

Interactive comment on “Non-microbial methane formation in oxic soils” by A. Jugold et al.

A. Jugold et al.

a.jugold@mpic.de

Received and published: 20 November 2012

The authors wish to thank referee 2 for his/her efforts in reviewing our manuscript and for the helpful comments provided. Below are our point by point responses to the issues raised by the referee. The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

Referee: comment 1. Aiming to discover new sources of greenhouse gases is intrinsically interesting, and a worthwhile effort. Pressure to produce results that are “relevant” in, for example, the context of climate change, is large. This often misleads to over-interpreting results and renders an otherwise great study unnecessarily difficult to accept in its entirety. I think this study could gain, if the authors would dispense with forcing “relevance” on its results. To give an example, the Abstract says: “We suggest that chemical formation of methane during degradation of soil organic matter may represent the missing soil source that is needed to fully understand the complete methane

C5808

cycle within the pedosphere.” Or, from Conclusions and outlook (page 11975): “However, given the large global soil areas and the frequency at which dried and rewetted soils release CH₄, this source can nevertheless be an important factor in aerobic soil organic matter degradation.” In light of the very small CH₄ emissions found, I find such statements inappropriate.

Authors: We appreciate the referees comment. We have revised the text based on these suggestions. The first sentence now reads “We suggest that chemical formation of methane during degradation of soil organic matter may represent the missing soil source that is needed to fully understand the methane cycle in aerobic soils”. The second sentence has been removed from the manuscript.

Referee: comment 2. Further, the studied soil samples are from locations (mid-latitude, 4 of 5 samples below forest canopies), which are neither subject to frequent drying-rewetting cycles nor high temperatures or UV radiation. So there are two large leaps of extrapolation. One is from the mild conditions under which the organic matter in the studied samples has developed in the field to the harsh environment of pre-treatment and finally incubation under the various stressors in the laboratory incubation. The second leap is from the laboratory to savannahs and tropical regions. Instead of trying to force the results into a global natural context, it would be better to provide in the outlook some indication of how a more mechanistic understanding of the processes underlying abiotic CH₄ emission could be studied.

Authors: The text in the outlook has been revised to reflect the referees suggestions (see also answer to comment above). The last sentences of the outlook now put a stronger emphasis on the elucidation of the pathways and propose two possible approaches. Referee: comment 3. Page 11963, line 21: “. . . emitted up to 6 ug CH₄ per core. . .” Please be more precise and let the reader know the mass or volume of a “core”. Authors: We have added the requested information. It now reads “. . . emitted up to 4.58 μg kg⁻¹ d⁻¹ . . .”.

C5809

C5810