

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Budget of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions at the watershed scale: role of land cover and topography (the Orgeval basin, France)” by G. Vilain et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 31 January 2012

Title: Budget of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions at the watershed scale: role of land cover and topography (the Orgeval basin, France) Authors: G. Villain et al.

This paper describes an ambitious task to estimate river-basin scale emissions of nitrous oxide. Although this greenhouse gas contributes only a small fraction to global warming, it receives much research attention. A large number of papers has been published in the past 2-3 decades, representing an enormous amount of financial resources from research funds. Despite this enormous effort, the uncertainty in the estimates of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions at the global scale has not been reduced. Now this paper describes an attempt to generate more reliable estimates for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions at the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

---

**Interactive  
Comment**

scale of a landscape, including both the direct emissions to air, and the indirect emissions from nitrogen leached from soils or lost through surface runoff, and subsequent denitrification in groundwater and riparian zones, and surface water. The paper is well written, well structured and reads easily.

However, there are some major questions related to the approach, and to the uncertainties in the estimates. In section 3.5.2 the authors mention that they assumed that all N<sub>2</sub>O in groundwater is released to the atmosphere from drains or by diffusion from the groundwater table to the unsaturated zone. This assumption at least merits some more discussion. This assumption implies that there is no denitrification in the groundwater in this river basin. The reasoning behind this assumption is missing. Denitrification in the unsaturated zone will occur if there electron donors available, so apparently this is not the case. So some more explanation is needed. Similarly, the authors need to argue why N<sub>2</sub>O moving through the unsaturated zone would not be prone to denitrification. It needs to pass through the soils, so could be reduced by denitrifiers.

Similarly, readers may wonder if there are no riparian zones in this landscape, or is there no denitrification in such zones? Many literature studies indicate that riparian zones may be important sources of N<sub>2</sub>O at the landscape scale. Or is the N<sub>2</sub>O flux estimated for springs actually the site where riparian zones are expected. If so, is there no double counting of emissions, since all N<sub>2</sub>O in groundwater is assumed to be released to the atmosphere?

This may, however, be totally unimportant, since the estimated contribution of direct emissions is 96%, but yet I think the assumptions need to be argued in more detail.

The second comment relates to the uncertainty. The emission coefficients and estimates of total emissions are different for the various approaches, which stem from the same measurements. So an estimate of the uncertainty in the emission coefficient would be very helpful for readers to understand the differences between the methods for upscaling. These uncertainties may be far larger than the differences between the

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

upscaling methods. Perhaps this has all been published in the previous papers by this group, but should at least be mentioned here.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 8, 10823, 2011.

**BGD**

8, C5548–C5550, 2012

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C5550

