

Uncertainty in Land Carbon Fluxes Simulated by CMIP6 Models from Treatments of Crop Distributions and Photosynthetic Pathways

Joseph Ovwemuvwose¹, Ian C. Prentice^{2, 3}, and Heather. D. Graven¹

¹Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, UK.

²Georgina Mace Centre for the Living Planet, Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, London, UK

³Department of Earth System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Correspondence to: Joseph Ovwemuvwose (j.owwemuvwose22@imperial.ac.uk & jsovw@gmail.com)

Abstract. A reliable representation of the diversity of vegetation in terrestrial ecosystems is needed for the accurate simulation of present and future biogeochemical cycling and global climate, particularly as climate change affects different vegetation types differently. We compare the distributions of crops and of C₃ versus C₄ photosynthetic pathways in both natural vegetation and crops across Earth System Models in the 6th Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6). We find a large range in C₃ and C₄ crop, natural and total vegetation for area and gross primary production (GPP) across the models. Even though 10 of the 11 models used Land Use Harmonization (LUH2) crop areas as input data, modeled total crop area ranges from -28 to +10 % of a satellite-based estimate. The C₃ and C₄ crop areas were -56 to +15 % and -100 to +38 % of LUH2 for 2014, respectively. The C₄ fraction of total vegetation area in the models is 9-25 %, compared to 20 ± 3 % in observation-based estimates for the year 2014. Total global GPP varies by a factor of two across the models, and the C₄ fraction of GPP ranges from 12 to 27 %. Simulated trends in the fraction of GPP by C₃ versus C₄ vegetation type (-20 to +29 %) would have changed global stable carbon isotopic discrimination by -0.35 to +0.11 ‰ over 1975-2005, not including changes in discrimination over time within C₃ and C₄ vegetation, indicating that modeled changes in the fraction of GPP by C₃ and C₄ vegetation do not account for the +0.7 ‰ increase indicated by atmospheric data. Disparity in vegetation with these photosynthetic pathways in models contributes to uncertainty in land carbon fluxes simulations and further constraints and improvements in models are needed.

1 Introduction

The terrestrial biosphere captures ~30 % of anthropogenically emitted CO₂ annually (Friedlingstein et al., 2025) reducing CO₂ accumulation in the atmosphere and the accompanying global warming. However, this CO₂ uptake may be sensitive to future climate change (Arora et al., 2020). Understanding the mechanisms contributing to the CO₂ uptake, including the role of

different types of vegetation and land use, is essential to understanding potential carbon-climate feedback and future changes to the terrestrial carbon cycle.

The implementation of land use and land cover change (LUCC) and its impact on vegetation cover and dynamics are important components of terrestrial biosphere model development (Hu et al., 2021; Hurtt et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022). LUCC is mainly driven by agriculture. The fraction of global land area used for agriculture increased from 14 % in 1850 to about 37 % in 2015 (Hurtt et al., 2020) and LUCC emitted about 118 PgC between 1850 and 2020 (Houghton & Castanho, 2023). In addition to CO₂ emissions, the biophysical effects of land conversion also drive global temperature rise due to changes in surface albedo (Arora & Boer, 2010; Houghton et al., 2012). The alteration of the land surface will continue to be significant in the future as, for example, it has been projected that 14 % of vegetation and 5 % of soil carbon stocks will be lost to cropland expansion globally over 2010-2050 in a “middle-of-the-road” scenario (Molotoks et al., 2018).

To represent plant diversity and function, most model developers use plant functional types (PFTs) that group vegetation by similar features such as growth form, ecological requirements, and photosynthetic pathways. This helps to account for the variation in adaptive mechanisms and ecological distribution of different plants (Haxeltine & Prentice, 1996; Hurtt et al., 2020; Wullschlegel et al., 2014). One important characteristic of plants is their use of either the C₃ or C₄ photosynthetic pathways. In C₃ plants the first product of the photosynthetic pathway is a three-carbon molecule called 3-phosphosphoglycerate (3-PGA), while in C₄ vegetation, it is a four-carbon molecule called oxaloacetate. C₃ and C₄ types also differ in their response to changes in soil moisture content, temperature, CO₂, and light (Luo et al., 2024). For more information about the anatomical/structural and physiological differences between vegetations with these photosynthetic pathways which drive their distinct climate and CO₂ concentration responses see Luo et al., 2024, Cortés et al., 2021; Smith & Boers, 2023, Polley et al., 1994, Farquhar et al 1989, Still et al 2003.

Under increasing temperature, especially increases above the thermal optimum threshold, productivity in C₃ vegetation is limited by an increase in photorespiration (Hermida-Carrera et al., 2016), which reduces photosynthetic efficiency in C₃ plants. In contrast, C₄ species overcome photorespiration through their CO₂ concentrating mechanism that increases the amount of CO₂ at the site of carboxylation (da Silva et al., 2020), leading to an abundance of C₄ species (natural grasses and crops such as maize) in hot areas in the tropics and sub-tropics (Luo et al., 2024). While rising temperature generally favours C₄ plants, rising atmospheric CO₂ concentration confers a physiological advantage upon C₃ species (Polley et al., 1994) due to a reduction in photorespiration and increase in water use efficiency. This CO₂ fertilization effect is responsible for the increasing presence of C₃ woody species in previously C₄ dominated grasslands (Luo et al., 2024). Shifts in C₃ and C₄ species composition and carbon fluxes across different regions are projected to continue in future due to changing temperature, water availability and increasing CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere (Cortés et al., 2021; Smith & Boers, 2023).

A change in the relative contributions of C₃ and C₄ vegetation to global productivity may contribute to a global trend in stable photosynthetic carbon isotope discrimination (Δ) because C₃ plants discriminate against carbon-13 more strongly than C₄ plants (Farquhar et al., 1989). Since atmospheric studies have indicated that Δ increased by 0.7 ‰ over 1975-2005 globally (Keeling et al 2017), and by 0.4 ‰ over 2000-2011 in the Northern Hemisphere (Peters et al 2018), understanding the effect

65 of changes in vegetation type on discrimination would help to quantify the environmental and physiological factors influencing
plant function and resulting discrimination, including soil moisture content, vapour pressure deficit and stomatal conductance
(Cornwell et al., 2018; Griffis et al., 2010).

Currently, the relative contribution, and its change over time, of C₃ vs C₄ vegetation to global terrestrial biosphere productivity
and their ecological roles in climate change mitigation are not well-known. Using remote sensing products, physiological
70 modeling and crop data, Still et al (2003) found that C₃ and C₄ area abundances are 87.4 and 18.8 million km² (17.7 % as C₄)
and C₃ and C₄ gross primary production were 114.7 and 35.3 PgC yr⁻¹ (23 % as C₄), respectively, on average for the 1980s and
1990s. More recently, Luo et al (2024) used global observations of plant photosynthetic pathways, satellite remote sensing,
and photosynthetic optimality theory to estimate a similar level of C₄ area coverage (17.5 %), but a lower fraction of gross
primary productivity (19.4 %), compared to Still et al (2003). Luo et al (2024) showed that C₄ vegetation coverage decreased
75 from 17.7 % to 17.1 % over 2001 to 2019 as natural C₄ grass cover declined in favor of C₃ vegetation, especially C₃ trees in
tropical grasslands and savannas. In comparison, across the TRENDY ensemble of dynamic global vegetation models, there
were large ranges of 7-23 % of vegetation area and 2-40 % of productivity from C₄ vegetation (Luo et al. 2024), showing a
need for better constraints and understanding of C₃/C₄ vegetation competition and change over time.

Here we investigate the contribution of vegetation diversity representation to uncertainty in carbon flux simulation in Earth
80 System Models. We evaluate the representation of C₃ and C₄ vegetation over 1850-2014 in 11 Earth System Models used in
the 6th Coupled Model Intercomparison project (CMIP6). We assess the distribution, productivity and carbon content of C₃
and C₄ vegetation and compare with observation/satellite-based estimates where possible. We also explore the potential trend
in global carbon isotope discrimination $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ due to C₃ and C₄ vegetation changes simulated in the models.

85 **2 Materials and Methods**

2.1 CMIP6 Models Outputs and the LUH v2 Data

To analyze the CMIP6 models, we obtained the output for the following variables from the CMIP6-ESGF repository
(<https://esgf-index1.ceda.ac.uk/projects/cmip6-ceda/>): fractions of C₃ and C₄ vegetation coverage (c3PftFrac and c4PftFrac),
C₃ and C₄ crop fraction (cropFracC3 and cropFracC4), total crop fraction (cropFrac), gross primary production (gpp), grid cell
90 area (areacella), and percentage of each grid cell covered by land (sftlf). The necessary output was available from 11 models
(Table 1). Brief descriptions of the implementation of vegetation abundance in each of the 11 models are provided in the
Supplementary resources (Materials and Methods S1).

Table 1. Summary of each model’s definition of crop cover and our calculation of C₃ and C₄ crop cover. More detail is given in SM Materials and Methods.

Earth Model	System	Resolution: Lat, Lon (°)	Land Model	C ₃ Crop Fraction	C ₄ Crop Fraction	Definition of crop cover
ACCESS-ESM1.5		1.25, 1.875	CABLE	cropFracC3	Zero everywhere	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CanESM5		2.813, 2.813	CLASS-CTEM	cropFracC3	cropFracC4	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CESM2		0.938, 1.25	CLM5.0	cropFrac * c3PftFrac	cropFrac * c4PftFrac	* LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CESM2-WACCM		0.938, 1.25	CLM5.0	cropFrac * c3PftFrac	cropFrac * c4PftFrac	* LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CMCC-CM2-SR5		0.938, 1.25	CLM4.5	cropFracC3	Zero everywhere	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CMCC-ESM2		0.938, 1.25	CLM4.5	cropFracC3	Zero everywhere	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
CNRM-CM6.1		1.406, 1.406	ISBA-CTRIP	cropFrac * c3PftFrac	cropFrac * c4PftFrac	* ECOCLIMAP-II fixed
CNRM-ESM2.1		1.406, 1.406	ISBA-CTRIP	cropFrac * c3PftFrac	cropFrac * c4PftFrac	* LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM		1.875, 1.875	JSBACH	cropFracC3	cropFracC4	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
MPI-ESM1-2-LR		1.875, 1.875	JSBACH	cropFracC3	cropFracC4	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs
UKESM1		1.25, 1.875	JULES-TRIFFID	cropFracC3	cropFracC4	LUH2 mapped onto PFTs with C ₃ /C ₄ competition from TRIFFID

100

To specify crop cover, ten of the eleven CMIP6 models use the Land Use Harmonization version 2 (LUH2) dataset (Hurtt et al 2017, Table 1) so we also analyze the LUH2 data directly here. LUH2 estimates the fractional area and transition of use of 12 categories at an annual and 0.25° by 0.25° spatiotemporal resolution, starting from the year 850 (Hurtt et al., 2020). Five of these categories are C₃ annual crops, C₃ perennial crops, C₃ nitrogen fixers crops, C₄ annual crops and C₄ perennial crops. We group these categories into C₃ crops and C₄ crops, and their sum as total crops.

105

The UKESM1 model uses the LUH2 crop cover data with some modifications including simulation of competition between C₃ and C₄ vegetation using the dynamic vegetation model TRIFFID (Top-down Representation of Interactive Foliage and Floral Including Dynamics, Sellar et al., 2019, Clark et al., 2011). Other models use the LUH2 data more directly, but differences can result from mapping the LUH2 data onto the model’s PFTs, land cover and grid maps.

110 In CNRM-CM6.1, the crop cover is based on the ECOCLIMAP-II database (Voldoire et al., 2019). CNRM-CM6.1 adopts a vegetation cover map that is fixed to its present-day distribution, so that temporal changes in crop area are not included. The reasoning for using a fixed distribution is that the carbon cycle is not fully resolved in the model and there is uncertainty in impacts of land use and land cover change on carbon flux (Faroux et al., 2013; Voldoire et al., 2019).

115 2.2 Global Land Vegetation Cover, and Productivity

We analysed changes in the vegetation cover (C_3 , C_4 cropland and natural vegetation) for the 11 CMIP6 models by calculating the gridded annual area fraction for C_3 and C_4 vegetation for each year 1850-2014, which we also separated into crops, natural and total vegetation. We also calculated gridded annual gross primary production (GPP) for C_3 and C_4 vegetation in crops, natural and total vegetation in each model. We combined gridded estimates into global totals.

120 We calculated annual maps of area fraction of C_3 crops (cropFracC3) and C_4 crops (cropFracC4). Most models included the cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 variables that could be used directly (Table 1). Some models had to be treated differently, due to the output provided. ACCESS-ESM1.5, CMCC-CM2-SR5 and CMCC-ESM2 did not provide cropFracC4 and their cropFracC3 was equal to the total crop fraction (cropFrac), so we specified the fraction of C_4 crops to be zero everywhere. The CESM2 models did not provide cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 variables, but they did provide c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac (the

125 fractions for total vegetation), so cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 were calculated by multiplying cropFrac by c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac. In CNRM-CM6-1 and CNRM-ESM2.1, the cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 variables were identical to the c3PftFrac and c4PftFrac variables, which appears to be an error in the output. So, in CNRM-CM6-1 and CNRM-ESM2.1 cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 were calculated by multiplying cropFrac by c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac. We also compared the total cropland area in all the models and the LUH2 dataset to a satellite-based estimate from Potapov et al (2022).

130 To calculate the fractions of natural C_3 and C_4 vegetation, we subtracted cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 from c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac (the total C_3 and C_4 vegetation fractions). Therefore, for each grid cell we had the fractional area of C_3 and C_4 crops and of C_3 and C_4 natural vegetation.

The GPP from C_3 or C_4 vegetation was not provided so we estimated these by multiplying total GPP with the area fractions. In Luo et al. (2024) it was found that the per unit area photosynthetic rate of C_4 grass was generally higher than for C_3 vegetation, indicating these calculations may overestimate the proportion assigned to C_3 vegetation. Therefore, we conducted a reliability analysis to determine the similarity between the values and distribution of C_3 and C_4 crops obtained from cropFrac $\times$ c3PftFrac and cropFrac $\times$ c4PftFrac in the models (CESM2, CESM2-WACCM, CNRM-ESM2-1 and CNRM-CM6.1) and LUH2 values and distribution using kernel density estimate (KDE) (Silverman 1986, Chen 2017) and constructed spatial probability distribution plots using all land pixels for C_3 , C_4 and total crops for the year 2014 (Chiang et al., 2021). We also

140 visually compared the spatial distribution of these values to LUH2 and to UKESM1 and MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM, two models that provided their C_3 and C_4 crops.

2.3 Global Stable Carbon Isotopic Discrimination

To estimate how the simulated changes in C₃ and C₄ fractions of GPP influenced the global stable carbon isotopic discrimination, we estimated discrimination assuming fixed values for stable carbon isotope discrimination by C₃ and C₄ vegetation. This neglects any environmental or physiological effects on discrimination that may be simulated by the models to isolate the potential effect from changes in C₃ and C₄ fractions of GPP alone. The total annual global stable carbon isotopic discrimination (Δ_{tot}) was calculated by the following weighted average with GPP:

$$\Delta_{\text{tot}} = (\text{GPP}_{\text{C}_3} \Delta_{\text{C}_3} + \text{GPP}_{\text{C}_4} \Delta_{\text{C}_4}) / (\text{GPP}_{\text{C}_3} + \text{GPP}_{\text{C}_4}) \quad (1)$$

Here, GPP_{C_3} and GPP_{C_4} are the integrated GPP for all C₃ and C₄ vegetation each year, and Δ_{C_3} and Δ_{C_4} are the fixed stable carbon isotope discrimination for C₃ and C₄ respectively. We also calculated the global natural stable carbon isotopic discrimination (Δ_{nat}) using the natural C₃ and C₄ GPP for all the models using the same weighted average approach. To calculate the effect of crops on the global annual stable carbon isotope discrimination (Δ_{crop}), we subtracted Δ_{nat} from Δ_{tot} .

Δ_{C_3} and Δ_{C_4} were specified as the means of C₃ and C₄ plant leaf stable carbon isotope discrimination observations from the database of 3987 species published by Cornwell et al. (2018), which are 20.7 ‰ for Δ_{C_3} and 6.3 ‰ for Δ_{C_4} (Fig. 1). The two peaks in the histogram are assumed to correspond to the highest count for the species with either the C₃ and C₄ photosynthetic pathways. A breakpoint of 12.5 ‰ was chosen for C₃ and C₄ based on the midpoint between the two peaks, such that discrimination values lower than 12.5 ‰ in the figure are taken to correspond to vegetation with the C₄ photosynthetic pathway while values higher than 12.5 ‰ correspond to stable carbon isotope discrimination in vegetation with the C₃ photosynthetic pathway. The means of these two distributions were calculated and used to specify the fixed C₃ and C₄ discrimination: 20.7 ‰ for Δ_{C_3} and 6.3 ‰ for Δ_{C_4} .




Figure 1: Stable carbon isotope discrimination in leaves from the database published by Cornwell et al (2018).

165 3 Result


3.1 Crops Spatial Distribution and its Change between 1970 and 2014

Based on the LUH2 dataset averaged over 1970-2014, the highest C_3 crop abundance is in agricultural regions in central North America, southwest Europe, southeast and south Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, southeast South America and southern Australia (Figures 2 and 3) (Hurt et al., 2020). The fractional crop area is between 60 and 100 % in these regions. For C_4 crops, the highest abundance is in the Great Plains in North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, southwest Asia and southeast Asia (Fig. 2). The models that do not use LUH2 data directly, UKESM1 (which used LUH2 indirectly) and CNRM-CM6-1, show differences with LUH2 (Figures 2 and 3). UKESM1 underestimates C_3 crops in Sub-Saharan and central Africa and in southeast Asia, particularly in India, which is likely due to decreased precipitation in UKESM1 in these areas since the vegetation cover is coupled to its simulated climate (Sellar et al 2019) and UKESM1 underestimates precipitation in India. UKESM1 estimates more C_4 crop coverage than LUH2, particularly in Asia (Figure 2 and 3 and Table S1). Crop coverage in UKESM1 is about 10 % lower than LUH2 between the equator and 30°N (Fig. 3). CNRM-CM6-1 has less C_4 crop cover in Europe and Africa, but more in North and South America, compared to LUH2 (Figures 2 and 3). For models using LUH2 directly, there was still

disagreement of the models with the LUH2 crop coverage, which could be due to a number of reasons such as preprocessing of the LUH2 vegetation classes into the plant functional types (PFTs) and remapping of the LUH2 data into the spatial resolution needed for each model (Table S1). For the models where we calculated C_3 and C_4 crop cover by multiplying cropFrac by C3PftFrac and C4PftFrac, CESM2, CESM2-WACCM, CNRM-ESM2-1 and CNRM-CM6.1, we found that the kernel density estimate (KDE) and visual comparison of the values of C_3 and C_4 crops distribution show they are within the range of values for UKESM1, MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and LUH2 in terms of magnitude, range and spatial distribution as shown by the spatial distribution, and the overlap area in the percentage cover vs density plots. For example, the overlap area between LUH2 and CESM2 in C_3 and C_4 crop cover is 0.68 and 0.70 respectively which is close enough to that between LUH2 and MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM that is 0.74 and 0.50 respectively (Figure 3, S7 – S13).

The models incorporating LUH2 have similar patterns in C_3 and C_4 crop; however, the total area of crops in these models differed from LUH2 by -19 to +3 % and from satellite-based estimate by -28 to +10 % (Fig. 4, Table S1) from Potapov et al (2022) study that analysed the change in global cropland area in the first two decades of the twenty-first century using satellite and sample data that estimate crop cover at ~10.9 and ~11.42 million km² respectively between 2003 and 2006. CanESM5 was the most consistent with LUH2. Inconsistencies among the models that use the LUH2 dataset may be due to how the data were pre-processed before incorporation into the model, due to grid spacing or due to differences in the model PFTs compared to LUH2 categories, particularly as some models did not include C_4 crops. Also, since the variables cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 were not available for all models, our calculations of the crop fractions may have contributed to the discrepancies. The magnitude of area abundance for C_3 and C_4 crop and natural vegetation for the years 1970 and 2014 are provided in the supplementary materials (Table S2).

Between 1970 and 2014, there were decreases in crop coverage in North America, Europe, Southern Africa, Chile, Japan and New Zealand but increases in South and Southeast Asia, Africa and South America (Figure 3b and S1). The largest increases of 10 % or more were concentrated around the eastern region of south America, especially in Brazil, the southern fringes of the Sahara Desert (sub-Saharan Africa) and southeast Africa. The largest decreases of more than 20 % were across the corn-belt of the United States and in southwest and central Europe. Changes in crop area in UKESM1 were consistent with LUH2 except in the low latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, where increases in C_3 crops in Africa and Asia were underestimated, compared to LUH2 (Figure 3b and S1).



205 **Figure 2: Mean percentage of Earth surface covered by crops between 1970 and 2014 for C₃ and C₄ in LUH2, CNRM-CM6.1 and UKESM1-0-LL. Other models not shown use the LUH2 crop variables directly for their crop coverage and change.**




Figure 3: Mean and change in crop coverage averaged over latitude between 1970 and 2014. (a) Mean crop coverage (b) change in crop coverage.

210 **3.2 Global Temporal Trends in Vegetation Coverage**

There is a strong positive trend in the area of croplands from 1850 until 2014 (Fig. 4a). Total crop area rose by 200 % in LUH2 and models using LUH2 data. Crop area in UKESM1 was lower than LUH2 but increased in greater proportion, from 3 to 10 million km² (217 %). In CNRM-CM6 total crop area was fixed at ~14 million km², similar to LUH2 in the 1990s.

215 While representing a smaller fraction of total crop area (10-45%) (Fig. 4a and g), the area of C₄ crops increased in greater proportion (>300 %) than C₃ crops (160 %) in the LUH2 data (Fig. 4). Historically, in the CESM2 models, C₃ crop area is lower and C₄ crop area is higher than in LUH2, despite the model using LUH2 data, although this may be affected by our calculation from the variables provided (Table 1). In UKESM1, C₃ crop area was much smaller than LUH2 while its C₄ crop area was larger (Fig. 4). UKESM1 C₃ crop area peaked between the 1980s and 90s before declining slightly in the 2000s, in contrast to LUH2 where it continued to increase after 2010. UKESM1 C₄ crop area rose through 2014, when it was about 42
220 % higher than LUH2. CNRM-CM6-1 had a fixed C₄ crop fraction of 24 %, slightly higher than the C₄ crop fraction in LUH2 in the 1990s. ACCESS-ESM1-5, CMCC-ESM2 and CMCC-CM2-SR5 do not have C₄ crops so their total crop area is equivalent to the C₃ crop area.

The area of natural vegetation decreases in all models from 1850 until 1940-70, when four models (CNRM-ESM2-1, UKESM1, MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR) start increasing while the others continue decreasing. Natural
225 vegetation is similarly dominated by C₃, with 9-23 % of natural vegetation as C₄ in 2014, and most of the decline in natural vegetation area is in C₃ vegetation. The trend in natural C₄ vegetation area is inconsistent across the models. In CanESM5 and ACCESS-ESM1-5, the natural C₄ vegetation area decreased over 1850-2014, while for MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR the natural C₄ vegetation area increased especially from 1990. For the CESM2, CMCC-ESM2 and CMCC-CM2-SR5 , the natural C₄ vegetation area was constant until the early 2000s before falling slightly. The UKESM1 estimate of the area of
230 natural C₄ vegetation for 2000-14 compares well with Luo et al (2024)'s, while other models simulate up to 15 % larger and up to 63 % smaller areas (Fig. 4h).




Figure 4: Global temporal trends in vegetation area from 1850 to 2014 in CMIP6 models. Trend of the area covered by (a) total crop, (b) total natural vegetation (c) total global vegetation, (d) C₃ crops, (e) C₃ natural vegetation, (f) total C₃ vegetation, (g) C₄ crop, (h) C₄ natural vegetation and (i) total C₄ vegetation. All models except CNRM-CM6-1 used LUH2 data to inform their crop coverage. ACCESS-ESM1-5, CMCC-ESM2 and CMCC-CM2-SR5 do not have C₄ crops.

For the total vegetation area, four models have distinct positive trends from the late 1960s through to 2014 (CNRM-ESM2.1, UKESM1, MPI-ESM1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR) (Fig. 4c), driven mostly by an increase in C₄ natural vegetation (Fig. 4h). In the other models the increase in crop area is balanced by the decreased in area covered by natural vegetation. The estimated total vegetated area from the European Space Agency Climate Change Initiative (ESA-CCI) for 2000-2014 is matched by the CMCC-ESM2 and CMCC-CM2-SR5, while the CESM2 models simulate larger vegetated areas and all other

models simulate smaller vegetated areas. The ESA CCI data shows a small increase that may be caused by the replacement of bare ground by natural grasses (Fig. S5).

245 **3.3 Global Trends in Gross Primary Production**

While all the models simulate an increase in GPP, the magnitude and contribution by vegetation types (in this context: crop/natural and C₃/C₄) differ (Figure 5). The models disagree on the magnitude of total global GPP, ranging from 80 PgC yr⁻¹ in CNRM-ESM2.1 to 150 PgC yr⁻¹ in MPI-ESM1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR (-20 to + 29 %) in 2014 (Gier et al., 2024; Arora et al., 2020) (Fig 5c). The total GPP for all the models increased steadily until the 1960s and then grew sharply for the rest of the historical period (Fig. 5c).

The increase in GPP in crops is linked to the cropland expansion, while the GPP change in natural vegetation is decoupled from the change in area (Figure S9 and S10). In Fig. 4a total crop area increased by 200 % compared to Figure 4 b, in which natural vegetation decreased by 7 % on average. Comparing this change in area to change in GPP in Fig 5a and 5b, total crop GPP increased by 209 % on average. However, for CNRM-CM6.1 with a temporally fixed vegetation cover, the increase in total crop GPP is only 18 %. For natural vegetation, even though there is a mean 7 % decrease in total natural vegetation cover, there is an ~18 % increase in GPP on average. In CNRM-CM6-1 with a fixed vegetation cover, the trend of C₃, C₄ and total crop GPP is not as strong compared to other models especially before the 1970 (Fig. 5a, d and g). They increased by 32 %, 27 %, and 18 % for C₃, C₄ and total crop GPP, respectively, compared to the ensemble mean increase of 195 %, 251 % and 209 % respectively (Fig. 5a, d and g).

260 For GPP in natural vegetation, there are large ranges of 54-100 PgCyr⁻¹ simulated for C₃ vegetation and 9-23 PgCyr⁻¹ simulated for C₄ vegetation across the models before 1970 (Fig. 5e and h). Despite the decrease in natural C₃ vegetation area before 1970, the C₃ GPP trend is generally either weakly negative or unchanging until the 1970 (Fig. 5e). Then all models increase steadily over 1970-2014. In natural C₄ vegetation, there is generally an increase in GPP since 1850, but the increase is not at the same rate in all the models. It is weaker in ACCESS-ESM1-5, CanESM5 and UKESM1 (Fig. 5h). Three models show a decrease in natural C₄ GPP over 2000-14 (ACCESS-ESM1-5 and the CESM2 models).

265 The proportion of total GPP by C₄ vegetation in the models is 12-27 % (Fig. 5i and S7), compared to 23 % in Still et al. (2003) and 20 ± 3 % in Luo et al (2024). Compared to other model simulations, the range was 2-40 % in TRENDY models (Luo et al. 2024), and 18-27 % in previous modelling studies (Farquhar & Lloyd, 1993; Fung et al., 1997).





Figure 5: Temporal trend in gross primary production (GPP) between 1850 and 2014. Trend of GPP of (a) total crop, (b) total natural vegetation (c) total global vegetation, (d) C₃ crops, (e) C₃ natural vegetation, (f) total C₃ vegetation, (g) C₄ crop, (h) C₄ natural vegetation and (i) total C₄ vegetation.

3.5 Global Trends in Stable Carbon Isotope Discrimination

The models disagree on the magnitude and trend of Δ_{tot} , Δ_{nat} and Δ_{crop} (Fig. 6), for our calculation of discrimination based only on the fraction of GPP from C₃ and C₄ vegetation, neglecting any physiological or environmental effects (Equation 1). As a result of the 12-27 % range in C₄ fraction of total GPP, the global total stable carbon discrimination ranges from 16.9 to 19.5 ‰ (Table S2) in 2014 across the models, compared to 16.5 ‰ in Still et al. (2003). Models simulate no change (CESM2 models), slightly increasing Δ_{tot} (ACCESS-ESM1.5 and CNRM-CM6.1) or decreasing Δ_{tot} (all other models). The strongest

decreases in Δ_{tot} were in MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR which had the strongest increases in C_4 vegetation area (Fig. 6). Compared to the strong positive trend in global stable carbon isotope discrimination trend derived by Keeling et al (2017) from atmospheric $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ data, the effect of vegetation change in the models was much smaller or had the opposite sign (Fig. 6).

The models also disagree on the sign and magnitude of the trends in change in Δ_{nat} (-0.83 to 1.7 ‰) and Δ_{crop} (-0.5 to 0.2 ‰, Table S2). Among models with decreasing Δ_{tot} , the trend is primarily driven by growth in productivity of C_4 natural vegetation affecting Δ_{nat} in MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR but by growth in productivity of C_4 crops affecting Δ_{crop} in UKESM1 and CanESM5 models (Fig 6).



290 **Figure 6: Trend of global stable carbon isotope discrimination between 1850 and 2014.** 10-year average stable carbon isotope discrimination of (a) total vegetation (Δ_{tot}), (b) difference in Δ_{tot} from 1850, (c) component of difference due to natural vegetation (Δ_{nat}) and (d) due to crops (Δ_{crop}).

4 Discussion

By examining the components of global vegetation area and GPP by vegetation types, we find that CMIP6 models span a large
295 range for nearly all variables. Some models showed stronger gains in GPP in natural C_3 vegetation, while for others the strongest gains were in either crop or natural C_4 vegetation. Therefore, better quantification of vegetation types and more consistency in models would improve future carbon modelling. For example, total vegetated areas in some models that are much lower than the ESA-CCI estimate (Harper et al., 2023) and total C_4 vegetated areas in some models that are much lower than the Luo et al. (2024) estimate can probably be ruled out. Additionally, Zhao et al (2025) show that the uncertainty in the
300 terrestrial biosphere GPP simulation in models depends strongly on the area of each PFTs and this dependence enabled them to reduce the spread in land carbon estimates by $\sim 75\%$. They also found that changes in PFTs distribution is responsible for $56 \pm 21\%$ climate-induced variability in dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs) GPP. This spread across models in many cases reflects the lack of observational constraints and may also be linked to the discrepancies in the natural vegetation composition in the context of our study

305 Even though nearly all the models use LUH2 for input data, their crop area and particularly its attribution to C_3 and C_4 vegetation are not consistent. While most models underestimated total crop area compared to LUH2 (Fig. 4a), another satellite-based cropland map (Potapov et al., 2022) estimates lower crop area that overlaps some of the CMIP6 models' crop areas. Therefore, the spread in crop area in the models may be consistent with the uncertainty in their input crop area data. A limitation of some current models is that they do not include C_4 crops, thus carbon fluxes associated with C_4 crops cannot be simulated
310 in those models. In future, the total crop area is likely to increase (Molotoks et al., 2018; O'Neill et al., 2016) so that agriculture will become an even stronger influence on carbon fluxes.

The range in global GPP was even larger than the range in vegetated area across the models, both for total (GPP: -23 to +37 % vs area: -11 to +8 %, compared to the model mean) and for C_3 (GPP: -24 to +32 vs area: -19 to +8 %) vegetation types. In C_4 natural vegetation, there was also disagreement over the sign of the trend in GPP, with some models showing increases in
315 GPP in grid cells dominated by C_4 (>75 %, Fig. S6; a-d), and others showing decreases. These inconsistencies indicate that models' parametrizations, simulated climate and other factors (Campbell et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2022; Lavergne et al., 2022; Zscheischler et al., 2014) are at least as important as vegetation area for GPP simulation. Therefore, achieving consistency in area for vegetation types is not sufficient and improved understanding and representation of C_3 and C_4 GPP in models is needed.

320 The range in total area fraction of C_4 vegetation of 10-26 % in the CMIP6 models spans the observation-based estimates of 17.1-17.7 % (Still et al. 2003; Luo et al. 2024) and has a similar range as the dynamic global vegetation models in the TRENDY project (7-23 %; Luo et al. 2024). Since the observation-based estimates are quite consistent, model simulations of carbon

fluxes can likely be improved by detailed comparison and specification of C₄ vegetation cover in particular PFTs in models to improve their correspondence to observational estimates.

325 The trends in C₃ vs C₄ contributions to GPP simulated by CMIP6 models produced differing trends in stable carbon isotopic discrimination, when only C₃ and C₄ fractions of GPP are used to calculate discrimination trends (Eq. 1, Fig. 7). The simulated changes in C₃ and C₄ fractions of GPP did not produce strong increasing trends as found by analysis of atmospheric $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ data (Keeling et al. 2017; Peters et al. 2018). Since the effect of changing C₃ and C₄ fractions of GPP on stable carbon isotopic discrimination varied widely across the CMIP6 models, it is still uncertain how much they could add to or oppose changes in
330 stable carbon isotopic discrimination caused by environmental or physiological effects. Nevertheless, Lavergne et al (2026) found that accounting for the changes in C₃ and C₄ vegetation abundance improves the modelled trends in atmospheric carbon isotope composition compared to data. In particular since the GPP trend in the models (11 to 18 %, Fig. S8) is weaker than the CO₂ fertilization effect over the 20th century based on carbonyl sulphide data (+30 %; Campbell et al. 2017), there may have been a more positive C₃ vegetation-driven trend in stable carbon isotopic discrimination in reality than in the models. Since
335 the CMIP6 models did not provide output for GPP for C₃ and C₄ vegetation or for crops and natural vegetation, we had to scale total GPP by the area fractions of each vegetation type for grid cells with mixed vegetation. This calculation may not represent the models' actual attribution precisely, since C₄ vegetation can have higher GPP relative to area (Luo et al. 2024) in grid cells with a mosaic of C₃ and C₄. However, the extra resources needed in the C₄ photosynthetic pathway (Ehleringer et al., 1978) to concentrate CO₂ may make the difference between C₃ and C₄ CO₂ uptake minimal, especially if they co-occur relatively equally
340 in such grid cells. Incorporating more detailed vegetation information from the models would improve the accuracy of the calculations and analysis based on TRENDY models could be a good place to start.

5 Conclusion

We analysed changes in vegetation with C₃ and C₄ photosynthetic pathways for natural vegetation and crops in 11 CMIP6 models over the historical period of 1850 to 2014. Except for one model that used a fixed vegetation distribution, the models
345 include the expansion of agriculture using LUH2 data. Still, there is a significant variation in the fraction of area and GPP allocated to crops in these models, and the UKESM1 model strongly underestimated crops in Asia and Africa, likely due to biases in simulated climate. The C₄ fraction of vegetated area has remained relatively constant in the models, though there is a large range in simulated C₄ area fraction of 10 to 26 % in 2014 while observation based estimates are quite consistent at 17.1 - 17.7 % from 1980s to 1990s and between 2001 and 2019 (Luo et al. 2024; Still et al. 2003). Overall, the total vegetation area
350 in most models is not changing, but the global vegetation composition is changing in favour of crops. Whereas all the models agree that C₃ vegetation GPP and total global GPP are increasing, the magnitude of the increase spans a large range. In C₄ vegetation, the models disagree on the magnitude of GPP but also the sign of its trend, especially in natural vegetation, implying that the understanding of and model parametrizations for the simulation of C₄ GPP need improvement. The strong positive trends in UKESM1 C₄ crop and MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM and MPI-ESM1-2-LR C₄ natural vegetation area clearly drive the decline

355 of their global stable carbon isotopic discrimination trend, an effect which is not as pronounced in other models' vegetation categories. However, due to the large uncertainty in vegetation area abundance and GPP, it will be difficult to determine if this effect of change in vegetation area abundance and GPP on global stable carbon isotopic discrimination trend is consistent across all the models. We have shown in this study that carbon flux simulation in current ESMs includes uncertainties in C₃ and C₄ photosynthetic pathways in crops and natural vegetation; reducing these uncertainties will require more observational
360 constraints and more robust and realistic model representations.

Appendices

Appendix A contains the supplementary material.

Code Availability

The code (Jupyter notebooks) used for the analysis of the CMIP6 models data and for the data visualization can be found in
365 the following Github repository: https://github.com/jovwemuvwose/CMIP6_Model_Analysis_Project_2025 and Zenodo at: <https://zenodo.org/records/16883407>

Data Availability

The CMIP6 models data used in the are available at the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (Phase 6) website: <https://esgf-node.ipsl.upmc.fr/projects/cmip6-ipsl/>. The leaf carbon isotope data
370 by Cornwell et al (2018) are available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/geb.12764>. For the ESA CCI, LUH2, Still, Potapov and Luo data used in Figure 4, see Harper et al (2023), Hurtt et al (2020), Still et al (2003), Potapov et al (2022) and Luo et al (2024) respectively. For the Keeling_vsCO2, Keeling_vstime used in Figure 7 see Keeling et al 2017. And for the GCB data used in Figure S4 see Friedlingstein et al (2025). The processed data used for the figures can be made available by the authors on request.

375 Authors contribution

JO and HG conceptualize the overarching research and CIP contributed to broadening it; JO prepared and created the published work, specifically data analysis and visualization and writing of the initial draft of the manuscript. HG and CIP reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Competing interests

380 The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Acknowledgement

This project is supported by Schmidt Sciences, LLC.

References

- Arora, V. K., & Boer, G. J.: Uncertainties in the 20th century carbon budget associated with land use change, *Global Change Biology*, 16(12), 3327–3348, <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-2486.2010.02202.X>, 2010.
- Arora, V. K., A., Williams, R. G., Jones, C. D., Brovkin, V., Friedlingstein, P., Schwinger, J., Bopp, L., Boucher, O., Cadule, P., Chamberlain, M. A., Christian, J. R., Delire, C., Fisher, A. R. A., Hajima, T., Ilyina, T., Joetzjer, E., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C. D., ... Ziehn, T.: Carbon-concentration and carbon-climate feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models, *Biogeosciences*, 17(16), 4173–4222. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-17-4173-2020>, 2020.
- 390 Campbell, J. E., Berry, J. A., Seibt, U., Smith, S. J., Montzka, S. A., Launois, T., Belviso, S., Bopp, L., & Laine, M.: Large historical growth in global terrestrial gross primary production, *Nature*, 544(7648), 84–87, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22030>, 2017.
- Chen, Y. C. A tutorial on kernel density estimation and recent advances. *Biostatistics & Epidemiology*, 1(1), 161–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24709360.2017.1396742>, (2017).
- 395 Chiang, F., Mazdiyasni, O. & AghaKouchak, A. Evidence of anthropogenic impacts on global drought frequency, duration, and intensity, *Nature Communication*, 12(2754), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-22314-w>, (2021).
- Cornwell, W. K., Wright, I. J., Turner, J., Maire, V., Barbour, M. M., Cernusak, L. A., Dawson, T., Ellsworth, D., Farquhar, G. D., Griffiths, H., Keitel, C., Knohl, A., Reich, P. B., Williams, D. G., Bhaskar, R., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Richards, A., Schmidt, S., Valladares, F., ... Santiago, L. S.: Climate and soils together regulate photosynthetic carbon isotope discrimination within C3 plants worldwide, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 27(9), 1056–1067, <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12764>, 2018.
- 400 Cortés, J., Mahecha, M. D., Reichstein, M., Myneni, R. B., Chen, C., & Brenning, A.: Where are global vegetation greening and browning trends significant? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(6), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091496>, 2021.
- da Silva, R. G., Alves, R. de C., & Zingaretti, S. M.: Increased [CO₂] causes changes in physiological and genetic responses in C4 crops: A brief review, *Plants*, 9(11), 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9111567>, 2020.
- 405 Ehleringer, J. R.: implications of quantum yield differences on the distributions of C₃ and C₄ grasses, *Oecologia* 31, 255–267 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00346246>, 1978.

- Ehleringer, J., Björkman, O.: Quantum yields for CO₂ uptake in C₃ and C₄ plants: dependence on temperature, CO₂, and O₂ concentration, *Plant Physiology*, 59(1), 86-90, <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.59.1.86>, 1977.
- 410 Faroux, S., Kaptué Tchuenté, A. T., Roujean, J.-L., Masson, V., Martin, E., & Le Moigne, P.: ECOCLIMAP-II/Europe: a twofold database of ecosystems and surface parameters at 1 km resolution based on satellite information for use in land surface, meteorological and climate models, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 6(2), 563–582, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-563-2013>, 2013.
- Farquhar, G. D., and Lloyd, J.: Carbon and oxygen isotope effects in the exchange of carbon dioxide between terrestrial plants and the atmosphere, in: *Stable Isotopes and Plant Carbon-water Relations*, edited by: Ehleringer, J. R., Hall, A. E., Farquhar, G. D., Elsevier, 47-70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-03312-1>, 1993.
- Farquhar, G. D., Ehleringer, J. R., and Hubick, K. T.: Carbon isotope discrimination and photosynthesis, *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Bioi.*, 40, 503-37, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pp.40.060189.002443>, 1989.
- Francey, R., Farquhar, G.: An explanation of ¹³C/¹²C variations in tree rings, *Nature*, 297, 28–31, 420 <https://doi.org/10.1038/297028a0>, 1982.
- Friedlingstein, P., O’Sullivan, M., Jones, M. W., Andrew, R. M., Hauck, J., Landschützer, P., Le Quéré, C., Li, H., Luijkx, I. T., Olsen, A., Peters, G. P., Peters, W., Pongratz, J., Schwingshackl, C., Sitch, S., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Jackson, R. B., Alin, S. R., ... Zeng.: Global Carbon Budget 2024, *Earth System Science Data*, 17(3), 965–1039. <https://doi.org/10.5194/ESSD-17-965-2025>, 2025.
- 425 Fung, I., Field, C. B., Berry, J. A., Thompson, M. V., Randerson, J. T., Malmström, C. M., Vitousek, P. M., James Collatz, G., Sellers, P. J., Randall, D. A., Denning, A. S., Badeck, F., and John, J.: Carbon 13 exchanges between the atmosphere and biosphere, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 11(4), 507–533, <https://doi.org/10.1029/97GB01751>, 1997.
- Gasser, T., Crepin, L., Quilcaille, Y., Houghton, R. A., Ciais, P., and Obersteiner, M.: Historical CO₂ emissions from land use and land cover change and their uncertainty, *Biogeosciences*, 17(15), 4075–4101, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-17-4075-2020>, 430 2020.
- Gier, B. K., Schlund, M., Friedlingstein, P., Jones, C. D., Jones, C., Zaehle, S., and Eyring, V.: Representation of the terrestrial carbon cycle in CMIP6, *Biogeosciences*, 21(22), 5321–5360, <https://doi.org/10.5194/BG-21-5321-2024>, 2024.
- Griffis, T. J., Baker, J. M., Sargent, S. D., Erickson, M., Corcoran, J., Chen, M., and Billmark, K.: Influence of C₄ vegetation on ¹³CO₂ discrimination and isoforcing in the upper Midwest, United States, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 24(4), 435 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GB003768>, 2010.
- Harper, K. L., Lamarche, C., Hartley, A., Peylin, P., Ottlé, C., Bastrikov, V., San Martín, R., Bohnenstengel, S. I., Kirches, G., Boettcher, M., Shevchuk, R., Brockmann, C., and Defourny, P.: A 29-year time series of annual 300m resolution plant-functional-type maps for climate models, *Earth System Science Data*, 15(3), 1465–1499, <https://doi.org/10.5194/ESSD-15-1465-2023>, 2023.

- 440 Haxeltine, A., and Prentice, C. I.: BIOME3: An equilibrium terrestrial biosphere model based on ecophysiological constraints, resource availability, and competition among plant functional types, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 10(4), 693–709, <https://doi.org/10.1029/96GB02344>, 1996.
- Hermida-Carrera, C., Kapralov, M. V., and Galmés, J.: Rubisco catalytic properties and temperature response in crops, *Plant Physiology*, 171(4), 2549–2561, <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.16.01846>, 2016.
- 445 Hou, H., Zhou, B. B., Pei, F., Hu, G., Su, Z., Zeng, Y., Zhang, H., Gao, Y., Luo, M., and Li, X.: Future land use/land cover change has nontrivial and potentially dominant impact on global gross primary productivity, *Earth's Future*, 10(9), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002628>, 2022.
- Houghton, R. A., and Castanho, A.: Annual emissions of carbon from land use, land-use change, and forestry from 1850 to 2020, *Earth System Science Data*, 15(5), 2025–2054, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-2025-2023>, 2023.
- 450 Houghton, R. A., House, J. I., Pongratz, J., Van Der Werf, G. R., Defries, R. S., Hansen, M. C., Le Quéré, C., and Ramankutty, N.: Carbon emissions from land use and land-cover change, *Biogeosciences*, 9(12), 5125–5142, <https://doi.org/10.5194/BG-9-5125-2012>, 2012.
- Hu, X., He, Y., Kong, Z., Zhang, J., Yuan, M., Yu, L., Peng, C., and Zhu, Q.: Evaluation of future impacts of climate change, CO₂, and land use cover change on global net primary productivity using a processed model, *Land*, 10(4),
 455 <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10040365>, 2021.
- Hurtt, G. C., Chini, L., Sahajpal, R., Frolking, S., Bodirsky, B. L., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Fisk, J., Fujimori, S., Goldewijk, K. K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Heinimann, A., Humpenöder, F., Jungclaus, J., Kaplan, J. O., Kennedy, J., Krisztin, T., Lawrence, D., ... Zhang, X.: Harmonization of global land use change and management for the period 850–2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13(11), 5425–5464, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5425-2020>, 2020.
- 460 Keeling, R. F., Graven, H. D., Welp, L. R., Resplandy, L., Bi, J., Piper, S. C., Sun, Y., Bollenbacher, A., and Meijer, H. A. J.: Atmospheric evidence for a global secular increase in carbon isotopic discrimination of land photosynthesis, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(39), 10361–10366, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1619240114>, 2017.
- Lam, W. Y., Chatterton, J., Sim, S., Kulak, M., Mendoza Beltran, A., and Huijbregts, M. A. J.: Estimating greenhouse gas
 465 emissions from direct land use change due to crop production in multiple countries, *Science of the Total Environment*, 755(2), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143338>, 2021.
- Lavergne, A., Hemming, D., Prentice, I. C., Guerrieri, R., Oliver, R. J., & Graven, H.: Global decadal variability of plant carbon isotope discrimination and its link to gross primary production, *Global Change Biology*, 28(2), 524–541, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15924>, 2022.
- 470 Lavergne, A., Harrison, S.P., Atsawawaranunt, K., Dong, N. & Prentice, I. C.: Minimal impact of recent decline in C₄ vegetation abundance on atmospheric carbon isotopic composition, *Commun Earth Environ*, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-025-03102-6>, 2026

- Luo, X., Zhou, H., Satriawan, T. W., Tian, J., Zhao, R., Keenan, T. F., Griffith, D. M., Sitch, S., Smith, N. G., and Still, C. J.: Mapping the global distribution of C4 vegetation using observations and optimality theory, *Nature Communications*, 15(1219), 475 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-45606-3>, 2024.
- Molotoks, A., Stehfest, E., Doelman, J., Albanito, F., Fitton, N., Dawson, T. P., and Smith, P.: Global projections of future cropland expansion to 2050 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon storage, *Global Change Biology*, 24(12), 5895–5908, <https://doi.org/10.1111/GCB.14459>, 2018.
- O'Neill, B. C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D. P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., Knutti, R., Kriegler, E., Lamarque, J. F., Lowe, J., Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Riahi, K., and Sanderson, B. M.: The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9(9), 3461–3482, <https://doi.org/10.5194/GMD-9-3461-2016>, 2016.
- Peters, W., van der Velde, I. R., van Schaik, E., Miller, J. B., Ciais, P., Duarte, H. F., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Molen, M. K., Scholze, M., Schaefer, K., Vidale, P. L., Verhoef, A., Wårlind, D., Zhu, D., Tans, P. P., Vaughn, B., and White, J. W. C.: Increased water-use efficiency and reduced CO₂ uptake by plants during droughts at a continental scale, *Nature Geoscience*, 11(10), 744–748, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0212-7>, 2018.
- Polley, H. W., Johnson, H. B., and Mayeux, H. S.: Increasing CO₂: comparative responses of the C4 grass *schizachyrium* and grassland invader *prosopis*, *Ecology*, 75(4), <https://doi.org/10.2307/1939421>, 1994.
- Potapov, P., Turubanova, S., Hansen, M. C., Tyukavina, A., Zalles, V., Khan, A., Song, X., Pickens, A., Shen, A., and Cortez, J.: Global maps of cropland extent and change show accelerated cropland expansion in the twenty-first century, *Nat Food*, (3), 19–28, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00429-z>, 2022.
- Sellar, A. A., Jones, C. G., Mulcahy, J. P., Tang, Y., Yool, A., Wiltshire, A., O'Connor, F. M., Stringer, M., Hill, R., Palmieri, J., Woodward, S., de Mora, L., Kuhlbrodt, T., Rumbold, S. T., Kelley, D. I., Ellis, R., Johnson, C. E., Walton, J., Abraham, N. L., ... Zerroukat, M.: UKESM1: description and evaluation of the U.K. Earth System Model, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(12), 4513–4558, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001739>, 2019.
- Smith, T., and Boers, N.: Global vegetation resilience linked to water availability and variability, *Nature Communications*, 14(1), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36207-7>, 2023.
- Silverman, B. W. *Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis*, 26, Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Chapman and Hall, London, 1986.
- 500 Still, C. J., Berry, J. A., Collatz, G. J., and DeFries, R. S.: Global distribution of C3 and C4 vegetation: Carbon cycle implications, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 17(1), 1006, doi:10.1029/2001GB001807, 2003.
- Ubierna, N., and Farquhar, G. D.: Advances in measurements and models of photosynthetic carbon isotope discrimination in C3 plants. In *Plant, Cell and Environment* 37(7), 1494–1498, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12346>, 2014.
- 505 Voldoire, A., Saint-Martin, D., S  n  si, S., Decharme, B., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Colin, J., Gu  r  my, J. F., Michou, M., Moine, M. P., Nabat, P., Roehrig, R., Salas y M  lia, D., S  f  rian, R., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Belamari, S., Berthet, S., Cassou,

- C., ... Waldman, R.: Evaluation of CMIP6 DECK Experiments With CNRM-CM6-1, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11(7), 2177–2213, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001683>, 2019.
- Wang, J., Bretz, M., Dewan, M. A. A., and Delavar, M. A.: Machine learning in modelling land-use and land cover-change (LULCC): Current status, challenges and prospects, *Science of the Total Environment*, 822(2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153559>, 2022.
- Winslow, J.C., Hunt Jr, E.R. and Piper, S.C.: The influence of seasonal water availability on global C3 versus C4 grassland biomass and its implications for climate change research, *Ecological modelling*, 163(1-2), 153-173, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(02\)00415-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00415-5), 2003
- 515 Wullschleger, S. D., Epstein, H. E., Box, E. O., Euskirchen, E. S., Goswami, S., Iversen, C. M., Kattge, J., Norby, R. J., Van Bodegom, P. M., and Xu, X.: Plant functional types in earth system models: past experiences and future directions for application of dynamic vegetation models in high-latitude ecosystems, *Annals of Botany*, 114(1), 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcu077>, 2014.
- 520 Zhao, R., Luo, X., Walker, A.P., Hoffman, F. M. & Koh, L. P.: Vegetation biogeography is a main source of uncertainty in modelling the land carbon cycle, *Nat Commun*, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-67636-1>, 2025Zscheischler, J., Mahecha, M. D., Von Buttlar, J., Harmeling, S., Jung, M., Rammig, A., Randerson, J. T., Schölkopf, B., Seneviratne, S. I., Tomelleri, E., Zaehle, S., and Reichstein, M.: A few extreme events dominate global interannual variability in gross primary production, *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(3), <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/035001>, 2014.

Supporting Information for

Uncertainty in Land Carbon Fluxes Simulated by CMIP6 Models from Inconsistent Treatments of Crop Distributions and Photosynthetic Pathways

J. Ovwemuvwose¹, I. C. Prentice^{2,3}, and H. D. Graven¹

¹Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, UK.

²Georgina Mace Centre for the Living Planet, Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, London, UK

³Department of Earth System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Corresponding author: joseph Ovwemuvwose (j.owwemuvwose22@imperial.ac.uk & jsovw@gmail.com)

Contents of this File:

Material and Method S1: Description of implementation of vegetation cover in CMIP6 models

Table S1

Table S2

Figure S1

Figure S2

Figure S3

Figure S4

Figure S5

Figure S6

Figure S7

Figure S8

Table S9

Table S10

Figure S11

Figure S12

Figure S13

Supplementary:

Material and Method S1 - Description of implementation of vegetation cover in CMIP6 models

35 S1.1 ACCESS-ESM1.5

In the Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator Earth System Model version 1.5 (ACCESS-ESM1.5) land surface and biogeochemical processes are simulated using the Community Atmosphere Biosphere Land Exchange (CABLE) (Kowalczyk et al., 2013) model and a modified Carnegie–Ames–Stanford Approach (CASA) carbon (C) cycle model which incorporates nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) cycles (CASA-CNP module) (Ziehn et al., 2020). The area abundance of crops for the historical period is based on the LUH2 dataset (Hurt et al., 2020). The 12 land-use types in the LUH2 dataset are mapped into 9 plant functional types (PFTs) in CABLE including C₃ grass, C₃ crops and C₄ crops. The rest of the PFTs (evergreen needleleaf forest, evergreen broadleaf forest, deciduous needleleaf forest, deciduous broadleaf forest, shrub and tundra) are not specified as either C₃ or C₄ but most of them would be C₃ vegetation since it is the most prevalent of these two photosynthetic pathways in the given PFTs. However, even though a C₄ crop PFT was specified in the model description (Ziehn et al., 2020), the variable cropFracC₄ was not provided in the CMIP6 archive. The values for cropFracC₃ and for the total crop fraction (cropFrac) were identical, so we specified the fraction of C₄ crops to be zero everywhere.

50 S1.2 CanESM5

The land component of the Canadian Earth System Model version 5 (CanESM5) is comprised of the Canadian Land Surface Scheme (CLASS) and the Canadian Terrestrial Ecosystem Model (CTEM) making up the CLASS-CTEM modelling framework. CLASS simulates the physical and CTEM simulates the biogeochemical land surface processes. Energy and water balances and land surface physical processes are calculated in CLASS using four vegetation categories: needleleaf trees, broadleaf trees, grasses and crops. Each of these is divided into sub-categories: needleleaf trees into evergreen and deciduous, broadleaf trees into three categories; cold deciduous, drought deciduous, and evergreen, crops into C₃ and C₄ types, and grasses into C₃ and C₄ types to form 9 PFTs (Swart et al., 2019). The increase in the area abundance of crops for the historical period is based on the LUH2 dataset (Hurt et al., 2020).

60

S1.3 CESM2, CESM2-WACCM, CMCC-CM2-SR5 and CMCC-ESM2-HAM

The Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2) and Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model (WACCM) are developed by teams of individuals from the National Centre for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), and other research institutions and universities. The major difference between CESM2 and CESM2-WACCM is the vertical extent of their atmospheric configuration. In CESM2-WACCM the simulated properties extend up to 130-140 km in the upper atmosphere with 70 vertical levels (Gettelman et al., 2019) whereas CESM2 has only 32 vertical levels and a model top of 40 km, without a prognostic scheme for ozone and other stratospheric entities (Danabasoglu et al., 2020).

CESM2 and CESM2-WACCM use the Community Land Model Version 5 (CLM5) for the simulation of terrestrial biogeochemical cycles including interactions with the soil-plant-atmospheric continuum, anthropogenic land use change and vegetation coverage (Danabasoglu et al., 2020; Lawrence et al., 2019). CLM5 computes land unit weights through two methods: dataset input or prognostic representation. In the prognostic representation, the land surface heterogeneity is represented in several land units which are divided into columns and the columns are divided into patches. The land units are vegetated land, lake, urban, glacier, and cropland. The vegetated land unit is divided into patches of 14 plant or crop functional type (P/CFTs) which are (N = needleleaf; B = broadleaf; E = evergreen; D = deciduous; T = tree; S = shrub): NET temperate, NET boreal, NDT boreal, BET tropical, BET temperate, BDT tropical, BDT temperate, BDT boreal, BES temperate, BDS temperate, BDS boreal, C₃ Arctic grass, C₃ grass and C₄ grass. Crops are categorised into C₃ unmanaged rainfed crop, C₃ unmanaged irrigated crop, managed rainfed unirrigated crops and managed irrigated crops. Apart from the last three PFTs, it is not explicitly stated which of the other PFTs uses the C₃ or C₄ photosynthetic pathways. However, their output variables provided include the percentage area coverage of all C₃ and C₄ vegetation. The CLM uses its Land Use Data Tool to translate the LUH2 dataset transitions and information into its P/CFTs distribution and management (Hurtt et al., 2020; Lawrence et al., 2019). The CESM2 models did not provide cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 variables, but they did provide c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac (the fractions for total vegetation), so cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 were calculated by multiplying cropFrac by c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac.

90 The Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change (CMCC) Foundation model simulates biogeochemical cycles and land use change with the Community Land Model version 4.5 (CLM4.5) (Lovato et al., 2022), which is an earlier version of the model used in CESM2 and CESM2-WACCM. The land use implementation is similar to CESM2, which implies they used the LUH2 dataset as well (Lawrence et al., 2019). However, unlike CESM2, the CMCC models do provide cropFracC3, although not cropFracC4. Their cropFracC3 was equal to 95 the total crop fraction (cropFrac), so we specified the fraction of C₄ crops to be zero everywhere

S1.4 CNRM-CM6.1 and CNRM-ESM2.1

CNRM-CM6.1 is the sixth generation of the fully coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation model jointly developed by Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques (CNRM) and Cerfacs. Its land surface is simulated with the Interaction Soil-Biosphere-Atmosphere-CNRM TRIP (ISBA-CTRIP) coupled system 100 (Decharme et al., 2019). Its vegetation cover is based on the ECOCLIMAP-II database in which each land cover type is portioned into fractions of 4 main surface types or tiles (nature, water bodies, sea, urban areas). The nature tile is further divided into bare soil, bare rock or one of ten PFTs. CNRM-CM6.1 adopts a fixed vegetation cover map from ECOCLIMAP-II (Faroux et al., 2013; Voldoire et al., 2019). It does not incorporate LUH2 datasets.

105 CNRM-ESM2.1 and CNRM-CM6.1 share the same code, physical parameterization and grid resolution but vegetation coverage in CNRM-ESM2.1 is dynamic, incorporating the LUH2 crop coverage dataset. In CNRM-CM6.1 and CNRM-ESM2.1, the cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 variables were identical to the c3PftFrac and c4PftFrac variables, which appears to be an error in the output. So, in CNRM-CM6.1 and CNRM-ESM2.1 110 cropFracC3 and cropFracC4 were calculated by multiplying cropFrac by c3PftFrac or c4PftFrac.

S1.5 MPI-ESM1.2

The Max Planck Institute Earth System Model version 1.2 (MPI-ESM1.2) uses the land surface scheme 115 JSBACH which focuses on the competition between two vegetation types: graminoids (grass-like) and woody species (trees and shrubs). These two broad categories are further divided into different PFTs. To integrate the LUH2 dataset into their JSBACH simulation, they aggregated the four LUH2 natural vegetation and grasslands states into the natural vegetation type, the five LUH2 crop variables into crops, the LUH2 pasture and urban into pasture. These three broad types: natural vegetation, crops and pastures are then proportionally adjusted to sum

up to one (Mauritsen et al., 2019). JSBACH dynamic vegetation component DYNVEG has 8 PFTs, 6 of which are woody (tropical evergreen trees, tropical deciduous trees, extratropical evergreen trees, extratropical deciduous trees, raingreen shrubs, deciduous shrubs) and 2 of which are grass (C₃ grasses and C₄ grasses). In the model, prevalent climate conditions determine the extent of the presence or absence of vegetation in hot and cold regions (Reick et al., 2013).

S1.6 UKESM1-0-LL

The UK Earth System Model version 1 (UKESM1) (Mulcahy et al., 2023; Sellar et al., 2019) uses a physical core built on a prior model, HadGEM3-GC3.1 (Kuhlbrodt et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2018). It simulates the terrestrial ecosystem biogeochemistry and land surface dynamics using the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES) (Clark et al., 2011; Littleton et al., 2020) which is built on the Top-down Representation of Interactive Foliage and Flora Including Dynamics (TRIFFID) which uses the LUH2 crop cover data with some modifications including simulation of competition between C₃ and C₄ (Cox et al., 2001). It uses Rothamsted carbon model soil carbon scheme (RothC) (Falloon et al., 1998). TRIFFID is a dynamic vegetation model that divides the earth surface into five components: vegetated land, urban and lake surface types, bare soil, and land covered permanently by ice. The vegetated component is divided into five PFTs : broadleaf trees, needleleaf trees, C₃ (temperate) grasses, C₄ (tropical) grasses and shrubs. These are assumed to sufficiently represent the phenotypic and genotypic variations needed to capture biophysical and biogeochemical roles of vegetation in earth system models (Sellar et al., 2019, Clark et al., 2011).

Table S1. Global land area in each category in LUH2 and in CMIP6 models for 1970 and 2014.

	Area Abundance (Million km ²)			
	C3 crop	C4 Crop	C3 Natural	C4 Natural
LUH2 1970 (2014)	11.59 (12.75)	2.68 (3.34)		
Luo (2014)		(3.32)		(17.02)
Ensemble mean 1970 (2014)	10.71 (11.55)	1.81 (2.31)	66.76 (66.41)	15.33 (15.29)
ACCESS-ESM1-5 1970 (2014)	12.41 (13.76)	0.00 (0.00)	67.66 (67.35)	9.97 (8.95)
CanESM5 1970 (2014)	11.43 (12.41)	2.68 (3.30)	64.96 (63.92)	6.88 (6.33)
CESM2 1970 (2014)	9.42 (9.94)	3.04 (3.92)	71.34 (70.48)	19.44 (18.91)
CESM2-WACCM 1970 (2014)	9.42 (9.94)	3.04 (3.92)	71.34 (70.48)	19.44 (18.91)
CMCC-CM2-SR5 1970 (2014)	13.21 (14.68)	0.00 (0.00)	68.99 (67.79)	19.63 (19.35)
CMCC-ESM2 1970 (2014)	13.21 (14.68)	0.00 (0.00)	68.99 (67.79)	19.63 (19.35)
CNRM-CM6.1 Fixed	9.71 (9.71)	3.00 (3.00)	59.82 (59.82)	19.22 (19.22)
CNRM-ESM2.1 1970 (2014)	9.48 (10.03)	2.26 (3.10)	65.01 (65.37)	20.09 (19.56)
MPI-ESM1.2-HAM 1970 (2014)	11.89 (13.19)	1.35 (1.96)	70.72 (71.18)	8.75 (10.18)
MPI-ESM1-2-LR 1970 (2014)	11.96 (13.03)	1.14 (1.60)	68.33 (68.59)	8.79 (9.91)
UKESM1-LL 1970 (2014)	5.68 (5.65)	3.36 (4.62)	57.12 (57.76)	16.84 (17.47)

Table S2. Ranges of simulated terrestrial biosphere carbon flux variables for 2014 simulated by CMIP6 models from 1850 to 2014.. GPP is Gross Primary Production;

Variable	Area (Million km ²)	GPP (PgCyr ⁻¹)	Discrimination (%)	Discrimination change (‰)
Total	95 [85, 105]	116 [93, 150]	18.12 [16.98, 19.15]	-0.23 [-0.68, 0.20]
Total Natural	82 [71, 90]	100 [80, 126]	18.15 [17, 19.42]	-0.17 [-0.80, 0.22]
Total Crop	14 [10, 15.4]	17 [13, 26]	-0.06 [-0.7, 0.33]	-0.07 [-0.50, 0.20]
C ₃ total	78 [63, 84]	96 [73, 126]		
C ₃ Natural	66 [57, 71]	82 [62, 105]		
C ₃ crop	12 [6, 15]	14 [6, 21]		
C ₄ total	18 [9, 13]	21 [12, 30]		
C ₄ Natural	15 [6, 19]	18 [15, 26]		
C ₄ crop	2 [0, 4.6]	3 [0, 8]		




Figure S1. Percentage change in crop abundance between 1970 and 2014 for C₃ and C₄ in LUH2 (a) and (c) and UKESM1-0-LL (b) and (d). All the other models not shown use the LUH2 crop variables for their crop coverage and change. CNRM-CM6-1 is not shown here because it has fixed crop coverage.




Figure S2. Relationship between the change in bare ground and natural grass in the ESA CCI land cover dataset between 2000 and 2014. The change is calculated as the difference between the values of the variables in 2000 and 2014.




Figure S3. Temporal trend of GPP in natural C₄ dominated grid cells between 1850 and 2014. Here natural C₄ => 75% except in CanESM5 where there are no grid cells with natural C₄ => 75% and as such a threshold of natural C₄ => 45.5% is used instead. (a) GPP in natural C₄ dominated grid cells, (b) GPP in natural C₄ dominated grid cells weighted by the natural C₄ vegetation fraction, (c) Changes in the GPP in natural C₄ dominated grid cells, (d) changes in the GPP in natural C₄ dominated grid cells weighted by the natural C₄ vegetation fraction.






Figure S4. CMIP6 models percentage change in total GPP between 1900 and 2000. The value of the percentage change in the GPP is weak (11 to 17%) compared to 30% observed in other studies in the 20th century.

205



210 **Figure S5. Relationship between GPP and area for natural vegetation for the mean of the 11 CMIP6 models.** The line is fitted with a cubic polynomial and $R^2 = 0.544$. It shows GPP is decreasing with increasing area which is contrary to what is theoretically expected which is a decrease in GPP with decreasing area, hence our assumption that the change in GPP in natural vegetation may be decoupled from the change in its area.



215 **Figure S6. Relationship between GPP and area for cropland for the mean of the 11 CMIP6 models.** The line is fitted with a cubic polynomial and $R^2 = 0.994$. The GPP increased with the increasing area.




Figure S7. Distribution density plot for CMIP6 models and LUH2 crop cover for 2014. Total crop (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ crop (c). The two models which have outliers for C₃ and C₄ crops are UKESM1 and MPI-ESM-1-2-HAM. The values we obtained by multiplying the total crop cover and the total C₃ and C₄ fraction to get the values of C₃ and C₄ crops for CESM2, CNRM-CM6.1 and CNRM-ESM2.1 are within the range of the other models and they are comparable to the values of the LUH2 values and the other models.




Figure S8. Plot of the spatial variation in cropland area in CMIP6 models and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ cropland (c). The spatial variation of C₃ and C₄ crops obtained by multiplying the total crop cover and the total C₃ and C₄ fraction in CESM2, CNRM-CM6.1 and CNRM-ESM2.1 is consistent with the range of those of the other models and the LUH2 datasets.




Figure S9. Kernel density plot of the spatial distribution of crop in and MPI-ESM-1-2-H and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C_3 crop (b), and C_4 cropland (c). The overlap area is 74, 76 and 50 % for total, C_3 and C_4 crops between the model and LUH2.




Figure S10. Kernel density plot of the spatial distribution of crop in and UKESM1 and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ cropland (c). The overlap area is 55, 46 and 66 % for total, C₃ and C₄ crops between the model and LUH2.

240




Figure S11. Kernel density plot of the spatial distribution of crop in and CESM2 and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ cropland (c). The overlap area is 68, 73 and 70 % for total, C₃ and C₄ crops between the model and LUH2.




Figure S12. Kernel density plot of the spatial distribution of crop in and CNRM-CM6.1 and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ cropland (c). The overlap area is 61, 56 and 59 % for total, C₃ and C₄ crops between the model and LUH2.

255




Figure S13. Kernel density plot of the spatial distribution of crop in and CNRM-ESM2.1 and LUH2 for 2014. Total cropland (a), C₃ crop (b), and C₄ cropland (c). The overlap area is 66, 63 and 58 % for total, C₃ and C₄ crops between the model and LUH2.

References

- Clark, D. B., Mercado, L. M., Sitch, S., Jones, C. D., Gedney, N., Best, M. J., Pryor, M., Rooney, G. G., Essery, R. L. H., Blyth, E., Boucher, O., Harding, R. J., Huntingford, C., and Cox, P. M.: The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES), model description – Part 2: Carbon fluxes and vegetation dynamics, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4, 701–722, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-4-701-2011>, 2011.
- Danabasoglu, G., Lamarque, J. F., Bacmeister, J., Bailey, D. A., DuVivier, A. K., Edwards, J., Emmons, L. K., Fasullo, J., Garcia, R., Gettelman, A., Hannay, C., Holland, M. M., Large, W. G., Lauritzen, P. H., Lawrence, D. M., Lenaerts, J. T. M., Lindsay, K., Lipscomb, W. H., Mills, M. J., Neale, R., Oleson, K. W., Otto-Bliesner, B., Phillips, A. S., Sacks, W., Tilmes, S., van Kampenhout, L., Vertenstein, M., Bertini, A., Dennis, J., Deser, C., Fischer, C., Fox-Kemper, B., Kay, J. E., Kinnison, D., Kushner, P. J., Larson, V. E., Long, M. C., Mickelson, S., Moore, J. K., Nienhouse, E., Polvani, L., Rasch, P. J., and Strand, W. G.: The Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2), *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001916>, 2020.
- Decharme, B., Delire, C., Minvielle, M., Colin, J., Vergnes, J. P., Alias, A., Saint-Martin, D., Séférian, R., Sénési, S., and Voldoire, A.: Recent Changes in the ISBA-CTRIP Land Surface System for Use in the CNRM-

- CM6 Climate Model and in Global Off-Line Hydrological Applications, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 11, 1207–1252, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001545>, 2019.
- 280 Falloon, P. D., Smith, P., Smith, J. U., Coleman, K., Szabó, J., and Marshall, S.: Regional estimates of carbon sequestration potential: linking the Rothamsted Carbon Model to GIS databases, *Biol Fertil Soils*, Springer-Verlag, 236–241 pp., 1998.
- Faroux, S., Kaptué Tchuenté, A. T., Roujean, J.-L., Masson, V., Martin, E., and Le Moigne, P.: ECOCLIMAP-II/Europe: a twofold database of ecosystems and surface parameters at 1 km resolution based on satellite
- 285 information for use in land surface, meteorological and climate models, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 6, 563–582, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-563-2013>, 2013.
- Gettelman, A., Mills, M. J., Kinnison, D. E., Garcia, R. R., Smith, A. K., Marsh, D. R., Tilmes, S., Vitt, F., Bardeen, C. G., McInerney, J., Liu, H. L., Solomon, S. C., Polvani, L. M., Emmons, L. K., Lamarque, J. F., Richter, J. H., Glanville, A. S., Bacmeister, J. T., Phillips, A. S., Neale, R. B., Simpson, I. R., DuVivier, A. K.,
- 290 Hodzic, A., and Randel, W. J.: The Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (WACCM6), *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124, 12380–12403, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030943>, 2019.
- Hurtt, G. C., Chini, L., Sahajpal, R., Frolking, S., Bodirsky, B. L., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Fisk, J., Fujimori, S., Goldewijk, K. K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Heinimann, A., Humpenöder, F., Jungclaus, J., Kaplan, J. O.,
- 295 Kennedy, J., Krisztin, T., Lawrence, D., Lawrence, P., Ma, L., Mertz, O., Pongratz, J., Popp, A., Poulter, B., Riahi, K., Shevliakova, E., Stehfest, E., Thornton, P., Tubiello, F. N., van Vuuren, D. P., and Zhang, X.: Harmonization of global land use change and management for the period 850-2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 13, 5425–5464, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5425-2020>, 2020.
- Cox, P. M., Betts, R. A., Betts, A., Jones, C. D., Spall, S. A., and Totterdell, I. J.: Modelling vegetation and the
- 300 carbon cycle as interactive elements of the climate system, in: *Meteorology at the Millennium*, edited by: Pearce, R. P., *International Geophysics*, Vol. 83, Academic Press, 259–279, 2002.
- Kowalczyk, E. A., Stevens, L., Law, R. M., Dix, M., Wang, Y. P., Harman, I. N., Haynes, K., Sribnovsky, J., Pak, B., and Ziehn, T.: The land surface model component of ACCESS: description and impact on the simulated surface climatology, *Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal*, 65–82 pp., 2013.
- 305 Kuhlbrodt, T., Jones, C. G., Sellar, A., Storkey, D., Blockley, E., Stringer, M., Hill, R., Graham, T., Ridley, J., Blaker, A., Calvert, D., Copsey, D., Ellis, R., Hewitt, H., Hyder, P., Ineson, S., Mulcahy, J., Siahann, A., and

- Walton, J.: The Low-Resolution Version of HadGEM3 GC3.1: Development and Evaluation for Global Climate, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 10, 2865–2888, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001370>, 2018.
- Lawrence, D. M., Fisher, R. A., Koven, C. D., Oleson, K. W., Swenson, S. C., Bonan, G., Collier, N., Ghimire, B., van Kampenhout, L., Kennedy, D., Kluzek, E., Lawrence, P. J., Li, F., Li, H., Lombardozzi, D., Riley, W. J., Sacks, W. J., Shi, M., Vertenstein, M., Wieder, W. R., Xu, C., Ali, A. A., Badger, A. M., Bisht, G., van den Broeke, M., Brunke, M. A., Burns, S. P., Buzan, J., Clark, M., Craig, A., Dahlin, K., Drewniak, B., Fisher, J. B., Flanner, M., Fox, A. M., Gentine, P., Hoffman, F., Keppel-Aleks, G., Knox, R., Kumar, S., Lenaerts, J., Leung, L. R., Lipscomb, W. H., Lu, Y., Pandey, A., Pelletier, J. D., Perket, J., Randerson, J. T., Ricciuto, D. M., Sanderson, B. M., Slater, A., Subin, Z. M., Tang, J., Thomas, R. Q., Val Martin, M., and Zeng, X.: The Community Land Model Version 5: Description of New Features, Benchmarking, and Impact of Forcing Uncertainty, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 11, 4245–4287, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001583>, 2019.
- Littleton, E. W., Harper, A. B., Vaughan, N. E., Oliver, R. J., Duran-Rojas, M. C., and Lenton, T. M.: JULES-BE: Representation of bioenergy crops and harvesting in the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator vn5.1, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 13, 1123–1136, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1123-2020>, 2020.
- Lovato, T., Peano, D., Butenschön, M., Materia, S., Iovino, D., Scoccimarro, E., Fogli, P. G., Cherchi, A., Bellucci, A., Gualdi, S., Masina, S., and Navarra, A.: CMIP6 Simulations With the CMCC Earth System Model (CMCC-ESM2), *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002814>, 2022.
- Mauritsen, T., Bader, J., Becker, T., Behrens, J., Bittner, M., Brokopf, R., Brovkin, V., Claussen, M., Crueger, T., Esch, M., Fast, I., Fiedler, S., Fläschner, D., Gayler, V., Giorgetta, M., Goll, D. S., Haak, H., Hagemann, S., Hedemann, C., Hohenegger, C., Ilyina, T., Jahns, T., Jimenéz-de-la-Cuesta, D., Jungclaus, J., Kleinen, T., Kloster, S., Kracher, D., Kinne, S., Kleberg, D., Lasslop, G., Kornbluh, L., Marotzke, J., Matei, D., Meraner, K., Mikolajewicz, U., Modali, K., Möbis, B., Müller, W. A., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Nam, C. C. W., Notz, D., Nyawira, S. S., Paulsen, H., Peters, K., Pincus, R., Pohlmann, H., Pongratz, J., Popp, M., Raddatz, T. J., Rast, S., Redler, R., Reick, C. H., Rohrschneider, T., Schemann, V., Schmidt, H., Schnur, R., Schulzweida, U., Six, K. D., Stein, L., Stemmler, I., Stevens, B., von Storch, J. S., Tian, F., Voigt, A., Vrese, P., Wieners, K. H., Wilkenskjaeld, S., Winkler, A., and Roeckner, E.: Developments in the MPI-M Earth System Model version 1.2 (MPI-ESM1.2) and Its Response to Increasing CO₂, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 11, 998–1038, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001400>, 2019.
- Mulcahy, J. P., Jones, C. G., Rumbold, S. T., Kuhlbrodt, T., Dittus, A. J., Blockley, E. W., Yool, A., Walton, J., Hardacre, C., Andrews, T., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Stringer, M., De Mora, L., Harris, P., Hill, R., Kelley, D.,

Robertson, E., and Tang, Y.: UKESM1.1: development and evaluation of an updated configuration of the UK Earth System Model, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 16, 1569–1600, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-1569-2023>, 2023.

Reick, C. H., Raddatz, T., Brovkin, V., and Gayler, V.: Representation of natural and anthropogenic land cover change in MPI-ESM, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 5, 459–482, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jame.20022>, 2013.

Sellar, A. A., Jones, C. G., Mulcahy, J. P., Tang, Y., Yool, A., Wiltshire, A., O'Connor, F. M., Stringer, M., Hill, R., Palmieri, J., Woodward, S., de Mora, L., Kuhlbrodt, T., Rumbold, S. T., Kelley, D. I., Ellis, R., Johnson, C. E., Walton, J., Abraham, N. L., Andrews, M. B., Andrews, T., Archibald, A. T., Berthou, S., Burke, E., Blockley, E., Carslaw, K., Dalvi, M., Edwards, J., Folberth, G. A., Gedney, N., Griffiths, P. T., Harper, A. B., Hendry, M. A., Hewitt, A. J., Johnson, B., Jones, A., Jones, C. D., Keeble, J., Liddicoat, S., Morgenstern, O., Parker, R. J., Predoi, V., Robertson, E., Siahann, A., Smith, R. S., Swaminathan, R., Woodhouse, M. T., Zeng, G., and Zerroukat, M.: UKESM1: Description and Evaluation of the U.K. Earth System Model, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 11, 4513–4558, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001739>, 2019.

Swart, N. C., Cole, J. N. S., Kharin, V. V., Lazare, M., Scinocca, J. F., Gillett, N. P., Anstey, J., Arora, V., Christian, J. R., Hanna, S., Jiao, Y., Lee, W. G., Majaess, F., Saenko, O. A., Seiler, C., Seinen, C., Shao, A., Sigmund, M., Solheim, L., Von Salzen, K., Yang, D., and Winter, B.: The Canadian Earth System Model version 5 (CanESM5.0.3), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 12, 4823–4873, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-4823-2019>, 2019.

Voldoire, A., Saint-Martin, D., Sénési, S., Decharme, B., Alias, A., Chevallier, M., Colin, J., Guérémy, J. F., Michou, M., Moine, M. P., Nabat, P., Roehrig, R., Salas y Méliá, D., Séférián, R., Valcke, S., Beau, I., Belamari, S., Berthet, S., Cassou, C., Cattiaux, J., Deshayes, J., Douville, H., Ethé, C., Franchistéguy, L., Geoffroy, O., Lévy, C., Madec, G., Meurdesoif, Y., Msadek, R., Ribes, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Terray, L., and Waldman, R.: Evaluation of CMIP6 DECK Experiments With CNRM-CM6-1, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 11, 2177–2213, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001683>, 2019.

Williams, K. D., Copsey, D., Blockley, E. W., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Calvert, D., Comer, R., Davis, P., Graham, T., Hewitt, H. T., Hill, R., Hyder, P., Ineson, S., Johns, T. C., Keen, A. B., Lee, R. W., Megann, A., Milton, S. F., Rae, J. G. L., Roberts, M. J., Scaife, A. A., Schiemann, R., Storkey, D., Thorpe, L., Watterson, I. G., Walters, D. N., West, A., Wood, R. A., Woollings, T., and Xavier, P. K.: The Met Office Global Coupled Model 3.0 and 3.1 (GC3.0 and GC3.1) Configurations, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, 10, 357–380, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017MS001115>, 2018.

365 Ziehn, T., Chamberlain, M. A., Law, R. M., Lenton, A., Bodman, R. W., Dix, M., Stevens, L., Wang, Y. P., and
Srbinovsky, J.: The Australian Earth System Model: ACCESS-ESM1.5, *Journal of Southern Hemisphere Earth
Systems Science*, 70, 193–214, <https://doi.org/10.1071/ES19035>, 2020.