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Tropical forests play a major role in determining the current atmospheric concentration of CO$_2$, as both sources of CO$_2$ following deforestation and sinks of CO$_2$ probably resulting from CO$_2$ stimulation of forest photosynthesis. Recently, researchers have tried to quantify this role. The results suggest that both the carbon sources and sinks in tropical forests are significantly greater than previously thought.

The values shown in this equation are the often quoted mean values for 1980–1989 in Pg C year$^{-1}$; they represent the state of knowledge of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1995 (Ref. 2.5). $E_g$ is the rate of CO$_2$ emission through fossil fuel combustion and cement production, $E_{\text{deforestation}}$ represents tropical deforestation, $\Delta_{\text{atm}}$ is the observed increase in atmospheric CO$_2$, and $\Delta_{\text{ocean}}$, $\Delta_{\text{ trop}}$ and $\Delta_{\text{other}}$ are the net sequestration into the oceans, the terrestrial biosphere and other components of the terrestrial biosphere, respectively. $E_g$ and $\Delta_{\text{atm}}$ can be estimated with reasonable accuracy, but the other terms have greater uncertainty attached; in particular, the terrestrial biosphere sink has often been calculated as a residue of the other terms. A great deal of research effort has gone into quantifying these terms more effectively; here, we will focus on recent thinking regarding the magnitude of $E_{\text{deforestation}}$ and $\Delta_{\text{trop}}$ – the terms relevant to tropical forests.

A case study of the tropical forest carbon cycle
The C dynamics of a forest are dominated by the assimilation of CO$_2$ through gross photosynthesis ($G_p$); the release of C through autotrophic (plant) respiration, $R_f$; the transfer of C to the soil in the form of leaf, wood and root litter, and the exudation of organic compounds into the rhizosphere; and the eventual release of this soil C back to the atmosphere through decomposition and respiration by microbes and other heterotrophs ($R_p$). There are few tropical sites where the internal forest C cycle has been examined in detail. Figure 1 shows a case study from a dense lowland tropical forest, with no history of disturbance, near Manaus in central Amazonia, Brazil. $G_p$ and $R_p$ were calculated directly from continuous measurements of CO$_2$ exchange above the forest canopy, using the micrometeorological technique of eddy covariance. Recently, this technique has been applied to tropical forests and has begun to produce a flood of information on the C balance of tropical forests and its relation to climatological variables.

Of the $G_p$ of 30.4 t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$, approximately 14.8 t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ are respired through leaves, wood and roots; the remainder (15.6 t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$) is termed the net primary production, $N_p$. This C is fixed into plant structural biomass before eventually being deposited into the soil in the form of litter, dead trees or animal faeces, from where it is eventually released by microbial decay. The mean residence time of C in biomass and soil can be estimated by dividing the respective C stocks by $N_p$. The above-ground biomass stocks were measured directly (C is approximately 48% of dry biomass), the belowground biomass was assumed to be 33% of aboveground biomass, and soil organic C stocks were derived from other studies in Amazonia.

We estimated the mean C residence times to be 16 years in biomass and 13 years in soils, totalling to 29 years. Figure 1b shows a simplified version of Fig. 1a. There is a net transfer of CO$_2$ into biomass at a rate of 15.6 t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$. This C remains in the biomass for a mean residence time of 16 years, at which time it is transferred to the soil where it remains for 13 years before being returned to the atmosphere.

The value of $N_p$ suggested here exceeds the usual values of 6–14 t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ derived from field allometric studies. However, it is now widely recognized that almost all $N_p$ estimates in the literature are low because root turnover and exudation have usually been ignored. Aboveground growth and respiration can account for only a fraction of the total $G_p$; there has to be a significant transfer of C belowground to bring consistency to forestry and gas-exchange measurements. If fine root turnover and exudation are neglected in our calculation, then $N_p = 9.8$ t C ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ – within the usual range. Is our estimate for belowground C cycling realistic? The few direct studies in temperate trees indicate that between 40% (for Liriodendron tulipifera) and 73% (for Pinus sylvestris) of assimilated C is transferred belowground to roots and to mycorrhizae; in Fig. 1a it is 45% for a tropical forest, a fairly conservative value compared with these temperate studies.

Whatever their exact magnitude, it seems certain that belowground C flows are a significant, and often underestimated, component of $N_p$. Thus, the value
of 18 Pg C year$^{-1}$, quoted earlier for global tropical forest productivity, might be an underestimate; 25 Pg C year$^{-1}$ might be closer to the true figure.

**Carbon emissions from tropical deforestation: $E_{\text{def}}$**

The three principal zones of tropical forest are in South America, central Africa and southeast Asia. All three areas are undergoing rapid deforestation, primarily because of clearing for crops (55%) or cattle pasture (20%), or because of the expansion of logging and shifting cultivation (12% each)$^{18}$. Table 1 shows the extent of tropical forests in 1990 (Ref. 3), and the rates of clearance between 1980–1990 and 1990–1995 (Ref. 19). The Americas account for over 50% of tropical forest area, and the absolute clearance rates are highest here. However, relative clearance rates are highest in tropical Asia. Although they are still high, deforestation rates appear to have diminished by 12% in the 1990s.

Table 1 shows two recent estimates of net C emissions from tropical land-use change. Both estimates use data on annual land-use change, and stocks of C in biomass and soil to estimate the release of $CO_2$ at the time of ecosystem disturbance. Houghton$^{18}$ attempted to calculate annual C emissions from forest and soil, by tracking the decay and regrowth of C stocks in the years and decades following disturbance; however, Fearnside$^{20}$ expresses C loss as net committed emissions (the total amount of C lost as the landscape approaches a new equilibrium). If deforestation rates are approximately constant, the two values are approximately equivalent. Houghton’s results are essentially an update of those used to provide the IPCC 1995 value for $E_{\text{def}}$ of 1.6±1.0 Pg C year$^{-1}$, but they now include a revised and detailed analysis of tropical Asia$^{21}$, which has increased the estimate of mean 1980s emission in that region from 0.7±0.3 to 1.1±0.5 Pg C year$^{-1}$. Fearnside’s study is centred on a detailed analysis for Brazilian forest and savanna$^{12}$, which is based on a regional evaluation of C stocks, field studies of forest burning and satellite-derived deforestation rates.

These new studies significantly increase the estimated 1980s value of $E_{\text{def}}$ to about 2.0 Pg C year$^{-1}$, but in different regions and for varied reasons. In the final column in Table 1, we suggest a current ‘best estimate’ for C emissions in the 1980s, by combining the new analyses for the Americas$^{20}$ and Asia$^{21}$, and averaging the results for Africa. This now pushes the estimated emissions from tropical deforestation to 2.4±0.6 Pg C year$^{-1}$. However, even this might be an underestimate, because several recent studies have suggested that human activity induces significant biomass reduction in apparently intact forests that is not accounted for in current analyses. Fearnside estimated that a further 0.4 Pg C year$^{-1}$ are emitted through forest degradation. A field survey$^{22}$ of wood mills estimated that forest impoverishment through logging contributes an additional 4–7% to the net C release through Amazonian deforestation, and leaves the
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### Table 1. Deforestation rates and estimated resulting CO$_2$ emissions in tropical areas$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Forest area$^b$ (10$^6$ km$^2$)</th>
<th>Moist forest area$^a$ (10$^6$ km$^2$)</th>
<th>Deforestation rate$^a$ 1980–1990 (10$^6$ km$^2$ year$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Deforestation rate$^a$ 1990–1995 (10$^6$ km$^2$ year$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Carbon emission 1980–1990 (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Carbon emission 1990–1995 (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Carbon emission combined$^b$ 1980–1995 (Pg C yr$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>9179.2</td>
<td>8705.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5275.9</td>
<td>3730.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3106.0</td>
<td>2663.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17561.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>15098.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>129.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^b$Incorporates rainforest, moist deciduous forest, dry and very dry forest, hill and mountain forest, and alpine area forest, as defined by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).  
$^c$Incorporates only rainforest, moist deciduous forest, and hill and mountain forest, as defined by the FAO (Ref. 3).  
$^d$Estimate for C emissions in the 1980s by combining the new analyses for the Americas$^{20}$ and Asia$^{21}$, and averaging the results for Africa.
forest vulnerable to ground fires\textsuperscript{23} that have the potential to more than double total C emissions in dry years. In addition, much of the surviving forest, adjacent to areas of deforestation, is fragmented\textsuperscript{24} and, thus, prone to biomass loss even in the absence of human harvesting\textsuperscript{5}.

These recent studies suggest that it is not implausible that the true rate of CO\textsubscript{2} emission through tropical deforestation in the 1980s might have approached 3.0 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}, almost double the value reported by IPCC in 1995 (Ref. 5). If so, one question begs an answer: where is this extra C going?

### CO\textsubscript{2} in the tropical atmosphere

An independent view on terrestrial C emissions can be obtained by examining the temporal and spatial variation of CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations in the atmosphere. Recent studies have attempted to provide continental-scale maps of the distribution of C sinks and sources\textsuperscript{26–28}. There are small gradients in mean atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} concentration between hemispheres and between continents, caused primarily by the uneven spatial distribution of surface C sources and sinks, and by relatively slow mixing by the troposphere. In principle, if the global distribution of CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations and fossil fuel emissions, and the global transport and dispersion rates estimated from meteorological models, is known, the models can be inverted to provide a spatial surface map of CO\textsubscript{2} sources and sinks. Monitoring the ratio \^{13}C/\textsuperscript{12}C and O\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2}, Bousquet et al.\textsuperscript{28} analysed CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations over the period 1985–1995. The two results disagree significantly both in the spatial distribution of CO\textsubscript{2} sources and sinks, and in the net tropical balance. Rayner et al.\textsuperscript{27} suggest a modest net sink in the terrestrial tropics, whereas Bousquet et al.\textsuperscript{28} suggest a significant net source concentrated in southeast Asia. There are still several inconsistencies with this approach.

Commentaries on these results usually focus on the C sink in temperate regions. Perhaps this reflects the geographical bias of the scientific research community. Also, it is not always emphasized that these atmospheric techniques should find a large CO\textsubscript{2} source in tropical latitudes, of the magnitude indicated by the deforestation studies — neither of these studies does so. This feature encapsulates the debate surrounding the C balance of tropical forests: studies of deforestation indicate that tropical regions are releasing large quantities of CO\textsubscript{2}, but only some, or none, of this CO\textsubscript{2} is measured in the tropical atmosphere. There are several possible reasons for this discrepancy:

- The deforestation studies strongly overestimate the net C release accompanying land-use change.
- The atmospheric transport models underestimate the mixing of CO\textsubscript{2} between low and mid-latitudes, and, thus, underestimate how quickly the tropical CO\textsubscript{2} signature is dissipated.
- There is a large CO\textsubscript{2} sink in the terrestrial tropical biosphere.

Working on the third assumption and using the ‘best estimate’ of tropical deforestation in Table 1, the third and fourth columns in Table 2 show the magnitude of the C sink that would be required in each region to bring consistency between deforestation and atmospheric studies. The implied sink is significant and is probably distributed across all three continents. Is such a C sink plausible?

### A tropical carbon sink: $A_{\text{trop}}$

The net C budget of an area of forest is the balance between net production and heterotrophic respiration. As shown in Fig. 1b, these two terms must be in approximate balance because any change in $N_p$ eventually produces a corresponding change in $R_h$, with a lag time equal to the sum of the time scale of C transport and the residence time. For example, if there is a short-term increase in $R_h$ because of an increase in soil temperature, the soil C stocks will eventually decrease to bring $R_h$ back to a level with $N_p$. However, variations in $N_p$ and $R_h$ on a timescale shorter than the residence time can result in a net flux of C to or from the forest system. Thus, interannual variation in cloudiness, precipitation and temperature might result in significant interannual variations in forest C balance\textsuperscript{31}.

There is also probably a longer term shift superimposed on this interannual variation. Mean atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} concentration has increased from a preindustrial value of 280 ppm to 366 ppm in 1998 (Ref. 1), and is currently increasing at about 1.5 ppm year\textsuperscript{-1}. A recent review of experimental studies growing trees in open-top chambers\textsuperscript{40} indicates that a 300 ppm increase in atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} concentration stimulates photosynthesis by 60%, the growth of young trees by 73% and wood growth per unit leaf area by 27%. It seems probable that there will be a similar response in natural forest ecosystems. Because of their intrinsic high productivity, tropical forests are a prime candidate for such a C fertilization response\textsuperscript{5}; the crucial question has been to what extent such a response might be limited by low nutrient availability, in particular by low nitrogen or low phosphorus. Several studies have attempted to model the effect of rising CO\textsubscript{2} on tropical forest productivity, with the magnitude of the resulting increase being largely dependent on how the nutrient cycle is modelled\textsuperscript{36,37}. Recently, it has been argued that forests might simply
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**Table 2. Net carbon (C) balance and implied biotic C sink in tropical forest regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Net balance\textsuperscript{a} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Net balance\textsuperscript{b} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Net sink\textsuperscript{c} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Net sink\textsuperscript{d} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>−0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>−1.1</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>−0.4</td>
<td>−0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>−0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>−1.2</td>
<td>−0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>−2.7</td>
<td>−1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}The net C balance as inferred from analysis of atmospheric concentrations of CO\textsubscript{2}. The Rayner et al. estimate is taken from Ref. 27; and the Bousquet et al. estimate of net C balance is taken from Ref. 28.

\textsuperscript{b}The implied biotic C sink, calculated by subtracting our best estimate of CO\textsubscript{2} emissions from deforestation (last column of Table 1) from the estimates of net C balance (Columns 2 and 3, above).
increase their nutrient acquisition processes by investing in mycorrhizal colonization, and by mineralizing nutrient reserves in the soil by the production of surface enzyme systems and organic acid exudates\textsuperscript{34}.

A small steady increase in forest productivity can produce a large net C sink. For a linear increase in $N_p$, followed by a linear increase in respiration with lag time $\tau$, the rate of C sequestration is $\tau \cdot \frac{dN_p}{dt}$ (Ref. 39). Using the forest areas in Table 1 and making the assumption that the values of $N_p$ and $\tau$ presented in Fig. 1b are representative of the entire tropical forest biome, the C sink resulting from increases in forest productivity of 0.1% year\textsuperscript{-1} and 0.3% year\textsuperscript{-1} is calculated in Table 3. The result is a simple extrapolation and should be treated with caution, but it does demonstrate how a small increase in productivity can generate a significant C sink.

A terrestrial tropical C sink of 2.0 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1} is equivalent to a per unit area sink of 1.1 t C ha\textsuperscript{-1}, if distributed evenly across the tropical forest biome. If genuine, such a rate of C increase should be directly measurable at the surface. In recent years, an increasing amount of field research has attempted to directly measure this C sequestration.

One approach has been to directly measure the CO\textsubscript{2} exchange above tropical forests, using the eddy covariance technique mentioned previously. This is a high-technology, equipment-intensive measurement – thus far only three field results have been reported. A short study in central Amazonia\textsuperscript{3} in 1987 suggested an annual sequestration rate of 2.2 t C ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1}; a medium-term study in southern Amazonia\textsuperscript{4} in 1993 estimated a C sink of 1.0 t C ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1}; and a year-long study in central Amazonia\textsuperscript{5} in 1995–1996 calculated a net C sequestration of 5.9 t C ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1}. The last study is the same as that demonstrated in Fig. 1. Eddy covariance techniques provide a vast amount of data on the temporal variation of C balance from hourly to annual timescales, but their spatial extrapolation is hampered by the high costs involved and the few results currently available. In the past year, there has been a proliferation of eddy covariance studies in tropical forests, primarily as part of the LBA (Large Scale Biosphere–Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia) experiment in Brazil [LBA Science Plan (1999) http://www.cptec.inpe.br/lba/], but also in Costa Rica and southeast Asia.

However, a lingering concern is that micrometeorological techniques might not be fully measuring CO\textsubscript{2} respired at night and, therefore, might be overestimating the net C sink. There is vigorous ongoing debate and research on this issue\textsuperscript{40–42}. A further possibility is that C leaks out of the forest in forms that are not usually measured, such as gaseous emissions of hydrocarbons\textsuperscript{43,44} or dissolved C in groundwater flows\textsuperscript{45}. These are thought to be relatively small, but surprises cannot be ruled out. Table 3 plots the mean tropical forest C sink calculated by averaging the three eddy covariance studies and multiplying this by the area of wet tropical forest in each biome. The total predicted tropical C sink is 4.5 Gt C year\textsuperscript{-1}, the largest suggested by any of the calculations in this article. This seems implausible unless there are ‘missing sources’ in the global C budget that are currently neglected.

An alternative approach to detecting C uptake has been the examination of long-term forestry plots for evidence of an increase in biomass. A recent study\textsuperscript{46} compiled data from forest inventories across 68 sites in apparently undisturbed tropical forests. It found large variability between plots, but reached a remarkable conclusion – most South American forests have increased in biomass in recent decades and have been accumulating C in biomass at a rate of 0.71 ± 0.39 t C ha\textsuperscript{-1} year\textsuperscript{-1}. In African and Asian forests, there appeared to be no net increase in biomass, but too few plots were analysed to be confident of this conclusion. Assuming that soil respiration rates have not been increasing, we can estimate the rate of accumulation of C in soils by multiplying the biomass sequestration rate by the ratio of the residence times
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### Table 3. The net biotic carbon (C) sink in tropical regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>0.1% year\textsuperscript{-1} increase\textsuperscript{a} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>0.3% year\textsuperscript{-1} increase\textsuperscript{a} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Eddy covariance\textsuperscript{b} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Forest biomass\textsuperscript{c} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Forest soil\textsuperscript{d} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Forest total\textsuperscript{e} (Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>−0.41</td>
<td>−1.22</td>
<td>−2.6</td>
<td>−0.62</td>
<td>−0.53</td>
<td>−1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>−0.52</td>
<td>−1.1</td>
<td>−0.26</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>−0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>−0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>−0.71</td>
<td>−2.12</td>
<td>−4.5</td>
<td>−1.1</td>
<td>−0.9</td>
<td>−2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}The net C sink resulting from rates of increase of net primary productivity of 0.1% year\textsuperscript{-1} and 0.3% year\textsuperscript{-1}.

\textsuperscript{b}The net C sink extrapolated from the mean sequestration rate measured by eddy covariance studies (see text).

\textsuperscript{c}The net C sink in forest biomass is extrapolated from forest biomass data; the sink in forest soils is estimated from soil C residence times (see text); and the total C sink is the sum of biomass and soil C estimates.
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### Box 1. Conclusions

- The productivity of tropical forests might be higher than previously estimated when below-ground productivity is fully taken into account.
- Recent studies suggest that CO\textsubscript{2} emissions from tropical deforestation and degradation might be significantly greater than previously estimated, perhaps even approaching 3.0 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}.
- Studies of the distribution of atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} find either no tropical source or only a modest source, in spite of the large CO\textsubscript{2} efflux from deforestation, thus indicating the presence of a tropical sink of 1–3 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}.
- Forestry plot studies have indicated that the biomass of old-growth tropical forests has been increasing over recent decades, absorbing C into biomass at a rate of 1.1 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}. This might be a response to rising atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations. If soil C changes are taken into account, the probable sequestration rate is 2.0 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}; however, this might be reduced if soil respiration rates increase in response to climatic warming.
- There is some degree of consistency between deforestation, forestry plot and atmospheric studies, suggesting a tropical C sink of 2.0 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}, a deforestation source of 2.4 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1} and a net tropical source of 0.4 Pg C year\textsuperscript{-1}. These values suggest that tropical productivity is increasing by approximately 0.3% year\textsuperscript{-1} or 0.2% for every 1 ppm rise in CO\textsubscript{2} concentration.
- Micrometeorological studies are currently limited in number, but suggest a C sequestration rate that seems larger than plausible.
- On a continental scale, there is a surprising degree of consistency between sink estimates from the combination of atmospheric and deforestation studies, and those from the extrapolation of forest plot data.
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\( \frac{\tau_{trop}}{biomes} \) (Fig. 1b), thus arriving at a value of 0.61 t C ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) for soils or a total sequestration rate of 1.30 t C ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\). The net sequestration rate in each tropical region can be calculated by multiplying this rate by the area of forest (Table 3). This includes the assumption that the low increase measured in Africa and Asia reflects paucity in data rather than a genuine difference between regions, thus the mean uptake rate calculated for South American forests can be applied to all three regions. The calculation suggests a total tropical forest sink of 2.0 t C year\(^{-1}\), half of which is in South America.

On a continental scale, there is a surprising degree of consistency between these sink estimates, and between those obtained from the combination of atmospheric and deforestation studies. Both approaches indicate a sink of about 1 Pg C year\(^{-1}\) in the Americas and a smaller sink in the less extensive African forests. However, in Asia Rayner et al. indicate a much larger sink than seems plausible given the small relative area of Asian tropical forests. This suggests a problem either with the results of Rayner et al. or with Houghton’s C source estimate for Asia.

Is a global tropical forest sink of 2.0 Gt C year\(^{-1}\) consistent with recent studies of CO\(_2\) fertilization and is it sustainable? Table 3 indicates that forest productivity would need to increase by 0.3% year\(^{-1}\) as CO\(_2\) concentrations rise by 1.5 ppm year\(^{-1}\). If sustained, this implies a 60% increase in productivity for a 300 ppm increase in CO\(_2\) concentration. This result seems consistent with experimental observations\(^{34}\). However, in natural, as opposed to experimental, conditions, the trees form dense canopies that compete with each other and the stimulation of growth might be less. Perhaps a realistic estimate of the enhancement of productivity, taking into account competition by calculating the annual biomass increment per unit of leaf area, is about 30%. Thus, there appears to be an inconsistency between the magnitude of the tropical C sink suggested here and the results from laboratory studies of CO\(_2\) fertilization.

A revised global carbon budget?

In this perspective, we have examined recent developments in the study of the productivity and C balance of tropical forests, with any eye to converging on a consistent picture of the tropical forest C sink. Such a consistent picture has not yet emerged, but there have been several major new developments. Our main conclusions are listed in Box 1.

It seems probable that tropical forests are greater sources and sinks of C than previously estimated. We can suggest tentative revisions to the global C budget for the 1980s presented at the start of this article:

\[
E_{\text{eff}} + E_{\text{trop}} = E_{\text{atm}} + E_{\text{ocean}} + E_{\text{trop}} + E_{\text{other}} \]

5.5 ± 0.5, 2.4 ± 0.6, 3.3 ± 0.2, 2.0 ± 0.8, 2.9 ± 0.4

Several studies have suggested substantial C sinks at mid and high latitudes\(^{17,44}\), and, therefore, the 0.4 Pg C year\(^{-1}\) ascribed to \(E_{\text{trop}}\) is probably too small. This suggests that either \(E_{\text{trop}}\) is still being underestimated or \(E_{\text{trop}}\) is being overestimated. There are still significant error margins and further revisions to this budget are inevitable.

Future directions

The research areas reviewed here can all be expected to make significant progress over the next decade. There will be a substantial expansion of data sets in all fields, but methodological issues must still remain a focus of research.

For studies based on global atmospheric CO\(_2\) concentrations, there needs to be an expansion of data points in poorly monitored regions, including tropical oceanic and continental regions, and improvements in the modelling of global trace gas transport, particularly between the tropics and the mid-latitudes.

For eddy covariance and other micrometeorological studies, the key question will be to explain the high C uptake rates currently being measured in tropical forests. Recently initiated field studies will provide a substantial data set, but attention still needs to be focused on unresolved methodological issues.

Long-term tropical forest plots offer great potential for direct monitoring of aboveground C stocks. There will be a substantial expansion of available data when all historical long-term forest plot records are compiled; however, these historical data sets will have several statistical and methodological problems. A more rigorous approach will be the establishment of large plots specifically tailored for research into long-term change, such as the 50 ha plots within the Centre for Tropical Forest Science network [http://www.si.edu/organiza/centers/stri/forest/ctfs/start.html].

The final point of convergence will be when field studies, laboratory studies and physiological models converge on a consistent picture of the C balance of each biome. This article has hinted at convergence between these diverse fields; we are optimistic that a more consistent picture of the net C balance of tropical forests, and of other biomes, will emerge over the next decade.

References

3 Food and Agriculture Organization (1993) Forest Resources Assessment 1990 - Tropical Countries. FAO Forestry Paper 112
20 Fearnside, P.M. Global warming and tropical land-use change: greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning, decomposition and soils in forest conversion, shifting cultivation and secondary vegetation. Clim. Chang. (in press)
The nature of predation: prey dependent, ratio dependent or neither?

Peter A. Abrams and Lev R. Ginzburg

To describe a predator–prey relationship, it is necessary to specify the rate of prey consumption by an average predator. This functional response largely determines dynamic stability, responses to environmental influences and the nature of indirect effects in the food web containing the predator–prey pair. Nevertheless, measurements of functional responses in nature are quite rare. Recently, much work has been devoted to comparing two idealized forms of the functional response: prey dependent and ratio dependent. Although we agree that predator abundance often affects the consumption rate of individual predators, this phenomenon requires more attention. Disagreement remains over which of the two idealized responses serves as a better starting point in building models when data on predator dependence are absent.

The rate of prey consumption by an average predator is known as the functional response; this can be classified as: (1) prey dependent, when prey density alone determines the response; (2) predator dependent, when both predator and prey populations affect the response; and (3) multispecies dependent, when species other than the focal predator and its prey species influence the functional response. Until recently, predation theory was dominated by prey-dependent models and by Holling’s three-type classification of these responses. Arditi and Ginzburg stimulated recent interest in alternative forms for functional responses with their suggestion that a ratio-dependent functional response was a better starting point for modeling predation. Ratio dependence is a particular type of predator dependence in which the response only depends on the ratio of prey population size to predator population size, not on the absolute numbers of either species. Figure 1 illustrates a prey-dependent response and a comparable ratio-dependent response.

The publication of Arditi and Ginzburg’s suggestion received both support and criticism. The question underlying the debate is: how does predator population density influence the average predator’s consumption rate? The answer to this question has an important influence on when and why predator–prey systems fluctuate, how they are likely to evolve and how they respond to environmental changes. The debate has persisted for more than a decade, in part, because ecologists know pitifully little about the nature of functional responses. Following prey-dependent theory, early empirical work typically measured the number of prey eaten by single predators in small cages. This design eliminates the possibility of seeing anything other than prey dependence. Observations of