Interannual Variability of Carbon Uptake of Secondary Forests in the Brazilian Amazon (2004-2014)
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Abstract: Tropical secondary forests (SF) play an important role in the global carbon cycle as a major terrestrial carbon sink. Here, we use high-resolution TerraClass data set for tracking land use activities in the Brazilian Amazon from 2004–2014 to detect spatial patterns and carbon sequestration dynamics of secondary forests (SF). By integrating satellite lidar and radar observations, we found the SF area in the Brazilian Amazon increased from approximately 22 Mha (106 ha) in 2004 to 28 Mha in 2014. However, the expansion in area was also accompanied by a dynamic land use activity that resulted in about 50% recycling of SF area annually from frequent clearing and abandonment. Consequently, the average age of SF remained less than 10 years (age ~8.2 with one standard deviation of 3.2 spatially) over the period of the study. Estimation of changes of carbon stocks shows that SF accumulates approximately 8.5 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) aboveground biomass during the first 10 years after clearing and abandonment, 4.5 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) for the next 10 years followed by a more gradual increase of 3 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) from 20 to 30 years with much slower rate thereafter. The effective carbon uptake of SF in Brazilian Amazon was negligible \((0.06 \pm 0.03 \text{ PgC year}\(^{-1}\)) during this period, but the interannual variability was significantly larger \((\pm 0.2 \text{ PgC year}^{-1})\). If the SF areas were left to grow without further clearing for 100 years, it would absorb about 0.14 PgC year\(^{-1}\) from the atmosphere, partially compensating the emissions from current rate of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon.

1. Introduction

Tropical forests contain more than a third of global terrestrial carbon pool (Edward T. A. Mitchard, 2018; S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011). Over the past four decades, these forests have experienced significant changes from human activities in the form of large-scale deforestation and forest degradation (e.g., logging and fire disturbance) to support agriculture, livestock, and timber industries (Gibbs et al., 2007; Hecht, 2014; Pearson et al., 2017). The estimates of carbon loss from deforestation and land-use change over the last decade vary from 0.8 to 2.9 PgC year\(^{-1}\) (Harris et al., 2012; Pan et al., 2011; A. Tyukavina et al., 2015). From all tropical countries, Brazil stands out as the country with largest stock of forest carbon (~23–30% of all pan-tropical countries) (S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011) and the largest source of carbon emissions from forest clearing (Hansen et al., 2013; Harris et al., 2012). Despite a significant effort to reduce more than 70% of carbon emissions from gross deforestation over the past decade (Zarin et al., 2016), the Brazilian Amazon remains the top contributor to total carbon emissions (A. Tyukavina et al., 2015) among tropical countries, mainly due to extensive large-scale logging activities and increased fire frequency from shifting cultivation and clearing for grazing land (Aragão et al., 2014, 2018; Alexandra Tyukavina et al., 2017).

To combat these losses, there has been a major effort in restoring tropical forests through several initiatives such as REDD+ and CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) among others (Alexander et al., 2011; Sayer et al., 2004). Restoration of secondary forests (SF) is a slow process that can partially offset the rapid loss of carbon from forest clearing through fire (slash and burn) or degradation from timber extraction (Bongers et al., 2015). In most tropical ecosystems, SF regeneration may occur in the absence of any policy incentives through abandonment of actively managed lands (grazing and crop lands) due to socioeconomic drivers such as the decline of commodity price, changes of globalized demands for food production, and migration or urbanization (Hecht & Saatchi, 2007; Olszewski & Benítez, 2005; Rudel et al., 2004). Regardless of the
cause of regeneration, secondary forests can be highly productive, having an average recovery rate of about 3.05 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) in the Neotropics, approximately 11–20 times the uptake rate of an old growth forest (Bongers et al., 2015; Poorter et al., 2016). The rate of SF recovery and carbon accumulation, however, depends largely on the history of the land use before abandonment and a suite of environmental factors such as the soil fertility, climate, and the characteristics of regenerating landscape (Banks-Leite et al., 2014; Brown & Lugo, 1990; Johnson et al., 2001, 2001; Poorter et al., 2016; Uhl, 1987). Because of the extent of SF across tropics, the natural regeneration of these forests is widely considered to be an effective low-cost mechanism for carbon sequestration (Chazdon et al., 2016), and SF are often reported as a significant contribution to the global terrestrial carbon sinks (A. R. Houghton & Nassikas, 2018; Pan et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that Neotropical SF take a median time of 66 years to recover about 90% of the original forest carbon (Poorter et al., 2016). Potentially, Neotropical secondary forests may become a large carbon sink, with one estimate of 8.5 PgC in the tropical Latin America over 40 years (Chazdon et al., 2016), where Brazil has the bulk of that carbon sink potential (70%) (Chazdon et al., 2016).

The sequestration potential of SF is estimated through book-keeping models (R. A. Houghton et al., 2015) based on approximate data reported by tropical countries to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO). However, these estimates may exaggerate the role of secondary forests for absorbing atmospheric carbon for two reasons: (1) Most tropical countries do not have reliable land use monitoring systems in place and have no data to report on the area of secondary forests, and (2) the reported data do not include the dynamic land use activities of frequent reclearing and regeneration process (Pan et al., 2011). Therefore, considerable uncertainty remains regarding the carbon uptake of SF across global forest ecosystems (Pugh et al., 2019).

In this study, we focus on the carbon sequestration of SF in the Brazilian Amazon because of their large spatial extent and potential contribution to the global carbon balance. Recent studies and observations of the Brazilian Amazon suggest that while SF has been highlighted for its great capacity for carbon sequestration, there is little contribution from SF to the basin-wide carbon sink because of frequent clearing (Davidson et al., 2012). Similarly, the Brazilian national greenhouse gas emission model predicts that secondary regrowth has a small impact on the carbon balance because of the short duration of regeneration before reclearing of the land (Aguilar et al., 2012). Therefore, although the area of SF has increased by a factor of 5 over the period 1978–2002, the mean age of SF predicted from sequestration models remained less than 5 years over the 25-year period (Neeff et al., 2006). However, with more than a decade long decline of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon in this century (Souza et al., 2013; Alexandra Tyukavina et al., 2017), the fate of SF could change.

Here, we use the spatial distribution of SF areas produced by the TerraClass program from 2004 to 2014 (de Almeida et al., 2016), along with ground, lidar, and radar remote sensing data to quantify the spatial and temporal dynamics of SF in the Brazilian Amazon and its carbon sequestration in the 21st Century. By focusing on the age and carbon accumulation of SF through time series analysis, we show the year-to-year changes of carbon uptake from regeneration and emissions from reclearing process and quantify, for the first time, the contribution of SF carbon sequestration in the Brazilian Amazon for global carbon balance.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Materials

2.1.1. Maps of Deforestation and Secondary Forests

We used the deforestation and SF classification maps produced by the National Institute of Space Research (INPE). The deforestation database from the PRODES (Projeto de Monitoramento do Desmatamento na Amazônia Legal por Satélite) project (available at http://bit.ly/1QAp25M) records the time of old-growth forest clearing in the Brazilian Amazon from 1997 to 2016 at 30–60 m spatial resolutions and marks patches of deforestation with at least 6.25 ha in size (Aguilar-Amuchastegui et al., 2014; Hansen et al., 2013; Alexandra Tyukavina et al., 2017). PRODES product does not account for repeated clearing activities at the landscape; that is, for each pixel, the product only records the time of the first deforestation event. This will, therefore, not allow detection of any regeneration once a forest area has been cleared, avoiding any double counting problem.

To decouple deforestation of old-growth forest from deforestation of secondary forests, we used SF classification maps produced and continually updated by the TerraClass project over the Brazilian Amazon.
TerraClass is a complementary project to the PRODES deforestation products that provides detailed information about the land use and forest resurgence in areas cleared from deforestation (de Almeida et al., 2016). The TerraClass products have a 30-m spatial resolution and cover different time periods (2004, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014), allowing for statistical analysis of changes of land use and the dynamics of tropical SF areas.

### 2.1.2. ALOS PALSAR Data

The ALOS (Advance Land Observation Satellite, “DAICHI”) PALSAR (Phased Array L-band Synthetic Aperture Radar sensor) Fine-Beam Dual-polarization (FBD) image data with 25 m pixel size after terrain correction and orthorectification were used as the key remote sensing observations to map and monitor forest aboveground biomass (AGB; in Mg ha$^{-1}$) or carbon (AGC) of SF. L-band Radar ($\sim$24 cm wavelength) observations are sensitive to AGB in most forest types globally, where AGB does not exceed 100–150 Mg/ha (Bouvet et al., 2018; E. T. A. Mitchard et al., 2009; S. Saatchi, Marlier, et al., 2011; Yu & Saatchi, 2016). The ALOS PALSAR backscatter products are available globally from a joint project between JAXA and Japan Resources Observation System Organization over the global forested areas for the periods of 2007–2010, 2015, and 2016 at 25 m spatial resolution. We used ALOS PALSAR mosaic images acquired over the Brazilian Amazon, at HH and HV wave polarization mainly during the dry season when the variations in soil moisture and other environmental conditions were relatively small (Rosenqvist et al., 2007; Shimada et al., 2014). We aggregated the backscatter data to 100-m spatial resolution using spatial averaging, in order to reduce pixel level speckle noise and improve data quality.

### 2.1.3. GLAS Lidar Data

The spaceborne Geoscience Laser Altimeter System (GLAS) lidar waveform measurements were used in this study as a complementary source for the quantification of forest aboveground biomass. The GLAS sensor aboard the Ice, Cloud and land Elevation Satellite (ICESat) was the first spaceborne waveform sampling lidar instrument to provide measurements of forest height and vertical structure. GLAS emitted short duration laser pulses and recorded the echoes reflected from the Earth’s surface (Abshire et al., 2005). Individual non-contiguous samples have an effective resolution of approximately 0.25 ha (varying among lasers) with global sampling (Abshire et al., 2005; Lefsky et al., 2005; Sun et al., 2008). For vegetated surfaces, the return echoes or waveforms from GLAS lidar are the function of canopy vertical distribution of scattering elements (leaves and branches) and ground elevation within the area illuminated by the laser (the footprint), thus reflecting the canopy structure information (Lefsky et al., 2005; S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011; Sun et al., 2008).

We used the GLAS/ICESat L2 Global Land Surface Altimetry Data (GLAH14) product and filtered the original data using a series of stringent quality controls and processing steps (Abshire et al., 2005; Mahoney et al., 2014; Sun et al., 2008; Zwally et al., 2014). The first important step is the cloud filter. We selected the GLAS laser pulses only when the quality flag for atmosphere (atm_char_flag) equals to 0 (clear sky). Another issue of GLAS retrieval is signal saturation. Lidar waveforms captured by the GLAS instrument may have pulse distortions when the received energy exceeds the linear dynamic range of GLAS detector. This happens often in areas with flat and bright surfaces. Saturated return signals in forests may not accurately preserve the shape of the scattering elements within canopy. In this study, we removed the saturated GLAS shots by investigating the Saturation Correction Flag. To avoid the false detection of ground and the mixture of signals from both canopy and ground, we also filtered all data with calculated slopes larger than 10°. For the slope calculation, we applied the independent slope method (ISM) by estimating the terrain slope from the GLAS waveform (Mahoney et al., 2014) at each footprint location. The concept of ISM slope calculation relies solely on the GLAS data itself and calculates the ground slope based on the shape of last waveform peak for each lidar shot. The same method has been applied successfully to our other studies related to the Amazon basin (Yang et al., 2018). We estimated GLAS-derived Lorey’s Height (LH) as the basal area weighted forest height, for broadleaf forests based on a calibration from ground plots distributed in the Brazilian Amazon (Lefsky, 2010; Lefsky et al., 2005, 2007) for the GLAS observational period from 2003 to 2008.

### 2.2. Methods

#### 2.2.1. Spatial and Temporal Analysis

We resampled all the raster data sets (TerraClass—30 m; PRODES—30 m/60 m; ALOS—25 m) to grid cells of 100 meters. For our analysis of TerraClass data, we combined three classes, secondary forest, dirty pasture, and regeneration into one class—SF, as they all represent a form of secondary regeneration phase but with...
different trajectories of biomass accumulation and dynamics. We developed maps at 100-m (1-ha) with two types of SF pixels: pure SF with 100% of coverage within the pixel and mixed SF with partial coverage of SF from the original 30-m pixel data. For each SF classification map at 100-m spatial resolution, we also produced the accompanied SF fraction map, showing the fraction of SF found in each 100-m pixel. For PRODES product, we used the majority resampling for the aggregation from its original resolution (30–60 m) to 100-m, as the values in PRODES represent the date of deforestation.

The classified SF maps were further analyzed for SF spatial distribution. SF patches in each year with available TerraClass data were calculated using the texture feature of spatial connectivity. We defined an SF patch as the combination of pixels, which are connected to each other. The connectivity only checks the immediate neighbors of the central pixel at the horizontal and vertical directions. This analysis provides information on the distribution of the SF patch size and the spatial extent of activities associated with forest clearing and land abandonment.

### 2.2.2. Forest Biomass Models

Assuming that the GLAS-estimated Lorey’s Height (LH; in meter) at footprint level (~70 m in diameter) can well represent the pixel-level forest canopy at the 100-m spatial resolution, we adopted a well-studied allometric relationship between aboveground biomass (AGB; in Mg ha\(^{-1}\)) and LH for the tropical forests in Amazonia that works well from 1-ha to 1 km scale (S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011):

\[
AGB = 0.6011LH^{1.894},
\]

where the coefficients of the model were derived using ground plots distributed in different regions of Amazonia, and the unit of AGB is the weight of aboveground biomass in Mg (10^6 grams) per hectare. The above model assumes that the average wood density (WD) of trees within the plots was approximately 0.6 g cm\(^{-3}\). Although this average value may be suitable for SFs that are distributed in the southern and eastern Amazonia (Ketterings et al., 2001), there will be some uncertainty due to WD variations across the landscape when using equation 1 (S. Saatchi et al., 2015).

Given the GLAS-derived AGB estimates in 2007 and 2008 (overlapped period with ALOS), we extracted the corresponding ALOS HV backscatter data (\(\sigma_0\)) at the same locations for the SF region of TerraClass 2008, coincident with GLAS footprints. We built a parametric model between GLAS-derived AGB (in Mg ha\(^{-1}\)) and \(\sigma_0\) from ALOS PALSAR values (in dB) in the form of log-quadratic function (E. T. A. Mitchard et al., 2009; S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011):

\[
\sigma_0 = \exp(a + b \times \ln(AGB) + c \times (\ln(AGB))^2),
\]

where \(a\), \(b\), and \(c\) are the coefficients for the regression function. The fitting process of this regression was only performed over pure SF pixels that have GLAS observations to improve the model accuracy. Due to the saturation effect of Radar data (ALOS) in dense tropical forests, we set an upper threshold (150 Mg/ha) for the AGB model in equation 2; that is, for any backscatter values producing an AGB value larger than 150 Mg/ha according to equation 2, we set AGB to be 150 Mg/ha (Yu & Saatchi, 2016). When biomass reaches 100 Mg/ha (Brown & Lugo, 1990; Wandelli & Fearnside, 2015), radar signal saturation starts to introduce uncertainty in the estimation of biomass in older secondary forests (>10 years). The setting of 150 Mg/ha as a hard threshold of AGB prediction also prevents extreme values due to the exponential form in the model, when the noisy measurement is beyond the model’s pseudo-linear range.

The total living carbon density (TCD; in Pg C) of SF was calculated by including the belowground biomass using allometric equation relating to AGB (S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011):

\[
TCD = 0.49F_{sf} \times (AGB + 0.489AGB^{0.89}),
\]

where \(F_{sf}\) is the area fraction (ranging from 0 to 1) of SF in each 1-ha pixel. Using the TerraClass maps in 2008 and 2010, we created both AGB and TCD maps. Note that we assumed the woody biomass has 49% carbon on a weight/weight basis for all secondary forests (Hartmann et al., 2013). The second term of equation 3 (\(BGB = 0.489AGB^{0.89}\)) represents below-ground biomass (BGB; in Mg ha\(^{-1}\)).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sf04</th>
<th>sf08</th>
<th>sf10</th>
<th>hv07</th>
<th>hv08</th>
<th>hv09</th>
<th>PRODES data (age)</th>
<th>Final age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>≥1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv07*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv07*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv07*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv07*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;hv07*0.8</td>
<td>&gt;hv08*0.8</td>
<td>=8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes the Pixel Classified as SF in TerraClass, and “N” Denotes the Pixel Classified as non-SF.

Table 1: Decision Tree Based (DTB) Age Quality Assessment (QA) to Estimate Forest Age in 2010. Here, sf04, sf08, and sf10 are the SF Maps in 2004, 2008, and 2010; hv07, hv08, and hv09 are the ALOS HV Values in 2007, 2008, and 2009. “Y” Denotes the Pixel Classified as SF in TerraClass, and “N” Denotes the Pixel Classified as non-SF.

with the availability of ALOS-PALSAR data only from 2007 to 2010, and the TerraClass data starting from 2004, the confirmation of forest age is limited to just a few years. Using PRODES-derived age map in 2010 as the base map, we applied additional corrections by checking values in TerraClass and ALOS HV backscatter and built a decision-tree-based (DTB) age quality assessment (QA) to determine the approximate forest age (Table 1). We started the DTB age QA from an initial guess of forest age using the PRODES-derived data. Secondly, we used TerraClass maps whenever available to check if the age is within reasonable classes (e.g., if a pixel defined by PRODES has an age of 1 or 2 years in 2010, the TerraClass map of 2010 should mark it as SF, whereas the TerraClass 2008 should show as non-SF). Thirdly, we used the PALSAR HV backscatter as an additional check of disturbance. We defined the observable disturbance as, during the period of ALOS observations, HV backscatter of current year being lower than that of previous year by 20% or more. Once disturbance was found, and the forest age determined from previous steps should be incorrect.

2.2.4. Forest Growth Model

To study the relationship between forest age and AGB/Carbon, we selected the pure SF pixels based on the TerraClass 2010 map. Applying the DTB age QA defined above, we obtained eight categories of age classes from 1 to 8 years. The final forest age versus AGB/Carbon relationship was estimated using the median AGB (in Mg ha⁻¹) values for ages (in years) from 1 to 8 years, in the form of the nonlinear Chapman-Richard growth function (Orihuela-Belmonte et al., 2013):

\[
\text{Age} = A \times \ln(1 + \alpha \text{AGB}^\beta),
\]

where \(A\), \(\alpha\), and \(\beta\) are the coefficients to fit for the nonlinear relationship. We also validated our growth function using field-measured estimates (Marín-Spiotta et al., 2007; Poorter et al., 2016) for forest ages of 10, 20, and 30. Combining equations 2, 3, and 4, we can generate the representative forest age map directly from ALOS HV imagery acquired over the Brazilian Amazon. The ALOS PALSAR prediction of forest age from AGB estimation ignores the variations in the growth pathways (Poorter et al., 2016) by assuming an average growth trajectory. We acknowledge that the choice of the average growth trajectory may introduce large uncertainty for determining forest age at the pixel level. However, the estimates of SF age across the entire region will provide us with a mean history of forest biomass accumulations without the the detailed knowledge of land use history, soil productivity, and climate conditions (Brown & Lugo, 1990; Poorter et al., 2016). For any studies interested in accurate mapping of forest age at the landscape scales, models with explicit representation of other confounding factors must be considered (Chazdon, 2003; Neeff & dos Santos, 2005; Wandelli & Fearnside, 2015). The main methodology used in this study for AGB and Age estimations was summarized in Figure 1.

2.2.5. Uncertainty in Biomass Estimation

The errors associated with the pixel-level GLAS-derived AGB model (\(\sigma_{\text{pix}}\)) have the following components (Chen et al., 2015):

\[
\sigma_{\text{pix}} = \sigma_{\text{model}} + \sigma_{\text{uncertainty}}.
\]
$\sigma^2_{\text{pix}} = \sigma^2_{\epsilon, \text{pix}} + \sigma^2_{f, \text{pix}} + \sigma^2_{z, \text{pix}}$  \tag{5}

where $\sigma^2_{\epsilon, \text{pix}}$ is the residual variance from the regression model and often modeled as the relative contribution to predicted values so as to account for heteroscedasticity; $\sigma^2_{f, \text{pix}}$ is the error variance of predictions associated with model parameters; and $\sigma^2_{z, \text{pix}}$ is the error associated with measured lidar metrics.

According to the original paper using this model (S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011), the residual error of tropical forest could reach ~30% of AGB prediction. Because of the lack of plot-level samples used in the original paper and the associated error assessment of independent variable (Lefsky, 2010), we estimated both variance terms $\sigma^2_{f, \text{pix}}$ and $\sigma^2_{z, \text{pix}}$ as 16% of AGB prediction (Chen et al., 2015), and thus, the total pixel-level relative AGB prediction error could be ~38%. Our ALOS-PALSAR AGB model (equation 2) was developed based on the GLAS observations, suggesting that the new AGB model inherits the 38% relative AGB error in the new $\sigma^2_{\epsilon, \text{pix}}$ term and enlarges the pixel-level AGB prediction errors. Applying equation 5 to the inversion form of equation 2, we can approximate the propagated error of our AGB estimation.

Uncertainty calculation of regional mean AGB needs to consider the covariance of estimated errors. When different sources of errors are assumed independent, the error variance of regional mean can be expressed as

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \text{cov}(\sigma_{\epsilon,i}, \sigma_{\epsilon,j}) \right) + \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \text{cov}(\sigma_{f,i}, \sigma_{f,j}) \right) + \frac{1}{N^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \text{cov}(\sigma_{z,i}, \sigma_{z,j}) \right), \tag{6}$$

where the three independent covariance terms are sources of errors related to prediction residuals, model parameters, and input variables (Chen et al., 2016). If the number of pixels is sufficiently large (e.g., our study of SF contains more than 10 million pixels), the regional uncertainty is dominated by the second term, $\sigma^2_{f}$ (Chen et al., 2016), which can be approximated using the first-order Taylor expansion (Ståhl et al., 2010),

$$\sigma^2_{f} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{m} \sum_{q=1}^{m} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi_p} \text{cov}(\varphi_p, \varphi_q) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi_q} \right), \tag{7}$$

where $p$ and $q$ are indices of estimated model parameter covariance matrix, $\text{cov}(\varphi_p, \varphi_q)$, along two dimensions; $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi_p} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi_p}$ is the mean of first derivative of prediction with respect to the allometric model (equation 2) parameter $\varphi_p$; similarly, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi_q}$ is the mean of the first derivative of prediction with respect to parameter $\varphi_q$; and $m$ is the total number of parameters in the allometric model ($m = 3$ in the case of equation 2). Since the error associated with input variable is often assumed independent
of samples, and the residual variance has spatial autocorrelation only within a limited distance, $\sigma^2_f$ can explain more than 99% of the error variance for regional estimates over large areas (Chen et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017). Therefore, even assuming a highly uncertain pixel-level error of ~100% relative to AGB predictions, the regional uncertainty of AGB can still be approximated using equation 7 (Cooke et al., 2016). To avoid numerical errors due to the exponential forms used in the model, we generated multiple sets of model parameters using Monte Carlo simulations based on covariance...
matrix of parameters and calculated AGB uncertainty from these repeated realizations. We further calculated the regional uncertainty of carbon by adding an additional source of uncertainty from BGB formulation (equation 3) and applied a nominal 20% relative error due to the lack of plot-level data.

The uncertainty of forest growth model (equation 4) can theoretically apply the same uncertainty calculation (equation 5) and propagate errors from AGB modeling. However, the lack of statistical power due to the small sample size in this study could create a large number of type-II errors (Draper & Smith, 1998) and, as a result, making the error assessment of forest age meaningless. Therefore, forest age numbers are reported as nominal values based on limited samples, representing the mean relationship between AGB and Age.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Spatial Distribution of SF Area

We estimated the areal coverage of SF over the entire Brazilian Amazon using the TerraClass data. At the 100-m spatial resolution, we found a large fraction of pure SF pixels (12.46 Mha in 2014) in the Eastern Amazon (states of Pará and Maranhão) and a relatively high portion of mixed SF pixels (3.74 Mha in 2014) in the South within states of Rondônia and Mato Grosso. These are regions with frequent land clearing, slash and burn, and small scale land use activities, which together capture a large portion of SF areas (Figure 2a). The mixed SF class has a comparable number of pixels (Figure 2b) to the pure PF pixels but contributes 20%–30% of the total SF area across the Brazilian Amazon (Figure 2c). Therefore, the contribution from mixed SF pixels cannot simply be ignored when reporting the national statistics, and the layer Fsf, representing the fraction of SF in each pixel, was kept in the calculation of total carbon density numbers (equation 3).

3.2. Temporal Dynamics of SF Area

The total area of SF in Brazilian Amazon increased by more than 25% from 22 to 28 Mha during the decade from 2004 to 2014 or about 75% from 2002 (16.1 Mha) using earlier Pre-TerraClass estimates (Neeff et al., 2006) (Figure 2c). The increase in the SF area coincides with the reduction in deforestation by more than 50% during this period (Boucher & Chi, 2018).

In addition to the area of SF across the Brazilian Amazon, we also explored the SF patch size dynamics using the five (2004, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014) TerraClass distribution maps. By defining the patch size as the area of a contiguous SF through connected pixels, we explored the frequency distribution of SF patches changing with patch size. Results show that small patches less than 10 ha are the most abundant. The number of patches for each patch size varies year-to-year, particularly for small patches (<10 ha) (Figure 3a). A much higher number of small patches were found in 2012 compared to other years, possibly due to the use of high-resolution ancillary data to compensate the loss of Landsat 5 data. In 2014, we found quite a few small SF patches connected to form relatively large SF patches, significantly changing the distribution of patch sizes from 2012 to 2014. Since small SF patches are more often seen in the Brazilian Amazon (Figure 3a), we also compared the SF coverage (in ha) changing with patch size for different years (Figure 3b). The SF coverage shows a more dynamic distribution of SF areas of different patch sizes, indicating the contributions of small and large patches to the total area of SF are comparable.

The dynamics of SF coverage show that almost half of the existing SF regions changed to other land cover types, and a similar size of forest...
clearing was transformed to SF on a year-to-year basis (Table 2). Although the total area of SF in Brazilian Amazon remains relatively stable through time (varying from 22 to 28 Mha over 10 years), the year-to-year changes suggested frequent clearing of SF areas as part of the land use activities.

### 3.3. Secondary Forest Biomass

Using GLAS data as the proxy for AGB, we investigated the relationship between AGB and ALOS HV for GLAS samples in 2007 and 2008 that have simultaneous ALOS observations (Figure 4) and translated the backscatter values to AGB by inverting equation 2,

\[
AGB = \exp\left(6.52 - 2.83\sqrt{-\sigma^0 - 11.83}\right),
\]  

where \(\sigma^0\) is the ALOS PALSAR backscatter data at HV polarization normalized by incidence angle and converted to dB from power (\(\sigma^0 = 10 \times \log_{10}\text{[Power]}\)). This parametric model provided us mean AGB estimates over SF regions of Brazilian Amazon from 2007 to 2010. Results show that the mean SF AGB had small but meaningful year-to-year variations from the maximum value of 48.7 ± 0.79 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) in 2008 to a minimum value of 43.4 ± 0.44 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) in 2010 (Figure 5a). Considering the frequent recycling of SF areas with clearing, our results suggest the net biomass variation in the SF of Brazilian Amazon was small or negligible. Nevertheless, the interannual variability of biomass density can be significant for a few pixels in SF.

Taking both the mixed and pure SF pixels into account based on the SF fractions, we estimated the total carbon in SF for the observational period of ALOS (2007 to 2010) using equation 3. The total carbon stock in SF contributed a small fraction (1.4%) to the total carbon pool (~54 PgC) in the entire Brazilian Amazon.

Figure 5. Annual variation of AGB and carbon stock from 2007 to 2010. (a) AGB variations, and (b) total carbon variations. (c) The carbon loss and gain between 2008 and 2010, calculated using SF area loss and gain from Table 2. We used the 2008 SF map to calculate the carbon stock of 2007 and 2008 and the 2010 SF map to calculate the carbon stock of 2009 and 2010. The white boxes thus represent the carbon stock calculation based on the next year’s SF maps (e.g., carbon stock of 2007 was calculated using SF of 2008), and the gray boxes represent the carbon stock calculation using the current year’s SF map. The error bar in the figure stands for 95% confidence interval (~2 standard errors) of each mean estimate of AGB or total carbon.

Figure 6. Analysis of mixed SF contribution. (a) Histograms of mixed SF pixels in 2008 and 2010 (pure SF pixels are excluded); (b) annual variations of carbon stock from 2007 to 2010 separating pure and mixed SF pixels. The calculations of total carbon follow the same method used in Figure 5b.
Amazon (S. S. Saatchi, Harris, et al., 2011). Checking the maximum variation of this carbon pool, we found a significant change from $0.67 \pm 0.02 \text{PgC}$ in 2007 to $0.80 \pm 0.02 \text{PgC}$ in 2009 (Figure 5b), translating to an annual carbon sink of $0.06 \pm 0.03 \text{PgC year}^{-1}$ in which the increase was mainly due to the change of SF spatial area, as the mean AGB of SF at pixel level had almost no change (Figure 5a). However, the SF spatial areas calculated from TerraClass have their own uncertainties but not evaluated comprehensively. The estimated total carbon of SF in 2010 was in fact lower than the estimation in 2009, probably impacted by the 2010 drought in Amazonia (Lewis et al., 2011; Xu et al., 2011). The seemingly small interannual variability of SF carbon was balanced by the large fractions of gain and loss of SF areas each year. If gain and loss effects were plotted separately, we found a much larger carbon dynamics of around $\pm 0.2 \text{PgC year}^{-1}$ (Figure 5c) in the SF of Brazilian Amazon.

The estimation of AGB and carbon stocks of SF in mixed pixels can be biased due to the use of equation 3 and the mixture of vegetation types occupying these 1-ha pixels. However, the magnitude of this bias, if present, is difficult to quantify. To study the relative importance of the bias and the impact of the mixed pixels on the total carbon stock change of SF, we investigated the distribution of SF fractions during the period of carbon estimations (by comparing the SF maps in 2008 and 2010). Results show that SF fractions had little change from 2008 and 2010 (Figure 6a), indicating any potential biases caused by mixed SF should be small in calculating the carbon fluxes. We also found that the contribution of mixed SF pixels to total carbon never exceeded 30% (Figure 6b), and the dynamics of total carbon from all SF pixels followed the same pattern as of pure SF pixels that dominated (more than 70%) the SF areas.

### 3.4. Age-AGB Growth Model of SF

Using equation 4, we converted AGB estimates to forest age. Applying the proposed DTB age QA (Table 1), we show the average distribution of AGB changing with age (Figure 7) across the Brazilian Amazon. Using the median AGB values for ages from 1 to 8, we built the AGB-Age model (in the form of equation 4) for SF forests,

$$Age = -37.55 \ln \left(1 - \frac{AGB}{250}\right)^{0.39}.$$  

Due to the limited availability of multitemporal SF maps and a short period of ALOS observations, we only tested our model using numbers found in literature for forests older than 8 years of age. Using data based on plot measurements, we found the biomass of SF for ages 10, 20, and 30 years (Marín-Spiotta et al., 2007; Poorter et al., 2016) was mostly within one standard error of our AGB-Age model (Figure 8). Interestingly, for mean
SF biomass at the plot level, Neeff and dos Santos (2005) reported lower values than our model for young forests (age < 10 years). This may have resulted from scaling issues because we estimated biomass at 1-ha grid cells with the possible inclusion of other land-cover types other than secondary forests. Furthermore, the regeneration immediately after the detection of disturbance was included in our estimation from ALOS data but may be absent in other studies. As SF grow older, the plot-level biomass estimation became comparable to other existing estimates.

Regardless of differences in the scale of SF area and biomass estimation, we found a potentially rapid accumulation of forest biomass in SF comparable to other studies (Cassol et al., 2019; Poorter et al., 2016). Our results show that on average, the forests sequestered about 8.5 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) during the first 10 years after clearing and abandonment, slowing down to about 4.5 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) for the next 10 years, followed by a much gradual growth of about 3 Mg ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) from the age of 20 to 30 years. These estimates are from average models developed for this study without considering the regional differences and the impacts of soil, climate, and the history of land use.

### 3.5. Mapping SF Age and Potential Carbon Sink

We estimated the forest age of SF using the AGB-Age model combined with PRODES and TerraClass and with a disturbance correction based on ALOS backscatter (Figure 9). The map shows large areas of young SF (age ≤ 10 years) with the average age of 8.2 years with a standard deviation of 3.2 years, spatially distributed across the entire Brazilian Amazon. Our study predicts a mean SF age within the range of the previous estimations from literature (Carreiras et al., 2017; Cassol et al., 2019; Neeff et al., 2006). However, our study is based on spatial data covering a larger area of secondary forests not sampled in field surveys, and the average age estimate is not old enough to suggest less deforestation or reclearing in SF areas. From the time series analysis and the age maps, we predict that the recycling time of SF in the Brazilian Amazon has been approximately 5 to 10 years. If the 2010 extent of SF (28 Mha) was left to regenerate following the carbon uptake trajectory predicted in this study (Figure 8), the potential SF carbon sink for the region would be about 0.14 PgC year\(^{-1}\) over the first 10 years, comparable to the average annual emission quantities from fire or deforestation over the entire Amazon basin (Yang et al., 2018) and significantly larger than the maximum changes of total carbon (Figure 5b) observed in our study.

**Figure 9.** SF age map in 2010 estimated using ALOS backscatter data and AGB-Age model (see SECTION 2.2.4). Zoomed-in images show regions with both old SF and young SF. Note that the AGB-Age model was built from young SF (age < 10 years), and SF ages older than 10 years were inferred from the AGB-Age relationship (Figure 8).
4. Conclusion
Through the analysis of a suite of satellite data for SF in Brazilian Amazon, we found that young secondary forest is a potentially significant carbon sink because of fast rates of carbon accumulation and rapid expansion of the SF area during the last decade. However, we also found that frequent disturbances of the SF interrupted the regrowth process such that the average SF age never exceeded 10 years. In comparison to intact old growth forests, the SF in the Brazilian Amazon contain a small fraction of the total carbon storage. Moreover, the gain in SF area in recent years translated into only a small sink for carbon annually because the rapid carbon uptake of young SF was balanced by emissions from extensive clearing.
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