

Journal Pre-proof

The importance of accounting for enhanced emissions of monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage in models - A Finnish case study

Ditte Taipale, Juho Aalto, Pauliina Schiestl-Aalto, Markku Kulmala, Jaana Bäck



PII: S2590-1621(20)30037-X

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeaoa.2020.100097>

Reference: AEAOA 100097

To appear in: *Atmospheric Environment: X*

Received Date: 11 August 2020

Revised Date: 11 November 2020

Accepted Date: 23 November 2020

Please cite this article as: Taipale, D., Aalto, J., Schiestl-Aalto, P., Kulmala, M., Bäck, J., The importance of accounting for enhanced emissions of monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage in models - A Finnish case study, *Atmospheric Environment: X* (2021), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeaoa.2020.100097>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Credit Author Statement

Juho Aalto developed and calculated the yearly needle mass growth, Pauliina Schiestl-Aalto calculated the seasonal needle mass development and wrote the corresponding method section, while Ditte Taipale conducted the remaining calculations. Ditte Taipale prepared the paper, with contributions from all co-authors.

Journal Pre-proof

The importance of accounting for enhanced emissions of monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage in models - a Finnish case study

Ditte Taipale^{1,2,3}, Juho Aalto^{2,3}, Pauliina Schiestl-Aalto^{2,3,4}, Markku Kulmala¹, Jaana Bäck³

¹Institute for Atmospheric and Earth System Research / Physics, Faculty of Science, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 64, 00014 Helsinki, Finland

²Hyytiälä Forestry Field Station, Hyytiäläntie 124, 35500 Korkeakoski, Finland

³Institute for Atmospheric and Earth System Research / Forest Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Helsinki, PO Box 27, 00014 Helsinki, Finland

⁴Department of Forest Ecology and Management, SLU, Umeå Sweden

Correspondence to: Ditte Taipale (ditte.taipale@helsinki.fi)

Abstract. Models to predict the emissions of biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) from terrestrial vegetation largely use standardised emission potentials derived from shoot enclosure measurements of mature foliage. In these models, the potential of new foliage to emit BVOCs is assumed to be similar, or up to twice as high, as that of mature foliage, and thus new conifers foliage is predicted to have a negligible to minor contribution to canopy BVOC emissions during spring time due to the small foliage mass of emerging and growing needles. Extensive observations have, however, recently demonstrated that the potential of new Scots pine needles to emit several different BVOCs can be up to about 500 times higher than that of the corresponding mature foliage. Thus, we build on these discoveries and investigate the potential impact of considering these enhanced emissions from new Scots pine foliage on estimates of monoterpene emissions and new atmospheric aerosol particle formation and their subsequent growth. We show that the importance of taking the enhanced monoterpene emission potential of new Scots pine foliage into account decreases as a function of season, tree age and latitude, and that new foliage could be responsible for the majority of the whole tree's foliage emissions of monoterpenes during spring time, independently of tree age and location. Our results suggest that annual monoterpene emission estimates from Finland would increase with up to ~25 % if the enhanced emissions from new Scots pine foliage were also considered, with the majority being emitted during spring time where also new particle formation has been observed to occur most frequently. We estimate that our findings can lead to increases in predictions of the formation rates of 2 nm particles during spring time by ~75-280 % in northern Finland and by ~130-870 % in southern Finland. Likewise, simulated growth rates of 2-3 nm particles would increase by ~65-180 % in northern Finland and by ~110-520 % in southern Finland if the enhanced emissions of monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage were explicitly considered. Since only one measurement study (Aalto et al., 2014), on which our work builds, has so far found highly pronounced emissions of monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage compared to those of mature, we conclude that more spring time measurements of new conifers foliage are required for improving emission algorithms in biogenic emission models.

Keywords

Scots pine; monoterpenes; plant volatile emission; forest growth; Finland

39 Biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) form a large, heterogeneous group of organic atmospheric trace gases with
40 wide varieties in chemical and physical properties. They are produced and emitted by vegetation due to many different
41 reasons (Holopainen, 2004; Yuan et al., 2009; Holopainen et al., 2013; Tumlinson 2014), for example as a by-product of
42 plant growth (e.g. Hüve et al., 2007; Aalto et al., 2014; Dorokhov et al., 2018) or in response to plant stress (Niinemets,
43 2010; Holopainen and Gershenson, 2010; Faiola and Taipale, 2020). Emissions of monoterpenes ($C_{10}H_{16}$), an important class
44 of terpenes, account for approximately 15 % of the total global BVOC emissions from vegetation (Guenther et al., 2012).
45 The fraction of assimilated carbon which is transferred back to the atmosphere in the form of a variety of BVOCs is usually
46 around a few percent (Guenther et al., 1995; Bouvier-Brown et al., 2012), but can at times be more than 10 % (Harley et al.,
47 1996; Llusia and Penñelas, 2000). Thus, BVOCs compose an important factor to consider in terrestrial plants' carbon
48 balance. In the atmosphere, BVOCs influence the chemical composition (Mogensen et al., 2011; 2015), and impact
49 formation (Donahue et al., 2013; Kulmala et al., 2014; Riccobono et al., 2014; Schobesberger et al., 2013) and growth (Ehn
50 et al., 2014; Riipinen et al., 2012) processes of atmospheric aerosol particles. Since aerosol particles are known to influence
51 our climate both directly and indirectly (Twomey, 1977; Albrecht, 1989; Charlson et al., 1992), reliable estimates of BVOC
52 emissions into the atmosphere are crucial for predictions of climate change.

53 There exists several models to predict the constitutive emissions of BVOCs from terrestrial ecosystems into the
54 atmosphere (e.g. MEGAN; Guenther et al. (2006, 2012), ORCHIDEE; Lathièrè et al. (2006), Messina et al. (2016), LPJ-
55 GUESS; Smith et al., (2001), Sitch et al., (2003)), with MEGAN being the most popular one. Traditionally, these types of
56 models have utilised emission potentials derived from shoot enclosure measurements of mature foliage. An emission
57 potential, or emission factor, represents the emission rate of a compound at standard conditions (in this work at a temperature
58 of 30 °C). As an increasing amount of studies have shown that the emissions of BVOCs depend on phenology (Guenther et
59 al., 1991; Monson et al., 1994; Goldstein et al., 1998; Hakola et al., 2001; Petron et al., 2001; Karl et al., 2003; Räisänen et
60 al., 2009; Aalto et al., 2014), attempts have been made to include this response in models. For example, in the ORCHIDEE
61 model, leaf age now impacts emissions of isoprene and methanol (Messina et al., 2016). Though leaf age is not explicitly
62 simulated in LPJ-GUESS, the emissions of isoprene from deciduous plant functional types are modelled to depend on
63 seasonality (Arneeth et al., 2007; Schurgers et al., 2011). In MEGAN v2.0 (Guenther et al., 2006), the emission rate of
64 isoprene is modulated by the leaf developmental stages of deciduous land cover types. This has been further expanded in
65 MEGAN v2.1 (Guenther et al., 2012), where the emission rates of more compounds (i.e. isoprene, methanol, 2-methyl-3-
66 buten-2-ol, mono- and sesquiterpenes) from all plant species are assumed to be regulated by plant growth. Though it is
67 assumed that leaf age impacts the emission rates of individual BVOCs differently, this dependency has not been treated to be
68 tree species, or plant functional type, specific (Guenther et al., 2012). Since the majority of studies investigating the impact
69 of leaf age on BVOCs emission rates have been conducted on deciduous isoprene emitting species, this might create a bias.
70 For example, in MEGAN v2.1, the potentials of growing foliage to emit methanol, 2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol and monoterpenes
71 are 3, 0.6, and 1.8 times that of mature foliage, respectively. However, measurements of Scots pine foliage have recently
72 shown that the potential of new foliage to emit these BVOCs can be orders of magnitude higher than that of mature foliage
73 (Aalto et al., 2014). This conclusion was drawn based on continuous enclosure measurements of three growing seasons
74 (Aalto et al., 2014). Aalto et al. (2014) showed that the emission potentials of new foliage peak during spring and decrease
75 significantly throughout the season, and hence depend far more on the time of year than that of mature foliage. Thus, it might
76 also not be representative to use a fixed emission potential of new foliage in models. These findings can have substantial
77 impacts on simulations of global BVOC emissions, since Scots pine is the most widely distributed pine species in the world;
78 it is found across large parts of Europe, Canada, US and northern Asia, and within the Eurasian taiga, it is one of the most
79 dominant evergreen tree species (e.g. Houston Durrant et al., 2016). For example, in Finland, Scots pine dominates ~65 % of

80 fo ty
81 that also other evergreen species exhibit a similar phenological emission trait as found for Scots pine in Aalto et al. (2014).

82 Micrometeorological measurements of ecosystem scale fluxes are able to capture the contribution of all BVOC
83 sources in the ecosystem, though without quantifying what those sources are. Unfortunately, such measurements are scarce,
84 rarely continuous, and usually conducted during a limited period, which is most often in the summer, when the very high
85 emission potentials of new Scots pine needles have already significantly decreased (Aalto et al., 2014). Rinne et al. (2000)
86 measured the ecosystem scale flux of monoterpenes from Scots pine dominated forests during two growing seasons,
87 including May, but only for a few days in total, thus they reported the emission potential as a seasonal average. Räisänen et
88 al. (2009) measured the ecosystem scale flux of monoterpenes from a Scots pine forest, in addition to the emissions from
89 new and mature needles individually. Measurements of the ecosystem flux and chamber emissions of mature foliage were
90 conducted from the end of June, while the detection of the emissions from new foliage was only started at the end of July. As
91 the measurements were performed sporadically, only seasonally averaged potentials have been provided. The authors found
92 that new needles have a higher potential to emit monoterpenes than mature needles by a factor of two, which is comparable
93 to what is used in Guenther et al. (2012). However, these measurements did not cover the vital spring season. Taipale et al.
94 (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015) measured the ecosystem scale flux of monoterpenes continuously starting from April or
95 May until September, during four years. In both studies, the micrometeorological measurements were conducted on the same
96 ~50 year old Scots pine forest at the SMEAR II station (Station for Measuring Ecosystem-Atmosphere Relations). The
97 canopy, within an area with a radius of 200 m, is made up by Scots pine (~75 %), Norway spruce (~15 %) and deciduous
98 species (~10 %), mainly silver birch (Mäki et al., 2019). The potential of the forest to emit monoterpenes per ground area
99 was in both cases shown to significantly decrease from spring and over the summer (Taipale et al., 2011; Rantala et al.,
100 2015). Since the pines in that region carry about 2.5 needle age classes (Tšupek et al., 2015), the foliage mass is
101 approximately 40 % less in the spring than later in the season (i.e. about August onwards). Hence, the conclusion by Taipale
102 et al. (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015) is further amplified if the potential to emit is considered per foliage mass.

103 If a model assumes that the emission potential of new needles is only slightly higher than that of mature foliage,
104 then the influence of new coniferous foliage to canopy BVOC emissions is predicted to be very minor, since the mass of
105 emerging and growing needles is small during spring time (Guenther et al. 2012). However, though the mass of new foliage
106 is very small in the beginning of the growing season, correspondingly larger emission potentials of new foliage during spring
107 time would change the conclusion of the contribution of new Scots pine foliage to Scots pine canopy BVOC emissions. In
108 order to obtain a better understanding of the formation of new aerosol particles, it is especially crucial to investigate this
109 importance of new Scots pine foliage to ecosystem BVOC emissions during spring time, since that is the time of year where
110 new particle formation has been found to be most frequent (Vehkamäki et al., 2004; Dal Maso et al., 2005, 2007, 2008;
111 Manninen et al., 2010; Vana et al., 2016).

112 The motivation of this study arises from the fact that Aalto et al. (2014) have shown that emerging and mature Scots
113 pine foliage can have very different potentials to emit BVOCs. Such evidence naturally calls for a quantification of its
114 potential atmospheric impacts. Thus, by making simple assumptions based on the existing data, and considering the
115 contribution of the enhanced constitutive emission potential of new Scots pine foliage, we investigated the potential effects
116 on the whole tree's emission potential. We examined this as a function of season, stand age and location in Finland, utilising
117 published emission rates by Aalto et al. (2014) and models to predict the seasonal and yearly growth of Scots pine foliage. In
118 order to analyse the potential underestimation of regional emissions when these enhanced emissions from new foliage is not
119 accounted for, we upscaled our results to answer how many Gg of carbon could be underestimated in the predictions of
120 constitutive monoterpene emissions from Finland. Finally, we estimated how this potential underestimation could impact
121 forecasts of formation and growth of new small particles. Our ultimate objectives were to demonstrate the potential effects of
122 monoterpenes from growing Scots pine needles on model predictions, question the current treatment of the emissions of

124 of other evergreen species is also a very strong emitter of monoterpenes and other BVOCs.

125 2 Materials and methods

126 2.1 Yearly development of Scots pine needle mass

127 The yearly development of Scots pine needle mass was calculated for southern and northern Finland, by considering the total
 128 amount of needle age classes present in the stand and the maximum stand needle biomass. Hence, we defined that the stands
 129 carry 2.5 and 5.5 needle age classes in southern and northern Finland, respectively, which is based on observations from
 130 Finland (Korhonen et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013; Ľupek et al., 2015). A maximum stand needle biomass of 5000 kg ha⁻¹,
 131 which is representative for southern and middle Finland (Ilvesniemi and Liu, 2001), was used for southern Finland, while
 132 3500 kg ha⁻¹, which is representative for a relatively poor site in Lapland (Kulmala et al., 2019), was used for northern
 133 Finland. We utilised this foliage mass value for northern Finland, as the calculation results of northern Finland should serve
 134 as a lower estimate of the potential impact of the emission of monoterpenes from new foliage to the total stand emission.
 135 Finally, it is assumed that needle mass development follows a sigmoidal form (e.g. Mäkelä, 1997). Since tree foliage growth
 136 models usually omit simulating the growth of very young trees (e.g. Hari et al., 2008; Minunno et al., 2019), because of their
 137 low relevance with respect to e.g. biomass production, we likewise only modelled the growth of trees aged ≥10 years. The
 138 maximum stand needle mass in southern Finland is reached at the same time as the observed canopy closure at the SMEAR
 139 II station, Hyytiälä, southern Finland (e.g. Hari and Kulmala, 2005; Kulmala et al., 2001). It is assumed that the maximum is
 140 reached in northern Finland 15 years later, due to slower forest growth in the north (Fig. 1a). Since the stand foliage mass is
 141 higher in southern than northern Finland, and since fewer needle age classes prevail in the south, both the mass of new
 142 needles and the mass of senescing needles are significantly higher in southern than northern Finland (Fig 1b, Fig. 1c). The
 143 mass of new needles is calculated as:


$$144 G_i^N = m_i^N - m_{i-1}^N + S_i^N \quad (1)$$

145 where G_i^N is the growth of new needles during year i (kgC), m_i^N is the maximum needle mass during year i (kgC) and S_i^N is
 146 senescence during year i . After canopy closure, $m_i^N = m_{i-1}^N$ and thus:

$$147 G_i^N = S_i^N = \frac{m_i^N}{l_j} \quad (2)$$

148 where l_j is needle longevity in the two locations. Since the foliage production rate is high in young stands (derivative of Fig.
 149 1a), the fraction of new needles to the total stand needle mass is also higher in young than mature pine forest stands (Fig.
 150 1d).

151



152

153

154

155

156

157

Figure 1. Yearly Scots pine needle mass development. Values are given for the end of the growing season, assuming that the stand carries 2.5 (southern Finland) or 5.5 (northern Finland) needle year classes, respectively. **(a)** total stand needle mass before senescing needles fall off, **(b)** mass of senescing needles, **(c)** mass of new needles, **(d)** proportion of new needles to the total stand needle mass. Note the different scales on the y-axis.

158

2.2 Seasonal development of Scots pine needle mass

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166


167

168

169

The seasonal development of Scots pine needle mass was modelled with the CASSIA growth model (Schiestl-Aalto et al., 2015), where the daily growth of tree organs is driven by environmental variables, mainly temperature. Scots pine needles start elongating in spring simultaneously with the shoot, but shoot length growth is completed approximately one month before the growth of needles finishes. The model considers two parameters, which need to be estimated for the location of interest. Those are: time of growth onset and time of growth cessation. CASSIA has previously been parameterized using growth data measured in 2008 at the SMEAR II station, and the model has been shown to successfully predict the growth of needles (Schiestl-Aalto et al., 2015). We used this parameterization of time of growth onset and time of growth cessation to predict the seasonal development of Scots pine needles in southern Finland, while the corresponding growth in northern Finland was predicted utilising needle growth measurements conducted at the SMEAR I station in Värriö, Finnish Lapland, during the 2017 growing season. Furthermore, the model considers needle length by the end of the growing season as a yearly varying parameter. This parameter can be modelled if needed, but as the final needle length was measured at both

170 st
 171 needles inside the bud) was set to 1 mm, and it was assumed that needle length is proportional to needle biomass (Aalto et
 172 al., 2014; Schiestl-Aalto et al., 2015, 2019). The relative needle mass per day was then calculated as L_d^N/L_{365}^N where L_d^N is the
 173 needle length on day d and L_{365}^N is needle length by the end of the growing season. Environmental data measured at the
 174 SMEAR II and SMEAR I station, respectively, during 2009-2011, were furthermore used as input to CASSIA. The resulting
 175 seasonal development of new Scots pine needles in southern and northern Finland is illustrated in Fig. 2a. Variations in the
 176 growth between the three investigated growing seasons are generally very small, but greater in northern Finland, due to
 177 larger interannual fluctuations in ambient temperatures. The seasonal development of the total needle mass for Scots pine
 178 stands of different ages growing in southern and northern Finland is presented in Fig. 2b. This has been calculated by
 179 combining the behaviour shown in Fig. 2a with total stand needle mass values from Fig. 1a. The seasonal behaviour is also
 180 in accordance with observations (Rautiainen et al., 2012) before needles fall off. The fraction of new needles out of total
 181 stand needle mass for Scots pine stands of different ages growing in southern and northern Finland is provided in Fig. 2c.
 182 This has been calculated by combining the behaviour shown in Fig. 2a with new stand needle mass values from Fig. 1c.
 183



184
 185 **Figure 2.** Seasonal Scots pine needle mass development. **(a)** development of new needle mass in southern and northern
 186 Finland expressed as the normalised fraction of new needles out of the total new needle mass. Black curves are calculated as
 187 the mean during 2009-2011 in SMEAR I (northern Finland) and SMEAR II (southern Finland) conditions. The grey areas
 188 illustrate the variation between the model predictions for the three years. **(b)** total needle mass development for a Scots pine

189 st
190 classes) Finland. (c) proportion of new needles to the total stand needle mass throughout the season for different stand ages
191 in southern (S.F.) and northern (N.F.) Finland. The legend shown in (c) is also valid for (b). Note the different scales on the
192 y-axis.
193

194 2.3 Emissions of monoterpenes

195 2.3.1 Emissions of monoterpenes from new and mature Scots pine foliage based on Aalto et al. (2014)


196 We utilised measured emission rates of monoterpenes and chamber temperatures described and published in Aalto et al.
197 (2014), hence we refer to Aalto et al. (2014) for details on the measurement set-up. In brief, the shoot exchange of
198 monoterpenes was measured with an automated gas-exchange enclosure system and analysed by PTR-QMS (Proton Transfer
199 Reaction - Quadrupole Mass Spectrometer) from one ~50 year old Scots pine tree located at the SMEAR II station during
200 2009-2011. Within one season, one mature shoot and one current year bud/shoot were measured, but during the next
201 growing season, different shoots were chosen for the measurements. The shoot enclosures included parts of the shoots, i.e.
202 both needles and the stem (see Fig. 1 in Aalto et al. (2014)). The reported emissions of VOCs from new foliage originated
203 from buds in the beginning of the measurement period. In an elongating bud of Scots pine the stem develops first and growth
204 of needles is very slow during the first ca. 5 weeks of the growth period (in southern Finland conditions, see e.g. Fig. 4 in
205 Aalto et al., 2014). Thus, during the first weeks, it is likely that the reported emissions originate from the elongating (green)
206 stem rather than from the needle primordia. It is additionally possible that some part of the emission, which is measured
207 before the bud starts elongating, could originate from resin, which can be exudated even from healthy trees (Eller et al.,
208 2013).

209 Only periods with data from both new and mature needles were considered. Since our analysis focused on emission
210 potentials, we did not include exactly the same data as Aalto et al. (2014), because we were limited by occasional breaks in
211 the measurements of chamber temperature. Though Ghirardo et al. (2010) and Taipale et al. (2011) have earlier
212 demonstrated that a significant fraction of the total emissions of monoterpenes from Scots pine trees originates directly from
213 *de novo* synthesis, the understanding of light-dependency on emissions from conifers trees is still very poor (e.g. Taipale et
214 al., 2011), and thus the emission rates were standardised by Eq. (5) in Guenther et al. (1993) ($T_s = 30\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, $\beta = 0.09\text{ }^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$) in
215 order to also compare to literature values. We refrained from utilising varying β values (e.g. Hellén et al., 2018), since the
216 temperature dependency is very sensitive to a low number of data points and any noise in the emission rate measurements.
217 We consider our standardisation practice to be reasonable, since the ratio of the emission rates of new and mature foliage
218 (Aalto et al., 2014) follows the same pattern as that of the emission potentials (Fig. 3).

219 The ratios of the emission potential of new needles to the emission potential of mature needles for the growing
220 seasons in 2009-2011 are presented in Fig. 3. The subfigures in Fig. 3 have been cut due to clarity, but the excluded outliers
221 are compiled in Table A1 together with information about the total amount of data points considered per one week average.
222 As seen from the figure and also concluded by Aalto et al. (2014), new Scots pine needles can have a much greater potential
223 to emit monoterpenes than mature needles. The difference in the potential to emit decreases throughout the season, but lasts
224 until the lignification of the shoot is finalised. Hence, young shoots continue to have a higher potential to emit monoterpenes
225 than mature needles until the end of August / beginning of September (Fig. 3f). Figure 3 also illustrates why continuous
226 measurements of VOC emissions are needed for providing sound emission potentials; (1) there is a large spread in the
227 emission rates, even when standardised, thus having only a few measurement points might lead to biased emission potentials,
228 and (2) emission rates, and hence potentials, are seasonally dependant, which has been shown already earlier for Scots pine,
229 but also for other tree species (e.g. Hakola et al., 2001, 2006; Wang et al., 2017; Karl et al., 2003; Komenda and Koppmann,

231 large variations in the emission potentials within the one-week averages.

232



233

234 **Figure 3.** Boxplot displaying the ratio of the emission potential of new needles to the emission potential of mature needles
 235 for years 2009 (a, d), 2010 (b, e, f) and 2011 (c). The date marks on the x axis indicate the middle points of the averaged
 236 periods. The subfigures have been cut due to clarity, but a list of the excluded outliers is found in Table A1. Note the
 237 different scales on the y-axis. The emission potentials are calculated based on the measurements presented by Aalto et al.
 238 (2014). Emission rates were obtained from one ~50 year old Scots pine tree at the SMEAR II station. Within one season, one
 239 mature shoot and one current year bud/shoot were measured, but during the next growing season, different shoots were
 240 chosen for the measurements. The emission potentials were standardised by Eq. (5) in Guenther et al. (1993) ($T_s = 30 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, β
 241 $= 0.09 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$). See Sec. 2.3.1 for more details.

242

243 2.3.2 Findings by Aalto et al. (2014) vs conclusions from other studies

244 In our analysis, we have only utilised data from Aalto et al. (2014) because there exists no other continuous long-term
 245 measurements of monoterpene emissions from different needle age classes simultaneously. However, measurement efforts
 246 have repeatedly demonstrated that there exist large intra-species variations in BVOC emission responses (e.g. Staudt et al.,
 247 2001; Bäck et al., 2012), and thus it is not certain that a similar seasonal pattern, as shown by Aalto et al. (2014), would be
 248 observed from other Scots pine individuals. Thus, in order to put findings by Aalto et al. (2014) into perspective and avoid
 249 drawing exaggerated conclusions in our study, the monoterpene emission potentials of new and mature Scots pine needles,
 250 calculated based on Aalto et al. (2014), are presented together with literature values, in Fig. 4. The literature values, which

measurement techniques (see Table A2). The requirement for including a study was that either the emission had been standardised to 30 °C or it was possible to (re)standardise it using the information provided in the paper. If the emission was not already standardised, a value of $\alpha = 0.09 \text{ °C}^{-1}$ was used as this is the most commonly used value in the literature for monoterpenes. The emission potentials used in MEGAN (Guenther et al., 2012) are not included in Fig. 4, because they have been standardised in a different way, and hence they cannot be directly compared to the potentials shown in the figure. For example, Langford et al. (2017) showed that the isoprene emission potential of oak might differ with up to a factor of four depending on which algorithm is used when standardising. Additionally, MEGAN provides emission potentials for plant functional types and not for individual tree species. According to Guenther (2013), the emission potentials of needle evergreen trees in MEGAN are partly based on literature values included in Fig. 4. Be aware that certain points in Fig. 4 represent only one measurement point, while most represent an average or median value based on a few measurement points, or e.g. in the case of Aalto et al. (2014), more than 100 or 200 data points.

The emission potentials of new foliage during spring and early summer, based on Aalto et al. (2014), are much greater than any other reported monoterpene emission potentials from Scots pine needles. The emission potentials, calculated from Aalto et al. (2014), of new needles decrease throughout the season, while the corresponding potentials of mature needles stay largely the same, when they have decreased after the initial short peak (Figs. 4, 5, Aalto et al. (2015)). Tarvainen et al. (2005) and Komenda and Koppmann (2002) also observed significantly higher monoterpene emission potentials from buds and new foliage, respectively, during spring, though not as large as Aalto et al. (2014). However, such a seasonal pattern is not detected in all studies (e.g. not in Janson, 1993 and Hakola et al., 2006). Räisänen et al. (2009), who measured the emissions from new and mature needles, individually, and without contributions from the woody parts of the branches, showed that the potential of new needles to emit monoterpenes is twice as high as that of mature needles when calculated based on the dry mass of the needles. This is based on measurements from August-September, and is in accordance with findings by Aalto et al. (2014), who show that the difference in the potentials of the two needle age classes is about a factor of two in August (Fig. 3f). However, when Räisänen et al. (2009) determined their emission potentials based on needle surface, instead of needle dry mass, the authors did not find a significant difference in the emission potentials.


By far most literature values, which are based on enclosure measurements, are reported to be within $\sim 0.1 - 2.3 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$. This also includes the entirety of emission potentials of mature needles based on Aalto et al. (2014). A few points range up to $\sim 6 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$, while only one measurement point results in a potential of $\sim 15 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ when data based on Aalto et al. (2014) is not considered. These few high potentials are based on measurements during spring and autumn on branches where both new and mature foliage were present, or in one case, only mature needles (Ruuskanen et al., 2005). The exceptionally high value of $\sim 15 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ originates from one measurement point of a mature shoot carrying buds (Tarvainen et al., 2005). The smallest reported potentials ($\sim 0.1 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$) are of new needles in the end of the growing season, and based on measurements by Aalto et al. (2014). The reported emission potentials of Scots pine seedlings are found in the lower end of the range ($\sim 0.2-0.9 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$), even though up to half of their needles are current year generation. However, the emissions from the seedlings were measured in the laboratory or in a research garden, and thus it is possible that the plants emit differently than plants growing in the field (Niinemets, 2010; Faiola and Taipale, 2020).

One reason for the discrepancy between the findings by Aalto et al. (2014) and previous chamber studies on Scots pines might be that other investigators, except Räisänen et al. (2009), have not measured the emissions from buds/growing needles and mature needles separately. And it might be very challenging to determine emissions from buds or growing needles, if the majority of needles inside the chamber are mature. Another reason might be that there is a larger uncertainty connected to the quantification of the biomass which was measured by Aalto et al. (2014), since it is difficult to quantify the biomass of the stem and needles very accurately at any given point of time, when the elongating branch tips are measured continuously. Accurate biomass measurements would require the branch to be cut. As mentioned above, it is possible that the enhanced emissions observed by Aalto et al. (2014) do to some extent originate from the elongating (green) stem rather

295 th
296 closure is similar in other studies, since most other branch scale measurements have also included the stem tissue in the
297 enclosures and also provide the emission rate per needle mass.

298 Five papers report ecosystem scale fluxes of Scots pine forests. Rinne et al. (2000) provide an ecosystem scale
299 emission potential that is within the range reported from enclosure measurements ($1.2 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$), while Rinne et al. (2007)
300 and Räsänen et al. (2009) report values that are slightly higher than the general range (2.5 and $2.9 \mu\text{g g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$). The potential
301 by Räsänen et al. (2009) is reported as a seasonal average (July - mid September) and is notably higher than the potentials
302 based on Aalto et al. (2014) during the same time period. Canopy scale emission potentials by Taipale et al. (2011) and
303 Rantala et al. (2015), which both measured in SMEAR II during separate years, are in a very good agreement with each
304 other, though the micrometeorological method was different. Both studies observe a clear diminishment in the forest's
305 potential to emit throughout the summer. The potential during April was, however, found to be less than during the summer
306 months (Rantala et al., 2015), which can partly, but probably not fully, be attributed to the fact that the potential represents
307 the entire month of April, while buds and new foliage are only contributing from mid April onwards.

308



309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

Figure 4. The monoterpene emission potentials of Scots pine needles standardised to 30 °C ($\beta = 0.09 \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$). **(b)** is a zoom of **(a)**, hence be aware of the different scales on the y-axis. Included in the figure are potentials calculated based on Aalto et al. (2014) together with other literature values (see Table A2). Literature values, which have been re-standardised to 30 °C, represent different years and locations (see Table A2). “New”, “mature”, “bud”, “seedling” and “ecosystem” indicate that the emissions were measured from either new or mature needles, from buds or seedlings or as an ecosystem scale flux. A “?” indicates that no information was provided about the age of the measured needles, but it does not include measurements from seedlings nor the entire ecosystem. The added error bars to literature values are those that the respective authors reported. Sometimes error bars were not provided in the papers, and hence none are shown in the figure. Error bars are not added to the potentials calculated based on Aalto et al. (2014) due to clarity (see instead Fig. 3 for the variation). When the authors have only provided a seasonal emission potential, the value is indicated in the figure as a line that spans the period during which the authors measured the emissions. The emission potential reported by Ruuskanen et al. (2005) was reported as a range for the measured period, which is illustrated by the box in the figure. We refer to Table A2 for further details about the literature values used.

324 **2.3.3 Monoterpene emission potentials used in our calculations**

325 We calculated the potential importance of new Scots pine foliage on total canopy monoterpene emission potential using the
326 means of the weekly medians of the monoterpene emission potentials from 2009-2011, based on Aalto et al. (2014). In our
327 investigations, we also considered the minima and maxima of the weekly medians of the monoterpene emission potentials
328 from the three measurement years (Fig. 5). In order to conduct our analysis, we have to assume that this is representative for
329 southern Finland. In order to approximate the influence of new Scots pine needles in northern Finland, we assumed that the
330 potentials of needles to emit monoterpenes are similar in southern and northern Finland, but that they depend on timing of
331 foliage growth. Since the foliage growth onset at the SMEAR I station is delayed by two weeks of that seen at the SMEAR II
332 station, also the monoterpene emission values – both for mature and new foliage – were delayed accordingly (Fig. 5). Since
333 needle growth has been observed to end about 1 week earlier in northern than southern Finland (Fig. 2), the seasonally
334 dependent emission potentials of northern Finland have been modulated likewise, thus, the emission potentials have been
335 adjusted to fit the more intensive, but (~ three weeks) shorter period of growth in the north (Fig. 5). The presumption that the
336 potential of the foliage to emit monoterpenes is similar in southern and northern Finland is naturally connected with some
337 degree of uncertainty, since observations from new needles in the north are limited, but nevertheless supported by previous
338 investigations on Scots pine (Tarvainen et al., 2005) and silver birch (Maja et al., 2015) in Finland. Finally, we assumed that
339 all mature needles have the same potential to emit monoterpenes independent of their needle age class. Though Scots pine
340 foliage preserves its ability to emit monoterpenes after a completed growing season (Vanhatalo et al., 2018), we only focus
341 on the period of growth, as our interest lies in the difference that new and mature foliage presents. This difference diminishes
342 by the end of the growing season, as the potentials to emit are then similar for all needle age classes. Observations from
343 SMEAR I and II were utilised due to data availability and in order to provide estimates across a latitudinal gradient.

344




Figure 5. The monoterpene emission potentials of (a) new, and (c) mature Scots pine foliage as a function of the season in southern and northern Finland. (b) is a zoom of (a). Note the different scales on the y-axis. Black curves are calculated as the means of the weekly medians from 2009-2011 (based on Aalto et al. (2014)). The grey areas illustrate the range of the emission potential. The lower and upper borders of the areas are calculated as the minima and maxima of the weekly medians of the three measurement years.

2.3.4 Traditional approach: canopy emission potential with Megan algorithm

In our analysis, we compared the canopy emission potential resulting from Aalto et al. (2014) with a canopy emission potential that assumes that the emission potential of current year needles is enhanced in a similar manner as in Guenther et al. (2012). This “MEGAN style” canopy emission potential has been calculated as:

$$\epsilon_{canopy,MEGAN\ style} = \epsilon_{mature} \times F_{mature} + \epsilon_{growing,MEGAN} \times F_{new} + \epsilon_{new,MEGAN} \times F_{bud} \quad (3)$$

where $\epsilon_{new,MEGAN}$ and F_{bud} are the emission potential and fraction of new foliage before needle elongation properly starts, respectively, while $\epsilon_{growing,MEGAN}$ and F_{new} are the emission potential and fraction of new foliage during the period with a significant needle elongation rate, respectively. $\epsilon_{mature,MEGAN}$ and F_{mature} are the emission potential of mature foliage and fraction of mature foliage, respectively. Using the coefficients from Guenther et al. (2012, Table 4) that describe the relative emission rates of buds, growing and mature foliage, Eq. (3) can be reformulated to:

$$\epsilon_{canopy,MEGAN\ style} = \epsilon_{mature} \times F_{mature} + 1.8 \times \epsilon_{mature} \times F_{new} + 2 \times \epsilon_{mature} \times F_{bud} \quad (4)$$

which can be shortened to:

$$\epsilon_{canopy,MEGAN\ style} = \epsilon_{mature} \times (1 + 0.8 \times F_{new} + F_{bud}) \quad (5)$$

from Fig. 2c. F_{bud} is the fraction of new foliage until ~13th of May in southern Finland (Fig. 2c and Aalto et al., 2014, Fig. 3b) and until ~27th of May in northern Finland (Fig. 2c). F_{new} is then the fraction of new foliage during 13/5-29/7 in southern Finland (Fig. 2c and Aalto et al., 2014, Fig. 3b) and during 27/5-26/7 in northern Finland (Fig. 2c).

2.4 Scots pine forest stand coverage in Finland

We utilised the coverage of Scots pine forests in Finland of different tree age classes (Fig. 6) from the Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014 (page 59, Table 1.13, Whole country, National Forest Inventory 11 (years 2009-2013), Pine dominated). The presented total area (12.931×10^6 ha) only includes Scots pine trees present on forest land, hence Scots pines growing on poorly productive forest land (~12 % of forest land in Finland, Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014) are not accounted for, since no data is available. The coverage of Scots pine on forest land is 6.064×10^6 ha in southern Finland and 6.867×10^6 ha in northern Finland (Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014). In our calculations, we assumed that there is an even distribution of trees of all ages within each tree age class (Fig. 6). Hence, within the first tree age class (1-20 years), we excluded 45 % of the stand area, as it is assumed to be covered by trees aged 1-9 years.




Figure 6. Scots pine forest stand area in Finland expressed as a function of tree age. Data from Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014 (page 59, Table 1.13, Whole country, National Forest Inventory 11 (years 2009-2013), Pine dominated).

3 Results and discussion


3.1 The emission potentials of new and mature Scots pine foliage as a function of season

Though the emission potential of new foliage is high, the corresponding biomass is low. Hence, in order to investigate the potential importance of new foliage to the whole tree's foliage emission potential, the products of the emission potentials of new (\square_{new}) and mature (\square_{mature}) foliage, respectively (Fig. 5), and the fractions that new (F_{new}) and mature (F_{mature}) foliage make of the total foliage, respectively (Fig. 2c), are compared ($\square_{\text{new}} \times F_{\text{new}}$ vs $\square_{\text{mature}} \times F_{\text{mature}}$) as a function of season, for trees of different ages and locations (Fig. 7). The high emission potential of new foliage counters the small mass of developing buds and needles in spring, and consequently new Scots pine foliage can be responsible for the majority of the whole tree's foliage emissions of monoterpenes during spring time, independently of tree age and location. In our estimations, new Scots pine foliage then generally accounts for ~80 - 90 % of the total monoterpene emission potential of

394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404

Journal Pre-proof

Finland, though at times it could be even higher. Though the new foliage biomass increases as the season progresses, the very high new foliage emission potential collapses in the beginning of the summer (Fig. 5), and the importance of the emissions from new Scots pine foliage therefore decreases as a function of the season (Fig. 7). The contribution of new Scots pine foliage to the whole tree's emissions decreases with tree age (Fig. 7), because the proportion of new foliage of the total stand foliage mass decreases with an increase in tree age (Fig. 2c). Likewise, new foliage accounts for a larger fraction of the total Scots pine monoterpene emissions in southern than in northern Finland (Fig. 7), where needles are preserved for a longer time (Fig. 2c). We appreciate that the extrapolation of the emission potentials based on Aalto et al. (2014) to trees of different ages and for making estimates of trees growing in northern Finland can be very uncertain due to lack of observations.



405
406
407
408
409
410
411

Figure 7. The emission potentials of monoterpenes multiplied by the fraction of either new (black stars) or mature (black diamonds) needles for Scots pines of different ages (**a-d**: 10 years, **b-e**: 25 years, **c-f**: ≥ 50 years) and locations (**a-c**: southern Finland, **d-f**: northern Finland). The grey areas illustrate the ranges caused by interannual variations in the emission potentials (Fig. 5). Dark grey areas represent the range for new needles, while light grey areas indicate the range for mature needles. Be aware that the y-axis changes between the different subplots.


3.2 The potential importance of new foliage to the whole Scots pine tree's foliage emission potential

The canopy emission potentials ($\square_{\text{new}} \times F_{\text{new}} + \square_{\text{mature}} \times F_{\text{mature}}$), as a function of season for trees of various ages and locations, are compared, in Fig. 8, to (1) the emission potentials of mature foliage (\square_{mature} , Fig. 5c), as several widely used models (e.g. LPJ-GUESS and ORCHIDEE) assume that the monoterpene emission potential is independent of needle age, and (2) canopy emission potentials that assume that the emission potentials of current year needles are enhanced in a similar manner as in Guenther et al. (2012) (see Sec. 2.3.4 for how this was calculated). We did not directly compare our canopy

418 et
419 tree species specific, but instead plant functional type specific emission potentials, and often they assume some dependency
420 on light. It is possible that models will greatly underpredict canopy emissions during the first ~2.5 months of the growing
421 season in southern Finland if they assume that the monoterpene emission potential is independent of needle age or that the
422 emission potential of new foliage is enhanced in a similar manner as in Guenther et al. (2012) (Fig. 8). The estimated
423 underestimation will be less severe for predictions of emissions from northern than from southern Finland (e.g. up to a factor
424 of ~7 vs ~29 for 10 year old forest), and more severe for younger than older stands (e.g. up to a factor of ~29 vs ~19 for 10
425 vs ≥ 50 year old forest in southern Finland, Fig. 8). After ~1st of July, the estimated underestimation in the canopy emission
426 potential of Scots pine growing in southern and northern Finland is less than a factor of 2.5 and 2, respectively. Assuming
427 that the emission potential of new needles is enhanced as in Guenther et al. (2012) will only lead to a neglectable increase in
428 the Scots pine canopy monoterpene emission potential (Fig. 8).

429 Canopy scale emission potentials by Taipale et al. (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015), derived from continuous
430 micrometeorological flux measurements of a ~50 year old pine forest in SMEAR II, are included in Fig. 8c for comparison.
431 We appreciate that the measured canopy, within an area with a radius of 200 m, is only covered by ~75 % Scots pine (and
432 ~25 % other tree species). Thus our results cannot be directly compared to Taipale et al. (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015), but
433 these two studies provide the most suitable observations for validation of our results. Be also aware that data from April
434 from Rantala et al. (2015) represents the measured flux during the entire month, also before buds and elongating needles
435 contribute to the emission. We refer to Table A2 in the Appendix for details on how these potentials (per ground area) have
436 been converted (to per foliage mass). The reported canopy scale emission potentials agree very well with our suggested
437 whole tree foliage emission potentials and the agreement is much better than that between Taipale et al. (2011) or Rantala et
438 al. (2015) and assuming that the emission potential is independent of needle age or that the potential of new foliage is
439 enhanced as in Guenther et al. (2012). Our enclosure-derived canopy emission potential overestimates the canopy
440 micrometeorological-derived potential by a factor of ~1.6 during May, and then slightly underestimates it during the
441 summer. The overestimation can partly be due to interannual variations in emission rates and seasonal foliage mass
442 development, and partly due to plant-to-plant variations (as rates by Aalto et al. (2014) were conducted on one tree). An
443 underestimation during summertime is expected, since the emission potentials by Taipale et al. (2011) and Rantala et al.
444 (2015) consider all sources of monoterpenes in the ecosystem, and not only Scots pine foliage. These additional sources
445 include at least Scots pine stems, forest floor, understory vegetation, Norway spruce (15 % of the stand) and deciduous
446 species (~10 %) (Bäck et al., 2010; Aaltonen et al., 2011, 2012; Vanhatalo et al., 2015; Mäki et al., 2019; Rissanen et al.,
447 2020).

448



449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

Figure 8. (a-f) The monoterpene emission potential of Scots pine canopies of various ages and locations. The canopy emission potentials are illustrated for Scots pine stands aged 10 (a+d), 25 (b+e) and ≥ 50 (c+f) years old, growing in southern (a-c) or northern (d-f) Finland. “MEGAN style” assumes that the emission potentials of buds and growing needles are 2 and 1.8 times that of mature needles, respectively (see Sec. 2.3.4), while “Mature needles” presume that the emission potential is independent of needle age. Canopy emission potentials for a ~ 50 year old Scots pine forest derived from micrometeorological flux measurements by Taipale et al. (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015) are included for comparison in c. Ranges of the whole foliage emission potential are not included in this figure due to clarity, instead we refer the reader to Fig. 7 for an idea about the range. Please pay attention to changing scales on the axes.

459

460

3.3 Effects of stand age and season on the estimated underestimation of the whole Scots pine tree’s foliage emission potential

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

The estimated underestimation of the whole Scots pine tree’s needle emission potential caused by not considering the enhanced potential of new foliage, is presented in Fig. 9 as a function of tree age, for southern and northern Finland separately. The ranges in the estimated underestimation are provided in Table A3. The estimated underestimation has been calculated individually for the spring and for the full season, since new particle formation events have been shown to occur more frequently during March - May in both southern and northern Finland (Vehkamäki et al., 2004; Dal Maso et al., 2005, 2007; Manninen et al., 2010; Nieminen et al., 2014; Vana et al., 2016). Hence, in our calculations, spring starts at the same time as emissions from new foliage is observed and lasts until the end of May, while the full season naturally includes the entire measurement period. Trees aged less than 10 years are excluded from our analysis, as it might not be reasonable to extrapolate conclusions extracted from emission rate measurements of a ~ 50 year old tree to very young trees. For example, Komenda and Koppmann (2002) showed that the emission potential of a 40 year old Scots pine tree was about five times higher than that of 3-4 year old seedlings. It should, however, be mentioned that measurements of seedlings were conducted in laboratory conditions, thus the difference in emission potential between seedlings and mature trees might be less.

entire growing season in southern Finland is similar to not accounting for the greater emissions from new needles during the spring in northern Finland, especially in the cases of younger Scots pine tree stands. An additional important conclusion from Fig. 9 is that it seems that neglecting the age of the stand only leads to a minor error if the longevity of needles is short (max ~8 %), but to a larger error if more needle age classes prevail (max ~20 %). This is because the relative proportion of new needles in stands that carry more needle age classes varies more between individual stands of different ages (Fig. 2c). Tree age is not usually considered specifically in BVOC models, instead only the biomass and/or leaf area index is/are included.

The spring time differences in emission potentials can lead to uncertainties in predictions of monoterpene emissions that are much greater than what has been estimated by Lamb et al. (1987) and Guenther et al. (2012). These investigators have estimated that the uncertainty on annual global emissions of monoterpenes into the atmosphere could be around a factor of three in total, with about 15-25 % of that uncertainty attributed to emission potentials (Lamb et al., 1987; Guenther et al., 2012). Guenther et al. (2012) emphasize that these uncertainties are estimated for *annual global* emissions, thus the uncertainty can be much greater for specific times and locations. Though the emissions from Scots pine species have been extensively measured, emissions during spring time have only relatively recently received more appropriate attention, thus it is reasonable to assume that model estimates of spring time Scots pine BVOC emissions are connected with a larger-than-average uncertainty.





Figure 9. The estimated underestimation of the whole Scots pine tree's needle emission potential caused by not considering the enhanced potential of new foliage, presented as a function of tree age. The estimated underestimation has been calculated as: (the integral of "other study" - the integral of "This study") / the integral of "This study", where "other study" is either "MEGAN style" or "Mature needles" and the integrals are the areas under the curves presented in Fig. 8. The estimated underestimation has been calculated for the spring and for the growing season separately and for both southern (S.F.) and northern (N.F.) Finland. Ranges in the estimated underestimation are not indicated in the figure due to clarity, but they are provided in Table A3.

3.4 Potential national level impacts caused by omitting the enhanced emissions from new Scots pine foliage

About 12.931×10^6 ha in Finland, i.e. ~43 % of the total land area in Finland, is covered by Scots pine forests (Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014). Hence, the estimated underestimation of not considering the emission potential of new Scots pine foliage (Fig. 9) is upscaled to Finland in Fig. 10. This has been estimated by (1) calculating the mean of the

504 product of the mean foliage biomass (Fig. 1a) within each tree age class (Fig. 6) and the stand area within each tree age class
 505 (Fig. 6). For this calculation, we have assumed that there is an even distribution of trees of all ages within each tree age class,
 506 and we have excluded the fraction of trees younger than 10 years old. Hence, it is assumed that there is no underestimation
 507 connected with the emission potential of Scots pine forest aged less than 10 years. The results presented in Fig. 10 only refer
 508 to potential underestimations in the emission potentials of Scots pine dominated areas and not to a general emission potential
 509 that would be representative for the entire Finland and hence also consider e.g. Norway Spruce and various deciduous
 510 species. In our estimate, the national scale uncertainty is controlled by the uncertainty connected to trees aged ≥ 50 years,
 511 because the majority of trees in Finland are older than 50 years and their foliage mass is larger than that of younger trees.
 512 Thus, it seems largely unnecessary to include a tree age dependent emission potential for regional or global annual
 513 calculations of BVOC emissions. However, an exclusion will lead to an error of up to 20 % in simulations of specific
 514 locations.
 515



517 **Figure 10.** The estimated underestimation of the whole Scots pine tree's needle emission potential caused by not considering
 518 the enhanced potential of new foliage, upscaled to Finland. The estimated underestimation has been calculated for the spring
 519 and full growing season separately, and for southern and northern Finland, separately. Errorbars are based on the interannual
 520 variations in the emission potentials (Figs. 5, 7).
 521

523 4 Implications

524 4.1 Emission potentials used in models

525 We emphasize that, in this study, we have not investigated how much MEGAN, LPJ-GUESS, ORCHIDEE or any other
 526 model could be underestimating the potential of Scots pine canopies to emit monoterpenes. This would, first of all, be
 527 inappropriate considering the fact that our estimations are based on a single measurement study. Secondly, it would largely
 528 be impossible, as it is not entirely transparent how models attain the emission potentials of their plant functional types. The
 529 sources of literature are provided in the model description, but often it is unclear if the plant functional type emission

distributions. Such information is vital, since Scots pine was the sole focus of our study. Additionally, it is also unclear how literature values, which are most often standardised to either 25 or 30 °C, are re-standardised to also depend on light, when no information about light is provided in the literature sources. Instead, we have explored how such treatments of the emission potential, which are used in models, can lead to a potential underestimation. As ecosystem scale flux measurements become increasingly available, such data is progressively being incorporated into biogenic VOC emission models. This is fortunate, since such measurements capture the entire emissions from the ecosystem. Unfortunately, such measurements are most often conducted in summer. Thus, if the potentials they produce are not modulated by the seasons in models, a similar underestimation persists.

According to Guenther (2013), the emission potentials of Needleleaf Evergreen Boreal Trees in MEGAN v2.1 are based on enclosure and canopy micrometeorological measurements and landscape inverse modelling of various boreal forest species. However, almost all measurements of Scots pine utilised for compiling the monoterpene emission potential are enclosure measurements (Guenther, 2013). Results by Taipale et al. (2011) and Rantala et al. (2015) are not considered in MEGAN v2.1, at least in the latter case due to its (more) recent publication date. Micrometeorological measurements by Rinne et al. (2000, 2007) and Räisänen et al. (2009) are considered (Guenther, 2013), but these measurements were mainly conducted during summer time. The monoterpene emission potential of the boreal needleleaf evergreen tree type in ORCHIDEE is extracted from the corresponding emission potentials used in Guenther et al. (2006, 2012), and otherwise exclusively from literature on enclosure measurements when Scots pine is concerned (Messina et al., 2016). LPJ-GUESS by far mostly considers enclosure measurements for construction of their emission potentials, but as in the case of MEGAN, also ecosystem scale fluxes from Rinne et al. (2000) are used (Schurgers et al., 2009).

Monoterpenes are not the only atmospherically relevant VOCs that have been shown to be emitted in substantially greater quantities from new than mature Scots pine needles (Aalto et al., 2014). For example, Aalto et al. (2014) showed that the emissions of methanol, acetone and 2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol from developing needles can contribute with up to about 50, 35, and 75 %, respectively, of the whole tree foliage emissions in case of a ~50 year old Scots pine stand. It is also possible that emerging foliage of other evergreen, conifers tree species would have a similarly much higher potential to emit VOCs than its corresponding mature foliage, as found in Aalto et al. (2014). If that is in fact the case, the impact of new needle emissions might be even larger than for Scots pine forests, because many evergreen trees, especially in tropical regions, have several needle cohorts flushing annually. Since evergreen trees are dominating in many ecosystems around the world, more measurements are required in order to improve the representation of the emissions of atmospherically important VOCs from new evergreen conifers foliage in models.

4.2 Potential impacts on monoterpene emission predictions from Finland

The potential error of not accounting for new foliage monoterpene emissions in the canopy's emission potential translates directly into the predicted emission rates, as emission potentials are multiplied with various activity factors in models in order to produce the emission rates (e.g. Guenther et al., 2006, 2012). Thus, under the same environmental conditions and foliage mass or leaf area index, a change in the emission potential leads to a proportional change in the predicted emission rate (F):

$$\Delta F \propto \Delta \square$$

(6)

We investigated how many Gg of monoterpenes the emissions from Finland could be underestimated, if biogenic emission models only consider the emissions from mature foliage. For this analysis, we utilised Eq. (5) in Guenther et al. (1993) and

stand area (A, Fig. 6):

$$\Delta F = \sum (\epsilon_{new+mature,i,j} - \epsilon_{mature,j}) \times \exp(\beta \times (T_j - T_s)) \times M_{i,j} \times A_i \quad (7)$$

together with weekly averaged air temperature (T) during 2014-2018 at the SMEAR II (16.8 m, Aalto et al., 2019a) and SMEAR I (9 m, Aalto et al., 2019b) stations. In our calculations, it is assumed that the temperature of all needles equals the ambient temperature, which is a reasonable assumption for low density canopies (Pier and McDuffie Jr., 1997; Martin et al., 1999; Zweifel et al., 2002; Leuzinger and Körner, 2007). T_s and β are the same as in Sec. 2.3.1. Eq. (7) considers our suggested canopy scale emission potentials (Fig. 8) and our emission potential of mature needles (Fig. 8). Our estimate suggests that about 27 Gg of monoterpenes could be additionally emitted from Finnish Scots pine forests yearly, if the enhanced emissions from new foliage are explicitly considered. The majority of these additional emissions, namely ~23 Gg, originate from southern Finland. This is partly due to higher temperatures in the south (the difference in the weekly averaged temperature between SMEAR I and II was 3.1°C during the investigated period), but mostly caused by a smaller production of new foliage in the north. The areas covered by Scots pine are almost identical in southern and northern Finland (Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014, Table 1.12).

The estimate of how many Gg of monoterpenes the emissions from Finland could be underestimated, is compared to several studies that have predicted the emissions of monoterpenes for Finland using different models and methods, in Table 1. Please be aware that these estimates consider emissions from all terrestrial land covers in Finland, and not only from Scots pine forests, except in the case of Kellomäki et al. (2001). Though Scots pine is the dominant forest species in Finland (~65 % coverage of forest land), Norway spruce and broadleaved species make up significant fractions of the forest land (~25 % and ~10 %, respectively, Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014).

Our estimate of emitted monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage is comparable to Kellomäki et al. (2001)'s estimate of monoterpenes emitted from the complete Scots pine foliage in Finland. Other studies estimate that the emissions of monoterpenes from all forest types in Finland sum up to 105-230 Gg/yr, with all except one study ranging the emission to 105-160 Gg/yr. Though our estimate of additionally emitted monoterpenes is within the range covered in the literature, the addition is still very significant and in some cases corresponds to about 25 % of the total monoterpene emission estimate from Finland.

Table 1. Other studies that have estimated the emissions of monoterpenes for Finland using different models and methods. Be aware that these values do not only cover the emissions from Scots pine, but all terrestrial land cover, unless otherwise specified.

Study	Monoterpene emission (Gg/yr)	Notes
Kellomäki et al. (2001)	30.3 (southern Finland: 15.9, northern Finland: 14.4)	These values are only for Scots pine and calculated using the total annual monoterpene emissions given in Kellomäki et al. (2001) Table 4 and multiplied by the Scots pine land cover in southern and northern Finland, respectively (Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry 2014, Table 1.12).
Lindfors and Laurila (2000)	150	
Lindfors et al. (2000)	160	
Oderbolz et al. (2013)	105, 145, 230	The three different values listed correspond to three different vegetation inventories used for model simulations.
Simpson et al. (1999)	160	

601

602 **4.3 Potential impacts on predictions of new particle formation and growth**

603 BVOCs, and especially monoterpenes, have been shown to participate in the formation (Kulmala et al., 1998, 2014; Donahue
 604 et al., 2013; Riccobono et al., 2014; Schobesberger et al., 2013) and growth (Ehn et al., 2014; Riipinen et al., 2012)
 605 processes of the climatically important secondary organic aerosol particles in the atmosphere. Though boreal forests are
 606 globally a small emitter of BVOCs when compared to e.g. the tropics (e.g. Guenther et al., 2012; Guenther, 2013), the
 607 ambient blend of BVOCs in boreal forests is, in contrast to e.g. the Amazonian rainforest, favorable for production of new
 608 particles (e.g. Lee et al., 2016). Previous studies from sites in the boreal forest indicate for example that 12–50 % of aerosol
 609 mass and 50 % of the climatically relevant cloud condensation nuclei originate from forests (Tunved et al., 2008; Sihto et al.,
 610 2011). In the specific case of Finland, it has been estimated that particle formation causes a local radiative perturbation of
 611 between -5 and -14 Wm^{-2} (global mean -0.03 to -1.1 Wm^{-2}) (Kurtén et al., 2003). As already stated earlier, the
 612 frequency of new particle formation events in boreal forests have been observed to be highest during spring time. We,
 613 therefore, extrapolate our results in order to assess the potential impact that an exclusion of the enhanced emissions of
 614 monoterpenes from new Scots pine foliage during spring time can have on predictions of formation and growth of small new
 615 particles in locations without measurements, or predictions of future climate.

616 As stated in Sec. 4.2, a change in the emission potential is proportional to a change in the (predicted) emissions
 617 under the same environmental conditions. Under the same boundary layer conditions, a change in the emissions of
 618 monoterpenes is largely proportional to a change in the atmospheric concentration of monoterpenes (MT), and hence in the
 619 concentration of oxidised organics (org), if the change in the concentrations is not extreme (see e.g. Smolander et al., 2014):

$$620 \Delta F \propto \Delta[\text{MT}] \propto \Delta[\text{org}] \quad (8)$$

621 The calculated canopy scale emissions of monoterpenes during spring time increase with 180 % in northern Finland and by
 622 560 % in southern Finland, when the emission potentials of both new and mature foliage are considered, and compared to the
 623 situation when only the emission potential of mature needles is included. This has been calculated as: (the integral of “This
 624 study” - the integral of “Mature needles”) / the integral of “Mature needles”, where the integrals are the areas under the
 625 curves presented in Fig. 8 during the spring time period. The values are therefore also different to Fig. 10, since those have
 626 been calculated as: (the integral of “Mature needles” - the integral of “This study”) / the integral of “This study”.

627 The formation of neutral 2 nm sized clusters, J_2 , from sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4) and oxidised organic compounds can be
 628 expressed as follows (Paasonen et al., 2010):

$$629 J_2 = K_{s1} \times [\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4]^2 + K_{s2} \times [\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4] \times [\text{org}] + K_{s3} \times [\text{org}]^2 \quad (9)$$

630 where K_{s1-3} are kinetic coefficients. The condensational growth rate, GR, of 2-3 nm particles can be calculated as follows
 631 (Nieminen et al., 2010):

$$632 GR = 0.5 \text{ nm} \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \times CC \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^3 \quad (10)$$

633 where CC is the concentration of condensable vapours, which we assume to be the sum of sulfuric acid and organics. We
 634 assume that the molar mass of organics is four times higher than that of sulfuric acid (Ehn et al., 2014) and hence we can
 635 write:

$$636 GR = 0.5 \text{ nm} \cdot \text{h}^{-1} \times ([\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4] + [\text{org}] \times 4^{1/3}) \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^3 \quad (11)$$

637 Changes in the formation and growth rate depend on the absolute concentrations of sulfuric acid and oxidised organics.
 638 Hence, we have calculated the impact on formation and growth rates utilising sulfuric acid concentrations of $1 - 10 \cdot$
 639 10^6 cm^{-3} and concentrations of organic condensables of $1 - 5 \cdot 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, which are reasonable ranges according to
 640 measurements of sulfuric acid and estimates based on observations of growth rates, respectively (Paasonen et al., 2010). The
 641 increase in the formation and growth rates are calculated in a similar manner as in the case of the emissions: (Y1-

642 Y needles, and Y2 = emission, formation or growth rate considering only the emission potential of mature needles. In our
643 calculations, we assume that simulations including the emission potential of both new and mature Scots pine foliage would
644 lead to concentrations of organic condensables in the range of $1 - 5 \cdot 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Thus, [org] is decreased by a factor of 2.8
645 (northern Finland) and 6.6 (southern Finland) in the calculations of the formation and growth rates using only the mature
646 foliage emission potential. The resulting changes in the formation and growth rate are presented in Table 2 and illustrated in
647 Fig. 11.

649 Models would predict significantly higher formation and growth rates of small new particles during spring time, if
650 they considered the enhanced emissions from new Scots pine foliage. Since the increase in emissions of monoterpenes would
651 be highest in southern Finland, also the induction in the simulated new particle formation and growth would be greatest
652 there. The scale of the enlargement largely depends on the ratios of concentrations of sulfuric acid and organics originating
653 from monoterpene oxidation. Hence, the increases in the predicted formation and growth rates are modest at high
654 $[\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4]/[\text{org}]$, but still greater than the uncertainty connected to the instrumentation used to obtain the rates (Manninen et
655 al., 2016; Wagner et al., 2016; Kangasluoma and Kontkanen, 2017) and the uncertainty related to the calculation of these
656 rates (Yli-Juuti et al., 2011). At low $[\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4]/[\text{org}]$ (e.g. $\frac{1}{5} \square 10^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3}$), J_2 would be predicted to be ~10 times larger in
657 southern Finland, when also considering the enhanced emissions from new foliage, while the corresponding growth rate
658 would be ~6 times greater. Such increases in the predictions of new particle formation and growth would severely impact
659 climate change predictions.

660 We emphasise that we are here not claiming that the discrepancy between field observations and model predictions
661 of new particle formation can solemnly be explained by an exclusion of BVOC emissions from new foliage, but instead
662 estimate how much aerosol processes would be predicted to increase if the enhanced emissions from new Scots pine foliage
663 were included in models. Accounting for emissions from stems (Rissanen et al., 2020) and emission bursts from mature
664 foliage earlier in the season (Aalto et al., 2015) would additionally work towards a closure of the gap. Pronounced early
665 spring time emission bursts from mature shoots are only partly included in our estimates (Fig. 5c), since such bursts have so
666 far been shown to mainly take place before growth onset, and thus before the period that our study targets (Aalto et al.,
667 2015). We accentuate that the influence of BVOCs on aerosol processes is far from simple and the formation of aerosol
668 particles e.g. also depends on the absolute concentration of individual compounds and blend of VOCs (e.g. Lee et al., 2016;
669 Faiola et al., 2018, 2019; McFiggans et al., 2019; Ylisirniö et al., 2020). The results presented in this section are connected
670 with a large degree of uncertainty, since no other equations than those given in this section were used for these calculations
671 and because our estimated underestimations of the emission potential in themselves are uncertain. One cause of this
672 uncertainty is the assumption that emissions originate from storage pools only, and that a fixed value of β can be used to
673 describe the emissions throughout the season. As also mentioned earlier, previous studies have, however, shown that a
674 significant part of the emissions of monoterpenes from Scots pine can originate from de novo synthesis (Ghirardo et al.,
675 2010; Taipale et al., 2011, Aalto et al., 2015; Rantala et al., 2015). Also, it is in reality known that β can vary during the
676 season and can be different for individual monoterpene isomers (Hakola et al., 2006; Hellén et al., 2018), and hence can
677 cause significant seasonal variations in the calculated emission potential which are not necessarily true (Hellén et al., 2018).
678 Thus, a different handling of the emission potentials would impact the findings of this study, though it is unsure to which
679 direction.


680
681 **Table 2.** Observed ranges in the concentrations of sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4) and condensable organics (org) together with the
682 differences in the formation rate of 2 nm clusters (J_2) and growth rate of 2-3 nm particles (GR) when the increased emission
683 potential of new Scots pine foliage is considered in addition to the emission potential of mature foliage, and compared to
684 situations where only the emission potential of mature foliage is included. All values are for spring time, while the resulting
685 differences (ΔJ_2 and ΔGR) are provided for northern and southern Finland, individually. The concentrations of condensable

687 assumed to be 2.8 times (northern Finland) and 6.6 times (southern Finland) less than the observed concentrations.

[H ₂ SO ₄] (cm ⁻³)	[org] (cm ⁻³)	[org] (cm ⁻³), northern Finland, only mature foliage is considered	[org] (cm ⁻³), southern Finland, only mature foliage is considered	ΔJ ₂ , northern Finland (%)	ΔJ ₂ , southern Finland (%)	ΔGR, northern Finland (%)	ΔGR, southern Finland (%)
10 ⁶	10 ⁷	3.6 · 10 ⁶	1.5 · 10 ⁶	180	470	150	400
10 ⁷	10 ⁷	3.6 · 10 ⁶	1.5 · 10 ⁶	73	130	65	110
10 ⁷	5 · 10 ⁷	1.8 · 10 ⁷	7.6 · 10 ⁶	150	350	130	310
10 ⁶	5 · 10 ⁷	1.8 · 10 ⁷	7.6 · 10 ⁶	280	860	170	520

688

689



690 **Figure 11.** The potential impact of considering the enhanced emission potential of new Scots pine foliage during spring.
 691 “MT” refers to both emissions and concentrations of monoterpenes. The factors are provided as a minimum-maximum range
 692 considering trees growing in northern and southern Finland and different concentrations of sulfuric acid and organics. The
 693 increases in the emission, formation (J₂) and growth (GR) rates are calculated as: $(Y1-Y2)/Y2 \times 100\%$, where Y1 =
 694 emission, formation or growth rate considering the emission potential of both new and mature needles, and Y2 = emission,
 695 formation or growth rate considering only the emission potential of mature needles.

696 5 Conclusions

697 We have investigated the potential effects of considering the enhanced monoterpene emission potential of new Scots pine
 698 foliage on the whole tree’s emission potential as a function of season, stand age and location. As methods, we used several
 699 years of continuous measurements of the emission rates of monoterpenes from new and mature Scots pine foliage, and
 700 growth models to predict the seasonal and yearly development of Scots pine needles. We found that the importance of the
 701 emissions from new Scots pine foliage decreases as a function of the season, tree age and latitude in Finland. During spring

702 ti _____s,
703 independently of tree age and location. Our calculations suggest that neglecting the specific age (but not biomass or leaf area
704 index) of the stand at most leads to an error of ~20 % in simulations of specific locations. We demonstrate a good agreement
705 between our whole tree foliage emission potentials, which account for the emissions from developing foliage, and
706 monoterpene emission potentials derived from measured ecosystem scale fluxes of a Scots pine dominated forest. We also
707 show that the ecosystem scale-derived emission potentials of monoterpenes are in better agreement with our whole tree
708 foliage emission potentials than with the emission potential of mature Scots pine foliage or the whole tree potential when it is
709 assumed that the emission from new foliage is enhanced in a similar manner as in MEGAN v2.1.

710 Our results suggest that the emissions of monoterpenes from Finland could be underestimated by ~27 Gg
711 monoterpenes / year, which corresponds to a very significant fraction of the total monoterpene emissions predicted from
712 Finnish forests. The estimated underestimation is especially severe during spring months where new particle formation is
713 most frequent. Thus, the implications of our findings can lead to increases in the predictions of formation and growth rates of
714 small particles during spring time in northern Finland by ~75-280 % and ~65-180 %, respectively, and in southern Finland
715 by ~130-870 % and ~110-520 %, respectively.

716 We speculate that the emission trait observed by Aalto et al. (2014), on which our study is based, is probably not
717 specific to Finnish Scots pine trees, nor is it sure that all Finnish Scots pines exhibit such trait, and thus our findings could be
718 of importance in simulations of all places where Scots pines make up a major fraction of the land cover. Since the certainty
719 of our conclusions are strongly limited by the availability of BVOC emission observations from new needles, we call for
720 additional spring time measurements of new foliage. Such could either be conducted by separate enclosure measurements of
721 new and mature foliage or by measuring the ecosystem scale flux with micrometeorological techniques. Since it is possible
722 that other conifers species than Scots pine exhibit a similar emission behaviour, measurements of also other evergreen needle
723 species are vital for improving emission algorithms.

724
725 *Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

726
727 *Acknowledgements.* This work was supported by the Academy of Finland Center of Excellence project (no. 307331), the
728 ERC advanced grant ATM-GTP No. 742206, and the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program
729 under grant agreement No. 654109. D. Taipale was additionally supported by the Academy of Finland (no. 307957), and P.
730 Schiestl-Aalto by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation (no. 2015.0047).

731 **References**

732 Aalto, J., Kolari, P., Hari, P., Kerminen, V.-M., Schiestl-Aalto, P., Aaltonen, H., Levula, J., Siivola, E., Kulmala, M., and
733 Bäck, J.: New foliage growth is a significant, unaccounted source for volatiles in boreal evergreen forests, *Biogeosciences*,
734 11, 1331-1344, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-11-1331-2014>, 2014.

735
736 Aalto, J., Porcar-Castell, A., Atherton, J., Kolari, P., Pohja, T., Hari, P., Nikinmaa, E., Petäjä, T., and Bäck, J.: Onset of
737 photosynthesis in spring speeds up monoterpene synthesis and leads to emission bursts, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 38, 2299-2312,
738 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12550>, 2015.

739
740 Aalto, J., Aalto, P., and Keronen, P.: SMEAR II Hyytiälä forest meteorology, greenhouse gases, air quality and soil, Institute
741 for Atmospheric and Earth System Research, urn:nbn:fi:att:a8e81c0e-2838-4df4-9589-74a4240138f8, 2019a.

743 A Journal Pre-proof id
744 Earth System Research, urn:nbn:fi:att:2a9c28bd-ca13-4a17-8b76-922bafa067a7, 2019b.
745
746 Aaltonen, H., Pumpanen, J., Pihlatie, M., Hakola, H., Hellén, H., Kulmala, L., Vesala, T., and Bäck, J.: Boreal pine forest
747 floor biogenic volatile organic compound emissions peak in early summer and autumn, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 151, 682-691,
748 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.12.010>, 2011.
749
750 Aaltonen, H., Aalto, J., Kolari, P., Pihlatie, M., Pumpanen, J., Kulmala, M., Nikinmaa, E., Vesala, T., and Bäck, J.:
751 Continuous VOC flux measurements on boreal forest floor, *Plant Soil*, 369, 241-256, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1553-4)
752 [1553-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1553-4), 2013.
753
754 Albrecht, B. A.: Aerosols, cloud microphysics, and fractional cloudiness, *Science*, 245, 1227-1230, DOI:
755 [10.1126/science.245.4923.1227](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.245.4923.1227), 1989.
756
757 Arneth, A., Niinemets, Ü., Pressley, S., Bäck, J., Hari, P., Karl, T., Noe, S., Prentice, I. C., Serça, D., Hickler, T., Wolf, A.,
758 and Smith, B.: Process-based estimates of terrestrial ecosystem isoprene emissions: incorporating the effects of a direct CO₂-
759 isoprene interaction, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 31-53, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-31-2007>, 2007.
760
761 Bäck, J., Aaltonen, H., Hellén, H., Kajos, M.K., Patokoski, J., Taipale, R., Pumpanen, J., and Heinonsalo, J.: Variable
762 emissions of microbial volatile organic compounds (MVOCs) from root-associated fungi isolated from Scots pine, *Atmos.*
763 *Environ.*, 44, 3651-3659, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.06.042>, 2010.
764
765 Bäck, J., Aalto, J., Henriksson, M., Hakola, H., He, Q., and Boy, M.: Chemodiversity of a Scots pine stand and implications
766 for terpene air concentrations, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 689–702, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-689-2012>, 2012.
767
768 Bouvier-Brown, N. C., Schade, G. W., Misson, L., Lee, A., McKay, M., and Goldstein, A. H.: Contributions of biogenic
769 volatile organic compounds to net ecosystem carbon flux in a ponderosa pine plantation, *Atmos. Environ.*, 60, 527-533,
770 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.06.070>, 2012.
771
772 Charlson, R. J., Schwartz, S. E., Hales, J. M., Cess, R. D., Coakley Jr., J. A., Hansen, J. E., and Hofmann, D. J.: Climate
773 Forcing by Anthropogenic Aerosols, *Science*, 255, 423-430, DOI: [10.1126/science.255.5043.423](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.255.5043.423), 1992.
774
775 Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., Riipinen, I., Wagner, R., Hussein, T., Aalto, P. P., and Lehtinen, K. E. J.: Formation and growth
776 of fresh atmospheric aerosols: eight years of aerosol size distribution data from SMEAR II, Hyytiälä, Finland, *Boreal Env.*
777 *Res.*, 10, 323-336, 2005.
778
779 Dal Maso, M., Sogacheva, L., Aalto, P. P., Riipinen, I., Komppula, M., Tunved, P., Korhonen, L., Suur-Uski, V., Hirsikko,
780 A., Kurtén, T., Kerminen, V.-M., Lihavainen, H., Viisanen, Y., Hansson, H.-C., and Kulmala, M.: Aerosol size distribution
781 measurements at four Nordic field stations: identification, analysis and trajectory analysis of new particle formation bursts,
782 *Tellus*, 59B, 350-361, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2007.00267.x>, 2007.
783
784 Dal Maso, M., Sogacheva, L., Anisimov, M. P., Arshinov, M., Baklanov, A., Belan, B., Khodzher, T. V., Obolkin, V. A.,
785 Staroverova, A., Vlasov, A., Zagaynov, V. A., Lushnikov, A., Lyubovtseva, Y. S., Riipinen, I., Kerminen, V.-M., and

787 2008.

788

789 Donahue, N. M., Ortega, I. K., Chuang, W., Riipinen, I., Riccobono, F., Schobesberger, S., Dommen, J., Baltensperger, U.,
790 Kulmala, M., Worsnop, D. R., Vehkamäki, H.: How do organic vapors contribute to new-particle formation?, *Faraday*
791 *Discuss.*, 165, 91-104, 10.1039/C3FD00046J, 2013.

792

793 Dorokhov, Y. L., Sheshukova, E. V., and Komarova, T. V.: Methanol in plant life, *Front. Plant Sci.*, 9, 1623,
794 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01623>, 2018.

795

796 Ehn, M., Thornton, J. A., Kleist, E., Sipilä, M., Junninen, H., Pullinen, I., Springer, M., Rubach, F., Tillmann, R., Lee, B.,
797 Lopez-Hilfiker, F., Andres, S., Acir, I-H., Rissanen, M., Jokinen, T., Schobesberger, S., Kangasluoma, J., Kontkanen, J.,
798 Nieminen, T., Kurtén, T., Nielsen, L. B., Jørgensen, S., Kjaergaard, H. G., Canagaratna, M., Maso, M. D., Berndt, T., Petäjä,
799 T., Wahner, A., Kerminen, V.-M., Kulmala, M., Worsnop, D. R., Wildt, J., and Mentel, T. F.: A large source of low-
800 volatility secondary organic aerosol, *Nature* 506, 476-479, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13032>, 2014.

801

802 Eller, A. S. D., Harley, P., and Monson, R.: Potential contribution of exposed resin to ecosystem emissions of monoterpenes,
803 *Atmos. Environ.*, 77, 440-444, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.05.028>, 2013.

804

805 Faiola, C. and Taipale, D.: Impact of insect herbivory on plant stress volatile emissions from trees: A synthesis of
806 quantitative measurements and recommendations for future research, *Atmos. Environ.* X, 5, 100060,
807 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeaoa.2019.100060>, 2020.

808

809 Faiola, C. L., Buchholz, A., Kari, E., Yli-Pirilä, P., Holopainen, J. K., Kivimäenpää, M., Miettinen, P., Worsnop, D. R.,
810 Lehtinen, K. E. J., Guenther, A. B., and Virtanen, A.: Terpene composition complexity controls secondary organic aerosol
811 yields from Scots pine volatile emissions, *Sci. Rep.*, 8, 3053, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-21045-1>, 2018.

812

813 Faiola, C. L., Pullinen, I., Buchholz, A., Khalaj, F., Ylisirniö, A., Kari, E., Miettinen, P., Holopainen, J. K., Kivimäenpää,
814 M., Schobesberger, S., Yli-Juuti, T., and Virtanen, A.: Secondary organic aerosol formation from healthy and aphid-stressed
815 Scots pine emissions, *ACS Earth Space Chem.*, 3, 1756-1772, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsearthspacechem.9b00118>, 2019.

816

817 Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry, Metsäntutkimuslaitos, Tampere, 2014.

818

819 Ghirardo, A., Koch, K., Taipale, R., Zimmer, I., Schnitzler, J.-P., and Rinne, J.: Determination of de novo and pool
820 emissions of terpenes from four common boreal/alpine trees by ¹³CO₂ labelling and PTR-MS Analysis, *Plant Cell Environ.*,
821 33, 781-792, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.02104.x, 2010.

822

823 Goldstein, A., Goulden, M., Munger, J. W., Wofsy, S., and Geron, C.: Seasonal course of isoprene emissions from a
824 midlatitude forest, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 31045-31056, <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JD02708>, 1998.

825

826 Guenther, A.: Biological and chemical diversity of biogenic volatile organic emissions into the atmosphere, *ISRN*
827 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 2013, 786290, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/786290>, 2013.

828

830 eucalyptus and emission rate algorithm development, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 10799-10808,
831 <https://doi.org/10.1029/91JD00960>, 1991.

832

833 Guenther, A. B., Zimmerman, P. R., Harley, P. C., Monson, R. K., and Fall, R.: Isoprene and monoterpene emission rate
834 variability: model evaluations and sensitivity analyses, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 12609-12617,
835 <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JD00527>, 1993.

836

837 Guenther, A., Hewitt, C. N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M., Mckay, W.
838 A., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zimmerman, P.: A global model of natural
839 volatile organic compound emissions, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 100, 8873-8892, <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD02950>, 1995.

840

841 Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P. I., and Geron, C.: Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene
842 emissions using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 3181-3210,
843 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-6-3181-2006>, 2006.

844

845 Guenther, A. B., Jiang, X., Heald, C. L., Sakulyanontvittaya, T., Duhl, T., Emmons, L. K., and Wang, X.: The Model of
846 Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature version 2.1 (MEGAN2.1): an extended and updated framework for modeling
847 biogenic emissions, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 1471-1492, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1471-2012>, 2012.

848

849 Hakola, H., Laurila, T., Lindfors, V., Hellén, H., Gaman, A., and Rinne, J.: Variation of the VOC emission rates of birch
850 species during the growing season, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 6, 237-249, 2001.

851

852 Hakola, H., Tarvainen, V., Bäck, J., Ranta, H., Bonn, B., Rinne, J., and Kulmala, M.: Seasonal variation of mono- and
853 sesquiterpene emission rates of Scots pine, *Biogeosciences*, 3, 93-101, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-3-93-2006>, 2006.

854

855 Harley, P., Guenther, A., and Zimmerman, P.: Effects of light, temperature and canopy position on net photosynthesis and
856 isoprene emission from sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) leaves, *Tree Physiol.*, 16, 25-32,
857 <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/16.1-2.25>, 1996.

858

859 Hari, P. and Kulmala, M.: Station for measuring ecosystem atmosphere relations (SMEAR II), *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 10,
860 315-322, 2005.

861

862 Hari, P., Salkinoja-Salonen, M. S., Liski, J., Simojoki, A., Kolari, P., Pumpanen, J., Kähkönen, M., Aakala, T., Havimo, M.,
863 Kivekäs, R., and Nikinmaa, E.: Growth and development of forest ecosystems: the MicroForest model, in: *Boreal forest and
864 climate change*, edited by Hari, P. and Kulmala, L., Springer Netherlands, 433-461, 10.1007/978-1-4020-8718-9, 2008.

865

866 Heijari, J., Blande, J. D., and Holopainen, J. K.: Feeding of large pine weevil on Scots pine stem triggers localised bark and
867 systemic shoot emission of volatile organic compounds, *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, 71, 390-398,
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2011.02.008>, 2011.

869

870 Hellén, H., Praplan, A. P., Tykkä, T., Ylivinkka, I., Vakkari, V., Bäck, J., Petäjä, T., Kulmala, M., and Hakola, H.: Long-
871 term measurements of volatile organic compounds highlight the importance of sesquiterpenes for the atmospheric chemistry
872 of a boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 13839-13863, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-13839-2018>, 2018.

- 873
874 Helmig, D., Ortega, J., Duhl, T., Tanner, D., Guenther, A., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Milford, J., and Sakulyanontvittaya,
875 T.: Sesquiterpene emissions from pine trees - identifications, emission rates and flux estimates for the contiguous United
876 States, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 41, 1545-1553, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es0618907>, 2007.
- 877
878 Holopainen, J. K.: Multiple functions of inducible plant volatiles, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 9, 529-533,
879 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2004.09.006>, 2004.
- 880
881 Holopainen, J. K. and Gershenzon, J.: Multiple stress factors and the emission of plant VOCs, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 15, 176-
882 184, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2010.01.006>, 2010.
- 883
884 Holopainen, J. K., Himanen, S. J., Yuan, J. S., Chen, F., and Neal Stewart Jr., C.: Ecological functions of terpenoids in
885 changing climates, in: *Natural Products*, edited by: Ramawat, K. and Mérillon, J. M., Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany,
886 2913-2940, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22144-6_129, 2013.
- 887
888 Houston Durrant, T., de Rigo, D., and Caudullo, G.: *Pinus sylvestris* in Europe: distribution, habitat, usage and threats, in:
889 *European atlas of forest tree species*, edited by: San-Miguel-Ayanz, J., de Rigo, D., Caudullo, G., Houston Durrant, T., and
890 Mauri, A., Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 132-133, 2016.
- 891
892 Hüve, K., Christ, M. M., Kleist, E., Uerlings, R., Niinemets, Ü, Walter, A., and Wildt, J.: Simultaneous growth and emission
893 measurements demonstrate an interactive control of methanol release by leaf expansion and stomata, *J. Exp. Bot.*, 58, 1783-
894 1793, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erm038>, 2007.
- 895
896 Ilvesniemi, H. and Liu, C.: Biomass distribution in a young Scots pine stand, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 6, 3-8, 2001.
- 897
898 Janson, R.: Monoterpene emissions from Scots pine and Norwegian spruce, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 2839-2850,
899 <https://doi.org/10.1029/92JD02394>, 1993.
- 900
901 Janson, R. and de Serves, C.: Acetone and monoterpene emissions from the boreal forest in northern Europe, *Atmos.*
902 *Environ.*, 35, 4629-4637, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(01\)00160-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(01)00160-1), 2001.
- 903
904 Janson, R., Rosman, K., Karlsson, A., and Hansson, H.-C.: Biogenic emissions and gaseous precursors to forest aerosols,
905 *Tellus*, 53B, 423-440, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v53i4.16615>, 2001.
- 906
907 Kangasluoma, J. and Kontkanen, J.: On the sources of uncertainty in the sub-3 nm particle concentration measurement, *J.*
908 *Aerosol Sci.*, 112, 34-51, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2017.07.002>, 2017.
- 909
910 Karl, T., Guenther, A., Spirig, C., Hansel, A., and Fall, R.: Seasonal variation of biogenic VOC emissions above a mixed
911 hardwood forest in northern Michigan, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 232186, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL018432>, 2003.
- 912
913 Kellomäki, S., Rouvinen, I., Peltola, H., Strandman, H., and Steinbrecher, R.: Impact of global warming on the tree species
914 composition of boreal forests in Finland and effects on emissions of isoprenoids, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 7, 531-544,
915 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2001.00414.x>, 2001.

- 917 K
918 variabilities, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, D134161, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JD000691>, 2002.
919
- 920 Korhonen, J. F. J., Pihlatie, M., Pumpanen, J., Aaltonen, H., Hari, P., Levula, J., Kieloaho, A.-J., Nikinmaa, E., Vesala, T.,
921 and Ilvesniemi, H.: Nitrogen balance of a boreal Scots pine forest, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 1083-1095,
922 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-1083-2013>, 2013.
923
- 924 Kulmala, L., Pumpanen, J., Kolari, P., Dengel, S., Berninger, F., Köster, K., Matkala, L., Vanhatalo, A., Vesala, T., and
925 Bäck, J.: Inter- and intra-annual dynamics of photosynthesis differ between forest floor vegetation and tree canopy in a
926 subarctic Scots pine stand, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 271, 1-11, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2019.02.029>, 2019.
927
- 928 Kulmala, M., Toivonen, A., Mäkelä, J. M., and Laaksonen, A.: Analysis of the growth of nucleation mode particles observed
929 in Boreal forest, *Tellus*, 50B, 449-462, <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0889.1998.t01-4-00004.x>, 1998.
930
- 931 Kulmala, M., Hämeri, K., Aalto, P. P., Mäkelä, J. M., Pirjola, L., Nilsson, E. D., Buzorius, G., Rannik, Ü., Dal Maso, M.,
932 Seidl, W., Hoffman, T., Janson, R., Hansson, H.-C., Viisanen, Y., Laaksonen, A., and O'Dowd, C. D.: Overview of the
933 international project on biogenic aerosol formation in the boreal forest (BIOFOR), *Tellus*, 53B, 324-343,
934 <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v53i4.16601>, 2001.
935
- 936 Kulmala, M., Petäjä, T., Ehn, M., Thornton, J., Sipilä, M., Worsnop, D. R., Kerminen, V.-M.: Chemistry of atmospheric
937 nucleation: on the recent advances on precursor characterization and atmospheric cluster composition in connection with
938 atmospheric new particle formation, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 65, 21-37, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-physchem-040412-110014>, 2014.
939
- 940
- 941 Kurtén, T., Kulmala, M., Dal Maso, M., Suni, T., Reissell, A., Vehkamäki, H., Hari, P., Laaksonen, A., Viisanen, Y., and
942 Vesala, T.: Estimation of different forest-related contributions to the radiative balance using observations in southern Finland,
943 *Boreal Env. Res.*, 8, 275–285, 2003.
944
- 945 Lamb, B., Guenther, A., Gay, D., and Westberg, H.: A national inventory of biogenic hydrocarbon emissions, *Atmos.*
946 *Environ.*, 21, 1695-1705, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981\(87\)90108-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-6981(87)90108-9), 1987.
947
- 948 Langford, B., Cash, J., Acton, W. J. F., Valach, A. C., Hewitt, C. N., Fares, S., Goded, I., Gruening, C., House, E.,
949 Kalogridis, A.-C., Gros, V., Schafers, R., Thomas, R., Broadmeadow, M., and Nemitz, E.: Isoprene emission potentials from
950 European oak forests derived from canopy flux measurements: an assessment of uncertainties and inter-algorithm variability,
951 *Biogeosciences*, 14, 5571-5594, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-5571-2017>, 2017.
952
- 953 Lathièrè, J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Friend, A. D., De Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Viovy, N., and Folberth, G. A.: Impact of climate
954 variability and land use changes on global biogenic volatile organic compound emissions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 2129-
955 2146, doi:10.5194/acp-6-2129-2006, 2006.
956
- 957 Lee, S.-H., Uin, J., Guenther, A. B., de Gouw, J. A., Yu, F., Nadykto, A. B., Herb, J., Ng, N. L., Koss, A., Brune, W. B.,
958 Baumann, K., Kanawade, V. P., Keutsch, F. N., Nenes, A., Olsen, K., Goldstein, A., and Ouyang, Q.: Isoprene suppression
959 of new particle formation: Potential mechanisms and implications, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121, 14621-14635,
960 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD024844>, 2016.

- 961
962 Leuzinger, S. and Körner, C.: Tree species diversity affects canopy leaf temperatures in a mature temperate forest, *Agr.*
963 *Forest Meteorol.*, 146, 29-37, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.05.007>, 2007.
- 964
965 Lindfors, V. and Laurila, T.: Biogenic VOC emissions from forests in Finland, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 5, 95-113, 2000.
- 966
967 Lindfors, V., Laurila, T., Hakola, H., Steinbrecher, R., and Rinne, J.: Modeling biogenic terpene emissions in the European
968 boreal region, *Atmos. Environ.*, 34, 4983-4996, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(00\)00223-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(00)00223-5), 2000.
- 969
970 Llusía, J. and Penúelas, J.: Seasonal patterns of terpene content and emission from seven Mediterranean woody species in
971 field conditions, *J. Exp. Bot.*, 87, 133-140, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2656691>, 2000.
- 972
973 Maja, M. M., Kasurinen, A., Holopainen, T., Kontunen-Soppela, S., Oksanen, E., and Holopainen, J.: Volatile organic
974 compounds emitted from silver birch of different provenances across a latitudinal gradient in Finland, *Tree Physiol.*, 35, 975-
975 986, <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpv052>, 2015.
- 976
977 Mäkelä, A.: A carbon balance model of growth and self-pruning in trees based on structural relationships, *Forest Sci.* 43, 7-
978 24, <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestscience/43.1.7>, 1997.
- 979
980 Mäki, M., Krasnov, D., Hellén, H., Noe, S. M., and Bäck, J.: Stand type affects fluxes of volatile organic compounds from
981 the forest floor in hemiboreal and boreal climates, *Plant Soil*, 441, 363-381, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04129-3>,
982 2019.
- 983
984 Manninen, H. E., Nieminen, T., Asmi, E., Gagné, S., Häkkinen, S., Lehtipalo, K., Aalto, P., Vana, M., Mirme, A., Mirme, S.,
985 Hõrrak, U., Plass-Dülmer, C., Stange, G., Kiss, G., Hoffer, A., Törő, N., Moerman, M., Henzing, B., de Leeuw, G.,
986 Brinkenberg, M., Kouvarakis, G. N., Bougiatioti, A., Mihalopoulos, N., O'Dowd, C., Ceburnis, D., Arneth, A.,
987 Svenningsson, B., Swietlicki, E., Tarozzi, L., Decesari, S., Facchini, M. C., Birmili, W., Sonntag, A., Wiedensohler, A.,
988 Boulon, J., Sellegri, K., Laj, P., Gysel, M., Bukowiecki, N., Weingartner, E., Wehrle, G., Laaksonen, A., Hamed, A.,
989 Joutsensaari, J., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-M., and Kulmala, M.: EUCAARI ion spectrometer measurements at 12 European
990 sites - analysis of new particle formation events, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7907-7927, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-7907-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-7907-2010)
991 2010, 2010.
- 992
993 Manninen, H. E., Mirme, S., Mirme, A., Petäjä, T., and Kulmala, M.: How to reliably detect molecular clusters and
994 nucleation mode particles with Neutral cluster and Air Ion Spectrometer (NAIS), *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 3577-3605,
995 <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-9-3577-2016>, 2016.
- 996
997 Martin, T. A., Hinckley, T. M., Meinzer, F. C., and Sprugel, D. G.: Boundary layer conductance, leaf temperature and
998 transpiration of *Abies amabilis* branches, *Tree Physiol.*, 19, 435-443, <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/19.7.435>, 1999.
- 999
1000 McFiggans, G., Mentel, T. F., Wildt, J., Pullinen, I., Kang, S., Kleist, E., Schmitt, S., Springer, M., Tillmann, R., Wu, C.,
1001 Zhao, D., Hallquist, M., Faxon, C., Le Breton, M., Hallquist, Å. M., Simpson, D., Bergström, R., Jenkin, M. E., Ehn, M.,
1002 Thornton, J. A., Alfarra, M. R., Bannan, T. J., Percival, C. J., Priestley, M., Topping, D., and Kiendler-Scharr, A.: Secondary
1003 organic aerosol reduced by mixture of atmospheric vapours, *Nature*, 565, 587-593, [10.1038/s41586-018-0871-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0871-y) y, 2019.
- 1004

- 1005 M
1006 biogenic volatile organic compound emissions in the ORCHIDEE and MEGAN models and sensitivity to key parameters,
1007 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 14169–14202, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-14169-2016>, 2016.
- 1008
1009 Mogensen, D., Smolander, S., Sogachev, A., Zhou, L., Sinha, V., Guenther, A., Williams, J., Nieminen, T., Kajos, M. K.,
1010 Rinne, J., Kulmala, M., and Boy, M.: Modelling atmospheric OH-reactivity in a boreal forest ecosystem, *Atmos. Chem.*
1011 *Phys.*, 11, 9709-9719, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-9709-2011>, 2011.
- 1012
1013 Mogensen, D., Gierens, R., Crowley, J. N., Keronen, P., Smolander, S., Sogachev, A., Nölscher, A. C., Zhou, L., Kulmala,
1014 M., Tang, M. J., Williams, J., and Boy, M.: Simulations of atmospheric OH, O₃ and NO₃ reactivities within and above the
1015 boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 3909-3932, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-3909-2015>, 2015.
- 1016
1017 Monson, R., Harley, P., Litvak, M., Wildermuth, M., Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P., and Fall, R.: Environmental and
1018 developmental controls over the seasonal pattern of isoprene emission from aspen leaves, *Oecologia*, 99, 260-270,
1019 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00627738>, 1994.
- 1020
1021 Minunno, F., Peltoniemi, M., Härkönen, S., Kalliokoski, T., Makinen, H., and Mäkelä, A.: Bayesian calibration of a carbon
1022 balance model PREBAS using data from permanent growth experiments and national forest inventory, *Forest. Ecol. Manag.*,
1023 440, 208-257, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.02.041>, 2019.
- 1024
1025 Nieminen, T., Lehtinen, K. E. J., and Kulmala, M.: Sub-10 nm particle growth by vapor condensation - effects of vapor
1026 molecule size and particle thermal speed, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 9773-9779, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-9773-2010>,
1027 2010.
- 1028
1029 Nieminen, T., Asmi, A., Dal Maso, M., Aalto, P. P., Keronen, P., Petäjä, T., Kulmala, M., and Kerminen, V.-M.: Trends in
1030 atmospheric new-particle formation: 16 years of observations in a boreal-forest environment, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 19B, 191-
1031 214, 2014.
- 1032
1033 Niinemets, Ü.: Mild versus severe stress and BVOCs: thresholds, priming and consequences, *Trends Plant Sci.*, 15, 145-153,
1034 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2009.11.008>, 2010.
- 1035
1036 Oderbolz, D. C., Aksoyoglu, S., Keller, J., Barmpadimos, I., Steinbrecher, R., Skjøth, C. A., Plaß-Dülmer, C., and Prévôt, A.
1037 S. H.: A comprehensive emission inventory of biogenic volatile organic compounds in Europe: improved seasonality and
1038 land-cover, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 1689-1712, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-1689-2013>, 2013.
- 1039
1040 Paasonen, P., Nieminen, T., Asmi, E., Manninen, H. E., Petäjä, T., Plass-Dülmer, C., Flentje, H., Birmili, W., Wiedensohler,
1041 A., Hörrak, U., Metzger, A., Hamed, A., Laaksonen, A., Facchini, M. C., Kerminen, V.-M., and Kulmala, M.: On the roles
1042 of sulphuric acid and low-volatility organic vapours in the initial steps of atmospheric new particle formation, *Atmos. Chem.*
1043 *Phys.*, 10, 11223-11242, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-11223-2010>, 2010.
- 1044
1045 Petron, G., Harley, P., Greenberg, J., and Guenther, A.: Seasonal temperature variations influence isoprene emission,
1046 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28, 1707-1710, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL011583>, 2001.
- 1047

- 1048 P
1049 white oak, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 23963-23971, <https://doi.org/10.1029/96JD03786>, 1997.
- 1050
- 1051 Räisänen, T., Ryyppö, A., and Kellomäki, S.: Monoterpene emission of a boreal Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) forest, *Agr.*
1052 *Forest Meteorol.*, 149, 808-819, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.11.001>, 2009.
- 1053
- 1054 Rantala, P., Aalto, J., Taipale, R., Ruuskanen, T. M., and Rinne, J.: Annual cycle of volatile organic compound exchange
1055 between a boreal pine forest and the atmosphere, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 5753–5770, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-5753-2015>,
1056 2015.
- 1057
- 1058 Rautiainen, M., Heiskanen, J., and Korhonen, L.: Seasonal changes in canopy leaf area index and MODIS vegetation
1059 products for a boreal forest site in central Finland, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 17, 72-84, 2012.
- 1060
- 1061 Riccobono, F., Schobesberger, S., Scott, C. E., Dommen, J., Ortega, I. K., Rondo, L., Almeida, J., Amorim, A., Bianchi, F.,
1062 Breitenlechner, M., David, A., Downard, A., Dunne, E. M., Duplissy, J., Ehrhart, S., Flagan, R. C., Franchin, A., Hansel, A.,
1063 Junninen, H., Kajos, M., Keskinen, H., Kupc, A., Kürten, A., Kvashin, A. N., Laaksonen, A., Lehtipalo, K., Makhmutov, V.,
1064 Mathot, S., Nieminen, T., Onnela, A., Petäjä, T., Praplan, A. P., Santos, F. D., Schallhart, S., Seinfeld, J. H., Sipilä, M.,
1065 Spracklen, D. V., Stozhkov, Y., Stratmann, F., Tomé, A., Tsagkogeorgas, G., Vaattovaara, P., Viisanen, Y., Vrtala, A.,
1066 Wagner, P. E., Weingartner, E., Wex, H., Wimmer, D., Carslaw, K. S., Curtius, J., Donahue, N. M., Kirkby, J., Kulmala, M.,
1067 Worsnop, D. R., and Baltensperger, U.: Oxidation products of biogenic emissions contribute to nucleation of atmospheric
1068 particles, *Science*, 344, 717-721, DOI: 10.1126/science.1243527, 2014.
- 1069
- 1070 Riipinen, I., Yli-Juuti, T., Pierce, J. R., Petäjä, T., Worsnop, D. R., Kulmala, M., and Donahue, N. M.: The contribution of
1071 organics to atmospheric nanoparticle growth, *Nat. Geosci.*, 5, 453-458, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1499>, 2012.
- 1072
- 1073 Rinne, J., Hakola, H., Laurila, T., and Rannik, Ü.: Canopy scale monoterpene emissions of *Pinus sylvestris* dominated
1074 forests, *Atmos. Environ.*, 34, 1099-1107, 2000.
- 1075
- 1076 Rinne, J., Taipale, R., Markkanen, T., Ruuskanen, T. M., Hellén, H., Kajos, M. K., Vesala, T., and Kulmala, M.:
1077 Hydrocarbon fluxes above a Scots pine forest canopy: measurements and modeling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 3361–3372,
1078 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-3361-2007>, 2007.
- 1079
- 1080 Rissanen, K., Vanhatalo, A., Salmon, Y., Bäck, J., and Hölttä, T.: Stem emissions of monoterpenes, acetaldehyde, and
1081 methanol from Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) affected by tree water relations and cambial growth, *Plant, Cell, Environ.*,
1082 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13778>, 2020.
- 1083
- 1084 Ruuskanen, T. M., Kolari, P., Bäck, J., Kulmala, M., Rinne, J., Hakola, H., Taipale, R., Raivonen, M., Altimir, N., and Hari,
1085 P.: On-line field measurements of monoterpene emissions from Scots pine by proton-transfer-reaction mass spectrometry,
1086 *Boreal Env. Res.*, 10, 553-567, 2005.
- 1087
- 1088 Schiestl-Aalto, P. and Mäkelä, A.: Temperature dependence of needle and shoot elongation before bud break in Scots pine,
1089 *Tree Physiol.* 37, 316-325, <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpw120>, 2017.
- 1090

1091 S
1092 intra-annual sink demand and interannual growth variation in Scots pine, *New Phytol.*, 206, 647-659,
1093 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13275>, 2015.

1094
1095 Schiestl-Aalto, P., Ryhti K., Mäkelä, A., Peltoniemi, M., Bäck, J., and Kulmala, L.: Analysis of the NSC storage dynamics in
1096 tree organs reveals the allocation to belowground symbionts in the framework of whole tree carbon balance, *Front. For.*
1097 *Glob. Change*, 2, 17, <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2019.00017>, 2019.

1098
1099 Schobesberger, S., Junninen, H., Bianchi, F., Lönn, G., Ehn, M., Lehtipalo, K., Dommen, J., Ehrhart, S., Ortega, I. K.,
1100 Franchin, A., Nieminen, T., Riccobono, F., Hutterli, M., Duplissy, J., Almeida, J., Amorim, A., Breitenlechner, M.,
1101 Downard, A. J., Dunne, E. M., Flagan, R. C., Kajos, M., Keskinen, H., Kirkby, J., Kupc, A., Kürten, A., Kurtén, T.,
1102 Laaksonen, A., Mathot, S., Onnela, A., Praplan, A. P., Rondo, L., Santos, F. D., Schallhart, S., Schnitzhofer, R., Sipilä, M.,
1103 Tomé, A., Tsagkogeorgas, G., Vehkamäki, H., Wimmer, D., Baltensperger, U., Carslaw, K. S., Curtius, J., Hansel, A.,
1104 Petäjä, T., Kulmala, M., Donahue, N. M., and Worsnop, D. R.: Molecular understanding of atmospheric particle formation
1105 from sulfuric acid and large oxidized organic molecules, *PNAS* 110, 17223-17228,
1106 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1306973110>, 2013.

1107
1108 Schurgers, G., Hickler, T., Miller, P. A., and Arneth, A.: European emissions of isoprene and monoterpenes from the Last
1109 Glacial Maximum to present, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 2779-2797, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-6-2779-2009>, 2009.

1110
1111 Schurgers, G., Arneth, A., and Hickler, T.: Effect of climate-driven changes in species composition on regional emission
1112 capacities of biogenic compounds, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D22304, doi:10.1029/2011JD016278, 2011.

1113
1114 Sihto, S.-L., Mikkilä, J., Vanhanen, J., Ehn, M., Liao, L., Lehtipalo, K., Aalto, P. P., Duplissy, J., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-
1115 M., Boy, M., and Kulmala, M.: Seasonal variation of CCN concentrations and aerosol activation properties in boreal forest,
1116 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 13269–13285, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-13269-2011>, 2011.

1117
1118 Simpson, D., Winiwarter, W., Börjesson, G., Cinderby, S., Ferreira, A., Guenther, A., Hewitt, C. N., Janson, R., Khalil, M.
1119 A. K., Owen, S., Pierce, T. E., Puxbaum, H., Shearer, M., Steinbrecher, R., Tarrasón, L., and Öquist, M. G.: Inventorying
1120 emissions from nature in Europe, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(D7), 8113-8152, <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JD02747>, 1999.

1121
1122 Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., Kaplan, J. O., Levis, S., Lucht, W., Sykes, M. T.,
1123 Thonicke, K., and Venevsky, S.: Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the
1124 LPJ Dynamic Global Vegetation Model, *Global Change Biol.*, 9, 161-185, <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2003.00569.x>, 2003.

1125
1126
1127 Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., and Sykes, M.: Representation of vegetation dynamics in the modelling of terrestrial ecosystems:
1128 Comparing two contrasting approaches within European climate space, *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 10, 621-637,
1129 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1466-822X.2001.t01-1-00256.x>, 2001.

1130
1131 Smolander, S., He, Q., Mogensen, D., Zhou, L., Bäck, J., Ruuskanen, T., Noe, S., Guenther, A., Aaltonen, H., Kulmala, M.,
1132 and Boy, M.: Comparing three vegetation monoterpene emission models to measured gas concentrations with a model of
1133 meteorology, air chemistry and chemical transport, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 5425-5443, [https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-11-5425-](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-11-5425-2014)
1134 2014, 2014.

- 1135
1136 Staudt, M., Mandl, N., Joffre, R., and Rambal, S.: Intraspecific variability of monoterpene composition emitted by *Quercus*
1137 *ilex* leaves, *Can. J. For. Res.*, 31, 174-180, <https://doi.org/10.1139/x00-153>, 2001.
- 1138
1139 Taipale, R., Kajos, M. K., Patokoski, J., Rantala, P., Ruuskanen, T. M., and Rinne, J.: Role of de novo biosynthesis in
1140 ecosystem scale monoterpene emissions from a boreal Scots pine forest, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 2247-2255,
1141 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-8-2247-2011>, 2011.
- 1142
1143 Tarvainen, V., Hakola, H., Hellén, H., Bäck, J., Hari, P., and Kulmala, M.: Temperature and light dependence of the VOC
1144 emissions of Scots pine, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 989-998, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-989-2005>, 2005.
- 1145
1146 Tarvainen, V., Hakola, H., Rinne, J., Hellén, H., and Haapanala, S.: Towards a comprehensive emission inventory of
1147 terpenoids from boreal ecosystems, *Tellus B*, 59, 526-534, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2007.00263.x>, 2007.
- 1148
1149 Tumlinson, J. H.: The importance of volatile organic compounds in ecosystem functioning, *J. Chem. Ecol.*, 40, 212-213,
1150 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10236240701602218>, 2014.
- 1151
1152 Tunved, P., Ström, J., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V.-M., Dal Maso, M., Svenningsson, B., Lunder, C., and Hansson, H.- C.: The
1153 natural aerosol over Northern Europe and its relation to anthropogenic emissions – Implications of important climate
1154 feedbacks, *Tellus B*, 60, 473–484, doi:10.1111/j.1600- 0889.2008.00363.x, 2008.
- 1155
1156 Āupek, B., Mäkipää, R., Heikkinen, J., Peltoniemi, M., Ukonmaanaho, L., Hokkanen, T., Nöjd, P., Nevalainen, S., Lindgren,
1157 M., and Lehtonen, A.: Foliar turnover rates in Finland - comparing estimates from needle-cohort and litterfall-biomass
1158 methods, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 20, 283-304, 2015.
- 1159
1160 Twomey, S.: The influence of pollution on the shortwave albedo of clouds, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 34, 1149-1152,
1161 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1977\)034<1149:TIOPOT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1977)034<1149:TIOPOT>2.0.CO;2), 1977.
- 1162
1163 Vana, M., Komsaare, K., Hörrak, U., Mirme, S., Nieminen, T., Kontkanen, J., Manninen, H. E., Petäjä, T., Noe, S. M., and
1164 Kulmala, M.: Characteristics of new-particle formation at three SMEAR stations, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 21, 345-362, 2016.
- 1165
1166 Vanhatalo, A., Chan, T., Aalto, J., Korhonen, J. F., Kolari, P., Hölttä, T., Nikinmaa, E., and Bäck, J.: Tree water relations
1167 can trigger monoterpene emissions from Scots pine stems during spring recovery, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 5353–5363,
1168 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-5353-2015>, 2015.
- 1169
1170 Vanhatalo, A., Ghirardo, A., Juurola, E., Schnitzler, J.-P., Zimmer, I., Hellén, H., Hakola, H., and Bäck, J.: Long-term
1171 dynamics of monoterpene enzyme activities, storages and emissions in boreal Scots pine, *Biogeosciences*, 15, 5047-5060.
1172 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-15-5047-2018>, 2018.
- 1173
1174 Vehkamäki, H., Dal Maso, M., Hussein, T., Flanagan, R., Hyvärinen, A., Lauros, J., Merikanto, P., Mönkkönen, M., Pihlatie,
1175 K., Salminen, K., Sogacheva, L., Thum, T., Ruuskanen, T. M., Keronen, P., Aalto, P. P., Hari, P., Lehtinen, K. E. J., Rannik,
1176 Ü., and Kulmala, M.: Atmospheric particle formation events at Väriö measurement station in Finnish Lapland 1998-2002,
1177 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 4, 2015-2023, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-4-2015-2004>, 2004.
- 1178

1179 W accuracy of ion measurements using a Neutral cluster and Air Ion Spectrometer, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 21, 230-241, 2016.

1181
1182 Wang, L., Ibrom, A., Korhonen, J. F. J., Arnoud Frumau, K. F., Wu, J., Pihlatie, M., and Schjoerring, J. K.: Interactions
1183 between leaf nitrogen status and longevity in relation to N cycling in three contrasting European forest canopies,
1184 *Biogeosciences*, 10, 999-1011, doi:10.5194/bg-10-999-2013, 2013.

1185
1186 Wang, M., Schurgers, G., Arneth, A., Ekberg, A., and Holst, T.: Seasonal variation in biogenic volatile organic compound
1187 (BVOC) emissions from Norway spruce in a Swedish boreal forest, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 22, 353-367, 2017.

1188
1189 Yli-Juuti, T., Nieminen, T., Hirsikko, A., Aalto, P. P., Asmi, E., Hörrak, U., Manninen, H. E., Patokoski, J., Dal Maso, M.,
1190 Petäjä, T., Rinne, J., Kulmala, M., and Riipinen, I.: Growth rates of nucleation mode particles in Hyytiälä during 2003–2009:
1191 variation with particle size, season, data analysis method and ambient conditions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 12865-12886,
1192 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-12865-2011>, 2011.

1193
1194 Ylisirniö, A., Buchholz, A., Mohr, C., Li, Z., Barreira, L., Lambe, A., Faiola, C., Kari, E., Yli-Juuti, T., Nizkorodov, S. A.,
1195 Worsnop, D. R., Virtanen, A., and Schobesberger, S.: Composition and volatility of secondary organic aerosol (SOA)
1196 formed from oxidation of real tree emissions compared to simplified volatile organic compound (VOC) systems, *Atmos.*
1197 *Chem. Phys.*, 20, 5629–5644, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-5629-2020>, 2020.

1198
1199 Yuan, J. S., Himanen, S. J., Holopainen, J. K., Chen, F., and Neal Stewart Jr., C.: Smelling global climate change: mitigation
1200 of function for plant volatile organic compounds, *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 24, 323-331, 10.1016/j.tree.2009.01.012, 2009.

1201
1202 Zweifel, R., Böhm, J. P., and Häsler, R.: Midday stomatal closure in Norway spruce - reactions in the upper and lower
1203 crown, *Tree Physiol.*, 22, 1125-1136, 10.1093/treephys/22.15-16.1125, 2002.

In models, emission potentials of new and mature foliage are assumed to be similar.

VOCs emissions from new vs mature pine foliage can differ by 2-3 orders of magnitude.

Accounting for new foliage emissions significantly impacts annual emission estimates.

Enhanced springtime emissions can lead to enhanced aerosol formation and growth.

Journal Pre-proof

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Journal Pre-proof