

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: Differences in the diurnal pattern of soil respiration under adjacent *Miscanthus x giganteus* and barley crops reveal potential flaws in accepted sampling strategies” by J. Ben Keane and Phil Ineson

q. zhang

quan.zhang@whu.edu.cn

Received and published: 13 November 2016

The paper is a nice work for guiding soil respiration measurement design.

Since the temperature response of soil respiration is so important to your topic, I assume the widely reported soil respiration-temperature hysteresis should be addressed. And you did discuss a little in 3.2 Environmental control of Rs, however, I think this section could be discussed even better by incorporating the knowledge from a few previous

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



efforts. Please see follows.

For the diurnal scale soil respiration-temperature hysteresis, there are a few representative works, including the classic Phillips et al. (2011) paper that applies mathematical models answering a few fundamental questions, like how soil temperature measurement depth selection, heat flow influence the respiration-temperature relation, etc; Afterwards, Zhang et al. (2015) combined both model exercise and field experiments to give a more comprehensive explanation of the occurrence and mechanism of the hysteresis. To exclude the possible effect of temperature depth selection by plotting respiration and temperature colocated at the same depth, this work demonstrated how heat flow, gas diffusion, photosynthesis contribute to the hysteresis, and also explained how soil moisture modulates hysteresis magnitude. Actually, the hysteresis may be more widely reported than the authors realized, see the literature list that reported field measured soil respiration-temperature hysteresis in Zhang et al. (2015).

As a useful knowledge to this manuscript, the argument that "Even the CO₂ flux ($F(z)$) and the environmental conditions at the same depth can be out of phase, since the flux integrates sources from other depths, causing hysteretic loops" (Zhang et al., 2015) would help explain why the temperature-depth selection cannot avoid hysteresis.

Another useful information for this manuscript is related to photosynthesis control on soil respiration. As photosynthesis has long been suggested as the determinant of soil respiration by providing respiration substrate (e.g., Kuzykov and Cheng, 2001; Kuzyakov and Gavrichkova, 2010), Zhang et al. (2015) suggested the time-delayed photosynthesis impact on soil respiration contribute to the '8' shaped soil respiration-temperature hysteresis, and altered the hysteresis direction (clockwise cycle, or counterclockwise cycle) under different time lag levels of transferring photosynthate from leaves to roots. But these are numerical modeling representations, Zhang et al. (2015) also acknowledge more field validation are still required. The authors can think a little about this.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



A third representative and nice work is by Oikawa et al. (2014) as you cited.

references:

Kuzyakov, Y., and W. Cheng (2001), Photosynthesis controls of rhizosphere respiration and organic matter decomposition, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 33(14), 1915–1925.

Kuzyakov, Y., and O. Gavrichkova (2010), REVIEW: Time lag between photosynthesis and carbon dioxide efflux from soil: a review of mechanisms and controls, *Global Change Biology*, 16, 3386-3406.

Oikawa, P. Y., D. A. Grantz, A. Chatterjee, J. E. Eberwein, L. A. Allsman, and G. D. Jenerette (2014), Unifying soil respiration pulses, inhibition, and temperature hysteresis through dynamics of labile soil carbon and O₂, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.*, 119, 521–536.

Phillips, C. L., N. Nickerson, D. Risk, and B. J. Bond (2011), Interpreting diel hysteresis between soil respiration and temperature, *Global Change Biol.*, 17, 515–527.

Zhang, Q., G. G. Katul, R. Oren, E. Daly, S. Manzoni, and D. W. Yang (2015), The hysteresis response of soil CO₂ concentration and soil respiration to soil temperature, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences*, 120, 1605-1618.

Interactive comment on *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/bg-2016-397, 2016.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

