

## ***Interactive comment on “Soil greenhouse gas fluxes from different tree species on Taihang Mountain, North China” by X. P. Liu et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 August 2013

Review of Liu et al. Soil greenhouse gas fluxes from different forest types on Taihang Mountain, North China The manuscript reports CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from six different forest types/tree species over a period of two years between 2010 and 2012. The authors conclude that CO<sub>2</sub> differs between tree species, seasons and is tightly related to soil moisture and temperature. N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes also differ between forest types, but are not related to either soil moisture or soil temperature as is also the case for CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes, which do not differ between forest types. The authors also include other soil factors such as pH, bulk density, SOC and soil N in order to explain observed tree species differences or lack thereof.

The data analysis in the paper must be improved by applying more sophisticated statistical analyses of their GHG time series in combination with the treatment factors (sea-

C4621

son, tree species, litter). This will also enable the authors to discuss their GHG fluxes to a greater degree and present novel findings. In its present form the manuscript rarely synthesizes their findings, but merely report. There is obviously a great work effort behind this work, but the data analyses and interpretation is still far from the standard to be expected in Biogeosciences. It is imperative that the reader reads something new and exciting in relation to GHG. The dataset holds the potential for a good paper, but it is not realized at this point. My recommendation is therefore reconsideration after major revisions incorporating new statistical analyses that can fulfill the authors objectives and subsequent synthesis of their results. I have given relatively detailed comments below as suggestions how to improve the paper.

Abstract Considering the paper in its current form the abstract is clear and well written.

Introduction Page 11039, line 16 – 22: Change sentences “Borken et al. (2003). . .” to “Borken et al. (2003) reported a strong impact of forest type on the soil CH<sub>4</sub> sink between natural mature beech forests and mature pine and spruce plantations in two study areas in Germany. On the other hand, Borken and Beese (2005) reported no differences in soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions between European beech, Scots pine and Norway spruce forests in two study areas in Germany with distinct climate, N deposition and soils.” Page 11039, line 24: insert “determining” instead of “identifying” after “Therefore,” Page 11039, line 25: delete “. . .and determining. . .rates” Page 11039, line 27: Add in one line why Taihang Mountain is ideal for studying tree species impact on GHG Page 11040, line 8-16: I suggest deleting this entire section as it is of minor relevance to your research in this paper. Page 11040, line 19: replace “exchanges of GHG” with “hence exchange of GHGs” Page 11040, line 23-25: Is this only in China or does it apply to other countries and is it a general gap in knowledge? Page 11040, line 25-30 & Page 11041, line 1 – 5: Move this paragraph to page 11039, line 27 as a new paragraph before the introduction of Taihang Mountain.

Materials and Methods 2.1 Page 11042, line 17-19: Delete part of sentence “Economic. . ., and” Page 11042, line 26-27: define “as usual” in relation to the for-

C4622

est management practice Page 11043, line 1: insert “are” instead of comma and insert “and” after Mountain Page 11043, line 8-9: delete “because...villagers.” Page 11043, line 12-15: Here it is unclear whether fertilizer or manure application was performed during your study. This needs to be clarified as nutrient addition can impact your results. Page 11043, line 23-24: Do you mean that canopy and community (table 1) cover is the same? Clarify or change wording so it is similar in text and tables. 2.2 Page 11044, line 5-6: Delete sentence “Fluxes...” Page 11044, line 15: Specify the gas volume you sampled Page 11045, line 6-9: please state the name of the  $p=P/RT$  constant and change units of chamber volume and area to SI units (e.g. m<sup>3</sup> and m<sup>2</sup>). 2.3. Page 11045, line 13: replace “soil respiration” with “GHG flux” Page 11045, line 14: 1) specify the weight of the soil sample and 2) define what “close to” means in quantitative terms (is close in meters or centimeters?) 2.4 Page 11045, line 22-23: Why do you use mean values for the three chambers? You reduce some of the natural variation in the dataset, but does that really serve your purpose to do this. Clarify your arguments for this. Page 11045, line 23: What do you mean by “Multiple comparisons analysis...”? Is it One-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons? And if so, what post-hoc test did you use? Page 11046, line 1-2: What statistical test did you use when data were normally distributed? Specify. Page 11046, line 5 – 6: you test the impact of season, litter and tree species, but on what time scale do you aggregate data? In my opinion univariate analyses is too simplistic approach and will not reveal if the tree species behave differently over seasons. Two suggestions how you can address this using more complex multiple regression. 1) A mixed model taking tree species and season in to account could give you the same result as the univariate, but also extend to the possible interactions between tree species and seasons. This is a reasonable assumption given that some of the tree species found at Taihang Mountain have adapted to different growing conditions (wet vs drier). 2) A repeated measures ANOVA with tree species and litter removal categorical variables and chamber number as the repeated factor could explore, by implicitly taking temporal variability of GHG fluxes in to account, how these factors affect GHG. Page 11046, line 5: Unclear what

C4623

type of “multiple linear regression analysis” you used. Was it stepwise or mixed models or more simple? Specify.

Results 3.2 Page 11047, line 10: insert “were on average” instead of “averaged”. Also in brackets after “average” should info on the uncertainty term: is it standard deviation or standard error of the mean? Page 11047, line 10-11: get rid of decimals. Maximum of 1 decimal for uncertainty terms. Accounts in the entire manuscript. Page 11047, line 25-27 & Page 11048, line 1-2: Insert this part AFTER the N<sub>2</sub>O result section. 3.4 Page 11049, line 1-4: Unclear sentences. Clarify Page 11049, line 5: insert “except for” instead of “when” Page 11049, line 6-8: This sentence sounds strange. It is as if you would expect the overall trend is no effect, but in fact half of your tree species actually show an effect. Describe in objective terms. Page 11049, line 15: replace “when” with “excluding”

Discussion 4.1 Page 11049, line 18: replace “average” with “significantly different”. I suggest being consistent with “tree species” or “sites” in the entire manuscript. Choose either one, preferably “tree species” Page 11049, line 20-23: I am not entirely sure you can extrapolate the cited studies to something about how future vegetation changes shaped response of GHG to environmental change. I suggest to delete. Page 11049, line 23-26: Delete sentence “The mean...” Repetition of results Page 11050, line 5: change “form” to “from” Page 11050, line 9-10: specify what “the substrate” is. Page 11050, line 10: replace “the woodland” with “which” Page 11050, line 11-16. Change sentence to: “The highest CO<sub>2</sub> flux occurred in Z.jujube could be attributed to weeding, mineral fertilization and manure application. Annual mineral fertilization and manure application in each spring increased C and N contents of grassland soils in xxxx (mention country), changed chemical element composition, affected easily-decomposable SOC pools and hence soil respiration (Verburg et al., 2004).” Page 11050, line 16-20: This argument comes out of the blue. According to table 1 all plots have similar understory, so in my opinion this argument here cannot really be backed by your data. Maybe moderate the statement, so that understory vegetation might affect CO<sub>2</sub> respiration

C4624

rates. Page 11050, line 21: Insert "Not surprisingly, we observed that..." before "seasonal changes" Page 11050, line 25-29 & Page 11051, line 1-2: This section is rather trivial and can be omitted without losing meaning in the rest of the text. Page 11051, line 2: Insert "Similar to," before "Yan et al. (2006)" Page 11051, line 3: insert "we" after "(2010)" and insert "most likely" before "by" Page 11051, line 4: delete "coming" and replace "slowing down" with "decreasing" Page 11051, line 5: insert "microbes" after "soil" Page 11051, line 5-6: delete sentence "In this study,..." Page 11051, line 13: Is this significant correlation positive or negative? Generally, clarify this throughout the manuscript. Page 11051, line 14: this is the first time the interaction between soil temp and soil moisture is mentioned. The methodology behind this should be described in 2.4 and results included in 3.2. Page 11051, line 23-24: Delete this sentence. You only measured SOC and not labile C and so by writing this you implicitly assume that SOC pool is a proxy for labile C, which is not necessarily the case. Page 11051, line 25-29 & Page 11052, line 1-3: This is interesting, but you do not follow up on it. There is a lot of factors and contrasting results in play here in your text, but you do not manage to conclude on it and what it means for your study. 4.2 Generally, I miss a short discussion of the temporal variability. Once rain starts CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes vary between sink and sources. This implies that CH<sub>4</sub> production is switched on and off in these relatively dry soils (see Angel et al. (2012), ISME Journal, vol. 6). Page 11052, line 8-9: insert "but" before "we found" and insert "or seasonal" after "annual" Page 11052, line 9-11: delete "...and no...(Tables 3, 4)." Page 11052, line 14-16: If you state this, elaborate on why CH<sub>4</sub> ox differ and what factors in the soil are important in Menyailo and Hungate (2003) and how that can be connected to your study. Page 11052, line 16-17: Again what factors are we talking about. Also, consider whether wetland plants are appropriate to compare with your sites. See Christiansen & Gundersen (2011), Biogeosciences, vol. 8 and Degelmann et al. (2009) Eur J Soil Sci, vol. 60 on tree species differences and CH<sub>4</sub> Page 11053, line 1-4: Delete sentence Page 11053, line 5: replace "had been reported frequently" with "in our study reflects previous findings" Page 11053, line 6-10: Like what? Inorganic N? Others? Page 11053, line 10-19: I am not sure what you

C4625

mean here. How does this help explain your findings? Clarify Page 11053, line 19-26: This is reasonable argumentation, but in Borken and Beese (2006) the litter removal most likely caused wetter soil in turn leading to less diffusion of atmospheric N in to the soil. This is an abiotic phenomena and less so a biotic. However, you cannot test this because you did not measure soil moisture in the litter removal. Page 11053, line 23: decreased flux = increased uptake? Do you mean decreased uptake? Also, you cannot prove this phenomenon, but merely confirm their observation. Reformulate. 4.3. Page 11054, line 2-4: repetition of lines 1-3 page 11049. Delete! Page 11054, line 8-9: delete from "long drought..." Page 11054, line 10-12: Move sentence "Rosenkranz et al. (2006) to page 11054, line 22 after "net sink." Page 11054, line 12-14: Delete sentence "Chapuis-Lardy et al. (2007)..." Page 11054, line 15: Insert "Similar to our study," before Goldberg and Gebauer (2009) Page 11054, line 16: change "served" to "serving" Page 11055, line 1-3: Delete from "N availability...Z. jujube." Page 11055, line 4-5: Move sentence to front of 4.3 Page 11055, line 8: what type of soil N concentrations? Exchangeable or total N? Clarify. Page 11055, line 12: delete "the majority of" and replace "activities happen" with "mainly take place" Page 11055, line 14-29 & Page 11056, line 1-2: I think this entire paragraph must be condensed in to maximum two sentences each of which deals with soil temperature and soil moisture respectively. Page 11056, line 4: Insert "However" before "N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes". Also specify what time scale it refers to. Annual fluxes? Page 11056, line 10-17: You cannot expect to get a pH effect because the values are similar across the mountain as well as slightly alkaline which does not support high N<sub>2</sub>O production (see Weslien et al. (2009) European J Soil Sci, vol. 60 in pH effect in N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes). I think instead you should discuss why you do not have a pH effect and not necessarily just report others findings. Use the literature to frame your own findings.

Tables Table 1. Usually if letters are different then  $p < 0.05$ . In your way here it is difficult to get an overview. You should change to a more simple denotation here and elsewhere in the manuscript. Table 2: Consider the number of decimals. I would give the numbers without decimals to provide better overview Table 3: The info in this

C4626

table can be incorporated in the text. I suggest deleting. Table 5: What does the numbers represent? Correlation coefficients? I wondered why there were no negative correlations and made me wonder if this is R<sup>2</sup> values. If this is the case you should change it to the correlation coefficients (r) and write the sign (+ or -)

Figure Good figures! Change Y-axis on Fig. 4 (CH<sub>4</sub> time series) to -200 - +200  $\mu\text{g CH}_4 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ .

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 11037, 2013.

C4627