Referee #1

No additional comments were made, all comments and questions are addressed.

Referee #2

No additional comments were made, all comments and questions were adequately addressed.

Referee #3

GENERAL COMMENTS
I provided a quick access report on the first version of this manuscript submitted to Biogeosciences. I am happy to see from the authors' response to the access reviews, and from reading the current version of the manuscript, how thoroughly the authors have responded to the referees' concerns. As discussed in my earlier report, I believe this meta-analysis is important and timely, given the growth in the number of empirical studies on this topic post-2005, the recent release of the IPCC AR5, and the rising interest in REDD+ schemes for mitigating climate change in developing & newly industrialised tropical countries. This study is especially useful in drawing our attention to major sources of uncertainty in global N-oxide budgets and highlighting major knowledge gaps; namely: pointing-out the scarcity of data on N-oxide fluxes from oil palm and soybean agro-ecosystems; and the under-representation of Africa and Oceania in empirical datasets. In this sense, this meta-analysis/literature review is potentially agenda-setting, and clearly articulates the case for expanding research on N-oxides into these understudied environments or regions. The meta-analysis also confirmed the validity of important under-pinning conceptual models, such as the Hole-In-the-Pipe (HIP) Model (first proposed by Firestone & Davidson in 1989), which has been in use by the modelling and empirical community for the last 3 decades. Further confirmation of the hierarchy of environmental drivers (e.g. N availability>WFPS; no significant role of temperature in modulating fluxes) which N-oxide fluxes provides a means for us to understand and predict how land-use change is likely to impact NO and N2O emissions in various LU & LUC scenarios.
Specific comments are provided in the section below.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS
1. Pages 12797-12804: There are several spelling or grammatical errors in the discussion and conclusion sections that require correction; please re-read these sections and revise the text accordingly.

Thank you, we checked these pages for additional errors.

2. Page 12799, lines 16-22: Consider revising these sentences as the authors' meaning here is not expressed very elegantly or clearly. What the authors appear to be saying is that there is no statistically significant increase in N-oxide emissions following LUC (although there appears to be a non-significant numerical increase); and that increased N-oxide emissions are only to be reliably expected in systems that receive N-fertiliser inputs (e.g. crops, fertilised plantations, etc.).

We have changed lines 16-20 into the following: “According to the meta-analysis LUC overall increased N2O and NO emissions, albeit not significantly. Land-use change types or practices that induced significant changes in emissions all pointed towards increased rather than decreased emissions.”

3. Page 12800, lines 12-21; page 12820 Figure 4: Do the authors have any thoughts as to what may lead to the trend identified in the meta-analysis, i.e. enhancement of N-oxide emissions in the first 5-10 years following disturbance? It may be interesting/thought-provoking for the authors to speculate here; for example, is the initial increase in N-oxides linked to a soil disturbance effect (e.g. mineralisation of N from SOM following land-clearing/site preparation?), or is this driven by external inputs (e.g. re-equilibration of the plant-soil system after it a switch-over to higher N inputs)?

Figure 4 shows that for croplands both non-fertilized and fertilized sites can emit substantial fluxes after conversion. So direct mineral N input alone is not the sole factor determining the increase for the first 5-10 years. Land-clearing and preparation effects are likely to play an important role. We added a sentence in lines 14-22 of page 12800. For pasture this is already discussed in lines 5-11 on page 12800.

4. Page 12802, lines 1-3: To what extent is this high variability caused by temporal variance in N-oxide fluxes? Even with adequate coverage of within or among-plot spatial heterogeneity, one of the underlying problems with field N-oxide flux measurements is the high temporal variability.

The spatial-temporal variation indeed is known to be large for N-oxide flux measurements, although spatial variability is often more important in the tropics than temporal variability. For example, several authors failed to find a diel cycle in chamber flux measurements because day and night temperature differences in the tropics are lower than in temperate and boreal zones.

Our dataset contains yearly averages, derived from measurements throughout the year taken from several spatial replicates. The number of studies that monitored the fluxes during more than a year was very limited. Therefore we cannot – with the existing data – fully answer this question.

True temporal variation needs to be addressed by analysing high-resolution multi-year measurements, similar to spatial variations that needs to be analysed within on temporal unit at varying positions. Although we agree with the reviewer that this is an important point, this is beyond the scope of this study. This is mentioned in the manuscript at page 12800 lines 11-13 and page 12804 lines 13-16.

5. Page 12802, lines 15-17: Lack of temperature sensitivity is a finding that is common to many tropical empirical studies, even with relatively large temperature ranges. Do the authors have any thoughts as to what may explain this lack of temperature response? Is it because N-oxide fluxes are more fundamentally constrained by other variables (e.g. N-availability, anaerobiosis/porosity), or is there some other fundamental reason?

Although for the temperate zone large Q10 values have been reported, several studies showed that when other factors are limiting N-oxide fluxes, the relationship with (soil) temperature could be suppressed (e.g. Dobbie et al., 1999; Skiba and Smith, 2000). We added the following sentences into the discussion at page 12802 line 17: “In the temperate zone exponential increases in N2O emissions with increasing temperature have been reported, whereas in the tropics the evidence is mixed (Skiba and Smith, 2000). Substrate (e.g. N, P) and moisture constraints of microbial processes influencing N-oxide fluxes may reduce the temperature effect. Werner et al. (2006), for instance, demonstrated that variations in N2O emissions from tropical rainforest soils were mainly affected by soil moisture changes and that temperature changes were of minor importance.”

6. Page 12803, lines 17-19: Consider revising this sentence; input of N fertiliser does change N availability. Perhaps a better way of phrasing this is, e.g. “However, increased emissions after LUC were not exclusively due to fertilization; changes in endogenous levels of soil nitrogen availability, or WFPS were also key factors impacting the changes in N2O fluxes.”

Thank you, this is added to the sentence (page 12803, line 18).

Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 12783–12821, 2015
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/12783/2015/
doi:10.5194/bgd-12-12783-2015

Biogeosciences Discussions
Open Access

Soil N_2O and NO emissions from land use and land-use change in the tropics and subtropics: a meta-analysis

J. van Lent[1,2], **K. Hergoualc'h**[1], **and L. V. Verchot**[1,3]

[1]Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Jl. CIFOR, Situ Gede, Bogor 16115, Indonesia
[2]Department of Soil Quality, Wageningen University, Wageningen, the Netherlands
[3]Earth Institute Center for Environmental Sustainability, Columbia University, New York, USA

Received: 15 April 2015 – Accepted: 5 July 2015 – Published: 11 August 2015

Correspondence to: J. van Lent (j.lent@cgiar.org)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Abstract

Deforestation and forest degradation in the tropics may substantially alter soil N-oxide emissions. It is particularly relevant to accurately quantify those changes to properly account for them in a REDD+ climate change mitigation scheme that provides financial incentives to reduce the emissions. With this study we provide updated land use (LU)-based emission rates (~~103~~ 104 studies, ~~387~~ 441 N_2O and 111 NO case studies), determine the trend and magnitude of flux changes with land-use change (LUC) using a meta-analysis approach (~~43~~ 45 studies, ~~132~~ 138 N_2O and 37 NO cases) and evaluate biophysical drivers of N_2O and NO emissions and emission changes for the tropics.

The average N_2O and NO emissions in intact upland tropical forest amounted to 2.0 ± 0.2 (n = ~~88~~ 91) and 1.7 ± 0.5 (n = 36) kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, respectively. In agricultural soils annual N_2O emissions were exponentially related to N fertilization rates and average water-filled pore space (WFPS) whereas in non-agricultural sites a Gaussian response to WFPS fit better the observed NO and N_2O emissions. The sum of soil N_2O and NO fluxes and the ratio of N_2O to NO increased exponentially and significantly with increasing nitrogen availability (expressed as $NO_3^-/[NO_3^- + NH_4^+]$) and WFPS, respectively; following the conceptual Hole-In-the-Pipe model. Nitrous and nitric oxide fluxes did not overall increase significantly as a result of LUC (Hedges's d of 0.11 ± 0.11 and 0.16 ± 0.19, respectively), however individual LUC trajectories or practices did. Nitrous oxide fluxes increased significantly after intact upland forest conversion to croplands (Hedges's $d = 0.78 \pm 0.24$) and NO increased significantly following the conversion of low forest cover (secondary forest younger than 30 years, woodlands, shrublands) (Hedges's d of 0.44 ± 0.13). Forest conversion to fertilized systems significantly and highly raised both N_2O and NO emission rates (Hedges's d of 1.03 ± 0.23 and 0.52 ± 0.09, respectively).

Changes in nitrogen availability and WFPS were the main factors explaining changes in N_2O emissions following LUC, therefore it is important that experimental designs monitor their spatio-temporal variation. Gaps in the literature on N oxide fluxes included

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

geographical gaps (Africa, Oceania) and LU gaps (degraded forest, wetland (notably peat) forest, oil palm plantation and soy cultivation).

1 Introduction

Land use (LU) and land-use change (LUC) are important contributors to global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The current contribution of LUC to total anthropogenic GHG emissions is estimated between 7 and 18 % (Houghton, 2003; Baumert et al., 2005; Baccini et al., 2012; Harris et al., 2012). This estimation heavily depends on biomass values and deforestation rates and is associated with high uncertainties, especially in the tropics (Houghton, 2005). Causes of LUC are a complex and interacting combination of economic, social and political factors (Lambin et al., 2001, 2003). However, population growth and agricultural export correlate well with forest conversion rates (DeFries et al., 2010). A recent comparative study showed commercial and subsistence agriculture to be the most prevalent deforestation driver in non-Annex I (i.e. developing) countries (Hosonuma et al., 2012). Between 1980 and 2000, 83 % of the new agricultural land within the tropical region were converted from intact or disturbed forest (Gibbs et al., 2010). As the world population and food demand are expected to grow (respectively 34 and 70 % by 2050; FAO, 2009), further deforestation is likely in the near future.

By avoiding deforestation and forest degradation and through enhancing carbon (C) stocks in forests, reducing worldwide GHG emissions could be achieved with a reasonable level of cost-efficiency (Stern, 2008; Streck and Parker, 2012). However, for climate change mitigation schemes such as reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+), where payments are based on performance, it is crucial to know how much emissions can be mitigated by preventing deforestation and reforesting. In addition to carbon dioxide (CO_2), several studies on LUC in the tropics reported high non-CO_2 GHG emissions, such as nitrous oxide (N_2O) (e.g. Ishizuka et al., 2005; Keller et al., 2005; Takakai et al., 2006; Verchot et al., 2006; Yashiro et al., 2008) and nitric

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

oxide (NO) (e.g. Verchot et al., 1999; Erickson et al., 2002; Perez et al., 2007; Davidson et al., 2008). Although the absolute mass of N_2O emissions might be small, the global warming potential for N_2O over a 100 year time horizon is 298 times greater than that of CO_2 (Forster et al., 2007). In addition this trace gas also contributes to ozone depletion in the stratosphere (Crutzen, 1970). Nitric oxide, on the other hand, is a free radical that enhances ozone production in the troposphere (lower atmosphere) (Chameides et al., 1992); ozone in the troposphere is a GHG (~~Forster et al., 2007~~). Although NO is in fact an indirect GHG, it is relevant to study its dynamic in combination with that of N_2O as they share the same processes of production (nitrification and denitrification) in the soil and are hypothesized to be interlinked (Firestone and Davidson, 1989).

Emissions factors in the IPPC guidelines for national GHG inventories (2006) have high uncertainties although some of these were slightly reduced in the 2013 wetlands supplement (Drösler et al., 2014). On the one hand, this high uncertainty can be explained by the high temporal and spatial variability of N_2O and NO emissions which are known to vary diurnally, seasonally (see e.g. Meixner et al., 1997; Chen and Huang, 2009; Lin et al., 2010), and locally due to micro site-specific soil variability (Dalal and Allen, 2008). On the other hand, the high uncertainty is partly due to the paucity of reliable estimates available in the peer-reviewed literature.

Sources of biogenic N_2O and NO fluxes from the soil can be a wide variety of microorganisms and processes (Anderson and Poth, 1989), but nitrification and denitrification are the main mechanisms (Davidson et al., 2000; Baggs and Philippot, 2010). Therefore, the magnitude of N_2O and NO fluxes depends on variables that enhance or inhibit nitrification and denitrification such as nitrogen (substrate) availability, soil water content (aeration status), soil temperature and pH (Skiba and Smith, 2000; Heinen, 2006; Dalal and Allen, 2008). Substrates for nitrification and denitrification are ammonium and nitrate, respectively. Ammonium (NH_4^+) is the result of microbial decomposition of soil organic matter and is converted to nitrate (NO_3^-) by the nitrifying bacteria under aerobic conditions. In this process, N_2O and NO are produced and partly emitted to the atmosphere. NO_3^- in return is used under anaerobic conditions as a terminal

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

electron acceptor for denitrifying bacteria that reduce NO_3^- to N_2. Along this reduction gradient N_2O and NO are also produced and partly emitted to the atmosphere (Anderson and Poth, 1989; Baggs and Philippot, 2010).

Both nitrification and denitrification produce N_2O and NO but are influenced differently by the same soil variables. Therefore, models predicting N_2O and NO fluxes need to consider both processes. Firestone and Davidson (1989) proposed a conceptual model – dubbed the "Hole-In-the-Pipe" (HIP) model – that uses two levels of control for N_2O and NO emissions in soils. The first level of control is nitrogen availability, symbolized as the amount of N flowing through the pipes. The second level of control is generally represented by the soil aeration status, explained as the size of the holes in the pipe through which N_2O and NO "leak" into the atmosphere. The HIP-model and its underlying assumptions were tested under distinct conditions, which showed that soil nitrogen availability could be expressed in different ways. Davidson et al. (2000) tested several indicators and found that the C : N ratio of litterfall and the ratio of NO_3^- to the sum of NO_3^- and NH_4^+ were promising proxies of N cycling. Underlining the importance of rapid cycling N in N-oxide production, Purbopuspito et al. (2006) showed a good correlation between $\delta^{15}N$ signatures of litter and soil and emissions of N_2O in Indonesia. Veldkamp et al. (1998) suggested that, in N fertilized systems of Costa Rica, the major factor controlling N_2O emissions was the soil aeration status (second level of control), as N availability exceeded demand. The soil aeration status is commonly expressed by the water-filled pore space (WFPS) (Linn and Doran, 1984); with a high WFPS meaning a low aeration (Heinen, 2006). Nitric oxide is mainly produced when the WFPS is below field capacity, whereas N_2O is produced at higher WFPS, exceeding field capacity (Davidson et al., 1991, 1993; Dobbie et al., 1999; Davidson and Verchot, 2000; Bateman and Baggs, 2005). Depending on soil texture, the field capacity is at a WFPS of around 60 %; whenever the WFPS exceeds 80 %, most of the N is expected to be denitrified into N_2.

The goal of this study was to review how the emissions of N_2O and NO in the tropics were affected by LU and LUC and to examine their variation in relation to biophysical

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

parameters. We used all studies published in the peer-reviewed literature up to 2013 to calculate emissions per LU type and evaluated relationships with environmental parameters. Next, the effect of LUC was assessed by using a quantitative meta-analysis statistical approach that allows for a comparison between independent studies, and weights studies according to their uncertainty (Hedges and Olkin, 1985). We used the Hedges' *d* (Koricheva et al., 2013) metric to evaluate LUC effects. This is a standardized mean difference similar to the Hedges' *g* but adjusted for small sample sizes. Finally we ran a meta-analysis regression to express the changes in emission rates following LUC as a function of environmental and soil variables changes.

2 Material and methods

We followed three main steps to assess how soil N_2O and NO emissions were affected by LU and LUC in the tropics and subtropics: (i) compiling a database of all studies on soil N_2O and NO fluxes, selecting those integrating seasonal variation in their experimental design and categorizing LU types, (ii) estimating average emission rate per LU category and exploring biophysical factors affecting them, and (iii) characterizing the magnitude of emission change due to LUC using a meta-analysis approach and evaluating how this change could be expressed as a function of the change in biophysical factors through a meta-analysis regression.

2.1 Data collection and calculation

The database of Stehfest and Bouwman (2006) (available at: www.mnp.nl/en/publications/2006) was used as a basis for our research. From this dataset, we extracted the 102 studies located in the tropics and subtropics (hereafter collectively referred to as "tropics"), defined as climate types 3–6, using the climate classification defined by De Pauw et al. (1996). We then extended the database by including 279 additional peer-reviewed studies published between 1990 and 2013 on soil emissions of

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

NO and/or N_2O in the tropics. A combination of the following keywords were used in the ISI Web of Science and ScienceDirect search engines: N_2O, nitrous oxide, NO, nitric oxide, emissions, fertilizers, forest, arable, grasslands, flux, nitrification, denitrification, land use, NO_x, nitrogen-oxide, tropics, subtropics. As N_2O and NO fluxes are known to vary seasonally (e.g. Meixner et al., 1997; Chen and Huang, 2009), we manually selected the studies that measured the fluxes during both dry and wet seasons. The 103 studies selected (Supplement Table S1), representing ~~387~~ N_2O and 111 NO LU case studies, were used to estimate annual mean N-oxides emission rates per LU category and to analyse their relationship with environmental proxies. Out of the ~~103~~ papers ~~43~~ measured N_2O and/or NO emissions synchronically in at least two different LUs, one of which was a forest. These ~~43~~ papers represented ~~132~~ N_2O and 37 NO LUC case studies which were analysed using a meta-analysis statistical approach (Supplement Table S2).

We summarized the number of studies and assessed the representation of LU per continent categorizing them in five geographical areas: North-Central America, South America, Africa, South Asia and Oceania. Average annual emission rates were expressed in kg NO-N or N_2O-N $ha^{-1}\,yr^{-1}$ using the estimates provided by the papers. Whenever annual fluxes were not provided by the authors, we calculated them. For studies covering year-round measurements, the annual flux was calculated by scaling up the units from hours or days to a year and cm^2 or m^2 to ha. Where possible reported fluxes were weighed according to their time interval. For instance, studies covering measurements made during the dry and wet seasons, the annual flux was calculated as the sum of each seasonal flux weighted by the number of days per year corresponding to each season. The biophysical variables associated with N_2O and NO emissions from the publications were also expressed as annual averages. Soil variables (temperature, WFPS, bulk density, pH, C content, N content, NH_4^+ and NO_3^-) are from the soil top layer (0–10 cm). Nitrogen fertilization and litterfall are given as a mass of nitrogen per hectare per year. In some cases the water-filled pore space (WFPS, %) was manually calculated as a function of the gravimetric water content (m, $g\,g^{-1}$ d.w.), bulk density (y_d,

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

$g\,cm^{-3}$) and particle density (y_s, $g\,cm^{-3}$) as WFPS = $100 \times (m \times y_d)/(1 - (y_d/y_s))$ (Linn and Doran, 1984). A y_s default value of $2.65\,g\,cm^{-3}$ was used for mineral soils (Hillel, 1980), whenever not provided by the studies. Nitrogen fixation was considered by using a dichotomous variable indicating the presence or absence of N_2 fixing species in the LU. Nitrogen fixation rates were barely reported and could not be included. For studies measuring N_2O and NO simultaneously, we calculated the ratio and sum of the two and tested their correlation with WFPS and soil N availability. The latter is expressed as the relative fraction of NO_3^- to total inorganic N ($NO_3^-/[NO_3^- + NH_4^+]$).

Three LU case studies from Takakai et al. (2006) and the celery plot in Xiong et al. (2006) were excluded from the analysis because the very high fertilizations rates were about three times higher than the International Fertilizer industry Association (IFA) recommended dose for the studied crops.

2.2 Land use and land-use change characterization

The LU were classified into nine main categories: (1) forest (primary forest and secondary forest older than 30 years), (2) wetland forest (swamp on peat, swamp on mineral soil and riparian forest), (3) low forest cover (low canopy closure: woodlands and shrublands, secondary forest younger than 30 years), (4) degraded forest (human-induced low forest cover after logging and burning or fallows), (5) agroforestry systems, (6) plantations (mono-specific plantations, e.g. *Acacia*, rubber, oil palm, cinnamon), (7) pastures (pastures and grasslands), (8) rice fields, and (9) croplands (annual and perennial crops). For agroforestry, plantation, pasture, rice and cropland both fertilized and unfertilized cases were combined and the effect of fertilization was tested separately. Only a few studies included age after conversion in a chronosequential sampling design; therefore we pulled together LU cases from different studies to evaluate the change in emission rates as a function of time since conversion.

The studies either focused on a specific LUC type (e.g. forest conversion to pasture), or considered several LUC types which were representative for the study region. In the

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

latter case, when only one control (forest) site was available, we used the same control for all converted sites. Whenever several control sites were available in a study we averaged the fluxes from all control sites. When a study measured emissions for several years, each year was considered a separate case. The following LUC were analysed: forest to degraded forest, agroforestry, plantation, pasture and cropland; wetland forest to degraded forest, plantation, pasture and rice; degraded forest to agroforestry; low forest cover to plantation, pasture and cropland. The effect of primary forest conversion to secondary forest is not included in this study as secondary forest (> 30 years old) and primary forest were merged into a single category. The same holds for logging impacts in degraded forests.

2.3 Statistics

Statistical analysis was performed using the software IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows 21.0 (IBM Corp. 2012) and statistical significance was set at a maximum probability level of 5 %. The normality of the flux distribution was tested using the test of Shapiro–Wilks. Neither NO and N_2O nor their log-transformed values were normally distributed hence a generalized linear model with a post-hoc pair-wise comparison was performed for comparing the fluxes between LU. Throughout the text averages are followed by standard errors (± S.E.).

Stepwise multiple linear regression was performed to identify the environmental variables that were significantly related to soil fluxes of N_2O and NO. Variables available in < 10 % of all study cases were excluded to obtain a sufficient sample size for the regression. In order to maximize the data availability we used pair-wise exclusion for dealing with missing values. We also excluded predictor variables that were collinear (multicollinearity test, VIF statistics) to other variables already included in the model. A non-linear Gaussian function was fit between N_2O, NO fluxes and WFPS using averages per 10 % WFPS intervals.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

2.3.1 Meta-analysis

A meta-analysis was used to quantify the effect of LUC on soil annual N_2O and NO fluxes. For this we used the software Comprehensive Meta-Analysis version 2.2.064 (Biostat Inc., New Jersey, USA) and MetaWin 2.0 (Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts). We defined N_2O or NO emissions after land-use change as being the treatment and N_2O or NO emissions before land-use change as being the control. Hedges' d (d) was used as metric to evaluate the effect size of LUC on N_2O and NO fluxes. This metric is defined as:

$$d = \frac{\left(\overline{X}_T - \overline{X}_C\right)}{S} \times J \quad (1)$$

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(N_C - 1)(SD_C)^2 + (N_T - 1)(SD_T)^2}{N_C + N_T - 2}} \quad (2)$$

$$J = 1 - \frac{3}{4(N_C + N_T - 2) - 1} \quad (3)$$

where, $\overline{X}_T$ and $\overline{X}_C$ are the average N_2O or NO flux (in $kg\,N\,ha^{-1}\,yr^{-1}$) of the treatment and control, respectively; S is the pooled standard deviation from the control and treatment flux standard deviations (SD_C and SD_T) and J is the correction factor calculated from the sample sizes (N_T and N_C). The effect size (d) for all LUC case studies combined, or that for a particular LUC type, was assessed using a random model which allows for a varying true effect size between studies (Gurevitch and Hedges, 1999; Borenstein et al., 2009). A d equal or smaller than 0.2 indicates a small effect size, a d around 0.5 a medium one and a $d > 0.8$ a large effect. Positive and negative d's respectively imply an increase and decrease in N_2O or NO emission after LUC, respectively.

Calculation of d requires knowledge of the standard deviation and sample size associated with the average N_2O or NO flux rate. Whenever these were not available in the

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

publication we contacted the authors, calculated it ourselves using the methodological description of the experimental design or measured it from the figures of the papers using PlotDigitizer 2.5.1 (Huwaldt, 2011).

Publication bias for studies with significant and/or high effect sizes was assessed using a normal quantile plot (Wang and Bushman, 1998). Deviation from linearity of the observed distribution suggests publication bias while gaps in the plotted scatter plot indicate that certain effect sizes are missing in the published literature (Borenstein, 2009).

Heterogeneity of effect sizes was assessed with the Q and I^2 statistics. A significant $Q_{overall}$ means that the variance among LUC study cases is greater than that expected by sampling. In a heterogeneous dataset, the $(1 - I^2)$ statistic quantifies the variation within case studies and I^2 the variation that could be explained by other variables (or "real variation"). I^2 of 25, 50, 75 % are respectively considered as low, moderate and high (Borenstein, 2009). An $I^2 > 0$ shows that a proportion of the observed variation is real; thus, subgroup division into LUC types and/or meta-analysis regression can be used (Gurevitch and Hedges, 1999). LUC effect sizes obtained from a low sample size are likely to be influenced by random deviations; hence their interpretation should be handled with caution.

Finally, we performed a meta-analysis regression (or "meta-regression") (Higgins and Green, 2011) to assess how the changes in environmental factors affected changes in soil N_2O or NO emission as a result of LUC. We looked at how the standardized mean difference of an environmental parameter was affecting that of soil N_2O or NO emissions. A meta-analysis regression is considered robust when it includes ten cases studies at least (Borentstein, 2009; Higgins and Green, 2011).

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

3 Results

3.1 Exploring the dataset

The publication rate of peer-reviewed papers on LU and soil emissions of N_2O and NO in the tropics has more than doubled over the past decade (less than 2 publications yr^{-1} before 2000, more than 5 yr^{-1} afterwards), but remains low. The Americas (combining North-Central and South America) and South Asia represented the majority of the dataset (n = 229 and n = 137), while Africa and Oceania were underrepresented (n = 21 and n = 35, respectively; Fig. 1).

LU types studied varied substantially across continents (Fig. 1). In South Asia ~~58~~ % of the LUs studied were croplands, rice fields or plantations, while these were only 13 % in South America. Some LUs were geographically well represented while others were clustered in one continent. For instance, agroforestry systems were spatially well represented, although few in numbers (n = 8), while rice paddies were mostly studied in Asia. Studies on wetland forest were underrepresented (n = 7) and restricted to South Asia (Fig. 1a).

Ninety-four percent of the LU case studies on soil fluxes of NO were in North-Central and South America (respectively, n = 62 and n = 36). In Africa and South Asia, respectively, only five and eight LU case studies were found, while Oceania had no measurements at all.

3.2 Average land use emissions and environmental parameter values

Neither N_2O nor NO fluxes were normally distributed and about 90 % of the observations were below 10 kg N_2O-N and 8 kg NO-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. Table 1 shows average annual N_2O and NO emissions per LU and environmental parameter associated. Croplands displayed the highest N_2O emission rate and also the highest average N fertilization rate. Both pastures and rice fields had relatively high N_2O emissions; however, these

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

were characterized by a high variation. The average NO emission rates did not show any significant difference between LU.

The availability of environmental parameters in studies on N-oxides emissions was variable. For example, only 4 % of the studies reported nitrogen input through litterfall, while precipitation was given in 91 % of all cases. ~~Although inconsistencies might be present due the comparison of values from different data sources, some generalizations per LU category can be made,~~ Overall, intact forest had a significantly lower bulk density compared to more compacted soils from pastures ~~and croplands~~. Wetland forest soils had a significant lower bulk density compared to all other soils. Wetland forest soils were more acidic than other soils in general, while cropland soils were significantly less acid than forest soils. Mineral N content did not differ significantly between LU, except for high NH_4^+ and NO_3^- concentrations in wetland forest and rice paddy soils. Plantation soils were the only ones where NO_3^- concentrations exceeded those of NH_4^+, other LU showed the opposite trend. Carbon and nitrogen content in the soils of natural wetland forest were very high and significantly higher than that in all other LUs. Degraded forest soils showed a high carbon content which is due to the inclusion of eleven degraded peat forests out of the twenty cases. Excluding them resulted in a soil carbon content of 3.8 %.

The multiple linear regression analysis indicated that N fertilization, WFPS, and N availability (expressed as $[NO_3^-/(NO_3^- + NH_4^+)]$) were the best proxies for estimating overall soil fluxes of N_2O (Table 2). For agricultural sites (i.e. crop and pasture) N fertilization rate explained part of the variation ($R^2 = 0.31$, df = 160, $p < 0.01$); but (pairwise) including the WFPS more than doubled the R squared. Proxies for overall soil NO fluxes were N availability and N fertilization. For agricultural sites N fertilization explained 31 % of the variation in NO fluxes, and the inclusion of the WFPS did not improve the relationship. In non-agricultural LUs a non-linear Gaussian function of the WFPS simulated with good fit N_2O and NO fluxes (Fig. 2, Table 2). The relationship indicates that NO and N_2O fluxes peak at WFPS of 45 and 61 %, respectively. The ratio of N_2O to NO displayed an exponential relationship with the WFPS (Fig. 3, Table 2),

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

which indicates N-oxide emissions predominantly in the form of N_2O (i.e. $N_2O/NO > 1$) above a WFPS of 48 %. In non-agricultural sites the predominance of N_2O over NO happens at a slightly lower WFPS (46 %). The sum of soil N_2O and NO emissions also increased exponentially with increasing N availability.

Time since conversion was available in 26 % of the LU cases only. Nitrous oxide fluxes from non-fertilized croplands appeared to be higher the first ten years after conversion and thereafter decrease, whereas fluxes from fertilized croplands remained high (Fig. 4). For pastures the pattern was less apparent, the first years after conversion both high and low fluxes were observed.

3.3 Land-use change effects on N_2O and NO emissions and environmental parameters

~~We assessed LUC effects per LUC type and for all LUC combined by looking at differences in emissions after and before LUC.~~ The effect sizes of LUC on N_2O emissions were not strictly normally distributed; however, all effect size ranges were present. Deviation from linearity occurred for high and low effect sizes indicating a potential bias for published studies measuring large effects following LUC. A normal quantile plot for NO emissions as affected by LUC indicated a normal distribution; however, some gaps were present in the observed values, possibly due to a biased representation of NO emission changes in the literature.

Nitrous oxide emissions were not overall affected by LUC ($d = 0.11 \pm 0.11$); the slight increasing trend was not significant because of opposing effects in different LUC trajectories (Table 3). The LUC case studies overall did not share a common effect size ($Q_{overal} = 221.3$, $P < 0.01$) and the majority of the variation was within case studies ($1 - I^2$, 59 %). Similarly to N_2O emissions, and for the same reason, NO emissions were not overall affected by LUC; with a homogeneous effect size ($Q_{overall} = 31.7$, $P = 0.67$) and 47 % of the variation within LUC case studies ($1 - I^2$).

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Most studies focused on forest clearing for croplands ($n_{\text{F-Crop}} + n_{\text{WF-Crop}} + n_{\text{DegF-Crop}} = 44$) and pastures ($n_{\text{F-Pa}} + n_{\text{WF-Pa}} + n_{\text{DegF-Pa}} = 42$). Transition from intact upland forest to croplands significantly increased N_2O emissions, while conversion to agroforestry ~~and plantations~~ showed a slight, but insignificant increasing trend. Intact forest conversion to pasture (F-Pa) tended to decrease N_2O emissions, whereas low forest cover conversion to pasture (LFC-Pa) showed the opposite trend. Further, conversion of low forest cover overall significantly increased NO emissions.

The Hedges' d effect size of forest conversion to fertilized LU amounted to 1.03 ± 0.31 and 0.52 ± 0.23 for N_2O and NO, respectively, indicating significant and high increased emissions after fertilization. Evidence for increased emission following conversion to LU with N fixing crops/trees was weak and fluxes of NO slightly raised but not significantly ($d_{\text{NO}} = 0.61 \pm 0.33$, $n = 8$).

The results of the meta-regression, which was run pooling all LUC case studies together, are presented in Table 2. The change in N_2O fluxes as affected by LUC was positively related to changes in N availability and WFPS. No significant relationships were found for NO. The interactive effect of WFPS and N availability change on N_2O flux change is illustrated in Fig. 5. Whenever N availability increased after LUC ($d_{\text{Navailability}} > 0$) the increase in N_2O emissions ($d_{N_2O} > 0$) was exacerbated if the WFPS also increased ($d_{\text{WFPS}} > 0$), or diminished if the WFPS was decreased ($d_{\text{WFPS}} < 0$). The slope of the regression between d_{N_2O} and $d_{\text{Navailibility}}$ was raised by 143 % for the $d_{\text{WFPS}} > 0$ cases, reduced by 58 % for $d_{\text{WFPS}} < 0$ cases.

4 Discussion

4.1 Dataset representativeness and average annual LU emissions

The body of research on LULUC and N_2O and NO emissions in the Tropics has increased during the past decade; however, Africa and Oceania remain strongly underrepresented. Most of Africa's LU case studies were from (converted) savannahs

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

although Africa has a variety of forest types unaccounted for at present in the literature. Furthermore, a comparison between the spatial distribution of LUC case studies and global forest conversion for 2005–2010 (FAO, 2010) shows that highest deforested areas overlapped well with studies on N emissions from LUC except for Oceania and Africa (Fig. 1c). These regions need more research on soil N_2O and NO emissions, in representative LULUC categories. Sampling bias ~~is~~ not only geographical; some biofuel or food crops such as oil palm and soy were also underrepresented ($n_{\text{oil palm}} = 6$ and $n_{\text{soy}} = 4$) although they are the most rapidly expanding perennial and annual crop in the tropics (Phalan et al., 2013). Land-use change categories were also not equally represented; there was a dominance of studies on forest conversion to croplands and pastures. Only a few cases (10–13 %) assessed the effect of nitrogen fertilization or the use of N-fixing species after LUC. Those studies took place in Latin America (Matson et al., 1996; Veldkamp and Keller, 1997; Veldkamp et al., 1998) and Asia (Verchot et al., 2006; Veldkamp et al., 2008). Some wetland forest conversion study cases showed high effect sizes for N_2O emissions (Hadi et al., 2005; Furukawa et al., 2005; Jauhiainen et al., 2012), but the overall tendency of wetland forest conversion to increase N_2O emissions was not significant (Table 3) as observed by Hergoualc'h and Verchot (2014). However, the sample size was small and none of the converted case studies ~~was~~ fertilized or intensively monitored following fertilization. Future research direction should consider conversion to fertilized land uses, using an experimental design adequate for capturing fertilization effects on N oxide emissions, and wetland forests in and outside of South Asia. Likewise, ~~few studies were available on forest degradation and need future attention~~ (Mertz et al., 2012).

~~Our estimated~~ annual N_2O emission rate in intact upland forest (2.0 ± 0.2 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, $n = 88$) is more than twice the value estimated by Stehfest and Bouwman (2006) (0.85 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, $n = 77$) for the tropics. We excluded ~~some of~~ the cases considered by Stehfest and Bouwman (2006) that did not cover seasonal variation, but ended up with a higher sample size ~~after~~ adding studies published after 2005. Our ~~estimate~~ is also larger than the model estimations of 1.4 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} by Potter

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

et al. (1996) and 1.2 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} by Werner et al. (2007). Dalal and Allen (2008) estimated average emissions in tropical forest of 3.0 ± 0.52 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} ($n = 22$) and Kim et al. (2013a, b) of 1.91 kg N $\pm$ 0.25 ($n = 69$). ~~Annual~~ NO emission rate in tropical forest ~~is estimated at~~ 1.7 ± 0.48 kg N-NO ha^{-1} yr^{-1} ($n = 36$), which is higher than previous estimates by Stehfest and Bouwman (2006) (0.39 kg NO-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, $n = 33$), Davidson and Kingerlee (1997) (0.8 kg NO-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, $n = 15$) and Potter et al. (1996) (1.2 kg NO-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}).

Nitrous oxide emission in agricultural fields and pastures reported by Duxbury et al. (1982) were the largest in the entire dataset (average emissions of 65 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}). The study was conducted in Florida on drained organic soils under crops, grass or kept as fallows; ~~with~~ high N mineralization rates (600–1200 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}). Excluding them ~~would~~ decrease the overall average N_2O emissions from 4.4 ± 0.6 ($n = 387$) to 3.5 ± 0.3 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} ($n = 381$), and croplands emissions from 8.6 ± 2.0 ($n = 93$) to 5.8 ± 0.9 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} ($n = 88$).

4.2 Land-use change effects on the emissions

~~The meta-analysis indicated an overall trend of increase in N_2O and NO emission rates following conversion in the tropics. This overall trend was not significant as the change in emission rate seemed to be driven by the type of LUC, its modalities and underlying changing factors. All significant changes in either N_2O or NO fluxes pointed towards increased emissions following LUC.~~ The meta-analysis confirmed that intact upland forest conversion to croplands and nitrogen fertilization after LUC significantly and highly increased soil emissions of N_2O. It also corroborated high increases in NO emissions after low forest cover conversion in general and when fertilizer is applied after LUC. For most LUC trajectories the effect of emission change was not significant even when the sample size was relatively large. For instance, the analysis indicated a trend of decreased N_2O emissions following intact upland forest conversion to pasture, which was not significant since the LUC studies not all agreed on the direction

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

of change. Several publications reported decreased emissions after conversion to pasture (e.g. Verchot et al., 1999; Erickson et al., 2001; Garcia-Montiel et al., 2001), others reported the opposite (e.g. Melillo et al., 2001; Takakai et al., 2006) and one showed no effect (Neill et al., 2005). These apparent contradicting results have been explained by differences or absence of differences in time after conversion of the studied pastures (Keller et al., 1993; Veldkamp et al., 1999; Verchot et al., 1999; Neill et al., 2005; Wick et al., 2005) or the practiced or not slash and burn technique to clear the forest, both affecting N cycling (Luizao et al., 1989; Matson et al., 1990; Steudler et al., 1991; Keller and Reiners, 1994; Neill et al., 1995; Melillo et al., 2001; Garcia-Montiel et al., 2001). Biomass burning produces N_2O during fires and may enhance soil N_2O afterwards by stimulating N mineralisation (Skiba and Smith, 2000). The paucity of field observations together with the lack of land-use history description did not allow to evaluate clearing practices effects or temporal trends in soil emission dynamics with LUC thoroughly. ~~For croplands and pastures, the fluxes of N_2O tended to increase during the first five to ten years after conversion and thereafter tended to decrease to average upland forest or low canopy forest levels, as conceptualized in Fig. 4. This indicates that the first ten years following LUC are crucial for GHG budget calculations. For fertilized cases, however, flux rates remained at a higher level even beyond this period. Other factors influencing the direction and magnitude of emission change could not be incorporated in the analysis. These include site preparation (e.g. soil compaction, drainage in wetland), species effect or multiple land use transitions.~~

We used a meta-analysis statistical approach to assess the trend and magnitude of forest conversion on soil emissions of N oxides. Meta-analysis consists in comparing site specific (pair-wise) effects weighted according to their robustness, therefore it provides a direction and a magnitude of emission change more reliable and precise than those obtained by comparing average emission rates per LU category from individual papers. For example, the meta-analysis effect on N_2O emissions of intact upland forest conversion to croplands (0.78) was much higher than the effect calculated (0.48) using average values from Table 1 and Eq. (1). The effect calculated from average emission

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

rate derived from individual studies can also lead to misleading conclusions such as in the case of intact upland forest conversion to pasture. The effect calculated from average emissions (0.34) was positive indicating increased emissions as opposed to the meta-analysis conclusion (−0.28). Simple assessments based on average values, in general, encompass more studies than meta-analysis but are biased due to the exclusion of pair-wise evaluations. In order to improve the understanding of LUC on trace gas emissions in general, more studies monitoring the fluxes simultaneously in control (forest) and converted sites are necessary. Whenever the conversion includes intermediary stages such as short fallows with the practice of slash-and-burn, the corresponding emission rates should be evaluated as well. When focusing on a specific crop/tree a chronosequential approach including different ages since planting should be considered, especially if fertilization rates evolve with time. The first few years after conversion are likely to be hotspots for N oxide emissions and time since conversion is an important factor to be included.

4.3 Biophysical drivers of NO and N_2O emission and emission change

An IPPC Tier 1 approach is generally used by countries in the Tropics to estimate their annual emissions of GHG. Average LU-based emission rates as provided in this paper or the contribution of N applied released as N_2O from agricultural soils (IPCC, 2006) illustrate the type of emission factors applied to activity data at a Tier 1 level. This approach is useful to compare anthropogenic emissions from different countries but does not capture the variations across climate regions for instance (Skiba et al., 2012). Soil fluxes of N_2O and NO are known to be controlled by climate (rainfall, temperature), soil conditions (drainage, aeration, texture, pH, etc.) and management (land cover, fertilization rate and type, etc.) (Skiba and Smith, 2000; Ludwig et al., 2001; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). Country- or regional LU-specific emission factors that better account for local climate, soil management and properties are defined as Tier 2 level whereas Tiers 3 methods usually involves process-based models (Del Grosso et al., 2006). The multiple regression analysis of the dataset indicated that tropical

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

N_2O and NO fluxes could be expressed as a combination of nitrogen availability and/or application and WFPS; even though the predictive power for simulating overall N_2O emissions was low (R^2 = 0.39). The establishment of an emission factor for agricultural soils that includes the WFPS in addition to N fertilization rate is likely to improve estimates of direct agricultural N_2O emissions, one of the largest source of N_2O in most countries. For non-agricultural sites a more mechanistic approach appeared to fit better the observed data. The fluxes of both NO and N_2O followed a Gaussian type relationship with the WFPS – a key determinant for soil anaerobiosis. This type of relationship was hypothesized by Davidson (1991), demonstrated in case studies (Davidson et al., 2000; Davidson and Verchot, 2000; Veldkamp et al., 1998) and used in modelling (Parton et al., 2001; Parton et al., 1996; Potter et al., 1996). Its application in the context of the current tropical database confirms a maximum of N_2O emissions around a WFPS of 60 % and indicates maximum NO emissions at a lower WFPS (45 %) than that reported by Davidson et al. (2000) (55 %). It also points out that N_2O emissions remain high at an 80 % WFPS and diminish towards 100 % WFPS. Neither air nor soil temperature were found to ~~drive~~ soil N-oxide fluxes across LUs, although the LU annual average span was wide (12–34 and 14–31 °C for air and soil temperatures).

The data confirmed the concepts formulated in the HIP model (Davidson et al., 2000) with the availability of mineral N in the system (first level of control) controlling in an exponential fashion the ($NO + N_2O$) flux rate and the WFPS (second level of control) controlling also in an exponential fashion the ratio of N_2O to NO. Although our exponential models are similar to those obtained by Davidson and Verchot (2000) using the TRAGNET database and by Davidson et al. (2000) using fluxes from forest to pasture conversions in the American Tropics, the magnitude of the coefficient is different. ~~At~~ a WFPS between 30 and 60 % the N_2O to NO ratio~~s~~ obtained using the relationship of Davidson and Verchot (2000) ~~are~~ five to nine times lower than the one~~s~~ obtained with the relationship developed here. Above a $NO_3^-/[NH_4^+ + NO_3^-]$ ratio of 0.5 the relationship of Davidson et al. (2000) departs from the one we developed. For instance, at a 0.75 $NO_3^-/[NH_4^+ + NO_3^-]$ value, we estimate annual NO + N_2O emissions of about

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

6 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} whereas the model of Davidson et al. indicates 10 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. The probable reason explaining the discrepancy is the ~~source of data~~, we used annual emission rates whereas Davidson et al. used hourly fluxes and thus took into account punctual high emission peaks less apparent in annual budgets. ~~We also tested the relationships developed by Davidson and Verchot (2000) and Davidson et al. (2000) with annual WFPS and inorganic N ratios, whereas the application of the variables at a shorter time scale followed by a summation of flux estimates for a year would lead to different results.~~ This demonstrate that relationships used in modelling exercises should be developed according to the time step of the model.

Land-use change involves major transformations of the soil-plant-atmosphere continuum. As a result of land-clearing fires, mechanical ploughing and compaction, vegetation change, fertilization, etc., the soil system is highly altered from its previous state. Soil properties such as bulk density, porosity, moisture, WFPS, temperature, mineral N content and pH are often affected by LUC (Farquharson and Baldock, 2008; Dobbie et al., 1999; Verchot et al., 1999). Fertilization N input after land-use change increased highly and significantly both N_2O and NO fluxes, as reported by many studies, e.g. Stehfest and Bouwman (2006). However, increased emissions after LUC were not exclusively due to fertilization, changes in ~~nitrogen availability and~~ WFPS were also key factors impacting the changes in N_2O fluxes. These variables should therefore ~~always~~ be measured and reported. Land-use change generally impacts more than one variable at a time, therefore changes in emissions will most likely result from an interaction of factors. This was illustrated by the interactive effect of the changes in N availability and WFPS on N_2O emission changes (Fig. 5).

5 Conclusions

We estimate natural tropical forests to emit 2.0 kg N_2O-N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} on average and emission rates to be significantly increased after conversion to cropland, and to a smaller degree to agroforestry ~~or plantation~~. Low forest cover also see their NO

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

emissions raise significantly after being converted. These LUC trajectories can hence contribute substantially to non-CO_2 GHG emission increases whenever they represent a substantial area for a given country. Default Tier 1 N_2O and NO emission factors currently proposed by the IPCC for the tropical region are based on a limited number of studies and rely essentially on N inputs. However, mechanisms of N-oxide production are the result of microbial processes controlled by a combination of factors; thus the IPCC Tier 1 approach is somewhat flawed. Here we established a set of predictive relationships linking annual soil N_2O and NO emissions to biophysical parameters and emission changes to biophysical parameter changes. The analysis established that N availability or N inputs as well as the soil WFPS were the key explanatory factors of emissions or emission changes. In particular, we developed a statistical model for tropical countries allowing the calculation of N_2O emissions from agriculture as a function of both N fertilization rate and WFPS. Improving the scientific understanding of N_2O and NO fluxes and how they relate to environmental parameters requires the design of experiments considering the high spatio-temporal variation of the fluxes and associated parameters and the use of standardized measurement methods. Also, studies considering a LUC transition pathway should include in their design all intermediate land use stages (e.g. degraded forest) susceptible to modify N cycling. Finally, even though the body of research on LUC and N_2O and NO emissions has steadily increased over the past decades, knowledge gaps are still important especially in Africa and Oceania, and for wetland forest (notably on peat), degraded forest and important world crops such as oil palm plantations and soy fields.

The Supplement related to this article is available online at doi:10.5194/bgd-12-12783-2015-supplement.

Acknowledgements. This research was generously supported by the contributions of the governments of Australia (Grant Agreement # 46 167) and Norway (Grant agreement # QZA-10/0468) and the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007–2013]

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

(Grant Agreement # 226 310) to the Center for International Forestry Research. This work was carried out as part of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research programs on Climate Change and Food Security (CCAFS). We gratefully thank Luluk Suhada for her work on the bibliography for this study and also all scientists that have measured and published the data that we used.

References

Anderson, I. C. and Poth, M. A.: Semiannual losses of nitrogen as NO and N_2O from unburned and burned chaparral, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 3, 121, doi:10.1029/GB003i002p00121, 1989.

Baccini, A., Goetz, S. J., Walker, W. S., Laporte, N. T., Sun, M., Sulla-Menashe, D., Hackler, J., Beck, P. S. A., Dubayah, R., Friedl, M. A., Samanta, S., and Houghton, R. A.: Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from tropical deforestation improved by carbon-density maps, Nature Climate Change, 2, 182–185, doi:10.1038/nclimate1354, 2012.

Baggs, E. M. and Philippot, L.: Microbial terrestrial pathways to nitrous oxide, in: Nitrous Oxide and Climate Change, Earthscan Ltd, London, UK, 4–35, 2010.

Bateman, E. J. and Baggs, E. M.: Contributions of nitrification and denitrification to N_2O emissions from soils at different water-filled pore space, Biol. Fert. Soils, 41, 379–388, doi:10.1007/s00374-005-0858-3, 2005.

Baumert, K., Herzog, T., and Pershing, J.: Navigating the Numbers – Greenhouse Gas Data and International Climate Policy, World Resources Institute (WRI), Washington DC, USA, 2005.

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., and Rothstein, H. R.: Introduction to Meta-Analysis, Statistics in Practice Series, John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Cambridge, UK, 2009.

Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E. M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R., and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S.: Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls?, Philos. T. R. Soc. B, 368, 20130122, doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0122, 2013.

Chameides, W. L., Fehsenfeld, F., Rodgers, M. O., Cardelino, C., Martinez, J., Parrish, D., Lonneman, W., Lawson, D. R., Rasmussen, R. A., Zimmerman, P., Greenberg, J., Mlddleton, P., and Wang, T.: Ozone precursor relationships in the ambient atmosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 97, 6037, doi:10.1029/91JD03014, 1992.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Chen, S. and Huang, Y.: Soil respiration and N_2O emission in croplands under different ploughing practices: a case study in south-east China, Aust. J. Soil Res., 47, 198, doi:10.1071/SR07225, 2009.

Crutzen, P. J.: The influence of nitrogen oxides on the atmospheric ozone content, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 96, 320–325, doi:10.1002/qj.49709640815, 1970.

Dalal, R. C. and Allen, D. E.: Greenhouse gas fluxes from natural ecosystems, Aust. J. Bot., 56, 369–407, doi:10.1071/bt07128, 2008.

Davidson, E. A.: Fluxes of nitrous oxide and nitric oxide from terrestrial ecosystems, in: Microbial Production and Consumption of Greenhouse Gases: Methane, Nitrogen Oxides and Halomethanes, edited by: Rogers, J. E. and Whitman, W. B., American Society for Microbiology, Washington (DC), 219–235, 1991.

Davidson, E. A. and Kingerlee, W.: A global inventory of nitric oxide emissions from soils, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 48, 37–50, doi:10.1023/A:1009738715891, 1997.

Davidson, E. A. and Verchot, L. V.: Testing the hole in the pipe model of nitric and nitrous oxide emission from soils using the TRAGNET database, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 14, 1035–1042, 2000.

Davidson, E. A., Vitousek, P. M., Matson, P. A., Riley, R., García-Méndez, G., and Maass, J. M.: Soil emissions of nitric oxide in a seasonally dry tropical forest of México, J. Geophys. Res., 96, 15439, doi:10.1029/91JD01476, 1991.

Davidson, E. A., Vitousek, P. M., Dunkin, K., Garcia-Mendez, G., and Maass, J. M.: Processes regulating soil emissions of NO and N_2O in a seasonally dry tropical forest, Ecology, 74, 130–139, 1993.

Davidson, E. A., Keller, M., Erickson, H. E., Verchot, L. V., and Veldkamp, E.: Testing a conceptual model of soil emissions of nitrous and nitric oxides, Bioscience, 50, 667, doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2000)050[0667:TACMOS]2.0.CO;2, 2000.

Davidson, E. A., De Abreu Sá, T. D., Reis Carvalho, C. J., De Oliveira Figueiredo, R., Kato, M. D. S. A., Kato, O. R., and Ishida, F. Y.: An integrated greenhouse gas assessment of an alternative to slash-and-burn agriculture in eastern Amazonia, Global Change Biol., 14, 998–1007, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01542.x, 2008.

DeFries, R. S., Rudel, T., Uriarte, M., and Hansen, M.: Deforestation driven by urban population growth and agricultural trade in the twenty-first century, Nat. Geosci., 3, 178–181, doi:10.1038/ngeo756, 2010.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

De Pauw, E., Nachtergaele, F. O., and Antoine, J.: A provisional world climatic resource inventory based on the length-of-growing-period concept, edited by: Batjes, N. H., Kauffman, J. H., and Spaargaren, O. C., National Soil Reference Collections and Databases (NASREC), Wageningen, ISRIC, 30–43, 1996.

Del Grosso, S. J., Parton, W. J., Mosier, A. R., Walsh, M. K., Ojima, D. S., and Thornton, P. E.: DAYCENT national-scale simulations of nitrous oxide emissions from cropped soils in the United States, J. Environ. Qual., 35, 1451–1460, doi:10.2134/jeq2005.0160, 2006.

Dobbie, K. E., McTaggart, I. P., and Smith, K. A.: Nitrous oxide emissions from intensive agricultural systems: variations between crops and seasons, key driving variables, and mean emission factors, J. Geophys. Res., 104, 26891, doi:10.1029/1999JD900378, 1999.

Drösler, M., Verchot, L. V., Freibauer, A., Pan, G., Evans, C. D., Bourbonniere, R. A., Alm, J. P., Page, S., Agus, F., Hergoualc'h, K., Couwenberg, J., Jauhiainen, J., Sabiham, S., Wang, C., Srivastava, N., Borgeau-Chavez, L., Hooijer, A., Minkkinen, K., French, N., Strand, T., Sirin, A., Mickler, R., Tansey, K., and Larkin, N.: Drained inland organic soils, in: 2013 Supplement to the 2006 Guidelines For National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, edited by: Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Jamsranjav, B., Fukuda, M., and Troxler, T., IPCC, Switzerland, 2014.

Duxbury, J. M., Bouldin, D. R., Terry, R. E., and Tate, R. L.: Emissions of nitrous oxide from soils, Nature, 298, 462–464, doi:10.1038/298462a0, 1982.

Erickson, H., Keller, M., and Davidson, E. A.: Nitrogen oxide fluxes and nitrogen cycling during postagricultural succession and forest fertilization in the humid tropics, Ecosystems, 4, 67–84, doi:10.1007/s100210000060, 2001.

Erickson, H., Davidson, E. A., Keller, M., and Url, S.: Former land-use and tree species affect nitrogen oxide emissions from a tropical dry forest, Oecologia, 130, 297–308, doi:10.1007/S004420100801, 2002.

FAO's Director-General on How to Feed the World in 2050, Popul. Dev. Rev., 35, 837–839, doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2009.00312.x, 2009.

FAO: Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010: Main Report, Rome, Italy, 2010.

Farquharson, R. and Baldock, J.: Concepts in modelling N_2O emissions from land use, Plant Soil, 309, 147–167, doi:10.1007/s11104-007-9485-0, 2008.

Firestone, M. K. and Davidson, E. A.: Microbial basis of NO and N_2O production and consumption in soil, in: Exchange of Trace Gases Between Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Atmosphere, edited by: Andrea, M. O. and Schimel, D. S., Wiley, Toronto, 7–21, 1989.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Berntsen, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D. W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D. C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schulz, M., and Van Dorland, R.: Changes in atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing, in: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 129–234, 2007.

Furukawa, Y., Inubushi, K., Ali, M., Itang, a. M., and Tsuruta, H.: Effect of changing groundwater levels caused by land-use changes on greenhouse gas fluxes from tropical peat lands, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 71, 81–91, doi:10.1007/s10705-004-5286-5, 2005.

Garcia-Montiel, D. C., Steudler, P. A., Piccolo, M. C., Melillo, J. M., Neill, C., and Cerri, C. C.: Controls on soil nitrogen oxygen emissions from forest and pastures in the Brazilian Amazon, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 15, 1021–1030, doi:10.1029/2000GB001349, 2001.

Gelfand, I., Feig, G., Meixner, F. X., and Yakir, D.: Afforestation of semi-arid shrubland reduces biogenic NO emission from soil, Soil Biol. Biochem., 41, 1561–1570, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.04.018, 2009.

Gibbs, H. K., Ruesch, A. S., Achard, F., Clayton, M. K., Holmgren, P., Ramankutty, N., and Foley, J. A.: Tropical forests were the primary sources of new agricultural land in the 1980s and 1990s, P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 107, 16732–16737, doi:10.1073/pnas.0910275107, 2010.

Gurevitch, J. and Hedges, L. V.: Statistical issues in ecological meta-analyses, Ecology, 80, 1142–1149, 1999.

Hadi, A., Inubushi, K., Furukawa, Y., Purnomo, E., Rasmadi, M., and Tsuruta, H.: Greenhouse gas emissions from tropical peatlands of Kalimantan, Indonesia, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 71, 73–80, doi:10.1007/s10705-004-0380-2, 2005.

Harris, N. L., Brown, S., Hagen, S. C., Saatchi, S. S., Petrova, S., Salas, W., Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., and Lotsch, A.: Baseline map of carbon emissions from deforestation in tropical regions, Science, 336, 1573–1576, doi:10.1126/science.1217962, 2012.

Hedges, L. V. and Olkin, I.: Statistical methods for meta-analysis, Academic Press, Inc., London, 1985.

Heinen, M.: Simplified denitrification models: overview and properties, Geoderma, 133, 444–463, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2005.06.010, 2006.

Hergoualc'h, K. and Verchot, L. V.: Greenhouse gas emission factors for land use and land-use change in Southeast Asian peatlands, Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang., 19, 789–807, doi:10.1007/s11027-013-9511-x, 2014.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Higgins, J. P. T. and Green, S.: Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011], available at: www.cochrane-handbook.org (last access: 8 August 2015), 2011.
Hillel, D.: Fundamentals of Soil Physics, Academic Press, Inc., London, 1980.
Hosonuma, N., Herold, M., De Sy, V., De Fries, R. S., Brockhaus, M., Verchot, L., Angelsen, A., and Romijn, E.: An assessment of deforestation and forest degradation drivers in developing countries, Environ. Res. Lett., 7, 044009, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044009, 2012.
Houghton, R. A.: Revised estimates of the annual net flux of carbon to the atmosphere from changes in land use and land management 1850–2000, Tellus B, 55, 378–390, doi:10.1034/j.1600-0889.2003.01450.x, 2003.
Houghton, R. A.: Aboveground forest biomass and the global carbon balance, Global Change Biol., 11, 945–958, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00955.x, 2005.
IPCC: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, edited by: Eggleston, H. S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., and Tanabe, K., IGES, Japan, 2006.
Jauhiainen, J., Silvennoinen, H., Hämäläinen, R., Kusin, K., Limin, S., Raison, R. J., and Vasander, H.: Nitrous oxide fluxes from tropical peat with different disturbance history and management, Biogeosciences, 9, 1337–1350, doi:10.5194/bg-9-1337-2012, 2012.
Keller, M. and Reiners, W. A.: Soil–atmosphere exchange of nitrous oxide, nitric oxide, and methane under secondary succession of pasture to forest in the Atlantic lowlands of Costa Rica, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 8, 399–409, doi:10.1029/94GB01660, 1994.
Keller, M., Veldkamp, E., Weitz, A. M., and Reiners, W. A.: Effect of pasture age on soil trace-gas emissions from a deforested area of Costa Rica, Nature, 365, 244–246, doi:10.1038/365244a0, 1993.
Keller, M., Varner, R., Dias, J. D., Silva, H., Crill, P., de Oliveira Jr, R. C., and Asner, G. P.: Soil–atmosphere exchange of nitrous oxide, nitric oxide, methane, and carbon dioxide in logged and undisturbed forest in the Tapajós National Forest, Brazil, Earth Interact., 9, 1–28, 2005.
Kim, D. G., Giltrap, D., and Hernandez-Ramirez, G.: Background nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural and natural lands: a meta-analysis, Plant Soil, 373, 17–30, doi:10.1007/s11104-013-1762-5, 2013a.
Kim, D.-G., Giltrap, D., and Hernandez-Ramirez, G.: Erratum to: background nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural and natural lands: a meta-analysis, Plant Soil, 373, 1007–1008, doi:10.1007/s11104-013-1883-x, 2013b.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Koricheva, J., Gurevitch, J., and Mengersen, K.: Handbook of Meta-Analysis in Ecology and Evolution, Princeton University Press, Princeton, USA, 2013.

Lambin, E. F., Turner, B. L., Geist, H. J., Agbola, S. B., Angelsen, A., Bruce, J. W., Coomes, O. T., Dirzo, R., Fischer, G., Folke, C., George, P. S., Homewood, K., Imbernon, J., Leemans, R., Li, X., Moran, E. F., Mortimore, M., Ramakrishnan, P. S., Richards, J. F., Skånes, H., Steffen, W., Stone, G. D., Svedin, U., Veldkamp, T. A., Vogel, C., and Xu, J.: The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths, Global Environ. Chang., 11, 261–269, doi:10.1016/S0959-3780(01)00007-3, 2001.

Lambin, E. F., Geist, H. J., and Lepers, E.: Dynamics of land-use and land-cover change in tropical regions, Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour., 28, 205–241, doi:10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105459, 2003.

Lin, S., Iqbal, J., Hu, R., and Feng, M.: N_2O emissions from different land uses in mid-subtropical China, Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 136, 40–48, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2009.11.005, 2010.

Linn, D. M. and Doran, J. W.: Effect of water-filled pore space on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide production in tilled and nontilled soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 48, 1267, doi:10.2136/sssaj1984.03615995004800060013x, 1984.

Ludwig, J., Meixner, F. X., Vogel, B., and Forstner, J.: Soil–air exchange of nitric oxide: an overview of processes, environmental factors, and modeling studies, Biogeochemistry, 52, 225–257, doi:10.1023/a:1006424330555, 2001.

Luizao, F., Luizao, R., Matson, P., Livingston, G., and Vitousek, P.: Nitrous oxide flux following tropical land clearing, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 3, 281–285, doi:10.1029/GB003i003p00281, 1989.

Matson, P. A., Vitousek, P. M., Livingston, G. P., and Swanberg, N. A.: Sources of variation in nitrous oxide flux from Amazonian ecosystems, J. Geophys. Res., 95, 16789–16798, doi:10.1029/JD095iD10p16789, 1990.

Matson, P. A., Billow, C., Hall, S., and Zachariassen, J.: Fertilization practices and soil variations control nitrogen oxide emissions from tropical sugar cane, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 18533, doi:10.1029/96JD01536, 1996.

Meixner, F. X., Fickinger, T., Marufu, L., Ser, D., Nathaus, F. J., Makina, E., Mukurumbira, L., and Andreae, M. O.: Preliminary results on nitric oxide emission from a southern African savanna ecosystem, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 123–138, 1997.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Melillo, J. M., Steudler, P. A., Feigl, B. J., Neill, C., Garcia, D., Piccolo, M. C., Cerri, C. C., and Tian, H.: Nitrous oxide emissions from forests and pastures of various ages in the Brazilian Amazon, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 34179–34188, doi:10.1029/2000JD000036, 2001.

Mertz, O., Müller, D., Sikor, T., Hett, C., Heinimann, A., Castella, J.-C., Lestrelin, G., Ryan, C. M., Reay, D. S., Schmidt-Vogt, D., Danielsen, F., Theilade, I., Noordwijk, M. Van, Verchot, L. V., Burgess, N. D., Berry, N. J., Pham, T. T., Messerli, P., Xu, J., Fensholt, R., Hostert, P., Pflugmacher, D., Bruun, T. B., Neergaard, A. De, Dons, K., Dewi, S., Rutishauser, E., and Sun, and Z.: The forgotten D: challenges of addressing forest degradation in complex mosaic landscapes under REDD+, Geogr. Tidsskr., 112, 63–76, doi:10.1080/00167223.2012.709678, 2012.

Neill, C., Piccolo, M. C., Steudler, P. a., Melillo, J. M., Feigl, B. J., and Cerri, C. C.: Nitrogen dynamics in soils of forests and active pastures in the western Brazilian Amazon Basin, Soil Biol. Biochem., 27, 1167–1175, doi:10.1016/0038-0717(95)00036-E, 1995.

Neill, C., Steudler, P. A., Garcia-Montiel, D. C., Melillo, J. M., Feigl, B. J., Piccolo, M. C., and Cerri, C. C.: Rates and controls of nitrous oxide and nitric oxide emissions following conversion of forest to pasture in Rondônia, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 71, 1–15, doi:10.1007/s10705-004-0378-9, 2005.

Parton, W. J., Holland, E. A., Del Grosso, S. J., Hartman, M. D., Martin, R. E., Mosier, A. R., Ojima, D. S., and Schimel, D. S.: Generalized model for NO_x and N_2O emissions from soils, J. Geophys. Res., 106, 17403, doi:10.1029/2001JD900101, 2001.

Phalan, B., Bertzky, M., Butchart, S. H. M., Donald, P. F., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Stattersfield, A. J., and Balmford, A.: Crop expansion and conservation priorities in tropical countries, PLoS One, 8, e51759, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0051759, 2013.

Potter, C. S., Matson, P. A., Vitousek, P. M., and Davidson, E. A.: Process modeling of controls on nitrogen trace gas emissions from soils worldwide, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 1361, doi:10.1029/95JD02028, 1996.

Purbopuspito, J., Veldkamp, E., Brumme, R., and Murdiyarso, D.: Trace gas fluxes and nitrogen cycling along an elevation sequence of tropical montane forests in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 20, 1–11, doi:10.1029/2005GB002516, 2006.

Skiba, U. and Smith, K. A.: The control of nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural and natural soils, Chemosph.-Glob. Chang. Sci., 2, 379–386, doi:10.1016/S1465-9972(00)00016-7, 2000.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Skiba, U., Jones, S., Dragosits, U., Drewer, J., Fowler, D., Rees, R. M., Pappa, V. A., Cardenas, L., Chadwick, D., Yamulki, S., and Manning, A. J.: UK emissions of the greenhouse gas nitrous oxide, Philos. T. R. Soc. B, 367, 1175–1185, doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0356, 2012.

Stehfest, E. and Bouwman, L.: N_2O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural vegetation: summarizing available measurement data and modeling of global annual emissions, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys., 74, 207–228, doi:10.1007/s10705-006-9000-7, 2006.

Stern, N.: The economics of climate change, Am. Econ. Rev., 98:2,1-37, 2008.

Steudler, P., Melillo, J. M., Bowden, R., and Castro, M.: The effects of natural and human disturbances on soil nitrogen dynamics and trace gas fluxes in a Puerto Rican wet forest, Biotropica, 23, 356–363, 1991.

Streck, C. and Parker, C.: Financing REDD, in: Analysing REDD, edited by: Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., and Verchot, L. V., Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 111–127, 2012.

Takakai, F., Morishita, T., Hashidoko, Y., Darung, U., Kuramochi, K., Dohong, S., Limin, S. H., and Hatano, R.: Effects of agricultural land-use change and forest fire on N_2O emission from tropical peatlands, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, Soil Sci. Plant Nutr., 52, 662–674, doi:10.1111/j.1747-0765.2006.00084.x, 2006.

Terry, R., Tate, R., and Duxbury, J.: Nitrous oxide emissions from drained, cultivated organic soils of South Florida, J. Air Pollut. Control Assoc., 31, 1173–1176, doi:10.1080/00022470.1981.10465342, 1981.

Veldkamp, E. and Keller, M.: Nitrogen oxide emissions from a banana plantation in the humid tropics, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 15889–15898, doi:10.1029/97JD00767, 1997.

Veldkamp, E., Keller, M., and Nuñez, M.: Effect of pasture management on N_2O and NO emissions from soils in the humid tropics of Costa Rica, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 12, 71, doi:10.1029/97GB02730, 1998.

Veldkamp, E., Davidson, E., Erickson, H., Keller, M., and Weitz, A.: Soil nitrogen cycling and nitrogen oxide emissions along a pasture chronosequence in the humid tropics of Costa Rica, Soil Biol. Biochem., 31, 387–394, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(98)00141-2, 1999.

Veldkamp, E., Purbopuspito, J., Corre, M. D., Brumme, R., and Murdiyarso, D.: Land use change effects on trace gas fluxes in the forest margins of Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, J. Geophys. Res., 113, G02003, doi:10.1029/2007JG000522, 2008.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Verchot, L. V, Davidson, E. A., Cattânio, J. H., Ackerman, I. L., Erickson, H. E., and Keller, M.: Land use change and biogeochemical controls of nitrogen oxide emissions from soils in eastern Amazonia, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 13, 31–46, doi:10.1029/1998GB900019, 1999.

Verchot, L. V., Hutabarat, L., Hairiah, K., and van Noordwijk, M.: Nitrogen availability and soil N_2O emissions following conversion of forests to coffee in southern Sumatra, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 20, GB4008, doi:10.1029/2005GB002469, 2006.

Wang, M. C. and Bushman, B. J.: Using the normal quantile plot to explore meta-analytic data sets, Psychol. Methods, 3, 46–54, doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.1.46, 1998.

Werner, C., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Haas, E., Hickler, T., and Kiese, R.: A global inventory of N_2O emissions from tropical rainforest soils using a detailed biogechemical model, Global Biochem. Cy., 21, GB3010, doi:10.1029/2006GB002909, 2007.

Wick, B., Veldkamp, E., de Mello, W. Z., Keller, M., and Crill, P.: Nitrous oxide fluxes and nitrogen cycling along a pasture chronosequence in Central Amazonia, Brazil, Biogeosciences, 2, 175–187, doi:10.5194/bg-2-175-2005, 2005.

Xiong, Z., Xie, Y., Xing, G., Zhu, Z., and Butenhoff, C.: Measurements of nitrous oxide emissions from vegetable production in China, Atmos. Environ., 40, 2225–2234, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.12.008, 2006.

Yashiro, Y., Kadir, W. R., Okuda, T., and Koizumi, H.: The effects of logging on soil greenhouse gas (CO_2, CH_4, N_2O) flux in a tropical rain forest, Peninsular Malaysia, Agr. Forest Meteorol., 148, 799–806, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.01.010, 2008.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Table 1. Average of annual N_2O and NO emissions in the Tropics and associated environmental parameter values. Land uses are F: forest, WF: wetland forest, LFC: low forest cover, DegF: degraded forest, AGF: agroforestry, Pl: plantation, Pa: pasture, R: rice and Crop: cropland. NA: not available, no nitric oxide cases were available for WF. Standard error and sample size are indicated in brackets, # indicates no statistics were possible. Letters in superscript indicate significant differences among land uses, whenever differences were not significant no letter was indicated.

Land use	Flux (kg N $ha^{-1} yr^{-1}$)	Annual precipitation (mm)	Annual temperature (°C)	Soil temperature (°C)	WFPS (%)	Bulk density (g d.w. cm^{-3})	pH	NH_4^+ (µg N g^{-1} d.w.)	NO_3^- (µg N g^{-1} d.w.)	C (%)	N (%)	Fertilization (kg N $ha^{-1} yr^{-1}$)	Litterfall (kg N $ha^{-1} yr^{-1}$)
Nitrous oxide													
F	2.0^{a} (0.2, 88)	2225 (83, 88)	22.6 (0.4, 78)	23.5 (0.5, 27)	54.8 (3.4, 43)	0.9^{a} (0.0, 56)	$4.9^{a, b, c}$ (0.2, 53)	20.8 (2.9, 45)	10.8^{a} (1.5, 45)	4.9 (0.6, 43)	0.4^{a} (0.04, 43)	0^{a} (0, 85)	99 (20, 12)
WF	$2.7^{a, b}$ (1.9, 7)	2485 (167, 6)	26.1 (0.4, 6)	$26.8^{a, b}$ (0.5, 4)	44.5 (7.7, 3)	0.1^{b} (0.0, 4)	3.8^{a} (0.2, 7)	412.0^{b} (119.9, 4)	70.9^{b} (12.2, 5)	49.7^{b} (3.2, 7)	1.6^{b} (0.1, 7)	$0^{a, b, c}$ (0, 7)	NA
LFC	0.5^{a} (0.1, 11)	1546 (390, 11)	23.9 (1.6, 9)	$28.8^{a, b}$ (1.2, 3)	47.7 (10.6, 8)	$1.1^{a, c}$ (0.1, 10)	$5.0^{a, b, c, d}$ (0.3, 11)	5.1^{a} (1.1, 8)	3.1^{a} (1, 8)	4.0^{a} (0.9, 8)	0.3^{a} (0.1, 8)	$0^{a, b, d}$ (0, 10)	NA
DegF	1.9^{a} (0.5, 30)	2220 (123, 30)	25.1 (0.4, 28)	27.6^{a} (0.6, 14)	48.4 (5, 19)	$0.9^{a, d}$ (0.1, 24)	$4.4^{a, b}$ (0.2, 23)	44.4^{a} (17.4, 20)	11.6^{a} (4.1, 20)	$30.0^{c, 1}$ (6.2, 20)	0.9^{c} (0.1, 20)	$0^{a, b}$ (0, 26)	122 (54, 3)
AGF	$3.4^{a, b}$ (1.6, 8)	2297 (112, 8)	25.2 (0.8, 6)	$22.1^{a, b}$ (2.3, 2)	77.1 (17.2, 3)	$1.2^{a, c}$ (0.1, 8)	$5.6^{b, c, d}$ (0.3, 7)	10.7^{a} (4.6, 7)	$7.8^{a, b}$ (3.1, 7)	$2.8^{a, c}$ (0.5, 3)	$0.3^{a, c}$ (0.1, 3)	$39^{a, b, c}$ (31, 8)	218 (#, 1)
Pl	1.5^{a} (0.3, 37)	2108 (148, 37)	23.8 (0.6, 35)	25.3 (0.6, 19)	56.8 (3.4, 23)	$1.0^{a, c}$ (0.1, 24)	$4.8^{a, b, c}$ (0.1, 34)	11.1 (2.5, 27)	$17.8^{a, b}$ (8.2, 27)	7.2 (2.4, 27)	0.4^{a} (0.1, 29)	57 (27, 32)	116 (#, 1)
Pa	5.2^{a} (1.3, 97)	1913 (89, 90)	23.4 (0.5, 54)	$26.3^{a, b}$ (1.9, 8)	64.2 (4.6, 18)	1.2^{c} (0, 54)	$5.4^{c, d}$ (0.1, 49)	26.1^{a} (4.2, 29)	$26.9^{a, b}$ (13.7, 29)	5.1^{a} (1.8, 41)	0.3^{a} (0, 39)	$90^{b, d}$ (17, 70)	NA
R	$5.1^{a, b}$ (1.7, 17)	1562 (234, 13)	21.9 (1.9, 13)	20.9^{b} (2.4, 5)	73.0 (1.2, 3)	$1.2^{a, c}$ (0, 4)	6.0^{d} (0.3, 17)	788.01 (#, 1)	$29.4^{a, b}$ (2.0, 2)	13.6^{a} (5.2, 17)	$0.5^{a, c}$ (0.1, 17)	228^{c} (61, 17)	NA
Crop	8.6^{b} (2.0, 92)	1965 (123, 76)	24.4 (0.6, 60)	$25.3^{a, b}$ (1.1, 23)	58.1 (5.2, 28)	$1.1^{c, d}$ (0.1, 44)	$5.7^{d, e}$ (0.1, 78)	21.3^{a} (10.9, 36)	12.2^{a} (2.6, 36)	7.5^{a} (1.6, 55)	0.4^{a} (0, 55)	$155^{c, d}$ (25, 92)	77 (28, 2)
Nitric oxide													
F	1.7 (0.5, 36)	2342 (166, 35)	21.6^{a} (0.8, 30)	24.9^{a} (0.4, 13)	60.1 (4.5, 24)	0.75^{a} (0.07, 24)	5.3 (0.3, 25)	15.4 (2.5, 21)	12.2^{a} (2.0, 21)	5.1^{a} (0.7, 15)	0.4 (0.1, 19)	$0^{a, b}$ (0, 36)	79 (16, 10)
DegF	2.9 (1.9, 20)	2119 (281, 19)	$25.4^{b, c}$ (0.9, 12)	$26.4^{a, b}$ (0.8, 9)	53.7 (7.8, 11)	1.08^{b} (0.09, 17)	5.6 (0.3, 17)	15.1 (3.1, 13)	$5.6^{a, b}$ (1.5, 13)	$3.1^{a, b}$ (0.8, 13)	0.3 (0.1, 10)	0^{b} (0, 20)	68 (6, 2)
AGF	2.3 (0.8, 5)	2219 (147, 5)	$26.0^{a, c, d}$ (0.0, 4)	24.4^{1} (#, 1)	56.0 (#, 1)	1.32^{b} (0.03, 5)	5.9 (0.2, 5)	9.5 (4.6, 4)	$4.9^{a, b}$ (3.1, 4)	2.5 (#, 1)	0.2 (#, 1)	$12^{b, d, e, f}$ (12, 5)	NA
Pl	5.4 (5.3, 2)	2124 (1839, 2)	$21.4^{a, c, d}$ (4.4, 2)	NA	70.0 (#, 1)	$1.23^{a, b}$ (0.43, 2)	7.6 (#, 1)	NA	NA	NA	NA	$180^{c, f}$ (180, 2)	NA
Pa	2.6 (0.7, 28)	2279 (252, 26)	$25.5^{b, d}$ (0.1, 13)	27.8^{b} (0.7, 8)	66.8 (6.0, 14)	1.22^{b} (0.07, 16)	5.8 (0.3, 17)	27.0 (5.9, 17)	5.4^{b} (1.1, 17)	1.2^{b} (0.4, 13)	0.2 (0.1, 6)	$91^{c, e}$ (26, 26)	NA
Crop	3.1 (0.8, 20)	1686 (268, 14)	$24.7^{a, c, d}$ (1.1, 3)	27.8^{b} (0.4, 11)	43.0 (12.3, 6)	1.31^{b} (0.09, 13)	5.7 (0.2, 20)	28.2 (14.5, 12)	$12.1^{a, b}$ (2.3, 12)	$2.5^{a, b}$ (1.0, 9)	0.3 (0.1, 4)	$88^{c, d}$ (17, 20)	NA

[1] Including 10 degraded peat forests, soil carbon content for non-peat soils was 3.8.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Table 2. Multiple regression between soil N_2O or NO emissions and associated environmental parameters; and meta-analysis regression between the standardized differences after and before land-use change of N_2O emissions (or Hedges' d, d_{N_2O}) and of environmental factors ($d_{Navailable}$, d_{wfps}). The models are presented with slope and intercept ± SE; P values are indicated with * ($p < 0.05$), ** ($p < 0.01$) and *** ($p < 0.001$). All regression models were significant ($p \leq 0.01$).

LU	R^2	df	Model
Linear regression LU study cases			
All	0.39	125	$Ln(N_2O + 1.2) = 0.002^{***} \pm 0.0004 \times N_{fertilization} + 0.87^{**} \pm 0.29 \times N_{available} + 0.014^{***} \pm 0.003 \times WFPS - 0.11^{ns} \pm 0.22$
Agr[a]	0.83	40	$Ln(N_2O + 1.2) = 0.008^{***} \pm 0.0007 \times N_{fertilization} + 0.017^{***} \pm 0.003 \times WFPS - 0.28^{ns} \pm 0.26$
Non-Agr[b]	0.17	80	$Ln(N_2O + 1.2) = 0.87^{**} \pm 0.27 \times N_{available} + 0.008^{***} \pm 0.003 \times WFPS - 0.15^{ns} \pm 0.21$
All	0.18	64	$Ln(NO) = 2.27^{**} \pm 0.80 \times N_{available} + 0.0085^{*} \pm 0.0039 \times N_{fertilization} - 1.42^{***} \pm 0.35$
Agr[a]	0.31	44	$Ln(NO) = 0.0081^{***} \pm 0.0019 \times N_{fertilization} - 0.65^{*} \pm 0.26$
Non-Agr[b]	0.20	36	$Ln(NO) = 3.02^{**} \pm 1.02 \times N_{available} - 1.67^{**} \pm 0.47$
Gaussian regression WFPS			
Non-Agr[b]	~~0.88~~ 1	~~97~~ 1	$N_2O = 2.3 \times \exp(-0.5 \times ((WFPS^{c} - ~~61.5~~ 1)/~~24.2~~ 1)^2)$
Non-Agr[b]	0.89	36	$NO = 2.5 \times \exp(-0.5 \times ((WFPS^{c} - 45.3)/16.5)^2)$
HIP model regression			
All	0.48	40	$Log(1 + N_2O + NO) = 0.92^{***} \pm 0.15 \times N_{available} + 0.15^{*} \pm 0.06$
All	0.39	42	$Log(1 + N_2O/NO) = 0.0129^{***} \pm 0.003 \times WFPS - 0.32^{ns} \pm 0.18$
Non-Agr[b]	0.40	29	$Log(1 + N_2O/NO) = 0.0125^{***} \pm 0.003 \times WFPS - 0.27^{ns} \pm 0.20$
Meta-analysis regression LUC study cases			
All	~~0.49~~ 1	89	$d_{N_2O} = 0.65^{**} \pm 0.14 \times d_{Navailable} - 0.04 \pm 0.13$
All	~~0.44~~ 1	~~66~~ 1	$d_{N_2O} = ~~0.50^{*}~~ 1 \pm ~~0.23~~ 1 \times d_{wfps} + ~~0.09~~ 1 \pm ~~0.17~~ 1$

N_2O and NO are expressed in kg N_2O-N yr^{-1} or N-NO ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, $N_{available}$ is $(NO_3^-/[NO_3^- + NH_4^+])$ without units, NO_3^- and NH_4^+ in µg N g^{-1} d.w., $N_{fertilization}$ in kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} and WFPS in %.

[a] Agr includes cropland and pasture.

[b] Non-Agr includes forest, low forest cover, degraded forest, agroforestry and plantation.

[c] WFPS intervals of 10 %.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

Table 3. Hedges' $d \pm$ SE (n) of N_2O (d_{N_2O}) and NO (d_{NO}) emission change following land-use change (LUC). Hedges' d is the standardized mean difference of N_2O (or NO) flux rates after and before LUC. A $d < 0$ indicates a reduction in emission; a $d > 0$ an increase. Land uses are: F-forest, WF-wetland forest, LFC-low forest cover, DegF-degraded forest, AGF-agroforestry, Pl-plantation, Pa-pasture, R-Rice and Crop-cropland.

LUC	d_{N_2O}	d_{NO}
F-DegF	0.09 ± 0.29 (15)	0.08 ± 0.34 (5)
F-AGF	0.34 ± 0.29 (4)	– (1)[a]
F-Pl	~~0.19~~ ± ~~0.41~~ (9)	–
F-Pa	−0.28 ± 0.17 (36)	−0.56 ± 0.67 (9)
F-Crop	0.78* ±0.24 (19)	– (2)[a]
Overall F	~~0.13~~ ± ~~0.12~~ (83)	−0.19 ± 0.37 (17)
WF-DegF	−0.17 ± 0.31 (9)	–
WF-Pl	1.07 ± 0.42 (3)	–
WF-Pa	2.37 ± 1.80 (3)	–
WF-R	−0.06 ± 0.62 (9)	–
Overall WF	0.31 ± 0.34 (24)	–
DegF-AGF	0.27 ± 0.19 (4)	0.72 ± 0.28 (4)
LFC-Pl	– (2)[a]	–
LFC-Pa	0.47 ± 0.37 (3)	−0.06 ± 0.31 (5)
LFC-Crop	−0.29 ± 0.40 (16)	0.57* ±0.09 (11)
Overall LFC[b]	−0.07 ± 0.25 (25)	0.44* ±0.13 (20)
Overall LUC	0.11 ± 0.11 (~~132~~)	0.16 ± 0.19 (37)
Fertilization[c]	1.03* ±0.31 (17)	0.52* ±0.23 (12)
N fixation[c]	−0.14 ± 0.33 (13)	0.61 ± 0.33 (8)

* $p < 0.05$; no statistics calculated for studies with $n < 3$.
[a] No statistics possible.
[b] Including 4 DegF-AGF LUC cases.
[c] Fertilization and N fixation indicate cases of forest conversion to fertilized LU and LU with N_2 fixing trees/crops.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015



Figure 1. Spatial distribution of land use case studies on soil fluxes of **(a)** N_2O and **(b)** NO per land use category in the tropics. Land uses are abbreviated as F: forest, WF: wetland forest, LFC: low forest cover, DegF: degraded forest, AGF: agroforestry, Pl: plantation, Pa: pasture, R: rice and crop: cropland. *Y* axes of the diagrams represent number of case studies per land use. Land use case studies from Europe are omitted ($n = 2$). **(c)** Spatial distribution of land-use change case studies on soil N_2O and NO fluxes, compared to a map of annual loss of forest area by country between 2005 and 2010. The four shades of grey, from black to light grey, respectively represent > 500, 500–250, 250–50 and < 50 net loss of area in 1000 ha. Adapted from FAO (2010).

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015



Figure 2. Gaussian relationships (dashed lines) between the WFPS and N_2O and NO emissions in non-agricultural land uses. N_2O and NO fluxes are averaged in 10 % WFPS intervals. Error bars are N flux standard errors in each WFPS interval.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015



Figure 3. Relationships between **(a)** the WFPS and the ratio of N_2O to NO; **(b)** $N_{available}$ ($NO_3^-/[NO_3^- + NH_4^+]$) and the sum of N_2O and NO. The domains of definition are **(a)** [0.02; 44.71] in N_2O to NO ratio and [30.4; 94.4] in WFPS; **(b)** [0.00; 12.80] in $N_2O + NO$ (kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}) and [0.01; 0.77] in $N_{available}$.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015



Figure 4. Effect of time since conversion on N_2O fluxes in **(a)** croplands and **(b)** pastures. Average N_2O flux and 95 % confidence intervals are given for upland forests (triangle) and low canopy forests (square). The solid and dashed lines represent a conceptual trend for non-fertilized and fertilized cases, respectively.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015



Figure 5. N_2O Hedges' d as affected by the interactive changes in $N_{availability}$ and WFPS. The meta-analysis regression between d_{N_2O} and $d_{Navailability}$ was performed for all cases (solid line) and for cases when $d_{WFPS} > 0$ or $d_{WFPS} < 0$ (dashed lines).Closed and open circles represent increased and decreased WFPS, respectively.

BGD
12, 12783–12821, 2015

A. Nitrous oxide LU study cases



B. Nitric oxide LU study cases



C. LUC study cases




5.0
4.0
3.0
2.0
1.0
0.0
N-flux (kg N ha-1 yr-1)
0
20
40
60
80
100
WFPS (%)
Observed NO
Observed N2O
Gaussian NO
Gaussian N2O