



Amazon forest faces severe decline under the dual pressures of anthropogenic climate change and land-use change

Selma Bultan^{a,1} , Yiannis Moustakis^a , Sebastian Bathiany^b , Niklas Boers^{b,c,d}, Raphael Ganzenmüller^a , Gergana Gyuleva^e , and Julia Pongratz^{a,f}

Affiliations are included on p. 10.

Edited by David M. Lapola, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil; received September 13, 2024; accepted October 27, 2025 by Editorial Board Member Eduardo S. Brondizio

The Amazon is a key climate system component, hotspot of biodiversity and many other ecosystem functions. However, progressive rainforest degradation, driven by anthropogenic climate change and land-use change, is increasing the risk of a large-scale critical ecosystem transition. Previous studies highlight forest vulnerability to isolated or combined climate change and land-use pressures, but have not disentangled individual driver contributions. This crucial knowledge gap needs to be addressed for a holistic understanding of the risks that the rainforest is facing. Combining Earth System Model data with a robust detection and attribution framework, we assess forest decline under individual and combined pressures of climate change and land-use change. We assess abrupt shifts and nonlinearities in local and basin-wide forest decline to reveal signs of resilience loss and potentially imminent forest transitions. We identify land-use change as the dominant driver of past degradation, accounting for 80% of the historical (1950 to 2014) forest decline. Future projections reveal that up to 38% of the mid-20th century forest area could be lost by 2100, with 25% caused by continued deforestation and 13% caused by unmitigated global warming. Importantly, the risk of abrupt rather than gradual forest decline increases as global warming progresses, with a strong nonlinear trend beyond a threshold of 2.3°. These findings highlight a substantial risk of a large-scale transition, with potentially devastating consequences for the global climate system, regional water and carbon cycles, human livelihoods, and biodiversity. Limiting this risk requires rigorous forest protection and climate mitigation in line with the Paris Agreement.

climate tipping elements | climate change | land-use change | Amazon rainforest

The Amazon rainforest ecosystem takes up around 0.3 Pg C per year (1), and therefore contributes substantially to regulating the global climate system by attenuating anthropogenic global warming (1, 2). It further offers unique services by providing water supply at continental scales, hosting biodiversity, and supporting livelihoods (1–4). Intact Amazonian rainforests “recycle” moisture through repeated cycles of evapotranspiration with subsequent cloud formation and rainfall (5), strongly increasing the overall amount of available moisture. However, the Amazon is facing a widespread conversion of intact rainforest to degraded forest, savanna, and managed land (6–9). The underlying drivers are direct human activities, primarily through deforestation, and anthropogenic climate change, leading to an increasing number and severity of natural disturbances (6–9). There is growing concern that these combined pressures might push the rainforest closer to a critical threshold of deforestation, global warming, and/or moisture supply. Crossing these critical thresholds could trigger a large-scale transition to a savanna-like or degraded forest state (referred to as “tipping point”) (3, 10–14).

Recent analyses of observational data reveal a declining resilience of the rainforest over the past decades (6) and a switch from net CO₂ sink to a source in the Southeast of the Amazon (7). These findings provide alarming evidence that the Amazonian ecosystem might be approaching a critical transition, but substantial conceptual (e.g., the general existence of a tipping point, the most likely alternative stable states) (4, 12) and quantitative (e.g., the values of the critical threshold(s), the spatial patterns and timing of forest transitions) (4, 12, 15) uncertainties remain.

Predicting the future state of the Amazon rainforest and the likelihood of abrupt changes (i.e., changes at a rate much faster than the typical rates for the ecosystem) and transitions requires an analysis of the dual, i.e., individual and combined, impacts of land-use change and climate change. Previous studies have identified deforestation (20 to 50%) (3, 16, 17) and global warming (2 to 6 °C) (15) threshold ranges beyond which a large-scale transition

Significance

The Amazon, the world's largest rainforest and a potential tipping element in the Earth System, faces increasing pressures from deforestation and global warming. Understanding the individual and combined impacts of these pressures is critical for anticipating the risk of widespread forest collapse. Our study offers crucial perspectives on the effects of land-use change and climate change on forest vulnerability. We identify a global warming threshold of 2.3 °C beyond which forest decline accelerates nonlinearly. This is accompanied by a growing risk of abrupt forest loss, indicating a decline in ecosystem functions and resilience. Our findings highlight the need for immediate policy action to prevent cascading ecological and climatic impacts that extend far beyond the Amazon itself.

Author contributions: S. Bultan and J.P. designed research; S. Bultan performed research; S. Bultan, Y.M., S. Bathiany, and J.P. contributed new reagents/analytic tools; S. Bultan, Y.M., S. Bathiany, N.B., R.G., G.G., and J.P. analyzed data; and S. Bultan, Y.M., S. Bathiany, N.B., R.G., G.G., and J.P. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no competing interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission. D.M.L. is a guest editor invited by the Editorial Board.

Copyright © 2025 the Author(s). Published by PNAS. This article is distributed under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0 \(CC BY-NC-ND\)](#).

PNAS policy is to publish maps as provided by the authors.

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: selma.bultan@lmu.de.

This article contains supporting information online at <https://www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.2418813122/-/DCSupplemental>.

Published December 8, 2025.

of the Amazon rainforest could occur. However, some of these studies only consider the isolated impact of climate change (6, 18, 19) or land-use change (3, 16, 20) on the forest. Consequently, they neglect interactions between the drivers (e.g., deforestation promotes wildfires at forest edges, which leads to greenhouse gas emissions that further increase global warming) (21) and thus likely underestimate the potential for critical forest transitions. Other studies consider these interactions by assessing the combined impact of land-use change and climate change, but do not explicitly separate their individual contributions (17, 22). This means that forest changes and transitions cannot be directly linked to deforestation and/or global warming levels, which is necessary for a holistic understanding of the risk of large-scale forest transitions in the future.

Although several studies suggest that a large-scale transition to savanna vegetation in the Amazon might occur gradually over several decades (15, 23), an assessment of the local patterns of abrupt versus gradual forest changes across the Amazon basin in response to land-use change and climate change is currently lacking. However, such an assessment is crucial, since an increasing frequency of local abrupt tree mortality and forest transitions could be an early signal of a declining resilience of the ecosystem, manifesting in a reduced capacity of the forest to withstand and recover from disturbances (24–28). Uncovering these early signals is crucial, since they indicate an increasing risk of a large-scale transition of the Amazon rainforest, which could reinforce global warming to an extent that could hamper the goals of the Paris Agreement (29, 30), posing a severe threat to global socioecological well-being (15).

Here, we provide a holistic assessment of Amazon forest vulnerability to individual and combined pressures of land-use change and climate change in the past and under different future pathways. We leverage data from four state-of-the-art Earth System Models (ESMs) to assess spatial and temporal trajectories of forest decline, which we define as reductions in tree cover with or without a “structural” transition, i.e., forest transitions to a different vegetation type (e.g., savanna). We address critical gaps in existing studies by 1) disentangling the contribution of each driver to forest decline, while still accounting for their interactions and 2) uncovering abrupt forest decline as early indications of declining resilience. We thereby identify spatial hotspots of forest vulnerability and attribute nonlinear and abrupt decline to specific levels of deforestation and/or global warming. This enables us to assess the plausibility of a potentially imminent large-scale structural forest transition. Important terms and their definitions are provided in Table 1.

Results

Overview. We use data from the 6th phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6) (32), including ESMs that simulate dynamic vegetation. Models without dynamic vegetation were excluded, as they do not simulate structural transitions from forest to an alternative vegetation type (28) with changing climate and/or natural disturbances. The chosen ESMs rely on different land components to simulate the response of vegetation to land-use and changing environmental conditions and therefore differ in their (degree of) implementation of anthropogenic and natural disturbances and vegetation demography (Table 2). This allows us to sample a range of model uncertainties related to these processes. Our methodology includes several steps that are applied to historical (1950 to 2014) and future (2015 to 2100) time periods separately (Fig. 1): First, we detect for each ESM local “forest declines,” defined as any long-term decrease in tree cover fraction

Table 1. Glossary of important terms used in this study

Term	Definition
Forest decline	Reduction in tree cover fraction with or without structural transition
Forest decline with structural transition	Reduction in tree cover fraction that triggers a structural forest transition, i.e., a transition from forest to another vegetation type (e.g., savanna)
Forest decline without structural transition	Reduction in tree cover fraction that does not trigger a structural forest transition (i.e., forest remains forest)
Local forest decline	Forest decline at a specific grid cell (size of the grid cell depends on the spatial resolution of each ESM)
Basin-wide forest decline	Forest decline on the basin scale, calculated by summing the local forest decline across the Amazon basin
Resilience	The ability of an ecosystem (e.g., a forest) to recover from any type of disturbance (31)
Forest degradation	A transitory or long-term deterioration in forest conditions (e.g., properties, functions, services) without a change in land cover (forest remains forest). This can be caused by forest fires, logging, and other drivers (8)
Deforestation	A conversion from forest to other land cover types, e.g. due to agricultural expansion (8)
Tipping point	A critical threshold at which a small perturbation can qualitatively alter the state or development of a system (23)

in a specific grid cell. Forest decline may or may not imply that a structural transition from forest to another vegetation type occurs. To identify forest declines involving a structural transition, we apply model-specific tree cover thresholds (*SI Appendix*). By definition, including structural transitions in the calculation of forest area changes will introduce more sudden changes compared to only considering tree cover changes. This helps to identify spatial “hotspots” of severe forest damage and vulnerability and facilitates the comparison of historical forest dynamics in ESMs with observational datasets, which typically only capture structural forest transitions. Second, we assess the timescales over which forest declines happen, by classifying the annual rate of forest decline as either abrupt or gradual. This step is crucial, as an increasing frequency of nonlinear and abrupt forest declines indicate a loss of forest resilience and an increased risk of structural transitions (4, 24, 25). Third, we identify the main driver of forest decline, which is either anthropogenic climate change or land-use change. There is no a priori separation of the main driver of forest decline in the model output. To ensure a robust attribution of forest decline to each driver, we develop two different approaches. This is done by choosing a threshold for the carbon emissions from land-use change (=fLuc), which serves as a proxy for the degree of land-use activity in each grid cell. If the fLuc threshold is exceeded, forest decline is attributed to land-use change. If fLuc is not exceeded and the likelihood of natural

Table 2. Comparison of general features and relevant processes for forest disturbance and mortality in the four Earth System Models used in this study

ESM	Hor. res. (km)	Ensemble members	Dynamic vegetation	Natural disturbances	Land model	TCR (°C)	GWL_CC (°C)
EC-Earth3-Veg (33)	100	3	-Yes -Age-height cohorts	-Natural fires -Wind throw -Pest attacks	LPJ-GUESS v4 (34)	2.6 (35)	3.9, 4.1
GFDL-ESM4 (36)	100	1	-Yes -Age-height cohorts	-Natural fires	LM4.1 (37)	1.6 (38)	3.0, 2.3
MPI-ESM1-2-LR (39)	250	29	-Yes -No age-height cohorts	-Natural fires -Wind throw	JSBACH 3.2 (40)	1.9 (38)	2.9, 3.1
UKESM1-0-LL (41)	250 (38)	16	-Yes -No age-height cohorts		JULES-ES-1.0 (42)	2.4 (38)	4.6, 4.6

ESM = Earth System Model, Hor. res. = horizontal resolution of the land surface scheme, TCR = Transient Climate Response, GWL_CC = Global warming level at breakpoint of climate change (SSP3-7.0, SSP5-8.5).

climate variability being the driver of forest decline is very low, forest decline is attributed to climate change. At each grid cell we differentiate between 1) local forest decline imposed by local land-use change (primarily through deforestation) and 2) local forest decline due to climate change, including impacts of radiative forcing as well as impacts of remote land-use change imposed in other grid cells (*SI Appendix*). For the future period from 2015 until 2100, we consider the SSP3-7.0 and the SSP5-8.5 scenarios, which assume a high degree of future land-use change (especially deforestation) and a fossil-fuel based economy, respectively (*SI Appendix*) (43). Further, we aggregate local forest decline to basin-wide forest decline to demonstrate the vulnerability of the

whole Amazon ecosystem to different degrees of deforestation and global warming.

Basin-Wide Dynamics of Forest Decline. We analyze how much forest has declined historically due to land-use change and climate change in the Amazon basin and how much forest is projected to additionally decline until 2100 under SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5 (Fig. 2). The basin-wide area of forest decline is calculated by summing the local (i.e., grid cell) area of forest decline over the whole Amazon basin. This allows us to assess how resilient the forest has been on an ecosystem scale rather than at the local scale and whether there is a danger of basin-wide structural forest




Fig. 1. Schematic overview of this study's methodology. First, we detect local (i.e., grid cell-scale) forest decline with and without a structural transition from forest to another vegetation type. A structural transition occurs when the tree cover falls below a model-specific threshold that characterizes forest vegetation (=Forest threshold). Second, we classify the forest decline as either abrupt or gradual by fitting different types of regression models that capture abrupt or gradual change to the time series of tree cover fraction. Last, we identify the driver (land-use change or climate change) of local forest decline. This is achieved by applying a model-specific threshold to the local CO₂ flux from land-use change (=fLuc), which is a proxy for the degree of local land-use change. For visualization purposes, we show the whole time period from 1950 to 2100. However, in practice, each methodological step is applied separately to the historical (1950 to 2014) and future (2015 to 2100) time series.

transition under unabated global warming and deforestation. We further dissect overall forest decline into areas with and without structural transition (from forest to other vegetation types). This additional layer of information is provided for all models except for GFDL-ESM4, as we could not robustly quantify an optimum tree cover threshold for this model due to strong differences between the simulated historical forest area change and the forcing dataset Land-Use Harmonization 2 (LUH2) (44). Over the entire historical period from 1950 to 2014, we find that, averaged across the four employed ESMs, forest declined over an area of 0.8 (model range: 0.2 to 1.2) mio. km², corresponding to 14% (7 to 19%) of the initial (1950) forest area. Our attribution reveals that 0.6 (0.2 to 0.9) mio. km² of forest declined due to land-use change and 0.2 (0.0 to 0.3) mio. km² due to climate change (Fig. 2). Around 86% (79 to 96%) of the total historical forest decline in the Amazon basin is made up by areas with a structural transition (i.e., transition from forest to other vegetation types), whereas the remaining 14% is explained by areas without a structural forest transition (i.e., forest remains forest).

We compare the historical area of forest decline with structural forest transitions due to land-use change simulated by three ESMs (EC-Earth3-Veg, MPI-ESM1-2-LR, UKESM1-0-LL) to an observational dataset [MapBiomas (45)]. To facilitate a direct comparison between the ESMs and the observational dataset, we choose the period of the observational data (1985 to 2014) and only consider the grid cells where a structural transition from forest to

other vegetation occurs. The comparison shows that the model mean (319,094 km²) is smaller than the observational dataset (MapBiomas: 497,802 km²). However, there is a large range across the models (140,930 to 437,000 km²), which is partly related to the different initial spatial distribution of forest at the start of the historical period (SI Appendix, Fig. S1). Consequently, differences across the models are reduced when expressing the area of structural forest transition as a fraction of the forest area at the start of the observational record in 1985 (Table 3). Accordingly, all models underestimate the historical fraction of structural forest transition, slightly (MPI-ESM1-2-LR and UKESM1-0-LL) and strongly (EC-Earth3-Veg), respectively. We further compare the spatial pattern of the historical structural forest transitions between the ESMs and the observational dataset (SI Appendix, Fig. S2). This reveals that all models capture the general pattern with hotspots of land-use change induced structural forest transitions in the Southeast of the basin. However, all models show a sparser pattern of structural forest transitions compared to the observations, indicating that the land-use forcing underestimates the spatial density of deforestation. To investigate whether the spatial resolution of the ESMs might also partly explain the differences to the MapBiomas data, we lower the spatial resolution of the MapBiomas data from its native resolution of 30 m to the ESM resolution of 100 km. This shows that especially areas where structural forest transitions are sparse are not captured at the lower spatial resolution. This occurs because sparsely distributed transitions within




Fig. 2. Basin-wide forest decline per driver for 1950 to 2100. Annual forest decline across the Amazon basin is shown for the two drivers, land-use change and climate change, and two pathways (SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5). Forest decline is shown in relation to the deforested area fraction (relative to the 1950 forest area) from the LUH2 land-use forcing and the global warming level relative to 1850 (model average), respectively. The solid lines represent the model average and the shaded areas represent the model range.

Table 3. Comparison of the area affected by structural transition from forest to other vegetation due to land-use change for 1985 to 2014 simulated by three Earth System Models (ESMs) and from observational data

	Dataset	Time period	Structural forest transition (km ²)	Fraction of structural forest transition (% of 1985 forest area)	Optimum tree cover threshold to define forest vegetation (%)
ESMs	EC-Earth3-Veg (33)	1985 to 2014	140,930	3	40
	MPI-ESM1-2-LR (39)		437,000	7	75
	UKESM1-0-LL (41)		379,353	7	65
Observations	MapBiomass (45)		497,802	9	–

The model-specific optimum tree cover threshold to define forest vegetation is chosen by comparing the historical forest area change from the LUH2 land-use forcing dataset to the ESM simulations. Note that GFDL-ESM4 is not included in the table since it was not possible to robustly quantify a tree cover threshold due to strong differences between the simulated historical forest area change and the LUH2 forcing dataset.

the large area of a grid cell at the coarse resolution may not sufficiently reduce the overall tree cover fraction of the grid cell to be detected as a forest transition. Therefore, we conclude that, apart from the forcing dataset and the initial forest distribution, the spatial resolution is a major driver for differences between the ESMs and the observations.

Under the assumption that the historical deforestation rates of the past 30 y largely persist into the future (SSP3-7.0), around 0.7 (0.4 to 1.1) mio. km² of forest are projected to additionally decline by 2100 due to land-use change (Fig. 2). On the other hand, following a path of marginal deforestation until 2030 and no deforestation afterward (SSP5-8.5), only 0.2 (0.0 to 0.3) mio. km² of forest are projected to decline by 2100. Reaching a global warming level of around 5 °C by 2100 (SSP3-7.0), around 0.3 (0.1 to 0.5) mio. km² of forest are projected to decline due to climate change. Reaching an even higher global warming level of 6 °C by 2100 (SSP5-8.5), forest decline due to climate change further increases to 0.5 (0.1 to 0.9) mio. km². Around 77% (39 to 98%) and 65% (12 to 99%) of future forest decline includes a structural forest transition under SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5, respectively. Overall, land-use change is projected to reduce the initial (1950) forest area by around 25% (17 to 37%) until 2100 under continued deforestation (SSP3-7.0). Moreover, unabated climate change is projected to reduce the historical forest area by around 9% (2 to 13%) under SSP3-7.0 to 13% (4 to 20%) under SSP5-8.5.

Although continued deforestation is projected to cause a larger forest area decline compared to climate change, we find a nonlinear increase in the forest decline area due to climate change. This dynamic is consistent across all models and both scenarios (Fig. 3). We use a breakpoint detection approach (*Materials and Methods*) to show that the intensification of the impact of climate change starts at around 2073 (2069 to 2079) in SSP3-7.0 and around 2063 (2058 to 2066) in SSP5-8.5. This corresponds to a global warming level of around 3.6 °C (2.9 to 4.6 °C) (SSP3-7.0) and 3.5 °C (2.3 to 4.6 °C) (SSP5-8.5) (Table 2). As a result of the rapidly advancing negative impacts of climate change on the forest, the rate of forest decline over 2070 to 2100 increases by a factor of six (1–11) under SSP3-7.0 and eight (2–16) under SSP5-8.5 relative to 1950 to 1980.

We further assess the fraction of forest area decline that is characterized by abrupt and gradual change, respectively (Fig. 4). This serves to assess whether there is an increasing risk of abrupt change under continued climate change and land-use change, which would indicate that the forest ecosystem is lacking resilience to withstand the degree of disturbance and is in danger of a large-scale irreversible structural transition. Between 1950 and 2100, there is a higher share of gradual forest decline (SSP3-7.0: 58 to 98%, SSP5-8.5: 32 to 100%) than abrupt forest decline (SSP3-7.0: 2 to 42%, SSP5-8.5: 0 to 68%). Evaluating the models

in terms of the degree of detail in their implementation of forest demography and the most important disturbance processes (Table 2) indicates to which degree models are expected to capture the impact of species competition, climate change, and other environmental changes on forests (46). Two of the models used in this study (EC-Earth3-Veg and GFDL-ESM4) can be considered more comprehensive in their land components compared to the other two models (UKESM1-0-LL and MPI-ESM1-2-LR), since they include competition, disturbances, and mortality across different age-height cohorts (28, 34, 37). This enables EC-Earth3-Veg and GFDL-ESM4 to simulate the spatial heterogeneity of the impact of climatic changes and disturbances at a higher degree of detail compared to the other two models (32). The two models with more comprehensive land components stand out in several aspects (Fig. 4). First, they simulate a much higher fraction of abrupt forest decline (SSP3-7.0: 37 to 42%, SSP5-8.5: 42 to 68%), compared to the other two models (SSP3-7.0: 2 to 5%, SSP5-8.5: 0 to 2%). Second, they simulate that the highest share of abrupt decline across both scenarios and drivers occurs under SSP5-8.5 due to climate change (36 to 63%). Third, they simulate a consistent increase in the share of abrupt forest decline with increasing climate change over the whole future period (SSP5-8.5) and toward the end of the 21st century (under SSP3-7.0), respectively.

Local Dynamics of Forest Decline. We analyze how intensities, rates, and timing of forest decline per driver vary spatially across the Amazon basin (Fig. 5). This allows us to identify emerging hotspots of forest vulnerability and early indications of declining resilience to climate change and land-use change.

Land-use change leads to high-intensity (>40% decline relative to the 1950 forest area) forest decline on a larger scale, triggering structural transitions from forest to other vegetation types. Climate change mainly leads to low (<20%) to medium intensity (>20 to <40%) local forest decline and does not trigger structural forest transitions on a larger scale. This is at least partly explained by the fact that forest decline due to climate change intensifies only in the second half of the 21st century, while forest decline due to land-use change starts earlier (Fig. 5C).

Consistent across all models (Fig. 5B and *SI Appendix, Fig. S3*), land-use change generally leads to local forest decline in the south and southeast of the Amazon basin under historical conditions (Fig. 5C), which agrees well with the observations (45, 47). Under the SSP3-7.0 scenario, land-use change causes large-scale forest decline with a structural transition in the west of the basin with the largest impact from ca. 2040 onward. Under the SSP5-8.5 scenario, there is only a marginal additional local forest decline due to land-use change until 2100. Consistent across all models, climate change leads to local forest decline in the central Amazon




Fig. 3. Timing of nonlinear intensification of the basin-wide forest decline due to climate change across four Earth System Models for 2015 to 2100. The fraction of the 1950 forest area that is projected to decline for two pathways (SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5) is shown on the y-axis. The thin lines depict the annual data, whereas the thick lines represent the (polynomial) trend. The vertical dashed lines mark the starting point of the nonlinear forest decline.

under both SSPs and stretches west under SSP5-8.5 (Fig. 5B), with the largest impact between 2070 and 2100 (Fig. 5C).

Discussion

We show that, basin-wide, land-use change will remain the major driver of forest decline under ongoing future deforestation, reducing the 1950 forest extent by up to 25% until 2100. This would imply reaching the critical deforestation threshold range of 20 to 25% suggested by Nobre et al. (17), in which a potentially irreversible large-scale structural transition of the forest to a degraded state is risked. Our results show that such a basin-wide transition is unlikely to happen within the 21st century, even under high degrees of global warming. This is in general agreement with other recent studies (19, 22). However, we unveil a breakpoint reached around the middle of the century, at an earliest global warming level of 2.3 °C. Beyond this breakpoint, all models project that the rate of forest decline due to climate change increases nonlinearly, by a factor of up to 16 for 2070 to 2100 relative to 1950 to 1980. Along with this nonlinear increase, we find that the two models with the most comprehensive land components project an increase in the share of abrupt forest decline attributed to climate change. These findings highlight a decreasing capacity of the Amazon rainforest to withstand climatic changes, indicating a declining resilience of the ecosystem with progressing climate change (4, 24, 28). We find that the regions that are most vulnerable to forest decline in response to global warming are the

currently intact forests of central, northern (under both SSPs), and western (under SSP5-8.5) Amazon. This is critical, as an increased mortality of these forests could lead to devastating socioecological consequences, since they host an exceptionally high diversity of plant and animal species (12, 48) and belong to numerous indigenous territories (49) and protected areas (50). Apart from these local impacts, widespread structural forest transitions in the central and northern Amazon are projected to have far-reaching negative impacts on water supply in the western Amazonian countries (4, 51, 52) and further downstream (16), increasing the risk of an ecosystem-scale structural transition (24).

While ESMs are a unique tool for projecting future ecosystem states, key uncertainties persist in their simulated vegetation responses to different types of disturbances, water and nutrient limitations, and enhanced levels of CO₂ (“CO₂ fertilization” or “CO₂ effect”) (28, 53–58). These uncertainties partly stem from incomplete representations of disturbance processes (e.g., logging and fires), mortality and post-disturbance recovery, as well as species composition and forest demography (53). A substantial gap persists between observations and models (59) in the Amazon, where the former suggest that substantial parts of the forest are already experiencing potentially irreparable damage and transitions to alternative vegetation types (4, 6, 7, 14, 60), whereas the latter tend to simulate a high forest resilience even under high degrees of global warming (4, 60). This is partly explained by the fact that many ESMs do not capture the observed saturation and decline of the carbon sink in intact forests (54, 61), likely due to





Fig. 4. Fraction of the basin-wide area of forest decline characterized by abrupt versus gradual decline for 1950 to 2100. The numbers indicate the 10-y average fraction of the regional area of forest decline (relative to 1950) caused by each driver (CC = climate change or LUC = land-use change) and characterized by either abrupt (=AB) or gradual (=GR) decline for two pathways (SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5). The average across four models is shown in the first row and the individual Earth System Models are shown in the second and third rows.


an underestimation of tree mortality in response to natural disturbance (54). Furthermore, ESMs exhibit uncertainties in their representation of the Amazonian hydrological cycle. Specifically, some ESMs underestimate seasonal precipitation recycling, partly due to an underestimation of evapotranspiration (62), and use simplified assumptions on the relationship between transpiration and precipitation (63). Recent research suggests that direct negative physiological effects on plants, such as reduced transpiration caused by deforestation, drought, or rising CO_2 can lead to large-scale decreases in precipitation, which challenges ecosystem resilience (4, 64, 65). Many models do not fully incorporate these physiological effects on plants and therefore likely overestimate forest resilience (4, 15, 60). However, recent studies demonstrate that models with more detailed plant hydraulics or drought-induced leaf shedding are able to better reproduce observed carbon losses and canopy-level responses to drought, indicating a promising path forward (28, 66, 67). Despite the mentioned limitations,

ESMs have a clear advantage over observational data (68) in that they allow for clearly isolating the vegetation response to specific natural, indirect anthropogenic (e.g., increasing atmospheric CO_2) and direct anthropogenic drivers (e.g., land-use change) (69). Consequently, they are an indispensable tool for deepening our understanding of nonlinear ecosystem transitions in response to specific drivers and thresholds. We deliberately include ESMs with varying degrees of detail in their land components in our analysis to demonstrate that improving model representations of forest demography and disturbance processes also enables them to predict structural transitions and signs of decreasing forest resilience to a larger degree. This finding is crucial, as it addresses the existing gap between observations and models in the Amazon (59) and suggests that a promising path forward to bridging this gap involves improved model representations of forest mortality and natural disturbance processes, together with a stronger integration of process-based modeling and observations (60, 70).

Forest decline relative to the 1950 forest area



Intensity of forest decline relative to the 1950 forest area per driver



Timing of largest forest decline




Fig. 5. Intensity and timing of forest decline across the Amazon basin. (A) Forest decline (%) relative to the 1950 forest area. Red areas in the small insets emphasize locations where forest decline includes a structural transition from forest to other vegetation. (B) Intensity of forest decline relative to the 1950 forest area per driver. Intensity (low, med(ium), high) is classified for each driver (climate change = CC or land-use change = LUC) depending on the fractional area of forest decline between 1950 and 2100: low: >0 to 20%, medium: >20 to 40%, high: >40%. Stipplings represent areas where at least three out of four models agree on the driver of forest decline. (C) Timing of the largest forest decline. The timing is classified as the year with the largest forest decline between 1950 and 2100. All values in (A–C) represent the model average for two pathways (SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5). The data for each Earth System Model are regridded to a common horizontal resolution of 100 km.

Recent studies with fully coupled ESMs either only focus on climate change impacts on forest stability in idealized CO₂ forcing simulations (19) or use plausible future pathways, but do not disentangle climate change impacts from land-use change impacts (17, 22). Moreover, indicators of decreasing forest resilience as early signs of imminent large-scale structural transitions, such as the occurrence of local abrupt forest decline, remain largely unexplored. Our unique detection and attribution framework enables us to address these critical knowledge gaps by uncovering the spatiotemporal patterns of forest decline due to individual and combined pressures of climate change and land-use change. We further unravel early indications of declining forest resilience by analyzing the occurrence of abrupt forest decline on the local scale as well as nonlinearities in the response of the forest to ongoing global warming on the basin scale. This holistic approach provides a detailed and robust assessment of the vulnerability of the Amazon rainforest to different anthropogenic stressors, which is the base for shaping effective policy measures. Our results emphasize that, by only considering impacts of climate change and neglecting land-use change, the primary driver of forest decline and structural transitions in the Amazon is overlooked, leading to a substantial overestimation of the stability of the Amazon ecosystem. The nonlinear increase in abrupt forest decline at a minimum global warming level of 2.3 °C suggests that the resilience of the Amazon forest is diminishing and that a large-scale structural transition toward a degraded ecosystem is likely if no strong countermeasures are taken. This finding is particularly concerning, as current trajectories are projected to result in a global warming of 2.5 °C to 2.9 °C by 2100 (71). It reinforces the urgent need for increased efforts to reduce deforestation and forest degradation through forest protection, conservation, and sustainable land-use practices and for climate mitigation in line with the Paris Agreement.

Materials and Methods

Detection of Local Forest Decline and Its Characteristic Timescales. We detect local (i.e., grid cell level) forest decline with and without structural transition from forest to other vegetation types in the Amazon.

First, we calculate the annual change in tree cover fraction at each grid cell over historical (1950 to 2014) and future (2015 to 2100) time periods. The periods are treated separately since the CO₂ and land-use change forcings are based on different assumptions (*SI Appendix*). The starting point of a local forest decline marks the first time step in the time series of annual change in tree cover fraction that fulfills the following conditions: 1) The change in tree cover fraction must be negative (i.e., the forest is declining). To exclude grid cells where forest declines initially, but recovers afterward, we further apply the condition that the average annual change in tree cover fraction of all subsequent timesteps is negative (i.e., forest decline continues until the end of the respective time period). 2) It must be highly unlikely that the forest decline would occur under natural climate variability. Building on the approaches by Drijfhout et al. (22) and Smith et al. (72), the average annual change in tree cover fraction (from the start of the event until the end of the respective period) must be smaller than the 5th percentile of the annual changes in the piControl simulation. We repeat the two previous steps for different degrees of smoothing of the initial time series of tree cover fraction. This step is necessary to filter out short-term climate variability, as our analysis targets the long-term trend of forest decline. We smooth the initial time series (prior to applying conditions 1 to 2) by applying a Savitzky–Golay filter (73) over a 15-y and 30-y time window, respectively, and compare the resulting classification to the results when no smoothing filter is applied to account for uncertainties related to this assumption. We subsequently only consider local forest decline that occurs in at least two out of the three smoothing options (i.e., 15-y, 30-y, no smoothing). For models with multiple ensemble members (all except for GFDL-ESM4), we additionally quantify the signal-to-noise ratio (i.e., the ensemble mean divided by the ensemble SD (74) of the occurrence of forest decline per member (0 = no forest decline, 1 = forest decline) to estimate the magnitude of the forced

climate signal (the ensemble mean) in relation to the internal climate variability (the ensemble SD). Accordingly, if more than half of the ensemble members simulate forest decline at a specific grid cell, the signal-to-noise ratio exceeds 1, which means that the forced climate change signal exceeds the internal variability (74). This serves as an additional criterion (to the piControl criterion) to ensure that the local forest decline is caused by anthropogenic changes (either land-use change or climate change) and not internal variability.

We assess the timescales over which local forest decline occurs by classifying the annual rate of tree cover change during the time period of forest decline as either abrupt or gradual. We follow the approach by Berdugo et al. (27), where different types of models that represent gradual (linear and quadratic models) or abrupt (step model) behavior are fitted to the annual time series of local forest decline. The type of change is classified according to the group of models (abrupt or gradual) that fit best to each time series of forest decline, i.e., the model with the smallest Akaike Information Criteria value. The purpose of this analysis is to analyze whether the annual rates of forest decline become increasingly abrupt beyond a specific deforestation and/or global warming level, which indicates an increased risk for upcoming structural forest transitions. Consequently, the annual fractions of abrupt versus gradual basin-wide forest decline per driver (Fig. 4) only include grid cells that have not yet experienced structural forest transitions.

Attribution of Local Forest Decline to Climate Change and Land-Use Change. The underlying assumption for attributing local forest decline to land-use change or climate change is that the degree of land-use change can be traced back through the carbon emissions from land-use change (fLuc) (=instantaneous fluxes from land-use change to the atmosphere) that are simulated by each model. It is not a priori known which threshold for fLuc leads to the most accurate attribution of forest decline to land-use change. Therefore, we calculate a range of percentiles (80 to 100 in 1 percentile steps) for fLuc. The percentiles are calculated for each ESM from the fLuc data of all grid cells within the Amazon basin, all scenarios (SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5) and all periods (historical and future). The optimum threshold is then chosen according to two approaches. The first approach compares 1) the simulated total area of forest cover change across the Amazon region attributed to land-use change, derived from applying the respective fLuc percentile threshold with 2) the forced total area of forest change across the Amazon region from the LUH2 dataset that each model was forced with (*SI Appendix, Fig. S4*, "Attribution approach 1"). The LUH2 dataset only includes forest changes due to land-use change, making it suitable to evaluate whether our attribution of the simulated forest changes to land-use change in the ESMs is accurate. Consequently, we choose the percentile value for fLuc that leads to the highest agreement, measured by the highest Pearson correlation coefficient, between 1) and 2). The second approach (*SI Appendix, Fig. S4*, "Attribution approach 2") compares 1) the annual sum of land-use related emissions across the Amazon region (i.e., spatial integral over fLuc) with 2) the simulated annual sum of grid cells with forest decline attributed to land-use change across the Amazon region. This approach is based on the assumption that the occurrence of grid cells with forest decline increases (decreases) with increasing (decreasing) basin-wide fLuc. Consequently, if the fLuc percentile threshold is chosen too low (high), too many (few) grid cells with forest decline will be attributed to land-use change, manifesting in a higher disagreement (i.e., lower Pearson correlation coefficient) between 1) and 2).

Overall, there is a high consistency (model range across both pathways: 74 to 95%, calculated as % of grid cells with the same driver across both attribution approaches) in the resulting attribution of forest decline to land-use change between both attribution approaches (*SI Appendix, Fig. S5*), indicating a robust attribution. To account for the remaining small uncertainties related to the choice of attribution approach, we use the average of both attribution approaches in all of our results.

Intensification of Basin-Wide Forest Decline due to Climate Change. We calculate the timing and the corresponding global warming level at which the basin-wide forest decline attributed to climate change intensifies nonlinearly.

We use the PiecewiseLinFit function from the pwlf package (75) in python, which automatically finds breakpoints in a time series (here: basin-wide forest decline; see Fig. 3) according to a specified number of segments (here: 2) by minimizing the sum-of-squares error of the residuals. The approach to detect abrupt shifts via a piecewise linear regression has been shown to work particularly well in previous applications (76–78). The global warming level at the timing of the

breakpoint (Table 2) is subsequently calculated by combining information from the SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5 scenarios and the 1pctCO2 simulation. We quantify the atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration at the timing of the breakpoint from the greenhouse gas forcing of the SSPs. The simulated global warming level at the respective breakpoint in the SSP simulations will include biogeophysical effects from land-use change [e.g., warming due to deforestation (68)]. However, we want to know at which global warming level the nonlinear forest decline due to climate change starts, excluding any land-use effects. Therefore, we derive the global warming level from the simulated air temperature of the 1pctCO2 simulation, where only CO₂ is increased by 1% per year without any land-use changes (32). We quantify the global warming level at the CO₂ concentration in the 1pctCO2 simulation that is the closest to the CO₂ concentration in the SSP simulations at the respective breakpoint.

Use of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process.

During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT (GPT-5) and Google NotebookLM to improve language and grammar. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Data, Materials, and Software Availability. All CMIP6 data can be retrieved from the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF; <https://esgf-metagrid.cloud.dkrz.de>) (79). The codes used for the detection and attribution, analysis, and production of figures are available at: https://github.com/Selma-Bultan/AMZ_FOR_DECL_DRIVERS/ (80). The code used for detecting abrupt changes is available at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.16546278> (81). The Mapbiomas data is available

at: <https://brasil.mapbiomas.org/en/colecoes-mapbiomas/> (82). The LUH2 land-use forcing data is available at: <https://luh.umd.edu/data.shtml> (44).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. This work was supported by the German Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft e.V. in collaboration with Volkswagen AG (Addressing the new role of terrestrial CO₂ fluxes for climate mitigation). This work used resources of the Deutsches Klimarechenzentrum (DKRZ) granted by its Scientific Steering Committee (WLA) under Project ID bm1240. This is ClimTip contribution #39; the ClimTip project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101137601. N.B. acknowledges further funding by the Volkswagen foundation. N.B. and S. Bathiany acknowledge further support from the European Space Agency Climate Change Initiative (ESA-CCI) Tipping Elements SIRENE project (contract no. 4000146954/24/I-LR). We acknowledge the CMIP community for providing the climate model data, retained and globally distributed in the framework of the ESGF. The CMIP data of this study were replicated and made available for this study by the DKRZ.

Author affiliations: ^aDepartment of Geography, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich 80333, Germany; ^bDepartment of Aerospace and Geodesy, School of Engineering and Design, Technical University Munich, Ottobrunn 85521, Germany; ^cDepartment of Complexity Science, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam 14412, Germany; ^dDepartment of Mathematics and Global Systems Institute, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QE, United Kingdom; ^eInstitute of Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zurich, Zurich 8092, Switzerland; and ^fMax Planck Institute for Meteorology, Hamburg 20146, Germany

1. T. M. Rosan *et al.*, Synthesis of the land carbon fluxes of the Amazon region between 2010 and 2020. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **5**, 46 (2024).
2. P. Friedlingstein *et al.*, Global carbon budget 2023. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **15**, 5301–5369 (2023).
3. N. Bochow, N. Boers, The South American monsoon approaches a critical transition in response to deforestation. *Sci. Adv.* **9**, ead9973 (2023).
4. B. M. Flores *et al.*, Critical transitions in the Amazon forest system. *Nature* **626**, 555–564 (2024).
5. E. A. B. Eltahir, R. L. Bras, Precipitation recycling in the Amazon basin. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* **120**, 861–880 (1994).
6. C. A. Boulton, T. M. Lenton, N. Boers, Pronounced loss of Amazon Rainforest resilience since the early 2000s. *Nat. Clim. Change* **12**, 271–278 (2022).
7. L. V. Gatti *et al.*, Amazonia as a carbon source linked to deforestation and climate change. *Nature* **595**, 388–393 (2021).
8. D. M. Lapola *et al.*, The drivers and impacts of Amazon forest degradation. *Science* **379**, eabp8622 (2023).
9. J. A. Marengo *et al.*, Changes in climate and land-use over the Amazon region: Current and future variability and trends. *Front. Earth Sci.* **6**, 228 (2018).
10. M. Hirota, M. Holmgren, E. H. Van Nes, M. Scheffer, Global resilience of tropical forest and savanna to critical transitions. *Science* **334**, 232–235 (2011).
11. T. E. Lovejoy, C. Nobre, Amazon tipping point. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaat2340 (2018).
12. C. Nobre *et al.*, "Amazon assessment report 2021" (Science Panel for the Amazon, United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network, New York, 2021), 10.5516/rwsx6527.
13. A. Staal *et al.*, Hysteresis of tropical forests in the 21st century. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4978 (2020).
14. N. Wunderling *et al.*, Recurrent droughts increase risk of cascading tipping events by outpacing adaptive capacities in the Amazon rainforest. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **119**, e212077119 (2022).
15. D. I. Armstrong McKay *et al.*, Exceeding 1.5 degrees C global warming could trigger multiple climate tipping points. *Science* **377**, eabn7950 (2022).
16. N. Boers, N. Marwan, H. M. J. Barbosa, J. Kurths, A deforestation-induced tipping point for the South American monsoon system. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 41489 (2017).
17. C. A. Nobre *et al.*, Land-use and climate change risks in the Amazon and the need of a novel sustainable development paradigm. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 10759–10768 (2016).
18. D. Nian *et al.*, A potential collapse of the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation may stabilise eastern Amazonian rainforests. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **4**, 470 (2023).
19. I. M. Parry, P. D. L. Ritchie, P. M. Cox, Evidence of localised Amazon rainforest dieback in CMIP6 models. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **13**, 1667–1675 (2022).
20. D. V. Spracklen, L. Garcia-Carreras, The impact of Amazonian deforestation on Amazon basin rainfall. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **42**, 9546–9552 (2015).
21. P. M. Brando *et al.*, The gathering firestorm in southern Amazonia. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay1632 (2020).
22. S. Drijfhout *et al.*, Catalogue of abrupt shifts in Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change climate models. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, E5777–E5786 (2015).
23. T. M. Lenton *et al.*, Tipping elements in the Earth's climate system. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 1786–1793 (2008).
24. G. Forzieri, V. Dakos, N. G. McDowell, A. Ramdane, A. Cescatti, Emerging signals of declining forest resilience under climate change. *Nature* **608**, 534–539 (2022).
25. Z. Ratajczak *et al.*, Abrupt change in ecological systems: Inference and diagnosis. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **33**, 513–526 (2018).
26. Y. Liu, M. Kumar, G. G. Katul, A. Porporato, Reduced resilience as an early warning signal of forest mortality. *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 880–885 (2019).
27. M. Berdugo, J. J. Gaitan, M. Delgado-Baquerizo, T. W. Crowther, V. Dakos, Prevalence and drivers of abrupt vegetation shifts in global drylands. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **119**, e2123393119 (2022).
28. I. M. Cano *et al.*, Abrupt loss and uncertain recovery from fires of Amazon forests under low climate mitigation scenarios. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **119**, e2203200119 (2022).
29. S. Bathiany, M. Claussen, V. Brovkin, T. Raddatz, V. Gayler, Combined biogeophysical and biogeochemical effects of large-scale forest cover changes in the MPI earth system model. *Biogeosciences* **7**, 1383–1399 (2010).
30. Y. Malhi *et al.*, The regional variation of aboveground live biomass in old-growth Amazonian forests. *Glob. Change Biol.* **12**, 1107–1138 (2006).
31. I. Ibáñez *et al.*, Forest resilience under global environmental change: Do we have the information we need? A systematic review. *PLoS One* **14**, e0222207 (2019).
32. V. Eyring *et al.*, Overview of the coupled model intercomparison project phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **9**, 1937–1958 (2016).
33. R. Döscher *et al.*, The EC-Earth3 Earth system model for the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 6. *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **15**, 2973–3020 (2022).
34. M. Forrest, H. Tost, J. Lelieveld, T. Hickler, Including vegetation dynamics in an atmospheric chemistry-enabled general circulation model: Linking LPJ-GUESS (v4.0) with the EMAC modelling system (v2.53). *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **13**, 1285–1309 (2020).
35. F. J. M. M. Nijse, P. M. Cox, M. S. Williamson, Emergent constraints on transient climate response (TCR) and equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) from historical warming in CMIP5 and CMIP6 models. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **11**, 737–750 (2020).
36. J. P. Dunne *et al.*, GFDL's ESM2 global coupled climate-carbon earth system models. Part I: Physical formulation and baseline simulation characteristics. *J. Clim.* **25**, 6646–6665 (2012).
37. E. Shevliakova *et al.*, The land component LM4.1 of the GFDL earth system model ESM4.1: Model description and characteristics of land surface climate and carbon cycling in the historical simulation. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **16**, e2023MS003922 (2024).
38. V. K. Arora *et al.*, Carbon-concentration and carbon-climate feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models. *Biogeosciences* **17**, 4173–4222 (2020).
39. T. Mauritsen *et al.*, Developments in the MPI-M Earth System Model version 1.2 (MPI-ESM1.2) and its response to increasing CO₂. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **11**, 998–1038 (2019).
40. C. H. Reick *et al.*, JSBACH 3—The Land Component of the MPI Earth System Model: Documentation of Version 3.2. 4990986 (Version 240, Berichte zur Erdsystemforschung, Hamburg, Germany, 2021). 10.17617/2.3279802.
41. A. A. Sellar *et al.*, UKESM1: Description and evaluation of the U.K. Earth System Model. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **11**, 4513–4558 (2019).
42. D. McNeill, E. Robertson, A. Wiltshire, Constraining the carbon cycle in JULES-ES-1.0. *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **17**, 1059–1089 (2024).
43. B. C. O'Neill *et al.*, The scenario model intercomparison project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6. *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **9**, 3461–3482 (2016).
44. G. C. Hurtt *et al.*, Harmonization of global land-use change and management for the period 850–2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6. *Geosci. Model. Dev.* **13**, 5425–5464 (2020).
45. C. M. Souza *et al.*, Reconstructing three decades of land-use and land cover changes in Brazilian biomes with Landsat archive and Earth Engine. *Remote Sens.* **12**, 2735 (2020).
46. N. G. McDowell *et al.*, Pervasive shifts in forest dynamics in a changing world. *Science* **368**, eaaz9463 (2020).
47. F. G. Assis *et al.*, TerraBrasilis: A spatial data analytics infrastructure for large-scale thematic mapping. *ISPRS Int. J. Geo Inf.* **8**, 513 (2019).
48. H. Ter Steege *et al.*, Mapping density, diversity and species-richness of the Amazon tree flora. *Commun. Biol.* **6**, 1130 (2023).
49. Red Ambiental de Información Socioambiental Georreferenciada (RAISG), "Indigenous territories" (2023). <https://www3.socioambiental.org/geo/RAISGMapaOnline/>. Accessed 12 November 2025.
50. Red Ambiental de Información Socioambiental Georreferenciada (RAISG), "Natural protected areas" (2023). <https://www3.socioambiental.org/geo/RAISGMapaOnline/>. Accessed 12 November 2025.
51. A. C. F. De Vasconcelos *et al.*, Land-use dynamics in Brazilian La Plata Basin and anthropogenic climate change. *Clim. Change* **127**, 73–81 (2014).

52. W. Weng, M. K. B. Luedeke, D. C. Zemp, T. Lakes, J. P. Kropp, Aerial and surface rivers: Downwind impacts on water availability from land-use changes in Amazonia. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **22**, 911–927 (2018).
53. R. A. Fisher *et al.*, Vegetation demographics in earth system models: A review of progress and priorities. *Glob. Change Biol.* **24**, 35–54 (2018).
54. A. Koch, W. Hubau, S. L. Lewis, Earth system models are not capturing present-day tropical forest carbon dynamics. *Earths Fut.* **9**, e2020EF001874 (2021).
55. C. Chen, W. J. Riley, I. C. Prentice, T. F. Keenan, CO₂ fertilization of terrestrial photosynthesis inferred from site to global scales. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **119**, e2115627119 (2022).
56. F. Hofhansl *et al.*, Amazon forest ecosystem responses to elevated atmospheric CO₂ and alterations in nutrient availability: Filling the gaps with model-experiment integration. *Front. Earth Sci.* **4** (2016), 10.3389/feart.2016.00019/full.
57. C. Terrer *et al.*, Nitrogen and phosphorus constrain the CO₂ fertilization of global plant biomass. *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 684–689 (2019).
58. A. P. Walker *et al.*, Integrating the evidence for a terrestrial carbon sink caused by increasing atmospheric CO₂. *New Phytol.* **229**, 2413–2445 (2021).
59. C. Huntingford *et al.*, Simulated resilience of tropical rainforests to CO₂-induced climate change. *Nat. Geosci.* **6**, 268–273 (2013).
60. T. M. Lenton *et al.*, Remotely sensing potential climate change tipping points across scales. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 343 (2024).
61. W. Hubau *et al.*, Asynchronous carbon sink saturation in African and Amazonian tropical forests. *Nature* **579**, 80–87 (2020).
62. J. C. A. Baker, D. V. Spracklen, Divergent representation of precipitation recycling in the Amazon and the Congo in CMIP6 models. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **49**, e2021GL095136 (2022).
63. M. Baudena, O. A. Tuinenburg, P. A. Ferdinand, A. Staal, Effects of land-use change in the Amazon on precipitation are likely underestimated. *Global Change Biol.* **27**, 5580–5587 (2021).
64. D. M. Lapola *et al.*, Not just semantics: CO₂ fertilization can be a disturbance leading to worldwide forest degradation. *Plants People Planet* **7**, 638–643 (2025).
65. G. Sampaio *et al.*, CO₂ physiological effect can cause rainfall decrease as strong as large-scale deforestation in the Amazon. *Biogeosciences* **18**, 2511–2525 (2021).
66. H. Wey, J. Pongratz, J. E. M. S. Nabel, K. Naudts, Effects of increased drought in Amazon forests under climate change: Separating the roles of canopy responses and soil moisture. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences* **127**, e2021JG006525 (2022).
67. P. Papastefanou *et al.*, Recent extreme drought events in the Amazon rainforest: Assessment of different precipitation and evapotranspiration datasets and drought indicators. *Biogeosciences* **19**, 3843–3861 (2022).
68. J. Pongratz *et al.*, Land-use effects on climate: Current state, recent progress, and emerging topics. *Curr. Clim. Change Rep.* **7**, 99–120 (2021), 10.1007/s40641-021-00178-y.
69. M. O'Sullivan *et al.*, Process-oriented analysis of dominant sources of uncertainty in the land carbon sink. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 4781 (2022).
70. J. Au *et al.*, Forest productivity recovery or collapse? Model-data integration insights on drought-induced tipping points. *Global Change Biol.* **29**, 5652–5665 (2023).
71. Climate Action Tracker, 2100 Warming Projections: Emissions and expected warming based on pledges and current policies. <https://climateactiontracker.org/global/temperatures/>. Accessed 10 August 2025.
72. T. Smith, D. Traxl, N. Boers, Empirical evidence for recent global shifts in vegetation resilience. *Nat. Clim. Change* **12**, 477–484 (2022), 10.1038/s41558-022-01352-2.
73. A. Savitzky, M. J. E. Golay, Smoothing and differentiation of data by simplified least squares procedures. *Anal. Chem.* **36**, 1627–1639 (1964).
74. C. Deser, A. S. Phillips, A range of outcomes: The combined effects of internal variability and anthropogenic forcing on regional climate trends over Europe. *Nonlinear Process. Geophys.* **30**, 63–84 (2023).
75. C. Jekel, G. Venter, pwlf: A Python Library for Fitting 1D Continuous Piecewise Linear Functions (2019). https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Jekel-2/publication/331231072_pwlf_A_Python_Library_for_Fitting_1D_Continuous_Piecewise_Linear_Functions/links/5c9107f945851564fae8aa57/pwlf-A-Python-Library-for-Fitting-1D-Continuous-Piecewise-Linear-Functions.pdf?origin=publication_detail.
76. S. Bathiany, J. Hidding, M. Scheffer, Edge detection reveals abrupt and extreme climate events. *J. Clim.* **33**, 6399–6421 (2020).
77. M. Mudelsee, Ramp function regression: A tool for quantifying climate transitions. *Comput. Geosci.* **26**, 293–307 (2000).
78. K. Riechers, N. Boers, Significance of uncertain phasing between the onsets of stadial-interstadial transitions in different Greenland ice core proxies. *Clim. Past* **17**, 1751–1775 (2021).
79. Deutsches Klimarechenzentrum (DKRZ), Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) Metagrid. <https://esgf-metagrid.cloud.dkrz.de/>. Accessed 10 November 2025.
80. S. Bultan, Code Repository for "Amazon forest faces severe decline under the dual pressures of anthropogenic climate change and land-use change." Github. https://github.com/Selma-Bultan/AMZ_FOR_DECL_DRIVERS/. Deposited 9 November 2025.
81. M. Berdugo, V. Dakos, Data and codes for the paper Abrupt shifts govern ecosystem productivity dynamics in global drylands. Figshare. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.16546278>. Deposited 26 September 2022.
82. MapBiomas Project, Collection 8 of annual land cover and land use maps. MapBiomas. <https://brasil.mapbiomas.org/en/colecoes-mapbiomas/>. Accessed 20 July 2025.