Climate, vegetation, and carbon and water cycles are intimately coupled, in particular via the simultaneous transpiration and CO₂ uptake through plant stomata in the process of photosynthesis. Hence, water flows such as runoff and evapotranspiration are affected not only directly by anthropogenic climate change as such (i.e., by changes in climate variables such as temperature and precipitation), but also indirectly by plant responses to increased atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. In addition, effects of climate change (e.g., higher temperature or altered precipitation) on vegetation structure, biomass production, and plant distribution have an indirect influence on water flows. Rising CO₂ concentration affects vegetation and associated water flows in two contrasting ways, as suggested by ample evidence from Free Air CO₂ Enrichment (FACE), laboratory and modeling experiments (e.g., Leakey et al., 2009; Reddy et al., 2010; de Boer et al., 2011). On the one hand, a physiological effect leads to reduced opening of stomatal apertures, which is associated with lower water flow through the stomata, that is, lower leaf-level transpiration. On the other hand, a structural effect ("fertilization effect") stimulates photosynthesis and biomass production of C₃ plants including all tree species, which eventually leads to higher transpiration at regional scales. A key question is to what extent the climate- and CO₂-induced changes in vegetation and transpiration translate into changes in regional and global runoff.

The physiological effect of CO₂ is associated with an increased intrinsic water use efficiency (WUE) of plants, which means that less water is transpired per unit of carbon assimilated. Records of stable carbon isotopes in woody plants (Peñuelas et al., 2011) verify this finding, suggesting an increase in WUE of mature trees by 20.5% between the early 1960s and the early 2000s. Increases since pre-industrial times have also been found for several forest sites (Andreu-Hayles et al., 2011; Gagen et al., 2011; Loader et al., 2011; Nock et al., 2011) and in a temperate semi-natural grassland (Koehler et al., 2010), although in one boreal tree species WUE ceased to increase after 1970 (Gagen et al., 2011). Analysis of long-term whole-ecosystem carbon and water flux measurements from 21 sites in North American temperate and boreal forests corroborates a notable increase in WUE over the two past decades (Keenan et al., 2013). An increase in global WUE over the past century is supported by ecosystem model results (Ito and Inatomi, 2012).

A key influence on the significance of increased WUE for large-scale transpiration is whether vegetation structure and production has remained approximately constant (as assumed in the global modeling study by Gedney et al., 2006) or has increased in some regions due to the structural CO₂ effect (as assumed in models by Piao et al., 2007; Gerten et al., 2008). While field-based results vary considerably among sites, tree ring studies suggest that tree growth did not increase globally since the 1970s in response to climate and CO₂ change (Andreu-Hayles et al.,
Therefore, there are conflicting views on whether the direct CO\textsubscript{2} effects on plants already have a significant influence on evapotranspiration and runoff at global scale. AR4 reported work by Gedney et al. (2006) that suggested that the physiological CO\textsubscript{2} effect (lower transpiration) contributed to a supposed increase in global runoff seen in reconstructions by Labat et al. (2004). However, a more recent analysis based on more complete data set (Dai et al., 2009) suggested that river basins with decreasing runoff outnumber basins with increasing runoff, such that a small decline in global runoff is likely for the period 1948–2004. Hence, detection of vegetation contributions to changes in water flows critically depends on the availability and quality of hydrometeorological observations (Haddeland et al., 2011; Lorenz and Kunstmann, 2012). Overall, the evidence since AR4 suggests that climatic variations and trends have been the main driver of global runoff change in the past decades; both CO\textsubscript{2} increase and land use change have contributed less (Piao et al., 2007; Gerten et al., 2008; Alkama et al., 2011; Sterling et al., 2013). Oliveira et al. (2011) furthermore pointed to the importance of changes in incident solar radiation and the mediating role of vegetation; according to their global simulations, a higher diffuse radiation fraction during 1960–1990 may have increased evapotranspiration in the tropics by 3% due to higher photosynthesis from shaded leaves.

It is uncertain how vegetation responses to future increases in CO\textsubscript{2} and to climate change will modulate the impacts of climate change on freshwater flows. Twenty-first century continental- and basin-scale runoff is projected by some models to either increase more or decrease less when the physiological CO\textsubscript{2} effect is included in addition to climate change effects (Betts et al., 2007; Murray et al., 2012). This could somewhat ease the increase in water scarcity anticipated in response to future climate change and population growth (Gerten et al., 2011; Wiltshire et al., 2013). In absolute terms, the isolated effect of CO\textsubscript{2} has been modeled to increase future global runoff by 4 to 5% (Gerten et al., 2008) up to 13% (Nugent and Matthews, 2012) compared to the present, depending on the assumed CO\textsubscript{2} trajectory and whether feedbacks of changes in vegetation structure and distribution to the atmosphere are accounted for (they were in Nugent and Matthews, 2012). In a global model intercomparison study (Davie et al., 2013), two out of four models projected stronger increases and, respectively, weaker decreases in runoff when considering CO\textsubscript{2} effects compared to simulations with constant CO\textsubscript{2} concentration (consistent with the above findings, though magnitudes differed between the models), but two other models showed the reverse. Thus, the choice of models and the way they represent the coupling between CO\textsubscript{2}, stomatal closure, and plant growth is a source of uncertainty, as also suggested by Cao et al. (2009). Lower transpiration due to rising CO\textsubscript{2} concentration may also affect future regional climate change itself (Boucher et al., 2009) and enhance the contrast between land and ocean surface warming (Joshi et al., 2008). Overall, although physiological and structural effects will influence water flows in many regions, precipitation and temperature effects are likely to remain the prime influence on global runoff (Alkama et al., 2010).

An application of a soil–vegetation–atmosphere–transfer model indicates complex responses of groundwater recharge to vegetation-mediated changes in climate, with computed groundwater recharge being always larger than would be expected from just accounting for changes in rainfall (McCallum et al., 2010). Another study found that even if precipitation slightly decreased, groundwater recharge might increase as a net effect of vegetation responses to climate change and CO\textsubscript{2} rise, that is, increasing WUE and either increasing or decreasing leaf area (Crosbie et al., 2010). Depending on the type of grass in Australia, the same change in climate is suggested to lead to either increasing or decreasing groundwater recharge in this location (Green et al., 2007). For a site in the Netherlands, a biomass decrease was computed for each of eight climate scenarios indicating drier summers and wetter winters (A2 emissions scenario), using a fully coupled vegetation and variably saturated hydrological model. The resulting increase in groundwater recharge up-slope was simulated to lead to higher water tables and an extended habitat for down-slope moisture-adapted vegetation (Brooisma et al., 2010).

Using a large ensemble of climate change projections, Konzmann et al. (2013) put hydrological changes into an agricultural perspective and suggested that the net result of physiological and structural CO\textsubscript{2} effects on crop irrigation requirements would be a global reduction (Figure VW-1). Thus, adverse climate change impacts on irrigation requirements and crop yields might be partly buffered as WUE and crop production improve (Fader et al., 2010). However, substantial CO\textsubscript{2}-driven improvements will be realized only if proper management abates limitation of plant growth by nutrient availability or other factors.

Changes in vegetation coverage and structure due to long-term climate change or shorter-term extreme events such as droughts (Anderegg et al., 2013) also affect the partitioning of precipitation into evapotranspiration and runoff, sometimes involving complex feedbacks with the atmosphere such as in the Amazon region (Port et al., 2012; Saatchi et al., 2013). One model in the study by Davie et al. (2013) showed regionally diverse climate change effects on vegetation distribution and structure, which had a much weaker effect on global runoff than the structural and physiological CO\textsubscript{2} effects. As water, carbon, and vegetation dynamics evolve synchronously and interactively under climate change (Heyder et al., 2011; Gerten et al., 2013), it remains a challenge to disentangle the individual effects of climate, CO\textsubscript{2}, and land cover change on the water cycle.
(a) Impact of climate change including physiological and structural crop responses to increased atmospheric CO$_2$.

(b) Impact of climate change only.

Figure VW-1 | Percentage change in net irrigation requirements of 11 major crops from 1971–2000 to 2070–2099 on areas currently equipped for irrigation, assuming current management practices. (a) Impact of climate change including physiological and structural crop responses to increased atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration (co-limitation by nutrients not considered). (b) Impact of climate change only. Shown is the median change derived from climate change projections by 19 General Circulation Models (GCMs; based on the Special Report on Emission Scenarios (SRES) A2 emissions scenario) used to force a vegetation and hydrology model. (Modified after Konzmann et al., 2013.)
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