Large but decreasing effect of ozone on the European carbon sink

Rebecca J Oliver¹, Lina M Mercado¹², Stephen Sitch², David Simpson³⁴, Belinda E Medlyn⁵, Yan-Shih Lin⁶, Gerd A Folberth⁶

¹ Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Benson Lane, Wallingford, OX10 8BB, UK
² College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, EX4 4RJ, Exeter, UK
³ EMEP MSC-W Norwegian Meteorological Institute, PB 43, NO-0313, Oslo, Norway
⁴ Dept. Space, Earth & Environment, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, SE-41296 Sweden
⁵ Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Locked Bag 1797, Penrith NSW 2751 Australia
⁶ Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK.

Correspondence to: Rebecca Oliver (rfu@ceh.ac.uk)
Abstract

The capacity of the terrestrial biosphere to sequester carbon and mitigate climate change is governed by the ability of vegetation to remove emissions of CO$_2$ through photosynthesis. Tropospheric O$_3$, a globally abundant and potent greenhouse gas, is, however, known to damage plants, causing reductions in primary productivity, yet the impact of this gas on European vegetation and the land carbon sink is largely unknown. Despite emission control policies across Europe, background concentrations of tropospheric O$_3$ have risen significantly over the last decades due to hemispheric-scale increases in O$_3$ and its precursors. Therefore, plants are exposed to increasing background concentrations, at levels currently causing chronic damage. We use the JULES land-surface model recalibrated for O$_3$ impacts on European vegetation, with an improved stomatal conductance parameterization, to quantify the impact of tropospheric O$_3$, and its interaction with CO$_2$, on gross primary productivity (GPP) and land carbon storage across Europe. A factorial set of model experiments showed that tropospheric O$_3$ can significantly suppress terrestrial carbon uptake across Europe over the period 1901 to 2050. By 2050, simulated GPP was reduced by 4 to 9% due to plant ozone damage and land carbon storage by 3 to 7%. However, the combined physiological effects of elevated future CO$_2$ (acting to reduce stomatal opening) and reductions in O$_3$ concentrations resulted in reduced O$_3$ damage in the future, contrary to predictions from earlier studies. This alleviation of O$_3$ damage by CO$_2$-induced stomatal closure was around 1 to 2% for low and high sensitivity respectively (on both land carbon and GPP). Reduced land carbon storage resulted from diminished soil carbon stocks consistent with the reduction in GPP. Regional variations are identified with larger impacts shown for temperate Europe (GPP reduced by 10 to 20%) compared to boreal regions (GPP reduced by 2 to 8%). These results highlight that O$_3$ damage needs to be considered when predicting GPP and land carbon, and that the effects of O$_3$ on plant physiology need to be considered in regional, add to the uncertainty of future trends in the land carbon cycle assessments sink, and, as such, this should be incorporated into carbon cycle assessments.
1 Introduction

The terrestrial biosphere absorbs around 30% of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions and acts to mitigate climate change (Le Quéré et al., 2015). Early estimates of the European carbon balance suggest a terrestrial carbon sink of between 135 to 205 Tg C yr⁻¹ (Janssens et al., 2003). Schulze et al. (2009) determined a larger carbon sink of 274 Tg C yr⁻¹, and more recent estimates suggest a European terrestrial sink of between 146 to 184 Tg C yr⁻¹ (Luyssaert et al., 2012). The carbon sink capacity of land ecosystems is dominated by the ability of vegetation to sequester carbon through photosynthesis and release it back to the atmosphere through respiration. Therefore, any change in the balance of these fluxes will alter ecosystem source-sink behaviour.

In recent decades much attention has focussed on the effects of rising atmospheric CO₂ on vegetation productivity (Ceulemans and Mousseau, 1994; Norby et al., 2005; Norby et al., 1999; Saxe et al., 1998). The Norby et al. (2005) synthesis of Free Air CO₂ Enrichment (FACE) experiments suggests a median stimulation (23 ± 2%) of forest NPP in response to a doubling of CO₂. Similar average increases (20%) were observed for C₃ crops, although this translated into smaller gains in biomass (17%) and crop yields (13%) (Long et al., 2006). The long-term effects of CO₂ fertilization on plant growth and carbon storage are now well established (Baig et al., 2015; Ciais et al., 2012). Little attention, however, has been given to tropospheric ozone (O₃), a globally abundant and increasing air pollutant recognised as one of the most damaging pollutants for forests (Karlsson et al., 2007; Royal-Society, 2008; Simpson et al., 2014b). Tropospheric O₃ is a secondary air pollutant formed by photochemical reactions involving carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), methane (CH₄) and nitrogen oxides (NOₓ) from both man-made and natural sources, as well as downward transport from the stratosphere and lightning which is a source of NOₓ. The phytotoxic effects of O₃ exposure are shown to decrease vegetation productivity and biomass, with consequences for terrestrial carbon sequestration (Felzer et al., 2004; Loya et al., 2003; Mills et al., 2011b; Sitch et al., 2007). Few studies, however, consider the simultaneous effects of exposure to both gases, and few Earth-system models (ESMs) currently explicitly consider the role of tropospheric O₃ in terrestrial carbon dynamics (IPCC, 2013), both of which are key to understanding the carbon sequestration potential of the land-surface, and future carbon dynamics regionally and globally.

Due to increased anthropogenic precursor emissions over the industrial period, background concentrations of ground-level O₃ have risen (Vingarzan, 2004; Parrish et al., 2012). O₃ levels at the start of the 20th century are estimated to be around 10 ppb for the site Montsouris Observatory near Paris, data for Arkona on the Baltic coast increased from ca. 15 ppb in the 1950s to 20-27 ppb by the early 1980s, and the Irish coast site Mace Head shows around 40 ppb by the year 2000 (Logan et al., 2012; Parrish et al., 2012). Present day annual average background O₃ concentrations reported in the review of (Vingarzan, 2004), show O₃ concentrations range between approximately 20 and 45 ppb, with the greatest increase occurring since the 1950s. Trends vary from site to site, even on a decadal basis (Logan et al., 2012; Simpson et al., 2014b), depending, for example, on local/regional trends in precursor (especially NOₓ) emissions, elevation, and exposure to long-range transport. Nevertheless, there is some indication that background O₃ levels over the mid-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere have continued to rise at a rate of approximately 0.5–2% per year, although not uniform (Vingarzan, 2004). As a result of controls on precursor emissions in Europe and North America, peak O₃ concentrations in
these regions have decreased or stabilised over recent decades (Cooper et al., 2014; Logan et al., 2012; Parrish et al., 2012; Simpson et al., 2014b). Nevertheless, climate change may increase the frequency of weather events conducive to peak O₃ incidents in the future (e.g. summer droughts and heat-waves; e.g., Sicard et al., 2013), and may increase biogenic emissions of the O₃-precursors isoprene and NOₓ, although such impacts are subject to great uncertainty (Simpson et al., 2014b; Young et al., 2013; Young et al., 2009). Furthermore, intercontinental transport of air pollution from regions such as Asia that currently have poor emission controls are thought to contribute substantially to rising near-ground O₃ concentrations. These concern significantly over the last decades (Cooper et al., 2010; Verstraeten et al., 2015). Northern Hemisphere background concentrations of O₃ are now close to established levels for impacts on human health and the terrestrial environment (Royal-Society, 2008). Therefore, although peak O₃ concentrations are in decline across Europe, plants are exposed to increasing background levels, at levels currently causing chronic damage (Mills et al., 2011b). Intercontinental transport means future O₃ concentrations in Europe are dependent on how O₃ precursor emissions evolve globally, including regions such as Asia that currently have poor emission controls (Cooper et al., 2010; Verstraeten et al., 2015).

Elevated O₃ concentrations impact agricultural yields and nutritional quality of major crops (Ainsworth et al., 2012; Aivery et al., 2011), with consequences for global food security (Tai et al., 2014). As well as being a significant air pollutant, O₃ is a potent greenhouse gas (Royal-Society, 2008). High levels of O₃ are damaging to ecosystem health and reduce the global land carbon sink (Arnth et al., 2010; Stich et al., 2007). Reduced uptake of carbon by plant photosynthesis due to O₃ damage allows more CO₂ to remain in the atmosphere. This effect of O₃ on plant physiology represents an additional climate warming to the direct radiative forcing of O₃ (Collins et al., 2010; Stich et al., 2007), the magnitude of which, however, remains highly uncertain (IPCC, 2013).

Dry deposition of O₃ to terrestrial surfaces, primarily uptake by stomata on plant foliage and deposition on external surfaces of vegetation, is a large sink for ground level O₃ (Fowler et al., 2009; Fowler et al., 2001). On entry to sub-stomatal spaces, O₃ reacts with other molecules to form reactive oxygen species (ROS). Plants can tolerate a certain level of O₃ depending on their capacity to scavenge and detoxify the ROS (Ainsworth et al., 2012). Above this critical level, long-term chronic O₃ exposure reduces plant photosynthesis and biomass accumulation (Ainsworth, 2008; Ainsworth et al., 2012; Matyssek et al., 2010; Wittig et al., 2007; Wittig et al., 2009), either directly through effects on photosynthetic machinery such as reduced Rubisco content (Ainsworth et al., 2012; Wittig et al., 2009) and/or indirectly by reduced stomatal conductance (gₛ) (Kitao et al., 2009; Wittig et al., 2007), alters carbon allocation to different pools (Grantz et al., 2006; Wittig et al., 2009), accelerates leaf senescence (Ainsworth, 2008; Nunn et al., 2005; Wittig et al., 2009) and changes plant susceptibility to biotic stress factors (Karnosky et al., 2002; Percy et al., 2002).

The response of plants to O₃ is very wide ranging as reported in the literature from different field studies. We compare results from the present study to two found in literature. The Wittig et al. (2007) meta-analysis of temperate and boreal tree species showed future concentrations of O₃ predicted for 2050 significantly reduced leaf level light saturated net photosynthetic uptake (-19%; range: -3% to -28%) and gₛ (-10%; range: -5% to -23%) in both broadleaf and needle leaf tree species. In the Feng et al. (2008) meta-analysis of wheat, projected O₃
concentrations for the future reduced aboveground biomass (-18%), CO2 13% to -24%, photosynthetic rate (-20%) and eC (-22%). One of few long-term field based O3 exposure studies (AspenFACE) showed that after 11 years of exposing mature trees to elevated O3 concentrations, O3 decreased ecosystem carbon content (-9%), and decreased NPP (-10%), although the O3 effect decreased through time (Talhelm et al., 2014). Zak et al. (2011) showed this was partly due to a shift in community structure as O3-tolerant species, competitively inferior in low O3 environments, out competed O3-sensitive species. Zak et al. (2011) GPP was reduced (-12% to -19%) at two Mediterranean ecosystems exposed to elevated O3 (dominated by either Pinus species or Citrus species), studied by Fares et al. (2013). Biomass of mature beech trees was reduced (-44%) after 8 years of exposure to elevated O3 (Matyssek et al., 2010a). After 5 years of O3 exposure in a semi-natural grassland, annual biomass production was reduced (-23%), and in a Mediterranean annual pasture O3 exposure significantly reduced total aboveground biomass (up to -25%) (Calvet-Soro et al., 2014). However, these were empirical studies at individual sites, and these focus on O3 effects on plant physiology and productivity, but do not quantify the impact on the land carbon sink. Modelling studies are needed to scale site observations to the regional and global scales. Models generally suggest that plant productivity and carbon sequestration will decrease with O3 pollution, though the magnitudes vary. For example, based on a limited dataset to parameterise plant O3 damage for a global set of plant functional types, Sitch et al. (2007) predicted a decline in global GPP of 14 to 23% by 2100. A second study by Lombardozzi et al. (2015) similarly predicted a 10.8% decrease of global GPP. Here we take a regional approach and take advantage of new measurements specifically for European vegetation and conduct a dedicated analysis for the European region. Results from the present study suggest projected O3 concentrations for 2050 will reduce mean GPP for Europe (-4% to -9%), NPP (-6% to -11%), total carbon content (-3% to -7%) and E (4% to -9%). Using GPP as a proxy, for a (these variables are not identical but they are related), our mean GPP and E estimates fall within the range given by the meta-analysis of Wittig et al. (2007). The remaining studies are not meta-analysis, so are site- and species-specific, our estimates appear to compare more conservatively with these, however these are a mean value for Europe and spatially our estimates show greater variability. Understanding the response of plants to elevated tropospheric O3 is challenged by the large variation in O3 sensitivity both within and between species (Karnosky et al., 2007; Kubiske et al., 2007; Wittig et al., 2009). Additionally, other environmental stresses that affect stomatal behaviour will affect the rate of O3 uptake and therefore the response to O3 exposure, such as high temperature, drought and changing concentrations of atmospheric CO2 (Mills et al., 2016; Fagnano et al., 2009; Kitao et al., 2009; Löw et al., 2006), such that the response of vegetation to O3 is a balance between opposing drivers of stomatal behaviour. Increasing concentrations of atmospheric CO2, for example, are suggested to provide some protection against O3 damage by causing stomata to close (Harmon et al., 2007; Wittig et al., 2007). However the long-term effects of CO2 fertilisation The long-term effects of CO2 fertilisation on plant growth and carbon storage remain nevertheless uncertain (Ibarra et al., 2015; Ciais et al., 2013). Further, in some studies, stomata have been shown to respond sluggishly, losing their responsiveness to environmental stimuli with exposure to O3 which can lead to higher O3 uptake, increased water-loss and therefore greater vulnerability to environmental stresses such as drought (Mills et al., 2016; Mills et al., 2009; Paoletti and Grulke, 2010; Wilkinson and Davies, 2009).
Given the critical role $g_c$ plays in the uptake of both CO$_2$ and O$_3$, we use an alternative representation and parameterisation of $g_c$ in JULES by implementing the Medlyn et al. (2011) $g_c$ formulation. This model is based on the optimal theory of stomatal behaviour, it does not currently include a representation of sluggish stomatal control, but it Medlyn et al. (2011) has the following advantages over the current JULES $g_c$ formulation of Jacobs (1994), i) a single parameter ($g_c$) which represents the marginal cost of water-use, compared to two parameters in Jacobs (1994) representing the the critical humidity deficit at the leaf surface ($d_{q\text{crit}}$) and the $c/e$ ratio at the leaf critical humidity deficit ($d/l$) (Clark et al., 2011), ii) ease to parameterise with leaf or canopy level observations of photosynthesis, $g_c$ and humidity – all variables that are commonly measured, and (iii) values of $g_c$ are available for many different plant functional types (PFTs) derived from a global data set of measured leaf-level measurements; stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and vapour-pressure deficit (VPD) (1 m et al., 2015).

The main objective of this work is to assess the impact of historical and projected (1901 to 2050) changes in tropospheric O$_3$ and atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration from 1901 to 2050 on the predicted GPP and the European land-carbon sink for Europe. These are the two greenhouse gases that directly affect plant photosynthesis and $g_c$. We use a factorial suite of model experiments, using the Joint UK Land Environment simulator (JULES) (Best et al., 2011; Clark et al., 2011), the land-surface model of the UK Earth System Model (UKESM) (Collins et al., 2011) to simulate plant O$_3$ uptake and damage, and to look at the interaction between O$_3$ and CO$_2$. In this work, plant O$_3$ damage in JULES is developed further by introducing a term for dry deposition of O$_3$ to external plant surfaces, an important sink for tropospheric O$_3$ that was previously absent from the model. Further, the model is re-calibrated using the latest observations of vegetation sensitivity to O$_3$, with the addition of a separate parameterisation for temperate/boreal regions versus the Mediterranean. The plant O$_3$-sensitivity of each PFT in JULES was re-calibrated for both a Bähr and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity to account for the large variation in O$_3$ sensitivity within and between species, using the latest observations for European vegetation in order to explore a range of plant sensitivities to O$_3$. This includes separate sensitivities for Mediterranean regions, and for agricultural crops (wheat) versus natural grassland. We make a separate distinction for the Mediterranean region where possible because the work of Büker et al. (2015) showed that different O$_3$ dose-response relationships are needed to describe the O$_3$ sensitivity of dominant Mediterranean trees. We modify the representation of stomatal O$_3$ flux in JULES from Sitch et al. (2007) by including a term for non-stomatal deposition of O$_3$ to leaf surfaces which is recognised as an important sink for ground-level O$_3$. In addition, we introduce an alternative $g_c$ scheme into JULES as described above. JULES is forced with spatially varying hourly O$_3$ concentrations from a high resolution atmospheric chemistry model for Europe, therefore our simulations account for diurnal variations in O$_3$ concentration and O$_3$ responses allowing for more accurate estimations of O$_3$ uptake by vegetation. We do not attempt to make a full assessment of the carbon cycle of Europe, instead we target O$_3$ damage, and its interaction with CO$_2$, which is currently a missing component in earlier carbon cycle assessments (Le Quéré et al., 2017; Sitch et al., 2015). To this end, we prescribe changing O$_3$ and CO$_2$ concentrations from 1901 to 2050, but use a fixed pre-industrial climate. We
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acknowledge the use of a 'fixed' pre-industrial climate omits the additional uncertainty of the interaction between climate change and \( g_c \) which will affect the rate of CO\(_2\) uptake and therefore O\(_3\) concentrations. To understand the impact of these complex feedback mechanisms is an important area for future work, but in the current study our aim is to isolate the physiological response of plants to both O\(_3\) and CO\(_2\), and determine the sensitivity of predicted GPP and the land carbon sink to this process, as the impact of O\(_3\) on European vegetation and the land carbon sink currently remains largely unknown.

Given the critical role plants play in the uptake of both CO\(_2\) and O\(_3\), we use an improved representation and parameterization of \( g_c \) in JULES by implementing the Medlyn et al. (2011) formulation. Based on the optimal theory of stomatal behaviour, Medlyn et al. (2011) has the following advantages over the current JULES formulation: (i) a single parameter \( g_c \) which represents the marginal cost of water use; (ii) easy to parameterize with leaf or canopy level observations; and (iii) values of \( g_c \) are available for different plant functional types (PFTs) derived from a global data set of measured leaf stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and vapour pressure deficit (VPD) (Lin et al., 2015).

We use a factorial suite of model experiments to investigate the temporal and spatial evolution of O\(_3\) impacts on European vegetation from 1991 to 2050. We do not attempt to make a full assessment of the carbon cycle of Europe, instead we target O\(_3\) damage which is currently a missing component in earlier carbon cycle assessments. Accounting for the well-known differences in plant sensitivity to O\(_3\) is complex, therefore here we provide a sensitivity assessment by using two sets of simulations — a high and lower plant O\(_3\) sensitivity parameterization, with O\(_3\) sensitivities that vary by PET and region. We investigate the interaction between CO\(_2\) and O\(_3\); the two greenhouse gases that directly affect plant photosynthesis, and indirectly \( g_c \). Our aim is to quantify the impact of these two gases on GPP and land carbon storage across Europe. We go beyond the present day carbon budget and investigate the impact of state-of-art future scenarios up to year 2050.

2 Methods

2.1 Representation of O\(_3\) effects in JULES

JULES calculates the land-atmosphere exchanges of heat, energy, mass, momentum and carbon on a sub-daily time step, and includes a dynamic vegetation model (Best et al., 2011; Clark et al., 2011; Cox, 2001). This work uses JULES version 3.3 (http://www.jchmr.org) at 0.5° x 0.5° spatial resolution and hourly model time step, the spatial domain is shown in Fig. S5. JULES which has a multi-layer canopy radiation interception and photosynthesis scheme (10 layers in this instance) that accounts for direct and diffuse radiation, sun fleck penetration through the canopy, inhibition of leaf respiration in the light and change in photosynthetic capacity with depth into the canopy (Clark et al., 2011; Mercado et al., 2009). Soil water content also affects the rate of photosynthesis and \( g_c \). It is modelled using a dimensionless soil water stress factor, \( \beta \), which is related to the mean soil water concentration in the root zone, and the soil water contents at the critical and wilting point (Best et al., 2011).
To simulate the effects of O₃ deposition on vegetation productivity and water use, JULES uses the flux-gradient approach of Sitch et al., (2007), modified to include non-stomatal deposition following Tuovinen et al. (2009). JULES uses a coupled model of $g_s$ and photosynthesis; because of the relationship between these two fluxes, the direct effect of O₃ damage on photosynthetic rate also leads to a reduction in $g_s$. Changes in atmospheric CO₂ concentration also affect photosynthetic rate and $g_s$, consequently the interaction between changing concentrations of both gases is allowed for. Specifically, the potential net photosynthetic rate ($A_{\text{pot}}$, mol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹) is modified by an ‘O₃ uptake’ factor ($F$, the fractional reduction in photosynthesis), so that the actual net photosynthesis ($A_{\text{net}}$, mol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹) is given by equation 1 (Clark et al., 2011, Sitch et al., 2007).

\[ A_{\text{net}} = A_{\text{pot}} F \]  
(1)

The O₃ uptake factor ($F$) is defined as:

\[ F = 1 - a \times \max [F_{\text{O}_3}, F_{\text{O}_3,\text{crit}}, 0.0] \]  
(2)

$F_{\text{O}_3}$ is the instantaneous leaf uptake of O₃ (nmol m⁻² s⁻¹), $F_{\text{O}_3,\text{crit}}$ is a PFT-specific threshold for O₃ damage (nmol m⁻² PLA s⁻¹, projected leaf area), and ‘a’ is a PFT-specific parameter representing the fractional reduction of photosynthesis with O₃ uptake by leaves. Following Tuovinen et al. (2009), the flux of O₃ through stomata, $F_{\text{O}_3}$, is represented as follows:

\[ F_{\text{O}_3} = \frac{O_{\text{i}} \left( g_s \left( \frac{U_{\text{a}}}{U_{\text{c}}^2} \right) \right)}{\left( g_s + \frac{1}{\gamma} g_{\text{st}} F_{\text{st}} \right)} \]  
(3a)

$O_{\text{i}}$ is the molar concentration of O₃ at reference (canopy) level (nmol m⁻³), $g_s$ is the leaf-scale boundary layer conductance (m s⁻¹, eq 3b), $g_{\text{st}}$ is the leaf conductance for water (m s⁻¹), $K_{\text{a}}$ accounts for the different diffusivity of ozone to water vapour, the ratio of leaf resistance for O₃ to leaf resistance for water vapour and takes a value of 1.51 after Massman (1998), and $g_{\text{st}}$ is the leaf-scale non-stomatal deposition to external plant layers (m s⁻¹) which takes a constant value of 0.0004 m s⁻¹ after Tuovinen et al. (2009). The leaf-level boundary layer conductance ($g_s$) is calculated as in Tuovinen et al. (2009)

\[ g_s = a L d^{-1/2} U^{-1/2} \]  
(3b)

$a$ is a constant (0.0051 m s⁻¹), $L$ is the cross-wind leaf dimension (m) and $U$ is wind speed at canopy height (m s⁻¹). The rate of O₃ uptake is dependent on $g_s$, which is dependent on photosynthetic rate. Given $g_s$ is a linear function of photosynthetic rate in JULES (Clark et al., 2011), from eq 1 it follows that:

\[ g_s = g_i F \]  
(4)

The O₃ flux to stomata, $F_{\text{O}_3}$, is calculated at leaf level and then scaled to each canopy layer differentiating sunlight and shaded leaf photosynthesis, and finally summed up to the canopy level. Because the photosynthetic capacity,
photosynthesis and therefore $g_s$ decline with depth into the canopy, this in turn affects O$_3$ uptake, with the top leaf level contributing most to the total O$_3$ flux and the lowest level contributing least.

2.2 Calibration of O$_3$ uptake model for European vegetation

Here we use the latest literature on O$_3$ dose-response relationships derived from observed field data across Europe (CLRTAP, 2017) to determine the key PFT-specific O$_3$ sensitivity parameters in JULES ($a$ and $F_{O3\text{crit}}$). Each JULES PFT (broadleaf, needle leaf, C$_3$ and C$_4$ herbaceous, and shrub) was calibrated for a high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity to account for uncertainty in variation of species sensitivity to O$_3$, using the approach of Sitch et al., (2007). For the C$_3$ herbaceous PFT – the dominant land cover type across Europe in this study (Fig. S1) - the O$_3$ sensitivity was calibrated against observations for wheat to give a representation of agricultural regions (high plant O$_3$ sensitivity), versus natural grassland (low plant O$_3$ sensitivity), with a separate function for Mediterranean grasslands (low plant O$_3$ sensitivity) (Table S1 and Figure S2). Broadleaf tree and shrub PFTs were calibrated against the birch/beech observed O$_3$ dose-response functions for the high plant O$_3$ sensitivity, with a separate function for Mediterranean broadleaf trees (deciduous oaks), needle leaf trees were calibrated against the function for Norway spruce, all data for dose-response functions were from CLRTAP (2017). The low plant O$_3$ sensitivity functions for trees/shrubs were calibrated as being 20% less sensitive based on the difference in sensitivity between high and low sensitive tree species in the Karlsson et al., (2007) study. Due to limitations in data availability, the parameterisation for C$_4$ herbaceous uses the observed dose-responses for C$_3$ herbaceous, however the fractional cover of C$_4$ herbs across Europe is low (Fig. S1), so this assumption affects a very small percentage of land cover.

To calibrate each JULES PFT for sensitivity to O$_3$, JULES was run, varying the value of parameter $a$, until model output of change in NPP with cumulative O$_3$ exposure matched the observed O$_3$ dose-response functions in CLRTAP (2017). To calibrate the JULES O$_3$ sensitivity parameter ‘$a$’ in eq (2), JULES was run to be as directly comparable as possible to the dose-based O$_3$ risk indicator used in CLRTAP (2017), using the O$_3$ flux per projected leaf area to top canopy sunlit leaves. Hourly averaged $F_{O3}$ in excess of $F_{O3\text{crit}}$ were accumulated over a species specific accumulation period. Values of $F_{O3\text{crit}}$ came from the observations, the parameter ‘$a$’ was modified until the modelled change in response variable with cumulative uptake of O$_3$ above the specified threshold matched the observations (see further method details in SI section S2).

2.3 Representation of stomatal conductance

In JULES, $g_s$ (m s$^{-1}$) is represented following the closure proposed by (Jacobs, 1994):

$$g_s = 1.6RT \frac{A_{\text{sat}}}{z_g c_i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

In this parameterisation, $c_i$ is unknown and when in the default JULES model is calculated as in equation 6, hereafter called JAC:
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\[ c_i = (e_a - c_i) f_0 \left(1 - \frac{d_q}{d_q^{crit}}\right) + c_i \quad (6) \]

\[ c_i = c_u \left(\frac{d_q}{d_q^{crit}}\right) \quad (7) \]

\( \beta \) is a soil moisture stress factor, the factor 1.6 accounts for \( g_c \) being the conductance for water vapour rather than CO₂. \( R \) is the universal gas constant (J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹), \( T \) is the leaf surface temperature (K), \( c_i \) and \( c_f \) (both Pa) are the leaf surface and internal CO₂ partial pressures, respectively. \( c^* \) (Pa) is the CO₂ photorespiration compensation point, \( d_q \) is the humidity deficit at the leaf surface (kg kg⁻³), \( d_q^{crit} \) (kg kg⁻³) and \( f_0 \) are PFT specific parameters representing the critical humidity deficit at the leaf surface, and the leaf internal to atmospheric CO₂ ratio (\( c/f \)) at the leaf specific humidity deficit (Best et al., 2011), values are shown in Table S1.

In this work, we replace equation 6 with the closure described in Medlyn et al. (2011), using the key PFT specific model parameter \( g_c \) (kPa m³ mol⁻¹) and \( d_q \) is expressed in kPa, shown in eq 7, hereafter called MED2.

PFT specific values of the \( g_c \) parameter were derived for European vegetation from the data base of Lin et al. (2015) and are shown in Table S1. The \( g_c \) parameter represents the sensitivity of the \( g_c \) to the assimilation rate, i.e. plant water use efficiency and it was derived as in Lin et al. (2015) by fitting the Medlyn et al., (2011) model to observations of \( g_c \), photosynthesis, and VPD, with no \( g_c \) term (Lin et al., 2015). The study of Hoshika et al. (2013) show a significant difference in the \( g_c \) parameter (higher in elevated O₃ compared to ambient) in Siebold’s beech in June of their experiment. However, this is only at the start of the growing season, further measurements show no difference in this parameter between O₃ treatments. Found an effect of O₃ on \( g_c \) for beech trees (Fagus crenata) only at the start of the growing season (June), but not during the following months (August and October). Quantifying an O₃ effect directly on \( g_c \) would require a detailed meta-analysis of empirical data on photosynthesis and \( g_c \) for different PFTs, which is currently lacking in the literature. As explained above, here we take an empirical approach to modelling plant O₃ damage, essentially by applying a reduction factor to the simulated plant photosynthesis based on observations of whole plant losses of biomass with O₃ exposure, for which there is a lot more available data (e.g. CLRTAP, 2017). The impact of the \( g_c \) model formulation is shown for two contrasting grid points (wet/dry) in central Europe (see SI section S3 for further details). We also carry out site level evaluation of the two \( g_c \) models compared to FLUXNET observations (see SI section S4).

### 2.4 Model simulations for Europe

#### 2.4.1 Forcing datasets

We used the WATCH meteorological forcing data set (Weedon et al., 2010; Weedon et al., 2011) at 0.5° x 0.5° spatial and three hour temporal resolution for our JULES simulations. JULES interpolates this down to an hourly model time step. For this study, the climate was kept constant by recycling over the period 1901 to 1920, to allow us to fully understand the impact O₃, CO₂ and their interaction.
JULES was run with prescribed annual mean atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. Pre-industrial global CO₂ concentrations (1900 to 1960) were taken from Etheridge et al. (1996), 1960 to 2002 were from Mauna Loa (Keeling and Whorf, 2004), as calculated by the Global Carbon Project (Le Quéré et al., 2016), and 2003-2050 were based on the IPCC SRIS A1B scenario and were linearly interpolated to gap fill missing years (Fig. 1).

JULES was run including dynamic vegetation with a land cover mask giving the fraction of agriculture in each 0.5° x 0.5° grid cell based on the Hurr et al. (2011) land cover database for the year 2000. Within the agricultural mask means that only C₃/C₄ herbaceous PFTs are allowed to grow, with no competition from and all other PFTs. No form of land management is simulated (assumed absent). By including dynamic vegetation, grid cell PFT coverage and Leaf Area Index (LAI) is a result of resource availability and simulated competition. Following a full spin-up period (to ensure equilibrium vegetation, carbon and water states), the fractional cover of each PFT changed little over the simulation period (1901-2050), the land cover for 2050 is shown in Fig. S1. The model experiments in this study are run for both a high and low plant O₃ sensitivity, for the high plant O₃ sensitivity, all herbaceous PFT fractional cover uses the O₃ sensitivity for wheat, and for the low plant O₃ sensitivity, all herbaceous PFT fractional cover uses the O₃ sensitivity for natural grasslands.

Tropospheric O₃ concentration was produced by the EMEP MSC-W model at 0.5° x 0.5° (Simpson et al., 2012), driven with meteorology from the regional climate model RCA3 (Kjellström et al., 2011; Samuelsson et al., 2011), which provides a downscaling of the ECHAM A1B-r3 (simulation 11 of Kjellström et al., 2011). This setup (EMEP+RCA3) is also used by Langner et al. (2012a), Simpson et al. (2014a), Tuovinen et al. (2013), Franz et al. (2017) and Engardt et al. (2017), where further details and model evaluation can be found. Unfortunately, the 3-dimensional RCA3 data needed by the EMEP model was not available prior to 1960, but as in Engardt et al. (2017) the meteorology of 1900-1959 had to be approximated by assigning random years from 1960 to 1969. This procedure introduces some uncertainty of course, but Langner et al. (2012b) show that it is emissions change, rather than meteorological change, that drives modelled ozone concentrations. The emissions scenarios for 1900-2050 merge data from the International Institute of Applied System Analysis (IIASA) for 2005-2050 (the so-called ECLIPSE 4a scenario, Klimont et al. 2016), recently revised EMEP data for 1990, and a scaling back from 1990 to 1960 using data from Lamarque et al. (2013). The EMEP model accounts for changes in BVOC emissions as a result of predicted ambient temperature changes, however as with all uncoupled modelling studies, there is no interaction between changes in leaf-level gₛ, BVOCs and O₃ formation.

This study used daily mean values of tropospheric O₃ concentration from EMEP MSC-W disaggregated down to the hourly JULES model time-step. The daily mean O₃ forcing was disaggregated to follow a mean diurnal profile of O₃ this was generated from hourly O₃ output from EMEP MSC-W for the two land cover categories across the same domain as in this study. Hourly O₃ values allow for variation in the diurnal response to O₃ exposure resulting in more accurate estimation of O₃ uptake. O₃ concentrations from EMEP were calculated at canopy height for two land-cover categories: forest and grassland (Fig. S3 and Fig. S4), which are taken as surrogates for high and low vegetation, respectively. These canopy-height specific concentrations allow for the large gradients in O₃ concentration that can occur in the lowest 10s of metres, giving lower O₃ for grasslands than seen at e.g. 20 m in...
a forest canopy (Simpson et al., 2012; Tuovinen et al., 2009). Figure 1 shows the regional mean annual O₃ concentration (regions are depicted in Fig. S5) along with the annual maximum. Together these clearly show the trend of increasing O₃ concentration on pre-industrial levels in all regions, although notably lower increases in the Boreal region. Around the 1990’s O₃ concentrations stabilise and then start to decrease into the future. Figure 1 shows large increases in tropospheric O₃ from pre-industrial to present day (2001), this is in line with modelling studies (Young et al., 2013) and site observations (Derwent et al., 2008; Logan et al., 2012; Parrish et al., 2012), and is predominantly a result of increasing anthropogenic emissions (Young et al., 2013). Figure’s S3 and S4 show this large increase in ground-level O₃ concentrations from 1901 to 2001 occurs in all seasons. Present day O₃ concentration show a strong seasonal cycle, with a spring/summer peak in concentrations in the mid-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere (Derwent et al., 2008; Parrish et al., 2012; Vingarzan, 2004). This is largely related to the seasonal cycle of photochemical O₃ production which is highest during periods of high radiation and temperature (Young et al., 2013), although increased stratospheric input is also thought to contribute (Vingarzan, 2004). Anthropogenic emissions, especially NOX, contribute to the seasonal cycle of O₃ through traffic, energy production and residential heating and cooling demands (Royal-Society, 2008). Bioegenic emissions are also seasonal which contributes to the seasonal change in O₃ concentrations (Pacifico et al., 2012; Young et al., 2009), and dry deposition, driven by plant productivity also has a strong seasonal component. How the seasonality of ground level O₃ changes in the future will depend on how these multiple different drivers change and interact.

Modelling studies such as Dentener et al. (2006) and Young et al. (2013) suggest that anthropogenic emissions will be the main factor controlling the evolution of future O₃ concentrations, and in the recent study of Young et al. (2013) most scenarios suggest reduced O₃ burden in the future as a result predominately of reduced precursor emissions. Seasonally, the O₃ concentrations used in the simulations in this study show increased O₃ levels in winter and in some regions in autumn and spring in 2050 compared to present day, this may be due to reduced titration of O₃ by NO as a result of reduced NOX emissions in the future (Royal-Society, 2008). Summer O₃ concentrations are lower in 2050 however, compared to 2001. Our simulations use a fixed climate, so we do not include the effect of climate change on shifting plant phenology. Therefore, our results may underestimate plant O₃ damage, since if the growing season started earlier or finished later, plants in some regions would be exposed to higher O₃ concentrations.
Figure 1. Regional time series of canopy height O$_3$ (ppb) forcing from EMEP a) to c), and d) global atmospheric CO$_2$ (ppm) concentration (this does not vary regionally; black dots show data points, the black line shows interpolated points). Each panel for the O$_3$ forcing shows the regional annual average (woody PFTs, black solid line; herbaceous PFTs, black dashed line) and the annual maximum O$_3$ concentration above: woody PFTs (red) and herbaceous PFTs (blue).

2.4.2 Spin up and factorial experiments

JULES was spun-up by recycling the climate from the early part of the twentieth century (1901 to 1920) using atmospheric CO$_2$ (296.1 ppm) and O$_3$ concentrations from 1901 (Fig. S3 & Fig. S4). Model spin-up was 2000 years by which point the carbon pools and fluxes were in steady state with zero mean net land–atmosphere CO$_2$ flux. We performed the following transient simulations for the period 1901 to 2050 with continued recycling of the climate as used in the spin-up, for both high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivities:

- O3: Fixed 1901 CO$_2$, Varying O$_3$
- CO2: Varying CO$_2$, Fixed 1901 O$_3$
- CO2 + O3: Varying CO$_2$, Varying O$_3$

We use these simulations to investigate the direct effects of changing atmospheric CO$_2$ and O$_3$ concentrations, individually and combined, on plant physiology through the twentieth century and into the future, specifically over three time periods: historical (1901-2001), future (2001-2050) and over the full time series (1901-2050). See more details in the SI section S6 for calculation of the effects due to O$_3$, CO$_2$ and O$_3$ + CO$_2$. We also use paired t-tests to determine statistically significant differences between the different (high and low) plant O$_3$ sensitivities.

2.4.3 Evaluation
To evaluate our JULES simulations we compare mean GPP from 1991 to 2001 for each of the JULES scenarios and both high and low plant O₃ sensitivities against the observation based globally extrapolated Flux Network model tree ensemble (MTE) (Jung et al., 2011). We use paired t-test to determine statistically significant differences in the mean responses.

3 Results

3.1 Impact of gs model formulation

The impact of gs model on simulated gs is shown for the wet site (Fig. 2). For the broadleaf tree and C₃ herbaceous PFT, the MED edlyn gs model simulates a significantly larger conductance compared to the JAC acobs gs model. In other words, with the MED edlyn gs model these two PFTs are parameterised with a less conservative water use strategy, which, for the grid point shown in Fig. 2 used in the simulation, increased the annual mean leaf-level water use by 35.22% (±29%) and 45.5% (±32%), respectively. In contrast, the needle leaf tree, C₄ herbaceous and shrub PFTs are parameterised with a more conservative water use strategy with the MED edlyn gs model, and the mean annual gs was decreased by 13.6% (±12%), 27.22% (±10%) and 36.41% (±13%), respectively, compared to the JAC acobs gs model. This comparison was also done for a dry site, and similar results were found (Fig. S6), suggesting these results are representative across the domain. The effect of gs formulation on simulated photosynthesis was much smaller because of the lower sensitivity of the limiting rates of photosynthesis to changes in ci in the model compared to the effect of the same change in ci on modelled gs (Fig. S7 & S8). Changes in leaf-level gs impact the partitioning of simulated energy fluxes. In general, increased gs results in increased latent heat and thus decreased sensible heat flux, and vice versa where gs is decreased (Fig. S7 & S8). Also shown is the effect of the MED edlyn gs model on O₃ flux into the leaf (Fig. 2 and Fig. S6, bottom panels). For the broadleaf tree and C₃ herbaceous PFT, the MED edlyn model simulates a larger conductance and therefore a greater flux of O₃ through stomata compared to JAC acobs, and this is indicative of the potential for greater reductions in photosynthesis (Fig. S7 & S8). The reverse is seen for the needle leaf tree, C₄ herbaceous and shrub PFTs. See SI section S4 for site level evaluation of the seasonal cycles of latent and sensible heat with both JAC and MED models compared to FLUXNET observations.
Figure 2. Comparison of simulated \( g_s \) with the MEDlyn et al. (2011) (y axis) versus the JACobs (1994) formulation (x axis) currently used in JULES for all five JULES PFTs at one grid point (lat: 48.25; lon: 5.25). Shown are hourly values for the year 2000 (see SI section S3 for further details). Shown are stomatal conductance (\( g_s \), top row), and the flux of O\(_3\) through the stomata (flux\(_{o3}\), bottom row).

3.2 Evaluation of the JULES O\(_3\) model

For all JULES scenarios similar spatial patterns of GPP are simulated compared to MTE (Fig. 3 and Fig. S10). MTE estimates a mean GPP for present day in Europe of 938 gC m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (Fig. 3). JULES tends to under-predict GPP relative to the MTE product, estimates of GPP from JULES with both transient CO\(_2\) and O\(_3\) give a mean across Europe of 813 gC m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (high plant O\(_3\) sensitivity) to 881 gC m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (low plant O\(_3\) sensitivity), both of which are significantly different to the MTE product (\( t=27, d.f.=5750, p=2.2\times 10^{-16} \) (high); \( t=4.3, d.f.=5750, p=1.5\times 10^{-05} \) (low); Fig. 3). Forcing with CO\(_2\) alone (fixed 1901 O\(_3\)) gives a mean GPP across Europe of 900 to 923 gC m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (high and low plant O\(_3\) sensitivity respectively), and O\(_3\) alone (without the protective effect of CO\(_2\)) reduces estimated GPP to 732 to 799 gC m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (Fig. S10). At latitudes >45°N JULES has a tendency to under-predict MTE-GPP, and at latitudes <45°N JULES tends to over-predict MTE-GPP (Fig. S11). These regional differences are highlighted in Fig. S12, where in the Mediterranean region, JULES tends to over-predict MTE-GPP, so simulations with O\(_3\) reduce the simulated GPP bringing it closer to MTE. In the temperate region however, JULES tends to underestimate MTE-GPP, so the addition of O\(_3\) reduces simulated GPP further (Fig. S12). In the boreal region, JULES under-predicts GPP, but to a lesser extent than in the temperate region, and the addition of O\(_3\) has less impact on reducing the GPP further (Fig. S12).
Figure 3. Mean GPP (g C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) from 1991 to 2001 for a) the observationally based globally extrapolated Flux Network model tree ensemble (MTE) (Jung et al., 2011); b, c) model simulations with transient CO$_2$ and transient O$_3$, high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity respectively.

3.3 European simulations - Historical Period: 1901-2001

Over the historical period (1901-2001), the physiological effect of O$_3$ reduced GPP (-3% to -9%) for the low and high plant O$_3$ sensitivity parameterizations, respectively (Table 1). The difference in plant O$_3$ sensitivity was significant ($t$=102.2, d.f.=6270, $p$=2.2e-16). Figure 4 highlights regional variations, however, where simulated reductions in GPP are up to 20% across large areas of Europe, and up to 30% in some Mediterranean regions under the high plant O$_3$ sensitivity. Some Boreal and Mediterranean regions show small increased stomatal conductance later in the year when soil moisture may otherwise have been limiting to growth (up to 10%, Fig. 5) and therefore higher GPP, but these regions comprise only a small area of the entire domain. Indeed, over much of the Europe, O$_3$-induced stomatal closure led to reduced $g_c$ (up to 20%) across large areas of temperate Europe and the Mediterranean, and even greater reductions in some smaller regions of southern Mediterranean (Fig. 6), and these are not associated with notable increases in soil moisture availability (Fig. 5), resulting in depressed GPP over much of Europe as described above. Under the low plant O$_3$ sensitivity, similar spatial patterns occur, but the magnitude of GPP change (up to -10% across much of Europe) and $g_c$ change (-5% to -10%) are lower compared to the high sensitivity. Over the twentieth century the land carbon sink is significantly suppressed (-2% to -6%, Table 1). Large regional variation is shown in Figure 6, with temperate and Mediterranean Europe seeing a large reduction in land carbon storage, particularly under the high plant O$_3$ sensitivity (up to -15%). Combined, the physiological
response to changing CO₂ and O₃ concentrations results in a net loss of land carbon over the twentieth century under the high plant O₃ sensitivity (-2%, Table 1), dominated by loss of soil carbon (Table S2). This reflects the large increases in tropospheric O₃ concentration observed over this period (Fig. 1). Under the low plant O₃ sensitivity, the land carbon sink has started to recover by 2001 (+1.5%) owing to the recovery of the soil carbon pool beyond 1901 values over this period (Table S2).

To gain perspective on the magnitude of the O₃ induced flux of carbon from the land to the atmosphere we relate changes in total land carbon to carbon emissions from fossil fuel combustion and cement production for the EU-28-plus countries from the data of Boden et al. (2013). We recognise that our simulation domain is slightly larger than the EU28-plus as it includes a small area of western Russia so direct comparisons cannot be made, but this still provides a useful measure of the size of the carbon flux. For the period 1970 to 1979 the simulated loss of carbon from the European terrestrial biosphere due to O₃ effects on vegetation physiology was on average 1.32 Pg C (high vegetation sensitivity) and 0.71 Pg C (low vegetation sensitivity) (Table 2). This O₃ induced reduced C uptake of the land surface is equivalent to around 8% to 16% of the emissions of carbon from fossil fuel combustion and cement production over the same period for the EU28-plus countries (Table 2). Current emissions data availability goes up to 2011, so over the last observable decade (2002 to 2011) this land carbon loss has declined but is still equivalent to 2% to 4% of the emissions of carbon from fossil fuels and cement production for the EU28-plus countries (Table 2). Therefore, the indirect O₃ effect on the land carbon sink potentially represents a significant additional source of anthropogenic carbon.

### 3.4.3 European simulations - Future Period: 2001-2050

Over the 2001 to 2050 period, region-wide GPP with O₃ only changing increased marginally (+0.1% to +0.2%, high and low plant O₃ sensitivity, Table 1), with a significant difference between the two plant O₃ sensitivities (t=57, df=6270 p<2.2e-16), although with large spatial variability (Fig. 4g & h). This reflects changes in tropospheric O₃ concentration as emission control policies reduce O₃ concentrations. Figures S24 and S45 show that despite decreased tropospheric O₃ concentrations by 2050 in summer compared to 2001 levels, all regions are exposed to an increase in O₃ over the wintertime, and some regions of Europe, particularly temperate/Mediterranean experience increases in O₃ concentration in spring and autumn. Therefore, although increased GPP (dominantly 10%, but up to 20% in some areas) on 2001 levels is simulated across large areas of Europe, decreases of up to 21% are simulated in some areas of the Mediterranean, up to 15% in some areas of the boreal region and up to 27% in the temperate zone (Fig. 4g & h). When O₃ and CO₂ effects are combined, simulated GPP increases (+15% to +18%, high/low plant O₃ sensitivities respectively, Table 1). This increase is greater than the enhancement simulated when CO₂ affects plant growth independently, because additional O₃ induced stomatal closure increases soil water availability in some regions, which enhances growth more in the O₃ and CO₂ simulations, compared to the CO₂ only run. Nevertheless, although the percentage gain is larger, the absolute value of GPP by 2050 remains lower compared to GPP with CO₂ only changing (Table S44).

Despite small increases in GPP in the O₃-only simulation, the land carbon sink continues to decline from 2001 levels (+0.7% to -1.6%, low and high plant O₃ sensitivity respectively, Table 1). This is because the soil and...
vegetation carbon pools continue to lose carbon as they adjust slowly to small changes in input (GPP), i.e. the soil carbon pool is not in equilibrium in 2001, and is declining in response to reduced litter input as a result of 20°C O₂ impacts on GPP. Nevertheless, the negative effect of O₂ on the future land sink is markedly reduced relative to the historical period. Figure 4e & f however highlights regional differences. Boreal regions and parts of central Europe see minimal O₂ damage, whereas some areas of southern and northern Europe see further losses of up to 8% on 2001 levels. The combined O₂ and CO₂ effects are dominated by the physiological effects of changing CO₂, with land carbon sink increases of up to 7% (Table 1).

3.5.4 European simulations - Anthropocene: 1901-2050

Over the Anthropocene, O₂ reduces GPP (-4% to -9%), with a significant difference between the low and high plant O₂ sensitivity (\( r = 0.95, d.f. = 6270, p = 2.2 \times 10^{-16} \)) and land carbon storage (-3% to -7%, Table 1, Fig. S139). Regionally, O₂ damage is lowest in the boreal zone, GPP decreases are largely between 5% to 8% / 2% to 4% for the high/low plant O₂ sensitivity respectively, with large areas minimally affected by O₂ damage (Figure 7a), consistent with lower gₛ of needle leaf trees that dominate this region, and so lower O₂ uptake (Fig. S140 & S152). In the temperate region, O₂ damage is extensive with reductions in GPP dominantly from 10% to 15% for the low and high plant O₂ sensitivity respectively. Across significant areas of this region reductions in GPP are up to 20% under high plant O₂ sensitivity (Figure 7a). In the Mediterranean region, O₂ damage reduces GPP by 5% to 15% / 3% to 6% for the high/low plant O₂ sensitivity respectively, with some areas seeing greater losses of up to 20% under the high plant O₂ sensitivity, but this is less extensive than that seen in the temperate zone (Figure 7a). In these drier regions, O₂ induced stomatal closure can increase available soil moisture (Fig. S140 & S152).

Varying CO₂ and O₂ together shows that CO₂ induced stomatal closure can help alleviate O₂ damage by reducing the uptake of O₂ (Table S65). In these simulations, CO₂-induced stomatal closure was found to offset O₂ suppression of GPP, such that GPP by 2050 is 3% to 7% lower due to O₂ exposure, rather than 4% to 9% lower in the absence of increasing CO₂ (Table S65). Figure 6 shows this spatially, O₂ damage is reduced when the effect of atmospheric CO₂ on stomatal closure is accounted for, however despite this, the land carbon sink and GPP remain significantly reduced due to O₂ exposure.

Over the Anthropocene, changing O₂ and CO₂ in tandem results in an increase in European land carbon uptake (+5% to +9%), and an increase in GPP (+20% to +23%) by 2050 for the high and low plant O₂ sensitivity, respectively (Table 1). Nevertheless, despite this increase there remains a large negative impact of O₂ on the European land carbon sink (Fig. S139). By 2050 the simulated enhancement of land carbon and GPP in response to elevated CO₂ alone is reduced by 3% to 6% (land carbon) and 4% to 9% (GPP) for the low and high plant O₂ sensitivity respectively, when O₂ is also accounted for (Table 1). This is a large significant reduction in the ability of the European terrestrial biosphere to sequester carbon.
Figure 4. Simulated percentage change in total carbon stocks (Land C) and gross primary productivity (GPP) due to O$_3$ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration. Changes are shown for the periods 1901 to 2001, and 2001 to 2050 for the high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity.

Figure 5. Simulated percentage change in plant available soil moisture (fsmc) due to O$_3$ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration. Changes are shown for the periods 1901 to 2001, and 2001 to 2050 for the high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity.
Figure 6. Simulated percentage change in stomatal conductance ($g_s$) due to O$_3$ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration. Changes are shown for the periods 1901 to 2001, and 2001 to 2050 for the high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity.
Figure 7. Simulated percentage change in total carbon stocks (Land C) and gross primary productivity (GPP) due to i) (a, e, i, m) O₃ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO₂ concentration (O₂), ii) (b, f, j, n) CO₂ fertilisation at fixed pre-industrial O₃ concentration (CO₂), iii) (c, g, k, o) the interaction between O₃ and CO₂ effects (CO₂ + O₃), iv) (d, h, l, p) O₃ effects with changing atmospheric CO₂ concentration (i.e. O₂ damage accounting for the effect of CO₂ induced stomatal closure; O₂(CO₂)). Changes are depicted for the periods 1901 to 2050 for high and lower ozone plant sensitivity.
### High Plant O$_3$ Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1901 - 2001</th>
<th>2001 - 2050</th>
<th>1901 - 2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-8.95</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>28.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1901 - 2001</th>
<th>2001 - 2050</th>
<th>1901 - 2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>19.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>26.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Low Plant O$_3$ Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1901 - 2001</th>
<th>2001 - 2050</th>
<th>1901 - 2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>26.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Simulated changes in the European land carbon cycle due to changing O$_3$ and CO$_2$ concentrations (independently and together). Shown are changes in total carbon stocks (Land C) and gross primary productivity (GPP), over three different periods (historical: 1901 to 2001, future: 2001 to 2050, and Anthropocene: 1901 to 2050). Absolute (top) and relative (bottom) differences are shown. For 2001 to 2050, please refer to Table S1, for the initial value for each run. See the SI for details of the estimation of the O$_3$ and CO$_2$ effects and their interaction.
Table 2. Simulated change in total land carbon due to O₃ damage with changing atmospheric CO₂ concentration for the two vegetation sensitivities. The sum of carbon emissions for each decade from fossil fuel combustion and cement production for the EU-28 countries plus Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Belarus, Serbia, Moldova, Norway, Turkey, Ukraine, Switzerland and Macedonia (EU28-plus) are shown, the data is from Boden et al., 2013. The simulated change in land carbon as a result of O₃ damage is depicted as a percentage of the EU28-plus emissions to demonstrate the magnitude of the additional source of carbon to the atmosphere from plant O₃ damage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modelled O₃ effect on land C sink:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher sensitivity</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of C emissions from fossil fuel combustion and cement production (Pg C):</strong></td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher sensitivity</td>
<td>-15.73</td>
<td>-11.70</td>
<td>-7.91</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>-3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low sensitivity</td>
<td>-8.46</td>
<td>-6.72</td>
<td>-4.08</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

4.1 Comparison of gs models

Comparison of the new gs model implemented in this study (MEDlyn et al., 2011) with the gs model currently used as standard in JULES (JACobs, 1994) revealed large differences in leaf-level gs for each PFT, principally as a result of the data-based parameterisation of the new model. Leaf-level water use increased for the broadleaf tree and C₃ herbaceous PFTs using the MEDlyn gs model compared to JACobs, but decreased for the needle leaf tree, C₄ herbaceous and shrub PFTs which displayed a more conservative water use strategy compared to the Jacobs parameterisation. These changes are in line with the work of De Kauwe et al. (2015) who found a reduction in annual transpiration for evergreen needle leaf, tundra and C₄ grass regions when implementing the Medlyn gs model into the Australian land surface scheme CABLE. Changes in leaf-level gs in this study resulted in differences in latent and sensible heat fluxes. Changes in the partitioning of energy fluxes at the land surface could potentially have consequences for the intensity of heatwaves (Cruz et al., 2010; Kala et al., 2016), runoff (Betts et al., 2007; Gedney et al., 2006) and rainfall patterns (de Arellano et al., 2012), although fully coupled simulations would be necessary to detect these effects. The differences in effect of the gs model on simulated gs stomatal conductance led to differences in the uptake of O₃ between the two gs models because the leaf-level rate of gs is the predominant determinant of the flux of O₃ through stomata. Higher O₃ uptake is indicative of greater damage. Therefore, given that C₃ herbaceous vegetation is the dominant land cover class across the European domain used...
in this study, this suggests a greater O₃ impact for Europe would be simulated with the MED eddy-$g$ model compared to JAC— and that studies using the Jacobs et al. formulation may underestimate the O₃ impact for Europe.

4.2 Lower than expected O₃ damage?

We compare results from the present study to values found in literature. The Witten et al. (2007) meta-analysis of temperate and boreal tree species showed future concentrations of O₃—predicted for 2050—significantly reduced leaf level light saturated net photosynthetic uptake (LCU, range 10% to 28%) and GPP (10% range 5% to 23%) on both broadleaf and needle leaf tree species. In the Feng et al. (2008) meta-analysis of short-projected O₃ concentrations for the future reduced aboveground biomass (−18%, CI 13% to −23%), photosynthesis rate (−20%) and gₑ (−22%). One of few long-term field-based O₃ exposure studies (AspenFACE) showed that after 13 years of exposing mature trees to elevated O₃ concentrations, O₃ decreased ecosystem carbon content (−9%), and decreased NPP (−10%), although the O₃ effect decreased through time (Talhelm et al., 2014). GPP was reduced (−12% to −40%) at two Mediterranean ecosystems (dominated by either Pinus species or Citrus species) studied by Feng et al. (2013). Biomass of mature beech trees was reduced (−4%) after 8 years of exposure to elevated O₃ (Matyssek et al., 2010a). After 5 years of O₃ exposure in a semi-natural grassland, annual biomass production was reduced (−23%), and in a Mediterranean annual pasture, O₃ exposure significantly reduced total aboveground biomass (up to −25%) (Calvete Sago et al., 2014). Results from the present study suggest projected O₃ concentrations for 2050 will reduce mean GPP for Europe (−11% to −16%), NPP (−14% to −18%), total carbon content (−13% to −72%) and gₑ (−4% to −9%). Using GPP as a proxy for gₑ (these variables are not identical but they are related), our mean GPP and gₑ estimates fall within the range given by the meta-analysis of Witten et al. (2007). The remaining studies are not meta-analyses, so site, site-specific, or species-specific, our estimates appear to compare more conservatively with these, however there are a mean value for Europe and spatially our estimates show greater variability.

The impact of O₃ on present day European GPP simulated in this study is slightly lower compared to previous modelled estimates. Our estimates suggest present day O₃ reduced GPP by 3% to 9% on average across Europe and NPP by 5% to 11% (Table S3). Anav et al. (2011) simulated a 22% reduction of GPP across Europe for 2002 using the ORCHIDEE model. Present day O₃ exposure reduced GPP by 10% to 25% in Europe, and 10.8% globally in the study by Lombardozzi et al. (2015) using the Community land model (CLM). O₃ reduced NPP by 11.2% in Europe from 1989 to 1995 using the Terrestrial Ecosystem Model (TEM) (Felzer et al., 2005). Globally, concentrations of O₃ predicted for 2100 reduced GPP by 14% to 23% using a faster parameterisation of O₃ sensitivity in JULES (Sitch et al., 2007). The recent study by Franz et al. (2017) showed mean GPP declined by 4.7% over the period 2001 to 2010 using the OCN model over the same European domain used in this study. These similar lower—lower than expected—results are likely the result of using the same domain, and, more importantly, O₃ forcing produced by the same model (EMEP MSC-W).

4.3 Impacts of O₃ at the land surface

In this study, O₃ has a detrimental effect on the size of the land carbon sink for Europe. This is primarily through a decrease in the size of the soil carbon pool as a result of reduced litter input to the soil, consistent with reduced GPP/NPP. Field studies show that in some regions of Europe, soil carbon stocks are decreasing (Bellamy et al.,
itrogen availability.

3. We fully acknowledge is that we have assumed would be optimally ferti-

sensitive crop species. As with all uncoupled modelling studies, a change in g and flux will impact the O3 concentration itself. Therefore adopting the Medlyn formulation with a higher g and subsequently higher O3 flux for broadleaf and C3 PFTs (Fig 2) would lead to reduced O3 concentration, which in turn would act to dampen the effect of higher g on O3 flux. Essentially this study provides an ‘upper bound’ as in the high plant O3 sensitivity scenario, all C3/C4 fractional cover uses the wheat O3 sensitivity. Additionally, this version of JULES does not have a crop module; it has no land management practices such as harvesting, ploughing or crop rotation – processes which may have counteracting effects on the land carbon sink. Further, without a coupled Carbon and Nitrogen cycle, it is likely that the CO2 fertilisation response of GPP and the land carbon sink is over estimated in some regions of our simulations since nitrogen availability limits terrestrial carbon sequestration of natural ecosystems in the temperate and boreal zone (Zaehle, 2013). This would have consequences for our modelled O3 impact, particularly into the future where the large CO2 fertilisation effect was responsible for partly offsetting the negative impact of O3. Although in our simulations a high fraction of land cover is agricultural which we assume would be optimally fertilised. Nevertheless, we emphasise that this study provides a sensitivity assessment of the impact of plant O3 damage on GPP and the land carbon sink.

Another caveat we fully acknowledge is that at the leaf-level JULES is parameterised to reduce g, with O3 exposure. Whilst this response is commonly observed (Wittig et al., 2007; Ainsworth et al., 2012), there is evidence to suggest that O3 impairs stomata in some species, making them non-responsive to environmental stimuli (Hayes et al., 2012; Hoshika et al., 2012a; Mills et al., 2009; Paolletti and Grulke, 2010). In drought conditions the mechanism is thought to involve O3 stimulated ethylene production which interferes with the stomatal response to ABA signalling (Wilkinson and Davies, 2009; Wilkinson and Davies, 2010). Such stomatal sluggishness can...
result in higher O$_3$ uptake and injury, increased water-loss, and therefore greater vulnerability to environmental stresses (Mills et al., 2016). McLaughlin (2007a, 2007b) and Sun et al. (2012) provide evidence of increased transpiration and reduced streamflow in forests at the regional scale in response to ambient levels of O$_3$, and suggest this could increase the frequency and severity of droughts. (Hoshika et al., 2012b)

However, there is an important area of future work. The calculation of O$_3$ deposition in the EMEP model uses the stomatal conductance formulation presented in Emberson et al. (2000, 2001), which depends on temperature, light, humidity and soil moisture (commonly referred to as DO$_3$SE). Because we link two different model systems, the $g_s$ values in the EMEP model differ from those obtained using the Medlyn formulation. We acknowledge this inconsistency as a caveat of our study, however comparison of $g_{max}$ (maximum $g_s$) values from both models (EMEP and JULES) suggests the differences are small for deciduous forest (EMEP 150-200, JULES ~180, all units in mmole O$_3$/m$^2$ (PLA)/s), and C$_3$/C$_4$ crops (EMEP 270-300, JULES ~260-390 – the dominant land cover in our simulations), but are larger for coniferous forest (EMEP 140-200, JULES ~60-70) and shrubs (EMEP 60-200, JULES 360-390). The role of EMEP in this study is not to provide $g_s$ directly, but to provide O$_3$ at the top of the vegetation canopy. The main driver of such O$_3$ levels is the regional-scale production and transport of O$_3$ and the main impact of $g_s$ is in affecting the vertical O$_3$ gradients just above the plant canopy. Differences in $g_s$ are known to have minimal impact on canopy-top O$_3$ for trees, mainly due to the efficient turbulent mixing above tall canopies, but also due to non-stomatal sink processes. For shorter vegetation, substantial O$_3$ gradients, driven by deposition, occur in the lowest 10s of metres of the atmosphere, and stomatal sinks (as given by $g_s$) can have a significant role. However, calculations of such gradients made with the EMEP model for CLRTAP (2017) showed that differences amounted to only ca. 10% when comparing O$_3$ concentrations at 1m height above high $g_s$ crops compared to moderate $g_s$ ($g_{max}$ ~ 450 and 270 mmole O$_3$/m$^2$ (PLA)/s respectively); therefore this uncertainty is small.

These offline simulations show the sensitivity of GPP and the land carbon sink to tropospheric O$_3$, suggesting that O$_3$ is an important predictor of future GPP and the land carbon store across Europe. There are uncertainties in our estimates however from the use of uncoupled tropospheric chemistry, meteorology and stomatal function. For example, increased frequency of drought in the future would reduce stomatal conductance (assuming no sluggish stomatal response) and thus O$_3$ uptake. Since our offline simulations do not include this feedback it is possible the O$_3$ effect is over estimated here. Given the complexity of potential interactions and feedbacks it remains difficult to diagnose the importance of individual factors (e.g. the direct physiological response) in a fully coupled simulation. Once the importance of a process is demonstrated offline, it provides evidence of the need to incorporate such process in coupled regional and global simulations.
4.4 $O_3$ as a missing component of carbon cycle assessments?

Comprehensive analyses of the European carbon balance suggest a large significant biogenic carbon sink (Janssens et al., 2003; Luyssaert et al., 2012; Schulze et al., 2009). However, estimates are hampered by large uncertainties in key components of the land carbon balance, such as estimates of soil carbon gains and losses (Ciais et al., 2010; Janssens et al., 2003; Schulze et al., 2009; Schulze et al., 2010). We suggest that the effect of $O_3$ on plant physiology is a contributing factor to the decline in soil carbon stores observed across Europe, and as such this $O_3$ effect is a missing component of European carbon cycle assessments. Over the Anthropocene, our results show elevated $O_3$ concentrations reduce the amount of carbon that can be stored in the soil by 3% to 9% (low and high plant $O_3$ sensitivity, respectively), which almost completely offsets the beneficial effects of $CO_2$ fertilisation on soil carbon storage under the high plant $O_3$ sensitivity. This would contribute to a significant change in the size of a key carbon sink for Europe, and is particularly important when we consider the evolution of the land carbon sink into the future given the impact of $O_3$ on soil carbon sequestration and the high uncertainty of future tropospheric $O_3$ concentrations. Schulze et al. (2009) and Luyssaert et al. (2012) extended their analysis of the European carbon balance to include additional non-$CO_2$ greenhouse gases (CH$_4$ and N$_2$O). Both studies found that emissions of these offset the biogenic carbon sink, reducing the climate mitigation potential of European ecosystems. This highlights the importance of accounting for all fluxes and stores in carbon/greenhouse gas balance assessments, of which $O_3$ and its indirect effect on the $CO_2$ flux via direct effects on plant physiology is currently missing.

4.5 The interaction between $O_3$ and $CO_2$

We looked at the interaction between $CO_2$ and $O_3$ effects. Our results support the hypothesis that elevated atmospheric $CO_2$ provides some protection against $O_3$ damage because of lower $g_s$ that reduces uptake of $O_3$ through stomata (Harmens et al., 2007; Wittig et al., 2007). In the present study, reductions in GPP and the land carbon store due to $O_3$ exposure were lower when simulated with concurrent changes in atmospheric $CO_2$. Despite acclimation of photosynthesis after long-term exposure to elevated atmospheric $CO_2$ of field grown plants (Ainsworth and Long, 2005; Medlyn et al., 1999), there is no evidence to suggest that $g_s$ acclimates (Ainsworth et al., 2003; Medlyn et al., 2001). This suggests the protective effect of elevated atmospheric $CO_2$ against $O_3$ damage will be sustained in the long term. However, although meta-analysis suggest a general trend of reduced $g_s$ with elevated $CO_2$ (Ainsworth and Long, 2005; Medlyn et al., 1999), this is not a universal response. Stomatal responses on exposure to elevated $CO_2$ with FACE treatment varied with genotype and growth stage in a fast-growing poplar community (Bernacchi et al., 2003; Tricker et al., 2009). In other mature forest stands, limited stomatal response to elevated $CO_2$ was observed after canopy closure (Ellsworth, 1999; Uddling et al., 2009). Also, some studies found that stomatal responses to $CO_2$ were significant only under high atmospheric humidity (Cech et al., 2003; Leuizinger and Körner, 2007; Wallischleger et al., 2002). These examples illustrate that stomatal responses to elevated atmospheric $CO_2$ are not universal, and as such the protective effect of $CO_2$ against $O_3$ injury cannot be assumed for all species, at all growth stages under wide ranging environmental conditions.

5 Conclusion
What is abundantly clear is that plant responses to both CO₂ and O₃ are complicated by a host of factors that are only partly understood, and it remains difficult to identify general, global patterns given that effects of both gases on plant communities and ecological interactions are highly context and species specific (Ainsworth and Long, 2005; Fuhrer et al., 2016; Matyssek et al., 2010b). This study quantifies the sensitivity of the land carbon sink for Europe and GPP to changing concentrations of atmospheric CO₂ and O₃ from 1901 to 2050. We have used a state of the art land surface model calibrated for European vegetation to give our best estimates of this sensitivity within the limits of data availability to calibrate the model for O₃ sensitivity, current knowledge and model structure. In summary, this study has shown that potential gains in terrestrial carbon sequestration over Europe resulting from elevated CO₂ can be partially offset by concurrent rises in tropospheric O₃ over 1901-2050. Specifically, we have shown that the negative effect of O₃ on the land carbon sink was greatest over the twentieth century, when O₃ concentrations increased rapidly from pre-industrial levels. Over this period soil carbon stocks were significantly diminished over agricultural areas, consistent with reduced NPP and litter input. This loss of soil carbon was largely responsible for the decrease in the size of the land carbon sink over Europe. The O₃ effect on the land carbon store and flux was reduced into the future as CO₂ concentration rose considerably and changes in O₃ concentration were less pronounced. However, there remained a large cumulative negative impact on the land carbon sink for Europe by 2050. The interaction between the two gases was found to reduce O₃ injury owing to reduced stomatal opening in elevated atmospheric CO₂. However, primary productivity and land carbon storage remained significantly suppressed by 2050 due to plant O₃ damage. Expressed as a percentage of the emissions from fossil fuel and cement production for the EU28-plus countries, the additional carbon emissions from O₃-induced plant injury are a potential significant additional source of anthropogenic carbon previously not accounted for in carbon cycle assessments. Our results demonstrate the sensitivity of modelled terrestrial carbon dynamics to the direct effect of tropospheric O₃ and its interaction with atmospheric CO₂ on plant physiology, demonstrating this process is an important predictor of future GPP and trends in the land-carbon sink. Nevertheless, this process remains largely unconsidered in regional and global climate model simulations that are used to model carbon sources and sinks and carbon-climate feedbacks, highlighting that such effects of O₃ on plant physiology significantly add to the uncertainty of future trends in the land-carbon sink and climate-carbon feedbacks. Given the potential to limit the climate mitigation effect of European terrestrial ecosystems, we suggest plant O₃ damage should be incorporated into carbon cycle assessments.

Data availability

The JULES model can be downloaded from the Met Office Science Repository Service (https://code.metoffice.gov.uk/trac/jules - see here for a helpful how to http://jules.jchmr.org/content/getting-started). Model output data presented in this paper and the exact version of JULES with namelists are available upon request from the corresponding author.
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Supplementary Information

S1 Fractional cover of JULES PFTs

**Figure S1.** Fractional cover of each JULES PFT and bare soil at 0.5° x 0.5° resolution.

S2 Calibration of O₃ uptake model for European vegetation

Here we use the latest literature on O₃ dose-response relationships derived from observed field data across Europe (CLRTAP, 2017) to calculate the key PFT-specific parameters. Data comes from the UNECE CLRTAP (2017) report which is a synthesis of the latest peer reviewed literature, collated by a panel of experts and so is considered the state-of-the-art knowledge. Each PFT was calibrated for a high and low plant O₃ sensitivity to account for uncertainty in the sensitivity of different plant species to O₃ using the approach of Sitch et al., (2007). In addition, where possible owing to available data, a distinction was made for Mediterranean regions. This was because the work of Bäker et al. (2015) showed that different O₃ dose-response relationships are needed to describe the O₃ sensitivity of dominant Mediterranean trees. For the C₃ herbaceous PFT – the dominant land cover type across the European domain in this study (Fig. S1) - the O₃ sensitivity was calibrated against observations for wheat to give a representation of agricultural regions (high plant O₃ sensitivity), versus natural grassland (low plant O₃ sensitivity), with a separate function for Mediterranean grasslands (low plant O₃ sensitivity), all taken from CLRTAP (2017). Tree/shrub PFTs were calibrated against observed O₃ dose-response functions for the high plant O₃ sensitivity (BT = Birch/Beech, BT-Med = deciduous oaks, NT = Norway spruce, shrub = Birch/Beech) all...
from CLRTAP (2017). The low plant O\textsubscript{3} sensitivity functions for trees/shrubs were calibrated as being 20 \% less sensitive based on the difference in sensitivity between high and low sensitive tree species in the Karlsson et al. (2007) study. Due to limitations in data availability, the shrub parameterisation uses the observed dose-response functions for broadleaf trees. Similarly, the parameterisation for C\textsubscript{4} herbaceous uses the observed dose-responses for C\textsubscript{3} herbaceous, however the fractional cover of C\textsubscript{4} herbs across Europe is low (Fig. S1), so this assumption affects a very small percentage of land cover. See Table S1 and Figure S2.

To calibrate the O\textsubscript{3} uptake model for the fast carbon fluxes, e.g. net primary productivity (NPP), JULES was run across Europe forced using the WFDEI observational climate dataset (Weedon, 2013) at 0.5° X 0.5° spatial and three hour temporal resolution. JULES uses interpolation to disaggregate the forcing data down from 3 hours to an hourly model time step. The model was spun-up over the period 1979 to 1999 with a fixed atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} concentration of 368.33 ppm (1999 value from Mauna Loa observations, (Tans and Keeling)). Zero tropospheric O\textsubscript{3} concentration was assumed for the control simulation, for the simulations with O\textsubscript{3}, spin-up used spatially explicit fields of present day O\textsubscript{3} concentration produced using the UK Chemistry and Aerosol (UKCA) model with standard chemistry from the run evaluated by O’Connor et al. (2014). A fixed land cover map was used based on IGBP (International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme) land cover classes (IGBP-DIS), therefore as the vegetation distribution was fixed and the calibration was not looking at carbon stores, a short spin-up was adequate to equilibrate soil temperature and soil moisture. JULES was then run for year 2000 with a corresponding CO\textsubscript{2} concentration of 369.52 ppm (from Mauna Loa observations, (Tans and Keeling)) and monthly fields of spatially explicit tropospheric O\textsubscript{3} (O’Connor et al., 2014) as necessary.

Calibration was performed using four simulations: with i) zero tropospheric O\textsubscript{3} concentration, this was the control simulation (NPP\textsubscript{control}), ii) tropospheric O\textsubscript{3} at current ambient concentration (NPP\textsubscript{O3}), iii) ambient +20 ppb (NPP\textsubscript{O3+20}) and iv) ambient +40 ppb (NPP\textsubscript{O3+40}). The different O\textsubscript{3} simulations (i.e. ambient, ambient + 20 and ambient + 40 ppb) were used to capture the range of O\textsubscript{3} conditions used in constructing the observed O\textsubscript{3} dose-response relationships deployed for calibration, often these had been constructed under artificially manipulated conditions of ambient + 40 ppb O\textsubscript{3} for example. For each simulation with O\textsubscript{3}, JULES used the observed PFT-specific threshold value of O\textsubscript{3} uptake (i.e. parameter F\textsubscript{O3crit}), and an initial estimate of the parameter ‘a’ (equation 2). For each PFT and each simulation, hourly estimates of NPP and O\textsubscript{3} uptake for the top sunlit leaf in excess of F\textsubscript{O3crit} were accumulated over a PFT dependent accumulation (i.e. ~6 months for broadleaf trees and shrubs, all year for needle leaf trees, and ~3 months for herbaceous species, through the growing season). Change in total NPP over the accumulation period (NPP\textsubscript{O3+20}/+40 divided by NPP\textsubscript{control}) was calculated for each O\textsubscript{3} simulation and plotted against the cumulative uptake of O\textsubscript{3} over the same period. The linear regression of this relationship was calculated, and slope and intercept compared against the observed dose-response relationships. Values of the parameter ‘a’ were adjusted, and the procedure repeated until the linear regression through the simulation points matched that of the observations (Fig. S2). JULES is run to be as comparable as possible to the dose-based O\textsubscript{3} risk indicator used in CLRTAP (2017), as only the O\textsubscript{3} flux to top of canopy sunlit leaves is accumulated (i.e. the O\textsubscript{3} flux per projected leaf area). See Table S1 Figure S2.
Figure S2. Calibration of JULES for O₃ impacts on plant productivity for each JULES PFT; a) broadleaf tree – temperate/boreal, b) broadleaf tree Mediterranean, c) Needle leaf tree, d) C₃ herbaceous (split into temperate/boreal and Mediterranean for the natural grasslands), e) C₄ herbaceous (split into temperate/boreal and Mediterranean for the natural grasslands), and f) shrub. High (red) and low (blue) plant O₃ sensitivities are shown. For the herbaceous PFTs the low sensitivity calibration is separate for Mediterranean regions (black). The solid line is the regression line through the modelled points, the dashed line is the regression line from the observed dose-response relationship. The x axis is cumulative uptake of O₃ (CUO) above the critical O₃ threshold ($F_{O3crit}$).
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Table S1. PFT-specific parameter values used in the O₃ uptake and gₛ formulation in JULES. \( F_{O3\text{crit}} \) is the critical \( O₃ \) threshold above which damage occurs, \( a \) determines the reduction in photosynthesis with \( O₃ \) exposure, and ‘function’ shows the regression equation for the observed functions (\( x \) is \( F_{O3\text{crit}} \), \( dq\text{crit} \) (kg kg\(^{-1}\)) is a PFT specific.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFT</th>
<th>High Sensitivity</th>
<th>Low Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F_{O3\text{crit}} ) (nmol/m(^2)/s)</td>
<td>( a ) (mmol/m(^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F_{O3\text{crit}} ) (nmol/m(^2)/s)</td>
<td>( a ) (mmol/m(^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT - Med.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Med.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Med.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parameters representing the critical humidity deficit at the leaf surface (used in the default JULES gs model), $f_0$ is the leaf internal to atmospheric $\text{CO}_2$ ratio ($c_i/c_a$) at the leaf specific humidity deficit (also used in the default JULES gs model), and $g_1$ is the PFT specific parameter of the Medlyn et al., (2011) gs model. The parameters $dq_{crit}$, $f_0$ and $g_1$ vary by PFT, but not by O$_3$ sensitivity so are only shown once here.

Figure S3. (a-d) 1901 seasonal mean (DJF, MAM, JJA, SON) O$_3$ concentration (ppb) from EMEP for woody (tree and shrub) PFTs; (e-h) change in seasonal O$_3$ concentration (%) from 1901 to 2001; (i-l) change in seasonal O$_3$ concentration (%) from 2001 to 2050.
**Figure S4.** (a-d) 1901 seasonal mean (DJF, MAM, JJA, SON) O₃ concentration (ppb) from EMEP for herbaceous PFTs; (e-h) change in seasonal O₃ concentration (%) from 1901 to 2001; (i-l) change in seasonal O₃ concentration (%) from 2001 to 2050.

**Figure S5.** Regions, blue is Boreal, green is Temperate, red is Mediterranean.
Here we assess the impact of \( g_s \) model formulation, comparing the standard JULES Jacobs (1994) formulation (equation 6; JAC) with the alternative Medlyn et al., (2011) formulation (equation 7; MED). This was done for two contrasting grid points (wet/dry) in central Europe with a fixed fractional cover of 20% for each PFT.

JULES was spun-up for 20 years (1979-1999) at two grid points in central Europe representing a wet (lat: 48.25; lon: 5.25) and a dry site (lat: 38.25; lon: -7.75). The modelled soil moisture stress factor (fsmc) at the wet site ranged from 0.8 to 1.0 over the year 2000 (1.0 indicates no soil moisture stress), and at the dry site fsmc steadily declined from 0.8 at the start of the year to 0.25 by the end of the summer. The WFDEI meteorological forcing dataset was used (Weedon, 2013), along with atmospheric CO\(_2\) concentration for the year 1999 (368.33 ppm), and either no O\(_3\) (i.e. the O\(_3\) damage model was switched off) for the control simulations, or spatially explicit fields of present day O\(_3\) concentration produced using the UK Chemistry and Aerosol (UKCA) model from the run evaluated by O'Connor et al. (2014) for the simulations with O\(_3\). Following the spin-up period, JULES was run for one year (2000) with corresponding atmospheric CO\(_2\) concentration, and tropospheric O\(_3\) concentrations as described above. The control and ozone simulations were performed for both JAC and MED model formulations.

Land cover for the spin-up and main run was fixed at 20% for each PFT. For the simulations including O\(_3\) damage, the high plant O\(_3\) sensitivity parameterisation was used. The difference between these simulations was used to assess the impact of \( g_s \) model formulation on the leaf level fluxes of carbon and water.

We calculate and report in the main manuscript (results section 3.1), the difference in mean annual leaf-level water-use that results from the above simulation using the different \( g_s \) models. For each day of the simulation we calculate the percentage difference in water-use between the two simulations, we then calculate the mean and standard deviation over the year to give the annual mean leaf-level water-use.
Figure S6. Comparison of the Medlyn et al. (2011) g_s model (y axis) versus the Jacobs (1994) g_s model (x axis) currently used in JULES for all five JULES PFTs, for stomatal conductance (gs, top row) and the flux of O_3 through the stomata (flux_o3, bottom row) for a dry site.
**Figure S7.** Comparison of the Medlyn et al., (2011) $g_s$ model (y axis) versus the Jacobs (1994) $g_s$ model (x axis) currently used in JULES for all five JULES PFTs at a wet site, for net photosynthesis ($A_{net}$, top row). Residual plots (Medlyn - Jacobs) show the difference between models over the year for latent heat (le, middle row) and sensible heat (h, bottom row).

**Figure S8.** Comparison of the Medlyn et al., (2011) $g_s$ model (y axis) versus the Jacobs (1994) $g_s$ model (x axis) currently used in JULES for all five JULES PFTs at a dry site, for net photosynthesis ($A_{net}$, top row). Residual plots (Medlyn - Jacobs) show the difference between models over the year for latent heat (le, middle row) and sensible heat (h, bottom row).

### Site level evaluation of $g_s$ models

We carried out site-level simulations using sites from the FLUXNET2015 dataset to evaluate the seasonal cycle of latent and sensible heat using the two $g_s$ models JAC and MED compared to observations. Sites were selected to represent a range of land cover types (Table S2). In general, at all sites the MED model improved the seasonal cycle of both fluxes (lower RMSE), but the magnitude of this varied from site to site. At the deciduous broadleaf site US-UMB, MED resulted in large improvements of the simulated seasonal cycle particularly in the summer months for both fluxes. At the second deciduous broadleaf site IT-CA1 however, there was almost no difference.
between the two g_ models. Both evergreen needleleaf forest sites (FI-Hyy and DE-Tha) saw large improvements
in the simulated seasonal cycles of latent and sensible heat with the MED model, primarily as a result of lower
latent heat flux in the spring and summer months, and higher sensible heat flux over the same period. With the
MED model the monthly mean latent heat flux was improved at the C_3 grass site (CH-Cha) as a result of increased
flux in the summer months, however there was no improvement in the sensible heat flux and RMSE with MED
was increased. At the C_4 grass site (US-SRG), small improvements were made in the seasonal cycle of both latent
and sensible heat with the MED model. At the deciduous savannah site (CG-Tch) which included a high
proportion of shrub PFT in the land cover type used in the site simulation, large improvements in the seasonal
cycle of both fluxes were simulated with the MED model, as a result of a decrease in the latent heat flux and an
increase in the sensible heat flux.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Simulated years</th>
<th>Land cover</th>
<th>Dominant PFT(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-UMB</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>-84.71</td>
<td>2000-2014</td>
<td>Broadleaf forest</td>
<td>100% BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-CA1</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td>Broadleaf forest</td>
<td>100% BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI-Hyy</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1996-2014</td>
<td>Needleleaf forest</td>
<td>100% NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE-Tha</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>1996-2014</td>
<td>Needleleaf forest</td>
<td>100% NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-Cha</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>2006-2014</td>
<td>C3 grassland</td>
<td>80% C3, 20% bare soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-SRG</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>-110.83</td>
<td>2008-2014</td>
<td>C4 grassland</td>
<td>80% C4, 20% bare soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-Tch</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
<td>Deciduous savanna</td>
<td>soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table S2.* Sites from the FLUXNET2015 dataset used in the site simulations to evaluate gr models.
Fig. S9 Monthly mean fluxes of latent and sensible heat. Observations ± standard deviation from FLUXNET2015 sites are shown as black line with grey vertical bars, JULES with the JAC gs model is shown in red and JULES with the MED gs model are shown in purple. Also shown are the root mean squared error (rmse) for each simulation.
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Figure S10. Mean GPP (g C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) from 1991 to 2001 for a) the observations based globally extrapolated Flux Network model tree ensemble (MTE) (Jung et al., 2011); b, c) model simulations with transient CO$_2$ and fixed O$_3$; d, e) model simulations with fixed CO$_2$ and transient O$_3$; and f, g) our model simulations with transient CO$_2$ and transient O$_3$. All model simulations show GPP for high and low plant O$_3$ sensitivity respectively.
Figure S11. Zonal mean GPP from 1991 to 2001 for FLUXNET-MTE (Jung) and all JULES scenario simulations with both high (solid lines) and low (dashed lines) plant O₃ sensitivity.
Figure S12. Mean GPP from 1991 to 2001 shown by region, comparing MTE (Jung) and all JULES scenario simulations with both high and low plant O₃ sensitivity.

Estimation of effects due to O₃, CO₂ and O₃ with CO₂

For each variable analysed (GPP, NPP, vegetation carbon, soil carbon, total land carbon and gs), we use the mean over 10 years to represent each time period, e.g. the mean over 2040 to 2050 is what we call 2050, 1901 to 1910 is what we refer to as 1901. The difference between the simulations gives the effect of O₃ and CO₂ either separately or in combination over the different time periods. We look at the percentage change due to either O₃ at pre-industrial CO₂ concentration (i.e. without the additional effect of atmospheric CO₂ on stomatal behaviour), CO₂ (at fixed pre-industrial O₃ concentration) or the combined effect of both gases, which is calculated as:

\[
100 \times \frac{\text{var}[y_1] - \text{var}[y_2]}{\text{var}[y_2]}
\]

(S1)

Where var[y₁] represents the variable in time period y, e.g. \(100 \times (\text{varO₃}[2050] - \text{varO₃}[1901]) / \text{varO₃}[1901]\) gives the O₃ effect (at fixed CO₂) over the full experimental period. The meteorological forcing is prescribed in...
these simulations and is therefore the same between the model runs. Other climate factors, such as VPD, temperature and soil moisture availability are accounted for in our simulations, but our analysis isolates the effects of O₃, CO₂ and O₃ + CO₂.

**Figure S13.** Times series (1901 to 2050) of changes in total carbon stocks (Land C) and gross primary productivity (GPP) due to O₃ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO₂ concentration (O₃, blue), CO₂ effects at fixed pre-industrial O₃ concentration (CO₂, black), and effects of CO₂ and O₃ together (CO₂+O₃, red), for the higher and lower plant O₃ sensitivity. The horizontal dashed line shows the pre-industrial value, and the vertical dashed line marks the year 2001.
Figure S14. Simulated percentage change in stomatal conductance (gs) a–c), soil moisture availability factor (fsmc) d–e) and leaf area index (LAI) g–i) due to O₃ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO₂ concentration (O₃), CO₂ effects at fixed pre-industrial O₃ concentration (CO₂), and effects of CO₂ and O₃ changing simultaneously (CO₂+O₃). Changes are shown for the periods 1901 to 2050 for the higher plant O₃ sensitivity.
Figure S15. Simulated percentage change in stomatal conductance (gs) a-c), soil moisture availability factor (fsmc) d-e) and leaf area index (LAI) g-i) due to O$_3$ effects at fixed pre-industrial atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration (O$_3$), CO$_2$ effects at fixed pre-industrial O$_3$ concentration (CO$_2$), and effects of CO$_2$ and O$_3$ changing simultaneously (CO$_2$+O$_3$). Changes are shown for the periods 1901 to 2050 for the lower plant O$_3$ sensitivity.
Table S3. Simulated changes in the European land carbon cycle due to changing O<sub>3</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Shown are changes in total carbon stocks (Land C), split into vegetation (Veg C) and soil (Soil C) carbon, and gross primary productivity (GPP), net primary productivity (NPP) and conductance (g<sub>s</sub>), between 1901 and 2001.

### Future run, constant climate (1901 - 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hi Sensitivity</th>
<th>Lower Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPP (Pg C yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>NPP (Pg C yr&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;+O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative diff. (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-8.95</td>
<td>-10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>17.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;+O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S4. Simulated changes in the European land carbon cycle due to changing $O_3$ and CO$_2$ concentrations. Shown are changes in total carbon stocks (Land C), split into vegetation (Veg C) and soil (Soil C) carbon, and gross primary productivity (GPP), net primary productivity (NPP) and conductance ($g_s$), between 2001 and 2050.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPP</th>
<th>NPP</th>
<th>$g_s$</th>
<th>Veg C</th>
<th>Soil C</th>
<th>Land C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value in 2001:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.02952</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>116.71</td>
<td>157.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.03032</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>127.32</td>
<td>171.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.02787</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>120.25</td>
<td>163.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2050 - 2001):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative diff. (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>-13.89</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>-11.37</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in 2001:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>123.02</td>
<td>163.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>130.1</td>
<td>173.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.02991</td>
<td>43.31</td>
<td>126.69</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2050 - 2001):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative diff. (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>-14.64</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>-13.37</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S5. Simulated changes in the European land carbon cycle due to changing O$_3$ and CO$_2$ concentrations. Shown are changes in total carbon stocks (Land C), split into vegetation (Veg C) and soil (Soil C) carbon, and gross primary productivity (GPP), net primary productivity (NPP) and conductance ($g_s$), between 1901 and 2050.

Future run, constant climate (1901 - 2050)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPP (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>NPP (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$g_s$ (m/s)</th>
<th>Veg C (Pg C)</th>
<th>Soil C (Pg C)</th>
<th>Land C (Pg C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hi Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.03228</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute diff. (2050 - 1901):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-11.44</td>
<td>-11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative diff. (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
<td>-10.54</td>
<td>-8.55</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-9.09</td>
<td>-6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>28.51</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>-19.11</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>-23.48</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPP (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>NPP (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$g_s$ (m/s)</th>
<th>Veg C (Pg C)</th>
<th>Soil C (Pg C)</th>
<th>Land C (Pg C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in 1901:</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.03319</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>167.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute diff. (2050 - 1901):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-4.32</td>
<td>-4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>19.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative diff. (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>-4.28</td>
<td>-5.81</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>-20.10</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ + O$_3$</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>-21.93</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPP_hi</td>
<td>GPP_low</td>
<td>LandC_hi</td>
<td>LandC_low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value in 1901:</strong></td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>167.00</td>
<td>167.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value in 2050:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>184.22</td>
<td>187.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>155.35</td>
<td>162.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ + O₃</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>174.83</td>
<td>182.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† % change due to O₃ at PI CO₂</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
<td>-4.28</td>
<td>-6.98</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ % change due to O₃ at high CO₂</td>
<td>-6.79</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>-5.10</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†† Alleviation of O₃ damage by CO₂ increase [%]</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S6.** Percentage reduction in simulated GPP and Land C by 2050 due to future O₃ effects at pre-industrial (PI) CO₂ concentration, and under increasing future CO₂ concentration. The difference between these defines the alleviation of the O₃ effect by CO₂. O₃ = Fixed 1901 CO₂; Varying O₃; CO₂ = Varying CO₂; Fixed 1901 O₃; CO₂ + O₃ = Varying CO₂; Varying O₃. Calculated as: † O₃ effect with fixed pre-industrial CO₂: 100*(fixCO₂_varO₃[2050] - value[1901])/value[1901], where value[1901] represents the hypothetical value at 2050 from a run with fixCO₂_fixO₃ which is equivalent to the initial state, i.e. the value in 1901; ‡ O₃ effect with increasing CO₂: 100*(varCO₂_varO₃[2050] - varCO₂_fixO₃[2050])/varCO₂_fixO₃[2050]; †† the alleviation of O₃ damage by CO₂ is the difference between the two runs: † ‡.
This work used eddy covariance data acquired and shared by the FLUXNET community, including these networks: AmeriFlux, AfriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, CarboEuropeIP, CarboItaly, CarboMont, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada, GreenGrass, ICOS, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux-TERN, TCOS-Siberia, and USCCC. The ERA-Interim reanalysis data are provided by ECMWF and processed by LSCE. The FLUXNET eddy covariance data processing and harmonization was carried out by the European Fluxes Database Cluster, AmeriFlux Management Project, and Fluxdata project of FLUXNET, with the support of CDIAC and ICOS Ecosystem Thematic Center, and the OzFlux, ChinaFlux and AsiaFlux offices.
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