



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Direct evidence for phosphorus limitation on Amazon forest productivity

Citation for published version:

Cunha, HFV, Anderson, KM, Lugli, LF, Santana, FD, Aleixo, I, Martins Moraes, A, Garcia, S, Di Ponzio, R, Oblitas Mendoza, E, Brum, B, Schmeisk Rosa, J, Cordeiro, AL, Portela, BTT, Ribeiro, G, Deambrozi Coelho, S, Trierveiler de Souza, S, Siebert Silva, L, Antonieto, F, Pires, M, Salomao, AC, Miron, AC, de Assis, RL, Domingues, TF, Aragao, LEOC, Meir, P, Camargo, JL, Manzi, A, Nagy, L, Mercado, LM, Hartley, IP & Quesada, CA 2022, 'Direct evidence for phosphorus limitation on Amazon forest productivity', *Nature*, vol. 608, pp. 558–562. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05085-2>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1038/s41586-022-05085-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05085-2)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Nature

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 Direct evidence for phosphorus limitation on Amazon forest productivity

2 Hellen Fernanda Viana Cunha^{1*}, Kelly M. Andersen^{2,3}, Laynara Figueiredo Lugli^{1,4},
3 Flavia Delgado Santana¹, Izabela Aleixo¹, Anna Martins Moraes¹, Sabrina Garcia¹,
4 Raffaello Di Ponzio⁵, Erick Oblitas Mendoza¹, Bárbara Brum¹, Jéssica Schmeisk Rosa¹,
5 Amanda L. Cordeiro⁶, Bruno Takeshi Tanaka Portela¹, Gyovanni Ribeiro¹, Sara
6 Deambrozi Coelho¹, Sheila Trierweiler de Souza¹, Lara Siebert Silva¹, Felipe Antonieto¹,
7 Maria Pires¹, Ana Cláudia Salomão⁵, Ana Caroline Miron¹, Rafael L. de Assis^{1,7}, Tomas
8 F. Domingues⁸, Luiz E.O.C. Aragão^{3,9}, Patrick Meir¹⁰, José Luis Camargo⁵, Antonio
9 Manzi¹, Laszlo Nagy¹¹, Lina M. Mercado^{3,12}, Iain P. Hartley³ and Carlos Alberto
10 Quesada¹

11 **The productivity of rainforests growing on highly-weathered tropical soils is expected to be limited**
12 **by phosphorus (P) availability¹. Yet, controlled fertilisation experiments have failed to demonstrate**
13 **a dominant role for P in controlling tropical forest net primary productivity (NPP). Recent syntheses**
14 **have demonstrated that responses to N addition are as large as to P², and adaptations to low P**
15 **availability appear to allow NPP to be maintained across major soil P gradients³. Thus, the extent to**
16 **which P availability limits tropical forest productivity is highly uncertain. The majority of the**
17 **Amazonia, however, is characterised by soils even more depleted in P than where most tropical**
18 **fertilisation experiments have previously taken place². Thus, we established the first P, nitrogen (N),**
19 **and base cation addition experiment in an old growth Amazon rainforest, with the site's low soil P**
20 **content representative of ~60% of the basin. Here we show that NPP increased exclusively with P**
21 **addition. After 2 years, strong responses were observed in fine root (+29%) and canopy productivity**
22 **(+19%), but not stem growth. The direct evidence of P limitation of NPP suggests that P availability**
23 **may restrict Amazon forest responses to CO₂ fertilisation⁴, with major implications for future carbon**
24 **sequestration and forest resilience to climate change.**

25 The inclusion of nutrient cycling in Earth systems models has substantially reduced predictions of future C
26 uptake by vegetation under elevated atmospheric CO₂ (^{4,5,6,7}). Furthermore, fundamental differences
27 between the cycles of nitrogen (N) and rock-derived elements such as P, mean that P limitation may place
28 a greater constraint on plant responses to CO₂ fertilisation than N limitation^{8,9}. During soil development¹⁰,
29 the weathering of rocks or parent material provides the major source of P for initial vegetation development.
30 Over millions of years, however, the parent material is gradually depleted, and available P, as well as rock-
31 derived base cations such as calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg) and potassium (K), may be lost via leaching
32 or made unavailable through occlusion by iron and aluminium-oxides, with organic forms of P becoming
33 key pools in depleted and highly weathered systems^{10,11}. Meanwhile, N tends to accumulate over time, with
34 inputs from biological fixation and atmospheric deposition exceeding N losses¹². For these reasons, a long-
35 standing paradigm in tropical ecology (the so-called P paradigm) has been that forest productivity on

¹Coordination of Environmental Dynamics, National Institute for Amazonian Research, Manaus, AM, Brazil. ²Asian School of the Environment, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. ³Geography, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Amory Building, Rennes drive, Exeter, Devon, EX4 4RJ, United Kingdom. ⁴TUM School of Life Sciences, Technical University of Munich, Freising 85354, Germany. ⁵Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragment Project, National Institute for Amazonian Research, Manaus, AM, 69067-375, Brazil. ⁶Colorado State University – CSU, Fort Collins, CO, USA. ⁷Natural History Museum, University of Oslo, Norway. ⁸Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciência e Letras de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil. ⁹National Institute for Space Research, São Jose dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil. ¹⁰School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH8 9AB, UK. ¹¹University of Campinas. ¹²UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, UK. *e-mail:hfcunha.florestal@gmail.com

36 highly-weathered soils, such as in those in central Amazonia, is primarily limited by plant available P¹³,
37 with a potential secondary role of other rock-derived elements. Supporting this paradigm, seminal forest
38 ecology studies demonstrated very low levels of P and base cations in plant tissues in Amazonia¹⁴, and high
39 C:P ratios in litterfall of tropical forest more generally¹. In Amazonia, greater wood productivity has also
40 been observed in forests growing on fertile soils in western Amazonia when compared to less fertile sites
41 in central and eastern portions of the basin, with relationships with total soil phosphorus being strongest^{15,16}.
42 However, across the Amazon basin, climatic and edaphic factors covary¹⁷ influencing species distributions,
43 standing forest biomass and turnover rates¹⁶. Thus, directly determining the extent to which soil fertility
44 controls tropical forest growth, and which elements are most important, remains a key knowledge gap¹⁸,
45 and addressing this is critical for understanding forest growth dynamics and predicting responses to CO₂
46 fertilisation¹⁹.

47 By minimising confounding factors, manipulation experiments can identify directly which specific
48 elements limit forest productivity²⁰. Although no large-scale N, P and base cation experiment has been
49 carried out in Amazonia until now, a recent synthesis study argued that there is as much evidence for N
50 limitation of tropical forest productivity as there is for P (ref 2). For example, in Costa Rica, P additions
51 did not elicit any changes in litterfall and fine root productivity in two years after fertilisation²¹, and in
52 Panama, an increase in litter production with P addition was evident only 8 years after fertilisation²², with
53 initial responses stronger for N additions, at least in the rainy season²³. Critically, previous nutrient
54 manipulation studies in primary tropical rain forests have mainly taken place where total soil P contents are
55 much greater than in central and eastern Amazonia (~443-1600 mg kg⁻¹ versus 70-120 mg kg⁻¹ in typical
56 Amazon Ferralsols). In Amazonia, fertilisation experiments have been carried out in secondary forests, but
57 little evidence for strong P limitation has been observed^{24,25}, with N availability found to be important
58 during initial forest recovery^{26,27}. There have been fertilisation experiments in forests growing on soils with
59 P as low as in Amazonia in Cameroon²⁸ and Borneo²⁹. These studies have also generally failed to provide
60 clear support for the P paradigm, with no positive effects of P addition being observed²⁸, or with responses
61 to N being at least as large as those to P²⁹. However, the tree communities were very different to those
62 found across Amazonia, with fundamental differences in nutrient uptake strategies including contrasting
63 mycorrhizal associations. Therefore, while previous fertilisation studies strongly question the ubiquity of P
64 limitation in tropical forests, their results cannot be extrapolated to Amazonian forests, especially those
65 growing on low fertility soils in central and eastern regions of the basin.

66 To address this major knowledge gap, in 2017 in lowland tropical evergreen rainforest near Manaus, Brazil,
67 we set up a large-scale fully factorial N, P and base cation-addition experiment (the Amazon Fertilisation
68 Experiment-AFEX), manipulating 8 hectares of forest across 32 plots in four blocks³⁰. The Ferralsols of
69 the study site have low concentrations of total P and base cations that are characteristic of up to 60% of
70 Amazon forest soils³¹ (Fig. 1). To determine directly which nutrient(s) control Amazon forest productivity,
71 we measured the responses of fine root, stem wood, and litterfall production between 2017 and 2019 (see
72 Methods), making nearly 1500 measurements of canopy production, quantifying root productivity every
73 three months across 160 locations and measuring the growth of 4849 trees. Importantly, our base cation
74 treatment added the same amount of calcium as in the super-triple phosphate that was used in the P addition
75 treatment. Thus, comparisons between these treatments ensure that the effects of P can be isolated.

76 Annual NPP rapidly increased with the addition of P in a Central Amazon Forest. After two years of P
77 addition, annual NPP significantly increased by 1.16 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, or 15.6% (+P (with P addition): 8.60
78 ± 0.33 versus -P (without P addition): 7.44 ± 0.21 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; F_{1,27} = 9.56, p = 0.005; Fig. 2a), due to
79 greater canopy and fine root productivity. No significant effects of N and base cation addition were
80 observed on total NPP or any of its components measured. The increase in NPP may have been driven by
81 the increase in P availability stimulating GPP³², and/or through reductions in autotrophic respiration³³. It
82 has been shown that forests growing on high fertility soils may produce biomass more efficiently and thus
83 show greater carbon use efficiency (CUE, the ratio of net carbon gain to gross carbon assimilated,

84 NPP/GPP)³⁴. Although the direct causes of changes are not yet clear, our results clearly demonstrate that
85 NPP in this forest is limited by P alone. The observed increase in NPP with +P, and the lack of any N
86 response, strongly contrasts with a meta-analysis based on previous tropical forest fertilisation studies²,
87 with the lower levels of soil P in Amazonia likely explaining this contrast (Fig. 1). We have previously
88 observed that base cation addition affects root morphology and mycorrhizal colonisation³⁰. Thus, while
89 base cation availability did not appear to limit NPP, they do appear to influence key belowground processes.

90 We observed a substantial 0.83 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, or 19% (+P: 5.19 ± 0.15 *versus* -P: 4.36 ± 0.12 Mg C ha⁻¹
91 yr⁻¹; F_{1,30} = 18.3, *p* < 0.001; Fig. 2b), increase in canopy productivity. Investment in leaf production provides
92 a return revenue stream of photosynthate that can promote NPP of other tissues and can be used to acquire
93 other limiting resources³⁵, such as light and nutrients. We observed weak evidence towards higher leaf area
94 index (LAI) with P addition over the first 1.5 years of the experiment (3.6% increase: +P: 5.75 ± 0.10 *versus*
95 -P: 5.55 ± 0.15 m² m⁻²; F_{1,27} = 1.76, *p* = 0.20; Extended Data Figure 1), which may have had minor
96 contributions to enhanced rates of C gain. The increase in litterfall productivity in our site appears to result
97 from a decrease in leaf life span, which was estimated to have decreased by 10 to 20% following phosphorus
98 addition (+P: 1.03 ± 0.04 *versus* -P: 1.15 ± 0.05 yr; F_{1,30} = 4.08, *p* = 0.05 and +P: 1.15 ± 0.05 *versus* -P:
99 1.56 ± 0.07; F_{1,27} = 28.4, *p* = 0.0000127, analysis based on fresh and litter leaves, respectively – see methods;
100 Extended Data Figure 2). Therefore, the increases in leaf turnover appear important in driving the greater
101 canopy productivity in response to P addition, and so far no substantial LAI increment was observed.

102 Fine root productivity responded strongly to P addition, increasing by 0.35 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹, and had the
103 strongest relative increase of 29.4% in the top 30 cm of soil (+P: 1.54 ± 0.09 *versus* -P: 1.19 ± 0.06 Mg C
104 ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; F_{1,30} = 9.24, *p* = 0.005; Fig. 2b). The overall increase in fine root productivity over two years of
105 fertilisation, was greater compared to observations during the first 12 months (23.4% ref 30). Fine root
106 productivity increased significantly in the top 10 cm of soil depth (+P: 0.96 ± 0.05 *versus* -P: 0.71 ± 0.04
107 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; F_{1,30} = 12.9, *p* = 0.001; Table S25-27), but below 10 cm, although fine root productivity was
108 ~20% greater following P addition, this difference was not statistically significant (+P: 0.58 ± 0.04 *versus*
109 -P: 0.48 ± 0.03 Mg C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹; F_{1,30} = 3.56, *p* = 0.069; Table S29-30). The greater fine root productivity in
110 the upper soil layer may be due to the low mobility of P in the soil³⁶, with most of the added P likely to
111 remain in the top 10 cm, where it can be rapidly taken up by roots^{30,37,38}, or soil microbes. In a nearby site,
112 at least 40% of fine root productivity was shown to occur below 30 cm³⁹. Thus, while it is unlikely that
113 reductions in productivity below 30 cm could have compensated for the increased root growth near the
114 surface, across the full rooting depth the overall stimulation of fine root production will probably have been
115 lower than 29%.

116 There is very limited information on fine root productivity responses to nutrient addition in old growth
117 tropical rainforests. In a fertilisation experiment in Panama, while fine root productivity was not measured
118 directly, K addition induced significant changes, decreasing fine root standing biomass, increasing fine root
119 turnover, and reducing root tissue density, leading to shifts toward the construction of fine roots with a
120 more acquisitive strategy^{40,41}. In one of the few studies that measured root productivity responses to large-
121 scale nutrient additions in the tropics, in a secondary tropical forest (~30 years) in Costa Rica, the addition
122 of P did stimulate root productivity one year after fertilisation, but this appeared to be at the expense of
123 aboveground tissue production, with no overall effect of nutrient addition on total productivity⁴². The clear
124 increase in fine root productivity in our experiment also contrasts strongly with results observed in
125 temperate forests, where reductions in root productivity and soil respiration (less heterotrophic and
126 autotrophic respiration) have generally been observed following experimental fertilisation and alleviation
127 of N limitation⁴³.

128 No significant effects of the nutrient addition were detectable on stem wood productivity (P: F_{1,24} = 0.001,
129 *p* = 0.97; cations: F_{1,27} = 0.01, *p* = 0.92; N: F_{1,26} = 0.003, *p* = 0.96). Mean stem wood productivity was 1.85
130 ± 0.39 Mg C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ (DBH > 10 cm). While plants that grow in high-fertility soils can increase the

131 concentration of nutrients in tissues, with the potential to promote growth⁴⁴, species in low-fertility sites
132 may be adapted to allocate nutrients to tissues with higher P demand (more active), prioritising roots and
133 leaves, increasing photosynthetic and metabolic capacities, promoting ion uptake, tissue growth and
134 maintenance⁴⁵. In addition, the advantage of higher woody biomass production occurs only if it provides a
135 competitive advantage over neighbouring trees (competition for light) or decreases the risk of mortality⁴⁶.
136 The rapid responses to P addition observed for the canopy and fine roots are important and enhance our
137 understanding of nutrient limitation in Amazon forests, but longer-term monitoring of the experiment is
138 required to determine whether the responses of different NPP components, and resource allocation, change
139 over time, and whether a stem wood productivity response becomes apparent.

140 While attributing variation in forest productivity to P availability across fertility gradients in Amazonian
141 has proven challenging due to confounding variation in tree species composition and both climatic and soil
142 physical factors, our results suggest that P availability may be critical in controlling geographical variation
143 in canopy and fine root productivity across the basin. Along a natural soil fertility gradient spanning the
144 Amazon Basin, fine root productivity, measured in the top 30 cm and extended to 1 m depth, increased on
145 average by ~28% and canopy productivity also increased by ~28% from East (less fertile soils) to West
146 (high-fertility soils)⁴⁷. Thus, after two years of P addition, the 29.4% stimulation in fine root productivity
147 in our experiment is comparable to the difference in fine root productivity between Amazon regions with
148 contrasting soil fertility (Extended Data Table 1). The observed 19% increase in canopy productivity with
149 P addition (Fig. 2b) is lower than the 28% greater litterfall production in fertile Western forests of the basin
150 (Peru, Colombia), compared with low-fertility sites in Central and Eastern Amazonia (Brazil)⁴⁷ (Extended
151 Data Table 1). This may be explained by spatial variability representing the combination of direct P effects
152 as well as changes in the species present, with a greater dominance of fast-growing species with lower wood
153 density in the western Amazon¹⁶. However, overall, the similar magnitudes of the responses observed in
154 our experiment, in which confounding variation in climatological variables, other edaphic factors, and
155 species present has been minimised, to the patterns observed across major soil fertility gradients, strongly
156 suggest that P availability is a critical in controlling geographical variation in fine root and canopy
157 productivity across the basin.

158 Direct demonstration of limitation by P, rather than N, of NPP in a Central Amazon forest has major
159 implications for predicting forest responses to climate change and rising atmospheric CO₂. In contrast to
160 the N cycle, the P cycle has no major gaseous phase, and aqueous losses are low⁹. Therefore, while
161 ecosystem N stocks can increase under elevated CO₂ if rates of biological fixation increase, or aqueous or
162 gaseous losses are reduced⁸, in ecosystems with highly weathered soils there is little opportunity for total P
163 stocks to change due the lack of inputs and outputs⁹. For this reason, P limitation may place a stronger
164 constraint on forest responses to rising atmospheric CO₂ than N limitation, questioning the potential for
165 current high rates of C uptake in Amazonia to be maintained. Recent model projections demonstrated that
166 the inclusion of P in dynamic global vegetation models reduced predictions of C uptake and biomass
167 production in Amazon forests⁴, decreasing forest C sink, and contributing to more rapid global climate
168 change⁷. Furthermore, because the resistance of tropical forests to climate change depends on their ability
169 to respond positively to rising CO₂ levels, if the responses to elevated CO₂ are limited by P availability,
170 Amazon forests growing in low fertility soils may be more vulnerable than currently recognised⁴⁸. Testing
171 this suggestion directly with experimental manipulations of atmospheric CO₂ in tropical rainforests remains
172 an urgent research priority, with the AmazonFACE (<https://amazonface.inpa.gov.br/en/index.php>)
173 experiment aiming to do just that. Overall, in contrast to recent meta-analyses and the results from
174 experiments in different tropical regions, our results provide direct evidence for P availability controlling
175 forest productivity in the low fertility soils that characterise central and eastern Amazonia, with no evidence
176 for a role of N. This new understanding of the role of nutrient limitation in Amazon forests has critical
177 implications for current and future mitigation policies required to avoid the most dangerous consequences
178 of climate change.

- 179 1. Vitousek, P.M. Litterfall, nutrient cycling, and nutrient limitation in tropical forests. *Ecology* **65**,
180 285-298 (1984).
- 181 2. Wright, S. J. *et al.* Plant responses to fertilization experiments in lowland, species rich, tropical
182 forests. *Ecology* **99**, 1-10 (2018).
- 183 3. Turner, B.L *et al.* Pervasive phosphorus limitation of tree species but not communities in tropical
184 forests. *Nature* **0**, 1-4 (2018).
- 185 4. Fleischer, K. *et al.* Amazon forest response to CO₂ fertilization depend on plant phosphorus
186 acquisition. *Nat. Geosci.* **12**, 736-741 (2019).
- 187 5. Goll, D. S. *et al.* Nutrient limitation reduces land carbon uptake in simulations with a model of
188 combined carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycling. *Biogeosciences* **9**, 3547-3569 (2012).
- 189 6. Sun, Y. *et al.* Diagnosing phosphorus limitation in natural terrestrial ecosystems in carbon cycle
190 models. *Earths future* **5**, 730-749 (2017).
- 191 7. Zhang, Q. *et al.* Nitrogen and phosphorus limitations significantly reduce allowable CO₂
192 emissions. *Geohys Lett.* **41**, 632-637 (2014).
- 193 8. Luo, Y., Hui, D. & Zhang, D. Elevated CO₂ stimulates net accumulations of carbon and nitrogen
194 in land ecosystem: a meta analysis. *Ecology* **87**, 53-63 (2006).
- 195 9. Jordan, C.F. The nutrient balance of an Amazonian Rainforest. *Ecology* **63**, 647-654 (1982).
- 196 10. Walker, T.W. & Syers, J. K. The fate of phosphorus during pedogenesis. *Geoderma* **15**, 1-19
197 (1976).
- 198 11. Crews, T.E. *et al.* Changes in Soil Phosphorus Fractions and Ecosystem Dynamics across a long
199 chronosequence in Hawaii. *Ecology* **76**, 1408-1424 (1995).
- 200 12. Hedin, L.O. *et al.* Nutrient losses over four million years of tropical forest development. *Ecology*
201 **84**, 2231-2255 (2003).
- 202 13. Dalling, J.W. *et al.* Nutrient availability in Tropical Rain Forests. The paradigm of phosphorus
203 limitation. *In Tropical Tree Physiology* (Springer, 2016).
- 204 14. Herrera, R.R & Medina, E. Amazon Ecosystems, their structure and functioning with particular
205 emphasis on nutrients. *Interciencia* **3**, 223-231 (1978).
- 206 15. Quesada, C.A. *et al.* Variations in chemical and physical properties of Amazon forest soils in
207 relation to their genesis. *Biogeosciences* **7**, 1515-1541 (2010).
- 208 16. Quesada, C.A. *et al.* Basin wide variations in Amazon forest structure and function are mediated
209 by both soils and climate. *Biogeosciences* **9**, 2203-2246 (2012).
- 210 17. Mercado, L. *et al.* Variations in Amazon forest productivity correlated with foliar nutrients and
211 modelled rates of photosynthetic carbon supply. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*
212 **366**, 3316-3329 (2011).
- 213 18. Wright, S.J. 2019. Plant responses to nutrient addition experiments conducted in tropical forests.
214 *Ecol. Monogr.* **0**, 1-18 (2019).
- 215 19. Yang, X. *et al.* The effects of phosphorus cycle dynamics carbon sources and sink in the Amazon
216 region: a modelling study using ELM v1. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.* **124**, 3686-3698 (2019).
- 217 20. Sollins, P. Factors influencing species composition in tropical lowland rain forest: Does soil
218 matter? *Ecology* **79**, 23-30 (1998).
- 219 21. Alvarez-Clare, S. *et al.* A Direct Test of Nitrogen and Phosphorus Limitation to Net Primary
220 Productivity in a Lowland Tropical Wet Forest. *Ecology* **94**, 1540-1551 (2013).
- 221 22. Wright, S J. *et al.* Potassium, phosphorus, or nitrogen limit root allocation, tree growth, or litter
222 production in a lowland tropical forest. *Ecology* **92**, 1616-162 (2011).
- 223 23. Sayer *et al.* Variable responses of lowland tropical forest nutrient status to fertilization and litter
224 manipulation. *Ecosystems* **15**, 387-400 (2012).
- 225 24. Ganade, G. & Brown, V. Succession in old pastures of Central Amazonia: Role of Soil Fertility
226 and Plant Litter. *Ecology* **83**, 743-754 (2002).
- 227 25. Markewitz, D. *et al.* Soil and tree response to P fertilization in a secondary tropical forest supported
228 by an Oxisol. *Biol Fertil Soils* **48**, 665-678 (2012).

- 229 26. Davidson, E. et al. Nitrogen and Phosphorus limitation of biomass growth in a tropical secondary
230 forest. *Ecological Applications* **14**, 150-163 (2004).
- 231 27. Massad, T. et al. Interactions between fire, nutrients, and insect herbivores affect the recovery of
232 diversity in the southern Amazon. *Oecologia* **172**, 219-229 (2013).
- 233 28. Newbery, D.M. et al. Does low phosphorus supply limit seedling establishment and tree growth
234 in groves of ectomycorrhizal trees in a central African rainforest? *New Phytol.* **156**, 297-311.
- 235 29. Mirmanto, E. et al. Effects of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilization in a lowland evergreen
236 rainforest. *Phil. Trans.R.Soc.Lond.* **354**, 1825-1829 (1999).
- 237 30. Lugli, L.F. et al. Rapid responses of root traits and productivity to phosphorus and cation additions
238 in a tropical lowland forest in Amazonia. *New Phytol.* **230**, 116-128 (2020).
- 239 31. Quesada, C et al. Soils of Amazonia with particular reference to the rainfor sites. *Biogeosciences*
240 **8**, 1415-1440 (2011).
- 241 32. Giardina, C. et al. Primary production and carbon allocation in relation to nutrient supply in a
242 tropical experiment forest. *Glob Chang Biol* **9**, 1438-1450 (2003).
- 243 33. Rowland, L. et al. Scaling leaf respiration with nitrogen and phosphorus in tropical forests across
244 two continents. *New Phytol.* **214**, 1064-1077 (2017).
- 245 34. Vicca, S. et al. Fertile forests produce biomass more efficiently. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 520-526 (2012).
- 246 35. Wright, I.J., Reich, P.B., Westoby, M. et al. The worldwide leaf economics spectrum. *Nature* **428**,
247 821- 826 (2004).
- 248 36. Hinsinger, P. How do Plant roots acquire mineral nutrients? Chemical processes involved in the
249 rhizosphere. *Adv. Agron.* **64** (1998).
- 250 37. Van Langehove, L. et al. Rapid root assimilation of added phosphorus in a lowland tropical
251 rainforest of French Guiana. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **140**, 107646 (2019).
- 252 38. Martins, N.P et al. Fine roots stimulate nutrient release during early stages of litter decomposition
253 in a Central Amazon rainforest. *Plant Soil* **469**, 287- 303 (2021).
- 254 39. Cordeiro, A.L et al. Fine root dynamics vary with soil and precipitation in a low-nutrient tropical
255 forest in the Central Amazonia. *Plant Environment Interactions* **220**, 3-16 (2020).
- 256 40. Yavitt, J. Soil fertility and fine root dynamics in response to four years of nutrient (N,P, K)
257 fertilization in a lowland tropical moist forest, Panamá. *Austral Ecol.* **36**, 433-445 (2011).
- 258 41. Wurzburger, N. & Wright, S.J. Fine root responses to fertilization reveal multiple nutrient
259 limitation in a lowland tropical forest. *Ecology* **96**, 2137-2146 (2015).
- 260 42. Waring, B.G., Aviles, D.P., Murray, J.G. & Powers, J.S. Plant community responses to stand level
261 nutrient fertilization in a secondary tropical dry forest. *Ecology* **0**, 1-12 (2019).
- 262 43. Jansens, I.A. et al. Reductions of forest soil respiration in response to nitrogen deposition. *Nat.*
263 *Geosci.* **3**, 315- 322 (2010).
- 264 44. Alvarez Claire, S. et al. Do foliar, litter, and root nitrogen and phosphorus concentration reflect
265 nutrient limitation in a lowland tropical wet forest? *Plos one* **10**, 1-16 (2015).
- 266 45. Bouma, T. Understanding Plant Respiration: Separating Respiratory Components versus a
267 Process-Based Approach. In: *Advances in Photosynthesis and Respiration*. Vol 18, Springer,
268 Dordrecht, pp. 177-194 (2005).
- 269 46. Malhi, Y. et al. Comprehensive assessment of carbon productivity, allocation and storage in three
270 Amazonian forests. *Glob Chang Biol.* **15**, 1255-1274 (2009).
- 271 47. Aragão, L.E.O et al. Above and below ground net primary productivity across ten Amazonian
272 forests on contrasting soils. *Biogeosciences* **6**, 2759-2778 (2009).
- 273 48. Cox, P.M. et al. Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide
274 variability. *Nature* **494**, 341-344 (2013).
- 275 49. Quesada, C.A & Lloyd, J. Soil-Vegetation Interactions in Amazonia. In *Interactions Between*
276 *Biosphere, Atmosphere and Human Land Use in the Amazon Basin* (Springer, 2016).
- 277 50. Girardin, C.A.J et al. Seasonal trends of Amazonian rainforest phenology, net primary production,
278 and carbon allocation. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **30**, 700-715 (2016).

280 **Figure 1 | Total soil phosphorus measured in primary forest plots across the Amazon Basin, showing**
 281 **the low P concentration at our site and across central and eastern Amazonia.** A fertility gradient across
 282 the basin is shown, with red circles showing the lowest concentration of total phosphorus and blue circles
 283 showing the highest concentration of total phosphorus. The two large scale fertilisation experiments in
 284 Central American *terra firme* tropical forest are also shown, highlighting the five to eighteen-fold greater
 285 total phosphorus concentrations than in central Amazon. Total phosphorus concentrations are derived from
 286 Quesada and Lloyd 2016 (ref 49), except the values of Costa Rica²¹ and Panama⁴⁰. *In Costa Rica, values
 287 are available only for the 0-10 cm soil depth. For the other sites, values are for 0-30 cm soil depth.

288 **Figure 2 | The effect of N, P and base cation availability on total net primary productivity and its**
 289 **components. a,** The responses of total net primary productivity (NPP), representing the sum of NPP
 290 components. Only the statistically significant P effects are shown for total NPP, as N, base cation and all
 291 interactions had no effect (Table S2-4). **b-d,** The individual components of NPP where litterfall, stem wood
 292 and fine root productivity are shown in green, brown and orange bars, respectively. **b,** Litterfall productivity
 293 showed an increase with P addition only, and base cation (**c**) and N (**d**) are shown for comparison (Table
 294 S6-8). **b,** In stem wood productivity there was no effect of any nutrient addition (Table S32-33). **b,** Fine
 295 root productivity (0-30 cm) showed an increase with P addition only, and base cation (**c**) and N (**d**) are
 296 shown for comparison (Table S21-23). Both 0-10 and 10-30 cm had higher fine root productivity with P
 297 addition, but only the 0-10 cm layer had significantly different means. Means \pm 1SE are presented, n=16
 298 plots. The dotted lines represent the mean values for the control plots (no nutrients added; n=4 plots) for
 299 comparison purposes. Linear mixed models were performed to evaluate responses in total NPP and its
 300 components to added nutrients, where nutrient additions and their interactions were fixed effects and block
 301 was a random effect with the general full model formula $lmer(\text{response} \sim N * P * \text{Cations} + (1|\text{Block}))$.
 302 Only P addition remained in significant models after model simplification. All differences in mean values
 303 between plots with and without added nutrients with $p < 0.01$ are indicated. Cation (**c**) and nitrogen (**d**)
 304 panels for NPP components are added for comparison only.

305 **Acknowledgements** We thank Paulo Apóstolo Assunção (*in memoriam*) for the botanical identification of
 306 the trees, Jefferson “Pedrinho” Cruz, Alexandre dos Santos, and Benedito Sergio da Silva for helping in
 307 field campaigns. We are grateful for the contributions of Lars Hedin, Joe Wright and an anonymous
 308 reviewer during the revision process. The authors acknowledge funding from the UK’s Natural
 309 Environment Research Council (NERC), grant number NE/L007223/1. This paper is number XX on the
 310 BDFFP series. CAQ acknowledges the grants from Brazilian National Council for Scientific and
 311 Technological Development (CNPq) CNPq/LBA 68/2013, CNPq/MCTI/FNDCT N° 18/2021 and his
 312 productivity grant. CAQ, HFVC, FDS, IA, LFL, EMO and SG would like to acknowledge the
 313 AmazonFACE programme for financial support in cooperation with CAPES (Coordination for the
 314 Improvement of Higher Education Personnel) and the National Institute of Amazonian Research as part of
 315 the grants CAPES-INPA/88887.154643/2017-00 and 88881.154644/2017-01. TD acknowledges funds
 316 from *Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo* (FAPESP), grant 2015/50488-5, and the
 317 Partnership for Enhanced Engagement in Research program (PEER) grant AID-OAA-A-11-00012.

318 **Author contribution** H.F.V.C., C.A.Q., I.P.H. and K.M.A. planned the study. H.F.V.C., R.P., A.M., M.P.,
 319 J.S.R., B.B., A.L., S.D.C., S.T., F.A., L.S.S., G.R., R.L.A., A.C.S., B.T., C.M., L.F.L., E.O. and J.L.C
 320 collected the data and/or helped with project logistics. I.P.H., L.M., L.A., T.D., L.N., P.M. and C.A.Q wrote
 321 the grants that funded this research. H.F.V.C., K.M.A. and I.A organised the datasets. H.F.V.C., K.M.A.,
 322 I.A. and A.M. conducted the statistical analyses. H.F.V.C., L.F.L., I.P.H., C.A.Q., L.M., S.G., I.A., K.M.A.,
 323 F.D.S., T.D., A.L., P.M., R.P., R.L.A., L.A. and L.N discussed the results and the structure of the paper and
 324 improved the manuscript.

325 **Competing financial interests:** The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests.

326 **Supplementary information** is available for this paper.

327 **Correspondence and requests for materials** should be addressed to H.F.V.C

328 **Reprints and permissions information** is available at www.nature.com/reprints

329 **METHODS**

330 **Site.** This research was part of the Amazon Fertilisation Experiment (AFEX), a large-scale fertilisation
331 experiment installed in a lowland tropical forest, 80 km north of Manaus, Brazil, in Central Amazonia (lat
332 $2^{\circ} 30'S$, long $60^{\circ} W$) at one of the continuous old growth evergreen forests of the Biological Dynamics of
333 Forest Fragments Project (BDFFP)⁵¹. The experimental site is located in *terra firme* forest and has a high-
334 species diversity, with about 280 plant species (≥ 10 cm DBH) per hectare⁵². The dominant tree families in
335 our site are Lecythidaceae, Sapotaceae, Fabaceae and Burseraceae, and the most abundant species are
336 *Micrandropsis scleroxylon*, *Protium hebetatum*, *Eschweilera wachenheimii*, *Scleronema micranthum* and
337 *Eschweilera truncata*.

338 The mean annual air temperature is *c.* $26^{\circ}C$ ⁵³, and the mean annual precipitation is 2400 mm with a dry
339 season from June to October, when monthly precipitation can reach less than 100 mm⁵⁴. Above ground
340 biomass (AGB) was estimated to be 322 ± 54 Mg ha⁻¹ (tree individuals ≥ 10 diameter at breast height -
341 DBH) with mean wood density of 0.67 g cm⁻³⁵⁵. Local soils are geric Ferrasols (WRB Soil Classification)
342 also known as Oxisols (USDA Soil Taxonomy)^{56,57}. The soils are deep (≥ 400 cm) with good particle
343 aggregation, friable and with low subsoil bulk density ($0.8 - 1.2$ g cm⁻³)⁵⁸, typically acidic (pH ~ 4.1), with
344 low concentrations of nutrients such as P (total P = 87.5 mg kg⁻¹), calcium (Ca) (0.034 cmolc kg⁻¹), and K
345 (0.066 cmolc kg⁻¹). The soil texture of the site is 7.69% sand, 14.75% silt, and 77.55% clay.

346 **Experimental design.** AFEX is composed of thirty-two 50 m x 50 m plots distributed across four blocks
347 separated by at least 200 m³⁰. Each of the four blocks comprises eight plots, which are separated by at least
348 50 m, representing eight treatments applied in a fully factorial design: control (with no addition of
349 nutrients), N, P, CATIONS (Ca, Mg, K), N+P, N+CATIONS, P+CATIONS and N+P+CATIONS.

350 Fertilisation consists of 125 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ of N as urea (CO(NH₂)₂), 50 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ of P as triple
351 superphosphate (Ca(H₂PO₄)₂) and base cations with 160 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ as dolomitic limestone (CaMg(CO₃)₂)
352 for Ca and Mg plus 50 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ as potassium chloride (KCl) for K. Annual doses of N, P and K are
353 similar to the Panama fertilisation experiment, in order to facilitate comparisons⁵⁹, while the addition rates
354 of Ca within the base cation treatment equals the addition rate of Ca in the triple superphosphate, allowing
355 us to directly determine the effect of the added P. Nutrient additions are split into three equal applications
356 over the course of each wet season, with nutrients added every year since May 2017. The results presented
357 here correspond to forest growth after 2 years of field measurements.

358 **Fine root productivity.** The productivity of fine roots was measured every three months using the ingrowth
359 core method as described in detail in Lugli et al. (2021). In each plot, the five ingrowth cores were bulked
360 into a composite sample per plot, divided into depths of 0-10 cm and 10-30 cm, and roots were removed
361 from the soil core by hand in the field over a period of 60 minutes, which was split into 15 minutes time
362 intervals. Subsequently, fine roots (< 2 mm diameter) were cleaned, dried at $60^{\circ}C$ until constant mass and
363 weighed.

364 Different curve types were fitted to the first 60 minutes of manual root extraction and used to predict the
365 pattern of extraction up to 180 minutes^{30,60}.

366 We used the census from November 2017 to September 2019, comprising two years of data collection
367 (Year 1: November 2017 to Sept 2018 and Year 2: Dec 2018 to Sep 2019 in a total of 8 ingrowth core
368 collections). Total fine root productivity (0-30 cm) was summed for both years and the annual mean root
369 productivity was obtained dividing the root productivity by two. To convert root productivity from biomass
370 to C, we used C data from the root tissues carried out in the study area³⁰, in which the average C
371 concentration was 43.94%. Fine root productivity was expressed in Mg C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹.

372 **Stem wood productivity.** To calculate stem wood productivity, the stem diameter of all identified trees
373 with a diameter at breast height (DBH) ≥ 10 cm were recorded annually at the end of the wet season (May)
374 from 2017 - 2019. An allometric equation specific for tropical moist forest⁶¹ was applied to convert tree
375 DBH (cm), species wood density (g cm⁻³) and a bioclimatic parameter (*E*) in woody biomass. The equation
376 has the following expression:

$$377 \text{ AGB} = \exp(-2.024 - 0.896E + 0.920 \ln(\text{WD}) + 2.795 \ln(D) - 0.0461 [\ln(D)^2])$$

378 This is the slightly modified Eq 7 of Chave et al. 2014 given by the biomass package, where woody biomass
379 can be inferred in the absence of height measurements. The bioclimatic parameter (*E*) is a measure of
380 environmental stress⁶¹ related to climatic water deficit, temperature seasonality and precipitation
381 seasonality, inferred when the site coordinates were given (lat 2° 40' S; long 60° W).

382 Wood density was estimated for each species from the *getWoodDensity* function from R *biomass* package
383 using the global wood density database as a reference^{62,63}, ideally assigned to species, but to genus level
384 where species-level wood density data were not available. Of the total number of individuals, 55.1% of the
385 wood densities were obtained at the species level, 37.1% at the genus level and for the remaining 7.9% of
386 the individuals, we assumed the average wood density of the plot, because species was not identified or
387 was absent in the database.

388 Stem wood productivity was calculated as the change in stem biomass of surviving trees added to the
389 biomass of the recruited individuals divided by the census length. For 4600 tree individuals, we selected a
390 census length of two years (2017-2019) and for 249 trees where one census was missing (*e.g.*: tree not
391 measured in 2017, recruited in 2018 census, measurement error), annual productivity was calculated using
392 one year interval (2017-2018 or 2018-2019). Recruitment was the inclusion of new individuals who reached
393 10 cm of DBH in the 2019 inventory (42 trees). 22 trees with DBH > 15 cm in 2019 that were not measured
394 in at least two censuses were not considered in the analyses. For 38 trees that died in 2019, productivity
395 was calculated by the difference in biomass between 2018 and 2017.

396 The change in biomass was then summed over all trees ≥ 10 cm DBH in each plot (2500 m²) and
397 extrapolated to estimate the change in biomass per hectare. To convert biomass values into C, we assumed
398 that dry stem biomass corresponds to 50% C⁶⁴ and stem wood productivity was expressed in Mg C ha⁻¹
399 year⁻¹. To avoid or minimise potential errors, we used some parameters to check for quality control of the
400 data. We used data that fell inside both of the following criteria: diametric growth smaller than 4 cm yr⁻¹
401 and a negative growth limit of -0.5 cm across the census intervals. Small negative DBH increments were
402 included to accommodate measurement error and also because trees may shrink by a small amount due to
403 hydrostatic effects in times of drought⁶⁵.

404 **Litterfall Productivity.** Litterfall production was estimated by sampling litterfall every fifteen days in five
405 litter traps (0.25 m²) placed 1 m above the ground within the central area of each plot (30 x 30 m). Litterfall
406 includes leaves, twigs and thin branches with diameter < 2 cm, reproductive material (flowers, fruits and
407 seeds), residues (other fractions not identified) and insect frass that were oven-dried at 65 °C to constant
408 mass and weighed.

409 We used data from the census of July 2017 to June 2019, where this period comprises two years. Litterfall
410 productivity in $\text{g m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ was extrapolated to $\text{Mg ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$ and the average was obtained considering two
411 years of collection (Moraes et al, in prep; Supplementary material). Litter material was estimated to be 50%
412 C, based on mean values in our site, to convert biomass productivity into C productivity and it was also
413 expressed in $\text{Mg C ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$.

414 **Leaf area index (LAI).** A LAI-2200C (LI-COR Biotechnology, Lincoln, Nebraska USA) was used to
415 measure LAI inside the central 30 m x 30 m of each plot. Sixteen measurement points were made in each
416 plot, on a grid with an even spacing of 10 m. Measurements made on these 16 points per plot were averaged
417 to represent plot means. The data were collected from 6 am to 5 pm, avoiding recording data between 12:00
418 and 2:00 pm, to avoid direct sun. The LAI-2200C requires an above canopy reading for reference, and in
419 our case the optical sensor was placed in a clearing to log automatically while the operator collected
420 manually below the canopy. The sensors were always placed in the same compass direction (both in the
421 west in the morning and east in the afternoon) and we used a view cap of 45° in the sensors to remove the
422 operator from the sensor's view. The sensors were matched before the data collection. The raw data were
423 analysed using the FV2200 software, where LAI was obtained (m^2 one sided foliage area/ m^2 ground area)
424 and computed with 4 rings. These four rings read radiation in 4 angles, which are 7° , 23° , 38° and 53° . The
425 data were collected during 10 to 13 October 2017, 22 to 25 March 2018, 07 to 10 August 2018 and between
426 29 October and 02 November 2018. LAI was based on these 4 collections, and was transformed to a single
427 value representing the mean LAI over one year.

428 **Total Productivity.** We calculated total productivity, using the following equation:

$$429 \text{NPP}_{\text{total}} = \text{NPP}_{\text{fineroots}} + \text{NPP}_{\text{stem}} + \text{NPP}_{\text{litterfall}}$$

430 All terms are expressed in $\text{Mg C ha}^{-1} \text{year}^{-1}$.

431 **Leaf residence time.** This parameter was calculated by dividing the leaf biomass by annual leaf fall
432 productivity (from July 2017 to July 2018) in $\text{Mg dry biomass ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$ (⁶⁶). Leaf biomass was calculated by
433 dividing the mean LAI of four campaigns (10 to 13 October 2017, 22 to 25 March 2018, 07 to 10 August
434 2018 and between 29 October and 02 November 2018) by specific leaf area (SLA). The SLA was included
435 in two approaches: 1) Obtained from a census in October 2018, from about 8 individuals per plot from
436 canopy dominant trees (-P: $83.36 \pm 1.83 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ and +P: $88.02 \pm 2.49 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$, -CATIONS: 85.61 ± 2.25
437 $\text{cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ and +CATIONS: $85.77 \pm 2.28 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$, -N: $85.54 \pm 2.67 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ and +N: $85.85 \pm 1.76 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$, based
438 on mean values in our site; Andersen et al, unpublished) 2) Obtained from sampling in litter traps (-P:
439 $162.50 \pm 26 \text{ g m}^{-2}$ and +P: $128.75 \pm 11 \text{ g m}^{-2}$). Transformations from LMA to SLA were made when
440 necessary. The numerator, leaf biomass in g m^2 was extrapolated to Mg ha^{-1} . The denominator, leaf fall
441 productivity was based on 24 collections, and was transformed to a single value representing the mean leaf
442 fall productivity over one year.

443 **Data analyses.** Linear mixed models were used to test the effect of added nutrients and their interaction in
444 the factorial design N*P*base cations. The model simplification method used to find the best model was
445 the step function in *lmerTest* package, based on the drop1 function which systematically drops fixed factors
446 in order of the model hierarchy⁶⁷. We started with the full model including all nutrients and their interaction,
447 and followed a stepwise backward elimination on non-significant effects based on chi square test comparing
448 two consecutive models. When dropping interaction effects significantly changed the model fit, they were
449 retained in the model and the elimination process was completed. When all fixed effects were dropped from
450 the model, the intercept was accepted as the final model. A probability <0.05 was adopted to determine
451 significance. Results are reported for the best fit model in the text and figures. The denominator *degrees of*
452 *freedom* were estimated using the Satterthwaite approximation. The four blocks were used as random
453 factors and the response variables were fine root, stem wood, litterfall productivity, total productivity, leaf
454 area index and leaf residence time. All models were run using *lme4* and *lmerTest* R packages⁶⁸. We tested

455 the assumptions for normality and homogeneity of variance to meet assumptions for linear models, using
456 the Shapiro-Wilk and Levene tests. Since no interactions between nutrients were found, all plots where a
457 specific nutrient was not added (i.e – P, n = 16) are compared to all plots where that nutrient was added
458 (i.e., +P, n = 16)^{22,30}. Original datasets from this study are publically available (Moraes et al. 2020⁶⁹, Cunha
459 et al. 2021a⁷⁰, Cunha et al. 2021b⁷¹, Cunha et al. 2021c⁷²). Compiled datasets and R scripts used for
460 statistical analyses, figures and tables are available at <https://github.com/kmander7/Paper-AFEX-NPP>.

461 **Data availability.** Data that support the findings of this study have been deposited in NERC Environmental
462 Information Data Centre at (<https://doi.org/10.5285/b3a55011-bf46-40f5-8850-86dc8bc4c85d>) for root
463 biomass, at (<https://doi.org/10.5285/c2587e20-ba4a-4444-8ce9-ccdec15b0aa3>) for tree census,
464 at (<https://doi.org/10.5285/c0294ec9-45d6-464c-b543-ce9ece9fd968>) for litterfall production and at
465 (<https://doi.org/10.5285/6e70665f-b558-4949-b42a-49fbaec7e7cc>) for leaf area index. Global Wood
466 Density Database can be requested from <http://datadryad.org/handle/10255/dryad.235>. Plot mean datasets
467 for all response variables and AFEX plot treatment identifications are available at
468 <https://github.com/kmander7/Paper-AFEX-NPP>.

469 **Code availability.** The R code used to find the best model for each variable is available in the
470 Supplementary material. R scripts used to generate the Supplementary material are available at
471 <https://github.com/kmander7/Paper-AFEX-NPP>

472 51. Laurance, W.F. *et al.* An Amazonian rainforest and its fragments as a laboratory of global change. *Biol.*
473 *Rev.* **93**, 223-247 (2018).

474 52. De Oliveira, A. & Mori, S.A. A central Amazonia terra firme forest. I. High tree species richness on
475 poor soils. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **8**, 1219-1244 (1999).

476 53. Ferreira, S. J. F., Luizão, F. J., & Dallarosa, R. L. G. Precipitação interna e interceptação da chuva em
477 floresta de terra firme submetida à extração seletiva de madeira na Amazônia Central. *Acta Amaz.* **35**, 55-
478 62 (2005).

479 54. Tanaka, L. D. S., Satyamurty, P., & Machado, L. A. T. Diurnal variation of precipitation in central
480 Amazon Basin. *Int J Climatol.* **34**, 3574-3584 (2014).

481 55. Duque, A. *et al.* Insights into regional patterns of Amazonian forest structure and dominance from three
482 large terra firme forest dynamics plots. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **26**, 669-686 (2017).

483 56. Quesada C.A *et al.* Soils of Amazonia with particular reference to the rainfor sites. *Biogeosciences* **8**,
484 1415-1440 (2011).

485 57. Quesada, C.A. *et al.* Variations in chemical and physical properties of Amazon forest soils in relation
486 to their genesis. *Biogeosciences* **7**, 1515-1541 (2010).

487 58. Martins, D. L. *et al.* Soil induced impacts on forest structure drive coarse wood debris stocks across
488 central Amazonia. *Plant Ecol. & Divers.* **8**, 229-241 (2014).

489 59. Wright, S. J. *et al.* Potassium, phosphorus, or nitrogen limit root allocation, tree growth, or litter
490 production in a lowland tropical forest. *Ecology* **92**, 1616-1625 (2011).

491 60. Metcalfe, D.B. *et al.* A method for extracting plant roots from soil which facilitates rapid sample
492 processing without compromising measurement accuracy. *New Phytol.* **174**, 697-703 (2007).

493 61. Chave, J. *et al.* Improved allometric to estimate the above ground biomass of tropical trees. *Glob*
494 *Chang Biol.* **20**, 3177-3190 (2014).

495 62. Chave J. *et al.* Towards a worldwide wood economics spectrum. *Ecol. Lett.* **12**, 351-366 (2009).

496 63. Zanne, A. E., Lopes Gonzales, G., Gomes, D. A *et al.* Global wood density database. Dryad Digital
497 Repository, <http://datadryad.org/handle/10255/dryad.235> (2009).

498 64. Higuchi, N. & Carvalho, J. A. Fitomassa e conteúdo de carbono de espécies arbóreas da Amazônia.
499 *Anais do Seminário: Emissão e Sequestro de CO₂ – Uma Nova Oportunidade de Negócios para o Brasil*
500 **12**, 7-153 (1994).

501 65. Brienen, R. J.W., Philips, O. L. & Zagt, R.J. Long term decline of the Amazon carbon sink. *Nature* **519**,
502 344-348 (2015).

- 503 66. Malhado, A.C.M. *et al.* Seasonal leaf dynamics in an Amazonian tropical forest. *Forest Ecol Manag.*
504 **258**, 1161-1165.
- 505 67. Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B & Christensen, R.H.B. lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed
506 Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software* 82, 1-26.
- 507 68. Bates, D., Marcher, M., Bolker, B. M. & Walker, S C. Fitting Linear Mixed Effects Models using lme4.
508 *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1-48 (2015).
- 509 69. Moraes, A.C.M. *et al.* Fine litterfall production and nutrient composition data from a fertilized site in
510 Central Amazon, Brazil. NERC Environmental Information data Centre. (2020).
- 511 70. Cunha, H.F.V. *et al.* Fine root biomass in fertilised plos in the Central Amazon, 2017-2019. NERC
512 Environmental Information data Centre. (2021a).
- 513 71. Cunha, H.F.V. *et al.* Tree census and diameter increment in fertilised plos in the Central Amazon, 2017-
514 2020. NERC Environmental Information data Centre. (2021b).
- 515 72. Cunha, H.F.V. *et al.* Leaf area index (LAI) in fertilised plos in the Central Amazon, 2017-2018. NERC
516 Environmental Information data Centre. (2021c).


517

518 **Extended Data Figure 1| Nutrient addition effects on Leaf area index.** LAI was measured over four
519 field campaigns across treatments in a lowland forest in Central Amazon. Each panel represents mean \pm
520 1SE LAI with (+) or without (-) the addition of specific nutrients (phosphorus addition (a); base cation
521 addition (b); nitrogen addition (c)), based on the average LAI across the four field campaigns, n= 16 plots.
522 No significant differences among the means were detected in linear mixed models for any of the nutrients.
523 The dotted lines represent the mean values for the control plots (no nutrients added; n = 4 plots) for
524 comparison purposes.

525

526 **Extended Data Figure 2| Nutrient addition effects on Leaf residence time (LRT).** Leaf residence time
527 (yr) across treatments in a lowland forest in Central Amazon. Two separate measures of specific leaf area
528 were used in the leaf residence time calculations based on: 1) fresh canopy leaves of common families
529 represented across all plots sampled for a photosynthesis campaign (a-c); 2) composite leaf litter collected
530 in the plots (d-f). Leaf residence time showed a decrease with P addition only (a, d) for both LRT estimates,
531 with cations (b, e) and N (c, f) being shown for comparison. Means \pm 1SE are presented, n= 16 plots. Linear
532 mixed models were performed to evaluate responses in leaf residence time to added nutrients. The dotted
533 lines represent the mean values for the control plots (no nutrients added; n = 4 plots) for comparison
534 purposes.

535 **Extended Data Table 1| NPP comparisons along the Basin.** Total P (mg kg^{-1}), N (%) and sum of base
536 cations (SB in $\text{cmol}_c \text{ kg}^{-1}$ refer to the sum of Ca+Mg+K+Na), canopy, fine roots and stem wood net primary
537 productivity ($\text{Mg C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), from low fertility soils in eastern Amazonian sites (CAX 03, MAN 05, CAX
538 06) and more fertile soils in western sites (TAM 05, AGP 02, TAM 06) according to their total soil P
539 concentrations. Components of net primary productivity are derived from Aragão *et al.* 2009. Aragão *et al.*
540 2009 presents fine root productivity to 1 m, so we have extended our data to 1 m by dividing by 0.6, based
541 on the study of Cordeiro *et al.* 2020 that demonstrated that 40% of fine root productivity was located below
542 30 cm at a nearby site on the same soil type. The percentage indicates the magnitude of differences between
543 more fertile and least fertile sites.



■ Litterfall Productivity
 ■ Stem wood Productivity
 ■ Fine root Productivity

