

Title: Positive feedback of elevated CO₂ on soil respiration in late autumn and winter

Authors: Lisa Keidel¹, Claudia Kammann¹, Ludger Grünhage¹, Gerald Moser¹,
Christoph Müller^{1,2}

[1]{Department of Plant Ecology, Justus Liebig University Giessen, Germany}

[2]{School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College Dublin, Dublin,
Ireland}

Correspondence to: Lisa Keidel (Lisa.Keidel@bot2.bio.uni-giessen.de)

Department of Plant Ecology

Justus-Liebig-University Giessen, Heinrich-Buff-Ring 26-32

D-35392 Giessen, Germany

Phone: +49 641/9935322

Keywords: FACE, grassland, carbon cycle, seasonality, Li-8100, winter climate change,
winter dormancy, feedback effect, soil respiration, soil CO₂ efflux

Words: 6419 (main text)

Figures: 5

Tables: 3

Abstract

Soil respiration of terrestrial ecosystems, a major component in the global carbon cycle is affected by elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. However, seasonal differences of feedback effects of elevated CO₂ have rarely been studied. At the Giessen Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment (GiFACE) site, the effects of +20 % above ambient CO₂ concentration have been investigated since 1998 in a temperate grassland ecosystem. We defined five distinct annual seasons, with respect to management practices and phenological cycles. For a period of three years (2008-2010), weekly measurements of soil respiration were carried out with a survey chamber on vegetation-free subplots. The results revealed a pronounced and repeated increase of soil respiration under elevated CO₂ during late autumn and winter dormancy. Increased CO₂ losses during the autumn season (September-October) were 15.7 % higher and during the winter season (November – March) were 17.4 % higher compared to respiration from ambient CO₂ plots.

However, during spring time and summer, which are characterized by strong above- and below-ground plant growth, no significant change in soil respiration was observed at the FACE site under elevated CO₂. This suggests (i) that soil respiration measurements, carried out only during the growing season under elevated CO₂ may underestimate the true soil-respiratory CO₂ loss (i.e. overestimate the C sequestered) and (ii) that additional C assimilated by plants during the growing season and transferred below-ground will quickly be lost via enhanced heterotrophic respiration outside the main growing season.

1 Introduction

The atmospheric concentration of CO₂ has increased from pre-industrial values of 275 - 285 ppm (Raynaud and Barnola, 1985) to 400 ppm in 2013 (Monastersky, 2013). Projections of future atmospheric CO₂ concentration in the year 2100 range between 490 and 1370 ppm depending on representative concentration pathways (Moss et al., 2010). As the major radiative forcing component (IPCC, 2013), atmospheric CO₂ is positively correlated with air temperature and is therefore an important component for global warming. Additionally, indirect effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ (eCO₂), which are altering carbon (C) fluxes in ecosystems, may impose a feedback to climate change. About half of photosynthetically assimilated C returns immediately to the atmosphere as plant-respired CO₂ (autotrophic respiration) (Chapin et al., 2002). Portions of the net carbon gain (net primary production) are transferred to the soil via root exudates, fine root growth and -turnover or other litter, providing the substrate for soil organic carbon (SOC) buildup (Kirschbaum, 2000). Soil functions as an important C reservoir within the global carbon cycle and stores about 1500 Gt of C (Amundson, 2001; Lal, 2004; Batjes, 1996), which is about twice the amount of C in the atmosphere (Schils et al., 2008). Soil respiration, the sum of autotrophic root respiration and heterotrophic respiration from microorganisms and soil meso- and macrofauna, accounts for two thirds of the total C loss from terrestrial ecosystems (Luo, 2006). Enhanced net C losses under eCO₂ cause a positive feedback. Many past studies focused on soil-atmosphere CO₂ exchange during the growing season. However, soil respiration during vegetation dormancy may represent a significant component of the annual C budget and contributes to the observed winter CO₂ maximum in the atmosphere (Raich and Potter, 1995). Accordingly, analysis of CO₂ data from an air sampling network identified seasonal oscillation with highest concentrations occurring each winter

when respiration exceeds photosynthesis (Keeling et al., 1996). This emphasizes the necessity to study seasonal dynamics of soil respiration under future CO₂ conditions to gain a better understanding of how soil respiration responds to changing atmospheric CO₂ concentrations.

A meta-analysis of Zak et al. (2000) revealed a 51 % increase of soil respiration as a mean response in a grassland ecosystem under elevated CO₂, Janssens & Ceulemans (2000) provided evidence for consistent stimulation of soil respiration under a variety of tree species. However, the majority of studies, to date, are based on short-term exposure (less than five years) with *e*CO₂, often using open-top chamber experiments (Zak et al., 2000). Results from these experiments should be analyzed with appropriate caution because of the known “chamber effect” on the microclimate (Leadley and Drake, 1993) and their relevance to natural ecosystems in which longer-term biogeochemical feedbacks operate (Rastetter et al., 1991). Since soil respiration is a product of several rhizospheric processes i.e. root exudation, root respiration, and root turnover, as well as decomposition of litter and bulk soil organic matter from various pools with different characteristic turnover times, short- and long-term responses to *e*CO₂ may be quite different (Luo et al., 2001).

The most suitable approach for conducting ecosystem CO₂ experiments under natural conditions are FACE experiments, where intact ecosystems are exposed in-situ to a higher atmospheric CO₂ concentration. However, it has been reported that the sudden increase in atmospheric CO₂ (CO₂ step increase) at the beginning of a CO₂-enrichment, may cause certain short-term responses of the ecosystem that differ from long-term responses (Luo, 2001; Newton et al., 2001). Accordingly, Kammann et al. (2005) showed that yield responses to *e*CO₂, in the Giessen Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment (GiFACE), were different in the initial compared to the subsequent years. Moreover, plants may undergo micro-evolutionary changes in response to *e*CO₂ (Ward and Kelly, 2004), which may also be reflected in belowground processes (Klironomos et al., 2005). Consequently, to avoid misinterpretations due to insufficient experimental durations, results from long-term exposure studies are required. In the GiFACE this was after approximately 5-

6 years (Kammann et al., 2005). In the following we use the expression “short-term” for CO₂ enrichment durations <5 years and “long-term” for durations >5 years.

Based on a literature overview, we found 13 other FACE studies, from a wide variety of ecosystems, where in-situ soil respiration under *e*CO₂ has been investigated. All of these FACE studies operated at higher CO₂ enrichment concentrations than the GiFACE experiment (with +20 % CO₂ above ambient), i.e. they imposed larger initial step increases (Klironomos et al., 2005). Klironomos et al.(2005) have demonstrated that ecosystem responses to *e*CO₂ may differ between using a sudden step increase and a gradual rise in the CO₂ concentration. However, in any CO₂ enrichment study a step increase – also if lower than usual – cannot be avoided. Thus, experimental FACE results are more indicative for future predictions. However; experimental studies with duration of > 10 years are scarce (Carol Adair et al., 2011;Jackson et al., 2009). To our knowledge, 10 of the 16 investigations on soil respiration across these 13 FACE studies were carried out within the first five years of exposure, thus reporting short-term responses (Craine et al., 2001;King et al., 2001;Allen et al., 2000;Andrews and Schlesinger, 2001;Selsted et al., 2012;Masyagina and Koike, 2012;Soe et al., 2004;Lagomarsino et al., 2013;Liu et al., 2006;Nakayama et al., 1994). All short-term study results pointed towards a consistent stimulatory effect of *e*CO₂ on soil respiration. The average increase ranged from 12 % under a sweetgum plantation (King et al., 2004) to 70 % under a mixed plantation of *Populus* species (Lagomarsino et al., 2013). In two of the short-term studies, significant effects were only observed on days with high photosynthetic activity (Masyagina and Koike, 2012;Soe et al., 2004); measurements during dormancy were not carried out.

Three of the short-term studies conducted measurements during winter dormancy with contrasting results (Allen et al., 2000;Andrews and Schlesinger, 2001;Selsted et al., 2012;Lagomarsino et al., 2013). In a temperate heathland (CLIMAITE study), soil respiration was significantly increased under *e*CO₂ during three consecutive winter seasons (Selsted et al., 2012). Allen et al. (2000) detected a significant effect of *e*CO₂ on soil respiration during December 1997 in the Duke Forest

FACE study but not during the previous growing season beneath the loblolly pine forest. Andrews and Schlesinger (2001) reported from the same site greater increases of soil respiration during fumigation periods (26-59 %) than during non-fumigated periods (8-15 %). Fumigation was stopped when ambient air temperature dropped below 5 °C for more than one hour. In line with these results, much larger percentage enhancements of the soil CO₂ efflux were observed during the growing season (up to 111 %) than during dormant season (40 %) from a mixed plantation of *Populus* species exposed to eCO₂ (EuroFACE) (Lagomarsino et al., 2013). CO₂ enrichment was provided from bud burst to leaf fall at this site.

Out of six long-term studies on soil respiration (Carol Adair et al., 2011; Pregitzer et al., 2008; Jackson et al., 2009; Pendall et al., 2001; Bader and Körner, 2010; Dawes et al., 2013), only one study reported measurements throughout the dormant season, showing that after 10 years of eCO₂ during the growing season at a loblolly pine forest (Duke FACE) soil respiration was consistently higher in midsummer to early fall and diminished or disappeared in winter (Jackson et al., 2009). This was explained by a reduction in assimilation and hence available root exudate during dormancy. If the fumigation may continue during the dormant season in an ecosystem with a green canopy e.g. in a permanent grassland, the stimulation may theoretically continue on a higher level.

Reports from other long-term FACE studies in temperate ecosystems (disregarding the dormant season) were consistent by reporting an increase in soil respiration under eCO₂, with the exception of the Swiss Canopy Crane experiment in an old-growth, mixed deciduous forest. Bader & Körner (2010) reported that soil respiration from the site was only stimulated when volumetric water content was ≤ 40 % at soil temperatures above 15 °C.

In summary, only fragmented information is available on how soil respiration responds to eCO₂ during vegetation as well as dormant periods after long-term eCO₂. To our knowledge, no long-term FACE study in a grassland ecosystem exists which has investigated soil CO₂ fluxes across

several years. Consequently, it is difficult to generalize temporal patterns of soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$, and thus the soil respiratory response to $e\text{CO}_2$ at all.

Based on the available studies and earlier observations at our site, where whole-ecosystem respiration including the green canopy was increased under $e\text{CO}_2$, mainly during non-growing season (Lenhart, 2008), we hypothesized that (i) long-term (>10 years) moderate CO_2 enrichment causes increased soil respiration, (ii) soil respiration is more enhanced in the growing season than during vegetation dormancy (*winter*) and (iii) soil respiration is significantly enhanced in *winter* under $e\text{CO}_2$ in the GiFACE where the CO_2 enrichment is continuing during *winter*.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study site and design

The Giessen Free Air Carbon Enrichment (GiFACE) experiment is located on permanent semi-natural grassland. It is situated near Giessen, Germany (50°32'N and 8°41.3'E) at an elevation of 172 m above sea level.

The set-up and performance of the GiFACE system has been described in detail by Jäger *et al.* (2003). In brief, from May 1998 until present, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were enriched by 20 % above ambient, all-year-round during daylight hours. At present the GiFACE experiment is still ongoing.

The CO₂ enrichment was applied in three rings, each eight meter in diameter (E plots). Three equally sized control plots were maintained at ambient atmospheric CO₂ levels (A plots). The experimental design was a randomized block design. A block consisted of two plots to which ambient and eCO₂ treatments were randomly assigned. A characteristic attribute of the study site is a soil moisture gradient, resulting from a gradual terrain slope (2-3°) and varying depths of a subsoil clay layer. Within each of the three blocks, soil moisture conditions were relatively homogeneous (Jäger *et al.*, 2003).

The vegetation is an Arrhenatheretum elatioris Br.Bl. Filipendula ulmaria subcommunity, dominated by *Arrhenatherum elatium*, *Galium mollugo* and *Geranium pratense*. At least 12 grass species, 15 non-leguminous herbs and 2 legumes are present within a single ring. For at least 100 years, the grassland has not been ploughed. Since several decades, it was managed as a hay meadow with two cuts per year, and fertilized in mid-April with granular mineral

calcium-ammonium-nitrate fertilizer at the rate of 40 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹. Before 1996, fertilizer was applied at a rate of 50–100 kg N ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (Kammann et al., 2008).

The soil of the study site is classified as a Fluvisol (FAO classification) with a texture of sandy clay loam over a clay layer (Jäger et al., 2003).

Observations in this study were carried out from January 2008 - December 2010 (i.e. more than 9 years after the onset of CO₂ enrichment). During the observation period the mean annual temperature was 9.2 °C and mean annual precipitation was 562 mm which was identical to the average rainfall since the beginning of recording in 1995. Rainfall was recorded at the site in 30-min intervals with 20 randomly distributed “Hellmann” samplers. Air temperature was recorded continuously at two locations at the site in 2 m height and averaged 9.5 °C since 1995.

2.2 Measurement of soil CO₂ fluxes at the field site

In each of the six FACE plots, soil respiration rates were measured using an automated closed dynamic chamber system with an infrared gas analyzer (LI-COR 8100, LI-COR, Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, USA) with a patented vent for pressure equilibration between the closed chamber and the atmosphere (McDermitt et al., 2005). Carbon dioxide fluxes were reported in μmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹. The measurements were performed at four permanently installed PVC soil collars per FACE ring, to cover the spatial heterogeneity within each ring. The soil collars had a diameter of 20.3 cm (8 inch) and were about 11 cm high. A beveled edge at one end facilitated the insertion into the soil, which took place on 9th May 2006 and the vegetation cover, including surficial rhizomes, was removed manually. Subsequently, the surface was held vegetation-free by removing germinated seedlings weekly. Due to uneven soil conditions, soil collars varied +/- 1 cm in their insertion depth. Generally, the insertion was chosen to be as shallow as possible, minimizing the trenching effect (Heinemeyer et al., 2011)

while maintaining an airtight connection between soil and chamber. A foam gasket and rubber seal between the bottom of the chamber and the top of the soil collar minimized leaks between the collar and the chamber. Before each measurement, the distance between the soil surface and the top of each soil collar (i.e. chamber offset) was measured and entered into the LICOR-software to enable correct flux calculations (= total chamber volume). After installation in May 2006, soil CO₂ efflux measurements were carried out over a period of one month to record the insertion and disturbance effects (Fig. S1). The investigation period spanned over three years (January 2008 until December 2010), after the collars were well established and held vegetation free for 1.5 years, allowing a die-back and decomposition of trenched roots, and in-growth of new roots from the outside vegetation. This ensured that soil respiration measurements in a dense, closed grassland canopy were taken as unbiased as possible. Measurements of soil respiration were carried out weekly in the evening, except in July 2009. From May to July 2010 and from October to December 2010, measurements were carried out every second week. No measurements were carried out in November and December 2008. During the measurement, a pump provided circulating air flow from the closed chamber on its collar to the infrared gas analyzer for thorough mixing of the systems' inner volume. Chamber closure time was between 1 and 3 min., depending on the season (i.e. the strength of the CO₂ efflux and thus the detection limit). CO₂ and H₂O concentrations were measured simultaneously. The software calculated soil respiration rates by using the changes in CO₂ concentration over a period of time, taking the dilution of water vapor into account. Rates were calculated either by linear regression (lin_flux) or as the efflux rate at time t_0 at chamber closure using an exponential CO₂ efflux function (exp_flux) (LI-COR, 2007). The latter takes the diminishing CO₂ concentration gradient between the soil and the chamber headspace into account (Hutchinson and Mosier, 1981) and is implemented by LI-COR in the LI-8100 to avoid underestimations of the CO₂ efflux. We used the following algorithm to choose between

these two types of flux calculation for the subsequent processing of all obtained flux data. The use of the exp_flux calculation was only allowed when (1) the R^2 of the exp_flux calculation was better than that of the lin_flux calculation, and (2) when the number of iterations necessary for the exp_flux calculation was lower than 5. By applying these comparatively strict criteria (stricter than those that are inbuilt by the manufacturer) we minimized miscalculations caused either by large initial CO₂ concentration fluctuations at chamber closure (when the exp_flux calculation is used) or underestimations of the true soil CO₂ efflux (when only the lin_flux calculation is used). The algorithm was applied to each measurement with the same settings. In general, CO₂ flux rates with an R^2 below 0.90 were excluded. This was the case in 0.6 % of all measurements taken in this study throughout the three year investigation period.

Soil moisture was measured in each FACE plot as the volumetric water content (VWC) with time-domain-reflectometric (TDR) probes (Imko, Ettlingen, Germany, type P2G). The probes were permanently installed (in March 1998) within the top 15 cm. The probes were monitored manually once a day, except on weekends or holidays. Soil temperature was logged in every plot at 10 cm depth as 30-min means (Imko, Ettlingen, Germany, Pt-100 sensors).

2.3 Data analyses

In order to describe changes in soil respiration during different seasons and to test for differences in soil respiration between ambient and elevated CO₂, we performed a linear mixed-effect model analysis with SPSS version 18. We used all observational data of three years for the linear mixed-effect model analysis. CO₂ treatment was considered as a fixed effect in the model. Coding variables were introduced to indicate the hierarchical order of the data. The six mean fluxes taken in one measurement cycle received the same numerical code; this variable (“measurement cycle”) was considered as a random effect in the linear mixed

effect model. A further variable (“ringreplicate”) was introduced to define the ring where the measurement was taken (1-6). “Ringreplicate” was selected as a repeated measure in the SPSS software using linear mixed effect model analysis. Maximum likelihood was used as the estimation method for the parameters in the model. The total observational data set was split by season to analyze seasonal CO₂-response patterns. Therefore, we distinguished the following five seasons (1 – 5), depending on major dates of phenology and management practices at the grassland study site (Fig. 1): **1** = *winter* (November – March); **2** = *start of vegetation period* up to the date of spring fertilizer application (March – middle of April); **3** = *spring* until first biomass harvest (middle of April – end of May); **4** = regrowth and *summer* growing season (end of May – beginning of September); **5** = regrowth and *autumn* growing season (beginning of September – end of October).

The start of the vegetation period for the grassland ecosystem was identified according to the calculations defined by Wasshausen (1987). The date of leaf discoloration of *Quercus robur* in the nearby phenological garden was used to identify the beginning of winter dormancy. All other dates were chosen according to the management practices at the study site (Fig. 1); the exact dates varied by a few days between the years.

2.4 Soil respiration model

We applied a temperature response model to fill gaps in the measured data set. Therefore a function was fitted according to Lloyd & Taylor (1994) (Eq. 1) to 20 % of the data that were randomly selected. We defined values for coefficients E0 (= 62.16), T0 (= 262.47) and R10 (= 2.85) for the first run of the model. Subsequently, E0, T0 and R10 were fitted for each treatment (ambient and eCO₂) by using the dynamic fit function in the SigmaPlot 11.0 software package (Systat Software, San Jose, CA, 2008). Mean soil temperature values were converted from °C to K.

$$f = R_{10} e^{E_0 \left(\frac{1}{(283.15 - T_0)} - \frac{1}{(x - T_0)} \right)} \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

with E_0 = activation-energy-type empirical coefficient

T_0 = lower temperature limit for soil respiration in K

R_{10} = respiration rate at 10 °C

Consequently, the quality of the soil respiration model was evaluated by plotting modelled soil respiration rates against the remaining 80% of the observed respiration values to test if the linear trend line meets the requested slope of 1 (Fig. 5).

2.5 Gap filling of soil respiration data

To obtain annual sums of soil respiration, a gap filling procedure was applied. Therefore modelled soil respiration rates were calculated, based on the almost continuous data set of soil temperature in 10 cm depth measured at 2-3 positions per ring. We received modelled fluxes for every 15 minutes over the three year period for all gaps where no observational data were available. Estimates of annual sums were then calculated with the observational data and the modelled data (Table 3) per ring and averaged between treatments as true steps (n=3). Differences in annual soil respiration between the CO₂ treatments were tested by using a paired t-test. Further, the absolute difference and relative change of monthly mean soil respiration rates under eCO₂ were calculated in comparison to soil respiration under ambient CO₂, based on observational and modelled data (Table 3). For calculating the relative change ambient soil respiration was set to 0 %.

3 Results

3.1 Annual variability of soil respiration

From 2008 to 2010, soil respiration rates at the GiFACE experiment showed distinct annual dynamics, following the seasonal temperature cycle with lowest soil respiration effluxes during winter months and highest effluxes during mid-summer (Fig. 2c and 2g). Thus, soil respiration rates responded to abiotic factors in particular temperature and moisture. This is exemplified by the high CO₂ efflux rates in June 2009 which occurred shortly after a period of high precipitation while soil temperatures were > 20 °C (Fig. 2g).

The relative and absolute change of soil respiration under *e*CO₂ (Fig 2d and 2e) followed a seasonal pattern with greatest increases under *e*CO₂ during *autumn* and *winter*. During midsummer, when the largest absolute soil respiration rates occurred, the relative increase due to the CO₂ enrichment was lowest or non-existent. A linear mixed effect model analysis confirmed that soil respiration rates under *e*CO₂ were significantly higher compared to rates under ambient CO₂ during *autumn* (15.7 %) and *winter* (17.4 %) (Fig. 3). During all other seasons (*beginning of vegetation period* (season 2), *spring* (season 3) and *summer* (season 4)), covering most of the vegetation period, a trend towards higher soil respiration, but no significant CO₂ effect was observed with *e*CO₂ (Fig. 3).

3.2 Model performance and parameter estimation

By comparing modelled soil respiration with observed soil respiration for all observation dates from 2008 – 2010 a significant linear relationship was observed with a slope of 1.02 (Fig. 5).

Based on the temperature-respiration function by Taylor & Lloyd (1994), soil respiration was significantly correlated to soil temperature under ambient as well as $e\text{CO}_2$ ($p = <0.0001$). From 2008 to 2010, 75 % of the variability of soil respiration rates was explained by soil temperature under ambient CO_2 and 82 % under $e\text{CO}_2$ (Fig. 4, Table 1). Soil respiration rates did not differ in their relationship to soil temperature between the treatments (Fig. 4).

3.3 Annual sums of soil respiration

Comparing annual sums of soil respiration, no mean treatment effect of elevated CO_2 (over all seasons) was observed in any of the observation years (Table 2). Mean annual estimates of soil respiration under ambient CO_2 ranged from 1283 to 1344 $\text{g C} [\text{CO}_2] \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and under $e\text{CO}_2$ from 1300 to 1352 $\text{g C} [\text{CO}_2] \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Table 2).

4 Discussion

4.1 Annual sums of soil respiration

In contrast to our initial hypotheses, annual estimates of soil respiration were not different between the CO₂ treatments (Table 2). Mean annual sums of soil respiration were 1317 ± 18 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ under ambient CO₂ and 1331 ± 16 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ under elevated CO₂. Raich and Schlesinger (1992) estimated much lower rates of annual soil respiration, reporting 400 to 500 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ for temperate grasslands. Annual soil respiration sums from a sandstone and serpentine grassland were 485 and 346 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ (Luo et al., 1996). These soil respiration rates were lower than those from the wet grassland site investigated here due to the larger net primary productivity of the wet temperate grassland with a year-round more or less moist climate, compared e.g. to a seasonally dry Mediterranean-type grassland. A lower net ecosystem productivity (NEP) will automatically result in lower overall soil respiratory C losses. Methodological differences may have been to a lesser extent been responsible, because the studies of Luo et al. (1996) and Raich and Schlesinger (1992) may have overestimated rather than underestimated the annual soil respiration. Their measurements did not exceed 2 years in duration and soil respiration was less frequently measured for a portion of the year. Other recent studies reported higher rates of annual soil respiration which are closer to our estimates; however climatic factors are different from our site: In a tallgrass prairie of Oklahoma annual soil respiration rates were 1131 and 877 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ in 2002 and 2003 respectively (Zhou et al., 2006). In a Texas grassland annual soil respiration rates increased with annual precipitation and were 1600, 1300, 1200, 1000, 2100 and 1500 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ in 1993 through 1998 respectively (Mielnick and Dugas, 2000). At the Texas grassland site measurements were conducted year-round with a high time resolution. Consequently annual rates could be estimated by more measured (than gap-filled) data compared to other studies.

However the most important factors were likely the annual precipitation, its distribution over the year, and the annual mean temperature: High annual rainfall, a long growing season and large soil organic C contents explained the higher soil respiration rates (as a consequence of a higher NEP) at the Texas study site. Mean annual precipitation at the GiFACE study site (562 mm) was close to the mean precipitation reached in 1995 at the Texas grassland with 657 mm, when annual soil respiration averaged $1200 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ at the Texas grassland.

4.2 Seasonality of soil respiration

Also, contrary to our initial hypotheses is the observation that soil respiration was not significantly affected during the growing season (*start of vegetation period, spring and summer*) by the moderate long-term CO_2 enrichment. This indicates that any increase in the ecosystem respiration (Lenhart, 2008) during this season will not have been due to enhanced soil (root-derived) respiration but rather to increases in the respiration of the green canopy.

The majority of long-term FACE studies reported significantly increased soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$ during the growing season (Pregitzer et al., 2008; Jackson et al., 2009; Pendall et al., 2001; Dawes et al., 2013; Carol Adair et al., 2011), whereas Bader & Körner (2010) reported that seven years of $e\text{CO}_2$ failed to stimulate cumulative soil respiration significantly during the growing season. Among the mentioned long-term FACE experiments, the GiFACE operates at the lowest CO_2 enrichment step increase (20 % above ambient CO_2), which may have contributed to this result.

However, in line with our hypotheses, the results revealed that 10 years of moderate CO_2 enrichment increased soil respiration during *winter* and *autumn* (Fig. 3). These seasonal stimulations of soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$ were not observed by comparing the annual sums of soil respiration (Table 2). This may be because soil respiration fluxes were lower in *winter*

and *autumn* compared to fluxes from the other seasons where no differences in soil respiration between the CO₂ treatments were observed. However, within the *winter* and *autumn* season differences in soil respiration may play an important role concerning the global C balance. Increased rates of winter soil respiration under *e*CO₂ may increase the observed winter CO₂ maximum in the atmosphere (Raich and Potter, 1995; Keeling et al., 1996) when respiration exceeds photosynthesis. Another reason why annual sums of soil respiration were not different between the CO₂ treatments may be that our model underestimated high soil respiration fluxes (>10 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹). However these fluxes occurred only in 1.72 % of all observations. Our model did not take soil moisture into account. The high variability of observed soil respiration during summer may be partly due to differing soil moisture conditions, which were not significantly different between ambient and *e*CO₂ plots (Kammann et al., 2005; 2008).

In most FACE studies which reported the effect of *e*CO₂ on soil respiration, the winter was excluded since fumigation during this period was mostly switched off (often in response to sub-zero freezing temperatures or deciduous forest ecosystems). This was the case in the Swiss FACE study, where seeded grassland was exposed to 600 ppm CO₂ (de Graaff et al., 2004), the BioCON FACE, also a grassland study (Craine et al., 2001; Carol Adair et al., 2011), the Aspen FACE, an aspen forest enriched with *e*CO₂ (Pregitzer et al., 2008; King et al., 2001), a Japanese model forest ecosystem exposed to 550 ppm CO₂ (Masyagina and Koike, 2012) and in a 9-year FACE study of an alpine treeline ecosystem (Dawes et al., 2013). In the Swiss Canopy Crane study soil respiration was measured during the beginning of the dormant season but not over the complete dormant season while fumigation was switched off (Bader and Körner, 2010). In the Maricopa FACE, where a wheat field was exposed to *e*CO₂, no winter measurements were carried out because this season was a fallow

season (Pendall et al., 2001). Outside the cultivation period no soil respiration measurements were made on a cotton plantation exposed to $e\text{CO}_2$ (Nakayama et al., 1994).

Increased winter soil CO_2 fluxes are in line with results from Selsted et al.(2012), who reported stimulated rates during three consecutive winter periods in a Danish N-limited *Calluna-Deschampsia*-heathland exposed to FACE at 510 ppm (CLIMAITE study). Fumigation was carried out all year-round except during periods with full snow cover. Contrary to our results, in the CLIMAITE study, the stimulatory effect of $e\text{CO}_2$ on soil respiration persisted throughout most of the year, i.e. also in summer and not only during winter. However, in the CLIMAITE study, monthly soil respiration measurements were carried out within the first three years after the experimental start and may therefore reflect short-term responses, driven by the initial CO_2 step increase (Klironomos et al., 2005). Thus the results are not completely comparable to this study where measurements were carried out in the 11th – 13th year of CO_2 enrichment.

To our knowledge, the Duke Forest FACE is the only other FACE experiment where soil respiration was measured in an evergreen ecosystem year-round for several years and after long-term fumigation with $e\text{CO}_2$ (+200 ppm). On average, soil respiration was significantly higher by 23 % under $e\text{CO}_2$. Jackson et al. (2009) summarized, after 10 years of CO_2 enrichment, that the greatest stimulation of soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$ occurred from midsummer to early fall, in contrast to our observations, during winter the CO_2 response of soil respiration was weakest. However, fumigation was stopped at the Duke Forest FACE when ambient air temperature dropped below 5°C for more than one hour.

After short-term enrichment with $e\text{CO}_2$ (550 ppm) on a mixed plantation of *Populus* species (EuroFACE; in the 4th and 5th year of enrichment), Lagomarsino et al. (2013) recorded much

larger stimulation of soil respiration during the vegetation (up to 111 % enhancement) than dormant season (40 % enhancement), when fumigation was stopped, which is also contrary to our results. However, experimental setup and climate differed from our site. While minimum soil temperatures reached -1.7 °C in the GiFACE experiment during winter (Fig. 2b), comparably warm and mild winters without sub-zero temperatures were typical at the EUROFACE site located in Italy. Moreover, the *Populus* plantation was a fertilized agro-ecosystem, where coppicing was carried out every three years, while the GiFACE was an old established, species-rich ecosystem where N-supply was limited.

In line with results from the EuroFACE but in contrast to our findings, Volk & Niklaus (2002) did not observe any wintertime increase in the ecosystem CO₂ efflux from a calcareous grassland in response to three years of CO₂ enrichment (600 ppm) with a screen-aided CO₂ enrichment facility.

Investigations from the GiFACE experiment showed that N₂O emissions also exhibited a “seasonality response”, with the greatest stimulation of N₂O emission under *e*CO₂ being observed in late-summer and autumn (Kammann et al., 2008). These findings support the hypothesis that the driving mechanism of the *e*CO₂ seasonality responses of enhanced microbial activity may have been related to the mineralization of previously accumulated organic matter, fuelling denitrification (Kammann et al., 2008).

4.3 Root derived soil respiration

Increased root biomass was frequently recorded under *e*CO₂ (Rogers et al., 1994; Jastrow et al., 2000; Lukac et al., 2009), potentially affecting soil respiration rates (Zak et al., 2000). However, at the GiFACE, root biomass, picked with forceps (for set time intervals per sample, n=3 per FACE ring), was only different in December 2005 between the CO₂

treatments but not at other dates during 2004 – 2007 (Lenhart, 2008) or in November 2011 (unpublished results). Lenhart (2008) observed in the GiFACE $e\text{CO}_2$ plots, using Keeling plots and two-component mixing models that the fraction of root-derived CO_2 (root- and root-exudate respiration and fine root decay), as part of the total soil CO_2 efflux was lower in winter than during the growing season. Accordingly, during *winter*, the soil CO_2 efflux originated mainly from microbial soil respiration.

Higher fine root turnover under $e\text{CO}_2$, resulting in higher C input via root necromass could explain increased *autumn* soil respiration but unlikely the *winter* increase in soil CO_2 efflux at the GiFACE since root necromass was not changed under $e\text{CO}_2$ in November 2011 (unpublished results). Alternatively, differences in the root necromass could already have been decomposed at this time of sampling or may be observed later in the year, so that “enhanced fine root decomposition” as cause of the *autumn* and *winter* soil respiration increase under $e\text{CO}_2$ cannot be ruled out.

4.5 N availability

Since soil microorganisms require C as well as N for maintenance and growth (De Graaff et al., 2006; Zak et al., 1993), N availability plays an important role in determining soil CO_2 efflux. Root respiration rates were observed to correlate with tissue nitrogen concentration (Burton et al., 1996, 1998). In the Giessen-FACE, $e\text{CO}_2$ caused reduced tissue N concentrations and higher C:N-ratios of aboveground plant biomass (Kammann et al., 2008). Through freezing effects in winter, mineral N, which was immobilized into the microbial biomass shortly after fertilizer application in spring, became partly available again (Müller et al., 2003). It is possible that N, as a limiting factor in the temperate grassland, may

partly be responsible for the increase in soil C loss during the *autumn* and *winter* season under $e\text{CO}_2$.

4.6 Microbial community

Multiple observations from the GiFACE indicated that increases in winter soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$ were largely associated with microbial respiration (including rhizosphere microbiota). Recent studies from other FACE sites detected differences between microbial communities at $e\text{CO}_2$ compared to ambient CO_2 (Drigo et al., 2008; Drigo et al., 2009). At the GiFACE, stimulated rhizosphere-C utilization by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi were found under $e\text{CO}_2$ by a ^{13}C -PLFA study (Denef et al., 2007), which may have contributed to altered soil respiration. Recent measurements in 2013 did not indicate any differences in the abundance of bacteria and archaea between the ambient and $e\text{CO}_2$ plots (K. Brenzinger, personal communication) so that this can be ruled out as a cause for differed soil respiration between the CO_2 treatments if this observation persists throughout *autumn* and *winter*.

4.7 Soil moisture

Several studies showed that $e\text{CO}_2$ can affect soil moisture (Niklaus et al., 1998; Field et al., 1995; Hungate et al., 1997), which in turn regulates soil respiration. However, large effects are only expected and were detected at the dry end of the spectrum (Moyano et al., 2012; Guntinas et al., 2013; Rodrigo et al., 1997). During the investigation period, the volumetric water content ranged from 20 to 80 vol.% at the GiFACE site, with an average of 44% during 2008-2010, and 39% over the vegetation periods of these years. Thus, the soil moisture effect is likely not to be large. Moreover, no significant effect of $e\text{CO}_2$ on the soil water content was observed either during the first 5 years of enrichment (Kammann et al., 2005) or after 13 years of

enrichment (Meine, 2013). Consequently, a CO₂-induced soil moisture effect is unlikely governing increased soil respiration rates.

However, it can be assumed that annual dynamics of soil moisture with wettest conditions in winter, i.e. close to saturation, and driest conditions in summer (Fig. 2a) contributed to the seasonal dynamics of soil respiration under *e*CO₂ due to diffusion limitations. Previous results from the GiFACE site show that in periods when soil moisture in the main rooting zone was low (0.3 m³ m⁻³), soil continued to produce N₂O from deeper soil layers (20 – 50 cm), where soil moisture remained high (c. 0.6 m³ m⁻³) (Müller et al., 2004). The production of N₂O at deep soil layers seemed to coincide with the production of CO₂ during summer, which was also characterized by a homogenous δ ¹³CO₂ profile during vegetation period at our study site (Lenhart, 2008). However, a detailed investigation on layer-specific CO₂ production was beyond the scope of this study. At times of high soil moisture CO₂ diffusion was slowed down, coinciding with limited oxygen supply (Skopp et al., 1990). At these times, soil respiration was likely originating to a major part from the topsoil. However, increased *autumn* soil respiration under *e*CO₂ cannot be attributed to this phenomenon since soil water content is relatively low at this season (Fig. 2a). We suggest that increased substrate supply under *e*CO₂ from end-of-season dieback of roots and enhanced root-associated microbiome activity may explain stimulated soil respiration rates in *autumn*.

4.9 Plant community

Another aspect which may have contributed to altered soil respiration rates under *e*CO₂ is a shift in the plant community composition. Grütters et al. (2006) observed that summer-greens decreased, whereas evergreens increased under *e*CO₂ in the GiFACE experiment. Since soil respiration is controlled by substrate supply via rhizodeposition (Verburg et al., 2004; Wan

and Luo, 2003;Craine et al., 1999), higher photosynthetic activity in $e\text{CO}_2$ plots during mild *winter* may have contributed to the observed increase in soil respiration. In addition, since the vegetative aboveground growth is dormant and does not provide an assimilate sink, the relative proportion of assimilate partitioned below-ground towards the root-associated microbiota may increase, contributing to the relative increase under $e\text{CO}_2$ during *winter*. The higher abundance of evergreens at $e\text{CO}_2$ also underlines the importance of a year-round CO_2 enrichment strategy in such ecosystems with the respective climatic conditions. To date, increased winter soil respiration at $e\text{CO}_2$ was only found in FACE experiments with year-round fumigation and a photosynthesizing at least partly green canopy, i.e. in the CLIMAITE study (Selsted et al., 2012) and in this study.

5 Conclusions

In conclusion, our results demonstrate the importance of winter soil respiration measurements, by showing that soil respiration was increased during *autumn* and *winter* after moderate long-term $e\text{CO}_2$. Measurements and year-round CO_2 enrichment should not be neglected, at least in winter-green temperate ecosystems. Studies in such ecosystems excluding measurements during the dormant season may thus underestimate the effect of $e\text{CO}_2$ on annual soil-respiratory CO_2 losses (i.e. leading to an overestimation of C sequestered). Consequently, winter soil CO_2 fluxes may play a crucial role in determining the carbon balance and dynamics of temperate grassland ecosystems. Our results indicate that temperate European grasslands which are characterized by a greenhouse gas balance near zero (Soussana et al., 2007) may gradually turn into greenhouse gas sources with rising atmospheric CO_2 due to enhanced CO_2 losses during *autumn* and *winter*, in particular if N_2O emissions are significantly increased as well as observed in the GiFACE (Kammann et al., 2008; Regan et al., 2011).

To generalize and explain the variation in the temporal dynamics of soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$ more studies of winter C dynamics under long-term $e\text{CO}_2$ are required. For such future studies it is advisable to include frequent samplings of root biomass, including the fine root fraction and necromass, in particular during the *autumn/winter* period under $e\text{CO}_2$. Another beneficial research strategy may be combined (pulse) labelling of ^{15}N and ^{13}C to elucidate gross C and N turnover processes after long-term (>10 years) of CO_2 enrichment to study the C-N gross dynamics and associated carbonaceous gas losses.

578 *Acknowledgements*

579 We are grateful to both, the Hessian Agency for the Environment and Geology (HLUG) for
580 long-term financial support, and to the Hessian Ministry for Science and Arts for financial
581 funding within the LOEWE research project FACE₂FACE. The technical assistance of Jochen
582 Senkbeil, Jürgen Franz, Till Strohbusch and Birte Lenz at the Giessen FACE site is gratefully
583 acknowledged, as well as the assistance of Matthias Daum, Christian Eckhard, Christoph von
584 Bredow and Yvette Kühnel. We gratefully acknowledge the long-term engagement of Prof.
585 Dr. Dr hc. H.-J. Jäger († 18.8.2013) who initiated and nourished the Giessen FACE study over
586 more than a decade.

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

References

- Allen, A. S., Andrews, J. A., Finzi, A. C., Matamala, R., Richter, D. D., and Schlesinger, W. H.: Effects of free-air CO₂ enrichment (FACE) on belowground processes in a *Pinus taeda* forest, *Ecol. Appl.*, 10, 437-448, 10.2307/2641105, 2000.
- Amundson, R.: The carbon budget in soils, *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 29, 535-562, 2001.
- Andrews, J. A., and Schlesinger, W. H.: Soil CO₂ dynamics, acidification, and chemical weathering in a temperate forest with experimental CO₂ enrichment, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 15, 149-162, 10.1029/2000gb001278, 2001.
- Bader, M. K. F., and Körner, C.: No overall stimulation of soil respiration under mature deciduous forest trees after 7 years of CO₂ enrichment, *Global Change Biol.*, 16, 2830-2843, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02159.x, 2010.
- Batjes, N. H.: Total carbon and nitrogen in the soils of the world, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 47, 151-163, 10.1111/j.1365-2389.1996.tb01386.x, 1996.
- Burton, A. J., Pregitzer, K. S., Zogg, G. P., and Zak, D. R.: Latitudinal variation in sugar maple fine root respiration, *Can. J. For. Res.*, 26, 1761-1768, 10.1139/x26-200, 1996.
- Burton, A. J., Pregitzer, K. S., Zogg, G. P., and Zak, D. R.: Drought reduces root respiration in sugar maple forests, *Ecol. Appl.*, 8, 771-778, 10.1890/1051-0761(1998)008[0771:droris]2.0.co;2, 1998.
- Carol Adair, E., Reich, P. B., Trost, J. J., and Hobbie, S. E.: Elevated CO₂ stimulates grassland soil respiration by increasing carbon inputs rather than by enhancing soil moisture, *Global Change Biol.*, 17, 3546-3563, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02484.x, 2011.
- Chapin, F. S., III, Matson, P. A., and Mooney, H. A.: *Principles of terrestrial ecosystem ecology*, Springer, New York, 436 pp., 2002.
- Craine, J. M., Wedin, D. A., and Chapin, F. S.: Predominance of ecophysiological controls on soil CO₂ flux in a Minnesota grassland, *Plant Soil*, 207, 77-86, 1999.
- Craine, J. M., Wedin, D. A., and Reich, P. B.: The response of soil CO₂ flux to changes in atmospheric CO₂, nitrogen supply and plant diversity, *Global Change Biol.*, 7, 947-953, 2001.
- Dawes, M. A., Hagedorn, F., Handa, I. T., Streit, K., Ekblad, A., Rixen, C., Körner, C., and Hattenschwiler, S.: An alpine treeline in a carbon dioxide-rich world: synthesis of a nine-year free-air carbon dioxide enrichment study, *Oecologia*, 171, 623-637, 10.1007/s00442-012-2576-5, 2013.
- De Graaff, M.-A., Van Groenigen, K.-J., Six, J., Hungate, B. A., and Van Kessel, C.: Interactions between plant growth and soil nutrient cycling under elevated CO₂: a meta-analysis, *Global Change Biol.*, 12, 2077-2091, 2006.

636 de Graaff, M. A., Six, J., Harris, D., Blum, H., and van Kessel, C.: Decomposition of soil and
637 plant carbon from pasture systems after 9 years of exposure to elevated CO₂: impact on C
638 cycling and modeling, *Global Change Biol.*, 10, 1922-1935, 10.1111/j.1365-
639 2486.2004.00862.x, 2004.

640 Denef, K., Bubenheim, H., Lenhart, K., Vermeulen, J., van Cleemput, O., Boeckx, P., and
641 Müller, C.: Community shifts and carbon translocation within metabolically-active
642 rhizosphere microorganisms in grasslands under elevated CO₂, *Biogeosciences*, 4, 769-779,
643 2007.

644 Drigo, B., Kowalchuk, G. A., and van Veen, J. A.: Climate change goes underground: effects
645 of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on microbial community structure and activities in the
646 rhizosphere, *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, 44, 667-679, 10.1007/s00374-008-0277-3, 2008.

647 Drigo, B., Van Veen, J. A., and Kowalchuk, G. A.: Specific rhizosphere bacterial and fungal
648 groups respond differently to elevated atmospheric CO₂, *Isme J.*, 3, 1204-1217,
649 10.1038/ismej.2009.65, 2009.

650 Field, C. B., Jackson, R. B., and Mooney, H. A.: Stomatal response to increased CO₂:
651 implications from the plant to the global scale, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 18, 1214-1225, 1995.

652 Grüters, U., Janze, S., Kammann, C., and Jäger, H.-J.: Plant functional types and elevated
653 CO₂: a method of scanning for causes of community alteration, *Journal of Applied Botany*
654 and Food Quality, 80, 116-128, 2006.

655 Guntinas, M. E., Gil-Sotres, F., Leiros, M. C., and Trasar-Cepeda, C.: Sensitivity of soil
656 respiration to moisture and temperature, *J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 13, 445-461, 10.4067/s0718-
657 95162013005000035, 2013.

658 Heinemeyer, A., Di Bene, C., Lloyd, A. R., Tortorella, D., Baxter, R., Huntley, B.,
659 Gelsomino, A., and Ineson, P.: Soil respiration: implications of the plant-soil continuum and
660 respiration chamber collar-insertion depth on measurement and modelling of soil CO₂ efflux
661 rates in three ecosystems, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 62, 82-94, 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2010.01331.x,
662 2011.

663 Hungate, B. A., Chapin, F. S., III, Zhong, H., Holland, E. A., and Field, C. B.: Stimulation of
664 grassland nitrogen cycling under carbon dioxide enrichment, *Oecologia*, 109, 149-153, 1997.

665 Hutchinson, G. L., and Mosier, A. R.: Improved soil cover method for field measurement of
666 nitrous oxide fluxes, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 45, 311-316, 1981.

667 Jackson, R. B., Cook, C. W., Pippen, J. S., and Palmer, S. M.: Increased belowground
668 biomass and soil CO₂ fluxes after a decade of carbon dioxide enrichment in a warm-
669 temperate forest, *Ecology*, 90, 3352-3366, 10.1890/08-1609.1, 2009.

670 Jäger, H.-J., Schmidt, S. W., Kammann, C., Grünhage, L., Müller, C., and Hanewald, K.: The
671 University of Giessen Free-Air Carbon Dioxide Enrichment Study: Description of the
672 experimental site and of a new enrichment system, *J. Appl. Bot.*, 77, 117-127, 2003.

673 Janssens, I. A., and Ceulemans, R.: The response of soil CO₂ efflux under trees grown in
674 elevated atmospheric CO₂: A literature review, *Phyton-Ann. REI Bot.*, 40, 97-101, 2000.

675 Jastrow, J. D., Miller, R. M., and Owensby, C. E.: Long-term effects of elevated atmospheric
676 CO₂ on below-ground biomass and transformation to soil organic matter in grassland, *Plant*
677 *Soil*, 224, 85-97, 2000.

678 Kammann, C., Grünhage, L., Grüters, U., Janze, S., and Jäger, H.-J.: Response of
679 aboveground grassland biomass and soil moisture to moderate long-term CO₂ enrichment,
680 *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 6, 351-365, 2005.

681 Kammann, C., Müller, C., Grünhage, L., and Jäger, H.-J.: Elevated CO₂ stimulates N₂O
682 emissions in permanent grassland, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 40, 2194-2205, 2008.

683 Keeling, C. D., Chin, J. F. S., and Whorf, T. P.: Increased activity of northern vegetation
684 inferred from atmospheric CO₂ measurements, *Nature*, 382, 146-149, 1996.

685 King, J. S., Pregitzer, K. S., Zak, D. R., Sober, J., Isebrands, J. G., Dickson, R. E., Hendrey,
686 G. R., and Karnosky, D. F.: Fine-root biomass and fluxes of soil carbon in young stands of
687 paper birch and trembling aspen as affected by elevated atmospheric CO₂ and tropospheric
688 O₃, *Oecologia*, 128, 237-250, 2001.

689 King, J. S., Hanson, P. J., Bernhardt, E., DeAngelis, P., Norby, R. J., and Pregitzer, K. S.: A
690 multiyear synthesis of soil respiration responses to elevated atmospheric CO₂ from four forest
691 FACE experiments, *Global Change Biol.*, 10, 1027-1042, 10.1111/j.1529-8817.2003.00789.x,
692 2004.

693 Kirschbaum, M. U. F.: Will changes in soil organic carbon act as a positive or negative
694 feedback on global warming?, *Biogeochem.*, 48, 21-51, 10.1023/a:1006238902976, 2000.

695 Klironomos, J. N., Allen, M. F., Rillig, M. C., Piotrowski, J., Makvandi-Nejad, S., Wolfe, B.
696 E., and Powell, J. R.: Abrupt rise in atmospheric CO₂ overestimates community response in a
697 model-plant soil system, *Nature*, 433, 621-624, 2005.

698 Lagomarsino, A., Lukac, M., Godbold, D. L., Marinari, S., and De Angelis, P.: Drivers of
699 increased soil respiration in a poplar coppice exposed to elevated CO₂, *Plant Soil*, 362, 93-
700 106, 10.1007/s11104-012-1261-0, 2013.

701 Lal, R.: Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change and food security,
702 *Science*, 304, 1623-1627, 2004.

703 Leadley, P. W., and Drake, B. G.: Open top chambers for exposing plant canopies to elevated
704 CO₂ concentration and for measuring net gas-exchange *Vegetatio*, 104, 3-15,
705 10.1007/bf00048141, 1993.

706 Lenhart, K.: The effects of long-term Free Air CO₂ Enrichment (FACE) on soil aggregation,
707 soil carbon input, and ecosystem CO₂ dynamics in a temperate grassland ecosystem,
708 Department of Plant Ecology, Justus-Liebig University, Giessen, 134 pp., 2008.

- 709 LI-COR: LI-8100 Instruction Manual, LI-8100 automated soil CO₂ flux system., Li-COR,
710 Inc, Lincoln, NE, USA 68504, 2007.
- 711 Liu, Q., Edwards, N. T., Post, W. M., Gu, L., Ledford, J., and Lenhart, S.: Temperature-
712 independent diel variation in soil respiration observed from a temperate deciduous forest,
713 *Global Change Biol.*, 12, 2136-2145, 2006.
- 714 Lloyd, J., and Taylor, J. A.: On the temperature-dependence of soil respiration, *Funct. Ecol.*,
715 8, 315-323, 10.2307/2389824, 1994.
- 716 Lukac, M., Lagomarsino, A., Moscatelli, M. C., De Angelis, P., Cotrufo, M. F., and Godbold,
717 D. L.: Forest soil carbon cycle under elevated CO₂ – a case of increased throughput?,
718 *Forestry*, 82, 75-86, 10.1093/forestry/cpn041, 2009.
- 719 Luo, Y., Jackson, R. B., Field, C. B., and Mooney, H. A.: Elevated CO₂ increases
720 belowground respiration in California grasslands, *Oecologia*, 108, 130-137,
721 10.1007/bf00333224, 1996.
- 722 Luo, Y.: Transient ecosystem responses to free-air CO₂ enrichment (FACE): experimental
723 evidence and methods of analysis, *New Phytol.*, 152, 3-8, 2001.
- 724 Luo, Y., Wu, L., Andrews, J. A., White, L., Matamala, R., Schäfer, K. V. R., and Schlesinger,
725 W. H.: Elevated CO₂ differentiates ecosystem carbon processes: deconvolution analysis of
726 Duke forest data, *Ecol. Monogr.*, 71, 357-376, 2001.
- 727 Luo, Y. a. Z., Z.: *Soil Respiration and the Environment*, Academic/Elsevier, San Diego,
728 328 pp., 2006.
- 729 Masyagina, O. V., and Koike, T.: Soil Respiration in Model Plantations under Conditions of
730 Elevated CO₂ in the Atmosphere (Hokkaido Island, Japan), *Russ. J. Ecol.*, 43, 24-28,
731 10.1134/s1067413611060099, 2012.
- 732 McDermitt, D., Xu, L., Gracia, R., Madsen, R., and Anderson, D.: On equalizing pressure in a
733 soil respiration chamber with pressure in the ambient air under windy conditions, *Geophysical*
734 *Research Abstracts*, 7 05841, 2005.
- 735 Meine, M.: Charakterisierung und Quantifizierung der mikrobiellen Bodenrespiration eines
736 Grünlandbodens unter erhöhten atmosphärischen CO₂-Konzentrationen., diploma,
737 Geography, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Marburg, 101 pp., 2013.
- 738 Mielnick, P. C., and Dugas, W. A.: Soil CO₂ flux in a tallgrass prairie, *Soil Biology and*
739 *Biochemistry*, 32, 221-228, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(99\)00150-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00150-9), 2000.
- 740 Monastersky, R.: Global carbon dioxide levels near worrisome milestone, *Nature*, 497, 13-14,
741 2013.
- 742 Moss, R. H., Edmonds, J. A., Hibbard, K. A., Manning, M. R., Rose, S. K., van Vuuren, D. P.,
743 Carter, T. R., Emori, S., Kainuma, M., Kram, T., Meehl, G. A., Mitchell, J. F. B.,

744 Nakicenovic, N., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Stouffer, R. J., Thomson, A. M., Weyant, J. P., and
 745 Wilbanks, T. J.: The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment,
 746 *Nature*, 463, 747-756,
 747 http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v463/n7282/supinfo/nature08823_S1.html, 2010.

748 Moyano, F. E., Vasilyeva, N., Bouckaert, L., Cook, F., Craine, J., Curiel Yuste, J., Don, A.,
 749 Epron, D., Formanek, P., Franzluebbers, A., Ilstedt, U., Kätterer, T., Orchard, V., Reichstein,
 750 M., Rey, A., Ruamps, L., Subke, J. A., Thomsen, I. K., and Chenu, C.: The moisture response
 751 of soil heterotrophic respiration: interaction with soil properties, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 1173-
 752 1182, 10.5194/bg-9-1173-2012, 2012.

753 Müller, C., Kammann, C., Ottow, J. C. G., and Jäger, H.-J.: Nitrous oxide emission from
 754 frozen grassland soil and during thawing periods, *Z. Pflanzenern. Bodenk.*, 166, 46-53, 2003.

755 Müller, C., Stevens, R. J., Laughlin, R. J., and Jäger, H.-J.: Microbial processes and the site of
 756 N₂O production in a temperate grassland soil, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 36, 453-461, 2004.

757 Nakayama, F. S., Huluka, G., Kimball, B. A., Lewin, K. F., Nagy, J., and Hendrey, G. R.: Soil
 758 carbon dioxide fluxes in natural and CO₂-enriched systems, *Agric. For. Met.*, 70, 131-140,
 759 10.1016/0168-1923(94)90052-3, 1994.

760 Newton, P. C. D., Clark, H., Edwards, G. R., and Ross, D. J.: Experimental confirmation of
 761 ecosystem model predictions comparing transient and equilibrium plant responses to elevated
 762 atmospheric CO₂, *Ecol. Lett.*, 4, 344-347, 2001.

763 Niklaus, P. A., Spinnler, D., and Korner, C.: Soil moisture dynamics of calcareous grassland
 764 under elevated CO₂, *Oecologia*, 117, 201-208, 10.1007/s004420050649, 1998.

765 Pendall, E., Leavitt, S. W., Brookes, T., Kimball, B. A., Pinter, P. J., Jr, Wall, G. W.,
 766 LaMorte, R. L., Wechsung, G., Wechsung, F., Adamsen, F., Matthias, A. D., and Thompson,
 767 T. L.: Elevated CO₂ stimulates soil respiration in a FACE wheat field, *Bas. App. Ecol.*, 2,
 768 193-201, 2001.

769 Pregitzer, K. S., Burton, A. J., King, J. S., and Zak, D. R.: Soil respiration, root biomass, and
 770 root turnover following long-term exposure of northern forests to elevated atmospheric CO₂
 771 and tropospheric O₃, *New Phytol.*, 180, 153-161, 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02564.x, 2008.

772 Raich, J. W., and Schlesinger, W. H.: The global carbon dioxide flux in soil respiration and its
 773 relationship to vegetation and climate, *Tellus*, 44B, 81-99, 1992.

774 Raich, J. W., and Potter, C. S.: Global patterns of carbon dioxide emissions from soils, *Global*
 775 *Biogeochem. Cyc.*, 9, 23-36, 1995.

776 Rastetter, E. B., Ryan, M. G., Shaver, G. R., Melillo, J. M., Nadelhoffer, K. J., Hobbie, J. E.,
 777 and Aber, J. D.: A general biogeochemical model describing the response of the C and N
 778 cycles in terrestrial ecosystems to changes in CO₂, climate, and N deposition, *Tree Phys.*, 9,
 779 101-126, 1991.

780 Raynaud, D., and Barnola, J. M.: An Antarctic ice core reveals atmospheric CO₂ variations
781 over the past few centuries, *Nature*, 315, 309-311, 1985.

782 Regan, K., Kammann, C., Hartung, K., Lenhart, K., Muller, C., Philippot, L., Kandeler, E.,
783 and Marhan, S.: Can differences in microbial abundances help explain enhanced N₂O
784 emissions in a permanent grassland under elevated atmospheric CO₂?, *Global Change Biol.*,
785 17, 3176-3186, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02470.x, 2011.

786 Rodrigo, A., Recous, S., Neel, C., and Mary, B.: Modelling temperature and moisture effects
787 on C-N transformations in soils: comparison of nine models, *Ecol. Mod.*, 102, 325-339, 1997.

788 Rogers, H. H., Runion, G. B., and Krupa, S. V.: Plant responses to atmospheric CO₂
789 enrichment with emphasis on roots and the rhizosphere, *Environ. Pollut.*, 83, 155-189, 1994.

790 Schils, R. L. M., Kuikman, P., Liski, J., van Oijen, M., Smith, P., Webb, J., Alm, J., Somogyi,
791 Z., van den Akker, J., Billett, M., Emmett, B. A., Evans, C. D., Lindner, M., Palosuo, T.,
792 Bellamy, P. H., Jandl, R., and Hiederer, R.: Review of existing information on the
793 interrelations between soil and climate change, *Alterra*, Wageningen, 208, 2008.

794 Selsted, M. B., van der Linden, L., Ibrom, A., Michelsen, A., Larsen, K. S., Pedersen, J. K.,
795 Mikkelsen, T. N., Pilegaard, K., Beier, C., and Ambus, P.: Soil respiration is stimulated by
796 elevated CO₂ and reduced by summer drought: three years of measurements in a multifactor
797 ecosystem manipulation experiment in a temperate heathland (CLIMITE), *Global Change*
798 *Biology*, 18, 1216-1230, 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02634.x, 2012.

799 Skopp, J., Jawson, M. D., and Doran, J. W.: Steady-State Aerobic Microbial Activity as a
800 Function of Soil Water Content, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 54, 1619-1625,
801 10.2136/sssaj1990.03615995005400060018x, 1990.

802 Soe, A. R. B., Giesemann, A., Anderson, T. H., Weigel, H. J., and Buchmann, N.: Soil
803 respiration under elevated CO₂ and its partitioning into recently assimilated and older carbon
804 sources, *Plant Soil*, 262, 85-94, 10.1023/B:PLSO.0000037025.78016.9b, 2004.

805 Soussana, J. F., Fuhrer, J., Jones, M. B., and Van Amstel, A. R.: The greenhouse gas balance
806 of grasslands in Europe, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 121, 1-4, 2007.

807 Verburg, P. J., Arnone, J. A., III, Obrist, D., Schorran, D. E., Evans, R. D., Leroux-Swarthout,
808 D., Johnson, D. W., Luo, Y., and Coleman, J. S.: Net ecosystem carbon exchange in two
809 experimental grassland ecosystems, *Global Change Biol.*, 10, 498-508, 2004.

810 Volk, M., and Niklaus, P. A.: Respiratory carbon loss of calcareous grasslands in winter
811 shows no effects of 4 years' CO₂ enrichment, *Funct. Ecol.*, 16, 162-166, 2002.

812 Wan, S. Q., and Luo, Y. Q.: Substrate regulation of soil respiration in a tallgrass prairie:
813 Results of a clipping and shading experiment, *Global Biogeochem. Cyc.*, 17, 1054
814 10.1029/2002gb001971, 2003.

815 Ward, J. K., and Kelly, J. K.: Scaling up evolutionary responses to elevated CO₂: lessons from
816 *Arabidopsis*, Ecol. Lett., 7, 427-440, 2004.

817 Wasshausen, W.: Frühjahrspflege auf dem Grünland:Zehn Punkte beachten,
818 Landwirtschaftsblatt Weser-Ems, 8, 6-8, 1987.

819 Zak, D. R., Pregitzer, K. S., Curtis, P. S., Teeri, J. A., Fogel, R., and Randlett, D. L.: Elevated
820 atmospheric CO₂ and feedback between carbon and nitrogen cycles, Plant Soil, 151, 105-117,
821 1993.

822 Zak, D. R., Pregitzer, K. S., King, J. S., and Holmes, W. E.: Elevated atmospheric CO₂, fine
823 roots and the response of soil microorganisms: a review and hypothesis, New Phytol., 147,
824 201-222, 2000.

825 Zhou, X., Sherry, R. A., An, Y., Wallace, L. L., and Luo, Y.: Main and interactive effects of
826 warming, clipping, and doubled precipitation on soil CO₂ efflux in a grassland ecosystem,
827 Global Biogeochem. Cyc., 20, GB1003, doi:10.1029/2005GB002526, 2006.

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

Tables

Table 1

Results of fitting the temperature-dependence model after Lloyd and Taylor (Lloyd and Taylor, 1994) to 20% of our observation data under ambient and elevated CO₂.

CO ₂ treatment	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Standard Error of Estimate
Ambient CO ₂	0.87	0.75	0.75	1.35
Elevated CO ₂	0.91	0.82	0.82	1.19

Table 2

Annual sums of soil respiration under ambient and $e\text{CO}_2$ from 2008 – 2010. Data are presented as averages ($n=3$) \pm standard error (SE). P-values indicate the difference between treatments per year obtained by a paired t-test.

Year	CO ₂ treatment	Mean annual sum of soil respiration (g CO ₂ m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Mean annual sum of soil respiration (g C[CO ₂] m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Relative change to control (%)	P value
2008	Ambient CO ₂	4854 \pm 34	1324 \pm 9	1.22	0.17
	Elevated CO ₂	4913 \pm 14	1340 \pm 4		
2009	Ambient CO ₂	4928 \pm 48	1344 \pm 13	0.56	0.64
	Elevated CO ₂	4956 \pm 39	1352 \pm 11		
2010	Ambient CO ₂	4702 \pm 37	1283 \pm 10	1.38	0.23
	Elevated CO ₂	4767 \pm 12	1300 \pm 3		

Table 3

Results of the study based on observed and/or modelled data

Results	Observed soil respiration	Modelled soil respiration
Relative mean monthly change of soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$	X	X
Absolute mean monthly difference in soil respiration under $e\text{CO}_2$	X	X
Mean soil respiration rates during the five defined seasons under ambient and elevated CO_2 averaged over three years from 2008 – 2010	X	
Annual sums of soil respiration under ambient and $e\text{CO}_2$ from 2008 – 2010.	X	X

Figure legends

Fig. 1 Seasonal patterns and the five defined seasons at the GiFACE grassland study site.

Fig. 2 Volumetric water content under ambient and elevated CO₂ (a), daily sums of precipitation at the GiFACE (b), mean soil temperature during soil respiration measurements and minimum daily soil temperature at 10 cm depth (c), the relative mean monthly change of soil respiration under elevated CO₂ based on measured and modelled data (d), the absolute mean monthly difference in soil respiration under elevated CO₂ based on measured and modelled data (e), measured soil respiration under ambient and elevated CO₂ from 2008 to 2010 (f) and modelled soil respiration under ambient and elevated CO₂ from 2008 to 2010 (g). Data are presented as averages (n=3) ± 1 SE.


Fig. 3 Mean soil respiration rates during the five defined seasons under ambient and elevated CO₂ averaged over three years from 2008 – 2010. Error bars show ± 1 SE associated by averaging across the three replicates per treatment (n=3) (1) = *winter dormancy*; (2) = *start of vegetation period*; (3) = *spring*; (4) = *summer*; (5) = *autumn* (for details see methods). P-values indicate the difference between treatments obtained by a linear mixed-effect model analysis.

Fig. 4 Relationship between soil respiration rate and soil temperature under ambient and elevated CO₂. Equation of dynamic fit (Lloyd and Taylor, 1994):
$$f = R10e^{E0\left(\frac{1}{(283.15-T0)} - \frac{1}{(x-T0)}\right)}$$


Fig. 5 Observed versus modelled soil respiration rates under ambient and elevated CO₂.

Figures


Fig. 1



941 Fig. 2



943 Fig. 3



944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

Fig. 4





Fig. 5



Supporting Information

Fig. S1




Fig S1: Mean CO₂ efflux +/- standard error (n=3) after installation of the frames and removal of the aboveground biomass on 9th May 2006. On 11 out of 14 measurement occasions all three E-plot fluxes were higher than those of their corresponding A-plot partner. A mixed Model analysis (SPSS version 18) with the factors CO₂-treatment and time revealed that the soil CO₂ efflux was significantly increased by CO₂ enrichment.

Table S1

Parameter estimates of the temperature-dependence model after Lloyd and Taylor (1994)

CO ₂ treatment	Model parameter	Coefficient	P value
Ambient CO ₂	E0	61.92 ± 33.59	0.07
	R10	3.00 ± 0.19	< 0.001
	T0	261.18 ± 6.53	< 0.001
Elevated CO ₂	E0	143.68 ± 103.57	0.17
	R10	3.11 ± 0.17	< 0.001
	T0	248.72 ± 13.35	< 0.001