Declaration

This thesis has been composed by myself from the results of my own work, except where stated otherwise, and has not been submitted in any other application for a degree.

Patrick Meir
April, 1996.
To all my family,

for their unconditional love and support.

Everthing that man esteems
Endures a moment or a day.
Love’s pleasure drives his love away,
The painter’s brush consumes his dreams;
The herald’s cry, the soldier’s tread
Exhaust his glory and his might:
Whatever flames upon the night
Man’s own resinous heart has fed

from 'The Resurrection'
William Butler Yeats, 1931
Abstract

This study investigated the structure of, and carbon dioxide fluxes at, a 'primary' rain forest in SW Amazonia, Brazil (PRF), and a disturbed secondary rain forest in SW Cameroon (SRF). The total above-ground biomass and leaf area index (LAI) at PRF were respectively 220 (±95% c.l. 48) Mg ha\(^{-1}\) and 4.0 (±95% c.l. 0.7) m\(^2\) m\(^{-2}\), and at SRF 90 (±95% c.l. 9.4) Mg ha\(^{-1}\) and 4.4 (±95% c.l. 0.9) m\(^2\) m\(^{-2}\).

A novel method was devised to quantify the vertical profile in LAI: SRF was distinguished from PRF by a higher concentration of leaf area near the ground.

Three methods were used to determine the flux of CO\(_2\) from soil and gave overall agreement (static and dynamic chambers, and eddy covariance). The mean soil efflux in PRF and SRF was respectively 5.5 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (±95% c.l. 0.2; n = 42) and 4.5 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (±95% c.l. 0.2; n = 178) at 20 - 24 °C. The temperature response was higher in PRF than SRF (\(Q_{10}\) = 2.3 vs 1.9). Soil efflux rates were also obtained from cerrado vegetation in central Brazil, where the efflux was 3.2 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (±95% c.l. 0.2; n = 10) and the \(Q_{10}\) 1.6, at 16 - 23 °C. Heterogeneity in emissions was higher in SRF than in PRF and could be described by a non-linear model incorporating the variables: soil temperature, organic carbon and total nitrogen (\(r^2 = 0.82\)). Carbon was the most important variable determining respiration in SRF; soil moisture was not limiting. There was no observable effect of season on efflux rates in either rain forest, but a decline occurred in cerrado during the dry season.

Effluxes of CO\(_2\) were measured from stems and branches of diameter 0.002 m - 1.6 m in 24 species in PRF and 17 species in SRF; emission rates were 0.1 - 3.3 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) with a \(Q_{10}\) of 1.8 in PRF, and 0.2 - 5.2 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) with a \(Q_{10}\) of 1.6 in SRF. Bark temperatures ranged between 18 °C and 28 °C. Maintenance respiration was 80% and construction respiration 20% of total woody tissue respiration (\(R_e\)) in SRF. A functional model described the relationship between \(R_e\) and diameter in SRF better than a purely empirical one (\(r^2 = 0.66\)). A novel method was devised to estimate sap CO\(_2\) concentrations which in SRF were 1.2 - 11.0 mmol dm\(^{-3}\) for Distemonanthus benthamianus and Musanga cecropioides. Sap CO\(_2\) levels were sensitive to sap pH, and represented 1 - 30% of cuvette-measured leaf photosynthesis.

Maintenance leaf respiration (\(R_m\)) was measured through the vertical profile during the night in PRF and SRF. \(R_m\) increased with height at both sites: ~0.2 in PRF vs ~0.3 in SRF at 1.5 m, and ~0.5 in PRF vs ~0.9 in SRF at 26 m (values normalised to 22 °C, units: μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)). Leaf nitrogen and potassium concentrations (\(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\)) declined with height in the canopy. \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) concentrations were higher in SRF than PRF where \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) appeared to limit respiration. \(R_m\) was not significantly related to \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) or \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) on a mass basis, but was strongly correlated with these variables on an area basis, partly as a consequence of variation in specific leaf area. A molar ratio, \(R_m : N_{\text{leaf}}\) explained variation in \(R_m\) with height. A biochemical model was fitted to measurements of leaf photosynthesis (\(A_l\)) made throughout the vertical profile of the SRF canopy. Stomatal conductance (\(g_s\)) was highest in the morning at the canopy-top, and declined during the day; maximum \(g_s\) was 0.3 - 1.0 mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). \(A_l\) followed the same pattern, though a delayed peak was observed near the ground. \(A_{\text{max}}\) was 11 - 14 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) at the canopy-top and 6 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) near the ground; \(\alpha\), the quantum efficiency, varied from 0.04 - 0.06 mol mol\(^{-1}\). Fitted photosynthetic parameters varied with height and were significantly related on an area basis to \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\).

Forest stand respiration models were made for both sites by component summation. For SRF, a multilayer model of photosynthesis was constructed using leaf level photosynthetic parameters, and compared with a 'big-leaf' one parameterised using eddy covariance measurements. Respiration estimates were combined with both to retrieve net forest assimilation at 0.7 - 0.9 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\); a model estimated an annual carbon sink for PRF during 1992/3 of 0.3 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (0.9±0.2 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\); Grace et al., 1995, Science, 270, 778-780). Both forests were highly sensitive to CO\(_2\) concentration and temperature. The temperature sensitivity of effluxes from soil was found to determine strongly the sink-source strength of both forests and should remain a focus for further work.
Acknowledgements

Above all I would like to thank my supervisor, John Grace, for his guidance since my arrival in Edinburgh. His amazing enthusiasm in the field for almost everything was matched only by his interest in editing this thesis. Thanks must go as well to my second supervisor, Adrian Newton, whose assistance at various intervals was timely and generous. I am also grateful to Paul Jarvis for allowing me the flexibility to complete this thesis at the end of the write-up.

Antonio and Heloisa Miranda provided a great base for us upon arrival in Brasilia; working with them and Rocha was fun as well as productive. The staff at INCRA in Ji-Parana provided invaluable advice and logistic support for all our boat journeys to the Reserva Jaru. Joao, Maria, 'Ready Eddy' and Jose Carlos stick out as particularly memorable characters, and Divons Lancheonete deserves a special mention too.

My thanks go to Dieudonne Nguele for his help with all things official in Cameroon, and his good company. Also to Paulinus Ngeh, Zak Tcheundjeu, Gerry Lawson and Andy Roby who provided support at FMRP in Mbalmayo. But special gratitude is reserved for John and Rose Jenks who coped with any number of problems, were immensely hospitable, and looked after me so expertly when I caught scarlet fever. And, of course, I could not leave out 'our' nuns who looked after us with such kindness at the convent in Mbalmayo.

The Edinburgh group also collaborated with IH (UK) and ANU (Australia). Many thanks are due to John Gash for his generous interest and help at conferences and in the field. Colin Lloyd, Anna McWilliam, Alaistair Clift and Ivan Wright were great entertainment on boats, towers and in forests and night-clubs, as well as being good colleagues. Thanks also go to Jon Lloyd for making his data available, and to Lins Vellen for analysing so many samples.

The number to mention from Edinburgh is legion, but my particular thanks go to John McIntyre for his technical brilliance and wacky personality, to John Massheder for expert (and patient) help with analysing the eddy covariance data, to Sophie Hale and Bart Kruijt for more discussion, to Craig Barton for his Stanley knife (and general advice), to Peter Levy for discussion over the minutiae of gas exchange and for exaggerating my knowledge of pop music. I owe an especially large debt of thanks to Sheila Wilson for her friendly and reliable help at times of stress. I am also grateful to Alex Harrower, Dave Mackenzie and Peter Davis in the workshop, who put up with my constant stream of questions and impractical ideas. Slightly further afield, thanks are also reserved for Linda Sharp for her patience, and to Stephen Gundry and Jim Wright for access to some late-breaking map technology. Jim was also responsible for making life in Edinburgh so enjoyable, as was 'Dennis' and my other flatmates, and of course, Lorraine.
# Table of contents

1. **INTRODUCTION**
   - Background 1
   - Thesis aims and structure 4

2. **THE RESEARCH SITES**
   - PRF: Reserva Jarú, State of Rondônia SW Brazil 6
   - SRF: Mbalmayo Reserve, Central Province, Cameroon 10

3. **FOREST STRUCTURE: BIOMASS AND LEAF AREA**
   - 3.1 Introduction 15
   - 3.2 Methods
     - Woody biomass 16
     - Leaf area and biomass 17
   - 3.3 Results 23
   - 3.4 Discussion 30
   - 3.5 Conclusions 34

4. **THE FLUX OF CO₂ FROM THE FOREST FLOOR**
   - 4.1 Introduction 35
   - 4.2 Methods
     - Closed chamber 39
     - Open chamber 41
     - Eddy covariance 42
     - Soil composition 44
   - 4.3 Results 45
   - 4.4 Discussion 63
   - 4.5 Conclusions 69

5. **THE FLUX OF CO₂ FROM WOODY TISSUE**
   - 5.1 Introduction 70
   - 5.2 Methods
     - Measurement systems and chambers 74
     - The relationships among CO₂ efflux rate, \( T, D_w, R_m \) and \( R_t \) 77
     - Detection of CO₂ in the transpiration stream 78
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Results</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Discussion</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Conclusions</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LEAF RESPIRATION AT NIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Introduction</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Methods</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Results</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Discussion</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Conclusions</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PHOTOSYNTHETIC LEAF GAS EXCHANGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Introduction</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Methods</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Results and Discussion</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Conclusions</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FOREST - ATMOSPHERE GAS EXCHANGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Introduction</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and estimation of the driving environmental variables</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and processing of above-canopy eddy covariance data</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling respiration and assimilation</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Results</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Discussion</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Conclusions</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUDING REMARKS</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. Design of soil temperature probe</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Woody tissue respiration in light and dark/</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. The measurement of photosynthesis using the LCA3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Analytical solution for $A_1$</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Formulae to calculate $\lambda$, $e_s$, $s$, $\rho_s$, $\gamma$, $\mathcal{V}_M$ and $\mathcal{V}_H$</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Empirical relationships used to obtain in-canopy meteorological variables</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Species lists for SRF and PRF</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# List of symbols

## Roman Alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[CO₂*]</td>
<td>Concentration of CO₂ dissolved in stem sap (mmol dm⁻³).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO₂]₀</td>
<td>Initial CO₂ system CO₂ concentration (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H⁺]</td>
<td>Concentration of H⁺ ions in sap (mmol dm⁻³).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aₛ</td>
<td>Surface area enclosed by chamber (m²).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aᵢ</td>
<td>Rate of net photosynthesis by individual leaves (µmol m⁻² s⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bbole</td>
<td>Bole biomass (kg or Mg per tree or unit area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bbranch</td>
<td>Branch biomass (kg or Mg per tree or unit area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Open dry forest vegetation type, cerrado (sensu stricto).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c, c'</td>
<td>Ambient CO₂ concentration, and instantaneous departure from the mean c (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cₛ</td>
<td>Ambient concentration of CO₂ in air (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cₛₐ</td>
<td>Above-canopy Cₛ (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cₛ</td>
<td>Concentration of CO₂ in the chloroplast (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cᵢ</td>
<td>Internal concentration of CO₂ in the intercellular spaces at the surface of the cell walls in the leaf (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cₚ</td>
<td>Specific heat of dry air (J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cₑt</td>
<td>Concentration of CO₂ at the site of evaporation within the sub-stomatal cavity (µmol mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, Dₑ</td>
<td>Water vapour pressure deficit of air (mol mol⁻¹). Dₑ refers to above-canopy D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d[CO₂]</td>
<td>Difference between the initial and final CO₂ concentration (µmol µmol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d₃₀</td>
<td>Tree diameter at breast height (1.3 m).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Flux of water vapour between forest canopy and the atmosphere (mmol m⁻² s⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eₐₙₑ</td>
<td>Arrhenius activation energies for Kᵥ, K₀, Vₘₐₓ and Jₘₐₓ respectively (kJ mol⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fₛ</td>
<td>Flux of CO₂ about a plane in height, z (µmol m⁻² s⁻¹).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fₑt / etc</td>
<td>CO₂ flux between the forest stand and the atmosphere, or ecosystem exchange (units in µmol m⁻² s⁻¹). The subscripts n, c, cs, eco,ecom and ecob refer respectively to: net measured fluxes, canopy photosynthesis (corrected for respiration terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from soil and wood), selected dataset of canopy photosynthesis, storage corrected [biotic] fluxes, and modelled net fluxes using the multilayer and big-leaf models.

$g$ Coefficient determining the respiratory cost of constructing a unit of tissue.

$g_s$ [Canopy] aerodynamic conductance (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

$g_c$ Somatal conductance to CO$_2$ (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$g_i$ Internal conductance from the sub-stomatal cavity to the sites of carboxylation within the chloroplasts (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$g_j$ Fraction of leaf area in leaf angle inclination class $j$.

$g_s$ Stomatal conductance to H$_2$O (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

$g_s$, $g_{sc}$ etc Stomatal conductance to water vapour (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$). The subscripts s, sc, scm and scb refer respectively to leaf-level conductance, canopy conductance, and modelled canopy conductance using the multilayer and big-leaf models.

$h$ Tree height (m)

$H_i/S_i$ Parameters defining $J_{\text{max}}$ at low and high temperatures (J mol$^{-1}$ & kJ mol$^{-1}$),

$h_{\text{max}}$ Maximum predicted tree height (m).

$i$ Zenith angle or angle class of leaves in a canopy ($^\circ$).

IRGA Infra-red gas analyser.

$j$ Leaf inclination angle or angle class of leaves in a canopy ($^\circ$).

$k$ Coefficient for the exponential response in CO$_2$ efflux to temperature (°C$^{-1}$).

$k$ von Karman’s constant (~ 0.41).

$K_{1,2}(T)$ Dissociation constants for carbonate ions.

$K_c$ Michaelis-Menten constant for carboxylation by Rubisco (µmol mol$^{-1}$)

$K_{\text{Hi}}(T)$ Henry’s Constant for CO$_2$.

$K_f$ Fraction of true leaf area in angle class $i$ that is projected onto the horizontal.

$K_o$ Michaelis-Menten constant for oxygenation by Rubisco (mol mol$^{-1}$)

$L$, LAI Leaf area index of a canopy (m$^2$ leaf area m$^2$ ground area).

LAD Leaf angle distribution.

$m$ Coefficient determining the respiratory cost of maintaining a unit of tissue.

$N$ Number of leaf contacts with an infinitely thin rod inserted through a canopy.

$N_{\text{leaf}}$ Amount of nitrogen per unit leaf matter (in g m$^{-2}$, mol m$^{-2}$ and g g$^{-1}$, mol mol$^{-1}$).

$P$ The probability of an infinitely thin [light] probe passing through a gap in a plane of a leaf canopy.

$P$ Pressure in (kPa).

$P_{\text{leaf}}$ Amount of phosphorus per unit leaf matter (in g m$^{-2}$, mol m$^{-2}$ and g g$^{-1}$, mol mol$^{-1}$).
\(pO\)  
Ambient concentration of oxygen (mol mol\(^{-1}\)).

PRF  
Undisturbed, 'primary', rain forest site at Reserva Jarú, Rondônia, SW Brazil.

\(Q, Q_e\)  
Photosynthetically active photon flux density (\(\mu\)mol quanta m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)). \(Q_e\) refers to above-canopy \(Q\).

\(Q_{10}\)  
Relative increase in the rate of a [bio]chemical reaction in response to an increase in temperature of 10 °C (dimensionless).

\(R\)  
Efflux rate of CO\(_2\) (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R\)  
Universal gas constant (8.314 J mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_0\)  
Fitted rate of CO\(_2\) efflux at 0 °C (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(r_a\)  
[Canopy] aerodynamic resistance (s m\(^{-1}\)).

\(r_c\)  
Respiration rate required to construct tissue (e.g., \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_d\)  
Daytime leaf respiration rate at \(Q = 0\) (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(RGR\)  
Relative growth rate of trees (m\(^3\) m\(^{-3}\) time\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_m\)  
Night-time respiration rate in fully expanded, non-sensing leaves, i.e., at zero growth rate (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_m\)  
Respiration rate in at a growth rate of zero, i.e., maintenance (e.g., \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_n\)  
Net radiation (W m\(^{-2}\)).

\(R_r\)  
(Raw) rate of efflux of CO\(_2\) from woody tissue (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(r_s\)  
[Canopy] stomatal resistance to water vapour (s m\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_t\)  
Efflux rate of CO\(_2\) from woody tissue normalised to 25 °C (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_t\)  
Efflux rate of CO\(_2\) of a whole forest, i.e., modelled forest respiration (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(R_{td}\)  
Efflux rate of CO\(_2\) from woody tissue normalised to 25 °C and to the mean \(D_w\) of all trees in SRF measured with RGR ≥ 0. Normalisation by diameter was achieved using the linear relationship between \(\ln D_w\) and \(R_t\) (\(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)).

\(s\)  
Rate of change of the saturation vapour pressure with temperature (Pa K\(^{-1}\)).

SA  
Surface area of woody tissue section (m\(^2\)).

SLA  
Specific leaf area (cm\(^2\) g\(^{-1}\)).

SRF  
Secondary rain forest site at Mbalmayo Reserve, SW Cameroon.

\(t, t'\)  
Air temperature, and instantaneous departure from the mean \(t\) (°C).

\(T_{ab}, T_{AGB}\)  
Total above-ground biomass (kg or Mg per tree or unit area).

\(T_b, T_B\)  
Total biomass; above- and below-ground components (kg or Mg per tree or unit area).

TBGB  
Total below-ground biomass (kg or Mg per tree or unit area).

\(T_l\)  
Leaf temperature (°C or, as \(T_{ik}\), in K).
Temperature (°C). The subscripts t, s, pred and c refer respectively to tissue, soil, predicted and above-canopy temperatures.

Friction velocity (m s\(^{-1}\)).

Streamwise wind speed, and instantaneous departure from the mean \(u\) (ms\(^{-1}\)).

Volume of woody tissue section (m\(^3\)).

Lateral wind speed, and instantaneous departure from the mean \(u\) (ms\(^{-1}\)).

Chamber volume (m\(^3\)).

IRGA system volume (m\(^3\)).

Gas sample volume (m\(^3\)).

Vertical wind speed, and instantaneous departure from the mean \(w\) (ms\(^{-1}\)).

Distance to the top of the canopy or between target and observer (m).

Roughness length for momentum and heat respectively. \(z_{om}\) also represents the roughness lengths for H\(_2\)O and CO\(_2\) in this treatment (m).

**Greek Alphabet**

\(\beta\) Maximum predicted increase in \(h\) with \(d_{bh}\) (m m\(^{-1}\)).

\(\Delta[CO_2]_a\) Change in chamber CO\(_2\) concentration (\(\mu\)mol \(\mu\)mol\(^{-1}\)).

\(\gamma\) Psychrometer 'constant' (Pa K\(^{-1}\)).

\(\Gamma^*\) Leaf CO\(_2\) compensation concentration in the absence of dark respiration (\(\mu\)mol mol\(^{-1}\)).

\(\kappa\) The contact number for a light probe, calculated according to Lang (1987).

\(\lambda\) Latent heat of vaporisation of water vapour (J g\(^{-1}\)).

\(\rho_a\) Density of dry air (kg m\(^{-3}\)).

\(\sigma_w\) Square root of the variance in \(w\) (ms\(^{-1}\)).

\(\tau\) The transmitted fraction of light incident on a canopy.

\(\psi_M, \psi_H\) Adiabatic correction factors for momentum and heat respectively (Paulson, 1970).
1. Introduction

This thesis considers some processes governing the global carbon cycle on land, and especially the exchange of carbon dioxide between tropical forest and the atmosphere. Data are presented that quantify the rates of key physiological processes in the forest canopy and below-ground. The information is used in models that simulate the carbon dioxide exchange of soil and vegetation in order to improve the understanding of carbon cycling in one of the world's major biomes.

Background

An appreciable amount of current political and scientific activity addresses the effects of human disturbance on the environment (Tickell, 1977; Quarrie, 1992). One of the primary scientific observations driving this activity is the rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration ($C_a$) over the past 120 years from 280 to 360 $\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$ (Friedli et al., 1986; Keeling et al., 1995). Anthropogenic land-use changes and the burning of fossil fuels have been causally linked with this increase (Keeling, 1994). There exists broad consensus that a doubling of $C_a$ could result in a 'global warming' of 2 - 4 $^\circ$C (Arrhenius, 1886; Plass, 1956; Houghton et al., 1994). The physical, chemical and biological responses to such a climatic change are complex and far-reaching. They require investigation.

A global carbon budget can be computed by incorporating changes in $C_a$ with the estimated carbon fluxes resulting from land-use change, fossil fuel combustion, and oceanic uptake (Houghton, 1995; Marland et al., 1994; Francey et al., 1995). But only 56% of the increase in $C_a$ is explained by this (Keeling et al., 1995) - an extra sink for CO$_2$ is needed to close the balance (Figure 1.1). The isotopic composition of $C_a$ (the $^{13}$C:$^{12}$C ratio) measured in a global 'flask network' has been used to quantify terrestrial and oceanic exchange rates, and thereby infer the location of possible sinks. However, the calculations are not without uncertainty, and indeed remain divergent in their conclusions, suggesting that there may be strong CO$_2$ absorption in the northern temperate zone or at tropical latitudes (Tans et al., 1990; Ciais et al., 1995; Enting et al., 1995), or that the sink 'anomaly' can be explained by reference to small fractional increases in globally important carbon stores, such as in soil (Amthor, 1995).
Global carbon budgets necessarily depend on models of the carbon cycle. Current estimated values for net primary productivity are small relative to the overall fluxes of which they are composed. Gross primary production fixes 90 - 130 Pg C yr$^{-1}$ (Bolin 1983; Bolin & Fung, 1992), whilst respiration in soil and terrestrial plants releases 64 - 72 Pg C yr$^{-1}$ (Raich & Schlesinger, 1992) and 40 - 60 Pg C yr$^{-1}$ (Bolin & Fung, 1992) respectively$^1$. Clearly a small fractional change in one of these flows could have net consequences for $C_a$ that would be larger than the contribution anthropogenic disturbance makes to the climate. Uncertainty in these gross processes needs to be reduced. Direct measurement of CO$_2$ transport in the major biomes is required to refine and constrain climate and carbon cycle models (Jarvis & Dewar, 1990; Henderson-Sellers, 1991).

Figure 1.1. Reservoirs and fluxes in the global carbon cycle for 1980-89 (adapted from Siegenthaler & Sarmiento, 1993; units are Gt or Gt yr$^{-1}$). The figures in capitals can be used to constrain the net carbon balance; their sum leads to a 'missing' sink marked as a ?. The latest estimates for each of these figures are now: increase in $C_a$ = +2.1 (Amthor, 1995); emissions from land-use changes = +1.6 (±0.7) (Houghton, 1995); fossil fuel combustion = 5.7 (±0.3) (Gifford, 1994; Marland et al., 1994); oceanic uptake = +3.5 to -0.8 (Francey et al., 1995). Most estimates of the 'missing' sink are positive; Siegenthaler & Sarmiento (1993) estimated $? = 1.8$ (±1.3).

**THE TIGER AND ABRACOS RESEARCH PROGRAMMES**

The carbon cycle does not exist in isolation from other natural processes. Acknowledging this, in 1990 the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) set up a large multidisciplinary research programme, TIGER (Terrestrial Initiative in Global Environmental Research), to address the potential

---

$^1$One petagram, Pg ($10^{15}$g) = one gigatonne, Gt ($10^9$ tonne); one megagram, Mg ($10^6$g) = one tonne
1. Introduction

effects of climate change on land. The aim was to focus on the biosphere at its intersection with the hydrosphere, atmosphere and lithosphere, by means of measurement and modelling. It comprised four components, TIGERs 1-4: respectively, the carbon cycle on land; trace greenhouse gas emissions; the energy and water budgets; and ecosystem impacts (NERC, 1993).

The large extent of, and rapidly changing land-use patterns in tropical forests was addressed in TIGER1 as a study of the flux of carbon between tropical forest and the atmosphere. Direct measurements of forest gas exchange were planned using the newly-developed eddy covariance technique. This method has the capability of measuring the net fluxes over hours, days and weeks, but does not provide measurements of the underlying physiology that comprises the component processes. This information is important in the interpretation of eddy covariance data, and facilitates modelling. The need for such measurements created an opportunity to link plant and soil ecophysiological studies with research into ecosystem processes.

The main field sites for this study were an undisturbed Amazonian rain forest in Brazil, and a secondary rain forest in Cameroon. For Brazil, the Edinburgh University group were invited to join the Anglo-Brazilian Amazonian Climate Observation Study (ABRACOS). ABRACOS was funded by the UK Overseas Development Administration (ODA) to improve the predictions of the climatic effects of deforestation in Amazonia using General Circulation Models (GCMs). Direct collaboration took place with Drs A. and H. Miranda at the University of Brasilia (UnB) and with the UK Institute of Hydrology. The UnB collaboration also made possible additional measurements in an open forest vegetation type, cerrado (*sensu stricto*). In Cameroon, the Edinburgh group collaborated directly with the Cameroonian Ministry for Forests, the Institute of Hydrology, Imperial College London University, and the Forest Management and Regeneration Project of the Office National de Développement de Fôrets / ODA, under the auspices of TIGER1 & 3. Field work for this thesis took place in 1993 - 94.

**NON-LINEARITY AND HETEROGENEITY IN COMPOSITE AND COMPONENT ECOSYSTEM PROCESSES**

The goals of both TIGER and ABRACOS were to confer greater credibility and accuracy upon climate and ecosystem models through field validation. In this context, the perceived goal of a model is to simulate a process under conditions or in places where it is either inexpedient or impossible to make measurements, such as the effects of climate or land-use change on the land - atmosphere interactions. The responses of a system to changes in the driving variables (*e.g.*, temperature, radiation, moisture,
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$C_a$ are usually non-linear. For example, the predicted mean photosynthetic fixation of CO$_2$ by a leaf according to a linearly averaged radiation regime may be significantly different to that calculated using a 60 second time-step (e.g., Hari et al., 1984). If a flux is the result of several non-linear processes which may also depend on state variables, additional complexities ensue.

Clearly, to get a satisfactory answer the important processes must be represented with sufficient accuracy, and where they vary in space and time (e.g., variability in soil quality and seasonality in growth), heterogeneity should be accounted for. In doing this, phenomena at one point of reference are mapped onto, or scaled up to another. The principle is as relevant to the representation of biochemistry in physiology as to the representation of local species diversity changes in whole forested regions (for further discussion see: Grace, 1991; Ehleringer & Field, 1993; Körner, 1995; Jarvis, 1995). A correct scaling approach may also lead to the identification of emergent system properties. For example, the feedback effects between canopy foliage and the atmosphere may significantly change leaf-to-air vapour pressure deficits, and hence stomatal conductance (Jarvis & McNaughton, 1986). At the still-larger mesoscale, atmospheric circulation resulting from interactions with heterogeneity at the land surface may create locally high CO$_2$ concentrations (Grace et al., 1996). In the context of understanding the terrestrial carbon cycle, it was important to quantify the site-specific biological processes contributing to whole-forest carbon dioxide exchange in Brazil and Cameroon. The physiologically active compartments in a forest through which carbon flows are: soil, woody tissue and leaves. They form an armature around which this thesis is organised.

**Thesis Aims and Structure**

This study addressed key questions concerning the rôlle of tropical forests in the global carbon cycle by quantifying the following attributes, using measurement and modelling techniques:

- forest structure: biomass and leaf area
- respiration in soil, leaves and woody tissue
- leaf-scale photosynthesis
- forest stand gas exchange

There are eight chapters. Chapter 2 describes the research sites; the remainder contain data and analysis. The underlying theme of comparison between the two forests is maintained throughout.
Chapter 3: The variation in canopy leaf area in the horizontal and vertical planes was measured using an established and a novel method. Estimates were made of above- and below-ground biomass in woody and foliar tissue. These data were used for scaling up the gas exchange measurements described below.

Chapter 4: The hypothesis that respiration in soil is related to soil temperature, moisture, and nutrient concentration was tested by the measurement of soil CO₂ effluxes and soil constituents. The linked hypothesis that spatial variability in efflux rates could be explained using a model incorporating these variables was also tested. The modelling of respiration in soil is critically discussed and two empirically determined models are presented.

Chapters 5 - 7: Measurements were made in order to test the hypotheses that woody and foliar tissue gas exchange is determined by organ temperature, size, position and nutrient concentration. The functional relationship between woody limb diameter and CO₂ efflux was investigated. The hypothesis that respiratory enrichment of the transpiration stream with dissolved CO₂ may be large enough to affect net photosynthesis was tested. Models were generated to predict woody tissue and leaf respiration rates. Leaf photosynthesis data were analysed using a biochemical model that correctly simulated stomatal conductance as well as photosynthesis.

Chapter 8: Whole-forest gas exchange was calculated using two independent methods. First, for Cameroon, a multilayer model was generated using the data in Chapter 3 to scale the relationships reported in Chapters 4 - 7 to a forest stand. Second, eddy covariance measurements for the same site in Cameroon were used to parameterise a 'big-leaf' model using the same photosynthesis equations presented in Chapter 7. Both models were constrained by component-summed respiration estimates and critically compared with the whole-canopy measurements. A component-summed respiration estimate was also calculated for the rain forest site in Brazil, and by incorporation with published results (Grace et al., 1995b), an annual carbon budget was estimated. The potential effects of climatic changes on forest ecophysiological processes were modelled, and the results discussed.
2. The research sites

The two main sites visited for this study were separated not only in a biological and geographical sense by the Atlantic Ocean, but also by their respective histories. The forest in Brazil was apparently undisturbed, whilst that in Cameroon had experienced a limited degree of exploitation. For reference in this thesis, the former site is called 'primary rain forest' (PRF) and the latter 'secondary rain forest' (SRF). They are described separately in this chapter.

PRF: Reserva Jarú, State of Rondônia, SW Brazil

Location

Brazil is the largest country in South America. It spans from north of the fourth parallel in the northern hemisphere to south of the thirty-second parallel in the southern hemisphere. From east to west at its widest point the distance is almost as great, ranging from 35°W - 74°W. The catchment areas of the Amazon river cover about six million square kilometres in the north of the country, and form a conduit for the passage of approximately one sixth of all freshwater that is transported by rivers to the oceans (Junk & Furch, 1985). Much of this catchment area is found in Brazil, in the states of Amazonas, Pará, Mato Grosso, and Rondônia (Map 2.1).

The PRF study site was in the Reserva Jarú, Rondônia, and formed one of three sites used for the ABRACOS project referred to in Chapter 1. Rondônia has experienced considerable economic development since 1950, but retains regions of complete forest cover (Lisboa, 1990). There is no history of human disturbance at Jarú, and the physiognomy of the terra firme forest reflected this. The area is an ecological reserve administered by the Brazilian environmental protection agency, Instituto Brasileiro de Meio Ambiente e Recursos Renováveis (IBAMA). It is situated 80 km to the north of the nearest large settlement, Ji-Paraná, and is accessed by boat, and then by foot to the north-east of the Machado river. The micrometeorological tower was located at 10°05' S and 61°55' W. Land to the south-west of the river had suffered disturbance, characterised by the typical fishbone landscape pattern visible from space (Map 2.1).
The research sites

Map 2.1. South America, with Brazil unshaded. Expanded below right is part of the State of Rondônia; the region of the field site is marked with a box. Expanded further is a satellite image of the field site (white arrow). The light stripes in the SW of the photograph denote anthropogenic disturbance; to the NE is undisturbed forest in the Reserva Jaru.

Scale: ~ 5km
Climate

According to the Köppen nomenclature, the climate is classified as AM, where 'A' refers to 'tropical latitude and mean monthly temperature higher than 18 °C, and 'M' refers to precipitation greater than 1000 mm per annum, with one dry season (Amaral Filho et al., 1978). Day length at 10 °S differs only a little from 12 hours, and long term data from the nearest city, Porto Velho, indicate that mean temperatures range between 25 °C and 27 °C, whilst total annual rainfall is less than 2400 mm, with a dry season from June to September and a wet season from December to May (Salati, 1985). The prevailing air flows of the Amazon region come from the east, as part of the trade winds. A feature of the climatic regime is the invasion of periodic cool fronts, or 'friagens', characterised by northerly penetration of cold polar air masses. These can cause the air temperature to drop temporarily (1 - 3 days) to as little 14 °C (Salati, 1985).

Site data were measured at Jarú for the year 1992-93 (Culf et al., 1996), and are consistent with those for Porto Velho. Rainfall was 1900 mm with a similar timing for the wet and dry seasons, though 1992/3 was a drier than average year. The mean monthly temperature ranged from 23.2 °C to 25.7 °C, and the average water vapour pressure varied between 22 and 28 mbar. For the mid-range values, this corresponded to 81% relative humidity, and a water vapour pressure deficit of 0.006 mol mol⁻¹ (Figure 2.1). The lower temperatures at Jarú presumably reflect higher urban maxima in Porto Velho, as average temperatures over pasture were similar to those over the forest (Culf et al., 1996).

![Figure 2.1. Climate data for PRF at Reserva Jarú, recorded in 1992/93 by the ABRACOS project.](image)
Geology, Geomorphology and Pedology

Three geological provinces are identified in Rondônia (Leal et al., 1978). Reserva Jarú is situated in the Xingu Complex and comprises Late Pre-Cambrian and Middle-to-Late Pre-Cambrian granite formations. Although on a fluvial terrace less than 200 m above sea level, the morphostructural unit to which the area belongs is described as the 'Southern Amazon Dissected Highland'. This is itself a part of a larger morphoclimatic unit comprising both depressions and regions of submontane character.

A soil description for Jarú is given by Hodnett et al. (1996). The soil type was a red-yellow orthic acrisol (U.S. Soil Taxonomy), with a high sand content near the surface. At 0.6 m the texture was a sandy loam and below this the clay content rose to between 17% and 34%. In most places the soil merged downwards into saprolite and then hard-weathered granite bedrock at a depth varying between 1.6 m and 4.0 m. The bulk density of the soil was 1.38 Mg m\(^{-3}\) near the surface (Table 2.1). Soil nitrogen and organic carbon concentrations for two nearby sites on similar soils and under similar vegetation types are reported as 1.0% and 1.03% - 1.33% respectively (Amaral Filho, 1978).

Vegetation

The most common natural vegetation type in Rondônia is described as 'open forest' or 'floresta aberta ombrofila' (Lisboa, 1990; IBGE, 1993). This is characterised by a relatively low stature (tree height = 30 m - 35 m), wide spacing of trees, and sometimes with an abundance of palms of the genera Iriartea, Euterpe, Astrocaryum or Maximilliana. In the latter condition there may also be a local abundance of Brazil nut trees, Bertholletia excelsa (Pires & Prance, 1985). In contrast, 'dense forest' is characterised by a slightly greater stature (30 m - 40 m), more tightly knit tree crowns, and a relative absence of palms. The physiognomic differences between the two can be seen clearly from the air (Lisboa, 1990; page 195).

The forest at Jarú possessed features of both forest types. A full floristic survey was not carried out for the site, though a species list is given in Appendix E. The dominant families of both dense and open forest, Moraceae and Leguminoseae, were also common at Jarú. The local abundance of the palm Maximilliana maripa was indicative of open forest, but the above-canopy physiognomy as viewed from the 56 m tower and aircraft suggested the presence of denser forest (Plate 2.1). The mean canopy height was 33 m, though the tallest emergent tree reached up to 44 m. Intergradation of forest
The research sites types is a common feature throughout the Amazon basin (Pires & Prance, 1985), indeed similar forest formations can be found at other points on the periphery of the Amazon Basin (Pennington, 1994).

Plates 2.1a&b. Photographs of the PRF forest from the air, and from the tower.

**SRF: Mbalmayo Reserve, Central Province, Cameroon**

**Location**

Cameroon is centrally located on the western seaboard of Africa. Lying between 3° N and 13° N, it is bounded to the west by Nigeria and the Atlantic Ocean, to the north by Lake Chad, to the south by Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Congo, and to the east by the Central African Republic (Map 2.2).

The SRF study site was in the Mbalmayo Reserve, approximately 10 km from the town of Mbalmayo and 60 km south of the capital Yaoundé, in the Central Province of Cameroon. The reserve has existed since 1947, and has experienced varying degrees of human-related disturbance. It comprises areas of relatively undisturbed forest, degraded secondary forest, plantations, abandoned fields and small cultivated gaps (Lawson, 1995). The variation in land use reflects the activities of the French Colonial Forest Service (Lanthony, 1958), the Centre Technique Forestier Tropical (Foahom, 1982),
the Office National de Régénération de Forêts with the UK Overseas Development Administration (e.g., Tchoundjeu & Roby 1995), and the proximity of the reserve to nearby settlement. In the northern part of the reserve, the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture have a Humid Forest Station where experimental plots and undisturbed secondary forest are found. The micrometeorological tower was accessed by road to the reserve, and then by a small track to a point 0.8 km south of all current forestry activities, at 3° 23’ N and 11° 30’ W (Figure 2.2). The surrounding forest was secondary and had been logged more than once, most recently in 1988-9 (Lawson, 1995), but the volume of extracted wood was not recorded.

Map 2.2. Top left: Africa with Cameroon in the inset box, and expanded top right. Bottom: a map of Mbalmayo Reserve with the SRF site, and five other sites visited for fieldwork in Chapter 4 marked.
Climate

The region is sub-equatorial, and according to the Köppen nomenclature is classified as AWI (Trewartha, 1954), where 'W' indicates two rainy seasons separated by two dry seasons, and 'I' indicates that the mean temperature difference between the warmest and coldest months is less than 5 °C. The long-term (38 year) average rainfall for Mbalmayo varies between 1016 mm to 1990 mm, with a mean of 1522 mm, and is bimodal. The first rainy season extends from March to June, and the second from August to November (Figure 2.2). Air temperature varies by only 3°C through the year, with the warmest month February (25.2 °C) and the coolest July (22.5 °C). Relative humidity at Yaoundé Airport ranges from 73% to 84%. Further details can be found in Ngeh (1989).

Climate data were recorded during February to May 1994 by Grace et al. (unpublished data). Rainfall at the tower was lower than the Mbalmayo average for April and May, though no appreciable soil water deficit was experienced (Boyle, 1995). Mean temperature was 24.3 °C, and the vapour pressure of water in air remained close to the average value of 24.2 mbar, with a short period in late March (20th - 23rd) when it was drier, at 17 - 22 mbar. The lower temperatures in SRF compared to PRF appeared to explain the lower vapour pressure deficits experienced in the drier season. The mean value corresponds to a relative humidity of 74% and a vapour pressure deficit of 0.009 mol mol⁻¹.

![Figure 2.2. Annual climate data for SRF (1934-72 mean). Temperature and humidity data from Yaoundé airport, 60 km north of Mbalmayo Reserve. The rainfall data are for the Mbalmayo Region (Njib, 1987).](image-url)
Geology, Geomorphology and Pedology

The Mbalmayo region belongs to the Mbalmayo-Bengbis-Ayos series of the Intermediate Pre-Cambrian Formation, which extends east to the Central African Republic. It is slightly metamorphic and formed of greenish schists, micaschists, and gneiss (Ngeh, 1989). The reserve is in the Nyong river midstream catchment area, with a level, undulating and rolling plateau surface approximately 650 m above sea level (Segalen, 1967).

The soil is designated as a yellow desaturated ferruginous sesquioxide by the Office de la Recherche Scientifique et Techniques Outre Mer (ORSTAM). This corresponds to an ultisol or oxisol (Soil Taxonomy, 1975; FAO). A detailed pedological study of the region by Sarlin (1968, cited in Foaham, 1982) distinguishes four main soil types. The following description is one of these and describes the general type found at the SRF site: ‘highly weathered deep red or yellow, well drained, acid soils of low base status with generally excellent soil structure, loamy or clay texture’. Profiles taken by Ngeh (1989) in the reserve are consistent with this, describing a sandy clay near the surface (0 - 0.2 m) grading into a dark yellowish brown clay (0.2 -0.4 m) and then a yellowish brown clay (0.4 - 1.0 m) leading towards a gravelly structure or a hard laterile plinthite layer below 1.5 - 2.5 m (Table 2.1).

Vegetation

The climax semi-deciduous forest natural to Mbalmayo Reserve occupies an extensive area of the southern Cameroon plateau (Letouzey, 1985; Plate 2.2). It is variable across its range with the southern limit reaching the Atlantic and Djá forests, while to the north it abuts the foothills of the Adamawa plateau. In the north-west of the country, isolated patches may be found in the valleys.

Ngeh (1989) gives a species list typical for mature forest in the Mbalmayo Reserve. The dominant families are cited as Ulmaceae, Sterculiaceae and Combretaceae. The species list for the area close to the tower (Appendix E) is similar, though it indicates that Moraceae and Leguminoseae are also important in this part of the reserve. The vegetation within 0.7 km of the tower was a mosaic of mature and disturbed secondary forest with regenerating gaps left from the 1988-9 harvest. A few patches near the periphery were classified as flooded or plantation forest (Ministry for Forests, 1994, unpublished data; Lawson, 1995). This radius was also the approximate fetch for the eddy correlation measurements made from above the canopy as part of the TIGER I&3 projects (Chapter 1).
Plate 2.2a&b. Photographs of SRF from the tower showing heterogeneity in canopy structure.

Table 2.1. Summary soil and vegetation descriptions for PRF and SRF. The data and descriptions are derived from Letouzey (1985), Pires & Prance (1985), Ngeh (1989), McWilliam et al. (1996), Hodnett et al. (1986), and this study. The soil nitrogen and organic carbon concentrations in PRF (A1 horizon) are obtained from Filho Amarelo et al. (1978; profiles 109 and 153, pages 332-334). n/a = data not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>PRF, Brazil</th>
<th>SRF, Cameroon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest type</td>
<td>'Open', grading in places to 'dense'</td>
<td>Semi-deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean height</td>
<td>33 m</td>
<td>36 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant families</td>
<td>Moraceae, Leguminoseae, Palmeae</td>
<td>Sterculiaceae, Ulmaceae, Leguminoseae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil type</td>
<td>Orthic acrisol</td>
<td>Ultisol or Oxisol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface texture</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Sandy clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay @ 0-0.5 m</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand @ 0-0.5 m</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk density @ 0-0.5 m</td>
<td>1.38 Mg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay @ 0.5-1 m</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand @ 0.5-1 m</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk density @ 0.5-1 m</td>
<td>1.38 Mg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic carbon</td>
<td>1.03% - 1.33%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Forest structure: biomass and leaf area

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The nature of the land-atmosphere interaction is determined to a large extent by how much vegetation there is. The structure and size of a forest canopy affects the physical environment, the flows of mass and energy within and above a canopy, and the stores among which matter may be transferred. In order to scale gas exchange from leaf to canopy or further, structural information is required to quantify and drive the physiological source processes.

There exist few tropical moist forests for which the biomass, leaf area and structure are known. Furthermore most studies have concentrated on undisturbed forests only (e.g., Odum 1970; Klinge et al., 1975; Jordan & Uhl, 1978; Kato et al., 1978; McWilliam et al., 1993). Recently, the estimation of biomass has been made a little less challenging by the development of well tested regression techniques (e.g., Brown et al., 1989; Brown and Iverson, 1992; Deans et al., 1996). Leaf area measurement methods have also been advanced with the application of image analysis to theory and practice developed over the last decade (e.g., Lang et al., 1985; Lang & Yeuquin, 1986; Lang, 1987; Norman & Campbell, 1991; Campbell and Norman, 1989). Furthermore, the interest in whole canopy ecophysiology and micrometeorology has precipitated the construction of infrastructure needed to access leaves throughout the canopy of a few of these remote forests (Nadkarni & Parker 1994).

This chapter presents biomass and leaf area estimates for SRF and PRF. The total biomass comprises above and below ground terms. Above the ground, it is divided further into branch, bole and leaf components. The leaf area and biomass of the whole canopy are also estimated separately, and the manner in which the composite canopy values vary with respect to height above the ground is considered. These primary structural features provide the basis for understanding the differences between the two forests, and for the calculation of their gas exchange characteristics. A complete inventory of species composition was not possible in this work, but a list of the species studied in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 is given in Appendix E.
3.2 METHODS

WOODY BIOMASS

Inventories were made at both the PRF and SRF sites in plots sited randomly within the 'flux footprint' of the above-canopy eddy covariance measurements being made as part of the NERC-TIGER programme (Grace et al., 1995a; Grace et al., unpublished). Since trees with a diameter at 1.3 m ($d_{bh}$) > 10 cm constitute ≥ 96% of total forest biomass in closed forests of the tropics (Brown & Lugo, 1984), $d_{bh}$ was measured for all individuals with 10 cm as the prescribed lower limit. The variation of tree height ($h$) with $d_{bh}$ was also estimated using a hypsometer for a sample of trees (51 trees in PRF; 85 trees in SRF) chosen to represent a wide range of $d_{bh}$ values (0.03 m - 1.45 m in PRF; 0.05 m - 1.8 m in SRF). The choice of tree was random other than with respect to diameter class. A subsample of the $h$ estimates were made of trees close to the micrometeorological tower whose height could be accurately gauged by climbing the tower, and were found to be correct to within 10% for $h$ = 4 m - 35 m.

In Brazil, a 0.25 ha plot (50 m by 50 m) was marked out in 5 m intervals and the $d_{bh}$ of each stem measured. In addition, the life form of each plant was noted (tree, palm or liana) and mapped together with the presence of rosettes of the dominant palm, *Maximiliana maripa* (Corre Serra) Drude (McWilliam et al., 1996). Logistical circumstances prevented the use of identical procedures at SRF, where measurements were made by staff from the Ministry for Forests, Cameroon. Two separate 1 ha plots (250 m by 40 m) were marked out and all trees with $d_{bh}$ > 0.1 m were located and counted. Data were collated in diameter classes rising in 10 cm increments from 0.1 - 0.2 m to 1.0 - 1.2 m. An estimate of standing and lying dead wood was also made for the SRF: stems or branches were measured for total length and mean diameter down to a minimum of 0.1 m.

Biomass was calculated using regressions obtained from two sources: Brown et al. (1989), and Deans et al., (1996). Both require $d_{bh}$ and $h$ for the estimate. The Brown et al. formulation (Equation 3.1) is that given for moist tropical forest (*sensu* Holdridge, 1967) and refers to 'total above-ground biomass' (TAGB). The Deans regression (Equation 3.2) was obtained from trees harvested near the SRF site, in Cameroon during 1993 and refers to 'total biomass' (TB), that is, the sum of TAGB and the below-ground biomass, TBGB. The approximate ratio of TBGB : TAGB in the Deans data was 0.26; this is in agreement with unpublished data of Brown and Lugo (*personal communication*, D. Deans) and significantly larger than earlier estimates (Brown & Lugo, 1984; Nepstad et al., 1994). The TAGB
values comprise branch and bole biomass; Equation 3.3 (D. Deans, personal communication) describes the regression used to estimate the ratio of stem and branch biomass. The $d_{bh}$ of each tree in the PRF inventory, and the $d_{bh}$ class midpoint (Gillespie et al., 1992) from the SRF inventory, were used in the biomass estimates reported here.

Brown et al.  \[ T_{ab} = \exp[-3.375 + 0.948 \ln(d_{ph}^2 \cdot h)] \]  Equation 3.1

Deans  \[ T_b = 0.52 + 0.0246 \cdot d_{ph}^2 \cdot h \]  Equation 3.2

Deans  \[ B_{branch} = 0.23 \cdot B_{bole} - 0.25 \]  Equation 3.3

where $T_{ab}$ is TAGB in kg, $T_b$ is TB in kg, $B_{branch}$ is branch biomass in kg, and $B_{bole}$ is bole biomass in kg; $d_{ph}$ is in cm, and $h$ is in m.

**LEAF AREA AND BIOMASS**

Estimates were made of the leaf area of the whole canopy, and of the vertical distribution of leaf area with height in the canopy. Destructive methods were not permitted in either reserve, so indirect measurements were made using photographs of the canopies.

**Theory**

Photographic methods of leaf area estimation rely on light acting as an infinitely thin rod-like probe. It is assumed to pass through vegetation where gaps exist and not where there are leaves. Leaves are assumed to be black and opaque. In the first procedures of this kind (Levy & Madden, 1933; Warren Wilson & Reeve, 1960; Warren Wilson, 1965), it was shown that the probability distribution of leaf contacts with a metal rod passing through a canopy of leaves positioned at random to the azimuth approximated the Poisson distribution, where the variance and mean are equal. If a rod is inserted into a canopy at a zenith angle $i$, the number of leaf contacts with the rod, $N$, is proportional to the leaf area index of the vegetation (LAI, m$^2$ of leaf area per m$^2$ of ground area) such that:

\[ N_i = u \cdot z \cdot K_i \]  Equation 3.4
where \( z \) is the vertical distance from the top of the canopy, \( u \) is the leaf area density per unit volume of canopy, and \( K_i \) is an extinction coefficient defined by the inclination of leaves to the horizontal such that:

\[
K_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N_j} g_j \cos \alpha_j \quad \text{for } i \leq 90 - \alpha_j \quad \text{Equation 3.5}
\]

where \( g_j \) is the fraction of leaf area in leaf angle inclination class \( j \), and \( \cos \alpha_j \) is the fraction of true leaf area inclined at an angle \( \alpha_j \) to the horizontal that is projected in the direction of \( i \). In effect, the product \( uz \) is equal to the LAI, \( L \), and \( K_i \) is the fraction of true foliage area that is projected onto the horizontal (Norman & Campbell, 1991).

When applying this theory to light, the number of contact points cannot be measured, but the fraction of transmitted light can. The simplest condition of this type exists for horizontal leaves distributed randomly with respect to the azimuth on a horizontal plane. The probability, \( P \), of a [light] probe passing through a gap is given exactly by the binomial expression

\[
P = (1 - (A_1 / A_s))^x \quad \text{Equation 3.6}
\]

where \( x \) identical leaves of area \( A_1 \) are projected onto a horizontal surface \( A_s \) (Monsi & Saeki, 1953). If \( L \) is the leaf area per unit area of \( A_s \),

\[
L = x (A_1 / A_s) \quad \text{Equation 3.7}
\]

and therefore:

\[
P = (1 - (L / x))^x \quad \text{Equation 3.8}
\]

For fixed \( L \) and \( A_1 \), Equation 3.7 shows that increasing the area of sample, \( A_s \), increases \( x \). In the limit, as \( x \to \infty \), Equation 3.6 becomes the Poisson Law (as for the metal rod above), such that:

\[
P = e^{-L} \quad \text{or} \quad L = -\ln P \quad \text{Equation 3.9}
\]

This result can now be combined with Equations 3.4 and 3.5 to give leaf area from the probability of a light probe passing through a canopy with leaves in the inclination class \( j \):

\[
L K_{ij} = -\ln P = N_{ij} \quad \text{Equation 3.10}
\]
Extending the argument to light passing through a canopy into an upward-facing hemispherical lens near ground level, $P$ can be directly represented by $\tau$, the transmitted fraction of incident light:

$$-\ln \tau = LK$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 3.11}

where $K$ is the overall extinction coefficient for all angles of $i$ and all leaf angle inclination classes. If different leaf angle inclination classes are considered for any given probe angle, $i$.

$$-\ln \tau_i = f_1 K_{i1} + f_2 K_{i2} + \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 3.12}

where $f_j$ is the leaf area index in inclination class $j$, assuming azimuthal symmetry, a condition that is approximated by many canopies (Lemur, 1973; Ross, 1981; Lang & Yeuquin, 1986; Norman & Campbell, 1991). The LAI of a canopy may be calculated from suitably exposed hemispherical images looking skywards from the ground, by inverting this transmittance model for a range of incident zenith angles (Campbell and Norman, 1989). A simplified estimate of LAI has also been found to work well using the sum of the intercept and coefficient from a regression of contact number against zenith angle, $i$, in radians, for a range of zenith angles (Lang, 1987).

Techniques

Whole canopy LAI:

Hemispherical photographs were taken using a Nikon F camera with Nikkor 7.5 mm S3HP fisheye lens. The camera was mounted on a tripod at 0.5 m in PRF and 1.5 m in SRF. The greater height in SRF was chosen as a minimum to avoid overestimates of LAI resulting from the extensive litter and non-photosynthetic undergrowth that occurred at intervals in this disturbed secondary forest. The film used in PRF (1993) was a 35 mm monochrome Kodak TMX 100 ASA. In 1994, a high resolution colour image analysis system became available (Optimas 4.0 and 5.1) and the film type was changed to Kodachrome 200 ASA slide film. An extra advantage of the Kodachrome film is that it is processed using a standard procedure at one laboratory in the UK, so the images are comparable in quality and development.
Hemispherical photographs were taken during the first hour after dawn in conditions of even cloud cover, and diffuse light. In both forests account was taken of the horizontal heterogeneity in LAI by making measurements from many points on the ground: in PRF, 36 camera stations were marked out at 10 m intervals in the 0.25 ha plot; in SRF, 30 points were marked out at 10 m intervals along 150 m transects, directed along two randomly determined compass directions separated by more than 90°. To expose correctly for incident radiation, light readings were taken on the open sky by one person from above the canopy, standing on the micrometeorological tower. The camera operator on the ground took five photographs at each position, one at the 'correct' exposure, and two others bracketted at one and two f-stops either side of this. In the developed images, the optimal exposure was easily recognisable. For each photograph, the immobilised camera was remotely fired after levelling with a lens cap spirit level. The procedure at each point took approximately two minutes.

All photographs were analysed using the Optimas software linked to an LAI calculating routine coded by Dr P. van Gardingen of Edinburgh University. The technique constitutes three stages. Stage one requires the 35 mm image to be scanned at high resolution (850 - 1024 pixels per inch; Mikrotek Scanner). At this point, different filters can be used, and contrast, brightness, or exposure specified to improve the quality of the image. Quality is described as the best on-screen visual definition of leaf and non-leaf that most closely approximates the true image, which is simultaneously compared using an adjacent transparency projection system. In stage two, the range and number of zenith angles is chosen and the threshold procedure followed. In this latter method, the operator defines what shade of grey is allocated to 'black' (i.e., no gap), and what is white. In stage three, the LAI is calculated by inverting the gap fraction signal.

Stages one and two permit a rational and consistent method of image analysis, but still include a small degree of subjective judgement. To minimise this, a range of scanning specifications were tried on test images to determine the optimal software set-up. Black and white scans were found to give the same results as colour scans, and so were favoured. For each set of photographs, a given set of scanning specifications was adhered to, and the threshold level held constant to within 3%. In stage three, all images were analysed for zenith angles from 10° to 80° (where 0° is vertically above the lens), divided up into six annuli. Zenith angles greater than 80° are poorly resolved by fish-eye lens. The image was then further divided up into azimuth angle classes, and analysed for gap fraction by zenith angle class. This method reduces underestimation of leaf area that may result from clumped (rather than perfectly random) leaf distributions. The inversion procedure used was the linear regression method of Lang (1987), where the contact number, K, is calculated for each zenith angle.
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class, $\theta$. The intercept ($a$) and coefficient ($b$) of a linear regression between $\kappa$ and $\theta$ are then used to calculate $L$ from:

$$\kappa = -\cos\theta \ln \sigma(\theta)$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 3.13a}$$

$$L = 2(a+b)$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 3.13b}$$

**Vertical distribution of LAI:**

In Brazil, the vertical profile of LAI was estimated by taking hemispherical photographs at different heights (0 m, 8 m, 24 m and 32 m) up the micrometeorological tower. The camera was attached to a 3 m boom clamped to the tower, and remotely fired using an aluminium attachment and a length of cord. The exposure and analysis procedures described above were followed for these measurements. The difficulty with this technique is that the estimate at any point is subject to sampling error, as the spatial heterogeneity is high.

For the work in Cameroon a new method was devised, reminiscent of a semi-quantitative approach reported by MacArthur and MacArthur (1961). The heterogeneity of leaf area in the horizontal plane at each height must be accounted for in order to make a good estimate of the vertical profile in LAI. To do this, a tethered white meteorological balloon was filled with hydrogen and allowed to rise into the canopy at different heights above the ground at a known distance from the tower. A standard Nikon FE2 camera fitted with a Nikkor 300 mm lens was then positioned on the tower at each height and levelled using a tripod and spirit level. The objective was to measure the mean leaf area density between the lens and the balloon, and thus account for spatial heterogeneity in the vertical leaf area profile. Photographs were taken of the balloon using the camera light meter, and the bracketting procedure already described. Four profiles (north, south, east and west of the tower) were measured for a balloon raised to 4 m, 8 m, 16 m, 24 m and 40 m above the ground, over a 25 m path length from the tower. The balloon diameter was measured before and after taking the photographs (mean diameter was 0.64 m). It was necessary to use more than one balloon as a few burst during measurement; to avoid windy conditions and shadows on the target, photographs were taken early in the morning, as with the hemispherical images.

Gap fraction data were obtained using the Optimas software by restricting the analysed region of interest to the balloon target, seen as a flat white disc in the canopy (Plates 3.1a&b).
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was used to calculate the LAI by height after dividing the gap fraction term by the path length (25 m). Although the photographs were taken horizontally (rather than vertically), the theory given above can be applied to this situation by assuming that all light probes were perpendicular to the photographic image \(i.e., i = 0\), and that the leaf angle distribution approximated that of a sphere (making \(K = 0.5\)). Since this value of \(K\) was uncertain, a check was made by scaling the \(\ln t\) value at each level in each profile to the mean total LAI of the canopy estimated from hemispherical photographs. This proportionate scaling was possible as all images were taken over the same path length of 25 m.

Plate 3.1. Photographs of a balloon target taken horizontally from the micrometeorological tower at 4 m (left) and 20 m (right). The images were analysed to estimate the variation in leaf area density with height in the SRF canopy.

Leaf biomass

Freshly sampled leaves from different trees at different heights in the canopy of each forest were cored to produce 8 - 16 discs, using a leaf corer of internal diameter 16 mm (PRF) or 10 mm (SRF). The species chosen were those used for leaf respiration and photosynthesis measurements and are described in Chapters 6 and 7 respectively. Leaf material was dried to constant mass at 70° and the disc weights measured using a balance sensitive to 0.0001 g (Sauter Re1614, Albstadt, Switzerland). Further details of the analysis of leaf tissue are given in Chapters 6 and 7.
3. Forest structure

3.3 RESULTS

WOODY BIOMASS

Tree height and diameter

Brown et al. (1989) report a \( d_{bh} : h \) relationship in tropical forests of the form shown in Equation 3.13. However, a rectangular hyperbola (Equation 3.14) gave a better fit to the data from PRF (\( r^2 = 0.85 \) vs 0.80) and SRF (\( r^2 = 0.61 \) vs 0.50), and more accurately predicted tree height in the lower diameter classes. The \( d_{bh} : h \) relationships for each forest were rather similar, though the maximum fitted values for tree height were different (PRF = 50.0 m; SRF = 40.5 m). There were also differences in \( \beta \) for each forest (Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1). Neither of the fitted parameters were significantly different between SRF and PRF (data not shown). The spread of points at \( d_{bh} 0.2 \text{ m} - 0.4 \text{ m} \) was important in determining the shape of the rectangular hyperbola, especially for PRF.

Brown et al. (1989): \[ h = \exp(a + b \ln d_{bh}) \] Equation 3.13

This study: \[ h = \frac{h_{\text{max}} \beta d_{bh}}{(h_{\text{max}} + \beta d_{bh})} + c \] Equation 3.14

Table 3.1. Fitted parameters to Equations 3.14 using \( d_{bh} \) and \( h \) data from PRF and SRF. The \( d_{bh} \) and \( h \) of the largest tree in each forest sample are given as a reference. Units are: \( h_{\text{max}}, d_{bh} \) and \( c \) in :m; \( \beta \) in m m\(^{-1}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>( h_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>Max ( d_{bh} )</th>
<th>Max ( h )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plot biomass and diameter class frequency distributions

The frequency distributions of \( d_{bh} \) classes for both sites showed a reverse-J shape typical of naturally regenerated forest (Figure 3.2). But significant differences between them were apparent. Most obvious was the very high frequency of trees of \( d_{bh} = 0.1 - 0.2 \text{ m} \) in one of the SRF plots (Figure 3.2b). Visually, this plot (Plot 1) was more disturbed than the second (Plot 2) and was dominated in places by the pioneer species, *Musanga cecropioides* R. Br..
Plot 1 was not markedly different in the lowest $d_{bh}$ class from PRF (Figure 3.2a), but both SRF plots showed a much lower abundance of individuals between $d_{bh} = 0.2$ m and 0.5 m than was found in PRF. Above $d_{bh} = 0.55$ m, there were very few trees present in SRF, and many size classes were empty. In PRF, several size classes for $0.55$ m < $d_{bh}$ < 1.75 m contained one or more individuals.

Table 3.2 shows the total and component biomass estimates for SRF and PRF. Inspection of Figures 3.2 and 3.3 reveals the presence of one very large tree in the PRF plot ($d_{bh} = 1.75$ m). This tree was excluded from the biomass values given in Table 3.2 as it increased TB from 300 t ha$^{-1}$ to 400 t ha$^{-1}$ (see Discussion). The mean total biomass (TB) of PRF was 300 t ha$^{-1}$, whilst that of SRF was 122 t ha$^{-1}$; 95% confidence limits (c.l.) = 16 t ha$^{-1}$. It was not possible to obtain a rigorous error for PRF,
although if pseudoreplication was practised, and the 0.25 ha plot divided into four equal quadrants of 0.0625 ha (625 m², spatially defined by the four compass points) that were then treated as individual sample estimates, then the TB estimate for PRF was: 277 t ha⁻¹; 95% c.l. = 48 t ha⁻¹).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.2.** Frequency distributions per hectare of trees by dbh class. Each dbh class is defined as: 0.15 m (0.1 - 0.2 m), 0.25 m (0.2 - 0.3 m)... etc. In PRF, the data are scaled to 1 ha from the 0.25 ha inventory. In SRF, the data are for two 1 ha plots. Note the axis-breaks on the ordinates.

Within the TAGB component, tree boles comprised approximately 77%, and branches 23% of the total biomass in SRF and PRF. The distribution of biomass within different dbh classes varied markedly between the two forests (Figure 3.3). In PRF, ignoring the largest tree, the majority of the biomass was found in trees of dbh = 0.3 m - 0.9 m, with a peak at dbh = 0.55 m. In SRF, the dbh class with the maximum biomass was 0.15 m; above this diameter, the correlation between TB and dbh was weak and roughly negative. The amount of standing or lying dead wood was only assessed in SRF. The mean density of wood in natural tropical forests of Africa is 0.5 (Reyes et al., 1992). Assuming that the dead wood fraction had a density of 75% of this value, the mean dead wood biomass in SRF was 14.8 t ha⁻¹; 95% c.l. = 16 t ha⁻¹.
Data regarding the frequency of palms and lianas were not available for SRF, but were obtained in PRF. Palms were treated as trees in the biomass estimate for PRF; their frequency was 30 - 40 per hectare; mean \( d_{bh} = 0.16 \) m, with a \( d_{bh} \) range of 0.02 m - 0.35 m, most of which were less than 0.15 m. An additional regression was not sought to improve the estimate of the biomass contribution from this group; when treated as trees, their total exclusion only resulted in a reduction in TB of less than 10 t ha\(^{-1}\). This reduction is likely to be an overestimate, and is well within the error for the whole forest.

Palm rosette numbers in PRF were relatively high (100 - 150 per hectare), but most of their biomass was associated with leaf area and measured using hemispherical photography. For the same reason, lianas were not included in the TB estimate; their frequency in PRF was 90 - 110 individuals per hectare; mean \( d_{bh} = 0.06 \) m and with a \( d_{bh} \) range of 0.03 m - 0.1 m.
Table 3.2. Estimates of total biomass (TB), total above-ground biomass (TAGB), total below-ground biomass (TBGB), branch biomass ($B_{\text{branch}}$), and bole biomass ($B_{\text{bole}}$) for PRF and SRF using the Equations of Brown et al. (1989) and Deans et al. (1996). Biomass is in t ha$^{-1}$; Area = the total inventoried area of each forest. Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits of means of the two 1 ha plot inventories in SRF; errors are not given for the derived values of $B_{\text{branch}}$ and $B_{\text{bole}}$. TAGB estimates include leaf biomass values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>PRF, BRAZIL</th>
<th>SRF, CAMEROON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown et al.</td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>306.3</td>
<td>293.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBGB</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGB</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>216.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{\text{bole}}$</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>168.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_{\text{branch}}$</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.25 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEAF AREA AND BIOMASS**

The mean whole-canopy LAI values were statistically similar for the two forests. PRF had a slightly lower leaf area than SRF, and the variance in LAI for PRF was smaller too: in PRF, LAI = 4.0; 95% c.l. = 0.7; and in SRF, LAI = 4.4, 95% c.l. = 0.9 (Figure 3.4). The maximum LAI measured for each forest was similar, but in SRF, the minimum value found was under 1.8, whilst in PRF it was 2.5.

![Figure 3.4. The leaf area index of the whole canopy of SRF and PRF. Error bars are 95% confidence limits of the mean (open circles); the squares are the maximum and minimum LAI measured in each forest.](image-url)
Figure 3.5a-d. The variation in leaf area density with height in SRF and PRF. Figures (a) and (c) show data normalised by \( \ln \text{Int} \) to permit comparison of the form of the profile; in order to distinguish data from different profiles, these are plotted as line graphs. Figures (b) and (d) show the averaged profiles scaled to give actual leaf area densities. The measurements were taken at six points, centred on 2 m, 8 m, 16 m, 24 m, 32 m and 40 m; this produced 5 layers of 8 m and the bottom layer of 4 m. In order to adequately compare different layers, each 8 m layer was divided into two equal 4 m layers. This procedure was followed in all four graphs. The different profiles in PRF were obtained using gap fraction estimates or photographs; those in SRF were obtained using a novel photographic method (see text).

Comparing the vertical profiles in LAI for each forest was not straight-forward since the PRF hemispherical photographs represented a single point profile, whilst those from SRF were the average of four profiles, each accounting for horizontal heterogeneity in leaf area over a path length of 25 m. To improve the comparison, eye-estimated gap fraction data of the type formally obtained in Cameroon were used to obtain two extra profiles from PRF (Grace, unpublished data). Figure 3.5 shows the individual profiles, and the averaged profiles for each forest. The individual profiles (Figures 3.5a&c) are normalized to show the variation in shape among the different directions. Each profile may represent a different LAI specific to that area of the forest. The averaged profiles (Figure
3.5b&d) are scaled to the mean LAI for each forest. The PRF profiles were less variable than in SRF and indicate that, on average, there was less leaf area in the first 4 m in PRF than in SRF. The profile data from Cameroon were analysed further to test how robust the estimate of $K$ in Equation 3.11 was.

At $K = 0.5$ (a spherical leaf angle distribution, LAD), two of the profiles (S and W) were calculated to have an LAI ~4.4, whilst the remaining two (N and E profiles) gave LAI < 2.5 (Table 3.3).

### Table 3.3. The total LAI of four measured profiles of the vertical distribution in LAI through the SRF canopy. N, S, E, and W refer to the compass directions of each profile, as measured from the micrometeorological tower. Calculated LAI is obtained using Equation 3.11, and assuming $K = 0.5$; LAI units are $m^2$ leaf $m^{-2}$ ground area. The fractions of each profile with respect to the overall canopy LAI of 4.4 $m^2 m^{-2}$ are also shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile direction</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated LAI</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of mean LAI</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like LAI, specific leaf area (SLA, $cm^2 g^{-1}$) in each forest was also similar, with the largest values found near ground level and the highest at the top of the canopy (ranges in SLA: PRF = 80 - 200 $cm^2 g^{-1}$; SRF = 70 - 200 $cm^2 g^{-1}$). The vertical profiles in SLA are shown in Figure 3.6a and combined in Figure 3.6b with the average vertical profiles in LAI (Figure 3.5c&d) to show the variation in leaf biomass with height in SRF and PRF. As suggested by the LAI profiles, the foliar biomass in SRF was slightly greater than in PRF (3.4 vs 3.2 t $ha^{-1}$). Leaf biomass rose with height to a maximum in both forests at sub canopy-top levels, between 20 m and 30 m, but was higher in SRF at ground level.

![Figures 3.6a&b. In (a), the variation in specific leaf area with height in the canopies of PRF and SRF. Error bars are standard errors from means of 3 - 10 measurements. In (b1&2), the variation in leaf biomass with height in the canopies of SRF and PRF. The data are obtained by combining Figures 3.5 and 3.6a.](image-url)
3.4 DISCUSSION

WOODY BIOMASS

Tree height and diameter

The rectangular hyperbola used for the $d_{bh} : h$ relationship in this study fitted better to the observed data than the log-linear regression proposed by Brown et al. (1989). The main advantages accruing from this formulation were a smaller intercept ($c$ in Equation 3.14 vs $a$ in Equation 3.13), a more accurate estimation of $h$ at intermediate $d_{bh}$ and a [lower] maximum predicted $h$ that was closer to the observed values (Figure 3.1). Also, a rectangular hyperbola can be fitted with respect to the rate of increase in $h$ with $d_{bh}$ before $h$ reaches an asymptote. This feature may represent the biophysics of $d_{bh} : h$ relationships more realistically than a log-linear function.

Despite these advantages, the fit to PRF data still under-estimated $h$ at $d_{bh} = 0.2$ m - 0.4 m. The seven trees responsible for this (Figure 3.1), showed no pattern in species composition, so were not excluded from the dataset. With the omission of these seven values, the $r^2$ of the fitted model rose to 0.95.

The $h_{max}$ value obtained for PRF (50 m) was greater than for SRF (40.5 m), and $\beta$ was greater for SRF (220 mm$^{-1}$) than PRF (175 mm$^{-1}$). The tallest observed tree was also found in PRF (Figure 3.1), but the discrepancies in $h_{max}$ and $\beta$ are attributed to the spread and number of data points available to fit Equation 3.14 in each forest. Intrinsic differences in the $d_{bh} : h$ relationship between SRF in SW Cameroon and PRF in SW Amazonia may or may not be reflected in these results.

Plot biomass and diameter class frequency distributions

Both forests showed reverse-J shaped $d_{bh}$ class : frequency distributions, but they differed markedly in character (Figure 3.2). There were more large trees ($d_{bh} > 0.55$ m) and fewer trees in the smallest $d_{bh}$ class (0.15 m) in PRF than SRF. This pattern reflects the logging history of the two forests (none known of in PRF; at least one harvest during 1989 in SRF). The observation of a relatively high frequency of Musanga cecropioides, a pioneer tree (sensu Swaine & Whitmore, 1988), in one plot in SRF confirmed the disturbed and regenerating status of this forest. Very few pioneers (mostly of the
genus *Cecropia*) were found in PRF, and generally only where tree-fall gaps had occurred. The large differences between Plots 1 and 2 in SRF (Figure 3.2) highlight the heterogeneous nature of this forest. The TB, TBGB and TAGB estimates obtained using the Brown *et al.* and Deans formulations were surprisingly similar for each forest. The Deans regression was more relevant to SRF as it was derived from trees of the same locality, whilst the Brown *et al.* formulation was derived from pan-tropical data. Their agreement suggests that the data in Table 3.2 are close to the true values. The overall TBGB values highlight the importance of woody biomass below ground level to overall forest biomass (e.g., Nepstad *et al.*, 1994). In addition, the calculated ratio of $B_{\text{brach}} : B_{\text{bole}}$ was 0.22 in both forests; this was very similar to the ratio (0.24) given by Kato *et al.* (1978) for a much larger forest in Malaysia. As the ratio obtained here was largely determined by the coefficient (0.23) in Equation 3.3, it would only change significantly for a forest in which most of the biomass was in trees of low $d_{\text{bh}}$.

The estimate in Table 3.2 for PRF biomass is in the lower range for forests of Amazonia and the tropics in general, but compares well with values for different forests in the same state, Rondônia (Martinelli, 1988, unpublished; Revilla Cardenas, 1986, cited in Fearnside *et al.*, 1993; Brown & Lugo, 1992). It also reflects the forest-type designation of 'floresta aberta, ombrofila' (IBGE, 1993), and is in the most common biomass class obtained for moist forests of tropical America by Brown & Iverson (1992, Figure 1). Application to the PRF data of the $d_{\text{bh}} : h$ relationship referred to above (with $r^2 = 0.95$) increased the TB estimate by only 5%. This gave further credence to the values in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. Not all authors publish TB values, but most forests can be compared using TAGB estimates. Table 3.4 gives a range for forests in Amazonia, together with values for rain forests of tropical Africa and Asia. As noted elsewhere (e.g., Brown & Lugo, 1992; McWilliam *et al.*, 1993), South American undisturbed rain forests have a lower biomass than that of their Old World counterparts. To some extent, this is a consequence of lower stature: forests of S.E. Asia may commonly have $h_{\text{max}}$ values near 60 m (Fölster *et al.*, 1976; Whitmore, 1984). The lower biomass may reflect factors peculiar to the region such as oligotrophic soils, forest age, history of land use, and climate (Brünig, 1983; Brown & Lugo, 1992).

The good agreement with reported biomass data for PRF suggests that the exclusion from the calculations of the single large tree in the PRF 0.25 ha plot was an appropriate measure. Overestimates of forest biomass may have been reported in the past where small plots of this kind are extrapolated to larger scales. Bias can be introduced by the unwitting inclusion in a small plot of one or two large diameter trees (Brown & Lugo, 1992). This has also been considered a serious problem in temperate forests of the USA (McCune & Menges, 1986).
### Table 3.4. TAGB estimates (t ha⁻¹) for moist forest in Amazonia and the tropics of Africa and Asia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest location</th>
<th>TAGB</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasoh Forest, Malaysia</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Kato et al., 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary moist forest, Cameroon</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Lugo, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaus, Central Amazon, Brazil</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>McWilliam et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos de R. Negro, Venezuela, terra firme</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Jordan &amp; Uhl, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Dam, Rondônia, Brazil 'broadleaf, open'</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Martinelli, 1988 in Fearnside et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Hydroelectric Reservoir, N. Rondônia, Brazil</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Foster Brown et al., 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guapore district, Rondônia, Brazil</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Lugo, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserva Jarú, Rondônia, Brazil, 'aberta ombrofila'</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbalmayo Reserve, Cameroon, 'secondary, disturbed'</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are fewer estimates of biomass for secondary or disturbed forest, and these vary with the nature of the definition of 'secondary forest'. Clearly, the TB values for SRF are lower than for PRF, as their histories are very different. TB and TAGB at the SRF site (Tables 3.2 and 3.4) fall within the reported range of 43 t ha⁻¹ to 425 t ha⁻¹ for secondary forests in the tropics (Brown & Lugo, 1992; Brown et al., 1992; Honzak, 1996). The average density of the wood in SRF is likely to be different from undisturbed forest, so a further correction may be required for this site. An additional feature of SRF relevant to carbon balance estimates is the mass of dead wood present (15 t ha⁻¹; 95% c.l. 16 t ha⁻¹). This was greater than in PRF and presumably a consequence of harvesting (personal observation). An unknown amount of dead root biomass also accruing from the harvest in 1989 is likely to be present in SRF soil. This component could not be estimated as the harvest volume and previous forest condition are unknown.

#### LEAF AREA AND BIOMASS

LAI for the two forests was very similar (4.0 in PRF vs 4.4 in SRF; Figure 3.4). This result was surprising given the large difference in TAGB values. However, the difference can be explained by the high leaf area present near ground level in SRF (Figure 3.5). Informal field observations indicated that much of the ground level leaf area in SRF was not supported by trees, but herbaceous species, often of the Marantaceae family, e.g., Haumaniana danckelmaniana. Consequently, the expected positive correlation between LAI and TAGB (e.g., McWilliam et al., 1993) did not operate here. The variation and range of LAI in SRF was greater than in PRF (95% c.l. of mean: 0.7 in PRF vs 0.95 in SRF; range: 2.6 - 5.9 in PRF vs 1.8 - 5.7 in SRF). Large gaps resulting from the harvest of 1989 in SRF explain the higher variability of leaf area in this canopy.
Leaf area changes very rapidly after disturbance in the humid tropics, making comparisons with SRF difficult. The mean LAI of PRF was lower than that reported for other forests of the Amazon Basin (5.1 - 7.5; McWilliam et al., 1993), but was consistent with its relatively low TAGB, its forest-type designation (IBGE, 1993) and the relatively high abundance of palms. An independent estimate of LAI at the PRF site was made by Dr J. Roberts of the Institute of Hydrology, UK, using litter fall studies (personal communication); initial results gave an LAI of 4.0 - 4.5, in agreement with this study, though Roberts made an [untested] assumption of leaf longevity (1 year) in his calculations.

The vertical profiles in LAI for SRF were more variable than in PRF (Figure 3.5) and reflect the history of disturbance in SRF. The leaf area profiles from SRF are regarded as more reliable than those from PRF, as a formalized technique was used. To calculate LAI using the method used in Cameroon, an assumption was required either that $K = 0.5$ (Equation 3.11), or that $K \neq 0.5$, but remained constant with height (i.e., proportionate scaling of $\ln t$ to the mean canopy LAI). To obtain a measure of LAI at a given height, it was necessary to view the target balloon horizontally. Consequently, it was not possible to circumvent assumptions regarding $K$ by using a zenith angle of 57.3°, where all leaf angle distributions give a similar extinction coefficient (Warren Wilson & Reeve, 1960; Campbell & Norman, 1989). For $K = 0.5$, the LAI for each profile was found to be ~4.4 for two profiles, and significantly less for the other two (Table 3.3). Field notes describing the vegetation close to the tower suggested that the LAI for the latter two profiles was much lower, so the values in Table 3.3 may reflect the true values; the assumption of a spherical LAD appeared satisfactory.

Although this method of measurement of the vertical profile in LAI is relatively inexpensive and rapid to use, it remains limited by the position of the tower, and the path length between the target and the camera. If the local canopy structure is not typical of the forest in general, the profiles will not be representative. The maximum usable path length is probably 30 m - 50 m, depending on leaf area density. This limits the estimate of horizontal heterogeneity in leaf area to the canopy radius of only 1 - 2 trees. These limitations are extremely difficult to overcome, even with highly expensive canopy scaffolding (Koike & Syahbuddin, 1993). The technique suggested here provides one answer to a challenging problem.

The profiles in SLA indicated for both forests that leaf thickness is greatest at the top of the canopy, and declines (SLA increases) in an approximately linear fashion, in negative correlation with height (Figure 3.6a). This pattern has been observed elsewhere in tropical forests (Odum, 1970; Yoda, 1974; Medina & Klinge, 1983; McWilliam et al., 1993). The SLA values reported in these studies ranged
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from 40 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$ to 164 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$. Average SLA values in tropical rain forest given by Schulze et al. (1994) range from 47 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$ to 196 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$. These data are similar to those found for SRF and PRF (range: 69 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$ to 250 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$), although the maximum measured values were a little higher in this study. The differences between forests probably reflect species differences, but the similarity in profile character is striking and likely to be linked to leaf physiology (see Chapters 6 and 7). The vertical profiles in leaf biomass (Figure 3.6b) underline the importance of leaves near the ground SRF.

3.5 CONCLUSIONS

Inventories were made in 0.25 ha of PRF and 2 ha of SRF. The minimum $d_{bh}$ used was 0.1 m. Tree $d_{bh} : h$ relationships were derived for each forest and used to estimate forest biomass from the regressions of Brown et al. (1989) and Deans et al., 1996). The leaf area of each forest was measured indirectly using hemispherical photography, and the vertical distribution in leaf area was estimated using a new photographic technique.

The two forests differed structurally: SRF had a higher frequency of low $d_{bh}$ trees, and few trees of high $d_{bh}$, whilst the reverse was true for PRF. The independent regressions of Brown et al. and Deans et al. gave very similar results, suggesting that the estimates obtained were close to the true values. The total biomass of PRF (300 t ha$^{-1}$) was greater than that of SRF (122 t ha$^{-1}$), but within the range of reported values for forests of Amazonia, and the state of Rondônia in particular. The total biomass of SRF was within the wide range of reported values for secondary forests in the tropics.

The total leaf area index of both forests was very similar (4.0 for PRF vs 4.4 for SRF). A significant proportion of the leaf area in SRF was supported by herbaceous vegetation rather than trees. In both forests, the maximum leaf area was found between 20 m and 30 m above the ground. But the profiles differed significantly at ground level where in SRF leaf area was relatively high, whilst in PRF, it was low. The technique devised to estimate these profiles appeared to work reasonably well, and suggested that an assumption of a spherical leaf angle distribution may be satisfactory for such measurements when used in conjunction with ground-based hemispherical photographs. The specific leaf area was similar for both forests and was correlated negatively with height; the values were similar to, though the maxima a little higher than, those reported elsewhere for tropical rain forest (65 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$ to 250 cm$^2$ g$^{-1}$). Total leaf biomass was similar for both forests (3.2 t ha$^{-1}$ for PRF vs 3.4 t ha$^{-1}$ for SRF), and less than that reported for other forests of higher biomass, in central Amazonia.
4. The flux of CO$_2$ from the forest floor

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The respiratory component of the terrestrial carbon cycle is dominated by the evolution of carbon dioxide from the soil (Bolin 1983; Houghton & Woodwell, 1979). Despite its importance, the magnitude of this flux remains poorly quantified, especially so in tropical regions (Singh & Gupta, 1977; Fung et al., 1987; Raich & Schlesinger, 1992). In order to improve models of the carbon cycle it is necessary to improve our understanding of the main sources of carbon dioxide in tropical forests, and how the principal underlying emission process, in soil, may change in concert with climatic variables (Townsend et al., 1992; Gifford, 1994).

Carbon dioxide is produced in soils by the respiration of roots, bacteria, fungi, soil fauna, and by chemical oxidation of carbon compounds (Lundegårdh, 1927). The rate of transfer of CO$_2$ to the atmosphere is controlled by its rate of production, soil-atmosphere gradients in temperature and CO$_2$ concentration, soil physical properties, and turbulence-induced pressure fluctuations. The total flux of CO$_2$ from soil is a basic descriptor of metabolic activity in an ecosystem and the disentanglement of its component source processes has been an aim at site-specific scales (e.g., Newton, 1923; Coleman, 1973a) and global scales (e.g., Raich & Schlesinger, 1992). A further goal has been the characterisation of factors, such as soil moisture, composition and temperature, that determine respiration rates in soil (e.g., Edwards, 1974; Ewel et al., 1987).

The methods by which respiration in soil is assayed have changed as technology has improved; precise measurement of the phenomenon is not simple. Consequently a short discussion of measurement techniques and problems precedes the main body of this chapter. Emphasis is then given to the temperature response in soil CO$_2$ emissions. Soil composition factors are also included in the analysis for SRF. The spatial and temporal representation of CO$_2$ emissions from the forest floor as a whole is considered. Analysis is made of the effects of soil heterogeneity on how soil CO$_2$ emissions may be modelled, and improvements for future work are considered.
THE MEASUREMENT OF RESPIRATION IN SOIL

The measurement of CO₂ evolution from the soil began early in this century (e.g., Neller, 1918). Several methodologies for field application have been devised, first following the ideas of Lundegårdh (1927) using alkali absorption techniques, and later using gas exchange methods (e.g., Edwards, 1974; Verma, 1990). Reviews of these approaches can be found elsewhere (Schlesinger, 1977; Nakayama, 1990; Hutchinson and Livingston, 1993; Fang & Moncrieff, 1996). Detailed discussion here is restricted to those employed in this study, with the emphasis reflecting intensity of use.

Five main approaches have been taken for measurement of below-canopy soil CO₂ effluxes, three involving chambers sealed to the soil surface, one using eddy covariance and one using the CO₂ concentration profile method. The last of these, proposed by De Jong & Schappert (1972), differs from the other four in that efflux is not measured directly. Instead it is inferred from measurements of CO₂ concentration at different depths in the soil, together with respective estimates of gas diffusivity. The consequent benefit of avoiding the difficulties of surface flux measurement is offset by the requirement for an assumption of steady-state concentrations throughout the profile, and this approach is best followed in conjunction with other techniques.

The alkali absorption method operates whereby CO₂ released from the soil enclosed by a chamber is absorbed by hydroxide solution or soda-lime granules and measured by titration or weight gain. Although it is easy to employ in the field (e.g., Coleman, 1973b), it suffers from errors accruing from incomplete absorption of evolved CO₂. These errors are likely to be larger at temperatures higher than 15 °C (Cropper et al., 1985) even if more advanced methods are used (e.g., Edwards, 1982).

The relatively recent availability of gas chromatographs and field-portable IRGAs has improved the estimation of soil CO₂ emissions using chambers and micrometeorological techniques (e.g., Svensson, 1980; Parkinson, 1981; Keller et al. 1986; Norman et al. 1992). For this study three methods were used in conjunction with an IRGA: closed chamber, open chamber and eddy covariance. The chamber methods operate by sealing a chamber to the soil surface; they differ in that the closed chamber technique relies on the short-term spot measurement of the enrichment of CO₂ in air circulating within the chamber and IRGA only, whilst the open chamber technique requires ambient air to pass through and out of the measurement apparatus at a continuous flow rate. By contrast, eddy covariance makes no disturbance to the soil surface. Instead the vertical flux of CO₂ at a point is obtained by correlating instantaneous fluctuations of CO₂ concentration with vertical wind speed.
Methodological strengths and weaknesses

Chambers offer a relatively cheap approach but require care to avoid bias in measurement. Eddy covariance methods have the advantage of providing spatially integrated estimates, but are costly and require particular micrometeorological conditions. Furthermore, whilst the former approach measures the process(es) of CO₂ production from one compartment only (soil), the latter includes information about its transport and production within the trunk-space, as well.

Two categories of error using chamber methods can be identified: those arising from (a) physical or biological disturbances and (b) sample handling or computation of fluxes from concentration data (Hutchinson & Livingstone, 1993). The second of these is less relevant to the chamber methods employed in this study as the 'sample' was measured directly in the field, and the data obtained provided robust models for the computation of fluxes. Potential errors of the first type include: i) temperature anomalies resulting from covering the soil with a cuvette; ii) the effects of mean pressure differences between outside and inside the cuvette, or the damping of turbulence-induced high frequency surface pressure fluctuations; iii) internal concentration effects; iv) site disturbances such as soil compaction, root severance, disturbance of surface diffusion resistances upon collar emplacement, and the effects of rainfall on permanent installations.

Error types (i), (iii) and (iv) can be avoided with care, but type (ii) is strongly determined by the measurement method used. The open chamber approach is attractive as it allows continuous measurements to be made of soil CO₂ effluxes. But a major difficulty here has been the equalisation of the internal and external pressure whilst sucking or pushing ambient air through the system (Kanemasu et al. 1974), although recent advances have been made in this regard reducing pressure differences to below 0.1 Pa (Fang and Moncrieff, 1995; Rayment and Jarvis, 1996). A logistical challenge with this technique is the requirement for a satisfactory number of measurements to represent the mean properly. Soil CO₂ emissions are notoriously heterogeneous, varying by over 100% within 1m (Nakayama, 1990), and by season (Rochette et al., 1991).

The closed IRGA method does not necessarily suffer from anomalous suction-induced fluxes of CO₂ associated with some open chamber techniques as air is circulated round the sealed chamber system by one pump. The short deployment time of the chamber during measurement also allows the heterogeneity in soil to be sampled widely, and is likely to avoid problems associated with static
pressure fluctuations at the forest floor. Large turbulence events only rarely interrupt the low wind speeds at ground level in mature broadleaf forest (Odum et al., 1970; Baldocchi & Meyers, 1991; Hutchinson & Livingston, 1993; Hanson et al., 1993). But it is possible that such turbulent pumping can also aerate the soil and hence elevate oxidative processes over time (minutes or hours). Spot measurements are unlikely to disturb this hypothesised process, particularly if measurements are made during the night as well as the day, so that different conditions of turbulence are accounted for.

When comparing closed and open chamber systems, a balance should be met between the desire to understand the process(es) of soil CO$_2$ efflux, including the way environmental variables drive them, and the need for a good spatial estimate. These objectives are closely linked if predictive models are to be constructed, and hence the two methods are complementary.

Eddy covariance at 1 - 2 m above ground level offers a potential solution to the shortcomings of chamber methods if the objective is to quantify CO$_2$ fluxes passing from the soil into the canopy. The instruments sense wind speed and changes in temperature and gas concentration and the measurement is representative of a large (though variable) area, or 'flux footprint', making possible a good spatial estimate together with continuous data recording. No disturbance is made to the soil, so the effects of turbulence on respiratory processes can be assessed. Furthermore, a description of scalar transport is provided that may be important for the parameterisation of whole canopy transport models (Baldocchi & Meyers, 1991; Kruijt et al., 1996). However some theoretical objections remain over its application below a canopy because of varying wind-flows near the ground, the difficulty of defining a vertical flux, and the presence of respiring plant material between the source (soil) and the sensors (Kaimal & Finnigan, 1994). The magnitude of the trunk-space source is small in comparison to the soil efflux, but where in-canopy eddy covariance has been shown to work effectively, only semi-continuous recording has been possible as the requirement of steady-state conditions can rarely be met during the hours around sunset (Baldocchi & Meyers, 1991).
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4.2 METHODS

Three sites were visited in this study: in addition to the main PRF and SRF sites, it was also possible to take measurements in an open dry forest type in Central Brazil. This site, in the Reserva Aguas Emendades (15° 33' S, 47° 36' W); has an approximate LAI of 1 and a canopy height of 10 m. The vegetation is of the type cerrado sensu stricto, and is protected from fire. The soil is a red-yellow latisol, with a pH < 5. The annual rainfall is 1500 mm with a strong dry season from June to October, and the mean temperature is 22 °C (for further details, see: Miranda et al. 1996; IBAMA 1992). The nomenclature in this chapter remains the same for the rain forests, and cerrado is referred to as C.

CLOSED CHAMBER

This was the most intensively used technique. Efflux of CO₂ from the soil surface was measured by recording the accumulation of CO₂ in a chamber sealed to the soil surface and connected in closed circuit to an IRGA (Licor LI 6200; Licor Inc., Nebraska, USA), with a drying column containing magnesium perchlorate used for stabilising chamber air humidity. Soil CO₂ efflux, \( R \), was calculated according to Equation 4.1, after correcting the IRGA for atmospheric pressure.

\[
R \text{ (µmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}) = \frac{\Delta[CO_2]_{ch} \, V_{ch} \, (A_{ch} \, 0.0224)}{}
\]

where \( \Delta[CO_2] \) is the change in concentration of CO₂ in chamber (µmol mol\(^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}) \), \( V_{ch} \) and \( A_{ch} \) are chamber volume (m\(^3\)) and enclosed ground surface area (m\(^2\)) respectively, and 0.0224 m\(^3\) is the volume of one mole of gas at standard temperature and pressure.

The chamber was a perspex box, with drilled perspex sheet baffles behind the inlet and in front of the outlet. A small aperture at the side of the chamber (Plate 4.1) permitted venting to the atmosphere (by attachment of narrow bore tubing), or measurement of pressure differentials (by attachment of a digital manometer). The chamber was fitted into a narrow water trough attached to the perimeter of a steel collar inserted 1 - 2 cm into the soil. If the collar could not be inserted without minimal disturbance to the soil, damp sand was successfully used to seal the outside edges to the soil surface. The chamber was sealed to the collar by addition of water to the trough, carefully avoiding any spillage. The basal area of the whole unit was 0.042 m\(^2\); the volume (depending somewhat on depth of collar insertion) was 0.0073 (± 0.0004) m\(^3\).
After checking that chamber CO₂ concentration was close to or at ambient levels (380-600 µmol mol⁻¹, depending on time of day), measurements were made by logging data for 60 or 100 second intervals, using a five second time step, and then repeating the procedure. Data were subsequently checked for linearity of the CO₂ concentration time course over the observed increases of 30 - 60 µmol mol⁻¹. Measurements not fulfilling this stricture (approx. 10%) were discarded. In order to obtain time series data, a limited number of twenty-four hour measurements were made for individual points, or microsites, the collar being left in the soil for the whole of these periods.

Additional tests and observations were also carried out to explore possible errors. Initially, second readings were repeated at each microsite 10-20 minutes after the first to ensure that deployment of the collar had not caused an initial flush of CO₂ by disturbing diffusion resistances at the soil surface (Mosier, 1989); few sites behaved in this way. A collar was also left in the soil for seven days to identify any longer-term effects of chamber emplacement via biological disturbances such as fine root severance. In order to test for the effects of pressure differences between inside the chamber and out, a series of measurements were made with a narrow bore tube (15 cm long, 1.5 mm internal diameter) attached to the venting aperture. A digital manometer was also attached to the venting aperture. Finally, to investigate whether or not light at the bottom of the canopy might affect CO₂ evolution rates from the soil, a sheet of reflective plastic (Perifleur, UK) was used to compare dark and light conditions.

Plate 4.1. The closed chamber system used to measure soil CO₂ effluxes. The IRGA (foreground) is connected in a closed circuit to the chamber. A soil capacitance probe is also visible (left). The white plug on the chamber was the attachment point for the manometer or pressure venting tube.
Sampling of the forest floor was necessarily restricted to relatively flat patches of ground. Notwithstanding this, a wide range of microsites was chosen in an attempt to represent soil diversity with respect to distance from tree trunks, litter depth, and topography. In SRF, a more rigorous sampling strategy was logistically possible. Using the micrometeorological tower as a reference point, randomly positioned microsites were sampled in blocked areas concentric to the tower with radii as follows: 0 - 50 m, 50 - 100 m, 100 - 150 m, 150 - 300 m, and 300 - 500 m. These distances were within the flux footprint for the above-canopy eddy covariance measurements (Grace et al., unpublished), allowing comparison with these data.

In Brazil, measurements were made during May and June 1993 for PRF and April and July 1993 for C. In Cameroon, in SRF, they were made at spaced intervals from December 1993 to May 1994; in addition four other soils were sampled in the area close to the main Mbalmayo Reserve site during April 1994. Three other secondary forest sites and one previously bulldozed site (Table 4.1) were visited in collaboration with Professor John Lawton of Imperial College, London.

Table 4.1. The sites where soil CO$_2$ emissions were measured in SRF, 1994. The localities are shown in Map 2.2, Chapter 2. An illness prevented collection of more data from sites 2 - 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Forest description</th>
<th>Map no.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main tower site, SRF</td>
<td>Secondary forest, logged 1989</td>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebogo</td>
<td>Manually prepared forest, for plantation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eboufek</td>
<td>Mature, secondary forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilkik</td>
<td>Very mature secondary forest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA Fallow</td>
<td>Field: recently burned fallow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozed</td>
<td>Field: bulldozed forest, planted trees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEN CHAMBER**

The open chamber method was used for one microsite over a five day period during April 1994 in Cameroon, when equipment became available unexpectedly. A standard closed system cuvette was connected to a small pump system, air being drawn through the chamber at 1.0 l min$^{-1}$ and delivered to a fast response IRGA (Licor LI 6262, Licor Inc., Nebraska, USA) calibrated for carbon dioxide and water vapour. Data were logged as the differential between ambient and chamber concentrations. Efflux values were calculated according to Equation 4.2, after correcting the IRGA for atmospheric pressure.
where $\Delta[S]_{ch}$ is the difference in scalar concentration between air entering and leaving the chamber and $F_{ch}$ is the molar flow rate through the chamber.

**EDDY COVARIANCE**

The Edisol eddy covariance system was erected at 1.5 m height above the forest floor using spare tower scaffolding, and data were logged for 48 hours between 7th and 9th May 1994, in SRF. The system has been described in detail elsewhere (Moncrieff et al., 1996), and the precise set-up was as specified in Grace et al. (1995a), although particular care was taken to make sure the anemometer was vertical. The principle of the method is that fluxes of a scalar from a horizontally homogeneous surface, under steady-state conditions, can be calculated by the instantaneous correlation of fluctuations in vertical wind speed with scalar concentration (Verma, 1990). These entities are measured using a 3-dimensional sonic anemometer (Solent A1002R, Gill Instruments, Lymington, UK) and a fast response IRGA (Li6262, Licor, Nebraska, USA). Where the scalar in question is CO$_2$, Equation 3 can be used to represent this calculation:

$$F_C (\mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}) = -< w' \rho_{C'} >$$

**Equation 4.3.**

where $F_C$ is the CO$_2$ flux, $w'$ and $\rho_{C'}$ are instantaneous departures from the mean vertical wind speed and CO$_2$ concentration, calculated using a 200 s autoregressive moving average. By micrometeorological convention, the negative sign represents fluxes towards the surface (that is from the atmosphere) and the angle brackets denote time averaging. The Edisol software (Massheder & Moncrieff, 1995) corrects the measured fluxes for fluctuations in density (Webb et al., 1980). To derive the vertical component of CO$_2$ fluxes from above a canopy the three-dimensional anemometer data are normally rotated three times to obtain zero $< w >$ (McCracken, 1993). Smooth wind-flow streamlines are not usually found below the canopy, so the Edisol software was adapted for this study to retain only the first rotation into the average wind direction (J. Massheder, personal communication), and reliance was placed on the vertical erection of the anemometer to derive zero $< w >$. Post-processing corrections are usually employed to correct the data for non-ideal frequency responses in the system, such as attenuation of the signal down the sampling tube, mis-matched response times in the anemometer and gas analyser, and the underestimation of fluxes due to sensor
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separation (Moore, 1986; Leuning & Moncrieff, 1990). However, turbulence conditions below a forest canopy are not necessarily representative of those above it (e.g., McCracken, 1993), so the spectral models normally used to correct the data for signal loss resulting from differences in data acquisition by the anemometer and gas analyser (Kaimal et al., 1972; Moore, 1986) were not used here.

Instead, the covariance in spectral density between $w'$ and $t'$ (the instantaneous departure from the mean temperature, $t$) was compared with that of $w'$ and $c'$. An assumption was made that the $w't'$ cospectrum for a given time period (e.g., 30 minutes) represented the 'true' below-canopy cospectrum for this site, and that this could be used to correct the $w'c'$ co-spectrum. The basis for such an assumption is that $w$ and $t$ were recorded at very high frequency (21 Hz) and the signal was not subject to errors such as 'smearing' caused by passage through tubing to the gas analyser. As a consequence, they were unlikely to require the corrections that $c$ data demand. Comparing $w'c'$ and $w't'$ cospectra was not straightforward as attenuation in the $c$ signal created differences in the normalised covariances between $w't'$ and $w'c'$. At the minimum frequency (~0.01 Hz) there is likely to be no (or very little) signal loss with either species, so the covariances could be compared at this point. The fractional difference between the $w'c'$ and $w't'$ cospectral density at this minimum frequency was used to normalise the $w'c'$ cospectrum with respect to the $w't'$ cospectrum. The proportional difference between the overall flux signal in $c$ and $w$ was then calculated according to the difference between the integral under the new [retrieved, 'unattenuated'] $w'c'$ cospectrum and that of the $w't'$ cospectrum. This correction in signal was then applied in the final flux calculations.

The application of the eddy covariance technique near the forest floor remains experimental, though it has been successful elsewhere (e.g., Baldocchi et al., 1986). To my knowledge this was the first use of eddy covariance as a technique to measure soil CO$_2$ efflux in a tropical rain forest.

SOIL TEMPERATURE

With the closed chamber method soil temperature at 1cm depth was measured during the measurement of soil CO$_2$ efflux using a Cu-Cn thermocouple with an amplified output (sensitivity ± 0.2 °C). Soil temperature at 1 cm depth was also logged at other microsites, using a Campbell 21X micrologger (Campbell Scientific, Leicester, UK). The lag between changes in air and soil temperature, and the shaded environment of the forest floor, resulted in no detectable effect of chamber emplacement on soil surface temperature during measurement. In Cameroon the soil temperature profile was also
measured using a 25 cm probe (see Appendix A). The depths measured were litter, 1 cm, 2.5 cm, 5 cm, 10 cm and 25 cm. Four profiles were sampled during the field programme together with an extra profile measured in conjunction with the open chamber system.

SOIL COMPOSITION

Water volume fraction

Soil water volume fraction (WVF) was measured in SRF using a soil capacitance probe from the Institute of Hydrology, UK (IH). The instrument is a hand-held device based on the design of Dean et al. (1987) that exploits the high dielectric constant of water compared to that of dry soil (approximately 80 vs 4, at frequencies less than 1000 MHz) to detect small differences in soil water content.

The capacitance probe was site-calibrated for the SRF soil using augers designed to prevent compaction of the sampled soil, and gravimetric analysis was made using laboratory scales precise to 0.001g (Salter-AND FX-300, Salter, USA) and a drying-oven (Gallenkamp, UK) at the ODA/FMRP Research Station, Mbalmayo. The instrument was calibrated for soil WVF between 0.18 and 0.35. Over this span, the response of the probe approximates a straight line (IH, unpublished literature). The regressions between capacitance and WVF were highly significant at 5 cm and 10 cm (see Appendix A for calibration details). Surface moisture levels were measured at both depths in the microsites where soil CO₂ efflux was measured (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. The number of soil CO₂ efflux and water volume fraction (WVF) measurements obtained on different dates in Cameroon, 1993/4. One ‘extra’ measurement day was possible in 1993, denoted by day of year (345).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (day of year)</th>
<th>CO₂ efflux</th>
<th>WVF at 5cm depth</th>
<th>WVF at 10cm depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nutrient analysis

Soil samples were obtained from a subset of the soil respiration microsites in SRF. A total of 13 microsites were sampled to 5 cm and 10 cm using a 6 cm diameter auger; an illness prevented the collection of a larger dataset. Immediately after lifting the soil samples, all roots were carefully removed by hand using fine-tipped forceps, and then washed. Fine roots were separated from coarse roots using the criterion of a maximum fine root diameter of 2 mm (Ewel et al., 1987). Dead roots were not removed and were treated as soil organic matter. To ascertain whether or not a root was alive it was twisted or bent and the tissue inspected. All roots and soil samples were oven dried at 70 °C to constant mass. The soil samples were analysed by the laboratory of the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, in Yaoundé, Cameroon using the Kjeldahl method (Allen, 1974). The root samples were returned to the UK and analysed in Edinburgh using a standard wet digestion (Allen, 1974).

4.3 RESULTS

SOIL TEMPERATURE

The surface temperature rhythms for each vegetation type show an extending hysteresis with respect to the solar zenith in a progression from open dry forest (cerrado) to closed rain forest (Figure 4.1). The cerrado soil reached a maximum temperature of 22 °C at 1500 hours, whilst the rain forest sites attained maximum values of 23 - 24 °C nearer 1600 or 1700 hours. The amplitude of the temperature cycles differed as well: in cerrado, the diurnal temperature range was approximately 7 °C, whilst for rain forest it was 1-2 °C, except during friagens in PRF, or stormy weather. Furthermore, soil in the cerrado reached lower minima (~16 °C) than in the rain forests. The profile data from SRF typically showed temperature cycles to be damped and more strongly lagged with increasing depth down to 25 cm where the signal was very weak and daily weather regimes were only just observable (Figure 4.1d).
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Figures 4.1a-d. Diurnal temperature at 1cm depth for: (a) C, (b) SRF (c) PRF. The different symbols in (a) - (c) represent different microsites. In (d) diurnal cycles are shown for litter and soil at 1cm, 2.5 cm, 5 cm, 10 cm & 25 cm. The time is local time: for PRF and cerrado local time is solar time; for SRF, local time is one hour ahead of solar time.
CLOSED CHAMBER MEASUREMENTS

Mean measured rates of CO\textsubscript{2} emission from soil were higher in rain forest than in cerrado, and higher in PRF than in SRF: PRF mean = 5.51 (± 0.13), \(n = 42\), at 22.8 (± 0.1) °C; SRF mean = 4.60 (± 0.02), \(n = 178\), at 22.5 (± 0.1) °C; C mean = 3.0 (± 0.07), \(n = 10\), at 20.1 (± 0.5) °C, all effluxes in \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\) with SE in parentheses. Point variability was greatest in SRF (range = 10.5 - 2.6 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\)), and PRF was more variable than C (ranges = 7.1 - 4.0 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\) for PRF vs 3.8 - 2.2 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\) for C).

Table 4.2 summarises the CO\textsubscript{2} emissions from the five extra sites visited in SRF. The means and 95% confidence limits for each show that sites 1 - 4 were statistically indistinguishable and quite similar to the main SRF site, whilst the bulldozed site showed significantly lower CO\textsubscript{2} efflux rates and higher soil temperatures. Temperature-corrected data (assuming a \(Q_{10}\) of 2.0) grouped the three secondary forest sites as statistically different from the other two (\(p = 0.01\), \(n = 2\)). The bulldozed soil was particularly heterogeneous, and appeared to have only a sparse layer of decomposing matter.

Table 4.2. Soil temperature (at 1 cm, in °C) and CO\textsubscript{2} efflux rates (in \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}\)) from five extra sites in Mbalmayo Reserve, Cameroon. The data are not temperature corrected as temperature responses were unknown; 95% confidence intervals for each mean are given in parentheses. CO\textsubscript{2} efflux units are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map site number / Site</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2} efflux</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Secondary forest prepared for plantation</td>
<td>24.4 (0.1)</td>
<td>4.3 (0.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Mature secondary forest</td>
<td>24.2 (0.2)</td>
<td>5.4 (0.7)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Very mature secondary forest</td>
<td>23.6 (0.2)</td>
<td>4.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Fallow field, recently cut</td>
<td>27.3 (1.2)</td>
<td>4.7 (0.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Bulldozed forest, replanted</td>
<td>30.8 (2.4)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.7)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tests for possible biological or physical sources of measurement bias confirmed that the data from the closed chamber method were satisfactory. Pressure effects on CO\textsubscript{2} efflux rates were small and did not significantly affect measurement: differentials between inside and outside the chamber were not detectable during the short period of emplacement, and data obtained with and without a narrow-bore venting tube were virtually identical (Figure 4.2a). The seven day experiment where a collar was left in the ground confirmed indications from elsewhere (e.g., Anderson et al., 1983) that root severance leads to a gradual reduction in efflux rates (Figure 4.2b), and shading the chamber with a shroud did not affect efflux measurements, presumably because of the low light levels and little green vegetation on the forest floor (data not shown).
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The twenty-four hour time series data for individual microsites indicated a strong relationship between temperature and CO₂ efflux. Figure 4.1 shows the diurnal temperature cycles as measured with CO₂ efflux; Figure 4.3 plots the respective efflux values against these same temperatures for each microsite. The efflux at each microsite was explained to a large extent by temperature, yielding $r^2$ values between 0.62 - 0.95, although inter-microsite variation was large for the rain forest soils. Regression statistics
could not be ascribed to these data as they do not fulfil the criterion of independence. There was no evidence for a diurnal cycle in soil respiration other than through the effect of temperature.

Figures 4.3a-c. Variation in CO$_2$ efflux with temperature at individual microsites in C, SRF and PRF. The efflux data are, respectively, the same microsites as given in Figure 4.1; different symbols denote different microsites. The regression lines are linear fits through data from individual microsites (i.e., time series data).
The data from all the microsites \((n = 42, 178 \text{ and } 10 \text{ for PRF, SRF and C respectively})\) were fitted to an exponential temperature model, Equation 4.3:

\[
R = R_0 e^{(kT)} \tag{Equation 4.3i}
\]

which can be rearranged to a linear relationship:

\[
\ln R = \ln R_0 + kT \tag{Equation 4.3ii}
\]

where \(R\) = efflux in \(\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\) and \(T\) = temperature in \(^\circ\text{C}\). The \(Q_{10}\) value can be obtained from, \(\ln Q_{10} = 10k\).

The logarithmic function accounted for the variation in point emission rates to give highly significant regressions. Although the \(r^2\) values were lower than 0.5, the fitted \(k\) values for the main datasets were similar to those obtained for individual microsites (Figures 4.3 & 4.4; Table 4.3). Arrhenius-type models (e.g., Bridgham & Richardson, 1992; Lloyd & Taylor, 1994) were also applied to the data, but did not give improved fits, nor were the residuals spread more evenly about the predicted value (Figure 4.5). The temperature response functions in Table 4.3 were replotted on a linear scale in Figure 4.6 with the standard errors of prediction drawn in for SRF and PRF (Sokal & Rohlf, 1981). They emphasise the higher respiration rates in PRF than in SRF or C, and the larger \(Q_{10}\) value at 2.3 for PRF vs 1.9 for SRF and 1.6 for C. The \(R_0\) and \(Q_{10}\) values were lowest in C.

**Table 4.3.** The regression data obtained from fitting the data in Figure 4.4 to Equation 4.3ii. The mean \(Q_{10}\) value for individual microsites from Figure 4.3 are also indicated, with the sample size appended; subscripts dictate the origin of \(Q_{10}\) values. The \(*Q_{10}\) value is for five of six microsites, as one site gave a very high \(Q_{10}\) of 7.5 (see Figure 4.3); including this microsite, mean \(Q_{10} = 2.4\). Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest site</th>
<th>(R_0)</th>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(Q_{10}\text{eff+5})</th>
<th>(r^2)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(Q_{10}\text{eff+5*:} n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.32 (0.1)</td>
<td>0.044 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>1.09 (0.4)</td>
<td>0.063 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1.9*: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>0.81 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.083 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3 : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF + Sept 1992</td>
<td>0.34 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figures 4.4a-c. Soil CO$_2$ efflux rates (spots) for all microsites measured in C, SRF and PRF, plotted as ln ($R$) vs temperature. The regression results are given in Table 4.3; confidence limits are 95%. The open squares in (a) and (c) are mean values, with 95% c.l. for dry season data from cerrado (July 1993; $n = 8$) and PRF (September 1992, $n = 9$, J. Grace, unpublished).
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Figures 4.5 a&b. Residual plots for exponential and Arrhenius-type models fitted to data from SRF and PRF. The closed symbols represent the exponential model and the open symbols the Arrhenius-type model.

Figures 4.6a&b. Temperature response functions for CO₂ efflux in soil in C, SRF and PRF. The functions are fitted exponential models with the standard error of prediction intervals shown for SRF and PRF (Sokal & Rohlf, 1981).
Temporal and spatial representation of soil CO₂ emissions

Figure 4.4 also shows data obtained in C and PRF during a different time of year from the main dataset, the dry season (July 1993 for C, this work; and September 1992 for PRF (J. Grace, unpublished). The data were limited (C, n = 8; PRF, n= 9) but indicated a limitation in C during the dry season, whilst in PRF there was no apparent seasonality in soil effluxes: inclusion of the September 1992 data from PRF did not significantly change the regression obtained for the following wet season (Table 4.3). For SRF it was possible to get a better sample of temporal variation in respiration rates and a single factor analysis of variance revealed no significant between-date differences in fluxes from December 1993 to May 1994 (p = 0.8; n = 5).

Spatial heterogeneity was assessed in SRF via a single factor analysis of variance on temperature-corrected fluxes at different distances (0 to 500 m) from the tower: significant variance by distance was not observed (p = 0.6; n = 5; see Figure 4.7). The data from both SRF and PRF were further analysed by comparison with a normal distribution of soil CO₂ effluxes defined according to the mean and variance of each sample (Figures 8a&b, main plots). This was represented as the raw fluxes plotted against their expected probability of measurement, given in percentiles. Inset into both graphs is the same normal distribution plotted against expected frequency, but here the data (columns) were normalised to the mean observed soil temperature. In the main graph for PRF, the lack of deviation in observed fluxes from the expected distribution (the straight line) indicated a robust estimate of overall soil CO₂ emissions. For SRF (Figure 4.8b), the inset graph suggested some skew in the temperature-corrected data. This bias was a sampling problem also observed in the main graph, and resulted from the more heterogeneous soil at this site.

![Graph](image-url)  
**Figure 4.7.** The variation in soil CO₂ efflux with distance from tower in SRF. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals about the mean.
Figures 4.8a&b. Main graphs: CO₂ efflux plotted as percentiles of observed and expected distributions. Expected values are represented by the straight lines defined according to sample size and mean of samples. The inset graphs are frequency distributions of temperature-corrected effluxes, with the normal distribution calculated from the sample size and mean.
Response to soil moisture

The measurements from Brazil in C suggested that moisture limitation in respiration occurred during the dry season, but this did not happen in PRF (Figure 4.4). The data from SRF showed the surface 5 cm and 10 cm of the forest floor to become 15 - 30% wetter from February to May 1994, but the CO$_2$ efflux rates did not vary significantly over the same period (Figure 4.9). The storage of water in the soil profile was measured for both SRF and PRF (Hodnett et al., 1996; S. Boyle, unpublished): it varied from 560 - 660 mm in SRF and 585 - 720 mm in PRF during the respective periods of fieldwork. The profile data from SRF correlated strongly with surface WVF for the same period (Figure 4.10). Making a crude assumption that water storage in the SRF soil profile affected CO$_2$ efflux rates in a similar way to the manner in which they were determined in PRF, the data further support the hypothesis that respiration was not moisture-limited in either rain forest.

![Figure 4.9.](image)

Figure 4.9. Water volume fraction in the surface 5 cm and 10 cm of the SRF soil and mean measured CO$_2$ efflux (±S.E.), normalised to the mean measured temperature for each period (21 - 23 °C), using the fitted $R_0$ in Equation 4.3ii. Note the non-linear scale for time.
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Soil WVF, 10 cm, SRF, Cameroon
- Water storage in soil profile, SRF, Cameroon

NOTE: Water storage in the soil profile in PRF, Brazil, May-June, 1993 = 585 - 720 mm.

Figure 4.10. Soil surface (10 cm) and soil profile moisture levels in SRF, Cameroon, from February to May 1994. The soil profile storage for PRF during May - June 1993 is also shown in the key, for comparison. The spots represent profile storage data. Sources for soil profile water storage data: S. Boyle, personal communication (Cameroon) and Hodnett et al., 1996 (Brazil).

Soil nutrients

In SRF, soil nitrogen concentrations ranged between 0.14 - 0.17 % dry mass and carbon concentrations between 1.6 - 2 % dry mass, the concentrations of both were higher in the top 5 cm. The CO₂ efflux rates obtained from each microsite correlated well with soil chemical composition. A non-linear regression model was fitted to these data (Equation 4.4), treating the carbon and nitrogen components as linear terms and the temperature component as an exponential, according to Table 4.3:

\[ R = a[1.09 \, e^{(0.0637T)}] + b[N] + c[C] + d \]  

Equation 4.4

where \( R \) is in μmol m⁻² s⁻¹, [N] and [C] are nutrient concentrations, and \( T \) is temperature in °C.

Despite the small size of the dataset an \( r^2 \) value of 0.82 in the top 10 cm and 0.72 in the top 5 cm was obtained (Figure 4.11; Table 4.5). There was no strong bias in the residuals for the overall model and CO₂ effluxes were predicted well across a large range of values (3.5 - 9.5 μmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹). However, carbon was the only significant variable in both 0 - 5 cm and 0 - 10 cm layers (Table 4.4b).
4. CO₂ fluxes from soil

Figure 4.11. Measured vs modelled soil CO₂ efflux in SRF, Cameroon. A multiple regression of the form in Equation 4.4 was used to model the data. The regression statistics are given in Table 4.4. The arrow marks a microsite where the C:N ratio was 20 (see text).

Table 4.4a. Mean soil organic carbon and nitrogen concentrations (% by mass), SRF, Cameroon. 95% confidence limits are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample depth (cm)</th>
<th>Organic carbon</th>
<th>Total nitrogen</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.03 (± 0.39)</td>
<td>0.17 (± 0.02)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.62 (± 0.23)</td>
<td>0.14 (± 0.02)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4b. Regression results for the data in Figure 4.11 after fitting to Equation 4.4. The values in parentheses after each coefficient give the level of significance of each variable in the regression (p-value).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( a (p) )</th>
<th>( b (p) )</th>
<th>( c (p) )</th>
<th>( d (p) )</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 cm</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-2.2 (0.3)</td>
<td>6.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>1.9 (0.01)</td>
<td>10.7 (0.2)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 cm</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-2.1 (0.3)</td>
<td>-2.9 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.95 (0.006)</td>
<td>9.3 (0.3)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dry root mass in the surface layers was 3.9 (±0.6) t ha⁻¹ and 8.9 (±1.7) t ha⁻¹ at 0 - 5 cm and 0 - 10 cm respectively (data are means of 13 samples, with 95% confidence limits); fine roots (<2 mm) and coarse roots (>2 mm) constituted approximately half each of this total. Respiration was not significantly related to root density or root phosphorus concentration in either layer, but it was correlated with root nitrogen and potassium concentration for the 0 - 10 cm layer (Table 4.5).
Table 4.5. Root nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium concentrations in SRF, with 95% confidence limits in parentheses. The regression coefficients are given for the equation: \( R = a [X] + b \), where \( R \) is \( \text{CO}_2 \) efflux in \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) and \([X]\) is concentration at 10 cm of root nitrogen or potassium in g m\(^{-2}\); the coefficients, \( a \) and \( b \) have their \( p \)-values in parentheses after them. The regressions with root P were non-significant. The root data were obtained from the same microsites as the soil nutrient data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>g m(^{-2}) at 5 cm</th>
<th>g m(^{-2}) at 10 cm</th>
<th>( p )-value</th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>5.49 (1.7)</td>
<td>10.29 (4.34)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.097 (0.1)</td>
<td>4.6 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.03)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>43.36 (8.9)</td>
<td>82.75 (31.5)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.016 (0.04)</td>
<td>4.4 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPEN CHAMBER MEASUREMENTS

Open chamber measurements was possible only in SRF. Figure 4.12 shows soil temperature (at 1 cm and 10 cm depth), with water vapour (H\(_2\)O) and CO\(_2\) fluxes from one microsite, logged from April 30th to May 5th, 1994. Rainfall events are shown as downward arrows. For two days prior to the first storm, both gaseous scalars showed diurnal traces with larger fluxes during the day than during the night. Evolution of CO\(_2\) followed the soil temperature cycle with a lag of 15 and 120 minutes for soil temperature at 1 cm and 10 cm respectively, until it started to rain. At this point, efflux rates in the chamber increased dramatically, whilst soil temperature dropped. After the rain, the reverse happened, with the CO\(_2\) efflux subsequently responding to temperature again, but at a rate below the previous levels. Notwithstanding further precipitation events, there was an apparent decrease in efflux over the five day period; a concurrent reduction in soil temperature at both depths could also be observed.

Data were used from before the first rainfall event to derive the temperature response of CO\(_2\) and water vapour fluxes; the responses were a little noisy, reflecting the effects of static pressure fluctuations at the chamber inlet, but there was a strong relationship (for CO\(_2\); \( R_0 = 0.98; k = 0.07 [\text{Q}_{10} = 2.2]; R^2 = 0.60 \)). The mean efflux rate was 5.8 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \); this was higher than the mean rate for the rest of the SRF, but the temperature response for CO\(_2\) efflux was close to that obtained using the closed chamber method (\( k = 0.063 \)).

Soil temperature was logged from litter level down to 25 cm. After removing the lags in temperature at different depths, CO\(_2\) efflux - soil temperature responses were determined for each level. The \( R^2 \) value from each regression was plotted against depth and the strongest relationship with temperature found at 10 cm (though only 10% more of the variation was explained by temperature variation at 10
cm than at 1 cm). Soil temperature at 25 cm explained as much as 65% of the variation in surface effluxes, indicating that an important 'source' of CO₂ production extended to at least this depth.

**Figure 4.12.** Open chamber system CO₂ and H₂O flux data for April 30th - May 5th, 1994, SRF, Cameroon. Also plotted on the graph are soil temperatures at 5 cm and 10 cm, and rainfall. **Key to graph:** CO₂ efflux: •; H₂O flux: ●; Soil temperature at 1 cm: ---; at 10 cm: ---; Rainfall: downward arrows.

**Figure 4.13.** r² values for soil H₂O / CO₂ efflux - temperature regressions for temperature down the soil profile from litter to 25 cm. The data are from the open chamber system, SRF, Cameroon.
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Eddy Covariance Measurements

Figures 4.14a and b show typical variance spectra for $w$ (vertical component of wind speed) and $c$ (CO$_2$ concentration), and covariance spectra for $w't'$ and $w'c'$, with spectral cutoff frequencies occurring at approximately 1 - 2 Hz. These spectra were consistent from half hour to half hour, but distinct from the 'ideal' above-canopy spectra of Kaimal et al. (1972). However, the overall patterns of the $w'c'$ and $w't'$ cospectra were similar in shape, suggesting that the same sources and sinks were common to both scalars and this provided confidence in the use of the $w't'$ cospectrum to retrieve the true signal in the attenuated $w'c'$ cospectrum. The $w'c'$ signal was found to be attenuated by 6 - 12%, with the corrections being most important in the frequency range 0.05 - 0.1 Hz (Figures 4.14b-d).

![Graphs of CO$_2$ flux and temperature measurements](image)

Figures 4.14a-d. Power and cospectral plots for CO$_2$ flux and temperature measured at 1.5 m, SRF, Cameroon. Figures 4.15a&b show power- and cospectral plots. Figures 4.15c&d show the correction applied to the $w'c'$ cospectra (see text). The subscript 's' in (b) and (c) refers to either scalar, CO$_2$ or temperature. Key to graphs: open squares: CO$_2$; spots: temperature.
Figure 4.15a shows 30 minute CO$_2$ fluxes with chamber-derived model CO$_2$ effluxes for the same period (chamber measurements were not made between 7th and 9th May, because of an illness). The chamber-derived model was driven from above-canopy dry-bulb temperature measurements using the canopy-soil temperature algorithm described in Chapter 8 (page 143) and the fitted temperature response equation (Equation 4.3; Table 4.3). A diurnal pattern was not observed in the eddy covariance measurements, but the averaged efflux rate for the 48 hour measurement period was very similar to that obtained from the chamber-derived model (Table 4.6). As an additional check of this estimate, a further constraint was imposed upon the selection of data by defining ‘steady-state conditions’ as those half hour periods when 95% of the variation in CO$_2$ concentration was less than 5% of the mean CO$_2$ concentration. Most of the data that were removed were from the hours around dusk (1700 - 1900 hrs), as a result of low turbulence intensities in $w$. The mean efflux for this new dataset was the same as the mean efflux calculated from 30 min or 5 min intervals (4.3 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$).

The noise in the the 30 minute flux data may have resulted from limitations in the instruments, but it also reflected a turbulence regime below the canopy that was dominated by intermittent gusts penetrating through the whole vertical profile of the canopy (e.g., Denmead & Bradley, 1985). The gusts carry momentum and scalars with them. Depending on the rhythmic frequency of these large eddies, the resulting flux calculations could have been big or small. These hypothesised low frequency eddies were tracked by shortening the interval period for flux calculation from 30 minutes to 10, 5, 3 and 1 minute intervals, and the data plotted against $\sigma_w$, the square root of the variance in $w$. The five minute fluxes were correlated more closely to $\sigma_w$ than any other time interval, indicating that this was the dominant frequency of important turbulence events at 1.5 m above the ground (Figures 4.15b&c).

Table 4.6. Soil CO$_2$ effluxes measured using eddy covariance, in SRF. A comparison of the average upward flux rate of CO$_2$ at a height of 1.5 m with the soil CO$_2$ efflux rate for the same 48 hour period obtained using a chamber-derived model driven from soil temperature estimates. Three eddy covariance estimates are shown: (a) 30 minute fluxes; (b) 5 minute fluxes and (c) 30 minute fluxes using data selected for steady-state conditions (see paragraph above). Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits of the mean efflux for 48 hrs (30 minute estimates for the model data, 5 and 30 minute fluxes for eddy covariance data). All units are in $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate type</th>
<th>Average Efflux Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamber-derived model</td>
<td>4.5 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 30 minute fluxes</td>
<td>4.3 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 5 minute fluxes</td>
<td>4.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Selected 30 minute fluxes</td>
<td>4.3 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figures 4.15a-c. In (a) is shown a time series plot of the eddy covariance data at 1.5 m, with the chamber-derived model. The measurement dates were 7th - 9th May 1994, SRF, Cameroon. In (b) and (c) the relationship between $\sigma_w$ and CO₂ efflux: the closed symbols represent night-time fluxes (5 min fluxes: 1900 - 0100 hrs, day 127-128) and the open symbols daytime fluxes (5 min fluxes: 0900 - 1200, day 128). The 30 minute fluxes are for the full 48 hour measurement period.
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4.4 DISCUSSION

SOIL TEMPERATURE

For all soils the maximum temperature occurred after the solar zenith, but in C this happened at 1400 hrs, whilst in SRF and PRF it took place nearer 1600 - 1700 hrs (Figure 4.1). This probably reflects the differing heat capacities of the three canopy types, which ranged from open dry forest to disturbed and undisturbed closed moist forest. The extra sites visited in Cameroon showed analogous characteristics where, during the day, field soils were up to 7 °C warmer than forest soils, a difference of three times the diurnal amplitude at the main SRF site (Table 4.2).

SOIL CO₂ EFFLUXES

Overall differences among the forests

The CO₂ efflux rates obtained for C were consistent with previous studies for physiognomically similar vegetation types (Schulze, 1967; Raich & Schlesinger, 1992). Secondary rain forest data from the tropics are rare, and secondary forests are highly variable, although Raich (1983) reports similar values for a logged wet forest area on the Atlantic Slope in Costa Rica (4.4 vs 4.6 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ for Cameroon), though the temperature reported by Raich was a little higher than in SRF (23 - 27 °C vs 22.5 °C in SRF). The rates for PRF were higher than some other estimates for Amazonian forest soils (e.g., Medina et al., 1980; Keller, 1986) but are similar to those of Fan et al. (1990), and assuming a soil temperature of 20 °C, those of Wofsy et al. (1988) for the Central Amazonian site, Reserva Ducke, near Manaus (4.5 vs 4.2 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹). It is likely that the diversity of soil types across Amazonia (Jordan, 1985) will lead to a corresponding range of respiration rates in these soils. Metabolic activity in soil is maintained by above- and below-ground organic matter inputs. In the absence of such data, biomass and leaf area differences between the forest types can be used as surrogates to explain the observed variation, though given the low biomass in SRF (Chapter 3), the high efflux rate (4.5 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹) may have reflected continued decomposition of below-ground biomass that was live prior to the harvest in 1989.

The variation among the extra sites in Cameroon was low within the group of secondary forests in Table 4.2. The fallow field showed higher rates of respiration than expected, perhaps reflecting the
recent cutting of the vegetation. Most striking was the bulldozed plot, where pre-planting treatment appeared to have removed most of the organic layer in the soil, leaving a very patchy and resource-poor environment. Consequently root and microbial respiration was low, despite higher temperatures.

Response to soil temperature

The well-defined temperature response for individual microsites (Figure 4.3; closed chamber method) contrasted with the apparent variation in this relationship observed with spot measurements from many microsites (Figure 4.4). The rain forests showed greater variation than did cerrado, suggesting more heterogeneous soil, but also reflecting the effect of temperature response on quantitatively higher effluxes. The higher variance in SRF data reflected disturbance in that forest; point variation in CO₂ emissions from soils is a common feature (Schlesinger, 1977; Singh & Gupta, 1977). The individual microsite data underlined the importance of temperature in determining relative changes in efflux rates. But the variability among microsites in Figure 4.3 also revealed differences in two features of this response: the intercept and slope ($R_0$ and $k$ in Equation 4.1); these differences were averaged in the regressions in Figure 4.4.

It was desirable to determine whether an adequate sample of the natural variation in $R$, $R_0$ and $k$ existed in the data. The estimate of $R$ was tested in Figure 4.8 where observed data were compared with the experimentally determined Gaussian distribution for each sample. Overall the sample sizes were adequate, and rates closely followed a Gaussian distribution, though heterogeneity in SRF was visible. After correcting for temperature, inter-microsite differences in $R_0$ could be inspected (inset graphs, Figure 4.8). If soil chemical composition data had also been available to normalise all the observed microsite fluxes, a closer fit to the expected normal distribution would have been expected (cf. Figure 4.11). It was more difficult to directly assess variation in $k$, though it is reasonable to assume, other factors being equal, that the same features of the soil determining $R_0$ also determine $k$. Supporting this, the average $k$ for individual microsites were close to those for the forest-wide datasets (Table 4.3).

The open chamber data agreed reasonably well with the closed chamber estimates for SRF ($R_0 = 0.98$, $k = 0.08$), though here, $k$ was likely to be more reliable than $R_0$ as the chamber was not specifically designed for open path analysis. Two other features were significant. First, the data describe the effects of rainfall on CO₂ fluxes from soil: although the chamber created unnatural conditions by protecting the enclosed soil from rain, this artefact made clear the displacement of CO₂ from pores in the soil during and just after precipitation. It is possible that eddy covariance measurements could
detect this phenomenon. However, carbon dioxide in the soil would also go into solution during rain, and depending on soil pH and temperature, might be leached from the system. Estimates of dissolved CO\textsubscript{2} leached from forest ecosystems are rare, though Schlesinger & Melack (1981) suggest that 8.51 gC m\textsuperscript{-2} [of watershed] yr\textsuperscript{-1} flow out of the Amazon Basin.

Secondly, continuous data provide a means of remotely locating the primary temperature-sensitive source of CO\textsubscript{2} in the soil. Figure 4.13 implies that the top 10 cm, especially below 5 cm, was the site of maximum CO\textsubscript{2} production in the soil profile. Soil and litter may be drier at the surface, whilst decomposing matter may be most densely meshed between 5 and 10 cm, thus creating an environment where the greatest surface area of particulate metabolic substrate is present in favourable conditions of moisture and oxygen availability (White, 1987; Sorensen, 1981). A number of studies support a contention that the surface layer of tropical rain forest soil produces the greater proportion of total soil CO\textsubscript{2} (e.g., Medina \textit{et al.}, 1980; Luizao, 1987). However, although fine root density is highest near the surface (Cavelier, 1992), significant root mass (and therefore also root litter production) is known to exist deeper in SRF-type soils (Nepstad \textit{et al.}, 1994), and what is seen in these data could merely represent the uppermost fraction of total soil CO\textsubscript{2} production, that changes with diurnal temperature.

The proportion of soil CO\textsubscript{2} production that responds to daily temperature fluctuations must be large in order to explain the observed temperature responses. By assuming that the temperature-varying fraction of soil has an efflux rate with a specific $Q_{10}$, it is possible to investigate what proportion of the original $R_0$ value (in Equation 4.3) is required to increase $R$, as observed for SRF, where a temperature change from 20 - 22 °C results in an increase from 3.9 to 4.4 μmol m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} (Figure 4.6). Table 4.7 quantifies this approach for SRF using assumed $Q_{10}$ values from 1.9 - 3.0: for an assumed $Q_{10}$ of 2.0 (a realistic estimate of the 'pure' physiology (Amthor, 1989), 87% of total production responds to temperature, whilst 13% appears to be insulated from diurnal temperature cycles. The analysis supports the notion that the primary site of CO\textsubscript{2} production is near the surface, but is clearly simplified - without more data only limited account can be taken of the soil profile.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Assumed $Q_{10}$ & $R_0$ & Temp-labile fraction & Deep CO\textsubscript{2} fraction \\
\hline
1.9 (observed) & 1.09 & 1 & 0 \\
2.0 & 0.95 & 0.87 & 0.13 \\
2.5 & 0.58 & 0.53 & 0.47 \\
3.0 & 0.39 & 0.36 & 0.64 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Proportion of total soil CO\textsubscript{2} efflux that responds to daily temperature fluctuations assuming different $Q_{10}$ values for this labile component and using the observed temperature response of soil CO\textsubscript{2} efflux for SRF. The $Q_{10}$ range 1.9 - 3.0 is within that quoted by Singh & Gupta (1977).}
\end{table}
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Response to soil moisture

Whilst soil moisture is crucial to the prediction of soil efflux rates in many environments (Edwards, 1975; Cowing & McLean, 1982; Orchard & Cook, 1983; Norman et al., 1992) it may not be necessary for rain forest (Figures 4.9 & 4.10). Above and below certain limits, soil moisture is thought to have no effect on respiration rate (Tesarova & Gloser, 1976); soil profile data obtained during the measurement period in both SRF and PRF, confirmed that there was no appreciable soil moisture deficit (S. Boyle, personal communication; Hodnett et al., 1996), so it may be reasonable to assume that moisture levels were not limiting in either forest, though soil moisture deficits were experienced later on in the year at PRF (Hodnett et al., 1996). Clearly annual data would be desirable to confirm this, though the similarity of the September 1992 data from PRF to those obtained during the measurements of May - June 1993 suggest that seasonal effects in that forest were slight.

Response to soil composition

Point-to-point differences in soil carbon and nitrogen explain the spatial heterogeneity frequently found in respiration in soil (Chapman, 1979), as also observed here (Figure 4.11). At a larger scale it may be expected that CO₂ effluxes from soils of different types may be predicted using characteristic data on root and soil chemical composition. This issue has been addressed with soil decomposition models such as CENTURY (Parton et al., 1988) and the Rothamstead Model (Jenkinson, 1991). But in both cases the role of root respiration was not explicitly included. Carbon dioxide production by roots has been estimated at 5% to 70% of total soil efflux (e.g., Singh & Gupta, 1977; Chapman, 1979; Ewel et al., 1987), and is consequently important for estimates of total emission rates from soil. The significant relationship with root nitrogen and potassium in SRF was indicative of this relationship (Table 4.5), but root production estimates were not available for the site, and it is this process that may scale most clearly with CO₂ effluxes, not necessarily the standing crop (Nadelhoffer & Raich, 1992). The standing crop root biomass was slightly less than that for another semi-deciduous tropical forest, in Panama (9 ton ha⁻¹; Cavelier, 1992)

Table 4.4b indicates that the only significant variable in the regression used for Figure 4.11 was carbon - other nutrients did not limit respiration, whilst temperature did not explain well the inter-microsite differences (cf., Figure 4.4). Severe carbon limitation in well watered soils is a common feature of the decomposition cycle (Ladd et al., 1985). The regression was also re-expressed to include the C : N ratio as a fourth variable: in the 0 - 5 cm layer, the regression was highly significant.
(p < 0.001), C and the C : N ratio were both highly significant variables (p < 0.001), and the \( r^2 \) value rose from 0.82 to 0.87. All of the points in Figure 4.11, except one, represent C : N ratios of 10-15, suggesting that mineralisation was taking place (Carlyle, 1986). The microsite with the highest measured efflux rate also had a high organic carbon content (4.5%) and C : N ratio of 20 in the first 5 cm of soil; it is marked with an arrow in Figure 4.11. In these soil conditions, the large emissions might be explained by extra metabolic activity associated with a partial shift in microbial activity to immobilisation (cf. Jansson & Persson, 1982), or more simply, by hypothesising that the excess organic carbon was of a labile form and easily broken down, leading to high fungal, microbial and fine root respiration rates (Parton et al., 1988; White, 1987).

**Eddy covariance-derived data**

When compared as a 48 hr average, the eddy-covariance flux estimates agreed well with the chamber-derived model data, even when data were strictly selected for steady state conditions (Table 4.6). The correction procedure probably worked because the \( w'w' \) and \( w'c' \) co-spectra had peaks at the same frequency, though lower frequency spectral data would have confirmed this (Figure 4.14b). Despite this source of uncertainty and the error on individual spectral densities, the corrections were small, and the overall estimate was within ±15% of the chamber-derived value, the minimum error expected among point eddy covariance measurements (Moncrieff et al., 1992). A general discrepancy between chamber-based fluxes and eddy covariance-based fluxes could also have been ascribed to the different areas of soil measured by the two methods. For within-canopy turbulence, the variance in the flux data was greater than for the even streamlines usually found above a canopy, as the flux footprint was only 50 - 100 m in radius from the sensors, and the 30 minute means were dominated by relatively few, irregularly spaced eddies (Figure 4.15a). Figures 4.15b&c show that the average frequency most closely associated with such eddies was of the order of five minutes.

A longer time-series than two days is needed if the turbulence-induced variance in the data is to be reduced. In particular, to detect a diurnal pattern, or enhanced effluxes resulting from oxygenation of the soil surface by gusts of wind, data for one or two weeks may be required to obtain an adequate mean. These results show that eddy covariance provided a good method in SRF by which to obtain area-averaged estimates of CO\(_2\) effluxes passing from the soil into the canopy of a forest in certain situations. But, apart from their low capital cost, chamber techniques remain a necessity if process level data are required as well as fluxes.
MODELS OF CO₂ EVOLUTION FROM THE SOIL

A number of mathematical representations of empirical data on CO₂ flux from soils have been invoked in the past and are summarised by Fang & Moncrieff (1996). These range from linear to multiple variable polynomial functions. Polynomial models tend to predict efflux values well (e.g., Grahammer et al., 1991) but may be far removed from the underlying biology and physics. Applying such a function in a new or changed environment would probably not be successful.

In contrast, functions that have heuristic value are difficult to parameterise precisely. The clearest examples of this are found in attempts to include a soil moisture term (Howard & Howard, 1979; Bosatta, 1980). Soil moisture will influence respiration rates above and below certain thresholds (Tesarova & Gloser, 1976), and may simultaneously affect more than one parameter (Parker et al., 1983). It is easier to include soil nutrient and root factors into such a model and this may prove useful for the general typing of soil CO₂ emissions.

However, for the rain forest soils in this study, an absence of moisture limitation directs the focus for a given field site to the temperature response. An exponential model, rather than a linear one, was chosen for these data, as the regression was better defined and the underlying physiology is non-linear (ap Rees et al., 1988). Arrhenius-type models (e.g., Bridgham & Richardson, 1992; Lloyd & Taylor, 1994) did not further improve the fit to the observed data (Figure 4.5). They are more mechanistically explicit, for example in parameterising the activation energy of 'respiration', but the complexity of respiration in soil does not lend itself to detailed functional interpretation from basic efflux data. This is because different decomposing and growing assemblages are found at different depths in soil. This is further overlaid by temperature regimes that exhibit variation in hysteresis and amplitude so that (assuming other soil physical properties and rainfall events were controlled for) different series of respiratory processes will suffer different levels of limitation reflecting local resource availability. Variations with temperature in Q₁₀ or activation energy (Lloyd & Taylor, 1994) may result from this, though temperature variation in the rain forest soils studied here was not large enough to generate such phenomena. Composite soil CO₂ efflux rates will resist functional interpretation without more detailed profile data.
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4.5 CONCLUSIONS

The flux of carbon dioxide from soil was measured in two rain forests, PRF and SRF, and an open dry tropical forest, cerrado. Efflux rates were higher in rain forest than dry forest, and higher in primary than secondary rain forest. Three methods were used to measure CO₂ emissions from the forest floor: closed chamber, open chamber and eddy covariance, and the results showed good agreement. The weaknesses and strengths of each approach were discussed: expediency dictates that chamber methods are likely to be used in the future, and may be preferred in some circumstances. In this case, a combination of closed and open chambers might be favoured in order to estimate well both the spatial heterogeneity and the processes of respiration in soil.

Soil CO₂ emissions in rain forest were sensitive to temperature, and correlated with soil nitrogen and soil organic carbon concentrations, but not to soil moisture. However, seasonal data from cerrado suggested that soil moisture deficits did limit respiration in this open forest type. There was little indication of seasonal differences in efflux rates from rain forest soils. The temperature sensitivity of soil CO₂ emissions was also shown to vary from point to point, and data from many microsites were used to obtain a robust, spatially integrated response function. An exponential model explained as much or more of the variability in the data than other potential functions; its suitability to represent soil CO₂ effluxes was discussed. Soil heterogeneity was observed in all soil types, rain forest showing greater variability than cerrado. For a given field site, this heterogeneity was explained well by soil composition. A non-linear regression model fitted well to soil composition and temperature data, and suggested that organic carbon was most strongly limiting decomposition processes. This approach could be used as a predictive tool for estimating total carbon dioxide efflux from different soil types.
5. The flux of $\text{CO}_2$ from woody tissue

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Respiration occurs in all living plant tissues. It comprises five main processes, namely glycolysis, the oxidative pentose phosphate pathway and the citric acid cycle followed by electron transport and oxidative phosphorylation. The operation of these primary metabolic reactions is coordinated to oxidise organic substrate, thereby generating high energy compounds (e.g., ATP, NADH, NADPH) and carbon skeletons. These intermediate products may either be further oxidised or directly utilised for the biosynthesis of amino acids and organic acids (ap Rees, 1994). Two other types of respiration also exist, namely photorespiration and cyanide-resistant respiration, but they do not generate as much metabolic energy (Laties, 1982) and are not considered further here.

The main by-product of respiration is $\text{CO}_2$. This released by all cells, whereupon it may escape to the atmosphere, or be re-fixed by photosynthesis. The gas exchange of woody tissue is under-studied in comparison to that of leaves, particularly so in the tropics (Sprugel and Benecke, 1991). Autotrophic respiration may represent 40% to 60% of gross photosynthesis in cool temperate forest (Linder, 1985); Sprugel and Benecke (1991) suggest that this estimate may rise to 90% for tropical forests, though, depending on root respiration rates, perhaps 50 - 60% is more likely (Singh & Gupta, 1977; Chapter 8). However, if above ground woody tissue respiration alone is considered, the estimate for tropical forest reduces to around 13% (Ryan et al., 1994). The differences among these estimates represent an imperative for further research. Without more detailed knowledge it is not possible to answer apparently basic questions such as how the ratio of photosynthetic to respiring tissue changes with tree size, and to what degree respiration can limit forest production (Kira & Shidei, 1967; Ryan & Waring, 1992).

To answer such questions a mechanistic model of respiration in woody tissue is needed. This would provide the basis for identifying scalars suitable for estimating tree- and stand-scale respiration rates. Clearly temperature is one such scalar, but at a constant temperature, it is less clear whether surface area or [sapwood] volume describe $\text{CO}_2$ emissions from bark most accurately (Yoda et al., 1965; Sprugel et al., 1996). This is because $\text{CO}_2$ is produced by cambium and phloem cells near the outer surface of the stem but also by live parenchyma cells associated with the sapwood. If the stem is
growing, then the metabolic activity of the cambium and phloem cells will be high (Goodwin & Goddard, 1940); variable growth rates in similarly sized woody sections will confound efforts to identify the main source of respiration.

To overcome these problems it is useful to divide respiration into two main components - construction respiration ($R_c$), required to build new tissue, and maintenance respiration ($R_m$), required to sustain current tissue by protein replacement, membrane repair and the maintenance of ion gradients (Johansson, 1933; Penning de Vries, 1975; Lambers et al., 1983; Amthor, 1989; Sprugel & Benecke, 1991). This distinction, embodied in the functional model (McCree, 1970; Thornley, 1970, 1977), can be expressed as follows for a whole plant:

\[ R = m W + g \left( \frac{\Delta W}{\Delta t} \right) \]

Equation 5.1

where $R$ is total plant respiration, $W$ is plant mass, $\frac{\Delta W}{\Delta t}$ is the plant growth rate, $g$ is the cost of producing a unit of tissue, and $m$ is the cost of maintaining a unit of tissue. Thus, the first term refers to $R_m$ and the second to $R_c$.

In this view, $R_m$ is a basal metabolic requirement that is sensitive to temperature and dependent on the live biomass, whilst $R_c$ can be calculated simply as the biochemical cost of constructing new tissue, a cost that is independent of temperature (Penning de Vries et al., 1975; McDermitt & Loomis, 1981). This separation of $R_m$ and $R_c$ implies, though not explicitly, that the processes for each are different. They are not. Both are driven by the same respiratory pathways, and respond to the same environmental variables, particularly temperature. The heuristic value of this distinction is not disputed here, but when separating $R_m$ from $R_c$ it should be remembered that the CO$_2$ is being released by the same biochemical processes.

The functional model has also suffered from the criticism that it does not address certain metabolic details. Various reported formulations for $g$ (e.g., Lambers et al., 1983) describe additional respiration demands associated with growth, such as photosynthate transport costs (so-called 'maintenance for growth'). More seriously, variation in $R_m$ and $R_c$ between and within different tissues make it difficult to define $g$ and $m$ precisely for whole trees (Chung & Barnes, 1977; Szaniawski & Kielkiewicz, 1982; Brooks et al., 1991; Sprugel et al., 1996). Despite these shortcomings, the model provides a general framework for analysing respiratory costs that confers advantages outweighing most of the disadvantages.
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Two further processes affecting CO₂ efflux rates from wood are the transport of CO₂ in the transpiration stream and the re-fixation of CO₂ by photosynthetic chlorenchyma present in the cortex. Corticular photosynthesis can reduce net efflux rates of CO₂ by up to 80% in temperate species (Foote & Schaedle, 1976; Linder & Troeng, 1980), but this will be strongly affected by the photon flux density incident on chloroplasts below the bark. Schaedle (1975) estimated as a broad average that 15% of external light penetrates the periderm, so it is not clear how much re-fixation will take place within a dense forest canopy.

The possible transport of respired CO₂ within sap was recognised over sixty years ago (Boysen-Jensen, 1933, cited in Sprugel et al., 1996), and remains a confounding factor in woody tissue respiration measurements (e.g., Ryan, 1990). Carbon dioxide produced by roots and microbes in the soil and by respiring plant tissue may be carried in sap to other tissues. This can result in stem CO₂ efflux rates that are above or below the source production rate (e.g., Negisi, 1972; Sprugel, 1990; Martin et al., 1994). By carrying carbon to the leaves, sap flow has also been shown, using isotopic labeling, to act as a source of assimilate (Vapaavouri & Pelkonen, 1985). This phenomenon will generate errors in cuvette-based photosynthesis measurements.

In a study of CO₂ transport in the transpiration stream, effluxes of CO₂ from excised woody sections whose sap flow was experimentally controlled using a pump responded negatively to increased flow rates (Negisi, 1979). However, Negisi did not specify the sap CO₂ concentration, making the interpretation of the results rather difficult. A more direct approach would be to measure CO₂ concentration in sap, but this has rarely been done for trees. Chase (1934, cited in Kramer & Kozlowski, 1960) estimated CO₂ concentration to vary up to 10% in air spaces in poplar sapwood, whilst Hari et al. (1991) obtained estimates varying from 20 - 30,000 ppm for Chamaecyparis obtusa. Hari et al. used Henry's Law (Stumm & Morgan, 1981) to convert these figures to sap CO₂ concentration. Assuming typical transpiration and photosynthesis rates, they concluded that internal CO₂ transport could supply carbon representing 2 to 9% of total leaf photosynthesis. However, the authors did not appear to measure sap pH or temperature (both are required by Henry's Law), and their samples were obtained from drilled holes, apparently without maintaining atmospheric pressure within the sample chamber. The consequent measurements may have been contaminated by atmospheric air and tissue wounding, or affected by pressure differences in the gas samples.
The work in this chapter addresses process-level questions relating to woody tissue respiration, with a view to using this information for scaling up estimates to the stand level in Chapter 7. The following questions were addressed:

1) The temperature response of CO\(_2\) effluxes from woody tissue.
2) The relative importance of construction and maintenance respiration components, and how these affect the relationship between CO\(_2\) efflux and stem or branch diameter. The hypothesis that 'CO\(_2\) efflux scales with surface area and volume according to an alternating dominance defined by the diameter of the woody section' was investigated. The extent of corticular photosynthesis in bark was considered briefly.
3) The proportion of photosynthesis accounted for by dissolved CO\(_2\) in sap was quantified.

All the measurements were made in PRF, Brazil and SRF, Cameroon. A longer field period in Cameroon made possible more detailed measurements.

5.2 METHODS

INTRODUCTION

Carbon dioxide efflux from woody tissue was measured in PRF and SRF. Bark surface and bark sub-surface temperatures were measured at both sites, for individual trees. Shielded and unshielded bark temperatures were also measured through the vertical profile of the forest canopy by embedding thermocouples in the bark surface on upper and lower sides of branches, and in stems. In Cameroon, it was possible to make a more extensive study investigating woody tissue respiration in relation to stem growth and the occurrence of stem photosynthesis. All species identifications were carried out by botanists employed from national herbaria of Brazil and Cameroon. Where possible, fertile specimens of each species were deposited in the herbaria in Belém (Brazil) and Yaoundé (Cameroon). Experimental work devised and practised in Edinburgh to study the interaction of the transpiration stream with woody tissue CO\(_2\) efflux was also extended to two tree species in Cameroon.
Measurements of carbon dioxide efflux from woody tissue were made from trees in PRF, during May and June 1993, and in Cameroon, in SRF, from February to May 1994. Two measurement methods were used in this work: closed and open chamber infra-red gas analysis. The principle of operation was the same as for the respective soil CO₂ efflux systems described in Chapter 4.

Chambers

Chambers were constructed from perspex. Two designs were used: one (type A) to encircle the narrower stems (diameter < 10 cm) using a split cylinder; and one (type B) made to be adpressed against the bark surface of larger stems (diameter > 10 cm) sealing a rectangular area of bark from ambient air. In all cases neoprene gaskets were used to seal chambers to the bark. Type A cylinders were used on stems of differing diameter by varying the thickness of the end gaskets wrapped around the section of wood under study. Adequate mixing of air in the chamber was achieved by minimising chamber volume and placing inlet and outlet nozzles on opposite sides of the measured wood section (Plate 5.1). A small fan was inserted into the back wall of the type B chambers to provide mixing; to make a better seal against the bark on larger stems, two layers of neoprene (low density laid down on high density) were used as gaskets (Plate 5.2). Chambers were sealed to stems and branches using elasticated cord and nylon cable ties. Type A chambers were 8 - 15 cm in length and 80 - 250 cm³ in volume; Type B chambers were 15 cm x 6 cm, and including the fan, 400- 500 cm³ in volume.
Closed chamber measurements

Chambers were sealed to bark and attached in a closed circuit to an IRGA (LI 6200, Licor, Nebraska, USA). In order to minimise any possible leaks, chamber CO₂ concentration was drawn down to a point below ambient concentrations (360-450 ppm, depending on time of day) and allowed to rise an approximately equal amount above ambient. Measurements were made by logging data for 60 second intervals, using a five second time step, and then repeating the procedure. Data were subsequently checked for linearity of the time course of CO₂ concentration. Measurements not fulfilling this stricture (less than 5%) were discarded. Bark surface temperature was measured inside the chambers using a Cu-constantan thermocouple with an amplified output. Means of the repeated measurements were used as spot values, and recorded together with the diameter of the woody section enclosed by the chamber. Diameters were recorded as the average of four measures at the top and bottom of the section (measurement precision 0.1 mm, vernier calipers, RS, UK); woody sections were treated as cone frustra. It was not possible also to measure sapwood volumes in the woody sections.

For both forests, an initial experiment was set up with chambers permanently attached to stems for 24 hours. Ambient air was continuously passed through all chambers at ±1.5 l dm⁻³, except during CO₂ efflux measurements that were taken at intervals throughout the 24 hours. Subsequently, a wide range of species and stem, or branch sizes, were sampled as spot measurements in order to represent
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emissions of CO$_2$ for the stand as a whole (Table 5.1). In Cameroon a longer study was possible. For each tree, dendrometer bands were attached to ten trees of differing size. Efflux rates of CO$_2$ from bark were measured for all trees on three dates between February and May 1995. In this way any [seasonal] changes in respiration rates could be detected. Where possible up to 10 individuals of the same species were sampled in this way. The only four species found in suitable abundance were: *Musanga cecropioides* (a pioneer species, *sensu* Swaine and Whitmore, 1988; Anon., 1987), *Distemonanthus benthamianus* (a climax forest species, *sensu* Swaine and Whitmore, 1988; Anon., 1987), *Triplochiton scleroxylon* and *Trema orientalis* (Table 5.1).

Open chamber measurements

An open path IRGA was available for the Cameroon field campaign (LCA2, ADC, Hoddesdon, UK). This was connected in series to a cuvette and air was drawn in by a mass-flow controlled air supply unit (MASU, ADC, Hoddesdon, UK) at 350-500 cm$^3$ min$^{-1}$. Before entering the cuvette, ambient air was passed through a 2 dm$^3$ buffer chamber; and before entry into the optical bench of the analyser it was dried (using a column of silica gel) to allow for cross-sensitivity to water vapour in this instrument. The drying agent was changed regularly and the IRGA re-calibrated every two days. Bark surface temperature inside the chamber was measured using a Cu-constantan thermocouple, and all data were stored in a Campbell 21X datalogger (Campbell Scientific, Leicester, UK) as 15 minute averages of readings sensed every second. Continuous data were recorded for three *Musanga cecropioides*, two *Distemonanthus benthamianus* and one *Trema orientalis*.

This equipment was also used to examined the radial temperature profile across the stem, and its relation to stem respiration. Cu-constantan thermocouples were positioned at the bark surface, 1 cm and 5cm depth (holes drilled were ~1 mm diameter), and the CO$_2$ efflux recorded with temperature for 48 hours during 1st and 2nd May, 1994. In a further experiment, cortical photosynthesis was investigated in *Trema orientalis* on stem tissue near ground level, and in *Musanga cecropioides*, on branch tissue at 20 m height (accessed from the micrometeorological tower). Chambers were set up as above, with a PPFD sensor placed immediately above the cuvette, normal to the [vertical] plane of the stem. Data were recorded for two days and then a sheet of black-backed silver polyurethane (Peritherm, Perifleur, UK) was taped round the equipment, with the silver side outwards to prevent entry of any light, and a further two days' data were logged. Only limited measurements of this kind were possible because of an illness; the analysed results are in Table B1 (Appendix B) and are referred to in the Discussion.
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CO$_2$ EFFLUX RATE, $T$, $D_w$, $R_c$ AND $R_m$

The temperature response in CO$_2$ efflux rates

The temperature response of CO$_2$ effluxes from wood were fitted to an exponential equation using least-squares non-linear regression:

$$R_t = R_o e^{(k \cdot T)}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 5.2}

where $R_t$ is the raw efflux rate (µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), $R_o$ is the theoretical efflux rate at 0 °C, $T$ is temperature (°C) and $k$ is a coefficient determining the $Q_{10}$, the relative change in reaction rate with a change of 10 °C such that $\ln Q_{10} = 10k$. Efflux rates were normalised to 25 °C ($R_e$) for subsequent analysis and initially investigated in relation to woody section surface area and volume.

The calculation of $R_m$ and $R_c$

The growth data from SRF were used to estimate $R_c$ and $R_m$ from $R_t$ by two separate methods:

Method 1: The increase in wood volume under the chamber was calculated from growth measurements between February and May 1994. The specific gravity of each species (Reyes, et al., 1992) was then used to obtain the dry mass of new wood. Where specific gravity data were unavailable (only three species), a value of 0.5 g cm$^{-3}$ was assumed. The amount of carbon per gram of dry wood was then assumed to be 50% of the ash free dry mass (Edwards et al., 1980; Griffiths, 1993). Ash free dry mass was taken as 99.3% of dry mass (Ryan et al., 1994).

Penning de Vries (1975) estimated a metabolic construction requirement of 0.43 g CO$_2$ per gram of new woody tissue. This is likely to be a minimum as it excludes any extra growth-related processes, though experimental determinations show good agreement at 0.46 (Benecke, quoted in Sprugel and Benecke, 1991) and 0.47 (Ledig et al., 1976). Taking the average of these, and converting to grams of carbon expended per gram of new wood, a figure of 0.124 g g$^{-1}$ was reached. Recalculating for the carbon in one gram of wood gave a final requirement of 0.248 g carbon to be respired for one gram of
carbon to be constructed. Using these calculations, \( R_c \) was converted to standard units (\( \mu \text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \)) and subtracted from \( R_t \) to give \( R_m \), the maintenance respiration rate.

**Method 2:** Initial stem diameters \((D_w)\) and growth measurements were used to obtain the relative growth rates (RGR) for each tree. An empirical regression between the natural logarithms of \( D_w \) and \( R_t \) was used to normalise \( R_t \) for each tree to the average diameter of all trees with zero or positive growth patterns (Figure 5.6; Table 5.4). This efflux rate, \( R_{id} \), was plotted against RGR, and the regression between them extended back to the ordinate (RGR = 0) in order to determine the mean rate at zero growth, that is, \( R_m \). \( R_c \) was calculated as the difference between the mean \( R_d \) and \( R_m \).

**A functional interpretation of the \( D_w - R_m \) relationship**

The \( R_m \) values derived using 'Method 1' were fitted to Equation 5.3 in order to address point (2) in the Introduction where it was hypothesised that both surface area and volume determine efflux rates from woody tissue. The key features of this curve were thought to reflect the varying dominance of surface area (a linear function of \( D_w \)) and volume (a quadratic function of \( D_w \)) in determining \( R_m \): at low \( D_w \), \( R_m \) was approximately constant, and at larger diameters \( R_m \) increased to the [approximate] square of \( D_w \) until an asymptote was reached, after which \( R_m \) was constant with \( D_w \). The results of this analysis were compared with correlations between \( R_t \) and the radial temperature profile of a *Trema orientalis* stem (see 'Open chamber measurements' above).

\[
R_m = a + b [1 + \exp(c + d \log D_w)] \\
\text{Equation 5.3}
\]

where \( a \) is minimum value at low \( D_w \), and \( b, c \) and \( d \) are fitted constants.

**DETECTION OF DISSOLVED CO2 IN THE TRANSPIRATION STREAM**

Sap rising in a tree stem contains dissolved CO2; air in the sapwood was assumed to be in equilibrium with this dissolved CO2. Sapwood CO2 concentration was measured using a system designed and tested in Edinburgh in collaboration with P. Levy, of Edinburgh University. Two 50 cm3 cuvettes were constructed and sealed with 'Blu-tac' mastic to the stems of birch (*Betula pendula*) and oak (*Quercus petraea*) trees in Scotland, and *Musanga cecropioides* and *Distemonanthus benthamianus* trees in Cameroon. Each chamber had an aperture through which 2 - 5 cm3 samples could be removed.
with a closeable syringe. A second aperture, open to the atmosphere, was attached to a polyurethane bag which behaved rather like a lung by inflating inside the chamber as a sample was removed, thus preventing pressure changes developing in the sample or the chamber. Chambers were left in position for up to 9 days to allow full equilibration between CO₂ in air in the sapwood and the chamber air. Silicon grease was smeared around the bark within a 2 cm radius of the chambers to inhibit CO₂ diffusion out of the chamber. Samples were removed approximately once a day and injected into an IRGA operating as a closed system (LI 6200, Licor, Nebraska, USA). To avoid over-pressuring the analyser, the plunger was withdrawn to its original position after injecting and allowing 10 seconds for mixing. The concentration of the sample was calculated as:

\[
[CO₂]_s = \{(V_s + V_5) / V_s\} \times \{d[CO₂] + [CO₂]_i\} \text{ Equation 5.4}
\]

where \([CO₂]_s\) is sample CO₂ concentration, \(V_s\) is system volume, \(V_5\) is sample volume, \(d[CO₂]\) is the difference between the initial system CO₂ concentration, \([CO₂]_i\), and the final CO₂ concentration.

To obtain the concentration of CO₂ dissolved in water in the sap (\([CO₂^*]\)), Henry's Law, (Stumm and Morgan, 1981) was applied to the data. In Cameroon, pH was measured by pressing pH paper against freshly revealed sapwood, and temperature was measured with a Cu-constantan thermocouple. For birch, pH was estimated and air temperature was taken from a nearby weather station. The concentration of CO₂ in sap is very sensitive to pH and slightly less so to temperature, making the estimate of birch sap pH quite important.

\[
Henry's \ Law: [CO₂^*] = pCO₂ K_H(T) \left[ 1 + \frac{K_1(T)}{[H^+] + \frac{K_2(T) K_3(T)}{[H^+]^2}} \right] \text{ Equation 5.5}
\]

where \([CO₂^*]\) is the concentration of all forms of CO₂ dissolved in water,

\(pCO₂\) is the partial pressure of CO₂ in air,

\(K_H(T)\) is Henry's constant for CO₂,

and \(K_1(T)\) and \(K_2(T)\) are dissociation constants for carbonate ions.

The derived \([CO₂^*]\) in *Betula pendula*, *Musanga cecropioidea* and *Distemonanthus benthamianus* was examined in relation to measured transpiration and photosynthesis rates for each species, and the importance of sap-derived CO₂ to photosynthesis considered.
Table 5.1. The species and families of all trees measured for CO$_2$ efflux from woody tissue during fieldwork in PRF, Brazil (May-June, 1993) and SRF, Cameroon (February-May, 1994).

(1) PRF, BRAZIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Astronium lecointei Ducke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Xylopia sp</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td>Orbygynia speciosa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysobalanaceae</td>
<td>Licania sp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Hironima sp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauraceae</td>
<td>Ocotea cf caudata (Nees.) Mez</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecythidaceae</td>
<td>Bertoletia sp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Caes</td>
<td>Sclerolobium sp</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Guarea kunthii A. juss.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Trichilia quadriruga H.B.K.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Cecropia ficifolia Snethl.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Cecropia scadophylla Mart.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Naucleopsis glabra Spr. ex Baill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Naucleopsis krunnii (Standl) C.C. Berg.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Pseudomelidia sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Sorocea guilleminiana Grand.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Trymatococcus amazonicus Poepp et Endl.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Virola calophylla Warb.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Virola michelii Hackel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Sterculia pruriens (Aubl.) Schum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Theobroma microcarpum Mart.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violaceae</td>
<td>Rinorea pubiflora (Benth.) Spreng.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) SRF, CAMEROON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Xylopia etiopica</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>Vernonias conferta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Santira trimera (Oliv.) Aubr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combretaceae</td>
<td>Terminalia superba Engl. &amp; Diels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Caes</td>
<td>Distemonanthus benthamianus Baill.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Pap.</td>
<td>Pterocarpus soyauxii Taub.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icaciniaceae</td>
<td>Desmostachys tenuifolius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingiaceae</td>
<td>Desbordesia glaucescens (Engl.) Van Tiegh.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingiaceae</td>
<td>Kainedoxa gabonensis Pierre ex Engl. var oblongifolia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Musanga cecropoides R.Br.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Coelocaryon preussi Warburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochnaceae</td>
<td>Lophira alata Banks ex Gaertn.f.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olacaceae</td>
<td>Panda oleosa Pierre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Triplochiton scleroxylon K. Schum.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Celtis mildbraedi Engl.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Tremo orientalis (Linn.) Bl.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbenaceae</td>
<td>Vitex grandifolia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 RESULTS

WOODY TISSUE TEMPERATURE

Bark temperature measurements showed a typical diurnal cycle (Figures 5.1a&b). Canopy-top bark temperatures, whilst highest during the zenith, were also lower at night than those lower down. In the lower-canopy, temperatures were less extreme and lagged behind those higher up by up to three hours. Maximum temperatures were higher in PRF than SRF (42 °C vs 34 °C). The profile was also deeper: maximum temperature differences between upper and lower canopy in PRF were 15 - 20 °C, whilst in SRF they were rarely more than 10 °C. The PRF forest was subject to episodic ‘friagens’ which were associated with cooler southerly winds and reduced daytime maxima of up to 20 °C, though minimum temperatures were changed by less than 5 °C. The end of a friagem can be observed at the start of the graph in Figure 5.1a.

Shielded (lower side of twig) and unshielded (upper side of twig) temperatures changed in approximate synchrony with each other, although unshielded values were ± 0.5 °C higher than shielded ones, and up to 1.5 °C higher during maxima. A radial temperature profile within the stem of Trema orientalis is shown in Figure 5.1c; the expected hysteresis and damping between surface and internal temperatures (1 cm and 5 cm depth) is visible.

CO₂ EFFLUXES FROM WOODY TISSUE

The temperature response of woody tissue respiration

Time series measurements made using the closed chamber system on individual trees over 24 hours indicated that CO₂ efflux from wood was strongly related to temperature (Figures 5.2a-d). Measurements using Type B chambers made at different points around the circumference of a stem were statistically indistinguishable. The gradients and zero-intercepts in Figure 5.2c&d represent k and R₀ respectively; different trees exhibited fairly similar k values, but different R₀ values (Table 5.2).
Figures 5.1a-c. Typical woody tissue temperature profiles. In (a) & (b), the vertical profile in bark surface temperature through the canopy in PRF and SRF. The positions in the canopy that each trace represents can be identified during the maxima, where from top to bottom the lines represent temperature at 36m, 20m, 15m, 10m, & 3m for PRF; 40 m, 30 m, 20 m, 12 m and 8 m in Cameroon. In (c), the radial temperature profile through the vertical stem of a *Trema orientalis* tree of diameter 13.6 cm in SRF, 1st - 2nd May, 1994.
Table 5.2. Parameters fitted to Equation 5.2 using time series CO₂ efflux measurements made on individual trees. Data from Brazil collected during May - June 1993, and from Cameroon during February - May 1994 using the closed chamber system. Units: \( D_w \) in m and \( R_o \) in \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>BRAZIL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CAMEROON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( D_w )</td>
<td>( R_o )</td>
<td>( k )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N. krunnii.</em></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomelia sp.</em></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T. microcarpum.</em></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V. michelii</em></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N. krunnii.</em></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T. amazonicus</em></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 5.2a-d. Temperature response of CO₂ efflux from woody tissue in PRF, Brazil and SRF, Cameroon. All measurements were made with a closed chamber system. In (a) and (b) are raw data for one tree from each forest. In (c) and (d) are data for several trees (represented by different symbols), plotted as a linear function of ln (CO₂ efflux).
In Cameroon, continuous data were also obtained using an open chamber system. Temperature and CO₂ efflux data are shown in Figure 5.3 for a *Musanga cecropoides* and a *Distemonanthus benthamianus*. A comparison between the two measurement methods (Figure 5.4) showed good agreement among $R_i$ values. Data obtained with the open system were also analysed using Equation 5.2. The parameters were close to those found using the closed IRGA system (Tables 5.2 & 5.3).

![Graph showing temperature and CO₂ efflux data](image)

**Figures 5.3a&b.** Continuously recorded woody tissue temperature and CO₂ efflux from (a) *Distemonanthus benthamianus* (14th-18th March, 1994) and (b) *Musanga cecropoides* (14th-18th April, 1994). The inset graphs show temperature responses for (a) 6am - 5pm, 15th March and for (b) 6am - 5pm, 15th April. The breaks in the traces are when the IRGA was being re-calibrated. Squares = CO₂ efflux.
Table 5.3. Parameters fitted to Equation 5.2 using continuous CO$_2$ efflux and temperature data collected during February - May 1994, in SRF, Cameroon. Bark temperatures inside and outside the chamber did not differ by more than 3 °C during these measurements. The $M. cecropiodes$ reading was taken at 24 m, from a branch. $n =$ number days of measurement. Those trees marked with * are also found in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree species</th>
<th>$D_w$</th>
<th>$R_0$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M. cecropiodes$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M. cecropiodes$ *</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T. orientalis$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D. benthamianus$ *</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D. benthamianus$.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M. cecropiodes$. *</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for all species</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the data suggest that the sensitivity of woody tissue CO$_2$ emissions to temperature was higher in PRF ($Q_{10} = 1.8; k = 0.062$) than in SRF ($Q_{10} = 1.6; k = 0.044$), though the $R_0$ values were higher in SRF (0.1 - 0.2 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in PRF vs 0.5 - 0.6 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in SRF).

![Figure 5.4](image_url)

Figure 5.4. A comparison of the closed and open chamber systems used to measure CO$_2$ efflux from 5 tree species in SRF, Cameroon. All units are in μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. The 1:1 line is shown; a regression of the ordinate upon the abscissa, passing through the origin did not distinguish the measurements from this line: gradient = 1.1 with 95% confidence limits = 0.3; $p = 0.01$; $n = 5$. 
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5. CO₂ fluxes from wood

The effect of cortical photosynthesis on \( R_t \) estimates

It was only possible to make a few measurements to test the effect of cortical photosynthesis on respiration, by correlation with PPFD or placing a shroud over the stem. The data tentatively indicated that there was a small reduction (~2%) in \( R_t \) due to photosynthesis in the cortex of some woody species, but not others (Table B1, Appendix B). More data are needed to evaluate further these results.

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN \( R_t \), \( D_w \), \( R_c \) AND \( R_m \)

Woody tissue CO₂ efflux rates in PRF ranged from 0.1 to 3.3 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) for \( D_w \) between 0.1 and 1.4 m. In SRF, the efflux rates were higher: 0.2 to 5.2 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) for \( D_w \) between 0.002 and 0.6 m. \( R_t \) was plotted against diameter and expressed either on an area or volume basis (\( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) or \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-3} \text{s}^{-1} \); Figures 5.5a-d). Surface area did not predict CO₂ emissions well at \( D_w > 0.1 \) m (otherwise efflux would have been constant with \( D_w \)). The volume based description was hyperbolic but the relationship a little noisy. However, if the data were transformed to natural logarithms, highly significant regressions \( (p < 0.001) \) were obtained between \( D_w \) and \( R_t \) (Figures 5.6a&b; Table 5.4).

Table 5.4. Linear regression results for plots of \( R_t \) vs \( D_w \) for PRF and SRF. The form of the equation is \( \ln R_t = a + b \ln D_w \). The values in parentheses are 95% confidence limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRF, Brazil</td>
<td>1.56 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF, Cameroon</td>
<td>1.65 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculation of \( R_m \) and \( R_c \)

Efflux rates of carbon dioxide from each tree did not change significantly between February and May 1994, suggesting an approximately constant growth pattern during this time. Seventy-five percent of the trees grew by a detectable margin (minimum = 0.002 m girth); the remaining 25% showed no growth, or a very small reduction (less than 0.002 m girth) possibly attributable to a temporary low water status. \( R_c \) was calculated for each tree using ‘Method 1’, whilst \( R_m \) was obtained from the regression intercept on the ordinate of Figure 5.7, using ‘Method 2’. The calculations using either technique produced a similar answer, and suggested that \( R_m \) constituted approximately 80% of total respiration during the measurement period (Table 5.5).
Figures 5.5a-d. Efflux of CO$_2$ from woody tissue in SRF, Cameroon (squares) and PRF, Brazil (spots). Efflux is not a straight forward function of volume or surface area; see text. Figures (a) and (b) show efflux expressed on an area basis; Figures (c) & (d) show efflux expressed on a volume basis.
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Figure 5.6a & b. Efflux of CO₂, \( R_e \), from woody tissue in SRF, Cameroon (squares) and PRF, Brazil (spots). Both diameter and efflux are expressed as natural logarithms.

Figure 5.7. Relative growth rates of trees in SRF, Cameroon vs \( R_{id} \). The efflux rate on the ordinate is normalised according to the mean diameter using the results in Table 5.4, and corrected to 25 °C (see text). The regression line shown is highly significant (\( p < 0.001; r^2 = 0.34; n = 38 \); with the three highest \( R_{id} \) values removed, the \( r^2 = 0.48 \)). One month is defined as 30 days.
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Table 5.5. A comparison of the mean relative contributions of $R_m$ and $R$ to total respiration rates for trees in SRF. The $R$ value for method 1 = mean $R$, and for method 2 = mean $R_c$; the units for $R$ are μmol m⁻² s⁻¹. Standard errors are in parentheses. See Methods section for explanation of 'Methods 1 and 2'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation of $R_c$ or $R_m$</th>
<th>$R_1$</th>
<th>% $R_m$</th>
<th>% $R_c$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method 1</td>
<td>2.0 (0.7)</td>
<td>84 (8)</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 2</td>
<td>2.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>80 (7)</td>
<td>20 (7)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A functional interpretation of the $D_w$ - $R_m$ relationship

Figure 5.5 strongly suggested that surface area or volume were not good individual scalars upon which solely to base estimates of woody tissue CO₂ efflux for trees in SRF and PRF. When $R_m$ and $R$, were plotted against $D_w$ for the SRF data, the increased scatter in $R$, attributable to $R_c$ was revealed (Figure 5.8a). The same plot is also shown for four individual species: Musanga cecropioides, Distemonanthus benthamianus, Trema orientalis and Triplochiton scleroxylon (Figures 5.8b-e). The functionally based Equation 5.4 fitted better to the $R_m$ values, with an $r^2$ of 0.66, than did the empirical logarithmic regression model to the $R$ values, which gave an $r^2$ of 0.46 (Figure 5.9; Tables 5.4 & 5.6). An exceptionally good fit to Equation 5.4 was obtained for M. cecropioides ($r^2 = 0.95$), though the relationships for the other three species were less good (regression results not shown). Although there was some noise in Figure 5.9, a curve similar to the theoretical one inset on this graph could be clearly discerned. At smaller diameters, the flat section of the curve was very small, but at higher $D_w$, $R_m$ increased with the approximate square of $D_w$ until a saturation point was reached, after which $R_m$ increased slowly. At the smallest diameters (e.g., twigs of $D_w = 1 - 5$ mm) the relationship broke down as the proportion of living tissue rises very rapidly with reducing $D_w$. In SRF, twigs of 2 mm and 5 mm gave efflux rates of 0.65 and 0.61 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ (or 460 and 800 μmol m⁻³ s⁻¹; compare Figure 5.5).

Table 5.6. Parameters for Equation 5.4 fitted to $R_m$ and $D_w$ values SRF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitted value</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-10.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative dominance of surface area or volume in determining respiration was also investigated using continuously logged CO₂ efflux data with measurements of the radial profile in stem temperature (surface, 1 cm, and 5 cm). Temperatures at greater depths showed decreasing lags with respect to CO₂ efflux. After removal of the lags, an exponential temperature response (Equation 5.2) was fitted to the data. Temperature at all three depths explained over 90% of the variation in measured CO₂ efflux,
indicating that the temperature-sensitive contribution from the cells near the surface was rather similar to that from the sapwood volume (Table 5.6 & Figure 5.1c). Dendrometer measurements on this tree had shown very little growth, indicating that this result fitted the function in Figure 5.9, where at $D_w = 0.136$ m, the $R_t$ and $R_m$ values were in Stage 2 of the graph where both surface area and volume are important in determining total efflux rates (Figure 5.9).

**Figures 5.8a-e.** $R_m$ (closed symbols) and $R_t$ (open symbols) vs $D_w$ for trees in SRF, Cameroon. In (a) is the pattern for all the data; in (b) - (e) are the data for four species for which there were several trees available. Where $R_c$ was zero, the open square ($R_t$) is nested inside the closed square ($R_m$).
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Figure 5.9. Calculated maintenance respiration ($R_{m}$) for trees in SRF, Cameroon. The inset graph shows an idealised pattern with three stages (see text). The closed symbols are the fitted model ($r^2 = 0.66$) according to Equation 5.3, page 78.

Table 5.6. The lag times between temperature and CO₂ effluxes for a *Trema orientalis* tree in Cameroon at 3 depths into the stem. The $r^2$ values for the [de-lagged] temperature response function at each depth are also shown. Stem radius was 6.8 cm; $R_i = 1.3 \mu$mol m⁻² s⁻¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth in stem (cm)</th>
<th>Lag time for CO₂ efflux</th>
<th>$r^2$ for temp. response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cm</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cm</td>
<td>0 - 15 min</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISSOLVED CO₂ IN THE TRANSPERSION STREAM**

Chamber concentrations on the birch and oak trees reached an asymptote within one to two days of sealing the chambers to the trees (Figure 5.10). This maximum value was higher for wounded bark tissue, and lower when in the light (when the shroud was removed). The approximate equilibrium concentration for birch was measured at 30,000 ppm. For the *Musanga cecropioides* and
Distemonanthus benthamianus trees in Cameroon, equilibrium values ranged from 92,000 to 30,000 ppm. Using Henry's Law, the calculated concentration of CO₂ in sap, [CO₂*] ranged between 3 mmol dm⁻³ H₂O in Betula pendula to a maximum of 11 mmol dm⁻³ H₂O in Musanga cecropioides (Table 5.7).
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**Figure 5.10.** The increase in chamber CO₂ concentration with time. An equilibrium value of approx. 30,000 µmol mol⁻¹ was reached after 24 hours. This value was lower in the unshaded chamber and higher when holes were drilled, apparently inducing wound respiration. These data were collected jointly with P. Levy.
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**Figure 5.11.** The effect of temperature and pH on [CO₂*], the concentration of all products of CO₂ dissolved in water. The data were calculated using Henry's Law (Equation 5.5) assuming that the water in the sap was in equilibrium with air at 30,000 ppm CO₂ with a pH of 6.4 (a) and at 10°C (b). At both pH = 6.4 and 10°C, the calculated value = 0.054 µmol CO₂ mmol⁻¹ H₂O, or 3.02 mmol CO₂ dm⁻³ H₂O.
**Table 5.7.** Sap CO₂ concentrations (in mmol dm⁻³) in temperate and tropical trees. Temperature (°C) and pH values are also appended. Chamber [CO₂] is in μmol mol⁻¹. Values are means with 95% confidence limits in parentheses for pH and temperature, and the effects of these as calculated to produce [CO₂*].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Sap pH</th>
<th>Bark temp.</th>
<th>Chamber [CO₂]</th>
<th>[CO₂*]</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula pendula</em></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. cecropiodes</em></td>
<td>6.78 (0.2)</td>
<td>25.9 (2.0)</td>
<td>84,600 (5800)</td>
<td>11.01 (−4.97)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>D. benthamianus</em></td>
<td>5.25 (0.17)</td>
<td>25.2 (1.9)</td>
<td>31,700 (1800)</td>
<td>1.21 (−0.17)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using measured transpiration and photosynthesis rates for *B. pendula* in Scotland and *M. cecropiodes* or *D. benthamianus* in Cameroon, potential sap-sourced refixation was calculated to represent up to 30% of photosynthesis as measured using a cuvette, though estimated mean values were in the order of 1 - 10% (Table 5.8). The rate of re-fixation would have been greater at high sap pH and sap flow rates, and at lower temperatures (Figures 5.11a&b).

**Table 5.8.** Sap CO₂ refixation for *B. pendula* in Central Scotland and *M. cecropiodes* and *D. benthamianus* in SRF, Cameroon. $A_1$ is a leaf typical photosynthesis rate, in μmol m⁻² s⁻¹; $E$ is a typical transpiration rate, in mmol m⁻² s⁻¹; refixation rates are in Rmol m⁻² temperature in °C. The errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits for pH and temperature; for maximum and minimum refixation, the values were calculated using the ranges of values for $A_1$, $E$, pH and temperature. Typical photosynthesis and transpiration rates for *B. pendula* were provided by A. Rey (personal communication); for the trees in Cameroon the data are taken from Chapter 7. For comparison, an estimate for an arid-zone shrub from Niger, *Combretum micranthum*, is included (Levy, 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Refixation rate</th>
<th>Refixation as % of $A_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>B. pendula</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. cecropiodes</em></td>
<td>4 - 14</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>6.78 (0.2)</td>
<td>25.9 (2.0)</td>
<td>0.129 - 1.225</td>
<td>5.4 (31 - 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>D. benthamianus</em></td>
<td>4 - 14</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>5.25 (0.17)</td>
<td>25.2 (1.9)</td>
<td>0.019 - 0.101</td>
<td>0.6 (2.5 - 0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. micranthum</em></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 DISCUSSION**

**WOODY TISSUE TEMPERATURE AND THE RESPONSE IN CO₂ EFFLUX**

**Woody tissue temperature**

The lower night-time bark temperatures at the canopy-top were probably a result of radiative cooling in both SRF and PRF. The two forests were distinguished by the higher maxima in PRF and deeper
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daytime temperature profiles (Figure 5.1a&b). These differences probably reflected the more broken canopy in the secondary forest. Canopy gaps adjacent to the tower in Cameroon permitted light to penetrate to the forest floor at a several solar angles, creating a rather different temperature regime to that found in the closed canopy in Brazil.

The temperature response in CO₂ efflux

Assuming for the moment that other transport processes, such as sap flow, do not interact with diffusion of CO₂ through the bark, it is possible to model the temperature sensitivity of CO₂ production in wood. Without detailed biochemical data, many complex reaction series models reduce to behaving like an Arrhenius or an exponential function (Johnson & Thornley, 1985). The former is sometimes preferred as it encourages mechanistic rigour by requiring an activation energy \( E \) to be fitted to the data. However, this equation remains semi-empirical: in a reaction chain, activation energies may differ from one step to the next making an overall estimate of \( E \) uninformative. With an eye to parsimony, the simpler exponential function (Equation 5.2) was used here since the fit to the data was as good as or better than with the Arrhenius equation.

The fitted exponential temperature responses for both forests showed more variation among species in the value of \( R_o \) than \( k \) (Tables 5.2&5.3; Figures 5.2&5.3). Variation in \( R_o \) reflected differences in size, growth regimen and species, whilst \( k \) was likely to be more conservative as it refers to the biochemical processes of respiration. However there existed a general difference in temperature sensitivity between PRF and SRF; \( k \) was higher in the former (0.062; \( Q_{10} = 1.8 \) in PRF vs 0.044; \( Q_{10} = 1.6 \) in SRF). Possible causes for this discrepancy include differences between the forests in the rate of delivery of substrate to respiring cells, or removal of carbon dioxide from cells in the transpiration stream. The disturbed nature of the forest in Cameroon provides a basis for these hypotheses, but unfortunately they could not be addressed with these data. The \( Q_{10} \) values in both SRF and PRF were lower than the often-quoted general value of 2 (e.g., Linder & Troeng, 1981; Butler & Landsberg, 1981). \( Q_{10} \) values may be reduced at higher temperatures (Hulett, 1956; Ninomiya & Hozumi, 1981), although the results here are within the range of reported values from other woody species (\( Q_{10} = 1.4 - 3.4 \); Hagihara & Hozumi, 1981).
The logarithmic relationship between $D_w$ and $R_1$ was strong for both forests, and though apparently similar (Figures 5.6a&b), the regressions were significantly different (Table 5.4). The broadly higher efflux rates found in SRF were hard to explain, though soil nutrient status and differences in growth regimen during the measurement period were probably responsible. At the stand level, variation among species was probably less important. The regressions in Table 5.4 required the assumption that the growth patterns in the sample of measured trees accurately represented the forest as a whole. In the absence of more detailed information, they provide an empirical basis for predicting $R_t$ from $D_w$, but may be biased. Using a more functional approach, the physiological processes controlling the exchange of CO$_2$ in woody tissue can be split into respiration and cortical photosynthesis. The small dataset from SRF tentatively suggested that cortical photosynthesis may not cause large reductions in total efflux rates. To analyse $R_1$ further, its respiratory components needed to be distinguished. Since data on sapwood volumes by species were not available, $R_m$ was separated from $R_c$ using the growth measurements from SRF.

The two estimates of $R_m$ suggested that maintenance constituted the greater proportion (~80%) of total respiration (Table 5.5). This agreement was encouraging given the wide range of species, growth rates and stem sizes sampled. Between-species comparisons of $R_m$ and $R_c$ could not be made because of the range of growth rates, and the limited sample sizes. The proportionate contribution of $R_c$ to $R_1$ in SRF was very similar to that found for a mature rain forest species, *Minquarita guianensis*, in Costa Rica ($R_c = 25\%$ of $R_1$; Ryan *et al.*, 1994) though less than for a fast growing species in the same study (*Simarouba amara*, $R_c = 46\%$ of $R_1$). Few other comparative data exist for tropical trees, although Paembonan *et al.* (1991) reported an annual $R_c$ of 21% for *Chamaecyparis obtusa*. The values obtained in this study point either to rather low growth rates or high maintenance costs. Without data for a full year it is difficult to choose, though recovery from previous logging disturbance (Chapter 2) could explain low growth rates for this secondary forest.

Area or volume based expressions of woody tissue respiration (Figure 5.5a-d) indicated that the source of CO$_2$ production in wood partly resided just below the bark (viz: the cambium and phloem cells) and partly the live volume (viz: the sapwood parenchyma); the ratio depended on $D_w$. To account for this $R_m$ was expressed as a function of $D_w$ according to Equation 5.4 and gave a better fit than was obtained using the logarithmic relationship between $D_w$ and $R_1$ (Tables 5.4 & 5.6). The variation that was unaccounted for by the fitted model can probably be ascribed to error because of the sample size and the assumptions made in calculating $R_c$. In particular, it is likely that different trees effect different
construction conversion efficiencies that reflect local resource transport needs and species-specific chemical defence strategies (Amthor, 1989). The single conversion efficiency used here smoothed out this detail. The \( R_m \) values at low \( D_w \) did not fit the curve so well, but relatively high twig respiration rates are quite common (Sprugel et al., 1996) and may not be important at the stand scale. A functional interpretation of the relationship for larger woody sections identifies three stages, based on Figure 5.9:

1. \( D_w < 0.03 \) m. Surface area (SA) to volume (V) ratio dominated by SA.
2. \( 0.03 \) m < \( D_w < 0.3 \) m. SA:V ratio becomes increasingly dominated by V as sapwood volume and associated living parenchyma cell numbers increase (cf. Table 5.6).
3. \( D_w > 0.3 \) m. Sapwood volume and associated living cells have reached a maximum. Continuing growth requires that the trunk expands radially, increasing the total SA of the tree, but CO₂ efflux on an area basis does not increase as the volume of living cells below any given point remains constant.

The stage transitions are not switches, they are gradual. Furthermore, the suggested ‘break point’ for stage 3 of 0.3 m is an estimate averaging for a large number of species; the true value for each species may vary significantly. If growing conditions differ greatly, intra-specific variation is also possible (Lehto & Grace, 1994). At \( D_w \) values greater than in stage 3, sapwood volume increases very slowly as the leaf area of the tree (or branch) is hypothesised to reach an asymptote. Well accepted models of water transport within trees suggest that leaf area dictates sapwood volume on a supply/demand basis (Shinozaki et al., 1964; Cannell & Dewar, 1994). In this view, as growth proceeds, the increase in leaf area will eventually stop, resulting in the sapwood volume of the tree also reaching a maximum (Friend, 1993), and hence causing the curve in Figure 5.9 to flatten. When Equation 5.4 was also applied to \( D_w:R_m \) data from four individual species in SRF (Figures 5.8b-e), it fitted well for *Musanga cecropioides*. The relatively simple architecture of *M. cecropioides* probably contributed to a tightly constrained leaf area to sapwood volume ratio that would explain the high \( r^2 \) (0.95) in this species. The weaker fit in the other species may have been improved with larger sample sizes.

The preceding logic paves the way for a potential method of modelling whole-tree \( R_m \) using sapwood volumes: the same cross-sectional area of sapwood in the trunk is merely split up into branches in real crowns, and might be considered as a single column of cells the height of the tree. However this approach, which differs from the less accurate method of considering sapwood volumes in the bole only (e.g., Ryan, 1989, 1990; Sprugel, 1990), would not account for the \( R_m \) of phloem and cambium
cells around the circumference of the separate branches in a real crown. Unfortunately data to test these hypotheses in tropical forest, where branches may constitute 20% of total above-ground biomass (Kato et al., 1978; Chapter 3), is not readily available, though it may be so in the future (D. Deans, personal communication; cf. Ryan et al., 1994).

Woody tissue respiration is not a simple function of surface area as has sometimes been assumed (e.g., Whittaker & Woodwell, 1967; Landsberg, 1986). Above-ground woody tissue \( R_m \) for a forest stand may be estimated using a function of the form in Equation 5.4, given sufficient structural information. For an annual estimate of \( R_m \), additional information is needed to account for annual forest growth, and hence \( R_c \). Clearly more data are needed in these areas for tropical forests if precise values are required; more general estimates may be made using empirical models.

**DISSOLVED CO\(_2\) IN THE TRANSPIRATION STREAM**

Measurements of both respiration and photosynthesis contain an implicit assumption that measured changes in CO\(_2\) concentration within the chamber equate with all the activity in the enclosed leaf or woody stem. This experiment was designed to address the effect on such measurements of a high flux of CO\(_2\) from the transpiration stream, originating from respiration in other parts of the plant.

The 'equilibrium' gas concentrations of CO\(_2\) measured inside the purpose-built chamber were higher than the estimates of Hari et al. (1991), especially for the tropical trees (Figure 5.10; Table 5.7). Raven & Farquhar (1989) present data for pH and CO\(_2\) in a gas phase equilibrium with xylem exudate for *Phaseolus vulgaris* that also show CO\(_2\) concentrations of 20 - 30,000 ppm and a sap pH of 5.6 - 6.1, which are in line with the birch data. The sap CO\(_2\) concentrations in Table 5.7 were within the range of other values obtained using isotope tracer techniques: 0.8 mmol dm\(^{-3}\) and 3 - 16 mmol m\(^{-3}\) (Marshall et al., 1994) for mistletoe, and 22 mmol dm\(^{-3}\) found for *Juniperus osteosperma* (Marshall & Ehleringer, 1990).

Carbon dioxide present in the sap may diffuse outwards through the stem, or be re-fixed, primarily by leaf photosynthesis. The re-fixation rates estimated in Table 5.8 suggest a mean of 1 - 10%, though the maximum value for *Musanga cecropioides* was 30%. These data are in approximate agreement with an estimate for the arid-zone tropical shrub, *Combretum micranthum* (6.9%; Levy, 1995). In the case of *Musanga cecropioides*, the high re-fixation rate is of some speculative interest given the very fast growth rate of this species. High levels of dissolved inorganic carbon similar to those measured
here have been associated with markedly increased biomass production in *Salix* (Bergquist, 1964; Pelkonen et al., 1985; Vapaavuori & Pelkonen 1985; Vuorinen et al., 1989). If this phenomenon is real, and occurs in *M. cecropioides*, high sap pH may be maintained to facilitate fast growth.

The interaction of sap CO₂ concentration with cuvette-based measurements is more difficult to account for in measurements of woody tissue effluxes. It introduces an unknown bias and may hinder attempts to separate maintenance and growth respiration, especially at high sap flow rates. Similarly, the underestimate inherent in photosynthesis calculations is likely to introduce error into models formulated using cuvette-derived data that estimate total fluxes for a single component of a forest ecosystem. However, the problem does not extend to overall carbon budget estimates as ‘losses’ in the measurement of one component may be balanced by gains in another. This holds true for both cuvette and eddy-covariance techniques.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

Effluxes of CO₂ from woody tissue were measured on 24 tree species in PRF, Brazil and 17 tree species in SRF, Cameroon. Total efflux rates ranged between 0.2 and 5.2 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹. The temperature responses for CO₂ efflux were lower for secondary forest ($Q_{10} = 1.6$) than for primary forest ($Q_{10} = 1.8$); both figures are within the range reported in the literature. Using growth measurements, maintenance respiration rates were calculated to constitute approximately 80% of total woody tissue respiration for SRF. A functional relationship between $R_m$ and $D_w$ was developed to take into account the differential dominance of surface area and volume components contributing to $R_m$. This model explained 66% of the variation in the data for all species and 95% of the variation for one species, *Musanga cecropioides*. An empirical, logarithmic model linking $D_w$ and $R_i$ was also presented for data from Brazil and Cameroon. The model for each forest, though not functionally based, explained 62% and 42% respectively of the variation in the data.

Sap CO₂ concentration was measured in trees in Scotland and Cameroon. This CO₂ interacts with the fluxes of CO₂ to and from trees and can therefore affect the calculation of respiration and photosynthetic parameters obtained from flux measurements. The measured sap CO₂ concentrations were calculated to lead to underestimates of up to 30% of cuvette-derived photosynthetic rates, though the range 1 - 10% may be more common. These values were particularly sensitive to sap pH, transpiration rates and temperature.
6. Leaf respiration

6. Respiration in leaves at night

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The respiration of foliage in the dark consumes carbohydrate resources in order to fuel cellular metabolism. Energy and metabolites released in respiration are divided in their destinations among: tissue construction processes, maintenance and repair of existing biomass, particularly proteins, the transport of metabolites, and the upkeep of cellular ion gradients (Amthor, 1989). At an ecosystem level, the annual carbon cost of foliage respiration, as a fraction of total assimilation, has been estimated in temperate forests to range from 9% for a twenty-year old Pinus sylvestris L. stand (Linder & Axelsson, 1982; Linder, 1985) to 21% in a Pinus contorta Dougl. stand (Benecke & Nordmeyer, 1982). Few data are available for the tropics, although Yoda (1983) estimated leaf respiration to constitute approximately 50% of total above-ground biomass respiration, a value that we will see agrees with the up-scaled estimates for the present work (Figure 8.8).

Whilst photosynthesis is relatively well understood (e.g., Farquhar & von Caemmerer, 1982; Field & Mooney, 1986), respiratory leaf physiology has received less attention. Given the important role played by leaf respiration in the forest carbon cycle, further research is needed to model adequately respiratory CO₂ fluxes from foliage. In particular, maintenance requirements for leaves are not well parameterised. There already exist methods by which the carbon cost of leaf synthesis can be estimated using foliar elemental composition, organic nitrogen, or ash-free carbon content (McDermitt & Loomis, 1981; Williams et al., 1987; Vertregt & Penning de Vries, 1987), but there is no model in general use for predicting leaf maintenance requirements.

The link between respiration rate and tissue nitrogen content has been known for over forty years (James, 1953). Similarly, carbohydrate levels have also been correlated with respiration rates (e.g., Baysdorfer et al., 1987), though fewer studies have looked at other leaf tissue elements in this context. The focus on nitrogen is unsurprising since most organic nitrogen in leaves is in protein, and 60% of maintenance respiration goes towards protein repair and replacement (Penning de Vries, 1975). Indeed, linear relationships between nitrogen and respiration in leaves have been found in many studies (e.g., Kawahara et al., 1976; Waring et al., 1985). However it is not always the case that total nitrogen concentrations represent accurately the nitrogen that is the subject of maintenance activities.
Free amino acids, or nitrogen buried in structural molecules, may not reflect the metabolic status of a cell, and may thereby introduce noise into any relationship between respiration and nitrogen concentration (McCree, 1983; c.f. Aber et al., 1989; Brooks et al., 1991; Ryan, 1994). It is possible that the introduction of phosphorus into a model predicting leaf respiration may help to account for some of the variance. A general model of this kind is especially attractive given the connection then possible between models of other processes limited by nitrogen and phosphorus, such as photosynthesis (Field & Mooney; 1986; Reich et al., 1994) and litter decomposition (Parton et al., 1988; Carlyle, 1986).

The dark respiration of leaves measured during the daytime, and after correction for temperature, has been shown elsewhere to be 40% higher than that measured during the night (Hubbard et al., 1995), which suggests it is important to make measurements overnight. In this study, foliar respiration was measured in PRF and SRF. The initial focus of the work was to record the night-time characteristics of leaf respiration throughout the canopy of tropical forest, and to parameterise the temperature response of this process. The hypothesis was then tested that variability in respiration among leaves of different species and at different heights would collapse onto a single relationship governed by temperature and leaf chemical composition.

**6.2 METHODS**

**LEAF RESPIRATION AND NUTRIENT ANALYSIS**

Respiration measurements were made by placing leaves in a photosynthesis leaf chamber (Licor, Nebraska, USA) attached in a closed circuit to an IRGA (Licor 6200, Licor, Nebraska, USA). Measurements were made at ambient temperature and humidity during the night. Leaf temperature was measured using the proprietary leaf chamber thermocouple. Access to leaves through the vertical profile of the canopy was obtained using the micrometeorological tower at each site.

In order to measure maintenance respiration ($R_m$), measurements were made on fully expanded (but not apparently senescing) leaves from different species. Leaves at different heights in the canopies of PRF and SRF were accessed from a micrometeorological tower (Table 6.1) and measured at intervals throughout the night. In Brazil, measurements were made on the nights of 25th May and 4th June,
1993, and in Cameroon on the 11th and 22nd March 1994. Immediately after the final measurement was taken, most of the measured leaves were removed. In a few cases in SRF, leaves were also being used for the measurement of photosynthesis; these were removed after a delay of a maximum of 5 days. In the field laboratory, leaf area measurement was not possible, so leaves were carefully flattened and photocopied. Leaf area was measured using a pre-calibrated Delta-T leaf area meter (Delta-T Devices Ltd, Cambridge, UK) upon return to Edinburgh. A leaf corer was used to obtain 10-20 discs of known area (diameter = 16 mm, Brazil; 10 mm, Cameroon) from each fresh sample. All leaf material was then oven-dried at 70 °C to constant mass. Specific leaf area determinations were made using a precision balance (Sauter Re1614, Albstadt, Switzerland; maximum sensitivity = 0.0001g). Leaf total nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations were determined using a standard wet digestion (Allen, 1974) in Edinburgh (leaves from Cameroon). The leaves from Brazil were analysed at ANU, Canberra for soluble sugars, starch, total non-starch carbohydrate, leaf nitrogen and leaf phosphorus concentrations. In total, approximately 35 leaves were measured from each forest; those from PRF were grouped by species before nutrient assays were done, whilst those from SRF were treated individually where possible.

Table 6.1. Species and height (m) in canopy of leaves measured for respiration during the night in Brazil (1993) and Cameroon (1994). Each species was identified by botanists from national herbaria in Belém (Brazil) and Yaoundé (Cameroon); specimen samples were deposited in the respective herbaria. The † marks denote leaves found at more than one height. h is height, in m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Maximiliana maripa</em> (Corre Serra) Drude</td>
<td>Palmae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Hypsodelphis violacea</em> (Ridl.) M-Redh.</td>
<td>Marantaceae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Naucleopsis krunni</em> (Standl) C.C. Berg</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Dichapetalum sp.</em></td>
<td>Dichapetalaceae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Theobroma microcarpum</em> Mart.</td>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Afromomum giganteum</em> (Oliv. &amp; Harb.) K. Schum.</td>
<td>Zingiberaceae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erythroxylum c.f.macrophyllum</em> Cav.</td>
<td>Erythroxylaceae</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Trichilia sp.</em></td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leonia glycicarpa Ruiz</em></td>
<td>Violaceae</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td><em>Musanga cecropioides</em> R.Br.</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>1/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Derris pterocarpa</em> (DC) Killip</td>
<td>Leguminseae</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>Haumania dankelmaniana</em> M-Redh.</td>
<td>Marantaceae</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inga sp.</em> (nobilis or capitata)</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td><em>Celtis adolfi-friderici</em> Engl.</td>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Strychnos amazonicus</em> Krukoff</td>
<td>Loganaceae</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td><em>Amphimas pterocarpoides</em> Harms.</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>36/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cedrela odorata</em> L.</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Caesalpinaceae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3 RESULTS

LEAF TEMPERATURES

Leaf temperature in both forests declined over the nocturnal cycle. Leaves at the top of the canopy commenced the night at higher temperatures and cooled to lower temperatures by morning in comparison to those near ground level. The main difference between the two forests was in the greater decoupling of leaves at ground level in PRF over those in SRF. This resulted in steeper and more closely defined pre-dawn temperature gradients in Brazil (Figure 6.1). The absolute temperatures were similar for both forests, though the range was greater for SRF (25 - 18 °C) than for PRF (25 - 21 °C); if measurements had been made during a friagem period in Brazil the PRF minimum would have been lower.

![Leaf temperature during the night through the vertical profile of the canopy in SRF (open circles), and PRF (spots). The measurement dates were May/June, 1993 (PRF) and March, 1994 (SRF).](image)

Figure 6.1. Leaf temperature during the night through the vertical profile of the canopy in SRF (open circles), and PRF (spots). The measurement dates were May/June, 1993 (PRF) and March, 1994 (SRF).
LEAF RESPIRATION RATES

Figures 6.2a-d show nocturnal cycles in raw leaf temperatures and respiration rates for two species from Brazil and two from Cameroon. The traces for *C. adolfi-friderici* and *L. glycicarpa* reveal a pre-dawn rise in respiration that changes in counterpoint to leaf temperature, whilst *A. ptercarpoides* and *N. krunnii* show a pre-dawn drop in leaf respiration. This reduction is greater than would be expected given the measured foliar cooling, and assuming a $Q_{10}$ of 2.0. Patterns of this sort in pre-dawn leaf respiration were not consistent with species or height. In contrast, for measurements made before 0100 hrs, the temperature response of all leaves was more similar, with $Q_{10}$ values around two. Some variation in the measured $Q_{10}$ values occurred probably as a result of the very small temperature ranges from which they were obtained (Table 6.2.). A few of the species enumerated in Table 6.1 are not represented in Table 6.2 as in these cases insufficient measurements were made before 0100 hrs to calculate a temperature response.

![Figure 6.2a-d](image)

*Figure 6.2a-d.* Night-time traces in leaf temperature and respiration for two species from SRF (a) and (b) and PRF (c) & (d). The spots are leaf respiration and the open circles are leaf temperature.
6. Leaf respiration

All leaf respiration rates were normalised to 22 °C using a $Q_{10}$ of 2.0, and compared by height in the canopy (Figure 6.3). The patterns for SRF and PRF are rather similar: CO$_2$ effluxes remained constant up to 10 m, followed by a steep rise between 10 m and 20 m to maxima at 25 m (SRF) and 30 m (Brazil). Both canopies were divided into five strata (0-5 m; 5-15 m; 15-25 m; 25-30 m and 30-40 m) and the composite respiration rates compared. Leaf respiration at 22 °C was significantly larger ($p < 0.01$ for each stratum) in the secondary forest in Cameroon than in the primary forest in Brazil.

Table 6.2. Estimated temperature responses in leaf respiration before 0100 hrs from SRF and PRF. The all species value is the mean, with the 95% confidence in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>$Q_{10}$</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>$Q_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximiliana maripa</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Amphimas ptercarpoides</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobroma microcarpum</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Musanga cecropoides</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naucleopsis krunnii</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Afrumomum giganteum</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga sp.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Staudtia stipitata</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonia glycyicarpa</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Hypsodelphis violacea</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derris pterocarpa</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Celtis adolphi-friderici</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All species</td>
<td>2.3 (1.7)</td>
<td>All species</td>
<td>2.0 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 6.3a&b. Variation in night-time leaf respiration (leaf area basis) with height in SRF and PRF. The error bars are 95% confidence; $n = 1 - 3$ in PRF and 2 - 4 in SRF. Respiration rates are normalised to 22 °C.
Data were not processed as an analysis of variance by species and height, since most species occurred once only, at only one level. Among the exceptions to this, only one species, *Musanga cecropioides* in Cameroon, had a sufficient vertical separation between samples to show a significant difference in respiration rate between heights (respiration = 0.44 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) at ground level \([21.2 \, ^\circ\, C]\) and 0.80 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) at 24 m \([22.3 \, ^\circ\, C]\); \(p < 0.001\)). In Brazil, at ground level, the palm *M. maripa* gave a significantly lower respiration rate \((p < 0.05)\) than the other two species measured. In Cameroon, also at ground level, *H. violacea* and *Dichapetalum sp.* were grouped, with significantly lower leaf respiration rates \((p < 0.05)\) than the other three species at this height, *A. giganteum*, *Trichilia sp.*, and *M. cecropioides*. In PRF, near the top of the canopy, comparisons were possible between *P. polybotrium* and *D. pterocarpa* at 20 m, and between *Inga sp* and *S. amazonicus* at 30 m. For both, the latter of each pair was a liana species and showed significantly higher respiration rates \((p < 0.05)\).

### VARIATION IN LEAF RESPIRATION WITH NUTRIENT CONCENTRATION

The patterns in Figure 6.3 could have resulted from differences in leaf structure or nutrient concentration, or both. Figure 6.4 indicates that the variation in \(R_m\) with height, as expressed on an area basis, was strongly related to leaf thickness (specific leaf area, SLA; see also Figure 3.6). The variation with height in leaf nitrogen (\(N_{\text{leaf}}\)) and phosphorus (\(P_{\text{leaf}}\)) in the canopies of PRF and SRF was examined (Figures 6.5a-d). At the bottom level (first 2 m) there was some variation among leaves, but above this the area-based nutrient content increased with height, with a larger relative change for \(N_{\text{leaf}}\). Mass-based \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) did not show a clear gradient with height; when they were related to \(R_m\) (as g C g\(^{-1}\)) a significant correlation was found only with the \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) data for PRF (Figures 6.6a-d; Table 6.3). The nutrient concentrations in SRF were higher than in PRF, particularly so for \(P_{\text{leaf}}\). The relationship between \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(R_m\) was dissected further by reference to a molar ratio, \(R_m: N_{\text{leaf}}\) (μmol C s\(^{-1}\) [mol N]\(^{-1}\)). The molar \(R_m: N_{\text{leaf}}\) ratio was larger at greater heights: leaves at the top of the canopy in both forests appeared to respire at a faster rate per unit nitrogen than those at the bottom, though significant differences in \(R_m: N_{\text{leaf}}\) were only found between some heights (Table 6.4).

In the absence of a strong mass-based \(R_m\) - leaf nutrient relationships, regressions of \(R_m\) on \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) were calculated on an area basis (Figures 6.7a-d & Table 6.5a); only the regression for \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) in PRF was non-significant \((p = 0.06)\). The intercepts for the overall \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) regressions were not significantly different from zero at the 95% level. \(R_m\) was also related to \(N_{\text{leaf}}\) and \(P_{\text{leaf}}\) in a multiple linear regression (Table 6.5b). Measured leaf respiration rates agreed well with modelled rates using this function (Figure 6.8; in SRF, \(p < 0.001, r^2 = 0.68\); in PRF, \(p < 0.01, r^2 = 0.66\)). The intercept was
only significantly different from zero (95% level) for SRF and not for PRF (Table 6.5b). In addition, nitrogen was not a significant variable for the multiple regression in PRF, though phosphorus was ($p > 0.8$ vs $p < 0.001$). From the data available, $R_m$ measured in PRF did not appear to scale with leaf carbohydrate concentrations (Figure 6.9).

![Figure 6.4. The variation in leaf respiration rate with specific leaf area (SLA) in SRF and PRF.](image)

Table 6.3. Results for mass-based single regressions between $R_m$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$, where $R_m$ is in $g \text{ C} \text{g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ is in $g \text{ g}^{-1}$. Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits. The data are for PRF, PRF + SRF and SRF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Co-efficient</th>
<th>$p$ - value</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^7$ (3x10^8)</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^4$ (8x10^5)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$7.3 \times 10^8$ (4x10^9)</td>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^5$ (3x10^7)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ ratio in $\mu$mol C s$^{-1}$ [mol $N_{\text{leaf}}$]$^{-1}$ at different heights in the canopies of SRF and PRF. Errors in parentheses are the 95% confidence limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H_t$ (m)</th>
<th>SRF: $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>PRF: $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4.17 (0.33)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71 (0.52)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>5.45 (0.66)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57 (1.19)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>3.31 (0.44)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.61 (0.35)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.54 (1.89)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.60 (0.67)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.59 (0.73)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.43 (0.35)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 6.5a-d. Variation in $N_\text{leaf}$ and $P_\text{leaf}$ with height in the canopy for SRF and PRF. Data are expressed on an area and mass basis; the nitrogen data are spots and the phosphorus data are open circles.
Table 6.5a. Results for area-based single regressions between $R_m$ and $N_{leaf}$ or $P_{leaf}$, where $R_m$ is in µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $N_{leaf}$ or $P_{leaf}$ are in mol m$^{-2}$. Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits. The data are for SRF and PRF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Co-efficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-0.25 (0.37)</td>
<td>6.04 (2.70)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-0.25 (0.34)</td>
<td>306.9 (123)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.35)</td>
<td>2.59 (2.8)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.21)</td>
<td>397.1 (199)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5b. Results for the area-based multiple regressions between $R_m$ and $N_{leaf}$ and $P_{leaf}$, where $R_m$ is in µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $N_{leaf}$ and $P_{leaf}$ are in mol m$^{-2}$. Errors in parentheses are 95% confidence limits. The form of the relationship between respiration and nutrient content is $R_m = aN_{leaf} + bP_{leaf} + c$. The data are for SRF and PRF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>a (95% CI)</th>
<th>b (95% CI)</th>
<th>c (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>0.247(0.09)</td>
<td>205.7(65.8)</td>
<td>-0.45 (0.17)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>-0.243 (2.9)</td>
<td>414 (298)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 6.6a&b. The variation in leaf respiration with (a) $N_{leaf}$ and (b) $P_{leaf}$ as expressed on a mass basis. The PRF data are the open triangles and the SRF data are the spots. The regression line is plotted for $R_m$ vs $P_{leaf}$ from PRF ($p < 0.05$); the remaining plots show no significant correlation.
Figure 6.7a-d. The variation in leaf respiration with $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ expressed on an area basis. The nitrogen data are spots and the phosphorus data open circles. In (a) and (b), data from SRF refer to individual leaves; in (c) and (d), data from PRF are species averages at each height ($n = 4-16$). The data in plot (c) showed no significant correlation, so no line has been drawn; the regression results for all the graphs are given in Table 6.5a. The dashed lines on (b) represent $R_m: N_{\text{leaf}}$ ratios at different heights (see Discussion).
Figures 6.8a&b. The multiple regression of \( R_m \) on \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) and \( P_{\text{leaf}} \) in SRF. The PRF multiple regression is not shown as it was not significantly better than with \( P_{\text{leaf}} \) alone (see text). Figure (a) shows measured vs modelled leaf respiration for SRF and Figure (b) shows the model results for \( P_{\text{leaf}} \) and \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) over their measured physiological ranges. The \( r^2 \) value for the SRF model is 0.68.
6.4 DISCUSSION

Leaf respiration rates tend to be low, and consequently even measurements using a closed IRGA system, as used here, may be made near the limits of instrument sensitivity, thereby introducing noise into the data. However, most measured chamber - atmosphere CO₂ differentials were 15 - 50 times the sensitivity of the Licor 6200 IRGA, suggesting that the data were unlikely to have been swamped by random instrument error.

The lower temperatures of leaves during the night the near the ground in SRF may have resulted from better coupling than in PRF because of the more open canopy structure; also stable meteorological conditions during the night were more prevalent in PRF (Grace et al., 1995a; Grace et al., unpublished). Leaf respiration was determined by leaf temperature in a fairly regular manner before the pre-dawn period; Q₁₀ values were in the region of two, as found elsewhere (Amthor, 1989; Ryan, 1991). The larger temperature ranges experienced in Cameroon reduced the variability in calculated Q₁₀ values by comparison to those from Brazil.

Leaves exhibited inconsistent patterns of pre-dawn respiration. The two extremes of this behaviour were seen as increases in respiration against the prevailing temperature regime, or greater decreases than than expected given the rate of foliar cooling (Figure 6.2). The former condition might be explained by reference to entrained physiological rhythms generating elevated metabolic rates just before dawn in preparation for photosynthesis, though there is little experimental evidence for this.
phenomenon. The latter condition implies that the factors determining the respiration rate changed at the end of the night from temperature and oxygen availability to carbohydrate supply. Measurements of excised leaf sections have shown that soluble sugar levels do not limit night respiration in some temperate trees (Collier et al., 1992), though the period of darkness during that study was approximately 17% less than that of the two tropical rain forests studied. Furthermore, the tropical forest temperatures here were higher by 4 - 8 °C than those for the temperate trees.

There are almost no data on the variation in leaf respiration rates through the vertical profile of tropical forest canopies. What physiological information there is usually extends only to photosynthetic parameters (Roberts et al., 1990; Koch et al., 1994; McWilliam et al., 1996). In this study, respiration rates in leaves at a given height were consistently higher in SRF than in PRF (Figure 6.3). As all the measured leaves were fully expanded, this represents a difference in foliar maintenance respiration rates \( R_m \) (in \( \mu \text{mol}^2 \text{s}^{-1} \)) between the forests.

Variation in \( R_m \) is likely to result from differences in physiology engendered by prevailing light and nutrient availability. Amthor (1994) defines \( R_m \) as a function of canopy leaf nitrogen content, \( N_{\text{leaf}} \), and three physical states relating to temperature, ambient \( \text{CO}_2 \) concentration and incident photon flux density. For individual species, there is evidence that \( R_m \) increases linearly with \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) (Kawahara et al., 1976; Jones et al., 1978; Irving & Silsbury, 1987), though Byrd et al. (1992) did not find a relationship. Since 50 - 60% of maintenance respiration is attributed to protein turnover (Penning de Vries, 1975), an \( R_m \cdot N_{\text{leaf}} \) correlation might be expected, though if a large proportion of \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) is in the form of free amino acids rather than protein, then departures from the relationship are possible. Photopsonytic capacity is also related to \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) (Field & Mooney, 1986), so it is possible that carbohydrate synthesis during the preceding light period may further determine \( R_m \) values (Byrd et al., 1992; Azcon-Bieto & Osmond, 1983; Ryan, 1994) though the effect may be slight.

Leaf nutrient and physiological data have been expressed in the literature on both a mass and area basis (e.g., Reich & Walters, 1994; Reich et al., 1994; Evans, 1989). In both SRF and PRF, \( R_m \) varied on an area basis with nutrient concentration, height, and accordingly by leaf thickness (cf. Figure 3.6; Figures 6.3 - 6.5, 6.7). But any trends were generally non-significant when values were expressed on a leaf mass basis (Figures 6.5 & 6.6). The \( P_{\text{leaf}} \) data for PRF were an exception to this (Table 6.3) and highlighted a distinguishing feature of the leaves there (see discussion below). The \( R_m \) (gC g\(^{-1}\)) vs \( N_{\text{leaf}} \) (g g\(^{-1}\)) relationship was particularly weak (Figure 6.5), a result contrasting with that of Ryan (1994). His regression for 14 boreal and subalpine tree species was forced through the origin (apparently
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without justification), and showed variation within and among species about the fitted line, although the relationship was significant. However, the range of Ryan's $N_{\text{leaf}}$ values was large (0.005 - 0.04 g g$^{-1}$). It is possible that a wider range of $N_{\text{leaf}}$ in the samples for my study would have changed the result, but incorporation of $N_{\text{leaf}}$ data from PRF with SRF did not generate a significant relationship.

Alternatively, it may be that $R_m$ is not precisely related in a universal way to $N_{\text{leaf}}$ on a mass basis. Leaves at the top of the canopy appeared to respire at a faster rate for a given nitrogen concentration than those lower down (Table 6.4). This suggested that either respiration in these leaves was more 'nitrogen-efficient' or that a greater percentage of $N_{\text{leaf}}$ was involved in respiratory processes. The latter hypothesis is more reasonable since leaves at the top of the tower were thicker, and so contained less structural nitrogen relative to 'metabolic' nitrogen than the thinner leaves near the ground.

$R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ molar ratios have been reported for data from crops, ryegrass, boreal trees and subalpine trees (Table 6.6). The $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ ratio in leaves in the upper canopy for SRF and PRF was approximately double the values obtained elsewhere; since the non-tropical values were normalised to 10 °C, this discrepancy is most directly explained by the difference in temperature at which the data were obtained, assuming a $Q_{10}$ of two. Further variation among the estimates may result from $R_m$ and $Q_{10}$ values varying slightly between 10 and 22 °C (Amthor 1984; Ryan, 1994; Amthor, 1994).

Differences in the $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ ratio between 'sun' and 'shade' leaves were not significant in boreal and subalpine species (Ryan, 1994). Using height as a surrogate for the light environment, Table 6.4 suggested a decline in $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ from 'sun' leaves (top) to 'shade' leaves (ground) in both PRF and SRF. Variation in the pattern partly reflected species differences, but it is possible that this variation also reflected the different average radiation flux experienced by the individual leaves that were sampled. The high $R_m$:$N_{\text{leaf}}$ at 2 m in SRF indirectly supports this, given the canopy gaps present at this site. Assuming a close linkage between photosynthesis and respiration, these data are consistent with a theory of optimal nitrogen allocation within a forest canopy (e.g., Sellers et al., 1992; Schulze et al., 1994) and assuming an additional term to account for differences in total leaf nitrogen because of differences in structure among leaves.
Table 6.6. The \( R_m :N_{leaf} \) ratio expressed as \( \mu \text{mol C s}^{-1} [\text{mol } N_{leaf}]^{-1} \) for SRF and PRF (upper canopy leaves), crops, ryegrass, boreal trees and subalpine trees and shrubs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation type</th>
<th>( R_m :N_{leaf} )</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crops and ‘wild-land tissues’</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>10 °C</td>
<td>Ryan 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryegrass</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>10 °C</td>
<td>Jones et al., 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreal/Subalpine trees</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>10 °C</td>
<td>Ryan 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical rain forest (SRF)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>22 °C</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical rain forest (PRF)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>22 °C</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The area based \( R_m \) - leaf nutrient relationships in PRF and SRF produced significant regressions for each forest. The high \( r^2 \) value of 0.68 for the multiple regression of \( R_m \) on \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) in SRF suggested that it is a reasonable predictor of leaf respiration for that forest (Figure 6.8). The residuals for both the N and P coefficients (not shown) were not skewed, adding strength to the predictive capacity of the model across the full range of \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \). However, \( N_{leaf} \) was not a significant variable in the multiple regression of \( R_m \) on \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) for PRF. \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) values for the primary forest in Brazil were lower than in SRF. The difference was most marked with \( P_{leaf} \) which in Cameroon was almost double the levels found in Brazil (700 - 2000 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \) in Brazil, vs 2-4000 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \) in Cameroon). The differences in \( P_{leaf} \), rather than \( N_{leaf} \), explain the overall variation in \( R_m \) observed between SRF and PRF; this is supported by the significant regressions between \( R_m \) and \( P_{leaf} \) on either a mass or area basis, but the non-significant relationships with \( N_{leaf} \) (Tables 6.3 & 6.5a). The data suggest that \( P_{leaf} \) determined leaf respiration in PRF, whilst in SRF both \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) determined respiration. Low phosphorous availability in PRF, a common feature of Amazonian soils (Stark & Jordan, 1978; Nadkarni, 1981) could have been the cause of this discrepancy.

The intercepts on the ordinates of the respiration - leaf nutrient relationships in Figure 6.7 are also of interest. They are not significantly different from zero, a result consistent with the frequent assumption that the regression crosses the origin (e.g., Jones et al., 1978; Ryan, 1994). But the data for SRF still suggest that a proportion of \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) was not related to the respiration rate. At zero CO\(_2\) efflux, \( N_{leaf} \) was predicted to be 0.04 \( \text{mol m}^{-2} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) to be 0.0008 \( \text{mol m}^{-2} \). The significant intercept for the multiple regression of \( R_m \) on \( N_{leaf} \) and \( P_{leaf} \) in SRF (\( p < 0.001 \); Table 6.5b) also supports the existence of these intercepts. If they accurately reflect cellular metabolism, then they give an estimate of the average quantity of canopy leaf N or P that is decoupled from respiration. This protein is likely to be required for non-respiratory metabolism, or for structural proteins with low turnover rates, though it may also be in the form of free amino acids that do not have recurrent maintenance costs.
The $R_m:N_{leaf}$ ratios in Table 6.4 indicated that the proportion of structural to total nitrogen is lower nearer the ground; this can also be seen in the example of Figure 6.7b where dotted lines drawn from the origin to the regression line at different $R_m$ values represent the $R_m:N_{leaf}$ ratio at different heights (where $R_m$ is used to denote height, c.f., Figure 6.3). Removal of [structural] leaf N and P that is not involved in photosynthetic or respiratory metabolism from total $N_{leaf}$ and $P_{leaf}$ values could improve models that seek to treat canopies as a single 'big-leaf' (Kull & Jarvis, 1995).

### 6.5 CONCLUSION

Leaf respiration ($R_m$) was measured on leaves from a range of species throughout the vertical profile of PRF in Brazil, and SRF in Cameroon. A gradient in foliar respiration was observed rising from 0.2 - 0.4 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at ground level to 0.7 - 1.2 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at the canopy-top. Inconsistent patterns of pre-dawn respiration were observed among all species, although before 0100 hrs, the temperature response of most leaves approximated a $Q_{10}$ of two. The highest respiration rates were found in a liana species, *Strychnos amazonicus*, in Brazil, and in a pioneer tree species, *Musanga cecropioides*, in Cameroon. In the latter species, $R_m$ varied significantly with height in the canopy.

Leaf respiration on an area basis was strongly related to SLA and foliar chemical composition. For each forest, a model incorporating both $N_{leaf}$ and $P_{leaf}$ was found to explain 68% (SRF) and 66% (PRF) of the variation in CO$_2$ effluxes, irrespective of height or species. Both $R_m$ and $P_{leaf}$ at each height in the forest canopy in Cameroon were approximately double that found in Brazil. By contrast, $N_{leaf}$ did not explain the difference in $R_m$ between the two forests. A possible method for separating foliar protein ascribed to respiration from that involved in other metabolic and structural functions was proposed using the relationships between leaf $R_m$ and $N_{leaf}$ and $P_{leaf}$.

On a mass basis leaf respiration rate was poorly related to $N_{leaf}$ and only significantly related ($p = 0.02$) to $P_{leaf}$ in PRF. It is possible that $R_m$ does not respond in a general way to $N_{leaf}$ on a mass basis. The data were also expressed as the molar ratio between $R_m$ and $N_{leaf}$, and compared with values from different temperate vegetation types. The molar $R_m:N_{leaf}$ ratio in these environments was found to be consistent with the values for 'sun' leaves in SRF and PRF, after allowing for differences in acclimated leaf temperatures, and was reduced in leaves found in deep shade near the ground. The molar $R_m:N_{leaf}$ ratio integrates the effects of SLA on nutrient - respiration relationships, but variation among leaves...
may remain reflecting relative nutrient allocation to different cellular functions, which in turn may depend on the radiation environment of the leaves. These findings may provide the basis for a general model of leaf respiration applicable in a wide range of environments, although systems where nitrogen or phosphorus are not limiting may add complexity (Ryan, 1994). The prospect of a general model is attractive as it bridges this and other processes also determined by tissue nutrient levels, such as photosynthesis (Field & Mooney, 1986; Evans, 1989), and microbial decomposition processes in the soil, where carbon and nitrogen concentrations dictate the balance between immobilization and mineralization (Melillo et al., 1982; Carlyle, 1986; White, 1987).
Photosynthesis constitutes the largest single flux of carbon between vegetation and the atmosphere (Raich & Schlesinger, 1992). In forests this may be measured at the whole canopy level using eddy covariance techniques (Baldocchi et al., 1988), or at the leaf level, using portable IRGA’s and suitably designed leaf gas exchange chambers. The advantage of the latter approach is that it provides physiological data relating to one component of the ecosystem, and permits comparison by position in the canopy and species. Such information is vital for understanding leaf physiology, for modelling ecosystem gas exchange, and ultimately for the validation of larger scale vegetation - atmosphere models. In tropical forests, there is a dearth of information on photosynthesis, and even less on the pattern of gas exchange through the vertical profile of the canopy (McWilliam et al., 1996).

Photosynthetic physiology is complex, and is driven by a suite of primary environmental variables, the most important being incident photon flux density ($Q$), temperature, and the water vapour pressure deficit ($D$) of ambient air. These factors affect leaf biochemistry, and gas diffusion parameters such as stomatal conductance to water vapour and carbon dioxide ($g_s$). But they do not limit photosynthesis independently (Jones, 1992): unless controlled for in a laboratory, they can covary, making net $g_s$ and leaf photosynthesis ($A_l$) rates contingent upon these covarying interactions. Models of photosynthesis are made to account for this phenomenon by fitting observed data to non-linear equations that incorporate the form of the response in $A_l$ and $g_s$ to each environmental variable, as it is currently understood at the physiological and biochemical level.

Gas exchange data from leaves throughout the vertical profile of the canopy of SRF were obtained in March 1994. It was possible to analyse these data using two approaches. The phenomenological model of Reed et al. (1976) and Jarvis et al. (1985) drives $A_l$ according to observed responses in photosynthetic parameters to the physical environment. The model of Farquhar & von Caemmerer, (1982) incorporates these responses but interprets them according to the biochemistry of photosynthesis. It consequently has the advantage of allowing analysis of the effect of changes in ambient CO$_2$ concentration on photosynthesis. This model was fitted to the measurements from SRF. In order to constrain the possible set of fitting parameters within acceptable bounds, and where
reasonable, certain biochemical values were assumed from the literature (e.g., the Michaelis-Menten constants for carboxylation ($K_c$) and oxygenation ($K_o$) by ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase-oxygenase, Rubisco).

The physical environment in a tropical forest changes markedly from the canopy top to the forest floor (Lemon et al., 1970). Different species, with different physiognomies and physiologies, are commonly found at different heights. This variation must be accounted for when modelling the gas exchange behaviour of a whole canopy. Two approaches present themselves: the 'splitters' choice, where physiological and environmental detail at every level is described (e.g., MAESTRO, Wang & Jarvis, 1990); and the 'lumpers' approach where the canopy is accredited composite gas exchange characteristics and treated as a single 'big-leaf' (e.g., Grace et al., 1995a). The latter approach requires that photosynthetic capacity is distributed with height according to the local physical environment (irrespective of, though potentially covarying with, species composition). Leaf nitrogen and phosphorus are good indicators of photosynthetic capacity (Field & Mooney, 1986; Evans, 1989, Brooks, 1986). The allocation of leaf nitrogen with height in some mono-specific stands is in proportion to absorbed irradiance (Field, 1983; Evans, 1993). This is consistent with models of optimal carbon gain (Field 1988; Schulze et al., 1994). Under the assumption that such a distribution also occurs in mixed species forests, the condition of optimality (Farquhar, 1989) has been used to scale from leaf to canopy in the construction of composite gas exchange models for use at larger scales (e.g., Sellers et al., 1992). Leaf nutrient data and photosynthetic parameters are reported here with a view to comparing lumped and split canopy photosynthesis models in Chapter 8.

**MODELLING PHOTOSYNTHESIS**

$A_l$ is predicted from $Q$, $C_a$ and temperature, with additional calculated or assumed parameters. Those used or referred to in this chapter are listed below:

- $A_l$ is the rate of net photosynthesis by individual leaves ($\mu$mol m^{-2} s^{-1})
- $C_a$ is the ambient concentration of CO$_2$ ($\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$).
- $C_c$ is the concentration of CO$_2$ in the chloroplast ($\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$).
- $C_i$ is the internal concentration of CO$_2$ in the intercellular spaces at the surface of the cell walls in the leaf ($\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$).
- $C_s$ is the concentration of CO$_2$ at the site of evaporation within the sub-stomatal cavity ($\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$).
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$E_{\text{clorvij}}$ are the Arrhenius activation energies for $K_c$, $K_o$, $V_{\text{max}}$ and $J_{\text{max}}$ respectively (kJ mol$^{-1}$)

$g_s$ is the stomatal conductance to H$_2$O (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

$g_c$ is the stomatal conductance to CO$_2$ (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$g_i$ is an internal conductance from the sub-stomatal cavity to the sites of carboxylation within the chloroplasts (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$H_S/S_j$ are fitting parameters affecting $J_{\text{max}}$ at low and high temperatures (J mol$^{-1}$ & kJ mol$^{-1}$),

$K_c$ is the Michaelis-Menten constant for carboxylation by Rubisco (µmol mol$^{-1}$),

$K_o$ is the Michaelis-Menten constant for oxygenation by Rubisco (mol mol$^{-1}$)

$\Gamma^*$ is the leaf CO$_2$ compensation concentration in the absence of dark respiration (µmol mol$^{-1}$),

$pO$ is the ambient concentration of oxygen (mol mol$^{-1}$),

$R$ is the universal gas constant (8.314 J mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$),

$R_d$ is the daytime leaf respiration rate at $Q = 0$ (µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$Q$ is photon flux density of incident photosynthetically active radiation (µmol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$),

$T_l$ is leaf temperature (°C or, as $T_l$, in K).

The Farquhar & von Caemmerer (1982) model

$A_i$ is calculated as the minimum of Rubisco limited ($A_v$) and electron transport limited ($A_j$) assimilation (Farquhar et al., 1980; Farquhar & von Caemmerer, 1982).

Rubisco limited assimilation:

$$A_v = \frac{V_{\text{max}}(C_c - \Gamma^*)}{K_c\left[1 + pO/K_o + C_c\right]} - R_d$$

Equation 7.1

where $V_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum rate of carboxylation, and the Arrhenius-type temperature sensitivities for $V_{\text{max}}$, $K_c$ and $K_o$ are defined relative to their rates at 25 °C as given below:

$$V_{\text{max}} = V_{\text{max}25} \exp \left[ \frac{E_y}{298.2 R} \left( 1 - \frac{298.2}{T_l} \right) \right]$$

Equation 7.2a
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\[ K_c = K_{c25} \exp \left[ \frac{E_c}{298.2 R} \left( 1 - \frac{298.2}{T_{lk}} \right) \right] \]  
Equation 7.2b

\[ K_o = K_{o25} \exp \left[ \frac{E_o}{298.2 R} \left( 1 - \frac{298.2}{T_{lk}} \right) \right] \]  
Equation 7.2c

The compensation concentration of CO\(_2\) in the absence of dark respiration is \( \Gamma^* \). It differs from \( \Gamma \) used in some other formulations since the latter incorporates a [variable] amount of CO\(_2\) evolution (respiration) other than photorespiration, and is consequently a slightly poorer indicator of the ratio of carboxylation to oxygenation in chloroplastic Rubisco (Brooks & Farquhar, 1985).

Electron transport limited assimilation:

\[ A_j = \frac{J}{4} \left( \frac{C_c - \Gamma^*}{C_c + 2\Gamma^*} \right) - R_d \]  
Equation 7.3

where \( J \) is the rate of electron transport defined by the maximum rate of electron transport, \( J_{\text{max}} \) (i.e., at saturating \( Q \)), the irradiance, \( I_2 \), absorbed by photosystem II, and \( \theta \) a convexity factor varying from 0 (a rectangular hyperbola) to 1 (a Blackman response curve, two straight lines), according to Farquhar & Wong (1984). Implicit in the formulation of \( A_j \) is the assumption that four electrons generate sufficient ATP and NADPH for the regeneration of ribulose bisphosphate, RuBP, in the Calvin cycle (Farquhar & von Caemmerer, 1982).

\[ J = \frac{I_2 + J_{\text{max}} - \sqrt{(I_2 + J_{\text{max}})^2 - 4\theta I_2 J_{\text{max}}}}{2\theta} \]  
Equation 7.4

\[ I_2 = Q \left[ \frac{(1-f)(1-r-t)}{2} \right] \]  
Equation 7.5

where \( f \) corrects for the spectral imbalance of light (Evans 1987), \( r \) and \( t \) are the canopy reflectance and transmittance of the incident photosynthetically active radiation, \( Q \).
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\[
J_{\text{max}} = \frac{J_{\text{max}25}}{1 + \exp\left[\frac{S_j T_{\text{lk}} - H_j}{RT_{\text{lk}}}\right]}
\]

Equation 7.6

Leaf respiration, \( R_d \), and the compensation concentration, \( \Gamma^* \):

Leaf respiration, \( R_d \), is temperature sensitive according to an exponential relationship, but a constraint by \( Q > 10 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \) is also included (Brooks & Farquhar, 1985; Lloyd et al., 1995b):

\[
R_d = R_{d0} e^{(kT)} \quad \text{Equation 7.7a}
\]

At \( Q < 10 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \), \( R_d = R_{d0} \) \quad \text{Equation 7.7b}

At \( Q > 10 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \), \( R_d = R_{d0} [0.5 - 0.05 \ln(Q)] \) \quad \text{Equation 7.7c}

where \( k \) defines the \( Q_{10} \) of leaf respiration according to: \( Q_{10} = e^{(10.4)} \).

The temperature sensitivity of \( \Gamma^* \) follows the description by Brooks & Farquhar (1985), but uses an intercept more recently reported by von Caemmerer et al. (1994).

\[
\Gamma^* = [38.6 + 1.68 (T_l - 25) + 0.012 (T_l - 25)^2]
\]

Equation 7.8

Stomatal conductance:

In order to effectively predict \( A_l \), a stomatal conductance model must also be derived. Two commonly used general formulations are the Jarvis (1976) model and the Ball et al. (1987) model. The latter type predicts \( g_s \) using relative humidity (\( h \)) at the leaf surface, and the correlation between \( A_l \) and \( g_s \). However \( h \) is defined according to \( T \), and fitting a photosynthesis model using observed \( A_l \) for \( g_s \) as well as predicted \( A_l \) may introduce circular correlations.

To avoid these difficulties, a Jarvis-type model was chosen. This formulation prescribes the stomatal response to water (\( g_a \)) to different environmental variables (\( Q, D, T, \) leaf water potential, \( \psi \), etc) in a multiplicative non-linear model, and assumes that the separate functions do not interact. This
approach has been successful in a number of studies at the leaf (Lohammar et al., 1980) and canopy level (Shuttleworth, 1989; Lloyd et al., 1995b).

\[ g_s = g_q(Q) \cdot g_d(D) \cdot g_t(T) \cdot g_p(\phi) \ldots \]  
Equation 7.9

and according to the difference in diffusivity between CO$_2$ and H$_2$O,

\[ g_c = g_s / 1.6 \]  
Equation 7.10

The original model (Jarvis, 1976) proposed that: the response to $Q$ follows a rectangular hyperbola, saturating at high $Q$; the response to $D$ is linear with a negative slope; and the response to $T$ is bell-shaped with a maximum, minimum and optimum temperature. Various manipulations have been made to the original form, particularly in the response to $D$ (e.g., Leverenz, 1981; Leuning, 1995), which is more commonly represented as an hyperbolic relationship. The specific manipulations used to fit $g_s$ here are described in the Results and Discussion.

$C_c$ can now be estimated from $A_l$ and $g_s$, according to Equation 7.11:

\[ C_c = C_a - \frac{A_l}{g} \]  
Equation 7.11

where $g$ is the series sum of conductance to CO$_2$ diffusion across the stomatal pores ($g_e$) and the internal conductance from the sub-stomatal cavity to the sites of carboxylation in the chloroplasts ($g_i$), estimated from the literature (von Caemmerer & Evans, 1991; Lloyd et al., 1995b). In this way $A_l$ can be solved by combining Equations 7.1, 7.3 and 7.11, and the analytical solutions allowing $A_l$ to be calculated from $V, J, g, g_c, Q, T,$ and $R_d$ (Lloyd et al., 1995a) are given in Appendix C.
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7.2 METHODS

Leaf gas exchange data were obtained using an LCA3 IRGA (ADC, Hoddesdon, UK) with a propriety leaf chamber, and a PLC(N) designed for broadleaf species (ADC, Hoddesdon, UK). The leaf chamber and IRGA operate as an open gas exchange system and are described in Appendix C. Measurements were made on seven species accessed at different heights from the micrometeorological tower, and also at ground level (Table 7.2). The data were obtained in SRF, Cameroon, for the period 16th to 28th March 1994, when the equipment was available.

Table 7.1. Tree and shrub species measured for leaf gas exchange parameters in SRF, Cameroon, March 1994. Canopy position was used to provide a qualitative description of the prevailing light environment of each species; gaps above species in lower strata were over one sector of the sky. Not all individuals on the ground were next to the tower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Life form</th>
<th>Ht. (m)</th>
<th>Canopy position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphimas prerocarpoides Harms</td>
<td>Fabaceae - Caes.</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musanga cecropioides R.Br.</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Top, large gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtis adolf-friderici Engl.</td>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staudtia stipitata Warb.</td>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haumaniana danckelmaniana M-Redh.</td>
<td>Maranthaceae</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>0 - 1.5</td>
<td>Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaphryniwn macrostachyum</td>
<td>Maranthaceae</td>
<td>Herb</td>
<td>0 - 1.5</td>
<td>Ground, large gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichilia sp.</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>0 - 1.5</td>
<td>Ground, understorey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRGA was calibrated every morning using a pre-calibrated gas source; the PLC sensors were also calibrated and then checked up to four times during a measurement day. Temperature sensors were compared with a pre-calibrated thermocouple and the relative humidity sensors were calibrated using a water vapour generator (Licor 610, Licor, Nebraska, USA). The latter usually required slight re-adjustment during the course of a day. Where a constant environment was needed for calibration, the PLC was placed in an insulated box situated in the shade.

Data were obtained using two methods: (a) spot measurements, whereby leaves were placed in the chamber at their natural angle of inclination, the humidity and carbon dioxide levels allowed to stabilise before storage of the data; and (b) sequential shading, whereby leaves were exposed to full sunlight, a reading taken as in (a), and a neutral density filter placed over the chamber before taking a subsequent reading. In the latter technique, \( Q \) was sequentially reduced to zero (i.e., to give dark respiration). To make the spot measurements (type a) as representative as possible of ambient conditions they were taken relatively quickly (within 45 - 90 seconds of sealing the leaf in the chamber) to minimise any error accruing from stomata responding to the new environment within the chamber. For each species, two leaves were tagged and measured repeatedly; in addition, a larger
number of leaves were measured to provide an estimate for the whole tree. After the measurement period was complete, leaves were harvested, samples taken for specific leaf area determination (leaf disc diameter = 10 mm), and the tissue dried to constant mass at 70 °C. Leaf nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations were determined on these leaves in Edinburgh, using a standard wet digestion (Allen, 1974).

Gas exchange data were downloaded from the LCA3 to a portable computer. Software errors in the LCA3 can sometimes occur in the measurement of leaf temperature. Consequently gas exchange parameters were re-calculated using leaf temperature derived from solving the energy balance, and atmospheric pressure, as measured using a site-calibrated aneroid barometer. The main equations used are found in Field et al. (1989), Jones (1992) and the ADC manual (ADC, 1990). Models of stomatal conductance and photosynthesis were fitted to observed $A_1$ and $g_s$ using the relevant driving environmental variables. Models were fitted by minimising the error sum of squares using non-linear regressions (SPSS, v. 5.01, SPSS Inc., USA). The procedure followed was to obtain initial parameter estimates from previous, simpler analyses, or if not possible in the first place, from the literature. Constraints were only applied when the natural bounds of a parameter could be reliably estimated (e.g., minimum values greater than zero). Residual analysis of the fitted functions was used to detect skew in the predicted data. In fitting the Farquhar & von Caemmerer model to the data, a number of values had to be assumed as the variance in the measurements was too great to estimate all the features of the photosynthetic biochemistry, such as the embedded temperature coefficients. Table 7.2 lists the assumed parameters, their values and their sources.

Table 7.2. Parameters assumed when fitting the Farquhar & Caemmerer (1982) model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_c$</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>kJ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Harley et al. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_o$</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>kJ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Harley et al. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_r$</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>kJ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Kirschbaum &amp; Farquhar (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_l$</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>kJ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Lloyd et al. (1995b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_l$</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>kJ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Lloyd et al (1995a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_l$</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>kJ K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Lloyd et al (1995a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_c$</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>μmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>von Caemmerer et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_o$</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>von Caemmerer et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma^*$ intercept</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>μmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>von Caemmerer et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l - r - t$</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lloyd et al (1995a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Evans (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pO$</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>mol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STOMATAL CONDUCTANCE AND PHOTOSYNTHESIS RATES

A\textsubscript{1} reduced in all species from high rates at 0900 hrs - 1100 hrs to a minimum near sunset (Figure 7.1). In general, leaves at the top of the canopy exhibited higher assimilation rates than those at ground level. Assimilation near the ground, in *Trichilia*, peaked nearer 1200 hrs. Differences in the timing of maximum A\textsubscript{1} probably reflected more the daily radiation regime as dictated by the broken canopy above (c.f. Table 7.1), rather than changes in D (data not shown). A\textsubscript{max} declined with height (Table 7.4).

Analogous plots for g\textsubscript{s} (Figure 7.2) showed stomatal conductance to be highest before 1200 hrs in all species, and to drop throughout the day. The trees highest in the canopy did not show the highest g\textsubscript{s}, perhaps as a result of leaf water stress. The species with the largest value was a herb (*Megaphrynium macrostachyum*; maximum g\textsubscript{s} = 1000 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1}). The large entire leaves of such a species are likely to be associated with lower leaf boundary conductances and have been found elsewhere to show high g\textsubscript{s} values, in excess of 1200 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} (Whitehead *et al.*, 1981; Grace *et al.*, 1981; Grace, 1983). In *Amphimas*, at the canopy-top, g\textsubscript{s} dropped rapidly after the morning high, as expected in conditions where D increases the most rapidly (Roberts, 1990; Table 7.3 for maximum observed D values).

The gas exchange rates observed in Cameroon were similar to those found elsewhere for undisturbed tropical forests (e.g., Koyama, 1981; Grace *et al.*, 1982; Pearcy, 1987), though maximum g\textsubscript{s} values were greater than those found by Koch *et al.* (1994) in a ‘dense wet lowland forest’, in Cameroon (0.4 mol H\textsubscript{2}O m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1}). The few reported data on vertical profiles (Roberts *et al.*, 1990; McWilliam *et al.*, 1996) show maximum rates in the morning declining over the day, as found here.

STOMATAL CONDUCTANCE

The multiplicative model for g\textsubscript{s} excluded leaf water potential, as this was not measured (unpublished data from elsewhere suggest that leaf water potential does not affect g\textsubscript{s}; G. Jackson, personal communication). Stomatal conductance was strongly determined by the response to D (Figure 7.3a). Variation with Q showed a typical asymptotic curve but there was noise in the relationship caused by other factors, such as D (Figure 7.3d). g\textsubscript{s} showed only a weak response to T\textsubscript{i}; constraints were met, or optimal temperatures could not be found during the fitting process. Temperature covaries with D in
Figure 7.1. Diurnal patterns in photosynthesis in five of the trees in SRF. The values are means of all observations.

Figure 7.2. Diurnal patterns in stomatal conductance in five of the trees in SRF. The values are means of all observations.

field conditions (Figure 7.3b), and after correcting observed $g_s$ for $T_i$, $D$ and $Q$, (normalised to $T_i = 30$ °C, $D = 0.015$ mol mol$^{-1}$ and $Q = 300$ μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), a faintly peaked signal could be seen (Figure 7.3c). But the density of points at different temperatures prevented any improvement in the fit with $T_i$. 
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Consequently, only $D$ and $Q$ were used in the final model. The form of the fitted $Q$ response is described below. Several forms of the response to $D$ were tried: a best fit was found using a hyperbolic function (Equation 7.13b, below). The response of stomata to $D$ remains incompletely understood, indeed one author has suggested that the response is to evaporation rather than $D$ (Monteith, 1995). The hyperbolic function in Equation 7.13b, initially proposed by Lohammar et al., (1980), has been shown to be identical to treating $g_s$ as a linear function of evaporation (Leuning, 1995). A second, more complex $g_{sd}$ function was also devised (Equation 7.13a, below) which predicted $g_s$ well. However, this improved the overall fit to the observed data in one species only, *Musanga cecropioides*, so was not used further.

\[
\text{Response to } D: \quad g_{sd} = \left[ \exp \left( \frac{D}{a} \right) b \right] + cD \quad \text{NOT USED} \quad \text{Equation 7.13a}
\]

\[
\text{Response to } D: \quad g_{sd} = \left[ 1 + D / D_0 \right]^{-1} \quad \text{Equation 7.13b}
\]

\[
\text{Response to } Q:\quad g_{sQ} = \frac{g_{\text{max}} \alpha_s \left( Q + g_d / \alpha_s \right)}{\left( g_{\text{max}} + \alpha_s \left( Q + g_d / \alpha_s \right) \right)} \quad \text{Equation 7.14}
\]

\[
\text{Overall: } \quad g_{sp} = g_{sQ} + g_{sd} \times 1000 \quad \text{Equation 7.15}
\]

where $Q$ is photon flux density, $g_{\text{max}}$ is maximum $g_s$ at infinite $Q$; $\alpha_s$ is the initial slope of the $g_s$ - $Q$ response, $g_d$ is $g_s$ at $Q = 0$; $D$ is the water vapour pressure deficit in mol mol$^{-1}$, $D_0$ is a fitted constant and $g_{sp}$ is the predicted $g_s$, in mmol H$_2$O m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. The results for different species are shown in Table 7.3 and Figure 7.3e. The $r^2$ values for whole trees were higher than for individual leaves (data not shown) mainly because more data were available for whole trees and a wider range of $D$ and $Q$ values were recorded. The residual variation in the model fits derive from three main sources: systematic and random error, incomplete stomatal responses (see below), and biological variation among leaves. The generally even spread of residuals indicated that there was little systematic error in $g_{sp}$ (Figure 7.3; data are for *Amphimas ptercarpoides*). There is little skew in any of the variables driving stomatal conductance, though a small tendency was observed for the overall model to slightly underpredict at high $g_s$ (Figure 7.4a). The wide, though even, spread in residuals at low $D$ was primarily an artefact - at low $D$, $g_s$ is likely to be large, so that a random error of the same proportion will be numerically larger than at high $D$. 

---
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Figures 7.3a-e. Environmental variables correlated with $g_1$. (a) shows $g_1$ vs $D$; (b) shows the covariation of with $D$ with $T_1$; (c) shows the residual variation in $g_1$ after correcting for $Q$ and $D$; (d) shows variation in $g_1$ with $Q$ at $0.02 > D > 0.01$ (filled triangles); $0.03 > D > 0.02$ (open circles) and $0.04 > D > 0.03$ (filled squares). The data are for *Amphimas pterocarpoides*. Figure (e) shows the fitted $g_1$ response to $Q$ at $D = 0.005$ and $0.025$ for all seven species. All $D$ units are in mol mol$^{-1}$.
Errors resulting from incomplete stomatal responses were probably most closely linked to temperature effects. When a leaf was placed in the chamber, it entered a slightly changed environment. In particular, the temperature of the cuvette was 0 - 5 °C warmer than the air temperature. The response in chloroplasts to \( Q \) occurs within seconds, but stomata respond to changes such as a temperature increase more slowly, over the course of minutes. It is possible that some of the measurements were not made quickly enough to avoid this acclimation, resulting in an error term, though this did not appear to be systematic. The final source of error, biological variation, was accounted for by using a large sample size. For all species the sample size was quite big, though only one part of the tree was accessible, so some leaves may have been measured more than once, making the effective sample size a little smaller than the \( n \) value in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3. The fitted parameter values for all species, SRF. The data were fitted to Equation 7.15. \( D_0 \) is a fitted constant; \( g_{\text{max}} \) is in mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\); \( \alpha_g \) is in mol mol\(^{-1}\); \( g_d \) is in mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), \( D \) is in mol mol\(^{-1}\). \( r^2 \) represents the parameter constraint. The asymptotic 95% confidence limits are given in parentheses for the fitted parameters. Max \( D \) is the maximum \( D \) value observed for each species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>( D_0 )</th>
<th>( g_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( \alpha_g )</th>
<th>( g_d )</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Max ( D )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. pterocarpoides</td>
<td>2.1x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. cecropioides</td>
<td>2.6x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>8.0(^{1})</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. adolfi-friderici</td>
<td>2.7x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. stipitata</td>
<td>1.2x10(^{-3})</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. danckelmaniana</td>
<td>2.2x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. macrostachyum</td>
<td>3.8x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichilia sp.</td>
<td>2.1x10(^{-4})</td>
<td>8(^{1})</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3x10(^{-4}))</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 7.4a-f. $g_s$ model results. Figure a compare modelled with measured $g_s$, the line shown is the 1:1 line. Figures (b) - (f) are residual plots of $g_s - g_{s \text{ predicted}}$ vs $Q$, $D$, $T_v$, and $C_s$. The data are for *Amphimas ptercarpoides*. 

7. Leaf photosynthesis
PHOTOSYNTHESIS

Dark respiration rates and light response curves

In an initial examination of the data, a rectangular hyperbola was fitted to data from all the species (Table 7.4). The basic model used was a light response curve, as described by Equation 7.16:

\[
A_t = \frac{A_{\text{max}} \alpha Q}{(A_{\text{max}} + \alpha Q)} - R_d
\]

Equation 7.16.

where \(A_t\) is leaf assimilation rate, \(A_{\text{max}}\) is leaf assimilation rate at maximum \(Q\) in \(\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\), \(Q\) is photon flux density in \(\mu\text{mol quanta m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\), \(\alpha\) is the maximum light use (quantum) efficiency in \(\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ mol quanta}^{-1}\), and \(R_d\) is dark respiration in \(\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\).

The \(R_{d0}\) values obtained by shrouding the leaves to simulate \(Q = 0\), and the \(R_d\) values obtained using Equation 7.16 are in approximate agreement, though there was considerable variation in the shrouded leaf data. These values are greater than the night-time leaf respiration rates found in Chapter 6, though the temperatures during day were higher. Daytime dark respiration at 15 °C of Pinus strobus leaves was greater by 40% than respiration at the same temperature during the night (Hubbard et al., 1995).

The patterns through the vertical profile of the canopy in \(\alpha\) and \(A_{\text{max}}\) are also of note. From canopy top to bottom, \(\alpha\) increased from 0.04 to 0.06, whilst \(A_{\text{max}}\) declined from 14 to 6 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}\) (Figure 7.5a, inset). This may be explained by hypothesising that leaves lower down in the canopy harvest light more efficiently than those higher up, but are not able to maintain such high maximum photosynthetic rates. Alternatively, it may be that \(\alpha\) is a biophysical constant, and the variation in Figure 7.5a may reflect the effect on observed quantum efficiencies of within-leaf light gradients in leaves of different thickness (c.f. variation in SLA with height, Chapter 3). However, not all the species behaved in the same way; this was especially apparent at ground level where very different \(\alpha\) and \(A_{\text{max}}\) values were encountered. The variation was partly a species effect, but also reflected the open canopy of the SRF site. Some individuals at ground level were not homogenously shaded by the canopy above (Table 7.1), and exhibited characteristics found in leaves higher up. Megaphyllum macrostachyum appeared...
Figures 7.5a-h. Leaf photosynthetic light responses in SRF. In (a) are fitted curves to the data in each of (b)-(h), using Equation 7.16; the inset plot is the variation in $\alpha$ with height (see text). The data in (b)-(h) are for the 7 species in Table 7.1. $A_i$ is coded in (b)-(h) by $g_s > 100$ (triangles); $50 < g_s < 100$ (open circles) and $g_s < 50$ (spots). $g_s$ units are mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. 
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7. Leaf photosynthesis

to have a very high quantum efficiency ($\alpha = 0.09$). A second feature of these data is the low $r^2$ values for the highest two trees, *Amphimas* and *Musanga*. For both, the $A_1 : Q$ response showed much greater variation than for the other species (Figures 7.5b-h). These trees also experienced greater maximum $D$, as would be expected at the top of the canopy (Table 7.3). Incorporation of a stomatal conductance term in the prediction of $A_1$ could account for this variation.

Table 7.4. Parameter estimates obtained from fitting Equation 7.16 to $A_1 : Q$ data for all species. Height in m; the units for $A_{max}$, $\alpha$ and $R_d$ are as described for Equation 7.16; mean $R_{so}$ values (in $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) are the mean of 2 - 5 measurements on the same leaf shrouded to complete darkness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>$A_{max}$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$R_d$</th>
<th>Mean $R_{so}$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>A.pterocarpoides</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. cecropioides</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. adolfi-friderici</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S. stipitata</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H. danckelmaniana</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. macrostachyum</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trichilia sp</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Farquhar & von Caemmerer photosynthesis model

The $A_1 : Q$ plots in Figures 7.5b-h give assimilation for each species coded by stomatal conductance to show how the $A_1 : Q$ response varies with $g_s$. The Farquhar & von Caemmerer model was fitted to the measurements and incorporated this variation to give improved fits, particularly for *Amphimas* and *Musanga* (Table 7.5). In the residual plots, as found for $g_s$, there was no significant skew, suggesting that little extra variation could be accounted for with these variables (Figure 7.6b-h; data for *Celtis* are shown, other species behaved similarly). Species lower in the canopy showed quite high convexities (θ) for the light response portion of the model (Table 7.5; Figures 7.5d-h). This is consistent with photosynthesis saturating at lower $Q$ in these leaves, as noted in Table 7.4.

The estimates in Table 7.5 for $J_{max}$ and $V_{max}$ are in the lower range of those given by Harley et al. (1992) for cotton plants grown in non-limiting laboratory growing conditions, but are similar to or slightly greater than those obtained by Anten et al. (1996) for a tropical tree, *Tetrorchidium japbrivenium*. The estimate for $g_s$, the stomatal conductance from the sub-stomatal cavities to the sites of carboxylation in the chloroplasts, gave best fits at 0.65 mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, a figure similar to previous estimates (Caemmerer & Evans, 1991; Lloyd et al, 1995b). Fitting temperature optima did not improve the $r^2$ values shown in Table 7.5, and as found for the $g_s$ model (Figure 7.3c), the variability in the data obscured the temperature signal; constraints were often reached in the fitting process, so
fixed values estimated from the literature were used (Table 7.2). There was no unbiased way of refining the dataset, so further fits for optimal temperature parameters were not attempted.

Figures 7.6a-f. The Farquhar photosynthesis model results. All plots are residual plots of $A_1$ observed - $A_1$ predicted vs $g_s$, $D$, $Q$, $T_1$ and $C_a$. The data are for Celtis adolfi-friderici.
Table 7.5. Parameter estimates for Equations 7.2a and 7.6 after fitting to all species in SRF. Ht. is height in m; \(J_{max}, V_{max}\), and \(R_d\) are in \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\); \(\theta\) is a coefficient defining the shape of the non-rectangular hyperbola in Equation 7.4; the best fit value for \(g_i\) was 0.65 mol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). In parentheses are asymptotic 95% confidence limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Ht</th>
<th>(J_{max})</th>
<th>(V_{max})</th>
<th>(R_d)</th>
<th>(\theta)</th>
<th>(r^2)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. ptercarpoides</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83 (6)</td>
<td>37 (6)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.3)</td>
<td>10(^{-5})</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. cecropioides</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>106 (10)</td>
<td>49 (7)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.3)</td>
<td>10(^{-6})</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. adolfi-friderici</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58 (5)</td>
<td>26 (5)</td>
<td>0.8 (0.1)</td>
<td>10(^{-6})</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. stipitata</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41 (4)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. danckelmaniana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43 (4)</td>
<td>33 (2)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. macrostachyum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66 (5)</td>
<td>59 (3)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichilia sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (5)</td>
<td>37 (1)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.2)</td>
<td>10(^{-5})</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photosynthetic characteristics of leaves through the vertical profile of the forest canopy

In general, the leaves exhibited higher \(V_{max}\), \(J_{max}\) and \(R_d\) values at the canopy-top, and lower values nearer the ground; scatter visible at ground level in Figures 7.7a-d probably reflect the broken canopy in SRF where the radiation regime was very different for Trichilia sp. (in understorey shade) and H. danckelmaniana (in a gap). The differences in response to \(C_e\) between \(V_{max}\) and \(J_{max}\) describe the relative allocation in leaves to light capture and carboxylation, and thus provide a way of addressing the extent of light-acclimation in the SRF canopy. Measurements of leaf nitrogen and phosphorus permit an indirect approach, where variation in photosynthetic parameters could be related to leaf nutrient content (c.f., Field, 1983; Schulze et al., 1994). Figures 7.8a-h show variation in \(N_{leaf}\) and \(P_{leaf}\) with \(V_{max}\), \(J_{max}\), \(R_d\) and \(A_{max}\); each regression is significant (Table 7.6). Together they suggest that a degree of photosynthetic acclimation to the light environment occurs, and provide limited support for proposals of an optimal nitrogen distribution in ‘big-leaf’ canopies (e.g., Sellers et al., 1992). The question of mass or area based expressions of gas exchange and leaf composition (see Chapter 6) is also relevant here. The poor relationship with height in \(N_{leaf}\) and \(P_{leaf}\) on a mass basis (Figure 6.5) suggests that nutrient concentration by mass does not necessarily reflect photosynthetic capacity. The role of non-photosynthetic nitrogen and phosphorus in determining these values requires further study.
Figures 7.7a-c. Variation in the fitted photosynthetic parameters with height in the canopy of SRF. Figures (a)-(d) show $V_{\text{max}}$, $J_{\text{max}}$, $A_{\text{max}}$, and $R_d$ respectively. The data are from individual leaves (two per species).

Table 7.6. Regression results for the $N_{\text{leaf}}/P_{\text{leaf}}$ plots shown in Figures 7.8a-h, fitted using the relationship: $Y_1 = aX_1 + b$, where $X_1$ is $V_{\text{max}}$, $J_{\text{max}}$, $R_d$, or $A_{\text{max}}$ in $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, and $X_1$ is $N_{\text{leaf}}$ or $P_{\text{leaf}}$ in mol m$^{-2}$. The estimates were obtained from independent leaf estimates only. If the average values were used for each species, the regression results were almost identical, but not all were significant because only seven independent points could be used.
Figures 7.8a-h. Variation in the fitted photosynthetic parameters with $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$. In (a)-(h) respectively are: $V_{\text{max}}$, $J_{\text{max}}$, $A_{\text{max}}$ and $R_d$. All regressions are significant ($p < 0.05$; see Table 7.6). The data are from individual leaves (two per species).
Comparison of $N_{\text{leaf}} / P_{\text{leaf}}$ with leaf respiration (Chapter 6) and photosynthetic parameters

The regression for each photosynthetic parameter in Figure 7.8 parameterises $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ in the enzymes required for respiration and photosynthesis. Each has a negative intercept on the ordinate; at $X_1 = 0$, the graphs represent $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ that is not actively involved in photosynthetic metabolism. As in section 6.3, these intercepts are non-significantly different from zero ($p = 0.05 - 0.06$, except for $R_d$ where $p < 0.05$). But the multiple linear regression between $X_1$ and leaf nitrogen and phosphorus is highly significant ($p < 0.001$; $p$ (intercept) $< 0.01$; $p$ (N coefficient) $< 0.01$; $p$ (P coefficient) $< 0.1$), suggesting that the intercepts on the single element regressions are not artefacts. The residual $N$ and $P$ defined by these intercepts may be found in structural, or storage compounds that do not have high turnover rates. If the mean is taken of $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ at zero $V_{\text{max}}, J_{\text{max}}, R_d$ and $A_{\text{max}}$, (Table 7.6) the values are very similar to those obtained for the same average ‘low turnover’ $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ in section 6.3, obtained from night-time leaf respiration data: $N_{\text{leaf}} = 0.05 \text{ vs } 0.04 \text{ mol m}^{-2}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}} = 0.001 \text{ vs } 0.0008 \text{ mol m}^{-2}$ (the data given second are derived using night-time leaf respiration rates, section 6.3).

Reich et al. (1994) quote $A_{\text{max}} : N_{\text{leaf}}$ correlations for Amazon tree species from terra firme forest (e.g., Licania heteromorpha) and tall caatinga forest (e.g., Caraipa heterocarpa) in Brazil that are very close to the data in Table 7.6. On the other hand Harley et al. (1992) give data for cotton for a $V_{\text{max}} : N_{\text{leaf}}$ relationship that is close, and a $J_{\text{max}} : N_{\text{leaf}}$ relationship that is greater than these (at $N_{\text{leaf}} = 0.11 \text{ mol m}^{-2}$, predicted $V_{\text{max}} = 45 \text{ vs } 37$ and predicted $J_{\text{max}} = 70 \text{ vs } 142$; units $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, Harley et al. data given second). The differences may be real, or may reflect the effect of laboratory vs field measurement conditions. Figure 7.9 describes the variation in $A_{\text{max}}$ with $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ for SRF in Cameroon; the response slope shows that, over the natural range in leaf nutrient composition, $A_{\text{max}}$ is more sensitive to $N_{\text{leaf}}$ than $P_{\text{leaf}}$, though both variables are significant. Further data of this type from nutrient limited and non-limited environments should illuminate the relative roles played by N and P in determining maximum leaf photosynthesis and respiration rates. As with leaf respiration in Chapter 6, the separation from total leaf nutrient concentrations of $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ that is decoupled from leaf photosynthesis, may improve models seeking to treat canopies as a ‘big-leaf’ (Kull & Jarvis, 1996).
Figure 7.9a&b. The $A_{\text{max}} : N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ relationship for SRF. In (a) is plotted measured vs modelled $A_{\text{max}}$, and (b) shows the model results for $N_{\text{leaf}}$ and $P_{\text{leaf}}$ over their measured physiological ranges. The $r^2$ value for the model is 0.74.
7.4 CONCLUSIONS

Leaf gas exchange was measured on leaves through the vertical profile of SRF, in March 1994. Diurnal patterns in stomatal conductance were similar to other tropical forests: $g_s$ reached a maximum (100 - 400 mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) in the early morning, between 0800 hrs and 1000 hrs, and declined over the day. Stomatal conductance was higher in some species (e.g., *Megaphrynium macrostachyum*) near the forest floor, partly as a result of lower $D$, especially in the case of large leaves. Photosynthetic rates were also highest in the morning (2 - 7 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), though $A_t$ tended to peak later in the day (0900 - 1200 hrs) in response to increasing radiation. Maximal rates of photosynthesis were a little higher than in an undisturbed forest in Cameroon (Koch *et al.*, 1994), though the mean values were rather similar to those from other tropical rain forests (Roberts *et al.*, 1990; McWilliam, 1996 [PRF site]).

An initial analysis of the light response in $A_t$ showed $A_{max}$ and $\alpha$ to decline with height in the canopy. The pattern with height exhibited variation which was attributed to the light environment consequent upon the irregular canopy cover in this secondary forest, particularly at the forest floor. A multiplicative model (*sensu* Jarvis) was fitted to the $g_s$ data, whilst a biochemical model (*sensu* Farquhar) was fitted to the photosynthesis data. Both models fitted with $r^2$ values between 0.7 and 0.9 for most species. In particular, the two species highest in the canopy (*Musanga cecropioides* and *Amphimas distemonanthus*) showed $A_t$ rates that were strongly affected by $g_s$; this variation was incorporated by the photosynthesis model but not by a simple light response model.

The variation in photosynthetic parameters with height in the canopy was related to leaf nutrient concentrations. There was a strong relationship between $A_t$ and $N_{leaf}$ or $P_{leaf}$ on an area basis, which was partly a function of specific leaf area. The relative allocation of nitrogen and phosphorus to photosynthesising enzymes with respect to the leaf nutrient : $A_t$ relationship requires further research.
8. Forest - atmosphere gas exchange

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The gas exchange behaviour of a forest stand can be modelled using component-level or whole-ecosystem data. The objective here is two-fold: first, to test how well understood are small- and larger-scale processes and the links between them, and secondly to make estimates of gas exchange for situations when measurement is not possible.

In this chapter, two canopy photosynthesis models are developed for estimating the carbon balance of SRF. To retrieve net forest gas exchange rates, the models are linked to respiration estimates and tested against eddy covariance observations. In the first, a multilayer model is developed by marshalling data from Chapters 2 - 7, and scaling organ-level physiological measurements to the whole forest. In the second, eddy covariance measurements are used to calibrate a photosynthesis model by assuming that the canopy behaves as a 'big-leaf'. This approach has some theoretical basis (Farquhar, 1989; Sellers et al., 1992; Evans, 1993b), but has not been fully tested. The work presented here is the first attempt I am aware of that compares a big-leaf approach with up-scaled leaf photosynthesis and concurrent eddy covariance measurements for tropical forest. A big-leaf model of this sort has been presented elsewhere for PRF (Lloyd et al., 1995a) and an annual carbon balance estimate made for the site (Grace et al., 1995b). The respiration component of CO₂ exchange in PRF is also presented in this chapter, and considered along with the models for SRF in the context of climatic changes in temperature, radiation and carbon dioxide concentration.

8.2 METHODS

OVERVIEW

The two models for SRF are represented in Diagram 8.1. Canopy photosynthesis is calculated using parameters derived (i) from leaf-level chamber measurements at different heights in the canopy, given
in Chapter 7 (this is referred to as the multilayer model) and (ii) canopy-level measurements made using the eddy covariance technique, given in this chapter (this is referred to as the big-leaf model). For the multilayer model, photosynthesis at each level is scaled according to the vertical profile in leaf area density (Figure 3.5). Respiration is treated as the component sum of CO₂ efflux from soil, wood and leaves, and is calculated from the parameters derived in Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6. Respiration is combined with photosynthesis in both models to yield the net canopy assimilation rate. Both photosynthesis and respiration are driven using above-canopy weather station climate data; in-canopy climate variables are derived from these data using empirical models. The model outputs are analysed by comparison with the eddy covariance measurements in SRF (Grace et al., unpublished). For PRF, component-summed respiration is estimated and presented in the context of a big-leaf model for this forest (Lloyd et al., 1995b).

Diagram 8.1 A description of how forest gas exchange in SRF is estimated using the multilayer and big-leaf models. Gas exchange measurements are in broken-line boxes; parameters in solid-line boxes; driving environmental variables in italics; model calculations in ellipses; and model outputs are in bold capitals. For respiration, in-canopy climate data are used to drive leaf respiration, whilst soil and woody tissue temperatures at different heights are driven using the above-canopy measurements.
MEASUREMENT AND ESTIMATION OF THE DRIVING ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES

Each measured variable (temperature, humidity, CO₂) was related to the reference above-canopy weather station measurements in order to provide hourly estimates. The procedures used for this are described below.

Temperature

Continuously measured tissue temperature, \( T_t \), and soil temperatures, \( T_s \), (see Chapters 4 & 5) were empirically related to above-canopy dry bulb temperatures, \( T_e \), obtained from the weather station. In the case of woody tissue, the measured temperature at each height was taken as the mean of 'shielded' (underside of branch), and 'unshielded' (top side of branch) readings. For soil, the reference depth used was 1 cm, chosen to match that used for the measurement of CO₂ efflux from soil. Where it was necessary to introduce a time lag between the solar zenith and localised maxima, a polynomial function was fitted to the data that included a time component, as shown in Equation 8.1. This was important for soil temperatures which tended to peak between 1600 hours and 1700 hours.

Form of fitted equation used to predict \( T_t \) and \( T_s \) from \( T_e \):

\[
T_{\text{pred}} = (\cos (t + a)) b + cT_e + dT_e^2 + e
\]

Equation 8.1

where \( T_{\text{pred}} \) is predicted tissue or soil temperature, \( t \) is time in radians (where midday = \( \pi \) rads) and \( a \) - \( e \) are fitted constants. If a satisfactory model could be obtained using fewer fitted constants, this approach was favoured.

In Brazil and Cameroon, woody tissue temperature was logged at six heights by embedding Co-Cn thermocouples into the bark surface (Chapter 5). Night-time leaf temperatures were measured as part of the leaf respiration measurements made in both forests, though only in SRF were daytime leaf temperatures obtained, as part of the photosynthesis measurements (Chapters 6 & 7). Also available in the larger dataset from Cameroon (Grace et al., unpublished) were a sequence of air temperature profiles obtained between 9th and 28th of March, 1994 by Dr J. Lloyd of ANU, Canberra. Other variables measured in the canopy profile were the ambient water vapour pressure deficit and ambient CO₂ concentration. Temperature and water vapour were recorded at four heights (1 m, 15 m, 33 m and 46 m) using psychrometers, and CO₂ concentrations were recorded at six heights (1 m, 7 m, 15 m,
22 m, 33 m and 46 m) by pumping air from each sampling point through Decabon tubing to an infra-red gas analyser.

Soil temperature at 1 cm depth was measured for each CO\textsubscript{2} efflux measurement microsite, and was also continuously recorded (Chapter 4). In SRF, soil temperature profiles were obtained at several sites. The continuous temperature records were fitted to Equation 8.1, and the extent to which they were representative of spatial variation over the forest floor was assessed by comparison with the spot measurements obtained from the microsites at which CO\textsubscript{2} efflux was measured.

### Water vapour pressure deficit and carbon dioxide concentration

Water vapour pressure deficits ($D$) and CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations ($C_a$) were measured throughout the vertical profile of the SRF canopy during measurement of photosynthesis, and on a continuous basis as part of the profile dataset. Longer term measurements were made of $D$ and $C_a$ above the canopy (denoted $D_c$ and $C_{ac}$) using the weather station and the eddy covariance equipment (Grace et al., unpublished). As with temperature, empirical relationships between $D$ or $C_a$ at any given height in the canopy and that obtaining above the canopy were derived. The variation in $D$ with height was modelled as a simple first or second order function of $D_c$, whilst with $C_a$, variation in the shape of the profile according to time of day was incorporated into the expression driven by $C_{ac}$.

### Radiation flux

The photosynthetically active photon flux density ($Q$, in $\mu$mol quanta m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1}) was measured at six heights in the canopy (44 m, 24 m, 16 m, 8 m, 4 m, and 1 m) during a 14 day period from April 28th to May 12th 1994 (Grace et al., unpublished). The ratio of above-canopy solar radiation to $Q$ was determined, and logarithmic radiation profiles derived for hours of the day with similar profile shapes. The equation used to relate $Q$ at any given height, $Q_h$, with $Q_c$ above the canopy was:

$$Q_h = \exp\left[ a_t (h b + c)\right]$$  

Equation 8.2

where $a_t$ is the ratio between measured and expected $Q_c$ at the time $t$, and $b$ and $c$ are fitted constants, and $Q_h$ is $Q$ at height $h$ (m). Expected $Q_c$ is obtained from the linear regression between $\ln Q$ and $h$ for each time period, $t$. 

---
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MEASUREMENT AND PROCESSING OF ABOVE-CANOPY EDDY COVARIANCE DATA

The Edinburgh University eddy covariance system, Edisol, was erected at 46m above the ground. The components and operation of the equipment are described in detail elsewhere (Moncrieff et al., 1996). Likewise, the processing of raw data to reveal above canopy fluxes of the different scalars of interest is given in the same publication. Raw fluxes were corrected by J. McIntyre, Edinburgh University, for density fluctuations and attenuation of the signal down the tube (Webb et al., 1980; Leuning & Moncrieff, 1990), and for sensor separation (Moore, 1986). Although some of the high frequency signal was lost through smearing effects in the sampling tube, this was recovered using transfer functions derived by comparison of the data with an 'ideal' co-spectral density function (Kaimal et al., 1972). Uncertainty in the flux measurement is estimated at ±15 - 20% using this method (Baldocchi et al., 1988; Moncrieff et al., 1992).

Barring a few small gaps, a record of the net exchange of CO₂ between the forest and the atmosphere, \( F_a \), was logged from 3rd March to 6th May 1994. Similarly, net fluxes of heat and water vapour were also obtained (Grace et al., unpublished). Standard climatological variables were recorded during this period using instrumentation provided by Edinburgh University and the Institute of Hydrology (Campbell Scientific Ltd, UK, and Didcot Instruments, UK). The data were measured at the same height to give hourly means of solar radiation, net radiation, aspirated wet and dry bulb temperature, vapour pressure deficit, and rainfall.

In an initial analysis of the CO₂ profile data (J. Lloyd, unpublished), spline curves were fitted for each half hour, and the difference between successive intervals calculated to give the change in storage of CO₂ in the canopy space (\( \text{Md} \text{C}_a / \text{dt} \)). When subtracted from the net ecosystem exchange, the net assimilation of CO₂ by the ecosystem, \( F_{\text{eco}} \), can be calculated using Equation 8.3 (Grace et al., 1995b).

\[
F_a = F_{\text{eco}} + \text{MdC}_a / \text{dt}
\]

Equation 8.3

The measured water vapour fluxes were used to calculate canopy stomatal resistance to water vapour, \( r_s \), and by extension, to CO₂ (Jarvis, 1976). Data were derived at hourly intervals by first calculating the aerodynamic resistance, \( r_a \), (Equation 8.4), and then inverting the Penman-Monteith equation (Equation 8.5) to give \( r_s \):
The resistances represented by \( r_a \) and \( r_s \) may be converted into molar conductances which are used elsewhere in this thesis by application of Equation 8.6.

\[
g_s = \frac{P}{(RT_{r_s})}
\]

where \( g_s \) is stomatal conductance in mmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\); \( P \) is pressure in kPa; and \( R \) is the universal gas constant (8.314 J mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)). The formulae used for the calculation of \( \lambda, s, \rho_a, \gamma \) and \( e_s \), the saturation water vapour pressure, are given in Appendix D. The values were corrected for the average ambient pressure of 930 mbar.
MODELLING RESPIRATION AND ASSIMILATION

Respiration (PRF and SRF)

Spatially robust estimates of the amount of physiologically active tissue are required for stand-scale calculations of respiration. In the case of wood and foliage, detail in the vertical dimension is needed to correctly estimate the effect of a diurnally changing temperature profile on respiring tissue at different heights. For above-ground biomass, spatial estimates were obtained using the data presented in Chapter 3.

The temperature responses for soil efflux were taken from Chapter 4 (Equation 4.3), and night-time leaf respiration characteristics were taken from Chapter 6 and combined with the vertical profile in LAI (Figure 3.5) to give summed foliar respiration for total LAIs of 4 (PRF) and 4.4 (SRF). Errors in the calculated leaf respiration rates were obtained by varying the total LAI for each forest according to the upper and lower 95% confidence limits of the measured values shown in Figure 3.4.

Woody tissue respiration was calculated for individual trees, and separately for boles and branches. Fluxes of CO₂ from boles were calculated according to the dbh and height of each stem by estimating the frequency of 50 cm long woody sections of different diameters and applying Equation 5.3 to each section. The temperature sensitivities for respiration used Equation 5.2 and were taken from Table 5.2. A conic function was used to describe the variation in stem diameter with height. Data on branch respiration are very sparse, though branch tissue is generally more active than stem tissue (Sprugel et al., 1994). Table 3.2 showed that branch biomass was approximately 20% of stem biomass. Allowing for a higher ratio of active : inactive biomass, branch respiration was estimated at 40% of stem respiration. In SRF, the fluxes of CO₂ from rotting dead wood were calculated by assuming each decaying log was of the diameter and length given in the inventory described in Chapter 3, and applying Equations 5.2 and 5.3. The total uncertainty in the flux of CO₂ from woody tissue was difficult to calculate. In SRF an error was derived for effluxes from boles and dead wood by comparing the two 1 ha plot inventories. This was not possible in PRF and so a maximum error was ascribed by applying that derived for SRF.

Total canopy respiration, $R_c$, was calculated at hourly intervals using the sum of the wood and soil components during daylight hours, and the sum of the wood, soil, and leaf components during the night.
Photosynthesis (SRF)

Multilayer model:
The measured leaf-level parameters given in Tables 7.3 and 7.5 were assumed to represent accurately the average properties of foliage at each of the six heights in the canopy (1 m, 7 m, 15 m, 22 m, 33 m, and 46 m). Photosynthetic parameters for ground level vegetation were highly variable in SRF (Table 7.5). This was accounted for by assuming that 15% of the vegetation at ground level exhibited characteristics similar to gap-dwelling herbs of the genera *Megaphrynium* and *Haumanaiana*, whilst the remaining 85% behaved in a similar way to the understorey leaves of *Trichilia*.

Using measured or simulated values, stomatal conductance and assimilation at each level was predicted at hourly intervals using $Q$, $T$, $C_a$, and $D$ to drive Equations 7.1, 7.3 and 7.15. Whole canopy fixation, $F_{\text{cm}}$, was obtained by scaling the photosynthetic rate to the LAI measured at each height (Chapter 3). During the hours of darkness ($Q = 0$), measured leaf respiration rates were used in favour of the $R_d$ values fitted to the photosynthetic measurements. The net modelled ecosystem exchange, $F_{\text{eco}}$, was then calculated for this composite model by subtracting $R_i$ from $F_{\text{cm}}$.

Big leaf model:
The big leaf model was parameterised using $F_{\text{eco}}$ values (Equation 8.3) corrected for respiration, $R_i$, to give the total canopy assimilation, $F_c$, according to Equation 8.7:

$$F_c = F_{\text{eco}} + R_i$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 8.7}

However, high quality data were required for the fitting procedure (Grace *et al.*, 1995a), as the aim was to parameterise the photosynthetic physiology of the canopy rather than a mixture of the photosynthetic process and several micrometeorological processes that may have been occurring simultaneously. Examples of the latter include: conditions when the radiation field was changing rapidly; when the aerodynamic conductance was very low; when the leaves were wet; situations where the fetch was affected by a nearby settlement; and periods of exceptional CO$_2$ fluxes from the canopy in the early morning resulting from turbulent flushing events. $F_c$ data during these conditions were filtered out to give a selected dataset, $F_{\text{cs}}$. A parsimonious approach was followed in the selection of data so as to minimise any possible bias so caused.
The $F_{es}$ data were analysed using the same techniques described for individual leaves in Chapter 7. A Jarvis-type model (1976) was fitted to canopy [stomatal] conductances (Equation 7.15), and a Farquhar & von Caemmerer model (1982) was fitted to the assimilation data, using Equations 7.1 and 7.3. The resulting parameters were then used to model as a big-leaf the total canopy assimilation, $F_{eb}$. Hourly weather station data were used to run the simulations. Net modelled fluxes of carbon dioxide were obtained by removing $R_t$ from $F_{eb}$ at hourly intervals to reveal the ecosystem exchange, $F_{ecob}$.

The performance of each model was examined with respect to the eddy covariance measurements. Their response to changes in major climatic parameters (temperature; radiation, carbon dioxide concentration) was also discussed.

LIST OF SYMBOLS USED IN THIS CHAPTER

Basic climate variables:

$C_a, C_{ac}$ CO₂ concentration of air ($\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$). $C_{ac}$ refers to above-canopy $C_a$.

$D, D_c$ Water vapour pressure deficit of air (mol mol$^{-1}$). $D_c$ refers to above-canopy $D$.

$Q, Q_c$ Photosynthetically active photon flux density ($\mu$mol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$). $Q_c$ refers to above-canopy $Q$.

$R_n$ Net radiation (W m$^{-2}$).

$T_t, T_s, T_{pred}, T_c$ Temperature (°C). The subscripts t, s, pred and c refer respectively to tissue, soil, predicted and above-canopy temperatures.

$u$ Mean horizontal wind speed (m s$^{-1}$).

Fluxes, conductances and resistances:

$E$ Flux of water vapour between forest canopy and the atmosphere (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$).

$F_{nc}, F_{cc}$ etc CO₂ flux between the forest stand and the atmosphere, or ecosystem exchange (units in $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$). The subscripts n, c, cs, eco, ecom and ecob refer respectively to: net measured fluxes, canopy photosynthesis (corrected for respiration terms from soil and wood), selected dataset of canopy photosynthesis, storage corrected [biotic] fluxes, and modelled net fluxes using the multilayer and big-leaf models.

$g_s, g_{sc}$ etc Stomatal conductance to water vapour (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$). The subscripts s, sc, scm and scb refer respectively to leaf-level conductance, canopy conductance, and modelled canopy conductance using the multilayer and big-leaf models.

$r_a$ [Canopy] aerodynamic resistance (s m$^{-1}$).
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$r_s$  [Canopy] stomatal resistance to water vapour (s m$^{-1}$).

$R_t$  Total forest respiration - CO$_2$ efflux from soil + wood + leaves (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

$g_a$  [Canopy] aerodynamic conductance (mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)

**Aerodynamic variables:**

$u^*$  Friction velocity (m s$^{-1}$).

$\Psi_M$, $\Psi_H$  Adiabatic correction factors for momentum and heat respectively (Paulson, 1970).

$z_0M$, $z_0H$  Roughness length for momentum and heat respectively. $z_{0H}$ also represents the roughness length for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ in this treatment (m).

**Constants or known variables:**

$c_p$  Specific heat of dry air (J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$).

$\gamma$  Psychrometer 'constant' (Pa K$^{-1}$).

$k$  von Karman's constant (~ 0.41).

$\lambda$  Latent heat of vapourisation of water vapour (J g$^{-1}$).

$P$  Pressure in (kPa).

$R$  Universal gas constant (8.314 J mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$).

$\rho_a$  Density of dry air (kg m$^{-3}$).

$s$  Rate of change of the saturation vapour pressure with temperature (Pa K$^{-1}$).

---

8.3 RESULTS

**Driving environmental variables**

Temperature (PRF and SRF), water vapour pressure deficit (SRF) and radiation (SRF)

Figure 8.1 shows a comparison between predicted and observed soil temperatures in PRF and SRF. The modelled soil temperatures agree well with the measured data. The amplitude in soil temperature was 1 - 3 °C for both forests. The functions relating $T_c$ to wood or air temperature at different heights in the canopy fitted to the observed data with good accuracy, giving $r^2$ values of 0.9 - 0.98 (Appendix D). The variations in wood temperature with height were shown in Figures 5.1a and b; typical air
temperature profiles for SRF are shown in Figure 8.2a. In general, wood temperatures were slightly higher in PRF during the day (28 - 40 °C in PRF vs 28 - 33 °C in SRF) but similar in both forests during the night (18 - 21 °C for PRF and SRF).

The vertical profile in $D$ for SRF could also be described accurately by simple regression models driven from $D_c$ (Appendix D). Typical profiles are shown in Figure 8.2b; the water vapour pressure deficit varied from close to zero during the night to maximum values of 0.025 mol mol$^{-1}$ during the early afternoon.
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Figure 8.2a&b. Profiles of air temperature and water vapour pressure deficit in SRF, from 8th to 13th March, 1994. The measurement heights are 46 m, 24 m, 16 m, 8 m and 1 m above the ground. The data were collected by J. Lloyd (ANU, Canberra).

Figure 8.3a shows measured Q from April 28th to May 3rd. Midday values above the canopy rose to 1600 - 1800 µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), whilst those nearer the canopy floor reached 70 - 200 µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). The nature of the extinction curve varied with time of day, but in all cases could be linearised with respect to height using a lnQ transformation. Following linearisation, quantitatively similar Q profiles were encountered for three groupings of hours representing: the early morning and evening (0600 - 0700 hrs, 1800 hrs) the middle morning and late afternoon (0800 - 0900 hrs, 1600 - 1700 hrs), and the middle hours of the day (1000 - 1500 hrs). Linear regressions were fitted to these data and gave r\(^2\) values of 0.8 - 0.9 (Appendix D). Simulated values were obtained by scaling the fitted profile to the measured radiation above the canopy recorded by the weather station. Figures 8.3b-d show sample plots of measured vs modelled Q at 45 m, 8 m and 1 m above the ground for 28th April to 3rd May.
Higher in the canopy, the agreement was good, whilst nearer the ground the relationship was a little noisier. Where modelled values were in error they tended to slightly overestimate the measured data. However, none of the plots was significantly different from a 1:1 line at the 95% confidence level.

Figure 8.3a-d. In (a) are shown observed profiles in $Q$ for 28th April to 3rd May, 1994, in SRF. Data are plotted from 45 m, 24 m, 16 m, 8 m and 1 m above the ground. In (b) - (d), measured vs modelled data are shown for the same dates, at three of the levels: 45 m, 8 m and 1m, with 1:1 lines drawn in. The measurements were made by Grace et al. (unpublished).
Carbon dioxide concentrations (SRF)

The mean profile of CO₂ concentration varied during the day. In the early morning, average concentrations throughout the canopy were greater than 400 μmol mol⁻¹ and near ground level this increased sharply to 450 - 500 μmol mol⁻¹. During the middle of the day, increased turbulence created an almost vertical profile between the canopy-top (Cₜₐ₅) and the 7 m level, with Cₜₐ₅ values dropping to around 360 μmol mol⁻¹. Below 7 m, mean Cₐ was proportionately greater than Cₜₐ₅, this proportion differing hourly. Towards the end of the day overall concentrations began to rise, and a through-canopy gradient in Cₐ was generated again, with Cₜₐ₅ reaching a mean value of 380 μmol mol⁻¹ by 1900 hrs (Figure 8.4a).

These patterns were used to model empirically the in-canopy CO₂ concentrations. For the hours during the middle of the day, a vertical profile from Cₜₐ₅ to Cₐ at 7 m (taken as a mean difference of less than 2 μmol mol⁻¹ between Cₜₐ₅ and Cₐ at 7m) was assumed. The remaining hours at the start and end of the day were simulated individually by using the mean linear gradient in the profile from Cₜₐ₅ to Cₐ at 7m. For each daylight hour, Cₐ at 1 m was estimated as a fixed multiple of Cₐ at 7 m. This method permitted the estimation of Cₐ within the canopy for all hours when Cₜₐ₅ was measured using the eddy covariance equipment. Appendix D gives the fitted functions describing these gradients, and lists the mean hourly fractional increase in Cₐ from 7 m to 1 m. Measured vs modelled Cₐ values are plotted in Figure 8.4b-d for 36 m, 8 m and 1 m above ground level. None of the plots was significantly different from a 1:1 identity at the 95% confidence level.

Eddy covariance and canopy storage (SRF)

The aerodynamic properties of the SRF canopy were similar to those found elsewhere in tropical forests. Figures 8.5a and b indicate the relationships between wind speed (u), friction velocity (u*), and the aerodynamic conductance (gₐ) to heat, CO₂ and water vapour. For u*, the response to wind speed was linear with a gradient of 0.19 and an intercept statistically identical to zero. Aerodynamic conductance was also a linear function of wind speed, with maximum values of gₐ reaching ~4 mol m⁻² s⁻¹. Higher values of gₐ were observed during the day than night. gₐ (note Equation 8.6 for rₛ→gₐ interconversion) was sensitive to the value used for the term ln(z₀M / z₀H) in Equation 8.4; the value considered most likely by Garratt (1992) is 1.5, and was used here. Variation in ln(z₀M / z₀H) generates differences in the calculated values for rₛ, the canopy resistance to water vapour, but despite this
caveat, canopy $g_t$ showed diurnal patterns that were coherent with the other measured micrometeorological variables (Figure 8.6).

Figure 8.4a-d. In (a) are shown the mean vertical profiles in CO$_2$ concentration through the canopy in SRF. The measurements in (a) are from 9th - 15th March, 1994, and were made by J. Lloyd (ANU, Canberra). Figures (b) - (d) show the plots of measured vs modelled data from three heights: 36 m, 8 m, and 1 m, with 1:1 lines.
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Figure 8.5a&b. The relationships between wind speed and (a) friction velocity and (b) aerodynamic conductance in the SRF canopy. In (b), the spots are during unstable conditions, and the open circles are during stable conditions. Data were derived from eddy covariance measurements made by Grace et al. between 8th March and 13th March, 1994.

Using the spline-curve fitting procedure, the night-time canopy storage values were found to be extremely variable and will be analysed further (J. Lloyd, personal communication). However, during the day, storage was typically low and could be calculated using standard techniques, making possible the estimation of $F_{\text{eco}}$.

The sequence of panels in Figure 8.6 shows typical meteorological, canopy conductance, $F_a$, canopy storage and $F_{\text{eco}}$ data, obtained from March 17th, 1994. Micrometeorological convention requires that negative signs denote mass gain by the canopy (downward flux of gases from the atmosphere). In this presentation however, the physiologist's approach of using positive signs for assimilation is retained in order to make clear the subsequent big-leaf modelling procedures that employ the same equations as
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were used for individual leaves in Chapter 7. During the day, $Q$ rose to a maximum of 1700 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at 1200 hrs, and the same pattern was mimicked by transpiration. Plotted below these traces are temperature, $g_s$ and $D$. The vapour pressure deficit rose during the day to reach a peak of 0.02 mol mol$^{-1}$ around 1500 - 1600 hrs, whilst $g_s$ commenced the day at maximum values of 0.8 mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, dropping sharply by mid-morning and then falling more gradually. Lower values of $g_s$ coincided with $D$. The increase visible in $g_s$ at 1600 hrs was also reflected in the transpiration and assimilation records. The storage term during the day was largest in the early morning, as CO$_2$ was both vented from, and assimilated by, the canopy. After 0900 hrs, the canopy became further coupled to the airflow above, reducing the storage term, and making $F$ and $F_0$ rather similar. Net assimilation rates increased rapidly in the morning and reached a peak of 15 - 16 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ between 10 am and 1 pm, tailing off in the afternoon in response to the reductions in $g_s$ and $Q$. The canopy reached a carbon compensation point at 1700 - 1800 hours, after which it returned to being a net source for CO$_2$ during the night.

**Canopy physiology**

The period when all measurements were in progress, from which $g_s$, $F_0$ and $F_0$ could be directly calculated was limited to March 9th - March 22nd. After discounting night-time values, and a period on day 72 when weather station data were not recorded, a total of 225 data points were available. Selection for measurements that could be used for the modelling of canopy photosynthesis excluded 176 points, leaving a core of 46 high quality measurements, or approximately 21% of the original total.

Figure 8.7a shows the light response characteristics of the selected $F_0$ data. Photosynthetic assimilation was approximated a linear function of $Q$ up to 800 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, and above that the response began to saturate. A linear regression was fitted to the data for $0 < Q < 800$ $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ to determine the initial characteristics of the light response curve. The quantum requirement was approximately 40 ($\pm$7) photons per mole of fixed CO$_2$; and the apparent dark respiration of the system was 5.8 ($\pm$1.5) $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$; errors are 95% confidence limits, $n = 28$. After removal of $R_t$ from each $F_0$ value to give $F_0$, the data also show that maximal canopy photosynthesis reached 20 - 25 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, though light saturated rates were modulated by stomatal conductance (data not shown). Stomatal conductance itself varied as a function of $D$ and $Q$ (Figure 8.7b), and the sensitivity of conductance to $D$ was improved by using canopy ('leaf')-to-air vapour pressure deficits obtained from an analytical
solution of the energy balance to yield leaf temperature given by Jones (1992, Equation 9.5). Figure 8.7b indicates a positive correlation between $g_{sc}$ and $Q$, and a negative correlation with $D$. However, there were a few (marked by a triangle on Figure 8.7b) unexpectedly high $g_{sc}$ values associated with high $D$ values. The individual responses in $g_{sc}$ to $Q$ and $D$ are shown in Figures 8.7c&d.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 8.6a-d.** Fluxes over SRF of radiation, water vapour, and CO₂ on 17th March, 1994. In (a) incident radiation (PPFD - open circles) and water vapour flux (spots); in (b) temperature (spots) and water vapour pressure deficit (open circles); in (c) canopy [stomatal] conductance; and in (d) CO₂ fluxes: squares = changes in storage, spots = raw measurements, and open circles = raw flux corrected for storage. The measurements were made available by Grace *et al.*
Figure 8.7a-c. In (a), the response in storage-corrected CO₂ flux ($F_{\text{eco}}$) to $Q$. The main chart shows the selected data used for modelling; the inset shows the parent dataset. In (b), the response surface in $g_{\text{sc}}$ to $Q$ and $D$. The triangle encloses points with high $g_{\text{sc}}$ at high $D$, thought to result from contamination of the H₂O flux signal (see text). The individual responses in $g_{\text{sc}}$ to $D$ and $Q$ are shown in (c) and (d): the data are separated by bands of $D$ from 0-0.1(squares), 0.01-0.02(spots), >0.02(circles). Units = mol mol⁻¹. $F_{\text{eco}}$ data from J. Lloyd (ANU, Canberra).
MODELLING RESPIRATION AND PHOTOSYNTHESIS

Respiration (PRF and SRF)

The CO₂ efflux from each component of the forest in PRF and SRF varied with temperature. Maximum values were experienced during the night as a result of the extra contribution from leaves, though the peak efflux rates from soil and wood were between 1600 and 1700 hrs, in synchrony with the afternoon peak in biomass and soil temperature. Figure 8.8 describes the daily cycle in \( R_t \) for SRF in Cameroon; the pattern for PRF was similar. The disjunction between night and day is shown to emphasise the additional contribution from leaves, by assuming respiration only occurs when darkness falls; in the model results (Figure 8.12c), a smoother transition is incorporated where the photosynthesis equations predict partial assimilation or respiration at dawn and dusk. Inset on Figure 8.8 are pie charts that indicate the proportional contribution to \( R_t \) from the leaves, wood and soil in both PRF and SRF. The largest component of \( R_t \) was the soil which comprised over 75% of total respiratory fluxes in both forests. Typical night-time (~1800 hrs - 0600 hrs) values for \( R_t \) in PRF were 7.1 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹, and in SRF, 6.3 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹. Although the efflux from soil was greater in PRF, leaf respiration rates were higher in SRF, making the two overall \( R_t \) estimates rather similar.

![Figure 8.8. Total respiration. In the main graph the diurnal cycle in \( R_t \) is shown for SRF. The night - day difference is exaggerated (see text). The inset pie-charts show the proportional contribution made to night-time respiration by each component of the forest.](image)
A direct comparison between $R_i$ and the eddy covariance measurements can only be made during the night, as day-time data are confounded with assimilation. Two comparisons were possible for PRF, and one for SRF. For both forests, the intercept was estimated on the ordinate of the light response curve for the selected $F_{eco}$ values (Figure 8.7a for SRF; Figure 8 in Grace et al., 1995a for PRF). The second comparison required night data for $F_{eco}$, and is given here for PRF. Table 8.1 shows that the comparisons generally indicate good agreement among the different types of estimates. The largest discrepancy was found between $F_{eco}$ for PRF and the component-derived $R_i$ estimate, but they were not significantly different. Uncertainty regarding the error for $R_i$ is acknowledged and reflected the difficulty in sampling the spatial heterogeneity in the soil and the above-ground biomass.

Table 8.1 Comparison of canopy respiration rates at night as measured using (1) eddy covariance (a = measured during night; b = intercept on $Q : F_{eco}$ graph using the selected $F_{eco}$ datasets), and (2) component summation from chamber measurements. Errors are in parentheses. Standard errors are given for (1a); $n =$ 44 in PRF and (1b); $n =$ 16 in PRF and 28 in SRF; those for soil CO$_2$ efflux in (2) are standard errors of prediction from the regressions in Figure 4.5; the errors for leaf and woody tissue respiration in (2) are derived as explained in the Methods. Eddy covariance data were provided by Grace et al. (1995a & unpublished); n/a = not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>BRAZIL</th>
<th>CAMEROON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eddy c.</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1a)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.0 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.7 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.5 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.6 (0.25)</td>
<td>6.54 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using measured above-canopy temperature to drive the respiration models at hourly intervals, $R_i$ was estimated for one year in PRF (1992 - 1993, weather station data supplied by ABRACOS), and for days 67 - 113 of 1994 in SRF. The total efflux of CO$_2$ during the year 1992-3 in PRF was 23.2 ton C ha$^{-1}$; in SRF the 46 day total was 2.8 ton C ha$^{-1}$, which if extrapolated directly to 365 days would give a corresponding figure of 21 ton C ha$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$.

Stomatal conductance (SRF)

*Big-leaf model:*

Stomatal conductance measurements obtained from the selected $F_{eco}$ dataset were fitted to Equation 7.15. When the separate responses to $D$ and $Q$ were combined in the model, an $r^2$ of 0.65 was obtained (Figure 8.9). The residual plots in Figures 8.9a-f show two features. First they indicate that there was little skew in the model across the normal range of meteorological variables. And secondly,
they show that the normal range all variables was represented. The fitted values for Equation 7.15 and its components were: $D_0 = 0.007; \ g_{\max } = 8 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}; \ \alpha = 0.002 \text{ mol mol}^{-1}; \ g_d = 0.67 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The calculation of stomatal conductance was driven from weather data to yield canopy conductance estimates ($g_{sc}$).

**Figures 8.9a-f.** Canopy stomatal conductance (big-leaf) model results. All graphs plot the residuals as $g_{sc} - g_{sc \text{ model}}$ vs each of $g_{sc}, D, T, Q, C_a$, and wind direction respectively.
Multilayer model:

The daily patterns in stomatal conductance, vapour pressure deficit and radiation in SRF (Figures 8.10a&b) show diurnal leaf gas exchange traces for three of the six layers within the canopy: the bottom, middle and top. These results compared well with the measured values of $g_s$ (Figure 7.2).

For leaf-level $g_s$, maximal values of 100 - 500 mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ occurred at the start of the day (0800 hrs to 1000 hrs) and decreased towards minima of less than 100 mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ near sunset. The rate of decrease in $g_s$ tended to reduce after 1500 hrs. On some days (e.g., second day in Figure 8.10c), $g_s$ at one or two heights increased in response to reduced $D$; this phenomenon was not marked in the mean measured conductances (Chapter 7), though a tendency in Amphimas to maintain $g_s$ levels after 1500 hours can be discerned (Figure 7.2b). These values were scaled according to the vertical profile in LAI to give $g_{sc}$ estimates.

Figure 8.10d compares measured and modelled stomatal conductance for the whole canopy. The traces follow similar patterns with high morning values (400 - 1000 mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) dropping from 1100 hrs onwards down to 100 - 200 mmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ near sunset. However there are discrepancies. Most obvious is the difference in smoothness between the measured $g_{sc}$ and the modelled $g_{scm}$ and $g_{scb}$ (though the mean $g_{sc}$ approximated closely the modelled values). The modelled stomatal conductances differed mainly in that $g_{scm}$ was more responsive than $g_{scb}$ to changes in the driving variables, particularly $D$: the morning peak in $g_{scm}$ was larger than the respective $g_{scb}$ on both days when $D$ was lower. Concurrent peaks were also observed in the $g_{sc}$ trace. Overall, the multilayer model estimated $g_{sc}$ well in some instances but overestimated it in others, whilst the big leaf model tended to slightly underestimate $g_{sc}$.

Photosynthesis and net assimilation (SRF)

For both assimilation models the above stomatal conductance simulations were used to drive the equations of photosynthesis together with the weather data. Gross [canopy] photosynthesis estimates were then combined with gross respiration to resolve the net modelled canopy assimilation rate.

Big leaf model:

The leaf photosynthesis model (Equations 7.1 and 7.3) were fitted to the $F_{eb}$ values in Figure 8.7a and gave an $r^2$ of 0.61 for the photosynthesis model. The residual plots in Figure 8.11a-f show that the
Figures 8.10a-d. Stomatal conductance in SRF. In (a) & (b), modelled $D$ and $Q$ are shown for 45 m, 24 m, 8m and 1 m above ground level. In (c), leaf-level stomatal conductance, $g_\lambda$, is calculated at each height; and in (d), canopy conductance is shown for the eddy covariance observations (daytime $g_{sc}$), the big-leaf model ($g_{scB}$), and the multilayer model ($g_{scM}$). The data are for 16th - 19th March, 1994.
model was not skewed with respect to most of the driving variables. However, $F_e$ was underestimated above 20 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. The fitted values of $J_{\text{max}}$ and $V_{\text{max}}$ respectively were 187 and 91 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. Leaf respiration in the dark was estimated at 1.7 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at 25 °C, whilst the convexity of the photosynthetic response to light, $\theta$, was 0.08. The combined big leaf model was run from the weather station data to yield net canopy assimilation, $F_{\text{ecot}}$ (Figure 8.12c).

Multilayer model:

The daily rhythms in photosynthesis differed with height above the ground in a similar way to the measurements shown in Figure 7.1. Data are plotted for four of the six modelled levels in the canopy (Figure 8.12b). At the top, maximum leaf-level rates of 5 - 7 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ occurred at 1000 or 1100 hrs, and then declined. In contrast, at the bottom of the canopy, maximal irradiance levels were experienced around midday, and since $g_s$ was still not limiting at this hour near ground level, maximal rates of 2 - 3 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ obtained. Photosynthesis values were scaled to the whole canopy to give estimates of $F_{\text{cm}}$, which were combined with $R_t$ to give $F_{\text{ecot}}$.

Figure 8.12c compares values for measured and modelled $F_{\text{ecot}}$ for March 16th - 19th. As with stomatal conductance, although the measured $F_{\text{ecot}}$ trace was less smooth than $F_{\text{ecom}}$ and $F_{\text{ecob}}$, there was overall agreement between the three graphs: net assimilation reached a maximum of 12 - 20 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ around 1100 hrs, and then fell to 0 - 2 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ near sunset. Respiration rates fell with temperature during the night, averaging 6 - 7 μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. Overall agreement was closer during the day-time on the 17th and 19th, whilst on the 16th and 18th, the modelled values slightly underestimated $F_{\text{ecot}}$ during the hours of maximum photosynthesis. Day-time estimates of $F_{\text{ecom}}$ and $F_{\text{ecob}}$ were similar, though net assimilation in $F_{\text{ecob}}$ was less than in $F_{\text{ecom}}$ for the peak [morning] values. This difference was accentuated on the 16th and 18th, and almost completely removed on the 17th and 19th. Though variable at night, the mean $F_{\text{ecot}}$ value was similar to that estimated by $F_{\text{ecom}}$ and $F_{\text{ecob}}$. These modelled values were identical during complete darkness since $R_t$ was used for both, but at dawn and dusk some differences could be discerned reflecting variation in the modelled balance between leaf photosynthesis and respiration.
Figures 8.11a-f. Canopy photosynthesis (big-leaf) model results. All graphs plot the residuals as $F_{cs} - F_{cs\; mod}$ vs each of $F_{cs}, g_{sc}, D, Q, T$, and $C_a$, respectively. $F_{cs}$ data are $F_{eco}$ values corrected for $R_t$, total respiration.
Figures 8.12a-c. Photosynthesis and net assimilation by SRF. In (a) are climate variables for the period 16th March to 19th March: $Q$, $D$, and $T$. In (b), leaf level photosynthesis ($A$) is plotted for leaves at four heights: 45 m, 24 m, 8 m, and 1 m. In (c), net assimilation rates for SRF are shown for the eddy covariance observations ($F_{eco}$), the big-leaf model ($F_{big}$) and the multilayer model ($F_{mult}$). The modelled $F_{eco}$ data ($F_{eco}$ and $F_{com}$) were obtained by combining gross assimilation ($F_{gb}$ and $F_{cm}$) with $R_t$. 

8. Forest gas exchange
SCALING UP FLUX ESTIMATES IN TIME (PRF AND SRF)

Secondary rain forest, Cameroon

The multilayer and big-leaf models for SRF were 'assumed' to give spatially averaged estimates of the hourly changes in net canopy assimilation for the forest as a whole. For each, 46 days of modelled fluxes between forest and atmosphere were compared with the eddy covariance. The observed fluxes indicated the forest to be a source for CO\textsubscript{2} of 1.6 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}\), whilst the simulations predicted a net sink. Of the two models, the multilayer formulation estimated more assimilation (net sink = 0.9 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}\)) than did the big-leaf (net sink = 0.7 \(\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}\)).

The strong apparent source capacity of the forest as measured by eddy covariance suggested the need for a more detailed appraisal of night-time turbulence that is not presented here. However, a preliminary analysis of the distribution of observed fluxes with wind direction indicated that a large source for CO\textsubscript{2} could be detected over one sector, between 70° and 130° from north (Figure 8.13). These bearings coincided with part of the village of Eboufek (Map 2.2). Consequently, the measurements were thought to be affected by airflows enriched by fuel burning and non-forest land use. After removal of these data, mean night-time efflux values (for the period 2000 - 0400 hrs) were reduced by 50\%, whilst mean assimilation rates during daylight hours (1000 - 1600 hrs) were changed by only 7\%. The diurnal pattern of wind flow was not fully random (data not shown), and consequently affected overall flux measurements because of a night-time bias towards the 70° - 130° sector (the big-leaf model was fitted to a selected dataset that also had this sector removed).

Figure 8.13. The variation in CO\textsubscript{2} flux with respect to wind direction above SRF. The graph shows the median and interquartile range for 2.5° bins. The data are net fluxes, \(F_n\), without storage corrections, and are for 9th March to 4th May, 1994.
Climate change scenarios could not be investigated in terms of the annual forest carbon budget for SRF. However, it was possible to re-run the two models for hypothetical conditions during the field campaign. Figures 8.14a-c show the effects of single variable changes in carbon dioxide concentration, radiation and temperature on $F_{ecob}$ and $F_{ecom}$. The graphs are normalised by the estimates obtained using the true climatological data from February - May 1994. Increased radiation and CO$_2$ concentration resulted in both models predicting a stronger sink capacity for the forest, whilst for temperature the opposite obtained. The sink strength was most strongly determined by temperature and CO$_2$ concentration: a warming of 2 °C reduced the sink capacity of the forest by 16%, whilst increasing the CO$_2$ concentration by 300 µmol mol$^{-1}$ strengthened it by 125%. The multilayer model was less sensitive to changes in $C_a$ and $Q$, but more sensitive to $T$ than the big-leaf model.

![Graphs showing sensitivity of forest sink capacity to changes in carbon dioxide concentration, radiation, and temperature.](image)

Figures 8.14a-c. The sensitivity in the models for SRF to changes in $C_a$, $Q$ and $T$ respectively. Each graph shows the relative effect of change in the driving variable on the original estimates from the big-leaf and multilayer models.
Primary rain forest, Brazil

For PRF, a big leaf model was run for one year using the 1992-93 weather station data; the detailed results are presented in Grace et al. (1995b) and Lloyd et al. (1995b). Here, the net assimilation output from that model has been incorporated into the carbon flow diagram shown in Figure 8.15a together with the modelled total respiration, \( R_1 \). The forest was found to be a net sink for carbon of \( 0.9 \pm 0.2 \) ton C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) a net difference between gross primary production of 24.1 ton C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) and total respiration, \( R_1 \) of 23.2 ton C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (Grace et al., 1995b).

The most significant feature of these results was the higher sensitivity to temperature of respiration over photosynthesis (Grace et al., 1996; Meir et al., 1996). A small change in above-canopy temperature of 1 - 2 °C was found to have a large effect on respiration, but a smaller effect on photosynthesis (Grace et al., 1995b; Grace et al., 1996). The role played by respiration in determining the carbon balance of the forest is considered in Table 8.2 where the largest component contributing to CO\(_2\) efflux, emission from the soil, was estimated for hypothetical temperature records for 1992-93. The warming increments used (0.5 - 2.0 °C) were in line with climate change scenarios reported by Houghton et al. (1994), and the results show the forest to flip from a net sink to a weak net source of less than 0.3 ton ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) under a 2 °C warming. Even a small increase in temperature of 0.5 °C yielded a 28% reduction in the sink strength (from 0.9 - 0.64 ton ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\)). Clearly inclusion of the above-ground respiratory term would have increased the size of the modelled source. It is emphasised that only the soil component was changed in this simulation, but the results underline those from analogous scenarios described for net assimilation in Grace et al. (1995b).

Table 8.2 The effect of temperature on respiration in soil and the net carbon balance of PRF, using annual estimates from Grace et al. (1995b). Only estimates for the soil are changed to generate these data. Temperature in °C; carbon fluxes in ton C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) and negative fluxes indicate a carbon source (physiologist conventions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature change</th>
<th>Soil CO(_2) efflux</th>
<th>New net carbon balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since an annual estimate for CO\(_2\) fluxes in SRF was not possible, a comparison was made between the two sites by calculating the total amount of carbon metabolised in each component of the forest - leaves, woody tissue and soil. Figures 15b&c show the proportion of the total respired and photosynthesised CO\(_2\) that pertains to each. The similarity was striking: none of the components
Forest gas exchange differed by more than 5% between PRF and SRF, with leaves representing the largest component (60 - 65%), then soil (32 - 37%) and wood (4 - 5%) respectively.

(a) PRF, Brazil

Figure 8.15a. The carbon balance in PRF 1992-3. Estimates are given for the annual fluxes of carbon dioxide within the PRF canopy, and the net exchange between the PRF canopy and the atmosphere (data obtained from this thesis, Grace et al., 1995b & Meir et al., 1996; carbon content of wood, following Matthews (1993) assumed to be 50%). Storage values are in ton C ha⁻¹; fluxes in ton C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; the soil carbon storage is from Post et al. (1982).

(b) PRF, Brazil

c) SRF, Cameroon

Figure 8.15b & c. The proportion of the total metabolic flux of carbon dioxide through different forest components. The data represent the sum of gross respiration and photosynthesis for each component.
8. Forest gas exchange

8.4 DISCUSSION

DRIVING ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABLES

A late afternoon peak in soil temperature occurred in both forests, and although apparent differences were visible they were not significant (Figure 8.1). The daytime microclimate profiles for the SRF canopy showed the development of vertical gradients in $Q$, $D$ and $T$, but the destruction [by turbulence; c.f. Figure 4.16b] of nocturnal gradients in $C_a$ except near ground level (Figures 8.2 - 8.4). The midday vertical gradients visible in $T$ and $D$ resulted from variation in incident radiation, probably because of near-field heating effects. And the efficient mixing seen in $C_a$ also acted on water vapour: the changes in $D$ with height were in response to $T$ rather than water vapour concentration (data not shown). Consequently, the SRF canopy appeared fairly well coupled to the atmosphere during the day. Inspection of Figures 8.6a&c confirms this, and suggests that the decoupling coefficient ($\Omega$; Jarvis & McNaughton, 1986) was low near midday when turbulence was highest, and high (= decoupled) in the morning, when the opposite occurred. Strong coupling was probably responsible for the good estimates obtained for $D$ and $T$ from the above-canopy values.

With all simulated in-canopy microclimate data for SRF, the relationship between measured and predicted values near the ground was significantly noisier than for those near the canopy top (e.g., Figures 8.3b-d and 8.4b-d). For scalars such as temperature and gases, a turbulent mixing model (e.g., Raupach 1988) might improve these estimates, but representation of the radiation field by point sampling is prone to bias from canopy heterogeneity. Consequently, it was difficult to be certain how well the data from one measured profile mimicked the average $Q$ at each height in the forest. For example, the maxima in Figure 8.3a at 1 m are close to 100 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$; other areas of the forest exhibited peaks of less than this (personal observation), and it is possible that the mean $Q$ at 1 m was also less than 100 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

Overall, the SRF in-canopy climate showed some characteristics also found in PRF (McWilliam et al., 1996): vertical daytime gradients in $T$ and $D$ were generated, and light was attenuated with height in an exponential manner. However it was distinguished from PRF by its stronger coupling low in the canopy, lower overall $C_a$ (mean $C_a$ was $\sim$380 - 390 $\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$ in SRF vs $\sim$400 - 410 $\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$ in PRF), and by the highly heterogeneous radiation field, especially near ground level.
**Aerodynamic properties**

The gradient of the linear relationship between friction velocity and wind speed (Figure 8.5a) was close to that reported in the literature (1.9 in SRF vs 1.7: Shuttleworth et al., 1984; Grace et al., 1995a, both working in undisturbed rain forests in Amazonia). The increase in aerodynamic conductance of the forest canopy to heat, water vapour and CO₂ was also a positive function of wind speed (Figure 8.5b) and the gradient of this relationship was marginally greater than that found for the PRF site (Grace et al., 1995a).

The calculation of \( r_a \) was subject to some dependency on \( \ln(z_{om}/z_{oh}) \) in Equation 8.4. There exists variation in the published value for this term (Verma, 1989), and its effect has been examined elsewhere (Shuttleworth et al., 1988; Monteith & Unsworth, 1990; Grace et al., 1995b). This uncertainty is acknowledged here as \( r_a \) and \( r \) were occasionally of the same order of magnitude, though the good agreement among big-leaf, up-scaled leaf-level measurements and eddy covariance-derived values of canopy conductance suggests that the calculations were reasonable (Figure 8.10d; c.f., Figures 7.2 and 3.5).

**Canopy physiology**

The ‘natural history’ of canopy gas exchange appeared like that of a simple leaf (Figure 8.6), though clearly major differences exist. Two of the most important are the inclusion of an ‘extra’ respiratory component (soil and wood) in the data, and the variability of the sampling ‘footprint’ inherent to eddy covariance measurements. The heterogeneity in landscape around the SRF site acted as an additional source of variation in the data. The reserve at Mbalmayo was in an area near a small settlement and was composed of a variety of forest types itself, including some areas of swampy forest, as well as the locally dominant moist deciduous forest (Lawson, 1995; Grace et al., unpublished data). Figure 8.13 suggests contamination of the CO₂ signal from one direction and these data were excluded from the subsequent analysis.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, the physiological characteristics of the canopy are consistent with leaf-level measurements made both for this forest, and other tropical moist forests. In particular, the
maximum canopy conductances of 400 - 1000 mmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) were congruent with up-scaled leaf data for SRF and PRF, and the diurnal pattern of high morning conductances followed by declining fluxes in the afternoon has previously been found in two tropical rain forests (Shuttleworth, 1989; Roberts et al., 1990; McWilliam et al., 1996).

The responses in net assimilation and conductance to light and water vapour pressure deficit

Net assimilation:
The light response characteristics for SRF (Figure 8.7a) are similar to those found for two Amazonian forests reported by Fan et al. (1990; Reserva Ducke, Brazil) and Grace et al. (1995a; the PRF site). The estimated dark respiration rate at SRF was 5.8 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (at Reserva Ducke it was 6 - 7; at PRF it was 6.5); the quantum requirement at SRF was 40 (at Reserva Ducke it was 60; at PRF it was 40); and the light compensation point at SRF was 230 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (at Reserva Ducke it was 260; at PRF it was 280).

A larger discrepancy was found for the maximum assimilation rate where SRF showed greater capacity (25 - 30 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) than either the forest at Reserva Ducke or PRF (19 and 15 μmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) respectively). Furthermore, whilst the light response curve for SRF was linear up to 800 μmol quanta m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), it appeared to saturate above 1200 μmol quanta m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). The Reserva Ducke and PRF canopies did not fully saturate at high Q, but the overall light responses were also curvilinear. Studies in a temperate forest in north eastern USA have also indicated a non-linear light response (Wofsy et al., 1993), though it is possible that such data would show a linear relationship if presented on a daily basis. The asymptotic nature of the F\(_c\) - Q response is also suggestive of photosynthetically acclimation within a closed canopy, and the data in Chapter 7 tentatively support this notion. These kinds of analyses may be important for large scale modelling of forest gas exchange (Ruimy et al., 1995; c.f., Sellers et al., 1992; Kruijt et al., 1995). The differences among the tropical sites reflect structural and florisitic variation contingent upon their [bio]geography. But the SRF canopy was also a secondary forest (both Reserva Ducke and PRF were 'primary' sites), and may have contained a greater area of leaves with high nitrogen content and high A\(_{\text{max}}\) capacity (c.f., Chapters 2 and 7).

Canopy conductance:
Variation in canopy conductance was related to differences in incident radiation and vapour pressure deficit (Figures 8.7b and 8.9). The \(r^2\) value for the stomatal conductance model was 0.61 despite the uncertainties inherent to the eddy covariance technique. Inspection of the response surface in Figure
8.7b revealed some unexpectedly high $g_{\infty}$ values at high $D$ (see the triangle in Figure 8.7b). It is possible that these data represented flux measurements contaminated by evaporation from wet or swampy patches in the surrounding forest mosaic. Contamination of the evaporation signal because of poor coupling between the atmosphere and the canopy was less likely, though this may have occurred at low wind speeds. Further analysis by wind direction of measurements during the night and late afternoon would permit a more detailed interpretation of the stomatal conductance model.

Possible bias in the selected eddy covariance dataset:

It is reasonable to question how well the selected data in Figure 8.7a adequately represent the general behaviour of the forest. The filters used to select canopy scale data for modelling purposes were chosen to identify physiologically stable conditions and remove transitional states during changing weather conditions. In this sense, the purpose was to locate periods when the canopy could be regarded as equivalent to a leaf placed in a leaf chamber (Chapter 7). Such measurements have previously been used as source data for scaling to the whole canopy (e.g., Caldwell et al., 1986; Roberts et al., 1993; Amthor, 1994). A minimum possible number of points were filtered out, and the consequent photosynthetic light response curve is shown in Figure 8.7a. A detailed analysis (forthcoming) of the $F_{eco}$ data would require the inclusion of verified night-time measurements. As a first step, the inset graph on Figure 8.7a shows the light response of the selected data to be close to that of the parent dataset. Using the same regression method used for the selected data, the light response characteristics in each graph were found to be almost identical: for the inset graph the implied dark respiration rate is 5.9 $\mu$mol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, the light compensation point is 260 $\mu$mol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, the quantum efficiency is 43, and the maximum assimilation rate is around 25 - 30 $\mu$mol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. In addition, it is emphasised that the selected data represented a sizeable proportion of the main body of measurements (21%), and were also distributed widely across the normal range of driving environmental variables (Figure 8.9). Together, these observations suggest that the selected data were not significantly biased.
MODELLING RESPIRATION AND PHOTOSYNTHESIS

Respiration (SRF and PRF)

For both forests, soil CO₂ efflux was the largest respiratory component, followed by leaf respiration, and then woody tissue respiration (Figure 8.8). The differences between SRF and PRF reflected their structural and successional states. In this context, the slightly higher mean LAI and greater presence of pioneer species (e.g., Musanga cecropioides, Haumania danckelmaniana) in SRF (Chapter 3) could explain the higher leaf respiration rates. By the same token, the higher above- and below-ground biomass in PRF resulted in higher estimates for CO₂ efflux from woody tissue and soil. Given the importance of root respiration to total efflux rates from soil (Singh & Gupta, 1977; Raich & Schlesinger, 1992), it is perhaps surprising that the efflux from SRF soil was as high as 5.8 μmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹. One explanation for this may lie in the recent (1988-9) logging of the Mbalmayo forest: it is possible that a large amount of non-living below-ground litter remains and is continuing to decompose. Over several years this phenomenon would be seen in the overall fluxes as an initial minimum net rate of assimilation (peak in soil respiration relative to gross assimilation) followed by a rise. Indeed, a disturbed secondary forest may have the capacity to act as a temporary source for CO₂ (Uhl, 1987).

The determination of $R_{i}$ values by component summation is important for the independent verification of eddy covariance measurements over forest (Wofsy et al., 1993; Grace et al., 1996). This is particularly true for 30 or 60 minute night data, as calm and less buoyant nocturnal conditions can reduce aerodynamic conductance to levels not detectable by the eddy covariance technique (Kaimal & Finnigan, 1994). The agreement among measurements in Table 8.2 was encouraging in this respect. But there remains the problem for summation techniques of representing spatial heterogeneity. In this context, above-ground biomass estimates are limited to indirect approaches such as the use of empirical relationships or remote sensing. Some processes are particularly understudied: woody tissue respiration in branches is one example (Sprugel et al., 1996). However, this problem may prove less important in view of the small contribution to total efflux from stems and branches (Figures 8.15b&c). Uncertainty in efflux from the soil is more serious as its contribution to $R_{i}$ is larger. In this study, the precision of the temperature response in soil CO₂ efflux relied on relatively small sample sizes in a limited range of conditions; a fractional difference in the efflux estimate for soil could result in major changes in the overall forest carbon balance (Meir et al., 1996).
Stomatal conductance and photosynthesis (SRF)

**Big-leaf model:**
In each case the leaf scale models for stomatal conductance and photosynthesis explained over 60% of the variation in the observed data. The fitted values for the \( g_{scb} \) model were similar to those found for individual leaves, though \( g_{\text{max}} \) was larger, and \( \alpha_g \) was lower than for leaves. The spread of residuals in both fits (Figures 8.9 & 8.11) indicated that the models were fairly robust across a wide range of conditions. But there was a weakness in Figure 8.11a where predicted photosynthesis tended to underestimate \( F_c \) at values above 20 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \). This feature was probably a result of contamination in the \( g_{sc} \) signal.

The best fitting value for Rubisco activity, \( V_{\text{max}} \), was 187 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), for light-saturated electron transport, \( J_{\text{max}} \), it was 91 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), and for leaf respiration it was 1.7 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \), whilst the respective parameters for PRF were 130, 68 and 0.7 \( \mu \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \) (Lloyd *et al.*, 1995b). The difference in these fitted values reflects chiefly the higher maximum assimilation rate in SRF, though the abundance of gap-dwelling herbs in this forest may also have had a species specific influence on the fits. Temperature optima for \( g_{sc} \) and \( F_c \) were not fitted, but estimates from the modelled data indicated lower values for SRF than PRF (respectively: 27.5 °C and 29 °C vs 32 °C and 36.5°C for PRF), a probable effect of the lower peak temperatures experienced in SRF.

**Multilayer model:**
The leaf scale processes underlying the multilayer model have already been discussed in Chapter 7, so only their in-canopy predictions are discussed here (Figures 8.9c and 8.11c).

The response in stomata to \( D \) and \( Q \) can be observed alternately in the upper-canopy and lower-canopy leaves: the former experienced more radiation but higher vapour pressure deficits than the latter, and the extremes of these combinations provided for the high \( g_s \) values in the leaves at these two opposite points in the canopy (Figure 8.10c; *c.f.* Figure 7.2); similar results were found for PRF (McWilliam *et al.*, 1996). The greatest amount of transpiration was undertaken by the sub-canopy layer where the highest leaf area density was found (Figure 3.5). The conductance in some layers also tended to rise in the late afternoon. Both of these features were observed in simulations by Roberts *et al.* (1993) for the forest at Reserva Ducke, Brazil. The radiation environment in SRF may not have been sufficiently well modelled to always generate late afternoon stomatal closure, but the apparent error could also reflect a fault in the fitted \( g_s \) model (Equation 7.15). This Jarvis-type formulation drives \( g_s \) from \( Q \) and
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$D$ only. Consequently, if other factors determined afternoon closure, they were not accounted for and an afternoon reduction in $D$ could have resulted in overpredictions of $g_{sem}$.

The assimilation estimates in Figure 8.12c were determined to some extent by $g_{sem}$, but the importance of the light environment to photosystem II was made clear by leaves at the top of the canopy showing higher photosynthetic rates than those lower down ($5\, -\, 8$ μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at 36 m vs $1\, -\, 3$ μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at 1 m). A feature in the measured data (Figure 7.1) retained by this simulation was the tendency for leaves at 1 m to peak later than those at 36 m. This suggests that the model worked well, though the flat (rather than pointed) peak at 1 m indicated that predicted $Q$ and/or $g_s$ may have generated slight overestimates in photosynthesis.

Comparing measured and modelled canopy gas exchange

The comparisons in Figures 8.10d and 8.12c indicate that both multilayer and big-leaf model formulations were reasonably successful. The big-leaf estimates were the most conservative for $g_s$ and $F_{eco}$. For the $F_{eco}$ simulations (Figure 8.12d), the departure from observed values on duller days with lower $D$ was greater for the big-leaf data, which also tended to underestimate the morning peak in $g_s$. These observations suggest that $D$ was limiting for the canopy above 0.015 - 0.025 mol mol$^{-1}$ (all data show agreement at high $D$), but that insufficient sensitivity to low $D$ in $F_{ecob}$ reduced its accuracy on certain days, in comparison to $F_{ecoo}$. One improvement for both simulations would have been to calculate leaf [canopy] $D$ rather than to use the air values. This could have improved the morning $g_{scb}$ predictions, but would have probably increased further the late afternoon values which already tended to be overestimated, an effect sometimes also visible in the assimilation traces. The phenomenon of an afternoon increase in $g_{sc}$ has been observed elsewhere (e.g., Amthor et al., 1994) and points to a potential gap in our mechanistic understanding of leaf gas exchange. Future improved models may incorporate inhibition feedbacks in photosynthesis or respiration to accommodate this (Herold, 1980; Azcón-Bieto, 1983; Amthor & Cumming, 1988).

Of the two modelling approaches used, the big-leaf is more attractive on several grounds: it provides a large spatial average, the continuously recorded data encompass a wider range of conditions than point measurements, and the relatively simple computations make for suitable application at larger scales (e.g., Sellers et al., 1992; Amthor, 1994). The advantages of a multilayer approach can be seen in this study where the short-comings of the big-leaf formulation could be dissected in the context of detailed physiological information that would not normally be available. For the SRF site, the heterogeneity of
the vegetation resulted in non-uniform whole-canopy gas exchange observations. The multilayer model was therefore particularly useful for this site, and its [generic] use in scaling up and verification purposes has been recognised elsewhere (Caldwell et al., 1986; Reynolds et al., 1992; Roberts et al., 1993; Wofsy et al., 1993).

**SCALING UP FLUX ESTIMATES IN TIME (PRF AND SRF)**

The focus for up-scaling canopy models to estimate performance over a year is the relative sensitivities to climate of different physiologically active components in the canopy, and their interaction. Currently, such procedures refer exclusively to the effects of 'instantaneous' changes in the environment, not to the longer term effects of climate change on forest structure or growth dynamics, and the feedbacks implied therein. Climatic anomalies in 1992 have recently been attributed to the volcanic aerosols ejected by the eruption of Mount Pinatubo suggesting that models can be tested in this context (Blumthaler & Ambach, 1994). Indeed, year-to-year fluctuations in climate have been found to contribute significantly to variation in the annual rate of CO₂ increase (Sarmiento, 1993).

Before comparing PRF and SRF, the discrepancy between measured and modelled carbon exchange in SRF required consideration. It is rare that a measurement tower is situated with perfect fetch from all directions, and an analysis by wind direction is usually appropriate (e.g., Kruijt, 1993; Wofsy et al., 1993). The effect of a settlement on the measured fluxes was large at SRF, and the tendency for nighttime airflows to come from this direction compounded the overestimation of ecosystem respiration. Removal of data from this sector pointed to the forest acting as a carbon sink rather than a source, and this was confirmed by both models. The multilayer formulation predicted a stronger sink than the big-leaf one (0.9 vs 0.7 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹). These numbers were large in comparison to the net assimilation of PRF (0.3 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹), but similar to recent values obtained for a denser forest in Central Amazonia (Malhi, personal communication). They were also obtained from a 46 day period and so may not accurately represent the annual carbon budget in SRF. Whilst Fₑₑₑₙ tended to overestimate Fₑₑₒ on some days, Fₑₑₒₙ underestimated it on others (Figure 8.12c). The actual behaviour of SRF as a whole probably fell between the two, whilst different sectors of the forest mosaic may have resembled more one model than the other.

A primary role of a model in this case is to estimate behaviour at times other than those where measurement is possible. But the precision in such estimates requires that the model remains accurate across the full annual climatic cycle. This problem is reduced in the tropics, though some seasonality
remains (Culf et al., 1996). For PRF, measurements were made in both the dry and wet seasons before calibrating the model (Grace et al., 1995b). The data included friagem periods, though fewer measurements of respiration in soil derived from these dates. Although the predictions for soil behaved well during these intermittent cool spells, further verification of the efflux model in exceptional weather conditions would raise confidence in the annual estimates.

The carbon budget for PRF in Figure 8.15a is a fine balance between respiration and assimilation. The differential sensitivities of photosynthesis and respiration to physical parameters make this balance labile to climatic vicissitudes (Table 8.2; Grace et al., 1996). Figures 8.15b&c indicate a close similarity between PRF and SRF in the proportionation of total (24 hour) carbon fluxes to different tissues. The implication is that SRF should behave in a similar way to PRF. Figures 8.14a-c show that net forest assimilation is most strongly sensitive to ambient CO₂ concentrations. But in the context of inter-annual climatic variation, it is likely that radiation and temperature will fluctuate more. Further inspection of Figure 8.14 reveals that the SRF models are especially sensitive to temperature. This is because respiration rises rapidly with temperature, whilst photosynthesis is near its temperature optimum in these conditions. A sensitivity analysis for the PRF model yielded patterns consistent with this result (Grace et al., 1996).

The differences between the two SRF models chiefly reflect differences in the respective fitted photosynthesis parameters, as Rₜ was used in both. It seems reasonable to assume that photosynthetic physiology was represented better by the multilayer model, as this was parameterised from measurements of leaf tissue only. However, the greater spatial averaging of the big-leaf model calibration may have lead to a more representative estimate of gross productivity.

This work supports a notion that the gas exchange behaviour of well developed tropical moist forest can be generalised despite large differences in geography, structure and floristics. This suggestion has recently been extended to include biomes from different latitudes, such as boreal forest (Jarvis et al., 1995). But there remain important quantitative and qualitative differences. The nature of the canopy photosynthetic response to radiation is one area of contention and may vary importantly with canopy density. Even more clear is the role played at different sites by the temperature response of respiration in soil. This component may determine future changes in the carbon balance and should remain a focus in further studies. However, it is emphasised here that gas exchange models do not exist in isolation; they need to be combined with models of tree growth and below-ground processes before a complete picture of the forest carbon cycle can be drawn.
For use at larger scales, it is stressed that the present results are derived from site-calibrated models. This approach lends itself well to good local estimates of carbon dioxide exchange. But until whole-canopy measured data become available in larger amounts it will not be as widely applicable as more theoretically based models. Fortunately the eddy covariance technique is rapidly gaining currency: this is reflected not only in recent publications (e.g., Wofsy et al., 1993; Hollinger et al., 1994; Grace et al., 1995b; Valentini et al., 1991; Miranda et al., 1996), but also in current and planned international research programmes (ABRACOS, BOREAS, EUROFLUX, LBA). Many more long-term measurements are likely to emerge in the next few years.

### 8.5 CONCLUSIONS

Whole-canopy gas exchange measurements in SRF were compared with estimates from models derived by two different means. In one, measured leaf-scale photosynthetic parameters were applied to six layers of foliage and the processes scaled to the whole canopy. In-canopy environmental variables were empirically simulated and used to drive assimilation at each level. The second model was parameterised independently using eddy covariance measurements to calibrate a big-leaf type formulation. Both assimilation models were linked to an empirical respiration model so that net forest assimilation rates could be recovered.

Simulation of the in-canopy environment was satisfactory, though spatial representation in the radiation field was limited. Modelled canopy stomatal conductance and photosynthesis were close to the measured values and followed the diurnal pattern correctly. Despite this, each model suffered shortcomings. The multilayer approach was limited by its across-species representation of leaf photosynthetic parameters, and a requirement for detailed environmental data. But its better physiological definition resulted in improved morning conductance estimates, and a greater sensitivity to changes in the environment. The detail in the multilayer model provided analytical insight into the behaviour of the canopy that was not available from the simpler simulation. The big-leaf model gave a good spatial estimate, but the calibrating signal showed a degree of variance because of the forest mosaic surrounding the micrometeorological tower. Slight overestimates of afternoon conductance and assimilation pointed to possible missing elements in the conductance models, but otherwise the results suggested that the representation of leaf-level gas exchange characteristics in the canopy models was satisfactory. The non-linearity of the \( F_e - Q \) response for the big-leaf model was
suggestive of photosynthetic acclimation in the canopy, and the leaf-level data used to parameterise the multilayer model indicate that this is at least partly the case.

Results from a similar big-leaf model calibrated for PRF were compared with those from SRF. The broad features of forest gas exchange were shared by both sites. Extension of the PRF model to an annual estimate (Grace et al., 1995b) indicated the forest to be a sink of 0.9 (± 0.2) ton C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (0.3 (±0.1) µmol C m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)); the SRF site was a stronger sink of 0.7 - 0.9 µmol C m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), calculated over a 46 day period. Both models were highly sensitive to CO\(_2\) concentration and temperature, but less sensitive to radiation. A small increase in temperature (2 °C) converted the PRF site from a sink for CO\(_2\) to a source. A similar sensitivity in respiration was observed in SRF, though a reduced sink capacity was predicted, rather than a net source. The relatively high fluxes from SRF soil suggested that disturbance can create secondary forests that are temporary sources for carbon dioxide.
The goal of estimating larger scale phenomena by measurement of their component parts underpins this thesis. At the level of ecophysiology of the individual, the organ level gas exchange data suggested a way to quantify for whole trees the balance between respiration and photosynthesis (page 96), or explain the fast growth rate of pioneer trees such as *Musanga cecropioides* (page 97). However, the recent development of the eddy covariance technique provided a unique opportunity to test notions of scaling, and hence the primary focus was to understand the major features of the carbon cycle in forests.

Figures 8.15a-c summarise gross features of the forest carbon cycle that have been quantified. Good agreement was found among biomass estimates using different empirical equations based on measurements of basal trunk diameter (Brown *et al.*, 1989; Deans *et al.*, 1996; Chapter 3). The above ground store of carbon is important in the terrestrial carbon cycle, and until recently there has been little certainty in this value for tropical forests. However, respiration in wood represents ~5% of gross ecosystem carbon flows, so uncertainty in this flux is less important than errors in, and changes to, the state variable from which they come. This contrast is not apparent in leaf or soil gas exchange. Foliar biomass is low, but needs to be estimated accurately because 60 - 65% of gross ecosystem carbon fluxes pass through this tissue, most of which is physiologically active. And in soil both the size of the state variable and the flux of carbon to the atmosphere (30 - 40% of gross ecosystem carbon fluxes) are large and require accurate quantification.

The largest single flux in the terrestrial carbon cycle is photosynthesis (Farquhar *et al.*, 1993). Photosynthesis in leaves is relatively well understood (Farquhar & von Caemmerer, 1982) and was modelled in Chapter 7. However, the exact nature of its expression for a forest canopy is unresolved (Ruimy *et al.*, 1995). The overall agreement between measurements and models in Chapter 8 showed the simplified big-leaf approach to work reasonably well, a result consistent with optimisation theories of canopy physiology (Sellers *et al.*, 1992; Kruijt *et al.*, 1995). However, sensitivity to the driving environmental variables was lower for the big-leaf than the multilayer model and represents an area where more detailed research may be needed. Similarly, the interactions between photosynthetic physiology and mesoscale climate variables, such as water vapour and CO₂ concentration, also
determined canopy assimilation rates and require further elucidation before above-canopy eddy

covariance data are to be fully appraised (e.g., Grace et al., 1996; Chapter 8).

To retrieve net CO\textsubscript{2} exchange rates, it was also necessary to estimate whole-forest respiration, of

which 75% - 85% is derived from the soil. To measure the process of CO\textsubscript{2} production in soil a

chamber method was used, but this posed sampling problems because of the spatial heterogeneity

characteristic to soil. The agreement between eddy covariance and chamber-derived estimates

suggested that spatial variation in gross efflux rates was accounted for adequately. However, given the

high sensitivity of the forest carbon balance to the temperature response in soil CO\textsubscript{2} efflux (k in

Equation 4.3), there exists a priority to estimate this parameter more precisely (Townsend et al., 1992;

Grace et al., 1995b; Chapter 8). One modelling approach may be to use soil nutrient content

(especially organic carbon) to predict efflux rates (Chapter 4). But, if longer-term estimates are

required, proper feedback mechanisms need to be incorporated: decomposition process models of this

type currently exist for non rain forest sites (Parton et al., 1988; Jenkinson, 1990), though they do not

explicitly include root respiration (cf., Nadelhoffer & Raich, 1989).

Figures 8.15b&c suggest a close similarity between the cycling of carbon in SRF and PRF; their main
distinguishing features in this analysis were structural. However, the comparison ignored the

successional processes in each forest, and the different growth patterns and feedbacks implied therein. Feedbacks to changes in climate were also not considered in this thesis, but are needed for longer-term predictions of the terrestrial carbon cycle. The effects in different species of increasing CO\textsubscript{2} concentration on the efficiency of Rubisco, and the consequent effects on the C:N ratio in plant tissue may change the flux of carbon to vegetation, and the relative sizes of the storage components. These effects may be particularly strong at higher temperatures in the tropics (Drake & Dahlman, 1994). Similarly, below-ground production and decomposition in the soil may vary in response to changes in input rates and quality of the fixed organic matter (Zak et al., 1993; Ineson et al., 1995). We have begun to account for the present-day carbon cycle on land; understanding ecosystem feedbacks to climate change is the next major challenge.
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Appendices

APPENDIX A

A1. DESIGN OF SOIL TEMPERATURE PROBE

Copper-constantan junctions were positioned at different levels down a 50 cm plastic rod, and referenced against a known temperature measured using a temperature-calibrated ‘107’ thermistor (Figure A1). All wires were sealed into the plastic rod using epoxy resin. In order to minimise the response time to temperature changes the thermocouple junctions were electrically insulated from the soil by a thin layer of varnish.

Wiring Diagram for Soil Temperature Probes
APPENDIX B

B1. WOODY TISSUE RESPIRATION IN LIGHT AND DARK

The effect on respiration rates of placing a shroud over stem tissue was investigated in Chapter 5 (Table A1). The radiation flux incident to the stem was also measured by placing a PPFD sensor normal to the plane of the stem. An illness prevented the collection of more data.

Table B1. Comparison of CO₂ efflux rates normalised to 24 °C with the chamber shrouded or unshrouded; Q is incident photon flux density. All units: μmol m⁻² s⁻¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Without shroud (in light)</th>
<th>With shroud (in dark)</th>
<th>Maximum Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musanga cecropioides</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trema orientalis</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

C1. THE MEASUREMENT OF PHOTOSYNTHESIS USING THE LCA3

The foliar exchange of CO₂ and water vapour was measured in SRF using a portable infra-red gas analyser, in conjunction with a Parkinson leaf chamber (LCA3 and PLC(N), ADC, Hoddesdon, UK). Air drawn from a 2 m sample line is pumped into the leaf chamber via a 1 dm³ buffer tank and through chemicals that may remove CO₂ (soda lime) or humidify the air (ferrous sulphate). A sample of this ‘reference’ line is also delivered to the optical bench for the measurement of CO₂ concentration and subsequently followed by ‘analysis’ air that has passed through the chamber with the leaf in it. The IRGA works as an open system drawing air continuously through the sample cell. A solenoid switching system delivers air in a four stroke, 10 second sequence: reference air - CO₂ free air - analysis air - CO₂ free air.

The infra-red source emits in the 4.26 μm band; the absorption of this signal varies according to the CO₂ concentration, and is detected by a pyroelectric detector. The absolute sensitivity to water vapour in the 4.26 μm band is very small. Corrections are made for the broadening of the CO₂ absorption band by water vapour, and the dilution of CO₂ by evaporation into the analysis stream. Humidity is measured by two Coreci sensors positioned in the PLC inlet and outlet. They operate as a hygroscopic
polymer film separating two metal electrodes. The capacitance of the polymer changes with humidity, and one of the metal plates is very thinly plated (~0.02 μm) to ensure response times of less than a second. Response times are a little slower at very high humidity (> 85%), and some hysteresis may be experienced. Air and leaf temperature are measured using ‘Betatherm’ precision thermistors, respectively mounted in the chamber head and placed inside the chamber, against a leaf. The software can also be used to calculate leaf temperature from the energy balance (Parkinson, 1983). Radiation is sensed in the 0.4 - 0.7 μm band as photosynthetic photon flux density (Q) using a filtered selenium photocell mounted on top of the chamber.

**Calibration:**

Calibration for CO₂ was carried out in the field using the LCA3 software and gas of a known CO₂ concentration (400 μmol mol⁻¹) that had been pre-prepared using precision mixing pumps (Wösthoff, Germany) in the laboratory in Edinburgh, and then shipped to the field site. Calibration for the humidity sensors was done using a portable precision water vapour generator (Licor 610, Licor, Nebraska, USA). The response of each sensor can be fine-tuned with a small potentiometer located inside the handle of the PLC. The CO₂ calibration tends to be robust over 1 - 3 days, but was checked every morning; the humidity sensors have a tendency to drift and recalibrated up to 4 times a day, before each measurement session.

The leaf temperature sensors were calibrated using standard resistors of 2 kΩ (equivalent to 25 °C), and 1.15 kΩ (equivalent to 40 °C) connected to plugs that were then inserted into the thermistor socket. The air temperature thermistor could not be calibrated. Independent checks were made of the temperature measurements by placing the PLC in a cool box in the shade together with a Cu-Cn thermocouple, and the data logged for 60 minutes.

**Boundary layer resistance and system response time:**

The boundary layer resistance, $r_b$, of a leaf placed in the chamber needs to be measured so that the stomatal resistance (or conductance) can be derived from changes in the water vapour pressure of reference and analysis air. To do this a piece of wet filter paper (i.e., simulating a leaf with no stomatal resistance) was sandwiched between two layers of plastic with a 2 cm² circular hole cut to expose the filter paper, and this was then placed in the chamber as a leaf would be. The mean value obtained for $r_b$ in this chamber was 0.21 m² s mol⁻¹. The response time of the PLC depends on the chamber volume and flow rate used. It is important to know this value as some idea is required of the
time for equilibration after placing a leaf in the chamber. The PLC(N) has a volume of 12 cm³, which at a flow rate of 250 - 300 cm³ min⁻¹ reaches equilibrium after around 30 seconds.

C2. ANALYTICAL SOLUTION FOR \( A_1 \)

Following Farquhar and von Caemmerer (1982), the rate of CO₂ assimilation is found as the minimum of either the Rubisco-limited (\( A_v \)) or electron transport-limited (\( A_j \)) rate. The following gives the derivation for an analytical solution to \( A_v \) and \( A_j \) using \( V, J, g, g, Q, T, \) and \( R_d \) (Lloyd et al., 1995a).

Addressing \( A_v \) first, from Equation 7.1,

\[
A_v = \frac{V_{\text{max}} (C_c - \Gamma^*)}{K_c [1 + pO / K_0] + C_c} - R_d
\]

where \( pO \) is the ambient concentration of oxygen; \( K_c \) and \( K_0 \) are the Michaelis-Menten constants for carboxylation and oxygenation by Rubisco, \( C_c \) is the concentration of CO₂ in the chloroplast, \( \Gamma^* \) is the CO₂ compensation concentration in the absence of dark respiration, and \( R_d \) is the rate of respiration at \( Q = 0 \). \( A_v \) can also be expressed as a function of the internal conductance to CO₂ diffusion (\( g_i \)), as:

\[
A_v = g_i (C_{st} - C_c)
\]

Equation B1

where \( C_{st} \) is the concentration of CO₂ at the site of evaporation within the sub-stomatal cavity. If Equation B1 is combined with 7.1,

\[
A_v + R_d = V_{\text{max}} \left( \frac{C_{st} - A_v / g_i - \Gamma^*}{K_c (1 + pO / K_0) + C_{st} - A_v / g_i} \right)
\]

Equation B2

which can be re-arranged to form Equation B3:

\[
A_v^2 - \left[ g_i K_c \left( 1 + \frac{pO}{K_0} \right) + C_{st} \right] V_{\text{max}} - R_d A_v - R_d g_i \left( K_c \left( 1 + \frac{pO}{K_0} \right) + C_{st} \right) + V_{\text{max}} g_i (C_{st} - \Gamma^*) = 0
\]

This quadratic could now be solved using a standard route, but it is desirable to express \( A_v \) as a function of CO₂ and \( C_a \), rather than \( C_{st} \), and hence an equivalent form of Equation B1 can be written:

\[
A = g_c (C_a - C_c)
\]

Equation B4

where \( g_c \) is the stomatal conductance to CO₂ (\( g_c / 1.6; \) Jarvis, 1976). This can now be combined with Equation B3 to give:
\[ A_v^2 - \left[ g_i \left( \frac{K_c \left( 1 + \frac{pO}{K_o} \right) + C_a - \frac{A_v}{g_c} \right) + V_{\text{max}} - R_d \right] A_v \right] \]

\[-R_d g_i \left( K_c \left( 1 + \frac{pO}{K_o} \right) + C_a - \frac{A_v}{g_c} \right) \]

\[ + V_{\text{max}} g_i \left( C_a + \frac{A_v}{g_c} - \Gamma^* \right) = 0 \]

Equation B5

After further rearrangement a, b, and c can be defined for the standard quadratic, \( aA_v^2 + bA_v + c = 0 \):

\[ a = -g_i - g_c \quad \text{Equation B6a} \]
\[ b = g_i g_c (K_c (1 + pO/K_o) + C_a) + (g_i + g_c)(V_{\text{max}} - R_d) \quad \text{Equation B6b} \]
\[ c = g_i g_c (R_d (K_c (1 + pO/K_o) + C_a) - V_{\text{max}} (C_a - \Gamma^*)) \quad \text{Equation B6c} \]

Addressing \( A_j \), from Equation 7.3,

\[ A_j = \frac{J}{4} \left( \frac{C_e - \Gamma^*}{C_e + 2\Gamma^*} \right) - R_d \]

Equations 7.3 and B1 can be combined to give:

\[ A_j^2 - (g_i (C_{st} + 2\Gamma^*) + J/4 - R_d) A_j - R_d g_i (C_{st} + 2\Gamma^*) + g_i (C_{st} - \Gamma^*) J/4 = 0 \]

Equation B7

And, as before, by substituting Equation B4 into B7, an expression for \( A_j \) can be obtained in terms of conductances to CO2 diffusion, and the underlying metabolism, where \( aA_j^2 + bA_j + c = 0 \), where:

\[ a = -g_i - g_c \quad \text{Equation B8a} \]
\[ b = g_i g_c (C_a + 2\Gamma^*) + (g_i + g_c)(J/4 - R_d) \quad \text{Equation B8b} \]
\[ c = g_i g_c (R_d (C_a + 2\Gamma^*) - J/4 (C_a - \Gamma^*)) \quad \text{Equation B8c} \]

The photosynthetic rate of the leaf is taken as the minimum of the two quadratics given above for \( A_v \) and \( A_j \).
APPENDIX D

D1: FORMULAE USED TO CALCULATE $\lambda$, $e$, $s$, $\rho$, $\gamma$, $\psi_M$ AND $\psi_H$:

i) Latent heat of vaporisation of water vapour,

$$\lambda \ (J \ g^{-1}) = -2.496 \ T + 2501,$$

where $T$ = temperature in °C

Equation D1a

ii) Saturated water vapour pressure (Tetens formula),

$$e_s \ (kPa) = 0.611 \ exp\left(\frac{17.27T}{T+(273.15-36)}\right),$$

where $T$ = temperature in °C.

Equation D1b

iii) Slope of saturation vapour pressure vs temperature (by differentiation of Tetens formula),

$$s \ (Pa \ K^{-1}) = \frac{5004799371}{5000} \ exp\left(\frac{1727}{5} \ \frac{T}{(20T+4743)}\right) \ \frac{P}{(20T+4743)^2}$$

where $T$ = temperature in °C and $P$ is pressure.

Equation D1c

iv) The density of dry air,

$$\rho_s \ (kg \ m^{-3}) = 1.292 - 0.00428T$$

where $T$ = temperature in °C

Equation D1d

v) The psychrometer constant at a given temperature, $T$,

$$\gamma \ (Pa \ K^{-1}) = \frac{P \ c_p}{\left(\frac{M_{H_2O}}{M_{air}}\right) \ \lambda}$$

where $c_p$ is the specific heat of dry air (1012 J kg$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$), $\lambda$ is the latent heat of vaporisation of water vapour, and $M_{H_2O}$ and $M_{air}$ are the molecular weights of water vapour and air respectively.

Equation D1e

vi) As described in section 8.2, the aerodynamic resistance of the canopy, $r_a$, is partly determined by the term $[ln(z_{OM} / z_{OH}) + \psi_M - \psi_H]$ in Equation 8.4. The estimated value for $ln(z_{OM} / z_{OH})$ was 1.5 (Garratt, 1992; Grace et al., 1995a), while $\psi_M$ and $\psi_H$ are defined in unstable conditions as (Paulson, 1970; Lloyd et al., 1995b):
\[ \psi_M = 2 \ln\left(\frac{1 + x}{2}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{1 + x^2}{2}\right) - 2 \tan^{-1} x + \frac{\pi}{2} \]  
Equation D1f

\[ \psi_H = 2 \ln\left(\frac{1 + y}{2}\right) \]  
Equation D1g

where \( x = (1 - 16\xi)^{1/4} \), \( y = (1 - 16\xi)^{1/2} \) and \( \xi = (z - d)/L \), where \( z \) is the reference height above the ground, \( d \) is the zero place displacement, and \( L \) is the Monin-Obukhov length,

\[ L = \frac{-\left(u^* T c_p \rho_a\right)}{(k g H)} \]  
Equation D1h

where \( u^* \) is the friction velocity, \( T \) is air temperature, \( c_p \) is the heat capacity dry air, \( \rho_a \) is the density of dry air, \( k \) is von Karmen's constant (-0.41), \( g \) is acceleration due to gravity, and \( H \) is the sensible heat flux. In stable conditions it is assumed that \( \psi_M = \psi_H = -5\xi \) (Garratt, 1992; Lloyd et al., 1995b).

**D2. EMPIRICAL RELATIONSHIPS USED TO OBTAIN IN-CANOPY METEOROLOGICAL VARIABLES**

All in-canopy variables were derived from above-canopy measurements using empirical relationships based on short-term in-canopy measurements in SRF.

1) In-canopy air temperature, \( T \), and woody tissue temperature, \( T_w \), was related to above canopy temperature, \( T_c \), using a series of regressions (Tables D2.i.a & D2.i.b); no in-canopy measurements of \( T \) were made at 7 m or 22 m, so values for those heights were estimated as the mean of the two neighbouring measurements.

**Table D2.i.a.** Regressions relating \( T \) at height, \( h \) (m), with \( T_c \). Data are given for measured heights at 1 m, 15 m, 33 m and 46 m; temperature units are in °C. The form of the equation is \( T_h = aT_c + b \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( h )</th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6586</td>
<td>6.452</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9552</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.9941</td>
<td>-0.856</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.9632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table D2.i.b. Regressions relating $T_w$ at height, $h$ (m) with $T_c$. Data are given for five measured heights, at 8 m, 12 m, 20 m, 30 m and 40 m; temperature units are in °C. The form of the equation incorporates a lag to account for the heat capacity of woody tissue: $T_w = (\cos (t + a)) b + cT_c + dT_c^2 + e$, where $t$ is time in radians ($\pi$ rads = midday).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$c$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$e$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-4.57</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) In-canopy air vapour pressure deficit, $D$, was related to above-canopy vapour pressure deficit, $D_c$, using a similar procedure to that for temperature (Table D2.ii).

Table D2.iii. Regressions relating $D$ at height, $h$ (m), with $D_c$. Data are given for measured heights at 1 m, 15 m, 33 m and 46 m; $D$ units are in mol mol$^{-1}$. The form of the equation is $D = aD_c + b$, except for $D$ at $h = 1$ m, where a quadratic fitted the data better: $D (at h=1 m) = aD_c^2 + b$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.64</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9854</td>
<td>2.05x10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.0318</td>
<td>1.36x10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.9687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) In-canopy daytime CO$_2$ concentration, $C_a$, was driven from above canopy CO$_2$ concentration, $C_{ac}$. $C_a$ from 7 m to $C_{ac}$ was assumed to be identical between 0900 hrs and 1600 hrs (i.e., the mean profile was vertical; see Figure 8.4); for the times between 0600 hrs - 0800 hrs and 1700 hrs - 1900 hrs regressions by height were used to predict mean $C_a$ ($C_a^*$) between 7 m and the canopy-top (Table D2.iii.a). $C_a$ at 1 m was defined for each hour as a mean constant fraction of $C_a$ at 7 m (Table D2.iii.b).

Table D2.iii.a. Regressions fitted to estimate $C_a^*$ at height $h$ (m) between 7 m and the canopy-top ($C_{ac}$) for hours when the $C_a$ profile was not vertical. The form of the regression is $C_a^* = ah + b$; $C_a$ units are µmol mol$^{-1}$, where $n$ represents average concentrations (mean of 24 measurements) for each of 5 heights (Figure 8.4). Estimates of $C_a$ for a specific hour were then calculated according to: $C_a = (C_{ac} / C_a^*)C_a^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>452.3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>436.8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>405.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>376.3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>385.1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>398.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D2.iii.b. The mean proportional increase, $x$, in $C_a^*$ from 7 m to 1 m for individual hours between 0600 hrs - 1900 hrs; $C_{a(7m)} = x C_{a(1m)}$, units for $C_a = \mu$mol mol$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>0600</th>
<th>0700</th>
<th>0800</th>
<th>0900</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>1200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1400</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) In-canopy $Q$ was driven from above-canopy measurements, $Q_a$. The extinction in mean $Q$, ($Q^*$), with height, $h$, was linearised using a ln$Q$ transformation. Data from three different groups of hours were found to show similar extinction patterns with height (section 8.3). Regressions were fitted to these data to permit the estimation of $Q^*$ at height $h$, $Q_h^*$; $Q_h$ for specific hours was calculated by scaling $Q_h^*$ according to the difference between measured $Q_a$ and $Q_h^*$ at $h$ = the canopy-top (Table D2.iv).

Table D2.iv. Regressions between ln$Q^*$ and height, $h$ (m), for three groupings of hours. The form of the regression is $\ln Q_h^* = bh + c$. $Q_h$ can now be estimated according to Equation 8.2, where $Q_h = \exp[a(bh + c)]$, or $Q_h = \exp[a \ln Q_h^*]$. Units for $Q$ are in $\mu$mol quanta m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour groupings</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$c$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600, 0700, 1800</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800, 0900, 1600, 1700</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1500 inclusive</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX E**

Table E1. List of all species in SRF and PRF upon which gas exchange measurements were made.

(1) PRF, BRAZIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacardiaceae</td>
<td>Astronium lecointei Ducke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Xylopia sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arecaceae</td>
<td>Orbignya speciosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Protium polybotrium (Turcz) Engl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysobalanaceae</td>
<td>Licania sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Hironima sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythroxylaceae</td>
<td>Erythroxylum c.f. microcarpum Mart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauraceae</td>
<td>Ocotea cf caudata (Nees.) Mez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecythidaceae</td>
<td>Bertoletia sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae, Caes.</td>
<td>Sclerolobium sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annonaceae</td>
<td>Xylopia etiopica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>Vernononia conferta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Santira trimera (Oliv.) Aubr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combretaceae</td>
<td>Terminalia superba Engl. &amp; Diels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichapetalaceae</td>
<td>Dichapetalum sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Caes</td>
<td>Amphilas pterocarpoides Harms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Caes</td>
<td>Distemonanthus benthamianus Baill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminoseae; Pap.</td>
<td>Piercarpus soyauxii Taub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icacinaceae</td>
<td>Desmostachys tenuifoliis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingaceae</td>
<td>Desbordesia glaucescens (Engl.) Van Tiegh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingaceae</td>
<td>Kainedoxa gabonensis Pierre ex Engl. var oblongifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Trichilia sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marantaceae</td>
<td>Haumaniana dankanelmaniana M-Redh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marantaceae</td>
<td>Megaphrynium macrostachyum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marantaceae</td>
<td>Hypsodelphis violacea (Ridl.) M-Redh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Musanga cecropoides R.Br.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Coelocaryon preuzii Warburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myristicaceae</td>
<td>Staudia stipitata Warburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochnaceae</td>
<td>Lophira alata Banks ex Gaertn.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olacaceae</td>
<td>Panda oleosa Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Triplochion scleroxylon K. Schum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Celis adolfi-friderici Engl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Celis mildbraedi Engl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmaceae</td>
<td>Trema orientalis (Linn.) Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbenaceae</td>
<td>Vitex grandifolia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>