	-0.16	0.24	0.62	0.13	0.07	0.79	
P:Aridity	-0.32	0.00	0.96	-0.05	0.44	0.51	
Kµ:Aridity	-0.17	0.46	0.50	0.15	0.21	0.65	
Light:N:P	-0.19	0.42	0.52	-0.33	0.68	0.41	
Light:N:Kµ	0.23	0.16	0.70	0.03	0.06	0.81	
Light:P:Kµ	0.25	0.19	0.66	-0.17	0.13	0.72	
N:P:Kµ	0.26	2.65	0.10	-0.33	2.45	0.12	
N:P:Aridity	0.59	1.81	0.18	-0.05	0.12	0.73	
N:Kµ:Aridity	0.15	0.70	0.40	-0.25	2.25	0.13	
P:Kµ:Aridity	0.37	0.08	0.77	0.05	0.04	0.85	
Light:N:P:Kµ	-0.14	0.03	0.86	0.09	0.00	0.95	
N:P:Kµ:Aridity	-0.63	2.42	0.12	-0.02	0.02	0.89	

### Ecosystems

Figure 1. Mean parameter estimates and confidence intervals (thin and thick lines indicate 95% and 50% confidence intervals, respectively) for fixed effects in models evaluating the response of root mass fraction (RMF, in green) and root biomass (BGB, in black) to experimental addition of multiple nutrients, including nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P). Average light availability at the soil surface in control plots and aridity (Global Aridity Index, see Methods) were included as site-level covariates. Only statistically significant parameter estimates from Table 2 are displayed (note the main effect of light on BGB is not significant, but is displayed because of the significant light:N interaction). **Regression estimates** 0.0 -0.5 0.5 1.0 1.5 Aridity Light:N BGB Ρ RMF Ν Light 

Figure 2. The root biomass response to N addition depended on site-level light limitation. Fractional light availability (light) is the proportion of photosynthetically active radiation passing through the grassland canopy. The natural-log response ratio of root biomass to N addition (LRR N addition) is equivalent to the average ln-root biomass  $(g/m^2)$  in plots without N addition subtracted from the average ln-root biomass  $(g/m^2)$  in N addition plots. The grey line indicates LRR=0 or no difference in root biomass between ambient and N enriched plots. Negative values indicate a decline in root biomass in plots with N addition compared to plots without N addition. Black trend line shows the best linear fit, indicating that N addition increased root biomass only where abundant light passed through the canopy. Data labels indicate site names as in Table S1.







Ρ

Kμ

PKμ

Ν

NKμ

NP

NPKμ