

## ***Interactive comment on “Nitrous oxide emissions from soil of an African rain forest in Ghana” by S. Castaldi et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 10 April 2013

This paper reports N<sub>2</sub>O emission fluxes from an African tropical rain forest. The long-term measurements (19 months) with relatively high sampling frequency (six days per month) conducted by this study could greatly reduce the uncertainty of the annual N<sub>2</sub>O emission budget from the forest, and hence the data reported by the paper are valuable. However, the method used for N<sub>2</sub>O as well as CO<sub>2</sub> measurements in the study may have defects. Several authors (Zhang et al., *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 2013, 25(3): 547-553; Zheng et al., *Plant and Soil*, 2008, 311(1-2): 211-234) recently have recognized strong influence of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration on N<sub>2</sub>O measurements by using high purity N<sub>2</sub> as carrier gas for the GC-ECD method, and N<sub>2</sub>O flux would greatly overestimated by using the static chamber in comparison with high precision methods (DN-CO<sub>2</sub> method, DN-Ascarite method and AM method). Therefore, the reviewer suggests the authors to discuss a little bit about the quality of the data referring to the

C9314

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



two references. The English through the whole manuscript should be improved before publishing.

Specifics: 1. Abstract, line 1, the sentence is better replaced by “Most recently atmospheric studies have evidenced large N<sub>2</sub>O sources from tropical/subtropical lands”; Line 3-5, the two sentences are better combined together, e.g. The uncertainty related to both sources is very high, due to the paucity of data and small frequency of sampling in tropical studies, especially for the African continent; Line 19-21, the conclusion lack of evidence, because the authors didn’t provide comparison with other fields. 2. Results, the very large negative values of N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes obtained by the study may be due to the large uncertainty of the method used by the authors; Considering the standard deviation of the GC-ECD for measuring N<sub>2</sub>O, the small fluxes (less than 0.103mg/m<sup>3</sup>/d derived from their standard deviation) presented in line 15-16 (page 16571) were meaningless; Page 16571, line 23-24, I don’t know the meaning of the sentence. 3. Discussion, page 16574, line 1-3, I don’t think that the comparable annual N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in the three African sites mean similar key driving mechanisms of N<sub>2</sub>O production; Page 16575, line 10-13, are you sure the WFPS (37-78%) in the lowland is close to saturation? The WFPS values for most soils favor for nitrification and denitrification, and hence for N<sub>2</sub>O emission.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 16565, 2012.

**BGD**

9, C9314–C9315, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

