Attribution of seasonal leaf area index trends in the northern latitudes with “optimally” integrated ecosystem models
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Abstract

Significant increases in remotely sensed vegetation indices in the northern latitudes since the 1980s have been detected and attributed at annual and growing season scales. However, we presently lack a systematic understanding of how vegetation responds to asymmetric seasonal environmental changes. In this study, we first investigated trends in the seasonal mean leaf area index (LAI) at northern latitudes (north of 30°N) between 1982 and 2009 using three remotely sensed long-term LAI data sets. The most significant LAI increases occurred in summer (0.009 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹, p < 0.01), followed by autumn (0.005 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹, p < 0.01) and spring (0.003 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹, p < 0.01). We then quantified the contribution of elevating atmospheric CO₂ concentration (eCO₂), climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land cover change to seasonal LAI increases based on factorial simulations.
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from 10 state-of-the-art ecosystem models. Unlike previous studies that used multi-model ensemble mean (MME), we used the Bayesian model averaging (BMA) to optimize the integration of model ensemble. The optimally integrated ensemble LAI changes are significantly closer to the observed seasonal LAI changes than the traditional MME results.

The BMA factorial simulations suggest that eCO$_2$ provides the greatest contribution to increasing LAI trends in all seasons (0.003–0.007 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), and is the main factor driving asymmetric seasonal LAI trends. Climate change controls the spatial pattern of seasonal LAI trends and dominates the increase in seasonal LAI in the northern high latitudes. The effects of nitrogen deposition and land use change are relatively small in all seasons (around 0.0002 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ and 0.0001–0.001 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$, respectively). Our analysis of the seasonal LAI responses to the interactions between seasonal changes in environmental factors offers a new perspective on the response of global vegetation to environmental changes.

**Introduction**

In the context of rapid environmental changes, e.g., rising atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration, climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land use change, monitoring and analyzing vegetation dynamics have become a pivotal subject in global change research in recent decades (Donohue et al., 2013, Keeling et al., 1996a, Los, 2013, Lucht et al., 2002, Mao et al., 2016, Mao et al., 2013, Myneni et al., 1997, Piao et al., 2015, Zhou et al., 2001, Zhu et al., 2016). A growing body of literature demonstrates that vegetation generally show “greening” trends at annual and/or growing season time scale during recent decades (Los,
2013, Mao et al., 2016, Piao et al., 2015, Xu et al., 2013, Zhu et al., 2016). However, the environment has been changing rapidly and with asymmetric seasonal trends in recent decades (IPCC, 2013), raising the question of how vegetation will respond. Long-term temperature observations reveal asymmetric seasonal temperature trends in the northern latitudes between 1979 and 2010, with significant warming trends in all seasons except winter (Cohen et al., 2012). Changes in total precipitation in northern vegetated lands have not been significant in all seasons, but the spatial pattern of seasonal precipitation trends indicates substantial changes in local seasonal precipitation (Fig. S1 and S9). These asymmetric changes in seasonal climate conditions are expected to significantly alter seasonal vegetation growth, but this effect cannot be directly detected in studies based on annual analyses (Mao et al., 2016, Piao et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2011b, Zhu et al., 2016).

Studies revealed that some ecosystem processes have been responding to the seasonal climate change. For example, changes in spring and autumn climate have resulted in an extended growing season in the northern latitudes (Jeong et al., 2011, Liu et al., 2016, Piao et al., 2007), which are supposed to contribute to increased vegetation growth due to a longer photosynthesis period. Increases in temperature and water stress during summer, however, appear to have caused higher tree mortality rates (Allen et al., 2010, Hember et al., 2017), resulting in a net decrease in vegetation growth. The effects on vegetation growth of seasonal changes in other environmental factors, as well as their interactions with seasonal climate change effects, are presently unclear (Anderegg et al., 2015, Greaver et al., 2016, Reich et al., 2014, Sitch et al., 2003). Specifically, the response of vegetation to eCO2 concentration likely varies with seasonal changes in biotic and abiotic factors (Lewis et al., 1996). For
example, the extended growing season caused by climate change in the northern latitudes allows a longer time for eCO₂ effects to propagate; however, hydrothermal conditions during the extended growing season may not promote these effects. Thus, eCO₂ effects are predicted to be stronger during summer than in other seasons due to higher temperatures; however, continuous warming may hamper eCO₂ effects once the temperature exceeds the optimum for vegetation growth (Medlyn et al., 2002). Additionally, temperature-induced water deficiency may limit eCO₂ effects on vegetation in summer (Chaves et al., 2002), although eCO₂ typically increases water use efficiency in vegetation to some extent (Huang et al., 2016, van der Sleen et al., 2015). Detailed studies of the seasonal effects of environmental factors on vegetation and their interactions improve our understanding of vegetation dynamics and their driving factors, demonstrating the need for more effective approaches to detecting and analyzing seasonal vegetation changes.

Compared to previous statistical modeling methods (Los, 2013, Wu et al., 2015, Zhou et al., 2001), ecosystem process models are more effective in separating the contributions of environmental factors to changes in seasonal vegetation growth (Piao et al., 2006b, Sitch et al., 2003). When an ensemble of ecosystem model simulations with prescribed simulation protocol are available, the MME mean is a widely used approach to minimize uncertainties in model simulations. MME method inherently integrate the model ensemble by giving equal weight to each model regardless of its performance (Flato et al., 2013, Le Quéré et al., 2015, Martre et al., 2015, Piao et al., 2015, Zhu et al., 2016). In contrast to this “one vote per model” method, another type of approach integrate the ensemble members based on model basis or model performance (Flato et al., 2013). For example, the Bayesian model averaging
(BMA) method provides an optimal strategy for evaluating model performance and integrate model simulations (Hoeting et al., 1999, Vrugt et al., 2008). The “optimal” integrated ensembles typically perform better than MME mean or most of the individual models and has been widely used as optimal estimates for climate models (Flato et al., 2013, Furrer et al., 2007, Giorgi & Mearns, 2002, Milliff et al., 2011, Tebaldi & Knutti, 2007). However, the “optimal” integration approaches received less attention in the ecosystem modelling communities.

The primary objective of this study was to quantify seasonal trends in vegetation growth, and to quantify the contributions of their potential driving factors, including eCO2, climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land cover change. We used the mean monthly leaf area index (LAI) during three seasons (March–May, MAM; June–August, JJA; September–November, SON) as a proxy for seasonal vegetation growth. Three remotely sensed LAI products, i.e., Global Inventory Modeling and Mapping Studies (GIMMS) LAI3g (Zhu et al., 2013), Global Land Surface Satellites (GLASS) LAI (Xiao et al., 2014), and Global Mapping (GLOBMAP) LAI (Liu et al., 2012), were used to quantify changes in seasonal LAI measurements and their uncertainties in the northern latitudes (north of 30°N).

We also analyzed the relative contributions of each season to annual LAI increases between 1982 and 2009. To analyze the observed changes in seasonal LAI, we designed four experimental simulations (S1: varying CO2 only; S2: varying CO2 and climate; S3: varying CO2, climate, and nitrogen deposition; S4: varying CO2, climate, and land cover change) with 10 state-of-the-art ecosystem models (CLM4.5, LPJ, LPJ-GUESS, LPX-Bern, OCN, ORCHIDEE, VISIT, CLM4, CABLE, and VEGAS) (Le Quéré et al., 2013, Sitch et al., 2007).
For comparison to the traditional MME mean method, we used a Bayesian model averaging (BMA) strategy to minimize model uncertainties by optimizing the integration of model simulations.

**Materials and methods**

**Remotely sensed LAI data sets**

Remote-sensing LAI provides an efficient way to continuously monitor global vegetation dynamics at high frequency. Remotely sensed LAI data have been widely used to detect changes in regional and global vegetation growth (Dardel *et al.*, 2014, Wu *et al.*, 2016, Xu *et al.*, 2013), and they can be linked to ecosystem models to investigate the contributions of potential drivers of vegetation changes (Mao *et al.*, 2016, Piao *et al.*, 2006a, Piao *et al.*, 2015, Zhu *et al.*, 2016). In this study, we applied three widely used long-term remotely sensed LAI products (GIMMS LAI3g, GLASS LAI, and GLOBMAP LAI) to quantify trends in seasonal LAI values and their uncertainties in the northern latitudes (north of 30°N).

**GIMMS LAI3g.** GIMMS LAI was derived from the third-generation Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) GIMMS Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) data set and best-quality Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) LAI using artificial neural network (ANN) models (Zhu *et al.*, 2013). The quality and research applicability of the GIMMS LAI3g dataset were evaluated through comparisons with field LAI measurements, inter-comparisons with other satellite data products, and statistical analyses with large-scale climatic variations. The GIMMS LAI3g dataset, which provides LAI observations at 15-day temporal resolution and 1/12 ° spatial resolution for global vegetation from July 1981 to December 2011, has been widely used for various research purposes (Anav *et al.*, 2013a, Bellucci *et al.*, 2015, Huang *et al.*, 2015, Mao *et al.*, 2016, Murray-Tortarolo *et al.*, 2013, Shen *et al.*, 2015, Sitch *et al.*, 2015, Yan *et al.*, 2013, Zhu *et al.*, 2016).
**GLASS LAI.** The GLASS LAI data set was derived from AVHRR, MODIS, and CYCLOPES reflectance and LAI products using general regression neural networks (Xiao et al., 2014). The GLASS LAI provides global LAI products at 8-day temporal resolution and 1-km spatial resolution from 1981 to 2012 (http://www.bnu-datacenter.com/). Field measurements and validation of CYCLOPES and MODIS LAI products indicate that the GLASS LAI data set is appropriate for the study of long-term global vegetation dynamics.

**GLOBMAP LAI.** The GLOBMAP LAI product was generated by quantitative fusion of historical AVHRR (1981–2000) and MODIS (2000–2011) data (Liu et al., 2012). The pixel-level relationship between AVHRR observations (GIMMS NDVI) (Tucker et al., 2005) and MODIS LAI was first established for the overlapping period 2000–2006, and then used to estimate AVHRR LAI from historical AVHRR observations backward to 1981. The GLOBMAP LAI is a combination of the AVHRR and MODIS LAI, with global coverage at 15-day temporal resolution and 8-km spatial resolution for the period 1981–2011 (http://www.modis.cn/globalLAI/).

**Process-based ecosystem models**

We simulated gridded monthly LAI in the northern latitudes between 1982 and 2009 with 10 state-of-the-art ecosystem models. Seven of these models (CLM4.5, LPJ, LPJ-GUESS, LPX-Bern, OCN, ORCHIDEE, and VISIT) were coordinated by the “Trends and drivers of the regional scale sources and sinks of carbon dioxide” project phase 2 (TRENDYv2) (Le Quéré et al., 2013, Sitch et al., 2015). Three other models (CLM4, CABLE, and VEGAS) were run under protocols similar to those for the seven TRENDYv2 models (Lawrence et al., 2011, Wang et al., 2010, Zeng et al., 2000). All models performed simulations S1 and S2 using global atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration (Keeling & Whorf, 2010).
2005) and historical climate fields from the Climatic Research Unit National Centers for Environmental Prediction (CRUNCEP) data set (New et al., 2000). In simulation S1, models were forced with changing atmospheric CO₂ concentration, while climate was held constant. Both atmospheric CO₂ concentration and climate were varied in simulation S2. Two models (CLM4 and CABLE) performed simulation 3 (S3) with varying atmospheric CO₂ concentration, climate, and nitrogen deposition. The average differences between S3 and S2 of CLM4 and CABLE were used to assess the relative contribution of nitrogen deposition. The seven TRENDYv2 models performed simulation 4 (S4), in which CO₂ concentration, climate, and land cover were varied. The differences between S4 and S2 were used to evaluate the response of vegetation growth to land cover change. To further understand the response of vegetation to changes in individual climatic variables, we ran an additional set of simulations with the Organizing Carbon and Hydrology in Dynamic Ecosystems (ORCHIDEE) model: (C1) varying atmospheric CO₂ concentration, temperature, precipitation, and radiation; (C2) varying CO₂, precipitation, and radiation; (C3) varying CO₂, temperature, and radiation; and (C4) varying CO₂, temperature, and precipitation. We assessed the effects of temperature, precipitation, and radiation on vegetation growth by individually subtracting C2, C3, and C4 from C1. All model outputs and remotely sensed LAI data were composited to monthly temporal resolution and resampled to a common spatial resolution (0.5°) using the bicubic method.
**Bayesian model averaging**

We determined the optimal integration weights for the 10 ecosystem models according to their performance on simulating seasonal mean LAI anomalies using the Bayesian model averaging approach (Vrugt *et al.*, 2008). A suite of different simulation researches has demonstrated that the BMA method produces more reliable simulations than other available multi-model approaches (Ajami *et al.*, 2007, Neuman, 2003, Raftery *et al.*, 2005). The optimal probability density function (pdf) of seasonal LAI anomalies (L) is defined as

\[ p(L|f_1, \ldots, f_{10}) = \sum_{k=1}^{10} w_k g_k(L|f_k), \]

where \( f = f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{10} \) denote an ensemble of simulations obtained from the 10 ecosystem models, \( g_k(L|f_k) \) represents the conditional pdf of L on \( f_k \), and \( w_k \) denotes the posterior probability of simulation \( k \) being the best one. \( w_k \)'s are estimated by Monte Carlo Markov chains based on the maximum likelihood function (Vrugt *et al.*, 2008). The seasonal mean LAI anomalies simulated by the 10 ecosystem models and observed seasonal mean LAI anomalies for the period 1982–2009 were aggregated for each 3 × 3 grid window before estimating the weights for the ecosystem models using the BMA method. The arithmetic sum of the weights of all models is equal to one, and models with higher weights are believed to perform better at the given grid window. We then calculated the BMA model ensemble by summing the weighted model simulations. The same weights were used to calculate ensembles of seasonal mean LAI anomalies for all factorial simulations.
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We used linear least squares regression to estimate trends in the seasonal mean of satellite-observed monthly LAI and the seasonal mean of monthly LAI simulated by ecosystem models under predefined scenarios. Trends in seasonal LAI were compared using Student’s t-test, and considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Trends in seasonal LAI

Seasonal mean LAI in the northern latitudes increased significantly ($p < 0.05$) in all three growing seasons. The average trends in seasonal mean LAI were $0.003_{-0.002}^{0.008, \text{GLASS}}$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ ($p < 0.01$), $0.009_{0.005, \text{GIMMS}}^{0.015, \text{GLASS}}$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ ($p < 0.01$) and $0.005_{0.003, \text{GLOMAP}}^{0.007, \text{GLASS}}$ m$^2$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ ($p < 0.01$) for MAM, JJA, and SON, respectively (Fig. 1a). Earlier onset of the growing season was more prominent than delayed end of season (EOS) in the northern hemisphere (Liu et al., 2016); however, trends in LAI during SON were greater than those during MAM. The most substantial increases in LAI were observed during JJA; these were more than triple those in the onset (March and April) and dormancy months (October and November). These results indicate that the earlier start of season (SOS) in spring and delayed EOS are not likely to have been dominant driving factors for the greening trends.

More than half of the vegetated area showed significantly increasing ($p < 0.05$) trends in seasonal mean LAI during JJA ($60.8\%_{29.3, \text{GIMMS}}^{67.7, \text{GLASS}}$) and SON ($50.6\%_{28.8, \text{GLASS}}^{57.4, \text{GIMMS}}$), whereas approximately one third of the vegetated area showed significant increases ($p < 0.05$) in
seasonal mean LAI during MAM (35.1%\textsubscript{GIMMS}, 51.6%\textsubscript{GLASS}). The most notable greening regions were Europe, southeastern China, eastern North America, and Siberia (Fig. 1b, c, and d). Among these regions, Europe and southeastern China exhibited notable greening trends (>0.02 m\textsuperscript{2} m\textsuperscript{-2} yr\textsuperscript{-1}) in all three seasons, whereas eastern Siberia showed notable greening trends in JJA. In contrast, decreasing trends were observed over less than 5% of the northern vegetated area during all three growing seasons. There were significant uncertainties among the three observed seasonal LAI trends. The spatial distributions of the range of grid-level LAI trends (defined as the difference between the maximum and minimum trends among the three trend values derived from the three remotely sensed LAI products) showed that the three observed LAI products displayed notable discrepancies in seasonal LAI trends, particularly during JJA (Fig. S3). Large differences (>0.012 m\textsuperscript{2} m\textsuperscript{-2} yr\textsuperscript{-1}) were found, mainly in the mid–high latitudes and in eastern North America, Europe, eastern Siberia, and southeastern China. Most of the largest trends were derived from GLASS LAI for all three growing seasons, whereas the smallest trends for most regions were estimated from GLOBMAP LAI during MAM, and GIMMS LAI and GLOBMAP LAI during JJA and SON.

Fig. 2a shows the spatial pattern of the dominant greening/browning seasons, i.e., the seasons that made the greatest contribution to the annual increasing/decreasing trends. JJA was the dominant greening season over 62.3% of the northern vegetated lands, followed by SON (14.2%) and MAM (11.4%) (Fig. 2b). The regions where JJA dominated annual greening were distributed over most of the vegetated lands in Eurasia and over high latitudes in North America. JJA contributed more than 80% of the annual net greening trends in the northern high latitudes and northeast Asia, whereas its dominant role was less prominent in
Eastern Europe and at lower latitudes. The regions where MAM dominated the annual greening were mainly distributed in Western Europe and eastern and central Asia. The regions where SON dominated the annual greening area were discretely distributed within North America and Europe.

Browning occurred over a greater area during JJA and SON (45.8 and 29.8%, respectively). One region where JJA dominated the annual browning trends extended over northern China and eastern Mongolia, where water availability is limited (Nemani et al., 2003). The decreases in LAI during JJA reached approximately 80% of the annual net LAI decreases. The regions where annual browning occurred mainly in SON were sparse, located in northeastern North America and some parts of northern Russia.

**Attribution of seasonal trends in vegetation LAI**

We evaluated the performance of the 10 state-of-the-art ecosystem models in simulating seasonal LAI in the northern latitudes using the Taylor diagram (Fig. 3). LAI simulated by individual models and MME mean LAI were compared to remotely sensed LAI for northern lands. The performance of the modeled LAI was quantified by correlation coefficients (R) between the modeled and observed LAI, standard deviation (SD) of the inter-annual variation in the seasonal LAI time series, and the root mean square difference (RMSD) between the modeled and observed LAI (Taylor, 2001). Generally, the model-simulated seasonal LAI values were comparable to the observed seasonal LAI. For the study area, correlation coefficients between model-simulated seasonal LAI and observed LAI ranged from
between the modeled and observed LAI also suggest overall acceptable performance by the ecosystem models in reproducing observed northern latitudinal seasonal LAI variation (SD ranging from 0.041 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for MAM to 0.075 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for JJA) in the northern latitudes (SD ranging from 0.054 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for MAM to 0.066 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for JJA, and RMSD ranging from 0.036 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for MAM to 0.042 m$^2$m$^{-2}$ for JJA).}

The traditional MME method reduced the uncertainties in model parameterization and structure to some extent, yet this method inherently treats all models equally regardless of their performance in reproducing the changes in observed seasonal mean LAI. In this study, we synthesized the 10 ecosystem models based on the BMA strategy, which explicitly evaluated the performance of individual models in simulating observed LAI changes, assigned weights for the models accordingly, and then attributed the contributions of the potential driving factors to seasonal LAI changes based on the optimized integration of the 10 ecosystem models. Fig. 4 shows the spatial pattern of models that were assigned the largest BMA weights and their total area fraction for each season. Generally, the performances of the ecosystem models in simulating LAI changes were region specific; i.e., one model may have performed better in one region, whereas other models may have performed better in another. During MAM, ORCHIDEE had the largest area and was assigned the maximum BMA weight (32.01%), mainly distributed in central North America and the mid-latitudes of Eurasia. CABLE exhibited the best performance in the northern latitudes of North America and ranked second place in terms of the area fraction of the maximum BMA weight (21.46%).
CABLE well captured seasonal LAI changes over the largest vegetated area fraction during JJA (24.09%) and SON (39.29%), followed by ORCHIDEE (JJA, 18.60%; SON, 21.66%).

Fig. 5 shows the comparison of spatial patterns between the seasonal LAI trends estimated from MME and those estimated from BMA. Generally, the BMA optimized model ensemble was significantly superior to the MME results in terms of reproducing the observed LAI trends during all seasons. The spatial pattern of trends in MME seasonal LAI partly captured the observed seasonal LAI trend pattern, although important differences were found, particularly during SON (Fig. 6 and S4). During MAM, trends in MME LAI over 43.9% of the vegetated area lay within the boundary of the trends for the three remotely sensed LAI values, which were mainly distributed in the mid–high latitudes (Fig. 6a). The MME underestimated LAI trends for 20.0% of the vegetated area, mainly located in the western United States, northern China, and eastern Mongolia, but overestimated LAI trends for 36.1% of the vegetated area, mainly distributed in the northern latitudes, central North America, and other small regions in Eurasia. In contrast, BMA reproduced well the observed trends over 66.36% of the vegetated area, and underestimated and overestimated observed LAI trends over 19.12 and 17.53% of the vegetated area, respectively. The main differences between observed LAI trends and BMA LAI trends were detected in southwestern North America and central Asia (Fig. 6b). The spatial pattern of the comparison between MME LAI trends and observed LAI trends during JJA was similar to that during MAM, except for notable underestimation in Europe (Fig. 6c). BMA LAI significantly reduced discrepancies between simulated LAI trends and observed LAI trends, although the BMA LAI still underestimated observed trends over a small area in Europe (Fig. 6d). During JJA, MME (BMA) LAI
captured the observed LAI trends over 46.4% (66.07%) of the vegetated area, but underestimated and overestimated the LAI trends over 26.6% (21.41%) and 27.1% (12.52%), respectively. During SON, the MME simulation of observed LAI trends was conspicuously poor, capturing observed LAI trends over 29.4% of the vegetated area, while underestimating and overestimating LAI trends over 27.1% and 43.5% of the northern vegetated lands. Notable overestimation of the SON LAI trends occurred mainly over the high latitudes in North America and Eurasia (Fig. 6e). BMA LAI improved simulated LAI trends to some extent; the area fractions of good estimation, underestimation, and overestimation were 51.06, 24.37, and 24.57%, respectively (Fig. 6f). The main regions where BMA LAI trend underestimation occurred were southwestern North America and Europe, whereas the regions in which overestimation occurred were fragmentally distributed over Alaska, the central United States, northwestern Russia, central Asia, and southern China. The general consistency between BMA LAI and remotely sensed LAI imply that the ecosystem models combined with the Bayesian model averaging integration strategy are more appropriate for the analysis of potential drivers of LAI changes in the northern latitudes. Thus, the following attribution of seasonal LAI changes in the northern latitudes during 1982–2009 was based on the BMA integrated factorial simulations of the 10 ecosystem models.

At the hemispheric scale, LAI trends during all seasons simulated by ecosystem models with all factors considered were comparable to observed seasonal LAI trends (Fig. 7). Ecosystem models also captured the orders of magnitude of the observed seasonal LAI trends, i.e., JJA \(0.0066^{0.0211}_{0.0029,0.0292,0.0211} \text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}\text{yr}^{-1}\), SON \(0.0045^{0.0285}_{0.0030,0.0292,0.0211} \text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}\text{yr}^{-1}\), and MAM \(0.0030^{0.0161}_{0.0013,0.0030,0.0045} \text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}\text{yr}^{-1}\). During all seasons, increases in LAI due to increasing
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atmospheric CO₂ concentration explained the largest fraction of the observed greening trends in the northern latitudes (0.0019–0.0032 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹), whereas climate change explained slightly less (0.0007–0.0024 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹) (Fig. 7). Compared to eCO₂ and climate change, the effects of nitrogen deposition and land cover change explained only a small part of the observed seasonal LAI trends, around 0.0002 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹ and ranging from 0.0001 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹ to 0.0010 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹, respectively. These driving factors generally provided the largest contributions to greening trends during JJA over the northern latitudes.

The spatial pattern of eCO₂ effects on seasonal LAI trends was uniformly distributed over the northern latitudes (Fig. 8). Conversely, the spatial pattern of climate change effects was heterogeneous and dominated the spatial variation in seasonal LAI trends (Fig. 8). Ecosystem models indicated that climate change had led to increases in seasonal LAI over 62.83% (MAM, 23.32%, \( p < 0.05 \)) to 74.19% (JJA, 45.86%, \( p < 0.05 \)) of the vegetated area, and had led to decreases in seasonal LAI over 25.70% (JJA, 7.52%, \( p < 0.05 \)) to 37.13% (MAM, 8.31%, \( p < 0.05 \)) of the vegetated area. The increasing LAI trends due to climate change were mainly distributed over southeastern North America, Western Europe, and Russia, probably due to warming (Fig. 9). The decreases in LAI trends due to climate change occurred in southwestern North America, Eastern Europe, and eastern Mongolia. Decreasing water availability was likely the dominant climate variable driving LAI decreases over these regions (Fig. 9 and S9).

Land cover change exhibited strong local effects on LAI trends, although these effects were relatively small at the hemispherical scale. Notable positive land cover change effects were mainly distributed over southeastern North America, Eastern Europe, and southeastern
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China, likely due to agricultural activities, forest regrowth, and plantation in these regions. Negative land cover change effects were relatively small and generally distributed over regions where grazing is extensive (Kawamura et al., 2005, Li et al., 2016).

The effects of nitrogen deposition on vegetation were generally weak compared to other driving factors. Positive nitrogen deposition effects were simulated over a large fraction of the vegetated lands in the northern latitudes, consistent with increasing total nitrogen deposition rates in the northern hemisphere (Galloway et al., 2008, LeBauer & Treseder, 2008, Liu et al., 2013). However, we also observed significant negative trends in LAI due to changes in nitrogen deposition in Eastern Europe. This observation may be partly explained by the decreasing nitrogen deposition rate in these regions during recent decades due to reforestation and nitrogen purification of anthropogenic emissions (Baker & Samantha, 2009, Holland et al., 2005).

During all seasons, the fraction of the vegetated area where climate change contributed most greatly to vegetation greening were larger (MAM, 38.96%; JJA, 46.06%; SON, 42.27%) than those of other potential driving factors (Fig. 10). This dominant climate change effect was more prominent in the high latitudes. For example, the dominant climate change effect was widely distributed across Russia and northeastern Canada (Fig. 10). The CO$_2$ fertilization effect dominated the second largest vegetated area showing greening trends during all seasons (MAM, 35.00%; JJA, 30.59%; SON, 32.57%); however, the spatial pattern of the dominant CO$_2$ fertilization effect was fragmented (Fig. 10). The spatial pattern of the
dominant land use change effect was more clustered than that of the dominant CO$_2$ fertilization effect, and was mainly distributed over eastern North America, Europe, and northern China. The land use change effect dominated 9.79, 8.83, and 9.29% of the vegetated area during MAM, JJA, and SON, respectively. The fractions of vegetated area where nitrogen deposition was the dominant effect were small (<3%) during all seasons.

Discussion

Contributions of trends in maximum LAI and growing season length to annual LAI trends

Previous studies expressed the growing season productivity, which is well correlated with growing season mean LAI, as the product of maximum productivity and the length of the growing season (Xia et al., 2015). This expression implicitly assumes that the roles of maximum productivity and the growing season length are equally important in determining the growing season productivity of plants. However, our study revealed that maximum productivity (LAI$_{\text{max}}$) trends dominate annual productivity (annual mean LAI) trends. LAI trends during JJA contributed 47.7% of the annual LAI trends over the northern latitudes, whereas the contributions of LAI trends during MAM and SON were much smaller (16.3 and 25.4%, respectively). The increases in LAI during MAM and SON were the consequence of longer growing days and enhanced photosynthetic capability. Environmental factors such as radiation and nutrient and water availability were at very low levels for photosynthesis during
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the extended growing days in early spring and late autumn. Although the spatial pattern of
LAI trends during MAM/SON were well matched with the SOS/EOS trend pattern (Fig. S9),
earlier SOS or delayed EOS were unlikely to lead to significant increases in productivity. A
possible reason for similar patterns in MAM/SON LAI trends and SOS/EOS trends is that
they are co-limited by identical environmental factors. For example, the start of the growing
season in the northern latitudes is thought to be driven mainly by temperature increase, which
also benefits photosynthesis by releasing temperature limitations on plant biological
processes (Nemani et al., 2003).

According to state-of-the-art ecosystem models, the asymmetric seasonal LAI response
to increasing atmospheric CO₂ concentration is one explanation for our observation of a
maximum increase in LAI during summer. The ecosystem models indicated that eCO₂ led to
increasing LAI trends at a magnitude of 0.0032 m² m⁻² yr⁻¹ during summer, about 1.7 times
the LAI trends during spring. Although the amplitude of the seasonal change in atmospheric
CO₂ concentration in the northern latitudes has been increasing during recent decades (Forkel
et al., 2016, Graven et al., 2013, Keeling et al., 1996b), differences in the seasonal increases
in atmospheric CO₂ concentration were not significant during 1982–2009 (MAM, 44.82 ppm;
JJA, 44.78 ppm; SON, 45.15 ppm). Thus, the same increases in atmospheric CO₂
concentration have noticeably different effects on vegetation LAI in different seasons in the
northern latitudes. The asymmetric seasonal eCO₂ fertilization effects on vegetation LAI are
consistent with those on vegetation photosynthesis capacity from observation and theoretical
expectations (Lewis et al., 1996). Given the same increases in atmospheric CO₂
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concentration, it appears that better hydrothermal conditions during summer allow vegetation to assimilate more carbohydrate that can be used to form more leaves.

**Uncertainties in model-simulated and remotely sensed seasonal LAI trends**

Our results yielded significant differences between remotely sensed seasonal LAI trends and MME seasonal LAI trends (Fig. S7), indicating large uncertainties within state-of-the-art ecosystem models and/or uncertainties in remotely sensed seasonal LAI trends (Anav et al., 2013a, Anav et al., 2013b, Zhu et al., 2016). Uncertainties in ecosystem models are likely due to non-modeled ecosystem processes and poor representation of existing ecosystem processes and uncertainties in driving data sets (van den Hurk et al., 2016, Wang et al., 2011a). In some regions, the spatial distribution of croplands overlapped with areas showing significant residual seasonal LAI trends (e.g., southeastern North America, Western Europe, and eastern China), which is likely due to the fact that Agricultural activities are generally not well represented in current ecosystem models. For example, current ecosystem model still has many problems in representing intra-seasonal variations in LAI due to multiple cropping (Jeong et al., 2014). Additionally, current ecosystem models tend to be oversensitive to water availability (Piao et al., 2013), which appears to be a significant source of uncertainty in modeling vegetation LAI changes (Zhu et al., 2016). The geolocations where significant seasonal increases in soil water content (SWC) occurred were generally associated with negative residual seasonal trends, i.e., the model overestimated seasonal LAI trends, whereas the regions where significant seasonal SWC decreased were associated with positive residual...
seasonal LAI trends, i.e., the model underestimated seasonal LAI trends. Wildfire, together with significant SWC decreases, appears to explain the significant negative residual seasonal LAI trends in Alaska. However, there remained regions where large differences between satellite observations and model simulations were found that cannot be explained by agricultural activities, water availability changes, or wildfire. For example, significant positive residuals were found in Eastern Europe during MAM, JJA, and SON; however, no potential uncertainty source was found. A possible explanation for the underestimation of ecosystem models is forest regrowth and afforestation during recent decades in that region, as occurred in southeastern North America (Pan et al., 2011). Moreover, the phenology modules of the ecosystem models are thought to be not reliable, especially when complex mechanisms are incorporated (Murray-Tortarolo et al., 2013). Our results show larger discrepancies between simulated LAI trends and remotely sensed LAI trends during autumn than during other seasons, which is consistent with a previous study suggesting a relatively large bias in simulated dormancy dates during the growing season by current ecosystem models (Murray-Tortarolo et al., 2013). We suggest that improving the phenology module of current ecosystem models is a crucial first step toward improving our understanding of seasonal LAI changes.

Additionally, seasonal variation in nitrogen deposition rates and land cover change are generally not well represented in the current ecosystem models (Thomas et al., 2013, Wang et al., 2010, Zaehle et al., 2010). For example, many ecosystem models evenly assign the annual nitrogen deposition amount to each day due to the limitations caused by the temporal resolution of the nitrogen deposition driving data set (Wang et al., 2010). Similarly, the land cover...
cover change driving data sets used in the ecosystem models are typically updated annually. Uncertainties in the driving data sets tend to undermine the ability of the ecosystem models to simulate actual seasonal variation in the effects of nitrogen deposition and land use change on LAI trends. Thus, our study provides a simplified illustration of the contribution of nitrogen deposition and land use change to seasonal LAI trends.

Discrepancies in seasonal LAI trends between observed data and model simulations may also be due to uncertainties in the three remotely sensed LAI data sets. GIMMS LAI3g, GLASS LAI, and GLOBMAP LAI are three widely used long-term LAI products that provide global LAI records starting from the early 1980s. All of the LAI products have been extensively validated against field measurements and other satellite products, which supports their suitability for long-term vegetation research. However, we should also be mindful of their uncertainties. Although all three LAI products used in this study consistently showed the dominant greening trends over the northern latitudes, the spatial distribution and magnitudes of LAI trends were somewhat different (Fig. S3). There are several potential reasons for these discrepancies and uncertainties in the LAI products. First, the LAI products were generated using different strategies and different AVHRR products. Second, AVHRR sensors lack on-board calibration and have orbital loss problems, which cause biases that cannot easily be quantified. Third, although GLASS and GLOBMAP proposed their own methods to merge LAI derived from AVHRR sensors and MODIS, it is still difficult to create a consistent LAI time series because AVHRR and MODIS sensors have different spectral characteristics. These problems may be alleviated by generating accurate and consistent LAI time series data in the future.
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In summary, we tentatively quantified seasonal LAI trends and the effects of eCO\textsubscript{2}, climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land use change on seasonal LAI trends between 1982 and 2009 in the northern latitudes (north of 30°N) based on three remotely sensed long-term LAI data sets and 10 state-of-the-art ecosystem models. Although our immediate objectives have been achieved, there are several aspects that should be addressed in future studies. First, both remotely sensed LAI data sets and model-simulated LAI outputs showed large uncertainties. Further refinements of satellite observation and retrieval techniques and ecosystem models are the fundamental requirements for accurate detection and attribution of seasonal vegetation growth changes. Second, the attribution method used in this study assumed that the effects of the potential driving factors were additive and did not explicitly consider interactions among the driving factors (Zhang \textit{et al.}, 2016). Additionally, the lag effects of some environmental factors across seasons were not taken into account. For example, warming and warming-induced greening during MAM should have led to increases in evapotranspiration during MAM (Huang \textit{et al.}, 2016) and reduced soil water content during MAM (Wolf \textit{et al.}, 2016), which would limit vegetation growth during JJA. Also, drought-induced tree mortality (Allen \textit{et al.}, 2010, Dietze \& Moorcroft, 2011, van Mantgem \textit{et al.}, 2009) during JJA should strongly affect vegetation growth during SON and the subsequent seasons. Finally, although the factorial experiments based on the 10 ecosystem models made it possible to separate the effects of nitrogen deposition and land use change on trends in seasonal vegetation LAI, we should be aware of inherent deficiencies in the spatial and temporal resolution of input data for both nitrogen deposition and land use change, and in the representation of related biophysical processes. Applying high-quality spatiotemporal
nitrogen deposition and land use change data and incorporating and improving processes related to phenology, agricultural activities and wildfires should be priorities for the refinement of current ecosystem models.
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Figure Captions

Figure 1. Trends in seasonal and monthly leaf area index (LAI) in northern latitudes during 1982–2009. (a) Overall trends in seasonal and monthly LAI in northern latitudes. Black line indicates trends in monthly LAI. (b) Spatial pattern of the trends in seasonal mean LAI for (b) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA), and (d) autumn (SON) based on the average of the three remotely sensed LAI data sets (GIMMS LAI3g, GLASS LAI, and GLOBMAP LAI). Trends in seasonal mean LAI for each pixel were estimated by linear regression. Black dots indicate that the trends are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 2. Dominant seasons of greening and browning in northern latitudes. (a) Spatial pattern of the dominant seasons of greening and browning. (b) Area fractions of the dominant seasons. The dominant season of a vegetated pixel is defined as the season that shows the maximum greening trend if the annual leaf area index (LAI) trend of the pixel is increasing, or the maximum browning trend if the annual LAI trend of the pixel is decreasing. Black horizontal lines indicate regions showing decreasing annual LAI trends.

Figure 3. Taylor diagrams (Taylor, 2001) compare the remotely sensed and model simulated seasonal leaf area index (LAI) in the northern latitudes for (a) spring (MAM), (b) summer (JJA) and (c) autumn (SON). The standard deviation shows the interannual variability of the observed and the modeled seasonal LAI. The dash green lines show centered root mean square difference (RMSD) between model simulations and satellite observation.
Figure 4. Spatial distribution of the maximum optimal weights of the 10 ecosystem models estimated by Bayesian model averaging (BMA) for (a) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA), and (e) autumn (SON), and the area fractions of the models assigned the maximum weights for (b) spring (MAM), (d) summer (JJA), and (f) autumn (SON) during 1982–2009.

Figure 5. Spatial pattern of the trends in model-simulated seasonal mean leaf area index (LAI) for (a) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA), and (e) autumn (SON) based on the multi-model ensemble (MME) mean method and for (b) spring (MAM), (d) summer (JJA), and (f) autumn (SON) based on Bayesian model averaging (BMA) during 1982–2009. Trends in seasonal mean LAI for each pixel were estimated by linear regression. Black dots indicate that the trends are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 6. Comparison of model performance in estimating trends in model-simulated seasonal monthly mean leaf area index (LAI) based on multi-model ensemble (MME) mean and Bayesian model averaging (BMA) during 1982–2009. Spatial pattern of performance of model-simulated seasonal mean LAI trends for (a) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA), and (e) autumn (SON) based on MME mean method and for (b) spring (MAM), (d) summer (JJA), and (f) autumn (SON) based on BMA. Model-simulated seasonal monthly mean LAI trends were compared to trends estimated from the three remotely sensed LAI data sets (GLASS LAI, GIMMS LAI and GLOBMAP LAI) to determine whether the model-simulated trend was within the range indicated by the remotely sensed data (Good), smaller than the
minimum trend of the remotely sensed data (Underestimate), or larger than the maximum trend of the remotely sensed data (Overestimate).

**Figure 7.** The observed (OBS), multi-model ensemble mean (MME) and Bayesian model averaging (BMA) trends in seasonal leaf area index (LAI) and the effects of atmospheric CO₂ concentration (CO₂), climate change (CLI), nitrogen deposition (NDE), and land use change (LCC) on seasonal LAI trends in the northern latitudes (north of 30°N) during 1982–2009. The effects of eCO₂, climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land use change were estimated from simulations S1, S2 – S1, S3 – S2, and S4 – S2 by the 10 ecosystem models. The 10 ecosystem models were integrated based on the Bayesian model averaging (BMA) method. The size of each sphere indicates the standard deviation of the seasonal LAI trends.

**Figure 8.** Spatial patterns of the effects of atmospheric CO₂ concentration (eCO₂), climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land use change on trends in seasonal leaf area index (LAI) in the northern latitudes (north of 30°N) during 1982–2009. The effects of eCO₂, climate change, nitrogen deposition, and land use change were estimated from simulations S1, S2 – S1, S3 – S2, and S4 – S2 by the 10 ecosystem models. The 10 ecosystem models were integrated based on the Bayesian model averaging (BMA) method. The seasonal monthly mean LAI trends were estimated by linear regression and tested with Student’s t-test. Black dots indicate that the trends are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).
Figure 9. Spatial patterns of the effects of individual climatic variables (temperature, precipitation, and radiation) on trends in seasonal leaf area index (LAI) based on ORCHIDEE simulations in the northern latitudes during 1982–2009. Seasonal LAI trends were estimated by linear regression and tested with Student’s t-test. Black dots indicate that the trends are statistically significant \((p < 0.05)\). The pixel-wise spatial correlation coefficients between climate change effects on MAM, JJA and SON LAI trends simulated by ORCHIDEE and BMA model ensemble are 0.24 \((p<0.01)\), 0.32 \((p<0.01)\) and 0.14 \((p<0.01)\), respectively.

Figure 10. Spatial pattern of the composition of the effects of driving factors (eCO\(_2\), climate change, nitrogen deposition, and changes in land use and land cover) on seasonal leaf area index (LAI) during 1982–2009 for (a) March–May (MAM), (c) June–August (JJA), and (e) September–November (SON) and corresponding maps showing the sign of the effects of the driving factors for (b) MAM, (d) JJA, and (f) autumn (SON). Positive effects of eCO\(_2\), climate change, and nitrogen deposition and land use/land cover change are abbreviated as O, C, and L, respectively. Thus, their compositions are abbreviated as CL, OL, OC, and OCL.