Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, C5278–C5279, 2015 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/C5278/2015/ © Author(s) 2015. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



BGD 12, C5278–C5279, 2015

> Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Application of the ¹⁵N-Gas Flux method for measuring in situ N₂ and N₂ fluxes due to denitrification in natural and semi-natural terrestrial ecosystems and comparison with the acetylene inhibition technique" by F. Sgouridis et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 11 September 2015

This is a well written paper describing some interesting new advances in 15N-based methods for measuring denitrification, especially N2 fluxes in the field. Denitrification is a very difficult process to measure and there is a clear need for improved measurements of this process, especially from natural and semi-natural ecosystems where it is not possible to use techniques based on additions of large amounts of 15N. The



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



work here describes some improvements in mass spectrometry analysis that I am not qualified to review, and some nice comparisons of the new technique with the older acetylene inhibition technique (AIT).

The new method seems promising and the results here are certainly worthy of publication, but there needs to be a more thorough treatment of possible fertilization and water addition effects in the new method. The authors worked hard to minimize the amount of nitrate and water added to the field chambers but there needs to be a more clear statement of just how much the inorganic N pools and soil moisture content were increased by the additions. And once the extent of the increases is clarified, there should be some comparison with the literature to see if these increases have affected rates in previous studies. The authors correctly point out that "adding nitrate to the C2H2 amended cores would have been desirable for evaluating directly the priming effect of the added substrate on denitrification rates", yet they did not do this. As a result, they cannot really conclude that the AIT rates were lower due to incomplete blockage of N2O reduction from the data you have. The idea that "if the 15N tracer addition in the static chambers, even at such low rate (< 1 kg N/ha), were to stimulate the denitrification activity, this might have been reflected through high bulk N2O flux from the chamber compared to the intact cores" is not really valid, as the vast majority of the denitrification flux went to N2. So it would be hard to see a fertilization effect in the bulk N2O flux.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 12653, 2015.

BGD

12, C5278–C5279, 2015

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

