

Interactive comment on "A dual isotope approach to isolate carbon pools of different turnover times" *by* M. S. Torn et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 August 2013

Numerous models are available to simulate storage and turnover of soil organic carbon. A major problem has been to relate conceptual pools (model) to something that can be measured in a soil sample (experiment). Density fractionation is one way to meaningfully do this by equating the labile/intermediate and the stable carbon pools with the light and heavy soil fraction, respectively. The present paper proposes a refinement to this approach by separating each of two density fractions into a slow and a fast pool. This is achieved by means of a dual isotope approach (13C, 14C), the applicability of which seems to be limited to fossil CO2 enrichment experiments.

The paper is clearly written, provides some new insights to organic carbon cycling in annual grasslands in California and is a pleasure to read. Also, it leaves me with a question that I would like the authors to discuss more in depth in a revised version.

C4226

How much do the results of the experimental part of the study depend on the assumption that soil organic carbon pools are in a steady state (Equation 4 and related text)? Concentrations of CO2 were almost doubled in the labelled plots (to > 700 ppm). Even a much smaller enhancement of CO2 concentrations (to 475 ppm) can already substantially affect the size of carbon pools and respiration (Ross et al., Soil Biol. Biochem. 58, 265-274, 2013). I am wondering, to what extent does the better performance of the two-pool model in simulating similar turnover-times in control and elevated CO2 treatments result from its ability to better compensate a possible discrepancy between the steady state assumption in the model and a non-steady state behaviour in the field? Could there be a circularity between assumption and result? Please discuss.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 10189, 2013.