

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Spatial and temporal patterns of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems of North America during 1979–2008: application of a global biogeochemistry model” by H. Tian et al.***

**H. Tian et al.**

tianhan@auburn.edu

Received and published: 21 July 2010

Comments The manuscript by Tian et al. represents a well-written paper regarding a continental analysis of how CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes vary in space and time for North America. I think this is a worthy attempt at a large goal, and I enjoyed multiple aspects of the manuscript. However, I feel that there are a variety of changes that should be made to enhance the clarity and utility of the paper.

[Response: Thanks for the positive comments.]

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Comments In particular, I feel that a more in depth discussion of (1) the information that went into the model and (2) possible controlling factors behind the observed patterns is warranted. Please find my general and specific comments below.

[Response: We have made little revision on the manuscript putting put more discussion on the model. The controlling factors on the CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes were analyzed and reported in our other two manuscripts; so we did not put too much effort on these in present manuscript.]

General comments Comments Page 2836, lines 24-25: You talk about comparisons being made between modeled results and a variety of field data (e.g. from CERN and LTER) but you do not discuss these further. Are there comparisons that were made at this phase besides the two sites you discuss explicitly?

[Response: It has been revised a little; the comparisons have been done in our previous work, so we just put the citation, and did not go further for discussion.]

Comments Page 2837, lines 15-16: you say that the DOC is either used as a substrate for methane or that it is oxidized to CO<sub>2</sub>, but DOC could also be leached 'out the bottom', stabilized within soil organic matter, or used to form heterotrophic microbial biomass. Does the model not account for these other pathways or is 100% of the DOC in the modeled system converted either to CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub>? Or, do these other pathways not matter, because it is simply based upon a relationship between absolute DOC concentration and CH<sub>4</sub> efflux? Also, how are DOC and N concentrations determined / estimated? Are you using biome/ecosystem definitions to do this? If so, what are the definitions and where are the data coming from? Are you using information from a single site and extrapolating to whole biomes?

[Response: In the DLEM model, leaching is considered as a sink of nutrient in system. So, the leaching is accounted for DOC loss. We have revised the manuscript to show this. The DOC and N concentration are determined through the all major C and N processes in the DLEM. All the parameters for these processes are different for each

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

ecosystem. The optimization of these parameters for each biome might be conducted for one or more site, depending on the availability of the field observations. All these could be found in our previous publications for the DLEM model.]

Comments In your formulas describing the controls over CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O efflux to the atmosphere there is no term for O<sub>2</sub> availability. Is it because O<sub>2</sub> is unnecessary due to O<sub>2</sub> linkages with soil moisture, or simply that soil moisture vs CH<sub>4</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O relationships are so strong? Different ecosystems with the same soil moisture can have different soil O<sub>2</sub> concentrations (soil texture, root and soil heterotrophy respiration, etc can help regulate the relationship between soil moisture and soil O<sub>2</sub>), but perhaps at this scale soil O<sub>2</sub> is not required?

[Response: We agree that O<sub>2</sub> availability is critically important in controlling CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O processes. However, given the difficulty in well simulating O<sub>2</sub> availability in all ecosystems, and the strong relationship between soil moisture and O<sub>2</sub> availability, we use soil moisture to show the effects of O<sub>2</sub> availability on CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O processes.]

Comments Page 2843, line 5: you say that you use a Q<sub>10</sub> of 2.5, while Huang et al. used a Q<sub>10</sub> of 3. Though this seems like a small difference, changing Q<sub>10</sub> this amount can have very large effects on the results. Please include the rationale for making this change.

[Response: This change is made based on one of our field work in natural wetland (Song et al., 2009). Given that Huang et al's work is for rice paddy which might be influenced by human activity, and the natural ecosystems are the major domain in our study; we used the Q<sub>10</sub> as 2.5, rather than 3.0. Reference: Song, C., X. Xu, H. Tian, and Y. Wang (2009), Ecosystem-atmosphere exchange of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O and ecosystem respiration in wetlands in the Sanjiang Plain, Northeastern China, *Global Change Biology*, 15, 692-705.]

Comments I find it interesting that Mexico accounts for so little of the CH<sub>4</sub> flux but maintains a significant proportion of the N<sub>2</sub>O flux. I think this decoupling is worth

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

discussing.

[Response: We have added some discussion for this phenomenon.]

Comments In the same vein, I think you should more fully discuss Canada's very large increase in CH<sub>4</sub> efflux. What is causing this?

[Response: Thanks for the comments; we have revised the discussion section by highlighting to the Canada's large increase in CH<sub>4</sub> emission.]

Comments In general, I think a much deeper discussion of the controlling factors over the temporal and spatial patterns observed is needed. This receives little attention in the Discussion, with only a single paragraph that superficially mentions things like ozone and nitrogen input, but a deeper consideration of how these factors are regulating the patterns would be very useful. What is the role of climate (discuss Figure 9), of substrate concentration, etc and how do these important controls vary across space and time?

[Response: We have expanded our discussion on the controlling factors over the temporal and spatial patterns observed.]

Comments Also, Figure 6 suggests notable increases in efflux through time and I would be interested to hear more Discussion about the controlling factors regulating this pattern. In the first panel of Figure 4, you do see spikes in CH<sub>4</sub> production, yet in the text you discuss a lack of spikes and fine scale (e.g. hourly) temporal resolution. With that in mind, why do you think you see spikes here? This should be discussed.

[Response: We have expanded discussion for Figure 6 and Figure 7. The spikes in the Figure 4 are observational data; we in text said that our model results are lack of spikes in CH<sub>4</sub> flux.]

Specific comments Comments Page 2833, line 2: I would consider changing 'super-high' to something like 'very high'.

**BGD**

7, C1915–C1919, 2010

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Response: It has been revised.]

Comments Page 2833, line 8: put a 'the' before 'scientific community'

[Response: Thanks, mistake corrected.]

Comments Page 2835, line 16: when you say 'mineralization/immobilization' do you mean mineralization and immobilization of nutrients? Please be more specific.

[Response: Thanks, it is nutrient mineralization.]

Comments Page 2846, line 1: do you mean Landsat?

[Response: Thanks, misspell corrected.]

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, 2831, 2010.

**BGD**

7, C1915–C1919, 2010

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1919

