Modeling the vegetation–atmosphere carbon dioxide and water vapor interactions along a controlled CO2 gradient
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A B S T R A C T

Ecosystem functioning is intimately linked to its physical environment by complex two-way interactions. These two-way interactions arise because vegetation both responds to the external environment and actively regulates its micro-environment. By altering stomatal aperture, and therefore the transpiration rate, plants modify soil moisture and atmospheric humidity and these same physical variables, in return, modify stomatal conductance. Relationships between biotic and abiotic components are particularly strong in closed, managed environments such as greenhouses and growth chambers, which are used extensively to investigate ecosystem responses to climatic drivers. Model-assisted designs that account for the physiological dynamics governing two-way interactions between biotic and abiotic components are absent from many ecological studies. Here, a general model of the vegetation–atmosphere system in closed environments is proposed. The model accounts for the linked carbon–water physiology, the turbulent transport processes, and the energy and radiative transfer within the vegetation. Leaf gas exchange is modeled using a carbon gain optimization approach that is coupled to leaf energy balance. The turbulent transport within the canopy is modeled in two-dimensions using first-order closure principles. The model is applied to the Lysimeter CO2 Gradient (LYCOG) facility, wherein a continuous gradient of atmospheric CO2 is maintained on grassland assemblages using an elongated chamber where the micro-climate is regulated by variation in air flow rates. The model is employed to investigate how species composition, climatic conditions, and the imposed air flow rate affect the CO2 concentration gradient within the LYCOG and the canopy micro-climate. The sensitivity of the model to key physiological and climatic parameters allows it to be used not only to manage current experiments, but also to formulate novel ecological hypotheses (e.g., by modeling climatic regimes not currently employed in LYCOG) and suggest alternative experimental designs and operational strategies for such facilities.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Variability in mass and energy exchange rates between the vegetation and the atmosphere is primarily controlled by fluctuations in the environment (dePury and Farquhar, 1997; Friend, 1995; Landsberg and Waring, 1997; Leuning, 1995; Running and Gower, 1991; Williams et al., 1996), including variability in environmental conditions in the atmospheric layers immediately above the canopy (e.g., radiation, see Stoy et al., 2009). There is now growing interest in the other side of these interactions, which deal with how vegetation regulates these environmental variables (Daly et al., 2004; Siqueira et al., 2009). One way to proceed in exploring these complex two-way interactions is to experimentally amplify them, for instance by using closed environments such as greenhouses or growth chambers, where the boundary layer depth is restricted and the lateral boundaries are controlled. Considering the general interest in quantifying crop growth in greenhouses and the increasing use of growth chambers to investigate ecosystem responses to altered climatic conditions (Fay et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2000), it is imperative to formulate mathematical models of vegetation–atmosphere interactions in such closed systems.

Models describing the energy and water vapor balances of greenhouse systems have been used to characterize micro-environmental conditions and to improve greenhouse design (Boulard and Baille, 1993; Boulard et al., 2002; Kindelan, 1980; Majdoubi et al., 2009; Roy et al., 2002; Singh et al., 2006; Soribe and Curry, 1973; Teitel et al., 2010; Willits, 2003; Yang et al., 1990). These models generally neglect or over-simplify photosynthesis and transpiration, thus missing the alterations induced by the vegetation to the canopy micro-climate. These two-way interactions...
are critical to plant feedbacks to the atmosphere, and thus these models are not directly applicable to growth chambers designed to assess the effects of climatic changes on vegetation. On the other hand, canopy models are now available that incorporate physiological, radiative, and turbulent transport descriptions of vegetation–atmosphere interactions in open systems (Baldocchi and Meyers, 1998; Daly et al., 2004; Juang et al., 2008; Lai et al., 2002; Siqueira et al., 2006; Tuzet et al., 2003). These models may be adapted to resolve both vegetation and atmosphere contributions to coupled energy and mass fluxes in closed systems, allowing integration at seasonal to annual time scales on which ecological processes operate.

Here, a general soil–vegetation–atmosphere model applicable under both natural conditions and in closed environments is proposed. The major advances in this model formulation are: (i) generalization of an existing stomatal optimization scheme to account for the effects of leaf boundary layer and energy balance, and the implementation of this scheme in a multi-layer canopy model; (ii) inclusion of atmospheric scalar advective components to describe vegetation–atmosphere interactions in closed systems with ventilation. The model is then used to quantify water and carbon dioxide fluxes in grassland vegetation grown in systems with ventilation. The model is then used to quantify water and carbon dioxide fluxes in grassland vegetation grown along a continuous gradient in atmospheric CO2 concentration. The gradient was created by introducing CO2 enriched air into a linear sequence of chamber compartments, where photosynthesis progressively depleted the air of CO2 during advection through the chambers (Fay et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2000).

The shape of the CO2 concentration gradient is controlled by a combination of biological components, primarily species composition and photosynthetic capacity, and physical components, chiefly the transit time of air through the chambers and the degree of atmospheric mixing. The proposed model is employed to assess sensitivities of the system to both components, thus providing a mechanistic link between management options (e.g., controlling air flow rate within the chamber system) for regulating the desired CO2 gradient. This model allows for a complete characterization of vegetation–atmosphere coupling under CO2 concentrations spanning pre-industrial to mid-21st century conditions.

2. Methods

2.1. Theory

The model couples soil–vegetation–atmosphere dynamics (Fig. 1) at a temporal scale commensurate with averaging times of meteorological variables (~30 min). These time scales are sufficiently long to average over turbulent time scales (~10 s) but short enough to resolve diurnal variations in the meteorological drivers. The soil compartment is assumed to be lumped in space, whereas the vegetation and atmospheric compartments are resolved in the vertical dimension (~0.1 m). In the following, the model components are briefly described. Symbols used in the atmosphere, canopy, leaf-level, and soil-to-leaf conductance calculations are listed and explained in appendix Tables A1–A4, respectively.

2.1.1. Momentum and scalar mass balances

Mean air velocity $U$ and scalar transport within and above the canopy are modeled using a modified version of the CANVEG approach (Baldocchi and Meyers, 1998; Lai et al., 2002; Siqueira et al., 2006). For the discussion here, we align the coordinate system with $x$ being the longitudinal and $z$ the vertical directions, respectively, with the longitudinal being the mean wind direction (Fig. 1). In the absence of subsidence, the mean velocity $U$ is computed by solving the momentum balance equation in a stationary planar homogeneous system at high Reynolds number,

$$\frac{\partial F_M}{\partial z} = C_d LAD U^2, \quad (1)$$

where $F_M$ is the vertical flux of momentum, $LAD$ is the (measured) leaf area density and the drag coefficient $C_d = 0.3$, a typical value for dense canopies (Boulard et al., 2002; Katul et al., 2004; Poggi et al., 2004). Even for stationary conditions and in the absence of subsidence, the complete mean momentum budget would require the retention of the mean pressure gradient, the longitudinal advective term, and the longitudinal gradient of the horizontal velocity variance produced by turbulence. However, we assume here that the flow field attains its one-dimensional status far more rapidly than the scalar field so that for our purposes, we can neglect this rapid longitudinal adjustment of the flow as it enters the chamber compartments. The fact that the mean momentum budget adjusts over much shorter distances when compared to the mean scalar budgets as the flow encounters a step change in boundary conditions has been studied extensively (Hsieh and Katul, 2009; Rao et al., 1974). For a stationary and a high Peclet number flow, the atmospheric mean mass balances for a generic scalar $J$ such as water vapor concentration, CO2 concentration, or air temperature (see Table A1 for details) can be written as

$$U \frac{\partial J}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial F_J}{\partial z} = S_J, \quad (2)$$

where advection of the scalar $J$ by the mean longitudinal flow, and the variation of the mean turbulent vertical fluxes $F_J$ are balanced by the emission (or uptake) rate, $S_J$. Here, the horizontal gradients of the longitudinal turbulent fluxes are neglected though they can be readily accommodated if they are significant. Sources and sinks of CO2, water vapor, and sensible heat within the canopy are calculated by multiplying the local leaf area density by the leaf-level

![Fig. 1. Schematic representation of the coupled vegetation–atmosphere model. Leaf-level gas and heat exchange fluxes (Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5) are up-scaled to the canopy level by coupling sources for scalar $J$ at a given position (5) to atmospheric turbulent transport equations (solid arrows: CO2 fluxes; dotted arrows: water fluxes; dashed arrows: heat fluxes; see Section 2.1.1). Canopy-scale calculations are further up-scaled to the whole chamber level by accounting for advective transport. To describe the LYCOG facility, several compartments in series and linked by plenums containing air coolers are considered (Section 2.3).](image-url)
assimilation rate, transpiration rate, and sensible heat sources or sinks (described in Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5; see Fig. 1). The mean vertical momentum (subscript $M$) and scalar fluxes (subscript $J$) are computed through a first-order turbulent closure scheme (assuming that the turbulent Schmidt number for scalar $J$ is unity),

$$F_M = -k_l \frac{\partial U}{\partial z}, \quad F_J = -k_l \frac{\partial J}{\partial z}. \quad (3)$$

The turbulent diffusivity $k_l$ is described as

$$k_l = \ell^2 \frac{\partial U}{\partial z}, \quad (4)$$

where the mixing length $\ell$ is given by (Katu et al., 2004; Poggi et al., 2009)

$$\ell = k h \left(1 - \frac{d}{h}\right), \quad (5)$$

where $d$ is the centroid height of the drag force. This simplified modeling approach is consistent with the overall level of detail of the model and is supported by previous successful use in both open and closed environments (Katu et al., 2004; Poggi et al., 2009; Yang et al., 1990). In general, first-order closure principles are applicable when the production term is balanced by the dissipation term in the scalar flux budget with minimal contributions from the gradients in the turbulent flux transport terms. As explained in Appendix B, this condition is generally satisfied in the LCCG canopy. For application of the model to closed chambers with smooth cover, the typical linear increase in mixing length for $z > d$ (Katu et al., 2004) was not considered (Eq. (5)) due to the presence of the physical boundary imposed by the cover just above the canopy top.

### 2.1.2. Boundary conditions

Air velocity at the top of the domain was set to conserve air mass for a given flow rate, while $U(0) = 0.01 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ was set at the bottom to ensure that the air flow remains fully turbulent and the exchange rates between the ground and the air near the ground can be modeled via $k_l$ without any molecular diffusion contributions. Alternative (though no less arbitrary) formulations may approximate the ground as a pure boundary layer and employ the log-law formulation assuming a ground momentum roughness length. Zero-flux top boundary conditions were imposed for water vapor and CO$_2$, because the physical barrier imposed by the chamber cover blocks such exchanges. Skin temperature at the chamber cover was assumed equal to the outside temperature (i.e., we assume that the chamber cover is sufficiently thin and highly transmissive), and well-coupled with outside and inside air due to the presence of sustained wind. We also imposed a flux boundary condition at the soil surface for all three scalars. We assumed that soil evaporation is negligible with respect to transpiration (e.g., Boulard and Baille, 1993; Teitel et al., 2010), while we used an empirical temperature-dependent soil respiration function (based on observations) as boundary condition for CO$_2$.

We set the sensible heat flux from the ground $H_C$ as a boundary condition for the energy conservation equation. The ground surface temperature needed to define $H_C$ was computed from a simplified steady-state model of the ground surface energy balance (Kindelan, 1980; Singh et al., 2006) that considers absorbed shortwave radiation (Campbell and Norman, 1998 and Section 2.1.3 below), sensible heat flux to the atmosphere, and thermal losses to the deeper soil layers. For simplicity, we also assume that the ground surface (predominantly consisting of leaf litter) have the same spectral properties of the leaves in the canopy and the boundary layer conductance of the ground surface is approximated as a leaf boundary layer conductance with characteristic length scale of 0.0075 m. The mean soil thermal conductivity is modeled after Campbell and Norman (1998), and the soil temperature at a depth of Z/2 was set to 25°C.

### 2.1.3. Canopy radiation balance

Photosynthesis and leaf energy balance are controlled by incoming shortwave radiation at each level in the canopy, which is described by a simplified radiation attenuation model (see details in Goudriaan and van Laar, 1994; Leuning et al., 1995; Spitters, 1986). We accounted for near infrared and visible bands separately, while we neglected the longwave radiation balance in this closed system where emissivity and temperature differences between radiating surfaces are relatively small. Total incoming solar radiation was partitioned between visible (a fraction $f_V = 0.45$) and near infrared components (a fraction $f_{NIR} = 0.55$). Absorbed shortwave radiation in the canopy (per unit leaf area) was described by different exponential attenuation profiles, depending on the waveband (indicated by subscript $i$: near infrared, $i = \text{NIR}$; visible, $i = V$), following Goudriaan and van Laar (1994).

$$Q_i = Q_i^0 \left(1 - \frac{d}{h}\right) \sqrt{1 - \sigma_k \exp \left(-\sqrt{1 - \sigma_k k\xi}\right)}, \quad (6)$$

where $Q_i^0$ is the incoming radiation at the top of the canopy, $\xi$ the cumulative leaf area index profile, $\sigma_k$ the scattering coefficients, $k$ the extinction coefficient, and $\rho_i$ the canopy reflection coefficients (see details in Table A2).

$$\rho_i = \frac{2k}{k + kp_d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \sigma_1}}\right), \quad (7)$$

The total net absorbed radiation at each level in the canopy was found as the sum of all spectral components, $Q_n = Q_V + Q_{NIR}$.

### 2.1.4. Leaf gas exchange

Transpiration and net assimilation fluxes across the stomata were described by Fickian diffusion,

$$E = g_{LA,W} (w_{sat}(T_l) - w_A), \quad (8)$$

$$A = g_{LA,C} (C_A - C_l), \quad (9)$$

where $w_{sat}(T_l)$ and $w_A$ are water vapor concentrations at saturation (at leaf temperature) and in the bulk atmosphere, $C_A$ and $C_l$ are the atmospheric and internal CO$_2$ concentrations, and $g_{LA,W}$ and $g_{LA,C}$ are the leaf–atmosphere conductances, computed from the series of stomatal and boundary layer conductances to water vapor and CO$_2$, respectively, i.e., $g_{LA} = g_{LA,W}(g_{SL} + g_{SA})$. The leaf boundary layer conductance was calculated as a function of wind speed and leaf characteristic width $d_l$ (Campbell and Norman, 1998). The coefficients to convert conductances for water vapor to conductances for CO$_2$ or heat are reported in Table A3 (see details in Bonan, 2008; Campbell and Norman, 1998).

The CO$_2$ demand set by the leaf photosynthetic capacity can be expressed as a multiplicative function of light limitation and CO$_2$ limitation terms (Berninger and Hari, 1993; Hari et al., 1986). The CO$_2$ limitation term is here obtained by linearizing the Rubisco-limited photosynthesis kinetics from the Farquhar model (Farquhar et al., 1980). The linearization was carried out assuming that in the denominator internal CO$_2$ concentration is approximated as

$$c_I \approx R_c c_a, \quad (10)$$

where $c_I$ is the CO$_2$ compensation point, $R_c = 0.01a_1$ is the mitochondrial respiration, $a_1$, $a_2$, and $v_1$ are kinetic constants that depend on leaf water potential and temperature, $v$ is the efficiency of the CO$_2$ pump in C4 species (set to unity in C3 species), and $Q_F$ is the
absorbed photosynthetic active radiation (Eq. (6)). The linearization of Eq. (10) is justified by the fact that changes in $c_1$ are mainly due to changes in $c_A$, allowing the approximation $c_1 \approx C_A$. Note that the internal CO$_2$ concentration can still change in response to altered balance of CO$_2$ supply and demand, thus capturing the biochemical couplings between stomatal conductance and photosynthesis. The rate coefficient $a_1$ represents the carboxylation rate and $	au_2 = K_c(1 + [O_2]/[K_O])$ accounts for the balance of carboxylation and oxygenation reactions. The impairment of photosynthetic capacity under water stress (represented by increasingly negative leaf water potentials $\Psi_L$) is accounted for by means of an empirical curve that decreases the maximum rate under well-watered (WW) conditions (Vico and Porporato, 2008).

$$a_1 = a_{1,WW} \exp \left[-\left(a_1 \left| \Psi_L \right| \right)^{\alpha_2}\right].$$

(11)

Specific expressions for the temperature effects on $a_{1,WW}$, $a_2$, and $\tau$ are reported by Leuning (1995). Eqs. (8)–(10) allow computing three of the four unknowns (i.e., CO$_2$ and water vapor fluxes, internal CO$_2$ concentration, and stomatal conductance). To mathematically close the problem, a further equation must be introduced to define stomatal conductance, $g_{SL}$. Because of the complex feedbacks between energy and water fluxes and $g_{SL}$, it is more convenient to first define leaf temperature and water potential, and later present the expression for $g_{SL}$ (Section 2.1.7).

2.1.5. Leaf energy balance

The leaf energy balance can be written as (Campbell and Norman, 1998)

$$Q_n = LE + H,$$

(12)

where the absorbed radiation ($Q_n$) is balanced by latent ($LE$) and sensible ($H$) heat fluxes (i.e., leaf temperature is assumed in equilibrium at the half-hourly time scale). The latent heat flux is computed from Eq. (8), while the sensible heat exchange between the leaf and the atmosphere is given by

$$H = C_0 g_{SL}(T_L - T_A),$$

(13)

where $g_{SL}$ is the leaf boundary layer conductance for sensible heat. A suitable approximation for leaf temperature is obtained by neglecting the longwave contribution and linearizing Eq. (12).

$$T_L = T_A + \frac{Q_n - A_g g_{LA} W D}{C_p g_{SL} W}.$$

(14)

In this way, all quantities on the right hand side of Eq. (14) depend on air temperature and stomatal and boundary layer conductances only. As it will be clear in the following, this formulation is useful for an efficient implementation of the stomatal model in the fully coupled vegetation–atmosphere model (Section 2.2).

2.1.6. Soil–vegetation–atmosphere continuum

Because water storage within the vegetation-system is ignored (as vegetation in such controlled environments is relatively short-statured), the transpiration flux (Eq. (8)) must be conserved throughout the soil–vegetation–atmosphere system,

$$E = g_{SL} \left( \Psi_S - \Psi_L \right),$$

(15)

where $\Psi_L$ and $\Psi_S$ are leaf and soil water potentials, respectively, and $g_{SL}$ is the soil-to-leaf conductance to water. Eq. (15) can be inverted to compute the leaf water potential,

$$\Psi_L = \Psi_S - \frac{E}{g_{SL}}.$$

(16)

Note that $\Psi_L$ depends on $E$, which in turn is a function of stomatal conductance and leaf–atmosphere vapor gradient (Eq. (8)), so that $\Psi_L = \Psi_L(g_{SL})$.

The soil-to-leaf conductance was computed as the series of root-to-soil conductance $g_{SR}$ (dominant at low soil moisture), and root-to-leaf conductance $g_{RL}$ (dominant at high soil moisture and assumed constant for simplicity), as $g_{SL} = g_{SR}/(g_{SR} + g_{RL})$. The soil-to-root conductance is modeled after Daly et al. (2004),

$$g_{SR} = \varphi K_H \left( \frac{\Psi_S}{\Psi_L} \right) \left( \frac{R_H}{2 g_{SL} W S^2} \right),$$

(17)

where $K_H$ is the soil hydraulic conductivity, $R_H$ the root area index, $\varphi$ the root radius, $W$ the rooting depth, $w^2_a$ a correction factor to account for root elongation under low soil moisture, and $\varphi = 10^9/(18 \times 9.81)$ a coefficient to convert the conductance units to mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ MPa$^{-1}$.

2.1.7. Optimal stomatal conductance model

Stomatal conductance is modeled using an optimization approach based on the economics of gas exchange. An implicit expression to be solved for $g_{SL}$ is derived by maximizing the leaf assimilation rate $A$, subject to the constraint that leaf $E > 0$ (Berner and Hari, 1993; Cowan and Farquhar, 1977; Katul et al., 2009). To achieve this, we maximize the leaf C gain function, $f = A - \lambda E$, where $\lambda$ is the marginal water use efficiency (the Lagrange multiplier for the problem), by imposing $\partial f/\partial g_{SL} = 0$, and thus obtain an expression for $g_{SL}$. When the boundary layer resistance is assumed negligible and leaf water potential and temperature can be considered externally imposed parameters (as in the case of well-mixed leaf gas exchange cuvettes), the derivation of an explicit, analytical expression for $g_{SL}$ is straightforward (Berner and Hari, 1993; Hari et al., 1986; Katul et al., 2010; Manzoni et al., 2010). When the effects of stomatal conductance on leaf water status and temperature are considered (see Sections 2.1.5 and 2.1.6), the optimality condition becomes rather unwieldy and does not admit an analytical solution for $g_{SL}$ (e.g., Buckley et al., 2002). Here the optimality condition is derived for the general case.

Leaf temperature is controlled by stomatal conductance (Eq. (14)), but it also controls the water vapor concentration in the stomatal cavity and thus the driving force of transpiration (Eq. (8)). As a consequence, we can express the transpiration flux as $E = E L(g_L), T_L(g_L)$ (Eq. (8)). The assimilation flux can also be written as a function of stomatal conductance (by combining Eqs. (9) and (10) and eliminating $c_1$), and leaf temperature and water potential (Eqs. (10) and (11)). Leaf temperature and water potential are in turn controlled by stomatal conductance (Eqs. (14) and (16), respectively), so that $A = A \left[ g_{SL}, \Psi_L(g_L), T_L(g_L) \right]$. As a result, the optimality condition can be written as

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial g_{SL}} \left|_{g_{SL}} \right. = \frac{\partial A}{\partial g_{SL}} \left. \right|_{g_{SL}, g_C, T_L} + \frac{\partial A}{\partial g_C} \left. \right|_{g_{SL}, g_C, T_L} + \frac{\partial A}{\partial T_L} \left. \right|_{g_{SL}, g_C, T_L} = 0,$$

(18)

which can only be solved numerically for the unknown $g_{SL}$.

The marginal water use efficiency $\lambda$ varies with large changes in $c_A$ and plant water status (Katul et al., 2010; Manzoni et al., 2010). In the drought resistant grassland species considered here, the sensitivity of $\lambda$ to water availability has been shown to be not significant, while the CO$_2$ effect is nearly linear (Manzoni et al., 2010). This yields the relationship

$$\lambda(c_A) = \lambda^* \frac{c_A}{c_A^*},$$

(19)

where $\lambda^*$, the marginal water use efficiency at the reference $c_A^* = 400$ mol mol$^{-1}$, is the only parameter to be calibrated against gas exchange measurements (Section 2.3). As discussed by Katul
et al. (2010), Eq. (19) also recovers the well-known proportionality between $g_{SC}$ and $A/\alpha_a$ assumed in leaf-level formulations such as the Leuning (1995) approach.

2.2. Numerical implementation

The canopy model has been implemented in Matlab (The Math-Works, Inc.) using two nested routines. One performs the leaf-level calculations, which are used to compute the scalar sources at each canopy level necessary for the second routine to solve the atmospheric scalar transport equations. Leaf-level calculations are complicated by the solution of the optimality equation for stomatal conductance. The iterative scheme designed to numerically solve the problem is outlined below. Given an initial guess for stomatal conductance $g_{SC}$, leaf temperature (Eq. (14)), water potential (Eq. (16)), and internal CO2 concentration (expressed as a function of $g_{SC}$, $T_l$, and $\Psi_l$ by combining Eqs. (9) and (10)) are computed. Second, the partial derivatives of $T_l$, $\Psi_l$, and $c_l$ with respect to $g_{SC}$ are calculated assuming $g_{SC} = g_{SC}^*$. Third, the optimality condition (Eq. (18)) is written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{SC}} = \frac{\partial A}{\partial g_{SC}} \bigg|_{c_l,T_l} + \frac{\partial A}{\partial g_{SC}} \bigg|_{\Psi_l} \frac{\partial c_l}{\partial g_{SC}} - \frac{\partial E}{\partial g_{SC}} \bigg|_{c_l,T_l} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial g_{SC}} \bigg|_{\Psi_l} \frac{\partial \Psi_l}{\partial g_{SC}} = 0.$$  

(20)

Using Eqs. (8) and (9), Eq. (20) can be inverted to provide a new estimate for $g_{SC}$,

$$g_{SC} = \frac{(c_l - c_0)}{(X_{SWC} + X_{SWC}w_{SC} \frac{\delta g_{SC}}{\delta c_l}) - \frac{a}{X_{SWC}w_{SC}} \frac{\delta E \delta \Psi_l}{\delta g_{SC}} \bigg|_{c_l,T_l} + \frac{\delta E \delta \Psi_l}{\delta g_{SC}} \bigg|_{\Psi_l}}{\frac{\delta \Psi_l}{\delta g_{SC}} \bigg|_{c_l,T_l}}.$$  

(21)

where the partial derivative of $c_l$ contains the effects of leaf temperature and water potential on the photosynthesis parameters (the other coefficients are defined in Table A3). Eq. (21) is solved iteratively until convergence to a specified accuracy is achieved. A maximum value for $g_{SC}$ is also set to avoid unrealistically high conductances at low $D$. The numerical solution has also been compared against the theoretical results reported by Manzoni et al. (2010) in the case of negligible boundary layer and soil-to-leaf resistances with excellent agreement between these results and the numerical solution.

2.3. Application to the Lysimeter CO2 gradient (LYCOG)

As a case study, the species physiological differences that affect optimal leaf gas exchange parameters are investigated in terms of longitudinal scalar gradients that develop in the closed environment of the Lysimeter CO2 Gradient (LYCOG) facility (located in Temple, TX). The LYCOG facility is used to expose grassland vegetation consisting of mixtures of C4 grasses and C3 forbs to a continuous gradient of atmospheric CO2 concentration (250–500 μmol mol$^{-1}$). The gradient of CO2 is maintained by blowing enriched air into elongated chambers (composed of 20, 5-m-long compartments, as schematically depicted in Fig. 1) and allowing the vegetation to deplete CO2 from the air stream through photosynthesis. Both temperature and water vapor concentrations are regulated by means of cooling coils located at the compartment joints to match the outside conditions. The chambers are enclosed by a thin (0.15 mm), clear polyethylene cover with ~90% transmissivity that minimally alters the light spectrum (Johnson et al., 2000). Grassland vegetation is allowed to grow in intact soil monoliths of three soil types (varying in texture and fertility), each replicated along the CO2 gradient. Irrigation schedule and amounts also match typical rainfall patterns of the area. Further details about the experiment are reported elsewhere (Fay et al., 2009; Polley et al., 2008).

For the present sensitivity analyses, we modeled the LYCOG system as a continuous sequence of 5-m-long compartments joined by plenums that perfectly mix the air stream and reduce temperature and humidity to specified values (equal to the external conditions). For simplicity, we neglected air losses from the chambers and changes in pressure that result from the use of fans located adjacent to some of the plenums. Also, we assumed a single-species canopy of Solidago canadensis (the dominant C3 forb), or Sorgastrum nutans (the dominant C4 grass), growing on a single soil type. This simplified representation of the experimental facility and canopy structure allows us to focus on the interactions between the leaf-level biochemical features of these two species and their chamber environment. Hence, minimal model calibration was carried at the leaf level only, while the atmospheric flow sub-model was validated against observed velocity profiles (described below). Typical mid-summer external environmental conditions are assumed for all simulations.

Vertical profiles of mean longitudinal velocity were measured during July 2009 using T-AVM430 hot wire anemometers (Topac Instrumentation, Cohasset, MA, USA). For different fan speeds and at different locations in the chamber, five or six velocity readings (30 s averages) were recorded after equilibration of the anemometer at 8–10 locations in the vertical at each point considered in the chamber. LAI profiles for the sampling day were obtained by linearly interpolating in time LAI profiles measured during June and September 2009. We also assumed that the LAI of the 0–10 cm canopy layer (which can not be measured due to space constraints) was approximately equal to the 10–20 cm value.

The values of the physiological parameters used are reported in Table 1. We calibrated the leaf-level photosynthesis model (Eq. (10)) and the marginal water use efficiency function (Eq. (19)) using CO2 and light response curves from non-stressed leaves, as well as individual steady-state gas exchange measurements for S. canadensis and S. nutans. All gas exchange measurements were performed during the 2006, 2007, and 2008 growing seasons using an open path photosynthesis system (LI-6400, LiCor Biosciences, Lincoln, NE, USA). Parameters $\alpha_{1,WW}$ and $\alpha_{2}$ (at a reference temperature of 25 °C) were estimated by fitting Eq. (10) to the light-saturated CO2 response curves (Fig. 2a). The half saturation constant $\gamma$ was similarly obtained by nonlinear fitting of the light response curves (Fig. 2b). Parameters for Eq. (19) were obtained by fitting the marginal water use efficiency estimates for both species along CO2 and water availability gradients (Manzoni et al., 2010). Observed CO2 response curves and concomitant leaf water potentials were used to estimate the leaf photosynthetic capacity $a_1$ and its sensitivity to water stress. We did not find significant changes in $a_1$ over the available range of leaf water potentials, e.g., between about −1 and −2.5 MPa. Hence, we used the values for $a_1$ and $a_2$ (Eq. (11)) typical for stress-resistant species as reported by Vico and Porporato (2008).

The soil-to-leaf conductance model was parameterized for a sandy loam soil using hydraulic conductivity parameters reported by Laio et al. (2001) and assuming for both species a root area of 80 m²/m² (a typical value for grasslands, see Jackson et al. (1997)) mostly contained within a rooting depth of 2.5 m (Fay et al., 2009). The root-to-leaf conductance was adjusted to have leaf water potentials around the measured value of −1 MPa under well-watered conditions (Table 1). Soil respiration (the lower-boundary condition for the CO2 mass balance equation) was obtained from CO2 efflux measured with a LI-6400 connected to soil respiration chambers (Fay et al., 2009). The Kirschbaum (1995) temperature sensitivity model was used to account for temperature effects on respiration. To fit the model, we maintained the original optimum
temperature of 36.9 °C and obtained the base respiration and temperature sensitivity from linear regression of the log-transformed data ($\alpha = -2.1$ and $\beta = 0.24$, using Kirschbaum's notation). Since we assume vegetation characteristics are constant along the LYCOG, for consistency we also neglect atmospheric CO$_2$ effects on soil respiration.

### 3. Results and discussion

Model behavior was examined at three spatial scales. We first evaluated the performance of the atmospheric sub-model against observed velocity profiles (Section 3.1.1). We then modeled mean scalar concentrations and sources, as well as turbulent fluxes at the compartment level (Section 3.1.2). Finally, the entire chamber system was considered, and the responses of the CO$_2$ concentration gradient to changes in flow rate, species composition, and external environmental conditions were assessed (Section 3.1.3). The specific results refer to the LYCOG case study, but they qualitatively illustrate more general patterns that may be found in other closed systems.

#### 3.1. Vertical profiles of mean longitudinal velocity

The vertical profiles of mean longitudinal velocity affect the advective component of the mass and energy balance equation (Eq. (2)) and the strength of the turbulent mixing (Eq. (4)). We assessed the performance of the implemented first-order closure scheme (Eqs. (3)–(5)) by comparing the computed $U(z)$ with measured vertical profiles at different positions along the chamber and at different flow rates (Fig. 3). Because our goal here is to test the transport model under a variety of conditions, we consider canopies differing in both LAI profile and species composition, while in the following sections we will focus on a single LAI profile and specify the vegetation type. The model captures the main features of the observed mean velocity profiles without adjustments in the parameters, confirming the generally good performance of this simple first-order closure scheme (here with a specified constant mixing length) in modeling the profiles of longitudinal velocity and vertical turbulent fluxes in dense canopies (Katul et al., 2004; Poggi et al., 2009, 2004).

Most models for greenhouse simulation assume the greenhouse as a vertically well-mixed environment imposed on the vegetation, and focus on the bulk energy balance, while neglecting vertical gradients of air velocity and turbulent transport (Boulard and Bale, 1993; Kindelan, 1980; Kittas et al., 2003; Roy et al., 2002; Singh et al., 2006; Soribe and Curry, 1973; Teitel et al., 2010). This simplification may lead to errors in the characterization of the canopy micro-environment (to which leaf gas exchange is sensitive) where vertical gradients are important (Fig. 3; see also Zhao et al., 2001). Moreover, this assumption has been examined for 'open systems' 

---

**Table 1**

Values of physiological parameters used for the two grassland species considered (symbols are explained in Table A3). Temperature corrections for the kinetic constants are reported by Leuning (1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$S.\ canadensis$</th>
<th>$S.\ nutans$</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_{1,WW}$ (25 °C)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Calibrated (Fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_1$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Personal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_0$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Thornley and Johnson (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{s,max}$</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ MPa$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Calibrated from $\Psi_r$ under well-watered conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_c$ (25 °C)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>μmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Available gas exchange measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_0$</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>m$^2$ m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>Jackson et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Buckley (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_0$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Average of available gas exchange measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1$</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth containing &gt;80% of root mass (Fay et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vico and Porporato (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma^*$</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Vico and Porporato (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda^*$</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Calibrated (Fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Manzoni et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>von Caemmerer (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma^* (25 °C)$</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>μmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Daly et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 2.** Calibration of the leaf-level photosynthesis model (Eq. (10)). (A) CO$_2$ response and (B) light response curves for $S.\ canadensis$ and $S.\ nutans$ (on the $y$-axis in panel B, $y = (A + R_0) |c_1 + u_2|/|f_0 (T_1) (\alpha_1 - \Gamma)|$). In panel A, the curvature in the linearized photosynthesis model of Eq. (10) arises because $c_1$ is the only source of variability for $c_1$, resulting in simultaneous increase of both $c_1$ and $R_0C_a$. 
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by Juang et al. (2008) for a pine forest and was shown to be most significant for sensible heat fluxes and surface temperature predictions, which play a key role in the leaf energy balance and leaf temperature. To overcome this problem, some recent models employ direct numerical solution of the Navier–Stokes equations describing the greenhouse fluid dynamics (Boulard et al., 2002; Majdoubi et al., 2009). Compared to this computationally demanding method, two-dimensional approaches based on time-averaged equations (as employed here) are more efficient and provide reasonably good estimates of profiles of mean vertical velocity (Fig. 3). These time-averaged approaches can be readily integrated over seasonal, annual, and even inter-annual time scales thereby ensuring that all the key two-way interactions between the canopy and its micro-climate are accounted for across the widest possible ranges of environmental conditions (Siqueira et al., 2006). In essence, time-averaged approaches do not resolve all the scales characterizing turbulent eddies, but they account for the effects of turbulence on the micro-climate.

3.2. Results at the compartment level

Fig. 4 shows the mean scalar concentration, sources, and turbulent vertical fluxes in an individual 5-m long and 1.2-m tall compartment. Atmospheric CO2 concentration is primarily depleted by the high photosynthetic activity in the central region of the canopy, where both leaf area density and light availability are high. Regions of high photosynthetic activity are also sources of water vapor, which accumulates longitudinally throughout the chamber. The depletion of \( C_A \) creates a local vertical concentration gradient that brings CO2 from the soil surface and the upper regions towards the central, more photosynthetically active portion of the canopy. The downward vertical transport is more efficient than the transport from the soil surface because of higher mean velocity gradients (and consequently higher turbulent diffusion) in the upper part of the canopy (Fig. 3), which then drives higher turbulent fluxes (Eq. (4)). Water vapor fluxes move in the opposite direction (i.e., predominantly upward) because of the accumulation of water vapor in the central part of the canopy (also predicted in a greenhouse environment by Majdoubi et al. (2009)). Air temperature (lower left panel in Fig. 4) is highest near the ground level, but is similar to that of external air in the upper canopy region, where wind speed is sufficiently large and ensures adequate mixing. The vertical sensible heat flux is also highest at the bottom of the canopy because the ground surface heating propagates upward. Relatively high sensible heat transport also occurs around the top of the canopy where most of the solar radiation load occurs (but little evaporative cooling occurs because of low leaf area density and stomatal closure due to relatively large \( D \)), resulting in heating of the leaves. These temperature profiles are qualitatively similar to profiles obtained from direct numerical simulations for a greenhouse (Majdoubi et al., 2009), while taller vegetation in open systems tends to show the opposite pattern, with higher temperature around the top of the canopy at midday (Juang et al., 2008). Also in greenhouses, as the ventilation increases and with relatively uniform canopies, the negative air temperature gradient we predict may shift to a positive gradient due to stronger solar radiation interception at the top and effective mixing and cooling in the lower canopy (Zhao et al., 2001).

Sources and sinks of CO2 and water vapor within the canopy (\( S_C \) and \( S_W \), see right panels in Fig. 4) are primarily controlled by Fickian diffusion (Eqs. (8) and (9)), leaf physiological processes (Eq. (10)), light availability, and leaf area density. Local scalar concentrations change less along the vertical direction than light availability and leaf area, which are independent of position \( x \) in this homogeneous canopy. As a consequence, \( S_C \) and \( S_W \) are nearly homogeneous in the longitudinal direction, but vary significantly in the vertical direc-
fig. 4. Scalar concentration fields (left panels), vertical turbulent fluxes (central panels), and scalar sources and sinks (right panels), along a single compartment of length $L = 5$ m and height of 1.2 m ($h = 0.75$ m). Simulations refer to Sorghastrum nutans, with typical midday summer conditions at the LYCOG facility: $T_{A,IN} = 30°C$, $c_{A,IN} = 500 \mu$mol mol$^{-1}$, $w_{A,IN} = 0.01$ mol mol$^{-1}$, total radiation 900 W m$^{-2}$, $w_s = 0.4$ m$^3$ m$^{-3}$, flow rate 0.2 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$.

tion. Because transpiration (and hence latent heat production) and solar radiation input do not vary appreciably along $x$, also the sensible heat source mainly varies vertically by virtue of the leaf energy balance. Sensible heat sources are particularly high in the bottom canopy layer, where part of leaf area is not actively transpiring and turbulent mixing is relatively weak. In contrast, the lower part of the canopy absorbs sensible heat ($S_H < 0$) converting it into latent heat through high transpiration.

The accumulation of sensible heat in the chambers due to relatively slow heat losses by conduction at the soil surface and interface between the polyethylene cover and ambient air leads to increased air and leaf temperature in the longitudinal direction. Fig. 5 illustrates how input air temperature and flow rate affect such an increase. At low flow rates, advection is poor and air temperature increases faster than at high flow rates. In these conditions the vapor pressure deficit also increases in the longitudinal direction, causing stomatal closure and inhibiting the evaporative cooling provided by transpiration. As a consequence, $T_A$ increases sharply as the canopy converts virtually all the solar radiation input into sensible heat. The model captures the average temperature increase observed at the end of each of the LYCOG compartments of about 5°C (with average daytime $T_{A,IN}$ between 23 and 30°C and flow rate between 0.1 and 0.3 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$, see Fay et al. (2009)). Future experiments could be designed using model outputs as in Fig. 5 to optimize flow rate and chamber length so as to obtain a desired temperature gradient throughout the chambers, resulting in a compound elevated-temperature/enriched-CO$_2$ experiment.

Longitudinal accumulation of sensible heat is common in greenhouse systems as well (Kittas et al., 2003; Willits, 2003). Predictions from mathematical models that account for these longitudinal gradients are in agreement with our results of steeper gradients under
lower ventilation and higher air humidity (Kittas et al., 2003; Teitel et al., 2010; Willits, 2003).

3.3. Results at the whole chamber level

In general, a longer transit time of air in the chamber system allows a more efficient capture of CO2 by plants, resulting in a steeper atmospheric CO2 concentration gradient. This pattern is shown in Fig. 6 for idealized uniform canopies composed of either of the two dominant species grown in the LYCOG facility. The higher photosynthetic capacity of C4. S. nutans (Fig. 2) produces a stronger gradient than the C3 S. canadensis for any given flow rate. For the range of CO2 concentration maintained at the LYCOG site (500–250 μmol mol−1), the gradient of CA is nearly constant because the curvature of the leaf-level CO2 response is less important than the mixing processes at the canopy level. Additionally, soil respiration provides a large source of CO2 close to the bulk leaf area that partly decouples photosynthesis from bulk atmospheric conditions. This weakens the leaf-level nonlinear effect of CA on photosynthesis and contributes to the nearly linear longitudinal profile of CA. The change in CA per unit of change in distance along chambers decreases when CA<200 μmol mol−1 (see the simulation for S. nutans at low air flow rate) because photosynthetic capacity decreases sharply at low CA (Fig. 2). Under typical summer conditions, the modeled CA profiles for S. nutans slightly overestimate the slope of the average measured profile, while profiles for S. canadensis are flatter. Because about 75% of plant biomass is encompassed by C4 species at the LYCOG (mainly S. nutans, see Fay et al. (2009)), accounting for species heterogeneity in the model (even with an idealized homogeneous LAI profile) would easily improve the simulated CA profile.

Fig. 7 illustrates the combined effect of solar radiation and air flow rate on the efficiency of the chamber system, expressed as the ratio between atmospheric CO2 concentration at the exit to that at the entrance of the chamber, CA/CAIN. Low flow rates (as in Fig. 6) and higher available light generally allow a stronger depletion of CA because of increased transit time and photosynthetic activity, respectively, as observed in greenhouses as well (Teitel et al., 2010). However, at low flow rates and high external air temperature, reduced photosynthesis and sustained soil respiration result in a net accumulation of CO2 (i.e., CAOUT/CAIN > 1). Fig. 8 illustrates this effect, showing a transition occurring above TAIN = 36 °C (a not uncommon value at the LYCOG site) as fan speed is reduced. At high flow rate the vegetation effectively cools the chamber air through transpiration, while evaporative cooling is impaired at lower flow rates, resulting in stomatal closure and decreased activity in the vegetation, which now only exchanges sensible heat with the atmosphere (Fig. 5 illustrates where this transition occurs in the longitudinal direction). The occurrence of this transition makes it difficult to maintain a prescribed CAOUT/CAIN under some environmental conditions. The flow rate can be increased to avoid the break down of the CA gradient (e.g., following upwards the solid black line in Fig. 8), but in this way the resulting CAOUT/CAIN could differ from the prescribed value. The transition from vegetation that transpires rapidly and thereby provides effective evaporative cooling to vegetation that transpires little is sensitive to changes in air flow rate.

Figure 5. Increase in air temperature at 0.5 m height along a single compartment (L = 20 m), for different input air temperatures TAIN (thick lines, TAIN=30 °C; thin lines, TAIN=25 °C) and flow rates Q. The mean (and range) temperature increase at the LYCOG (where L = 5 m) is also shown (indicated by ; data from Fay et al., 2009). The simulations are for S. nutans under the same environmental conditions as in Fig. 4, except for varying TAIN and Q.

Figure 6. Sensitivity of the air CO2 concentration (expressed as ratio between CO2 concentration at the exit and at the entrance of the chamber) to changes in flow rate and species composition, along a sequence of 20, 5-m long compartments (as in the LYCOG facility). For each species, an increase in air flow rate flattens the curve (specific values of flow rate are 0.2, 0.4, and 0.6 m3 s−1; other external conditions as in Fig. 4). Measured mean CAOUT/CAIN at the LYCOG facility are also shown for a visual comparison with model results.

Figure 7. Contour plot of the ratio of CO2 concentration at the exit to that at the entrance of the chamber, for different combinations of flow rates (in logarithmic scale) and solar radiation levels. The thick gray line indicates the target for the LYCOG facility (a CO2 concentration gradient from 500 to 250 μmol mol−1, or CAOUT/CAIN=0.5, see Fay et al., 2009). The simulations are for S. nutans under the same environmental conditions as in Fig. 4, except for radiation input and air flow rate.
4. Conclusions

A vegetation–atmosphere gas exchange model is proposed to describe chamber systems used to investigate the effects of altered climatic conditions on ecosystem productivity. The model couples a description of leaf-scale physiology based on a water use optimality hypothesis to a simplified description of the atmospheric microclimate and boundary conditions characteristic of these closed systems. We parameterized the model to compute the main features of Lycog experiment and tested it to assess the effects of plant species composition and environmental conditions on the simulated CO2 concentration gradient. While some of the model assumptions and simplifications adopted here could be relaxed or improved, the model successfully reproduced key features of the Lycog, namely (i) the sensitivity of the CO2 concentration gradient to air flow rate (Fig. 6), (ii) the air temperature increase along a chamber and its dependence on flow rate and outside temperature (Fig. 5), (iii) the strong relationships among solar radiation, fan speed, and CO2 concentration in the air outflow (Fig. 7), and (iv) the air temperature threshold above which the gradient can not be maintained because of loss of evaporative cooling and consequent accumulation of excessive sensible heat in the chamber (Fig. 8).

Because the model allows mechanistic predictions of the effects of changes in air flow rate and external climatic conditions on ecosystem responses and the resulting CO2 concentration gradient, it can be used as a tool to optimize chamber design (Figs. 7 and 8). Similarly, the sensitivity of model results to species composition (Fig. 6) permits investigation on how plant communities (see Fay et al., 2009) might impact the CO2 gradient and to identify management options (e.g., changes in flow rate) for accommodating feedbacks from species change on environmental condition in the chamber.

The model also provides for the development of novel experimental designs to assess how climatic shifts impact ecological processes such as transpiration and photosynthesis. We showed that the length of a compartment and flow rate define a longitudinal air temperature gradient that can be used in compound elevated-temperature/enriched-CO2 experiments. Additionally, simulations can be performed to assess the responses of this grassland ecosystem to a wide range of rainfall patterns that can not be reproduced in the original experiment. To achieve this goal, a full coupling of canopy gas exchange (described here) to a plant growth and soil moisture and nutrient cycling sub-model (e.g., Manzoni and Porporato, 2009; Porporato et al., 2003) that resolves daily-to-yearly time scales is necessary. Such detailed representation of soil–vegetation–atmosphere interactions represents a viable option to guide the design and management of these chamber systems, and can be used to formulate ecological hypothesis to be later tested in the field.
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Appendix A. List of symbols

Tables A1–A4 list all symbols used for atmosphere, canopy, leaf-level, and soil-to-leaf conductance calculations, respectively. Specific values for the physiological parameters of the species considered are reported in Table 1.
Table A1
Symbols used in the atmospheric fluid mechanic sub-model. Subscripts M and J respectively identify momentum and the different scalars (CO$_2$, J = C [µmol mol$^{-1}$]; water vapor, J = W [mol mol$^{-1}$]; sensible heat, J = H [mol mol$^{-1}$]); subscripts IN and OUT indicate chamber input and output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_a$, $C_{A,in}$, $C_{A,out}$</td>
<td>CO$_2$ concentration</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Height of the drag force center of mass</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>Height of canopy top</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>Turbulent diffusivity</td>
<td>m$^2$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_{in}, W_{air}, W_{OUT}$</td>
<td>Water vapor concentration</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_{w(a)}(T)$</td>
<td>Water vapor concentration at saturation</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>Longitudinal direction</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>Vertical direction</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Mixing length (Eq. (5))</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Length of a compartment (LYCOG: 5 m)</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_d$</td>
<td>Drag coefficient, $C_d = 0.3$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_I, F_W$</td>
<td>Vertical flux of scalar J or momentum</td>
<td>[J] m$^2$ s$^{-1}$, m$^2$ s$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{AD}$</td>
<td>Leaf area density</td>
<td>m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_J$</td>
<td>Source term for a generic scalar J</td>
<td>[J] s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U$</td>
<td>Mean longitudinal air velocity</td>
<td>m s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_A$, $T_{AB}, T_{A,OUT}$</td>
<td>Air temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Von Karman constant, $\kappa = 0.4$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2
Symbols used in the radiation transfer and energy balance equations. Subscript i identifies the different wavebands (near infrared, $i = NIR$; visible, $i = V$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_p$</td>
<td>Air heat capacity, $C_p = 29.3$</td>
<td>J mol$^{-1}$ °C$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_i$</td>
<td>Solar radiation partitioning coefficients ($f_i = 0.45, f_{NIR} = 0.55$)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>Extinction coefficient for black leaves ($k = 0.5$)</td>
<td>m$^2$ mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_D$</td>
<td>Extinction coefficient for diffuse light ($k_D = 0.8$)</td>
<td>m$^2$ mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_c$</td>
<td>Sensible heat flux between the ground surface and the atmosphere</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_i$</td>
<td>Airflow rate m$^3$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>m$^3$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_o$</td>
<td>Net absorbed radiation</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_i$</td>
<td>Direct or diffuse absorbed radiation in waveband $i$</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{i,j}$</td>
<td>Radiation in waveband $i$ at the top of the canopy</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_P$</td>
<td>Absorbed photosynthetic active radiation, $Q_P = 4.6Q_b$</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Latent heat of vaporization (calculated after Bonan, 2008)</td>
<td>J mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_0$</td>
<td>Reflection coefficient in waveband $i$ (Eq. (7))</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Stefan Boltzmann constant, $\sigma = 5.67 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$ K$^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_i$</td>
<td>Scattering coefficient in waveband $i$ ($\sigma_i = 0.2, \sigma_{NIR} = 0.8$)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi$</td>
<td>Zenith angle</td>
<td>rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$</td>
<td>Cumulative leaf area index profile, $\xi = \int_0^H LAI(z) dz$</td>
<td>m$^2$ m$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A3
Symbols used in the leaf gas exchange and energy balance equations. Subscript J identifies the different scalars (CO$_2$, J = C [µmol mol$^{-1}$]; water vapor, J = W [mol mol$^{-1}$]; sensible heat, J = H [mol mol$^{-1}$]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_1, a_{1,WW}$</td>
<td>Photosynthetic rate (WW, well-watered conditions)</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>Half saturation constant in Eq. (10)</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_i$</td>
<td>Internal CO$_2$ concentration</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_i$</td>
<td>Average leaf width</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Gain function, $f = A - \lambda E$</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{BL}$</td>
<td>Leaf boundary layer conductance for scalar J</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{BL,j}$</td>
<td>Leaf bulk atmosphere conductance for scalar J</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{BL,CO_2}$</td>
<td>Maximum stomatal conductance to CO$_2$</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{C_B}$</td>
<td>Stomatal conductance to scalar J</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{C_B}$</td>
<td>Initial guess for stomatal conductance to CO$_2$</td>
<td>mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{WM,C}$</td>
<td>Ratio between leaf boundary layer conductances to water vapor and CO$<em>2$, $X</em>{WM,C} = \frac{g_{BL,W}}{g_{BL,C}} = 1.34$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{WM,C}$</td>
<td>Ratio between stomatal conductances to water vapor and CO$<em>2$, $X</em>{WM,C} = \frac{g_{C_B,W}}{g_{C_B,C}} = 1.65$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{WM,C}$</td>
<td>Ratio between leaf boundary layer conductances to sensible heat and CO$<em>2$, $X</em>{WM,C} = \frac{g_{BL,W}}{g_{BL,C}} = 1.23$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>$\delta w_{w(a)}(T)/DT$</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$ °C$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>Leaf net CO$_2$ assimilation</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Leaf transpiration</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_C$</td>
<td>Michaelis constant for carboxylation</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D$</td>
<td>Michaelis constant for oxygenation</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[O_2]$</td>
<td>Oxygen concentration, $[O_2] = 0.21$</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_C$</td>
<td>Long-term average $C_i/C_e$ (Eq. (10))</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_C$</td>
<td>Mitochondrial respiration</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1, \alpha_2$</td>
<td>Parameters for $\alpha_i(\psi_i)$ in Eq. (11)</td>
<td>Different units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Half-saturation constant of the light response (Eq. (10))</td>
<td>µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Marginal water use efficiency, $\lambda = \delta H/\delta E$</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda'$</td>
<td>Marginal water use efficiency at $C_a = 400$ µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>CO$_2$ compensation point</td>
<td>µmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_i$</td>
<td>Leaf water potential</td>
<td>MPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Conditions for the application of first-order closure principles

For completeness, the necessary conditions for the application of first-order closure principles and our rationale for choosing them for this particular application are presented here. We refer to Juang et al. (2008) and references therein for more detailed descriptions of the budget equation and closure models employed in this derivation. For a stationary and planar homogeneous high Reynolds number and Peclet number flows, the budget equation for an arbitrary scalar (\( J \)) flux is given by:

\[
\frac{\partial \langle w J \rangle}{\partial t} = 0 = -\frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \langle J \rangle}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \langle w \partial J / \partial z \rangle \right)
\]

where \( w, T_A, \rho, J \) represent fluctuations in vertical velocity, air temperature, air pressure, and scalar concentration, \( \rho \) is the air density, \( g \) the gravitational acceleration, and overbar and angle brackets indicate time and planar-averaging, respectively. The terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (B1) are defined as follows: the first term (I) is the flux production, the second term (II) is the turbulent flux transport, the third term (III) is the scalar–pressure interaction (a de-correlation or dissipation term), and the fourth term (IV) is the buoyancy production (or dissipation).

If the dissipation term is parameterized as:

\[
\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \langle J \partial J / \partial z \rangle}{\partial z} = C_4 \frac{\tau}{\langle w J \rangle},
\]

and the flux transport term is given as

\[
\langle w \partial J / \partial z \rangle = -C_5 \tau \langle w \rangle \frac{\partial \langle J \rangle}{\partial z} = -C_5 \tau \alpha J S_j,
\]

then combining Eqs. (B1)-(B3) yields

\[
\langle w J \rangle = \frac{\tau}{C_4} \left[ -\alpha J + C_5 \frac{\partial \langle J \rangle}{\partial z} \right] + \frac{g}{\langle \tau \rangle} \left[ \langle T_A J \rangle \right],
\]

where \( \tau \) is a relaxation time scale defined as the ratio of the turbulent kinetic energy to its dissipation rate, \( C_4 \) and \( C_5 \) are similarity constants, \( \alpha J = w J \), and \( S_j \) is, as before, the scalar source (or sink) term. Hence, we expect that when

\[
\left| \frac{\partial \langle J \rangle}{\partial z} \right| >> C_5 \frac{\partial \langle J \rangle}{\partial z} + \frac{g}{\langle \tau \rangle} \langle T_A J \rangle,
\]

first-order closure arguments inside the canopy hold.

For the Lycoc canopy, it is likely that \( \alpha J \) remains large inside the canopy. Moreover, given the ground heating and CO\(_2\) emission, and the concentration of foliage near the ground (Fig. 3), much of the canopy leaf area is experiencing strong vertical gradients (at least for air temperature, water vapor, and CO\(_2\)). Moreover, much of the canopy height has small leaf area density (i.e., \( S_j \) is small except close to the ground) so that \( \partial \langle \tau \alpha J S_j \rangle / \partial z \) is expected to be small except in the lower layers of the canopy, where the lower-boundary conditions generate the largest gradients (especially for \( T_A \)). Hence, the Lycoc setup favors a situation in which the condition (B5) is likely to hold, though we emphasize that condition (B5) is not generally satisfied for an arbitrary canopy.
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