

Optimal set of leaf and aboveground tree elements for predicting forest functioning

Écio Souza Diniz¹, Eladio Rodríguez Penedo¹, Roger Grau-Andrés¹, Jordi Vayreda¹, Marcos Fernández-Martínez¹,

¹ CREAM, Centre de Recerca Ecològica i Aplicacions Forestals, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Correspondence to: Écio Souza Diniz (eciodiniz@gmail.com) and Marcos Fernández-Martínez (m.fernandez@creaf.cat)

Abstract. The role played by environmental factors in the functioning of forest ecosystems is relatively well known. However, the potential of the elemental composition of trees (i.e., elementomes) as a predictor of forest functioning remains elusive. We assessed the predictive power of elemental composition from different perspectives: testing whether aboveground element stocks or concentrations explain forest production and productivity (i.e., production per unit of standing biomass) better than leaf elements or environmental factors; identifying the optimal set (combination and quantity) of elements that best predicts forest functioning. To do so, we used a forest inventory of 2000 plots in the northeast of the Iberian Peninsula, containing in-site information about the elementomes (C, Ca, K, Mg, N, Na, P, and S) of leaves, branches, stems and barks, in addition to annual biomass production per organ. We found that models using leaf element stocks as predictors achieve the highest explained variation in forest production. The optimal dimensionality was achieved by combining the foliar stocks of C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, and interactions (C×N, C×P, and N×P). Forest biomass productivity was best predicted by forest age. Hence, our results indicate that leaf element stocks are better predictors of forest biomass production than aboveground element concentrations or stocks, thus hinting toward leaf measurements as critical factors for predicting variations in forest biomass production.

1 Introduction

Environmental conditions influence the assembly of tree communities, thus forming different forest types across distinct environmental gradients, e.g., climate and soil variation (Chu et al., 2019; Sardans et al., 2016). Soil nutrient availability (e.g., N, P, K) directly affects tree growth and is thus a key regulator of global forest productivity and forest biomass accumulation (Batjes, 1996; Wiesmeier et al. 2019). The stocks of soil nutrients are influenced by the climatic conditions that drive water availability, temperature-dependent nutrient cycling, and soil organic matter decomposition rates (Zhang et al. 2018c; Mensah et al., 2023). Such environmental conditions encompass specific niches (e.g., climatic and soil conditions) and then drive functional adaptations of the species (e.g., morphology or physiology traits) (Lavorel et al., 2007; Augusto et al. 2017; Wang et al., 2022). As the backbone of functional adaptations to such niches, the concentration of elements (e.g., C, N, and P, amongst others) in organisms is a key factor driving ecosystem structure and functioning (Fernández-

32 Martínez, 2022; Peñuelas et al., 2019). Element concentrations in tree biomass vary along environmental gradients, species,
33 and forest age, which are key drivers of forest functioning (Santiago et al., 2004; Sardans and Peñuelas, 2014). Therefore,
34 investigating the combination and concentration of distinct elements is vital to better understanding forest functioning (e.g.,
35 biomass production).

36 The multi-dimensional concentration of elements of an organism has been defined as the elementome (Peñuelas et
37 al., 2019). Assessing the elementomes of different species allows for a better understanding of how they withstand contrasting
38 environmental conditions since their ecological strategies rely on different element concentrations and functional traits
39 (Peñuelas et al., 2019; Fernández-Martínez, 2022; Reich and Oleksyn, 2004). Within plant elementomes, the importance of
40 the concentrations of C in plants is paramount because it acts as an energy store and provides structure, representing most of
41 the plant biomass, i.e., around 46% in leaves, 47% in stems, 45% in bark and wood, and 45% in roots. (Thomas and Martin,
42 2012; Ma et al., 2017). The concentrations of other elements like N and P play significant roles in plant nutrition and metabolic
43 processes and act synergistically with C (Taiz et al. 2014). For example, N is essential for protein synthesis and chlorophyll
44 formation, directly affecting photosynthesis and carbon fixation, while P regulates energy transfer via ATP, impacting carbon
45 assimilation and growth (Hawkesford et al., 2012). Further, considering that the concentrations of elementomes differ across
46 species and populations in response to environmental gradients, forest ecosystems distributed over climatic gradients are
47 expected to vary in both their species composition and elementomes (Sardans et al., 2021; Vallicrosa et al., 2022).

48 Most studies analyzing ecosystem productivity found significant correlations with leaf elementomes (Fernández-
49 Martínez et al., 2020; Šímová et al., 2019; Yan et al., 2023). However, aboveground or whole organism (including roots)
50 elementomes should be more strongly correlated with forest functioning (e.g., forest production in biomass) since they
51 encompass information about several functional traits other than those related to leaves (Schreeg et al., 2014; Xing et al., 2022;
52 Zhang et al., 2018a). For example, positive relationships between N and P concentrations in different plant organs (e.g., roots,
53 stems, branches, and leaves) are essential for tree growth and productivity (Ding et al., 2022). Thus, to consider the
54 concentrations of aboveground elementomes, one should calculate them by weighing the elementomes of different organs by
55 their relative biomass (Fernández-Martínez, 2022). However, to date, no study has assessed or compared the predictive
56 performance of leaf versus whole or aboveground organism elementomes in predicting forest functioning.

57 Considering elements (concentrations and stocks) of the entire aboveground biomass and leaves only may contribute
58 to enhancing the understanding of ecosystem processes (Luo et al., 2020; Rocha et al., 2011). Forest biomass production (i.e.,
59 the overall total amount of biomass accumulated over an area in a given period) is influenced by the concentration of elements
60 the plants store (Dar and Parthasarathy, 2022; Ullah et al., 2024). Fine roots, for example, influence tree nutrient stocks since
61 they regulate processes like water absorption and nutrient uptake from the soil (Likulunga. et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022).
62 Further, tree elemental concentrations (e.g., from aboveground organs) significantly impact ecosystem productivity (Bitomský
63 et al., 2023; Elser et al., 2010). Therefore, elemental concentrations and stocks also contribute to forest biomass productivity
64 — a unit of biomass (e.g., per area and year) produced per unit of standing biomass that reflects ecosystem efficiency
65 (Margalef, 1998; Lartigue and Cebrian, 2012).

66 Forest biomass productivity is also affected by the variation of elementomes in different stand ages, e.g., limited N
67 and P content in older stands (Zhang et al., 2018a; Zhang et al., 2022). Different stand ages also shape the tree element stocks
68 (i.e., elements stored within the biomass) in tree organs (Hoover and Smith, 2023; Rodríguez-Soalleiro et al., 2018). The
69 variability of plant nutrient stocks, particularly C, N, and P, determines how trees allocate resources between roots and
70 aboveground organs, ultimately impacting their biomass growth (Yan et al. 2016; Li et al. 2024). Therefore, assessing the
71 effects of tree nutrient stocks on forest biomass contributes to a better understanding of their adaptation to varying nutrient and
72 environmental conditions (Peng et al., 2020). Nevertheless, the predictive performance of elementomes compared to element
73 stocks in explaining forest functioning remains scarcely understood. Furthermore, it remains unexplored whether elementomes
74 and element stocks predict forest functioning better than environmental factors (e.g., climate) and stand age.

75 Finally, the optimal elemental set (OES) — the minimum set (number and combination) of elements — for achieving
76 the best prediction of organism and ecosystem functioning in general remains elusive. Most studies investigating elementomes
77 in forested ecosystems only focused on C, N, P, and K (Sardans et al., 2017; Schreeg et al., 2014; Vallicrosa et al., 2022; Xing
78 et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2018b), while fewer ones have also included other important elements for the functioning of
79 organisms and forest ecosystems, like Ca, S, and Mg (Sardans et al., 2016; Sardans et al., 2021, 2015; Bai et al., 2019; Huang
80 et al., 2019). Acquiring knowledge on forest OES can improve predictions of forest functioning by increasing our mechanistic
81 knowledge of how organisms and forest ecosystems work.

82 In this study, we used a database including forest elemental composition and biomass growth in the northeast of the
83 Iberian Peninsula. This region is a suitable model for investigating topics related to OES, as it is composed of a notable
84 environmental gradient (e.g., wide variations in climate and altitude) that influences the formation of distinct forest types
85 (Sardans and Peñuelas, 2014). Variations in climate, soil nutrients, and species composition lead to differences in plant
86 stoichiometry (e.g., balance in the C, N, and P) across distinct forest types, thus affecting their growth rates and biomass
87 accumulation (Sardans and Peñuelas, 2014; Shi et al., 2016). Therefore, environmental gradients, such as the cited study region,
88 allow for more robust assessments of general trends in the influence of OES on forest biomass growth. We aimed to answer
89 four questions: Q1-Are the aboveground elements (elementomes and stocks) better predictors of forest functioning (biomass
90 production and productivity) than only leaf elements? Q2-Do element stocks better explain forest functioning than
91 elementomes? Q3-Do element stocks and elementomes (leaf and aboveground) explain better forest functioning than
92 environmental factors and stand age? Q4-What is the OES that best predicts forest functioning? Related to these questions, we
93 established three central hypotheses.: H1: Aboveground elements (elementomes and stocks) are better predictors of forest
94 functioning (biomass production and productivity) than only leaf elements (Q1); H2: Element stocks better explain functioning
95 than elementomes, as the former incorporates the effect of growth, while also encompasses effects of factors such as age and
96 hidden limitations (e.g., carbon saturation, nutrient limitation), in forest functioning (Q2, Q3); H3: OES effects in forest
97 biomass production and productivity models are greater in models using whole organisms than leaf elementomes (Q4).
98 Answering the questions above can contribute significantly to enhancing the knowledge about the role of plant elementomes

99 in forest growth while providing practical insights for researchers and managers on which type of elemental data (e.g.,
100 aboveground elements or only leaves' elements) to collect and assess.

101

102 **2 Material and Methods**

103

104 **2.1 Study Area**

105

106 This study was conducted across the northeast of the Iberian Peninsula (ca. 31,900 km²), bounded in the north by the
107 Pyrenees and in the east by the Mediterranean Sea. We chose this region due to its heterogeneous climatic conditions associated
108 with large ranges in altitude (i.e., 0 to > 3000 m) and distance from the sea, which together result in wide variations in mean
109 annual temperature (from 1 °C to 28 °C) and precipitation (annual mean from 350 to >1500 mm) (Martín Vide et al., 2008).
110 Further, the forests in this region exhibit a diverse range of soil types, predominating cambisols, fluvisols, regosols, and
111 leptosols (Soil Atlas of Europe, 2006; ICGC, 2019), with variations in organic matter and moisture content depending on the
112 specific forest area (Selkimäki et al., 2011). The Mediterranean climate is mostly characterized by mild winters, dry and warm
113 summers, and a high degree of interannual variability in precipitation. Such an array of environmental conditions in the study
114 region displays significant roles in variation in elemental allocation (e.g., N, P, K), thus influencing the nutrient stocks across
115 forest types (Sardans and Peñuelas, 2014). These pronounced climatic and soil gradients allow for the establishment of three
116 predominant forest types: Mediterranean evergreen angiosperm forests (dominated by *Quercus ilex* trees), Mediterranean
117 gymnosperms (stands of *Pinus halepensis*, *Pinus nigra*, *Pinus pinea*, *Pinus sylvestris*, *Pinus uncinata*, and often with *Quercus*
118 *petraea* and *Q. ilex* among them), and wet temperate deciduous angiosperms (with *Fagus sylvatica*, *Quercus faginea*, *Quercus*
119 *robur*, *Q. petraea*, *Abies alba*, and *P. sylvestris* dominating at altitudes from 800 to 1500 m and *P. uncinata* from 1600 to 2400
120 m) (García et al., 2004; Bolòs i Capdevila, 1991).

121

122 **2.2 Forest Inventory and Elemental Data**

123

124 We used the Ecological and Forest Inventory of Catalonia (IEFC) database, originally sampled in the period 1989-
125 1996 (Gracia et al., 2004) (<http://www.creaf.uab.es/iefc>). This database includes data on tree diameter, basal area, biomass,
126 and annual forest production of leaves, branches, barks, and stems, as well as the corresponding elemental composition of
127 these organs. The forest sites from which we compiled the data represent sampling plots (10 m radius) distributed throughout
128 Catalonia. The sampling was conducted at a density of one plot per square kilometer (sq km) of natural or managed forest
129 (Gracia et al., 2004). For plots having more than five tree species, only the five most abundant ones (DBH > 5 cm) were
130 recorded, and a tree core sample was used to calculate the stand age and annual tree growth over the last five years (Vilà et al.,
131 2003). The estimation of branch and leaf biomass was based on normalized dimensional analysis (Duvigneaud, 1971;
132 Whittaker and Woodwell, 1969). The concentrations of the elements, i.e., elementomes (N, C, P, K, S, Mg, and Ca), of the

133 individuals of each species were measured for samples of the entire set of aboveground organs (i.e., wood, bark, branches, and
134 leaves) by drying and grinding them to obtain homogeneous samples (Vayreda et al., 2016). Then, from an anhydrous
135 subsample (oven-dried at 75 °C) and of known weight, the concentration of nutrients was determined. The concentrations of
136 C and N were determined by gas combustion chromatography in a C.E. elemental analyzer INSTRUMENTS (Wigan, UK).
137 The concentrations of P, S, Mg, Ca, and K were determined by Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) in a Jobin Yvon JI-38
138 spectrophotometer (Edison, USES) (Vayreda et al., 2016). A complete description of the methods employed in this forest
139 inventory (e.g., sampling procedures, allometric equations, data processing, etc.) can be found in Gracia et al. (2004).

140 From the IEFC dataset, we extracted the data regarding forest stand ages, biomass of tree individual organs, forest
141 biomass production, and concentration of N, C, P, K, S, Mg, and Ca available for 2227 tree individuals (with a diameter at
142 breast height (DBH) > 5 cm) from 48 species located in 2000 plots. The stand age is expressed in years and was obtained from
143 the growth rings of tree wood cores in each plot (Gracia et al., 2004). In each plot, a core was taken from a tree that represented
144 the center of the size class (diametric class), which was defined from each 5 cm increment DBH (e.g., 5–10 cm; 15–20 cm;
145 20–25 cm, etc.). Finally, it was calculated as the weighted average of the stand age based on the number of trees per DBH
146 class. The elementomes of the trees were obtained for aboveground organs: leaves, branches, barks, and stems (data for roots
147 are missing in the inventory). To access see in detail the procedures, parameters, and allometric equations used to calculate the
148 biomass of each organ, please see the methodological details of the IEFC described in Gracia et al. (2004). In our analysis, we
149 used forest biomass production calculated considering the following equation:

150

$$151 \quad P = (Bt^2 - Bt^1)/5,$$

152

153 where Bt^2 is the current biomass ($t \text{ ha}^{-1}$: tons per hectare) per area and Bt^1 is the biomass 5 years before (Vayreda et
154 al., 2005; Vilà et al., 2003). Thus, forest production responds to the net increase in biomass in the ecosystem per year ($t \text{ ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$).
155 Further, to obtain forest productivity (production per unit of standing biomass, y^{-1}), we summed the biomass of tree organs
156 (leaves, branches, bark, and stem wood) to get the whole aboveground tree biomass. Then, we divided forest production by
157 the aboveground tree biomass. Therefore, we emphasize that in our study, forest biomass production and productivity were
158 measured considering only aboveground tree organs.

159 For our analyses (see section Statistical Analyses), we used values of concentration (g/100 g) and stocks of N, C, P,
160 K, S, Mg, and Ca for only leaves and the entire set of aboveground organs. The aboveground elementomes were calculated as
161 the weighted average of the elemental concentration ($g \text{ } 100 \text{ g}^{-1}$) of the different plant organs. The stocks ($t \text{ ha}^{-1}$) of the elements
162 per organ were calculated as the biomass of the organ multiplied by the concentration of the element. Finally, we summed the
163 values of the stocks of each element from the different organs to obtain the aboveground stock.

164

165

166

167 2.3 Climatic Data

168 For each forest plot, we acquired data on the 19 bioclimatic variables provided by the WorldClim database version 2
169 at a very high spatial resolution (approximately 1 km²) (Fick and Hijmans, 2017). From the 19 variables, we selected only the
170 ones with coefficients of correlation < 0.70 (Dormann et al., 2013) to avoid biasing the statistical models (see the section
171 Statistical Analysis) due to multicollinearity. Our final set of climatic variables was composed of temperature seasonality,
172 mean temperature of the wettest quarter (three months), precipitation of the wettest month, precipitation of the driest quarter,
173 precipitation of the warmest quarter, and precipitation of the coldest quarter.

175 2.4 Statistical Analysis

176
177 To test our hypothesis on the highest performance of aboveground elementomes and element stocks for predicting
178 forest functioning (biomass production and productivity) compared to leaves or to environmental variables (climate) and stand
179 age, we first constructed gaussian generalized additive mixed models (GAMM) using the R package “mgcv” (Wood, 2017).
180 For predicting forest biomass production, we used five different models characterized by the following sets of predictors: i)
181 aboveground elementomes; ii) aboveground element stocks; iii–iv) the same as items i and ii but for the leaves; and v) the
182 environment (climate) and stand age. To predict forest productivity, we used three different models with the following sets of
183 predictors: i) elementomes of the leaves; ii) aboveground elementomes; and iii) the environment and stand age. The predictors
184 representing elementomes and element stocks were N, C, P, K, S, Mg, Ca, and the interactions C×P, C×N, and N×P. For forest
185 productivity, stocks were not included as predictors to avoid statistical redundancy since the productivity calculation involves
186 the sum of organ biomass and stocks also use organ biomass (details in the Forest Inventory and Elemental Data section).

187 To adequately fit the GAMMs and eliminate spatial autocorrelation effects on the residuals, we included the
188 coordinates (longitude and latitude) of the forest plots as fixed smooth terms with Duchon splines (Duchon, 1977; Wood,
189 2003), while also adding species as random effects. This approach guaranteed that the degrees of freedom of the spline
190 functions (Edf) were correctly fitted according to the required number of knots (k) for the GAMMs to reach residual
191 independence. To verify whether potential spatial effects were sufficiently eliminated, the residuals extracted from the
192 GAMMs were modeled in spatial variograms using the function “fit.variogram” of the R package “gstat” (Pebesma, 2004).
193 We found no significant remaining spatial effect on the residuals of the models. Further, to achieve the normality of the
194 residuals, we transformed the target forest production into its natural logarithm in all models. For the proper fit and convergence
195 of the models regarding forest biomass productivity, we normalized (mean divided by the standard deviation) all elementomes
196 using the built-in “scale” R function.

197 To find the OES of the elementomes for predicting forest production and productivity and to discern whether leaf or
198 aboveground elementomes work better for this purpose, we performed a model selection procedure based on the Akaike
199 information criterion (AIC) (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). Such procedure consisted of including the global GAMMs (with
200 the same eight models above described: five for production and three for productivity) in the function “dredge” of the “MuMIn”

201 package (Bartoń, 2023) in the R programming environment version 4.3.3 (R Development Team Core, 2024). The use of the
202 minimum AIC selection procedure allowed us to extract the best combinations (subsets) of predictors from our global models
203 to predict forest functioning. We applied the same selection procedure to models with the environment and age as predictors.
204 In all selections, we considered the subsets with the lowest AIC values as the best models.

205 We also considered all subsets of selected models with delta (ΔAIC) < 4 as equally robust and statistically reliable,
206 thus allowing us to retain relevant and valuable information beyond single-best models (Burnham et al., 2011). From these
207 subsets ($\Delta AIC < 4$), we extracted information on the performance of the models (R-squared) and the number of variables they
208 selected. Then, we assessed the predictive performance (R-squared: R^2) by accessing the models' outputs in two ways: by the
209 subset models according to the number of selected predictors and by the overall performance only of the single best models.
210 This two-way performance ranking allowed us to compare the performance of only the single best models (lowest AICs) with
211 sets of models equally reliable ($\Delta AIC < 4$).

212 Finally, to obtain a reliable overview of which were the most important variables (e.g., elements concentration and
213 stocks) for explaining forest functioning, we performed model averaging for models with $\Delta AIC < 4$ using the function
214 "model.avg" of the "MuMIn" package (Bartoń, 2023) in R 4.3.3. We used the argument "beta=TRUE" to standardize the
215 coefficients, allowing for a comparison of the relative importance of each predictor variable in the average models. Model
216 averaging computes an average model output from the estimates of a set of models and weights their relative importance by
217 their AIC (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). Therefore, this approach allowed us to obtain information on the importance of
218 predictor variables extracted from the best model subsets (i.e., $\Delta AIC < 4$).

219 The complete routine with the codes used to execute the models described and presented in this study can be accessed
220 in Diniz (2024).


221

222 3 Results

223

224 By assessing the predictive performance of the best single models (lowest AIC; Table A1, Appendix A), we answered
225 the questions regarding the performance of the aboveground (elementomes and stocks) vs. leaves and of the elementomes vs.
226 stocks for explaining forest functioning. Our results indicated that leaves (rather than aboveground) and stocks (rather than
227 elementomes) are the best predictors of forest biomass production and productivity. We found that the best model of forest
228 biomass production using leaf element stocks as predictors explained 58% of the variance and had nine variables: C, Ca, K,
229 Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P (Fig. 1a). The second-best model explained 28% of the variance of forest biomass production
230 (Fig. 1a) and had three aboveground element stocks as predictors (C, N, and C×N). Regarding the best models of forest
231 production, including elementomes as predictors, we found that leaf elementomes also explained more variance (22%) than
232 aboveground elementomes (13%) (Fig. 1a). The best leaf elementome model included six variables (C, Ca, N, P, C×P, and
233 N×P), and the best aboveground elementome model included only one (Ca). Forest biomass productivity was best predicted
234 by the model with climate and stand age as predictors (Fig. 1c, d). Secondarily, between leaf elementomes (Ca, K, and N) and


235 aboveground elementomes (K), the first ones were the best predictors of forest biomass productivity (Fig. 1c; 28% of variance
 236 explained).



237
 238 **Figure 1: R^2 and AIC of the best models for explaining forest biomass production (a, b) and productivity (c, d),**
 239 **considering as predictors the stocks and the concentration of elements only for the leaves and for the entire set of**
 240 **aboveground plant organs, and climate and forest age. Numbers within the bars show the number of variables selected.**
 241 **ABG concentration = aboveground elementomes.**

242
 243 Our subsets of models, equally robust ($\Delta AIC < 4$), showed that the optimal elemental set (OES) for predicting forest
 244 biomass production from leaf element stocks (Fig. 2a) was nine variables (C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P). This
 245 model subset explained an average of 58% of the variance in forest biomass production. The subset of models using
 246 aboveground element stocks exhibited the second-best predictive performance for forest biomass production ($R^2 = 0.29$; Fig.
 247 A1, Appendix A). Differently, the subset of models using climatic variables and aboveground elementomes as predictors
 248 displayed the lowest prediction of forest biomass production (Fig. A1). The variance of forest productivity was moderately
 249 explained (28%) by models selecting three variables (Ca, K, and N) of leaf elementomes (Fig. 1c, d) and poorly explained
 250 (15%) by models with aboveground elementomes (Fig. A2, Appendix A). Forest productivity was best explained ($R^2 = 0.68$)
 251 with the subset of models that included two variables (temperature seasonality and stand age) (Fig. A2).

252 We also found that climate and stand age (Fig. A1, Appendix A) explained 21% of the variance in forest biomass
 253 production, while leaf element stocks explained 58% (Fig. 1a and 2a). On the other hand, the best subset of models that had
 254 forest age and temperature seasonality as predictors displayed the best performance and explained 62% of the variance in forest
 255 biomass productivity (Fig. A2, Appendix A).



256
 257 **Figure 2: Forest biomass production (a, b) and productivity (c, d) predicted by leaf element stocks (a, b) and leaf**
 258 **element concentration (c, d). Results demonstrated by the performance (AIC and R^2) of the most robust subsets of**
 259 **models ($\Delta AIC < 4$).**

260
 261 The information contained in Figures 3, 4, and A3 outlines the importance of individual elements (concentrations and
 262 stocks) in contributing to the performance of models in predicting forest functioning. The average models are based on different
 263 subsets of variables (i.e., leaves vs. aboveground elementomes and stocks, and elementomes vs. stocks; Table A2, Appendix
 264 A) and demonstrated that P, Ca, and N — from both models based exclusively on leaf element stock and models only with
 265 leaf elementomes — are the most important predictors for explaining spatial variability in forest production (Fig. 3 a, c; Fig.
 266 A3, Appendix A). Conversely, the aboveground elementomes and element stocks of the P exerted a low and non-significant

influence on forest biomass production (Fig. 3 b, d). N stocks (leaves and aboveground) and N leaf concentration were positively correlated to forest biomass production (Figures 3 a, b, and c, respectively; Fig. S3). On the other hand, in leaves, the interactions N×P (Fig. 3a) and C×P (Fig. 3c) and the concentration of C (Fig. 3 c) exerted a significant and negative effect on biomass production. The negative interaction of N×P indicated that the higher the value of P, the lower the effect of N on biomass production. Similarly, the negative interaction of C×P implied that higher values of P reduce the effect of C on biomass production. The average models using leaf and aboveground predictors did not significantly predict forest biomass productivity (Fig. 4).




Figure 3: Standardized coefficients from the model averaging ($\Delta AIC < 4$) for the prediction and explanation of forest biomass production, considering as predictors the stocks (a, b) and the concentration (c, d) of elements only for the leaves (a, c) and for the entire set of aboveground plant organs (b, d). R^2 is the average of R-squared derived from all models with $\Delta AIC < 4$. ABG element concentration = Aboveground element concentration. * Indicates significant coefficient.

Climatic variables also displayed significant effects on forest biomass production. Temperature seasonality and precipitation in the coldest quarter were negatively correlated with biomass production (Fig. 5a). Conversely, precipitation in the driest quarter correlated positively with biomass production (Fig. 5a). However, forest biomass productivity was not influenced by climate but decreased significantly with stand age (Fig. 5b).




Figure 4: Standardized coefficients from the model averaging ($\Delta AIC < 4$) for the prediction of forest biomass productivity, considering as predictors the concentration of elements only for the leaves (a) and for the entire set of aboveground plant organs (b). R^2 is the average of R squared derived from all models with $\Delta AIC < 4$. ABG element concentration = Aboveground element concentration.




Figure 5: Standardized coefficients from the model averaging ($\Delta AIC < 4$) for the prediction of forest biomass production (a) and productivity (b), considering as predictors climate variables and stand age. Temp. Wet. Quarter: Mean temperature of the wettest quarter; Temp. Seasonality: Temperature Seasonality; Precip. Cold. Quarter: Precipitation of Coldest Quarter; Precip. Warm. Quarter: Precipitation of Warmest Quarter; Precip. Dry. Quarter: Precipitation of Driest Quarter; Precip. Wet. Month: Precipitation of Wettest Month. R^2 was averaged from all models with $\Delta AIC < 4$.

300 4 Discussion

301

302 We refuted the hypothesis that using aboveground elementomes and element stocks predicts forest biomass
303 production better than leaf elementomes and element stocks alone. Models including nine leaf element stocks (C, Ca, K, Mg,
304 N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P) displayed the highest performance in predicting forest biomass production. On the other hand,
305 stand age was the best predictor of forest biomass productivity. Altogether, these findings suggest that forest production can
306 be best predicted by foliar element stocks and biomass productivity by stand age. Further, our average models indicate that
307 changes in forest biomass production are mostly explained by concentrations and stocks of Ca, P, and N.

308 Our finding that leaf element stocks are the main predictors of forest biomass production was unexpected. Since the
309 aboveground level considers different parts of the plant (e.g., stems, branches, bark) that require different nutrient
310 concentrations to exert distinct functions (e.g., uptake, transport, storage), we could expect that using aboveground element
311 concentrations and aboveground stocks would have higher predictive performance (Zhang et al., 2018; Delpiano et al., 2020;
312 Sardans et al., 2023) than only using elements of leaves. However, even though the leaves do not encompass the whole
313 functional space of a tree, they represent the essential photosynthetic part of a plant and the capability of rapid nutrient cycling
314 and responsiveness to environmental conditions (Foster & Bhatti, 2020). For instance, N and P, the most important elements
315 limiting plant growth, are more readily available in leaves for use in metabolic (e.g., growth) and ecosystem processes (e.g.,
316 biomass production) than in other organs (Liu et al., 2019; Roth-Nebelsick & Krause, 2023; Töpfer, 2021). Thus, the practical
317 implication of our results for further studies is that foliar element stocks may hold sufficient information to derive robust
318 predictions of forest functioning.

319 Foliar nutrient stocks are crucial for enhancing plant fitness by enhancing photosynthesis and thus biomass production
320 (Gilliam et al., 2011; Taiz et al., 2014; Beechey-Gradwell et al., 2020). Sufficient reserves of macronutrients such as K, Ca,
321 and Mg in specific leaf cell types are also vital for plant growth (Gilliam et al., 2011). The positive effect of the combination
322 of stored elements on growth is indicated by our best model for biomass production, which had as predictors the foliar stocks
323 of C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P. Further, our average models also indicated the leaf stocks of Ca, P, and N as the
324 most important predictors of forest biomass production.

325 The superior performance of leaf element stocks, compared to aboveground element stocks and concentrations, also
326 might be due to suitable environmental conditions resulting in increased foliar biomass (Rodríguez-Soalleiro et al., 2018b;
327 Urbina et al., 2011). In suitable climatic conditions (e.g., high precipitation), plant growth might be positively affected by high
328 concentrations of foliar N and P (Kerkhoff et al., 2005; P. Reich and Oleksyn, 2004; Sardans and Peñuelas, 2014). We found
329 a positive effect of precipitation in the driest quarters, N and P, on forest biomass production. Since, during summer, most of
330 the territory addressed in this study coincides with high temperatures and marked water stress (Martín Vide et al., 2008), plants
331 may invest in a strategy of retaining larger foliar nutrient reserves to cope with drought (Waring, 1987.; Gessler et al., 2017).
332 Increased precipitation might enhance the foliar nutrients stored in drier periods, thus contributing positively to aboveground
333 biomass production (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2017; Lie et al., 2018; Roa-Fuentes et al., 2012). In our study region, high

334 water availability (e.g., precipitation) correlates positively with mineralization, which enhances the nutrient availability to trees
335 and contributes to increasing their biomass (Sardans et al., 2008).

336 The highest predictive performance was achieved by using foliar stocks including C, Ca, K, N, Mg, and P as
337 predictors, which is congruent with the known high influence of the uptake and redistribution of these elements in forest
338 biomass production (Bond, 2010; Whittaker et al., 1979). Such an optimal set of elements is influenced by the effects of climate
339 and stand age on their uptake, redistribution, and storage (Woodwell et al., 1975; Augusto et al., 2008; Rodríguez-Soalleiro et
340 al., 2018; Dynarski et al., 2023; Li et al., 2021). Thus, the driving role of climate in the optimal elemental set is expected to
341 influence forest functioning ultimately. Indeed, we found that climate (precipitation in the driest quarter and temperature
342 seasonality) correlated positively and significantly with biomass production. These findings suggest climate as the main factor
343 that influenced the optimal combination of foliar stocks of C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P in predicting biomass
344 production (X. Wang et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2019; Q. Zhang et al., 2021).

345 Among the elements in the abovementioned optimal combination for predicting forest biomass production, N and P
346 stand out. We found that higher leaf stocks of N and P were related to higher biomass production. Plant growth is highly
347 influenced by the proportions of N and P, and particularly by the ratios N:P (Ågren, 2008; Gusewell, 2004; Sardans et al.,
348 2011; Willby et al., 2021). The plant N:P ratio reflects the balance between uptake and loss of N and P (Gusewell, 2004). Our
349 negative interaction with N×P indicates that the higher the leaf stocks of P, the lower the effect of N leaf stocks on biomass
350 production. Such a higher importance of P compared to N for biomass production might be due to the typically higher foliar
351 resorption of P than of N (Vergutz et al., 2012; Mulder et al., 2013).

352 The highest importance attributed to P for explaining forest biomass production is probably an outcome of its
353 continuous storage in the forest biomass (Sardans and Peñuelas, 2015; Y. Wang et al., 2022). Thus, the observed prominent
354 role of P might represent a long-term adaptive strategy of trees to store it in biomass and slow its loss from ecosystems (Sardans
355 and Peñuelas, 2015). Sardans and Peñuelas (2015), using data from the Catalan Forest Inventory, found that trees with high
356 woody biomass (branches plus stems) hold a higher P content than N and a higher P:N ratio with forest aging.

357 Aside from N and P, Ca also displayed a positive effect on forest biomass production and productivity, which is
358 congruent with the importance of this element for photosynthesis, nutrient absorption, and plant growth (Hirschi, 2004; Ågren,
359 2008; Hochmal et al., 2015). However, the average models indicated that the concentration of elements (e.g., Ca and N in
360 leaves and the entire set of aboveground organs) and climate were not significantly influential on biomass productivity. Rather,
361 we observed a significant negative relationship between stand age and forest biomass productivity, probably explained by the
362 increase of forest biomass and the decrease of forest nutrient availability with age (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2014; Goulden
363 et al., 2011).

364 Lastly, the lower relevance of C in our average models may be partially due to its variations across distinct plant
365 organs, e.g., the predominance of leaf and fine-root turnovers in C allocations (Yu et al., 2017). Besides, foliar nutrients,
366 particularly P, significantly impact photosynthetic C uptake in forests, promoting variation in biomass production (Mercado
367 et al., 2011). This leads to decreased biomass production in other organs, such as stems and barks (Jonsson et al., 2020; Ryan

et al., 1997; Schoonmaker et al., 2016; Yu et al., 2017). However, although plant biomass contains around 50% carbon, its production is not directly proportionate to C availability (He et al., 2020). Changes in N and P concentrations — important elements for regulating critical metabolic processes (e.g., protein synthesis, energy transfer) — may shift C allocation to maintenance and fine-root turnover, limiting structural biomass growth in stems and barks (Bruner et al., 2013; Likulunga et al., 2022). Consequently, other plant organs may allocate less C and reduce their biomass, ultimately limiting forest biomass productivity (Bruner et al., 2013; Neumann et al., 2020). Additionally, with growing P constraints under global change scenarios, C allocation patterns are projected to become more complex, directly reducing forest biomass production (Köhler et al., 2023).

376

377 **Caveats, limitations, and implications**

378

379 In this study, we bring new insights into the effects of the optimal elemental sets, compared to climate and stand age, on both forest biomass production and productivity. As practical implications for future research, our results suggest that using only data on leaf elements, especially stocks, allows us to achieve robust predictions of variations in forest biomass. Such information can contribute to decision-making by researchers and forest managers about the types of data (aboveground elements or only leaves' elements) they should prioritize collecting when assessing forest growth. Nevertheless, our presented results might be influenced by sampling limitations and analyses conducted only on aboveground organs (barks, branches, leaves, and stems). In the data used in this study, measurements of element concentrations in different aboveground organs of trees were obtained for various numbers of individuals per species. This difference in the number of individuals may have influenced, even if subtly, the results. Besides, the biomass of belowground organs (e.g., fine and coarse roots) may account for at least 22% of the total forest biomass (Ma et al., 2021) and display important roles in nutrient uptake and storage (Gao et al., 2021; Dybzinski et al., 2024). For some Mediterranean species, belowground organs may represent up to 50% of the forest biomass (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2014). Therefore, belowground biomass and elementomes may help explain above-ground production and productivity. The importance of roots for element stocks is also underscored by the fact that around 24% of total plant carbon is stored belowground (Ma et al., 2021). Root biomass is also influenced by climatic factors such as temperature, thus leading us to expect that future changes driven by warmer and drier climates will affect the balance between aboveground and belowground biomass allocations and element stocks (Pornon et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2021). Alongside roots, soil nutrient stocks are also important contributors to forest biomass, since these stocks influence the construction of foliage and wood components (Zarzosa et al., 2021; De Vos et al., 2015; Augusto et al., 2017). Soil nutrient availability directly influences aboveground organs (e.g., leaves) nutrient stocks by driving nutrient uptake and allocation, which controls photosynthesis and biomass accumulation (Augusto et al., 2022; Wiesmeier et al., 2019). Thus, including element concentrations and stocks of roots and soil nutrients (concentrations and stocks) in statistical models may enhance the predictability of forest functioning. We suggest that future research includes belowground and soil elements in addition to

elements in aboveground biomass, to allow for the comparison between the predictive performance using whole-plant elements (above and belowground) and only aboveground elements.

5 Conclusions

We found that elemental concentrations and stocks of leaves predict forest biomass production and productivity better than those of the entire aboveground set of plant organs. Leaf stocks explained the highest amount of variance in forest biomass production, thus suggesting that element stocks are better predictors than element concentrations. The optimal elemental set for predicting forest biomass production can be achieved using leaf elemental stocks of C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and N×P as predictors. Among these elements, N and P stocks and concentrations showed the strongest positive correlation with biomass production. Conversely, the concentration of elements and climate did not significantly influence forest biomass productivity, which was mainly driven by stand age. Altogether, our results indicate that leaf element stocks are critical predictors of forest biomass production.

Code and Data Availability

The data used in this study are maintained by the CREAM institute and are available upon request. Complete information about the data and instructions for requesting its use can be accessed at the link: <http://www.cream.uab.es/iefc/>. Codes used to produce the models are provided by Diniz (2024).

Author Contribution

Écio Souza Diniz: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. Eladio Rodríguez Penedo: Data Processing, Formal analysis, Writing – review. Roger Grau-Andrés: Methodology, Validation, Writing - review. Jordi Vayreda: Data curation, Writing - review. Marcos Fernández-Martínez: Methodology, Validation, Supervision, Visualization, Project administration, Writing – review, Funding Acquisition.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

435

436 This research was supported by the European Research Council project ERC-StG-2022-101076740 STOIKOS and
437 the Spanish Research Agency (AEI) project ETRAITS (PID2022-141972NA-I00). M.F-M. was supported by a Ramón y Cajal
438 fellowship (RYC2021-031511-I) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, the NextGenerationEU program
439 of the European Union, the Spanish plan of recovery, trans- formation and resilience, and the Spanish Research Agency. This
440 paper is dedicated to those who conducted the Ecological and Forest Inventory of Catalonia (IEFC) displaying works in the
441 field, office, and lab. The IEFC was financed by the “Departament d’Agricultura, Ramaderia i Pesca” and the “Departament
442 de Medi Ambient de la Generalitat de Catalunya.

443

444 **Funding Source**

445

446 This research was supported by fundings provided by: European Research Council project ERC-StG-2022-
447 101076740-STOIKOS, the Spanish Research Agency (AEI) project ETRAITS (PID2022-141972NA-I00), and Ramón y Cajal
448 fellowship (RYC2021-031511-I).

449 **References**

450 Ågren, G.I.: Stoichiometry and Nutrition of Plant Growth in Natural Communities, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. S.*, 39, 153–170,
451 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173515>, 2008.

452

453 Augusto, L., Meredieu, C., Bert, D., Trichet, P., Porté, A., Bosc, A., Lagane, F., Loustau, D., Pellerin, S., Danjon, F.,
454 Ranger, J., and Gelpe, J.: Improving models of forest nutrient export with equations that predict the nutrient concentration of
455 tree compartments, *Ann. For. Sci.*, 65, page808, <https://doi.org/10.1051/forest:2008059>, 2008.

456

457 Augusto, L., Achat, D. L., Jonard, M., Vidal, D., Ringeval, B.: Soil parent material - A major driver of plant nutrient
458 limitations in terrestrial ecosystems, *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 23, 3808-3824, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13691>, 2017.

459

460 Augusto, L., Boča, A.: Tree functional traits, forest biomass, and tree species diversity interact with site properties to drive
461 forest soil carbon, *Nat Commun*, 13, 1097, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28748-0>, 2022.

462

463 Bai, K., Lv, S., Ning, S., Zeng, D., Guo, Y., and Wang, B.: Leaf nutrient concentrations associated with phylogeny, leaf habit
464 and soil chemistry in tropical karst seasonal rainforest tree species, *Plant Soil*, 434, 305–326, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-018-3858-4)
465 [018-3858-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-018-3858-4), 2019.

466

467 Batjes, N. H.: Total carbon and nitrogen in the soils of the world, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 47,151-163, 1996.

468

469 Bartoń, K.: MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference, R package version 1.47.5, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>, 2023.

470

471 Beechey-Gradwell, Z., Cooney, L., Winichayakul, S., Andrews, M., Hea, S.Y., Crowther, T., and Roberts, N.: Storing

472 carbon in leaf lipid sinks enhances perennial ryegrass carbon capture especially under high N and elevated CO₂, *J. Exp. Bot.*,

473 71, 2351–2361, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erz494>, 2020.

474

475 Bitomský, M., Kobrová, L., Hroneš, M., and Duchoslav, M.: Plant functional groups and phylogenetic regularity control

476 plant community bioelement composition through calcium and magnesium, *Oikos*, 2023, e09546,

477 <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.09546>, 2023.

478

479 Bolòs i Capdevila, O.: *Les Zones de vegetació de Catalunya* (Vol. 25), *Treballs de la Societat Catalana de Geografia*,

480 Barcelona, ISSN 1133-2190, 1991.

481

482 Bond, W.J.: Do nutrient-poor soils inhibit development of forests? A nutrient stock analysis, *Plant Soil*, 334, 4–60,

483 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-010-0440-0>, 2010.

484

485 Burnham, K.P. and Anderson, D.R. (Eds.): *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information Theoretic*

486 *Approach*, 2nd ed, Springer, New York, 488pp., ISBN 978-0-387-22456-5, 2002.

487

488 Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R., and Huyvaert, K.P.: AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral ecology:

489 Some background, observations, and comparisons, *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*, 65, 23–35. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6)

490 [1029-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6), 2011.

491

492 Brunner, I., Bakker, M.R., Björk, R.G., Hirano, Y., Lukac, M., Aranda, X., Børja, I., Eldhuset, T.D., Helmisaari, H.S.,

493 Jourdan, C., Konôpka, B., López, B.C., Persson, H., Ostonen, I.: Fine-root turnover rates of European forests revisited: an

494 analysis of data from sequential coring and ingrowth cores. *Plant Soil*, 362, 357-372, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1313-5)

495 [1313-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1313-5), 2013.

496

497 Chu, C., Lutz, J.A., Král, K., Vrška, T., Myers, J.A., Abiem, I., and Alonso, A.: Direct and indirect effects of climate on

498 richness drive the latitudinal diversity gradient in forest trees, *Ecol. Lett.*, 22, 245–255, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13175>,

499 2019.

500

501 Dar, A.A., Parthasarathy, N.: Patterns and drivers of tree carbon stocks in Kashmir Himalayan forests: implications for
502 climate change mitigation, *Ecol Process*, 11, 58, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13717-022-00402-z>, 2022.

503

504 Delpiano, C. A., Prieto, I., Loayza, A. P., Carvajal, D. E., and Squeo, F. A.: Different responses of leaf and root traits to
505 changes in soil nutrient availability do not converge into a community-level plant economics spectrum, *Plant Soil*, 450, 463–
506 478, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04515-2>, 2020.

507

508 De Vos, B., Cools, N., Ilvesniemi, H., Vesterdal, L., Vanguelova, E., Carnicelli, S. Benchmark values for forest soil carbon
509 stocks in Europe: Results from a large scale forest soil survey, *Geoderma*, 251, 33-46,
510 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.03.008>, 2015.

511

512 Ding, D., Arif, M., Liu, M., Li, J., Hu, X., Geng, Q., Yin, F., and Li, C.: Plant-soil interactions and C:N:P stoichiometric
513 homeostasis of plant organs in riparian plantation, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 13, 979023, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.979023>,
514 2022.

515

516 Diniz, E.S.: Modeling forest functioning based on concentrations and stocks of tree elements, Figshare,
517 <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.26348347>, 2024.

518

519 Dormann, C.F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., Marquéz, J.R.G., Gruber, B., Lafourcade, B., Leitão,
520 P.J., Münkemüller, T., McClean, C., Osborne, P.E., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., Skidmore, A.K., Zurell, D., and Lautenbach,
521 S.: Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance, *Ecography*, 36,
522 27–46, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x>, 2013.

523

524 Duchon, J.: Splines minimizing rotation-invariant semi-norms in Solobev spaces, in: *Construction Theory of Functions of*
525 *Several Variables*, edited by: Shemp, W. and Zeller, K., Springer, Berlin, 85–100, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0086566>,
526 1977.

527

528 Duvigneaud, P (Ed.): *Productivity of Forest Ecosystems: Productivité Des Écosystèmes Forestiers*, UNESCO, Proceedings
529 of the Brussels Symposium Organized by Unesco and the International Biological Programme (Vol. 4), 1971.

530

531 Dybzinski, R., Segal, E., McCormack, M.L., Rollinson, C.R., Mascarenhas, R., Giambuzzi, P.G., Rivera, J., Fitzpatrick, L.,
532 Wiggins, C., Midgley, M.G.: Calculating Nitrogen Uptake Rates in Forests: Which Components Can Be Omitted,
533 Simplified, or Taken from Trait Databases and Which Must Be Measured In Situ?. *Ecosystems*, 27, 739-763,
534 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-024-00919-8>, 2024

535

536 Dynarski, K. A., Soper, F. M., Reed, S. C., Wieder, W. R., and Cleveland, C. C.: Patterns and controls of foliar nutrient
537 stoichiometry and flexibility across United States forests, *Ecology*, 104, e3909, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3909>, 2023.

538

539 Elser, J. J., Fagan, W. F., Kerkhoff, A. J., Swenson, N. G., and Enquist, B. J.: Biological stoichiometry of plant production:
540 metabolism, scaling and ecological response to global change, *New Phytol.*, 186, 593–608, [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03214.x)
541 8137.2010.03214.x, 2010.

542

543 Fernández-Martínez, M., Vicca, S., Janssens, I. A., Luyssaert, S., Campioli, M., Sardans, J., and Peñuelas, J.: Spatial
544 variability and controls over biomass stocks, carbon fluxes, and resource-use efficiencies across forest ecosystems, *Trees*, 28,
545 597–611, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-013-0975-9>, 2014.

546

547 Fernández-Martínez, M., Vicca, S., Janssens, I.A., Espelta, J.P., and Peñuelas, J.: The role of nutrients, productivity and
548 climate in determining tree fruit production in European forests, *New Phytol.*, 213, 669–679,
549 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14193>, 2017.

550

551 Fernández-Martínez, M., Sardans, J., Musavi, T., Migliavacca, M., Iturrate-Garcia, M., Scholes, R. J., Peñuelas, J., and
552 Janssens, I. A.: The role of climate, foliar stoichiometry and plant diversity on ecosystem carbon balance, *Glob. Change*
553 *Biol.*, 26, 7067–7078, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15385> 2020.

554

555 Foster, N. W. and Bhatti, J. S.: Ecosystems: Forest Nutrient Cycling, in: *Terrestrial Ecosystems and Biodiversity*, edited by:
556 Wang, Y., CRC Press, Boca Ratón, 1-5, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429445651>, 2020.

557

558 Fernández-Martínez, M.: From atoms to ecosystems: elementome diversity meets ecosystem functioning, *New Phytol.* 234,
559 35–42, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17864>, 2022.

560

561 Fick, S.E., and Hijmans, R.J.: WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas, *Int. J.*
562 *Climatol.* 37, 4302–4315, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>, 2017.

563

564 Gerdol, R., Iacumin, P., and Brancaloni, L.: Differential effects of soil chemistry on the foliar resorption of nitrogen and
565 phosphorus across altitudinal gradients, *Funct. Ecol.*, 33, 1351–1361, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13327>, 2019.

566

567 Gessler, A., Schaub, M., and McDowell, N.G.: The role of nutrients in drought-induced tree mortality and recovery, *New*
568 *Phytol.*, 214, 513-520, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14340>, 2017.

569

570 Gilliam, M., Athman, A., Tyerman, S.D., and Conn, S.J.: Cell-specific compartmentation of mineral nutrients is an
571 essential mechanism for optimal plant productivity - another role for TPC1? *Plant Signal. Behav.*, 6, 1656–1661,
572 <https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.6.11.17797>, 2011.

573

574 Goulden, M. L., Mcmillan, M. S., Winston, G. C., Rocha, A. V., Manies, K. L., Harden, J. W., and Bond-Lamberty, B. P.:
575 Patterns of NPP, GPP, respiration, and NEP during boreal forest succession, *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 17, 855–871,
576 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02274.x>, 2011.

577

578 Gracia, C., Burriel, J.A., Ibáñez, J.J., Mata, T., and Vayreda, J.: *Inventari Ecològic i Forestal de Catalunya. Mètodes.*
579 *CREAF, Bellaterra, ISBN 84-932860-2-8*, 2004.

580

581 Gao, G., Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Wang, S., Ju, C., Gu, J.: Tamm Review: Fine root biomass in the organic (O) horizon in forest
582 ecosystems: Global patterns and controlling factors, *For Ecol Manag*, 491, 119208,
583 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119208>, 2021.

584

585 Gusewell, S.: N:P ratios in terrestrial plants: variation and functional significance, *New Phytol.*, 164, 243–266,
586 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01192.x>, 2004.

587

588 Hawkesford, M. J., Cakmak, I., Coskun, D., De Kok, L. J., Lambers, H., Schjoerring, J. K., White, P. J.: Functions of
589 macronutrients, in: *Marschner's mineral nutrition of plants*, edited by: Marschner, P., Academic press, 201-281,
590 <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-63043-9>, 2012.

591

592 He, J. S., Fang, J., Wang, Z., Guo, D., Flynn, D. F. B., and Geng, Z.: Stoichiometry and large-scale patterns of leaf carbon
593 and nitrogen in the grassland biomes of China, *Oecologia*, 149, 115–122, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-006-0425-0>, 2006.

594

595 He, Y. et al.: Global vegetation biomass production efficiency constrained by models and observations, *Glob Chan Biol.*, 26,
596 1474-1484, , 2020.

597

598 Hirschi, K.D.: The calcium conundrum. Both versatile nutrient and specific signal, *Plant Physiol.*, 136, 2438–2442,
599 <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.046490>, 2004.

600

601 Huang, J., Liu, W., Li, S., Song, L., Lu, H., Shi, X., Chen, X., Hu, T., Liu, S., and Liu, T.: Ecological stoichiometry of the
602 epiphyte community in a subtropical forest canopy, *Ecol. Evol.*, 9, 14394–14406, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5875>, 2019.

603

604 Hochmal, A.K., Schulze, S., Trompelt, K., and Hippler, M.: Calcium-dependent regulation of photosynthesis, *Biochimica et*
605 *Biophysica Acta (BBA) – Bioenergetics*, 1847, 993–1003, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabbio.2015.02.010>, 2015.

606

607 Hoover, C. M., and Smith, J. E.: Aboveground live tree carbon stock and change in forests of conterminous United States:
608 influence of stand age, *Carbon Balance and Management*, 18, 1–11, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13021-023-00227-z>, 2023.

609

610 Huang, J., Liu, W., Li, S., Song, L., Lu, H., Shi, X., Chen, X., Hu, T., Liu, S., and Liu, T.: Ecological stoichiometry of the
611 epiphyte community in a subtropical forest canopy, *Ecol. Evol.*, 9, 14394–14406, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5875>, 2019.

612

613 ICGC: Mapa de sòls de catalunya. soil taxonomy 1:250000, Institut Cartogràfic i Geològic de Catalunya (ICGC), Barcelona,
614 2019.

615

616 Jonsson, M., Bengtsson, J., Moen, J., Gamfeldt, L., and Snäll, T.: Stand age and climate influence forest ecosystem service
617 delivery and multifunctionality, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 0940a8, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abaf1c>, 2020.

618

619 Kerkhoff, A.J., Enquist, B.J., Elser, J.J., and Fagan, W.F.: Plant allometry, stoichiometry and the temperature-dependence of
620 primary productivity, *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 14, 585–598, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-822X.2005.00187.x>, 2005.

621

622 Köhler, J., Yang, N., Pena, R., Polle, A., Meier, I.C.: Drought Deteriorates the N Stoichiometry of Biomass Production in
623 European Beech Saplings Under Global Change, *Front. For. Glob. Change*, 4, 647360,
624 <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2021.647360>, 2021.

625

626 Lartigue, J., Cebrian, J.: Ecosystem productivity and carbon flows: patterns across ecosystems, in: *The Princeton guide to*
627 *ecology*, edited by: Levin, S.A., Princeton University Press, Princeton, 320-329, 2012.

628

629 Lavorel, S., Díaz, S., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Garnier, E., Harrison, S.P., McIntyre, S., Pausas, J.G., Pérez-Harguindeguy, N.,
630 Roumet, C., and Urcelay, C.: Plant functional types: Are we getting any closer to the holy grail? in: *Terrestrial Ecosystems*
631 *in a Changing World*, edited by: Canadell, J.G., Pataki, D.E., and Pitelka, L.F. Springer, Berlin, 149–164,
632 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32730-1_13, 2007.

633

634 Li, Y., He, W., Wu, J., Zhao, P., Chen, T., Zhu, W., Ouyang, L., Ni, G., and Hölscher, D.: Leaf stoichiometry is
635 synergistically-driven by climate, site, soil characteristics and phylogeny in karst areas, Southwest China, *Biogeochemistry*,
636 155, 283–301, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-021-00826-3>, 2021.

637

638 Li, Y., Wang J., Wang, L.: Seasonal variations in C/N/P/K stoichiometric characteristics in different plant organs in the
639 various forest types of Sygera Mountain, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 15, 1293934, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1293934>, 2024.

640

641 Lie, Z., Xue, L., and Jacobs, D.F.: Allocation of forest biomass across broad precipitation gradients in China's forests, *Sci.*
642 *Rep.*, 8, 10536, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-28899-5>, 2018.

643

644 Likulunga, L. E., Clausing, S., Krüger, J., Lang, F., Polle, A.: Fine root biomass of European beech trees in different soil
645 layers show different responses to season, climate, and soil nutrients. *Fron For Glo Chan*, 5, 955327,
646 <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2022.955327>, 2022.

647

648 Liu, G., Ye, X., Huang, Z., Dong, M., and Cornelissen, J. H. C.: Leaf and root nutrient concentrations and stoichiometry
649 along aridity and soil fertility gradients, *J. Veg. Sci.*, 30, 291–300, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12717>, 2019.

650

651 Luo, X., Hou, E., Chen, J., Li, J., Zhang, L., Zhang, X., and Wen, D.: Dynamics of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus stocks
652 and stoichiometry resulting from conversion of primary broadleaf forest to plantation and secondary forest in subtropical
653 China, *Catena*, 193, 104606, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104606>, 2020.

654

655 Ma, H., Mo, L., Crowther, T.W., Maynard, D.S., van den Hoogen, J., Stocker, B.D., Terrer, C., Zohner, C.M.: The global
656 distribution and environmental drivers of aboveground versus belowground plant biomass, *Nat Ecol Evol.*, 5, 1110-1122,
657 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01485-1>, 2021.

658

659 Ma, S., He, F., Tian, D., Zou, D., Yan, Z., Yang, Y., Zhou, T., Huang, K., Shen, H., Fang, J.: Variations and determinants of
660 carbon content in plants: a global synthesis, *Biogeosciences*, 15, 693-702, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-15-693-2018>, 2018.

661

662 Margalef, R.: *Ecología*, 8th edition, Omega, Barcelona, 968 pp., ISBN 9788428204057, 1998.

663

664 Martín Vide, J., Raso, J. M., and Morera, A. (Eds.): *Atles Climàtic de Catalunya*, Generalitat de Catalunya, Barcelona,
665 35pp., ISBN 978-84-393-7697-2, 2008.

666

667 Mensah, S., Noulèkoun, F., Dimobe, K., Seifert, T., Glèlè Kakaï, R.: Climate and soil effects on tree species diversity and
668 aboveground carbon patterns in semi-arid tree savannas. *Sci Rep*, 13, 11509, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-38225-3>,
669 2023.

670

671 Mercado, L. M., Patino, S., Domingues, T. F., Fyllas, N. M., Weedon, G. P., Sitch, S., Quesada, C.A., Philips, O.L., Aragão,
 672 L.E.O.C., Malhi, Y., Dolman, A.J., Restrepo-Coupe, N., Saleska, S.R., Baker, T.R., Almeida, S., Higuchi, N., and Lloyd, J.:
 673 Variations in Amazon forest productivity correlated with foliar nutrients and modelled rates of photosynthetic carbon supply,
 674 Philos. Tr. R. Soc. Lon. B., 366, 3316-3329, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0045>, 2011.
 675
 676 Milla, R., Castro-Díez, P., Maestro-Martínez, M., and Montserrat-Martí, G.: Relationship between phenology and the
 677 remobilization of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in branches of eight Mediterranean evergreens, New Phytol., 168,
 678 167–178, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01477.x>, 2005.
 679
 680 Mulder, C., Ahrestani, F.S., Bahn, M., Bohan, D.A., Bonkowski, M., Griffiths, B.S., Guicharnaud, R.A., Kattge, J., Krogh,
 681 P.H., Lovorel, S., Lewis, O.T., Mancinelli, G., Naeem, S., Peñuelas, J., Poorter, H., Reich, P.B., Rossi, L., Rusch, G.M.,
 682 Sardans, J., and Wright, I.J.: Connecting the green and brown worlds: elemental factors and trait-driven predictability of
 683 ecological networks, Adv. Ecol. Res., 49, 69–175, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-420002-9.00002-0>, 2013.
 684
 685 Neumann, M., Douglas, L., Godbold, YH., Finér, L.: Improving models of fine root carbon stocks and fluxes in European
 686 forests, J Ecol, 108, 496-514, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13328>, 2020.
 687
 688 Pang, Y., Tian, J., Zhao, X., Chao, Z., Wang, Y., Zhang, X., and Wang, D.: The linkages of plant, litter and soil C×N:P
 689 stoichiometry and nutrient stock in different secondary mixed forest types in the Qinling Mountains, China., PeerJ, 8, e9274,
 690 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9274>, 2020.
 691
 692 Pebesma, E.J.: Multivariable geostatistics in S: the gstat package, Comput. Geosci., 30, 683–691,
 693 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2004.03.012>, 2004.
 694
 695 Peng, Y., Schmidt, I. K., Zheng, H., Heděnc, P., Bachega, L. R., Yue, K., Wu, F., Vesterdal, L.: Tree species effects on
 696 topsoil carbon stock and concentration are mediated by tree species type, mycorrhizal association, and N-fixing ability at the
 697 global scale, For Ecol Manag, 478, 118510, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118510>, 2020.
 698
 699 Peñuelas, J., Fernández-Martínez, M., Ciais, P., Jou, D., Piao, S., Obersteiner, M., Vicca, S., Janssens, I.A., and Sardans, J.,
 700 The bioelements, the elementome, and the biogeochemical niche, Ecology, 100, e02652, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2652>,
 701 2019.
 702
 703 Pornon, A., Boutin, M., Lamaze, T.: Contribution of plant species to the high N retention capacity of a subalpine meadow

undergoing elevated N deposition and warming, *Env. Poll.*, 245, 235-242, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.10.027>, 2019.

R Development Core Team.: R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, <https://www.R-project.org/>, 2023.

Reich, P., and Oleksyn, P.: Global patterns of plant leaf N and P in relation to temperature and latitude, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 101, 11001–11006, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0403588101>, 2004.

Roa-Fuentes, L.L., Campo, J., and Parra-Tabla, V.: Plant biomass allocation across a precipitation gradient: An approach to seasonally dry tropical forest at Yucatán, Mexico, *Ecosystems*, 15, 1234–1244, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9578-3>, 2012.

Rocha, M. R., Vasseur, D. A., Hayn, M., Holschneider, M., and Gaedke, U.: Variability patterns differ between standing stock and process rates, *Oikos*, 120, 17–25, 2011.

Rodríguez-Soalleiro, R., Eimil-Fraga, C., Gómez-García, E., García-Villabrille, J. D., Rojo-Alboreca, A., Muñoz, F., Oliveira, N., Sixto, H., and Pérez-Cruzado, C.: Exploring the factors affecting carbon and nutrient concentrations in tree biomass components in natural forests, forest plantations and short rotation forestry, *For. Ecosyst.*, 5, 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40663-018-0154-y>, 2018.

Roth-Nebelsick, A., and Krause, M.: The Plant Leaf: A Biomimetic Resource for Multifunctional and Economic Design, *Biomimetics*, 8, e145. <https://doi.org/10.3390/biomimetics8020145>, 2023.

Ryan, M., Binkley, D., and Fownes, J.H.: Age-related decline in forest productivity: pattern and process, *Adv. Ecol. Res.* 27, 213–262, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2504\(08\)60009-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2504(08)60009-4), 1997.

Santiago, L.S., Kitajima, K., Wright, S.J., and Mulkey, S.S.: Coordinated changes in photosynthesis, water relations and leaf nutritional traits of canopy trees along a precipitation gradient in lowland tropical forest, *Oecologia* 139, 495–502, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-004-1542-2>, 2004.

Sardans, J., Peñuelas, J., Prieto, P., Estiarte, M.: Drought and warming induced changes in P and K concentration and accumulation in plant biomass and soil in a Mediterranean shrubland, *Plant Soil*, 306, 261-271, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9583-7>, 2008.

739 Sardans, J, Alonso, R., Carnicer, J., Fernández-Martínez, M., Vivanco, M.G., and Peñuelas, J.: Factors influencing the foliar
 740 elemental composition and stoichiometry in forest trees in Spain, *Perspect. Plant. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, 18, 52–69.
 741 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2016.01.001>, 2016.

742

743 Sardans, J., Grau, O., Chen, H.Y.H., Janssens, I.A., Ciais, P., Piao, S., and Peñuelas, J.: Changes in nutrient concentrations of
 744 leaves and roots in response to global change factors, *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 23, 3849–3856, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13721>,
 745 2017.

746

747 Sardans, J., Janssens, I.A., Alonso, R., Veresoglou, S.D., Rillig, M.C., Sanders, T.G.M., Carnicer, J., Filella, I., Farré-
 748 Armengol, G., Peñuelas, J.: Foliar elemental composition of European forest tree species associated with evolutionary traits
 749 and present environmental and competitive conditions, *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 24, 240–255,
 750 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12253>, 2015.

751

752 Sardans, J., Llusà, J., Ogaya, R., Vallicrosa, H., Filella, I., Gargallo-Garriga, A., Peguero, G., Van Langenhove, L.,
 753 Verryckt, L.T., Stahl, C., Courtois, E.A., Bréchet, L.M., Tariq, A., Zeng, T., Alrefaei, A.F., Wang, W., Janssens, I.A., and
 754 Peñuelas, J.: Foliar elementome and functional traits relationships identify tree species niche in French Guiana rainforests,
 755 *Ecology*, 104, e4118, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.4118>, 2023.

756

757 Sardans, J., and Peñuelas, J.: Climate and taxonomy underlie different elemental concentrations and stoichiometries of forest
 758 species: the optimum “biogeochemical niche”, *Plant Ecol.*, 215, 441–455, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-014-0314-2>, 2014.

759

760 Sardans, J., and Peñuelas, P.: Trees increase their P:N ratio with size, *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 24, 147–156,
 761 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12231>, 2015.

762

763 Sardans, J., Rivas-Ubach, A., and Peñuelas, J.: Factors affecting nutrient concentration and stoichiometry of forest trees in
 764 Catalonia (NE Spain), *For. Ecol. Manag.*, 262, 2024–2034, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.08.019>, 2011.

765

766 Sardans, J., Vallicrosa, H., Zuccarini, P., Farré-Armengol, G., Fernández-Martínez, M., Peguero, G., Gargallo-Garriga, A.,
 767 Ciais, P., Janssens, I.A., Obersteiner, M., Richter, A., and Peñuelas, J.: Empirical support for the biogeochemical niche
 768 hypothesis in forest trees, *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, 5, 184–194, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01348-1>, 2021.

769

770 Sardans, J., Llusà, J., Ogaya, R., Vallicrosa, H., Filella, I., Gargallo-Garriga, A., Peguero, G., Van Langenhove, L.,
 771 Verryckt, L. T., Stahl, C., Courtois, E. A., Bréchet, L. M., Tariq, A., Zeng, T., Alrefaei, A. F., Wang, W., Janssens, I. A., and

772 Peñuelas, J.: Foliar elementome and functional traits relationships identify tree species niche in French Guiana rainforests,
 773 Ecology, 104, e4118, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.4118>, 2023.

774

775 Seidl, R., Albrich, K., Erb, K., Formayer, H., Leidinger, D., Leitinger, G., Tappeiner, U., Tasser, E., and Rammer, W.: What
 776 drives the future supply of regulating ecosystem services in a mountain forest landscape? For. Ecol. Manag., 445, 37–47,
 777 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.03.047>, 2019.

778

779 Selkimäki, M., González-Olabarria, J. R., Pukkala, T.: Site and stand characteristics related to surface erosion occurrence in
 780 forests of Catalonia (Spain), Eur J oFor Res, 131, 727–738, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-011-0545-x>, 2011.

781

782 Schoonmaker, A.S., Lieffers, V.J., and Landhäusser, S.M.: Viewing forests from below: fine root mass declines relative to
 783 leaf area in aging lodgepole pine stands, Oecologia, 181, 733–747, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-3621-6>, 2016.

784

785 Schreeg, L.A., Santiago, L.S., Wright, S.J., and Turner, B.L.: Stem, root, and older leaf N:P ratios are more responsive
 786 indicators of soil nutrient availability than new foliage, Ecology, 95, 2062–2068, <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-1671.1>, 2014.

787

788 Šimová, I., Sandel, B., Enquist, B. J., Michaletz, S. T., Kattge, J., Violle, C., McGill, B. J., Blonder, B., Engemann, K., Peet,
 789 R. K., Wiser, S. K., Morueta-Holme, N., Boyle, B., Kraft, N. J. B., Svenning, J. C.: The relationship of woody plant size and
 790 leaf nutrient content to large-scale productivity for forests across the Americas, J. Ecol., 107, 2278–2290,
 791 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13163>, 2019.

792

793 Shi, S., Peng, C., Wang, M. Zhu, Q., Yang, G., Yang, Y., Xi, T., Zhang, T.: A global meta-analysis of changes in soil
 794 carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and sulfur, and stoichiometric shifts after forestation, Plant Soil, 407, 323–340,
 795 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-016-2889-y>, 2016.

796

797 Soil Atlas of Europe.: 1 km Raster version of the European soil database (v. 2.0), in: Van Liedekerke, M., Jones, A.,
 798 Panagos, P. (eds): European Soil Bureau Network & European, Commission, EUR 19945 EN, 2006

799

800 Taiz, L., Zeiger, E., Moller, I. M., and Murphy, A. (Eds.): Plant Physiology and Development, Sinauer Associates,
 801 Sunderland, 700 pp., ISBN 978-1605353265, 2014.

802

803 Thomas, S.C., Martin, A.R.: Carbon Content of Tree Tissues: A Synthesis, Forests, 3, 332–352,
 804 <https://doi.org/10.3390/f3020332>, 2012.

805

806 Töpfer, N., Environment-coupled models of leaf metabolism, *Biochem. Soc. T.*, 49, 119–129,
807 <https://doi.org/10.1042/BST20200059>, 2021.

808

809 Ullah, S., Wu, J., Shah, J.A., Wang, X., Lyu, Y., Guo, Z., Ali, K., Chen, D., Sun, H.: Tree diversity drives understory carbon
810 storage rather than overstory carbon storage across forest types, *J. For. Res.*, 35, 125, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11676-024-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11676-024-01776-w)
811 01776-w, 2024.

812

813 Urbina, I., Grau, O., Sardans, J., Margalef, O., Peguero, G., Asensio, D., LLusià, J., Ogaya, R., Gargallo-Garriga, A., Van
814 Langenhove, L., Verryckt, L. T., Courtois, E. A., Stahl, C., Soong, J. L., Chave, J., Hérault, B., Janssens, I. A., Sayer, E., and
815 Peñuelas, J.: High foliar K and P resorption efficiencies in old-growth tropical forests growing on nutrient-poor soils, *Ecol.*
816 *Evol.*, 11, 8969–8982, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7734>, 2011.

817

818 Vallicrosa, H., Sardans, J., Maspons, J., Zuccarini, P., Fernández-Martínez, M., Bauters, M., Goll, D.S., Ciais, P.,
819 Obersteiner, M., Janssens, I.A., and Peñuelas, J.: Global maps and factors driving forest foliar elemental composition: the
820 importance of evolutionary history, *New Phytol.*, 233, 169–181, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17771>, 2022.

821

822 Vayreda, J., Ibàñez, J.J., and Alonso, C.G.: El Inventario Ecológico y Forestal de Catalunya y su consulta mediante la
823 aplicación MiraBosc “on-line”, *Cuadernos de la Sociedad Española de Ciencia Forestal*, 19, 217–227, 2005.

824

825 Vayreda, J., Martínez-Vilalta, J., and Vilà-Cabrera, A.: El Inventario Ecológico y Forestal de Cataluña: una herramienta para
826 la ecología funcional, *Ecosistemas*, 25, 70–79, <https://doi.org/10.7818/ECOS.2016.25-3.08>, 2016.

827

828 Vergutz, L., Manzoni, S., Porporato, A., Novais, R.F., and Jackson, R.B.: Global resorption efficiencies and concentrations
829 of carbon and nutrients in leaves of terrestrial plants, *Ecol. Monogr.*, 82, 205–220, <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0416.1>, 2012.

830

831 Vilà, M., Vayreda, J., Gracia, C., and Ibàñez, J.J.: Does tree diversity increase wood production in pine forests? *Oecologia*,
832 135, 299–303, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-003-1182-y>, 2003.

833

834 Vrede, T., Dobberfuhl, D.R., Kooijman, S., and Elser, J.J.: Fundamental connections among organism C: N: P stoichiometry,
835 macromolecular composition, and growth, *Ecology*, 85, 1217–1229, <https://doi.org/10.1890/02-0249>, 2004.

836

837 Wang, H., Wang, R., Harrison, S.P., and Prentice, I.C.: Leaf morphological traits as adaptations to multiple climate
838 gradients, *J. Ecol.*, 110, 1344–1355, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13873>, 2022.

839

840 Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., Wang, L., Jing, X., Yu, L., and Liu, P.: Response of leaf biomass, leaf and soil C×N:P stoichiometry
841 characteristics to different site conditions and forest ages: a case of *Pinus tabuliformis* plantations in the temperate
842 mountainous area of China, *Front. Plant. Sci.*, 13, 1060406, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.1060406>, 2022.
843

844 Wang, X., Wang, J., Zhang, L., Lv, C., Liu, L., Zhao, H., and Gao, J.: Climatic factors determine the distribution patterns of
845 leaf nutrient traits at large scales, *Plants*, 11, e2171, <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11162171>, 2022.
846

847 Wang, W., Peng, Y., Chen, Y., Lei, S., Wang, X., Farooq, T. H., Liang, X., Zhang, C., Yan, W., Chen, X.: Ecological
848 Stoichiometry and Stock Distribution of C, N, and P in Three Forest Types in a Karst Region of China, *Plants*, 12, 2503,
849 <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12132503>, 2023
850

851 Waring, R.H.: Characteristics of trees predisposed to die, *Stud. in Environ. Sci.*, 30, 117-123, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166->
852 1116, 70878-1, 1987.
853

854 Wiesmeier, M., Urbanski, L., Hobbey, E., Birgit, L., von Lützow, M., Marin-Spiotta, E., van Wesemael, B., Rabot, E., Ließ,
855 M., Garcia-Franco, N., Wollschläger, U., Vogel, H.J., Kögel-Knabner, I.: Soil organic carbon storage as a key function of
856 soils - A review of drivers and indicators at various scales. *Geoderma*, 333, 149-162,
857 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.07.026>, 2019.
858

859 Whittaker, R.H., Likens, G.E., Bormann, F.H., Easton, J.S., and Siccama, T.G.: The Hubbard Brook Ecosystem Study:
860 Forest Nutrient Cycling and Element Behavior, *Ecology*, 60, 203–220, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1936481>, 1979.
861

862 Whittaker, R. H., and Woodwell, G. M.: Structure, production and diversity of the oak-pine forest at Brookhaven, *J. Ecol.*, 57,
863 155–174, 1969.
864

865 Willby, N.J., Pulford, I.D., and Flowers, T.H.: Tissue nutrient signatures predict herbaceous-wetland community responses
866 to nutrient availability, *New Phytol.*, 152, 463–481, <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0028-646X.2001.00274.x>, 2021.
867

868 Wood, S.N.: Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R, 2nd edition, Chapman & Hall/ CRC, Boca Raton,
869 Florida, 496 pp., ISBN 9781315370279, 2017.
870

871 Wood, S.N.: Thin plate regression splines, *J. R. Stat. Soc. B.*, 65, 95–114, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00374>, 2003.
872

873 Woodwell, G.M., Whittaker, R.H., and Houghton, R.A.: Nutrient Concentrations in Plants in the Brookhaven Oak-Pine
874 Forest, *Ecology*, 56, 318–332, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1934963>, 1975.

875

876 Xing, S., Cheng, X., Fang, K., Wang, J., Yan, J., and Han, H.: The patterns of N/P/K stoichiometry in the *Quercus*
877 *wutaishanica* community among different life forms and organs and their responses to environmental factors in northern
878 China, *Ecol. Indic.*, 137, 108783, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.108783>, 2022.

879

880 Yan, Z., Li, P., Chen, Y., Han, W., Fang, J.: Nutrient allocation strategies of woody plants: an approach from the scaling of
881 nitrogen and phosphorus between twig stems and leaves, *Sci Rep*, 6, 20099, <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep20099>, 2016.

882

883 Yan, P., He, N., Yu, K., Xu, L., and Van Meerbeek, K.: Integrating multiple plant functional traits to predict ecosystem
884 productivity, *Comm. Biol.*, 6, e239. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-023-04626-3>, 2023.

885

886 Yang, L., Yang, Z., Peng, Y., Lin, Y., Xiong, D., and Li, Y.: Evaluating P availability influenced by warming and N
887 deposition in a subtropical forest soil: a bioassay mesocosm experiment, *Plant Soil*, 444, 87–99,
888 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04246-z>, 2019.

889

890 Yu, Y., Chen, J.M., Yang, X., Fan, W., Li, M., and He, L.: Influence of site index on the relationship between forest net
891 primary productivity and stand age, *Plos One*, 12, e0177084, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177084>, 2017.

892

893 Zarzosa, P.S., Herraiz, A.D., Olmo, M., Ruiz-Benito, P., Barrón, V., Bastias, C.C., de la Riva, E.G., and Villar, R.: Linking
894 functional traits with tree growth and forest productivity in *Quercus ilex* forests along a climatic gradient, *Sci. Total*
895 *Environ.*, 786, 147468, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147468>, 2021.

896

897 Zhang, H., Wang, J., Wang, J., Guo, Z., Wang, G. G., Zeng, D., and Wu, T.: Tree stoichiometry and nutrient resorption
898 along a chronosequence of *Metasequoia glyptostroboides* forests in coastal China, *For. Ecol. Manag.* 430, 445–450,
899 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2018.08.037>, 2018a.

900

901 Zhang, J., Zhao, N., Liu, C., Yang, H., Li, M., Yu, G., Wilcox, K., Yu, Q., and He, N.: C×N:P stoichiometry in China’s
902 forests: From organs to ecosystems, *Funct. Ecol.*, 32, 50–60, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12979>, 2018b.

903

904 Zhang, T., Niinemets, Ü., Sheffield, J., Lichstein, J. W.: Shifts in tree functional composition amplify the response of forest
905 biomass to climate, *Nature*, 556, 99–102, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature26152>, 2018c.

906

907 Zhang, Q., Luo, D., Yang, L., Xie, J., Yang, Z., Zhou, J., Li, X., Xiong, D., Chen, Y., Yang, Y.: Variations in Rainfall Affect
908 the Responses of Foliar Chemical Properties of *Cunninghamia lanceolata* Seedlings to Soil Warming, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 12,
909 705861, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.705861>, 2021.

910

911 Zhang, H., Sun, M., Wen, Y., Tong, R., Wang, G., Wu, Q., Li, Y., and Wu, T.: The Effects of Stand Age on Leaf N:P
912 Cannot Be Neglected: A Global Synthesis, *For. Ecol. Manag.*, 518, 120294, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120294>,
913 2022.

914

915 Zhao, X., Tian, Q., Huang, L., Lin, Q., Wu, J., Liu, F.: Fine-root functional trait response to nitrogen deposition across forest
916 ecosystems: A meta-analysis. *Sci Tot Env*, 844, 157111, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157111>, 2022.

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941 **Appendix A: Model Performance**

942

943 **Table A1: Performance of the best models (lowest AIC) showed in Figure 1 and the numbers (N) of predictors they**
944 **selected for predicting forest production and productivity. Response = dependent variable. Leaf Conc. and ABG Conc.**
945 **are leaf element concentration and aboveground plant element concentration, respectively. Clim. Age = climatic**
946 **variables and stand age. Temp. Season = Temperature Seasonality; Temp. Wet. Quart. = Mean Temperature of Wettest**
947 **Quarter; Prec. Dr. Quart. = Precipitation of Driest Quarter; Prec. Cold.Quart. = Precipitation of Coldest Quarter; Age**
948 **= Stand age.**

Response	Predictors	N	R2	AIC	Selected variables
					C, Ca, K, Mg, N, P, C×N, C×P, and
Production	Leaf Stock	9	0.58	64.7	N×P
Production	ABG Stock	3	0.28	1369.2	C, N, and C×N
Production	Leaf Conc.	6	0.22	2019.4	C, Ca, N, P, C×P, and N×P
Production	ABG Conc.	1	0.13	2326.2	Ca
Production	Clim. Age	1	0.21	2066.1	Temp. Season., Temp. Wet. Quart., Prec. Dr. Quart., Prec. Cold.Quart.
Productivity	Leaf Conc.	3	0.28	152.2	Ca, K, and N
Productivity	ABG Conc.	2	0.15	155.5	K
Productivity	Clim. Age	2	0.62	48.1	Temp. Season., Age

949


950

951 **Table A2: Total number (Total N) of models’ subsets produced by the selection with “dredge” using different**
 952 **predictors’ set for predicting forest production and productivity. N ($\Delta AIC < 4$) is the number of models equally robust**
 953 **under $\Delta AIC < 4$ and used to calculate the average models. ABG Concentration and ABG Stock are aboveground**
 954 **concentration and aboveground stock, respectively**

Target	Predictors	Total N	N ($\Delta AIC < 4$)
Production	Leaf Stock	575	10
Production	ABG Stock	575	10
Production	Leaf Concentration	852	10
Production	ABG Concentration	852	8
Production	Climate and Age	511	7
Productivity	Leaf Concentration	850	7
Productivity	ABG Concentration	850	8
Productivity	Climate and Age	511	7

955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975

976
977



978

979 **Figure A1: Performance (AIC and R²) of the most robust models ($\Delta AIC < 4$) in predicting forest biomass production**
980 **according to the number of selected predictors. The models' performance demonstrated by their AIC and R²: Plant**
981 **stocks (a, e); Leaf elemental concentration (b, f); climate and stand age (c, g); Aboveground (ABG) elemental**
982 **concentration (d, h).**

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995





Figure A2: Performance of the most robust models ($\Delta AIC < 4$) in predicting forest biomass productivity according to the number of selected predictors. The models' performance demonstrated by their AIC and R^2 : climate and stand age (a, c); Aboveground (ABG) elemental concentration (b, d).

1007
1008
1009



1010
1011 **Figure A3: Partial residuals plots showing the estimated effects of the elemental concentrations and stocks of Ca, P,**
1012 **and N on forest biomass production. SE: Standard error.**

1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021