

Interactive comment on “Phosphorus addition mitigates N₂O and CH₄ emissions in N-saturated subtropical forest, SW China” by Longfei Yu et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 November 2016

General comments:

Yu and co-authors present an interesting dataset of nitrous oxide (N₂O) and methane (CH₄) flux, nitrate (NO₃⁻) concentration and other ancillary measurements from a forest ecosystem P-addition experiment conducted in a N-saturated (N-deposition is about 40 to 65 kg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) secondary Masson pine-dominated forest at TieShanPing (TSP), Chongqing, SW China (developed after a clear cut about 50 years ago) over a period of 18 months. After a single dose of P (applied as solid NaH₂PO₄·2H₂O at a rate of 79.5 kg P ha⁻¹) was added, Yu and co-authors found out that both N₂O and CH₄ emissions and NO₃⁻ concentrations in soil water decreased following P-addition during the 18-months period. They speculate that P-addition may have stimulated mineral N uptake by P-limited plants or microbes leading to decreased NO₃⁻ concentrations and N₂O emissions. Concomitantly, decreasing mineral N concentrations may have relieved N-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



inhibition of microbial CH₄ oxidation leading to decreased CH₄ emissions. Spatial and temporal dynamics of nutrient imbalances and their effects on biogeochemistry in forest ecosystems are very complex and difficult to decipher but important to understand in order to predict impacts of global change processes on trace gas fluxes in forest ecosystems. The results from Yu and co-authors are very interesting and valuable. Nutrient-addition experiments in whole forest ecosystems are very difficult to conduct but their results are often much more realistic than countless laboratory experiments trying to mimic whole ecosystem conditions.

However, I have major concerns and recommend a reanalysis of the dataset:

1) I would suggest to reanalyze the whole dataset using linear mixed effects models (Koeehler et al. 2009 and Jones et al. 2016) to account for repeated measurements (monthly measurements over 1.5 years) and for within-group variance of a stratification (block-design of the study) which has not been done so far.

2) Please take into account that all of your replicates in your plot are pseudo-replicates because they depend on one single block (which is your true replicate). In total you have three independent samples for the P-addition plots and three independent reference samples. Consequently, the dataset and figures should be reanalyzed and presented appropriately. If the blocks are so heterogenous you may show patterns in different blocks or outliers but your whole discussion should focus on significant results of the reanalyzed dataset based on plot means and not subplots.

3) I doubt that chronic N deposition alone has transformed TSP soils to a regional hotspot for N₂O and CH₄ emissions. You have not measured that. Changes in soil bulk density/soil compaction following a clear-cut about 50 years ago may be even more important. Water-filled pore space or gravimetric water content in soils are major controllers of N₂O and CH₄ production. These variables are almost always measured in soil trace gas flux studies and highly depend on soil bulk density which has also not been measured or is not presented in the manuscript. Since there was a clear-cut

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

at the TSP site about 50 years ago and the soil type at this site is a Haplic Acrisol, where clay translocation processes in mineral horizons form clay-enriched horizons. Such a soil is prone to soil compaction. Especially in these clay-enriched horizons soil compaction may lead to increased bulk densities, may promote oxygen limitation and therefore increase rates of microbial denitrification and methanogenesis that eventually may lead to net CH₄ and N₂O emissions from this forest site. It would be great if authors could provide data about soil bulk densities, soil properties in general and soil water content variables.

Minor comments: Line 28 to 30: Nutrient imbalances in forest ecosystems and their effects on greenhouse gas emissions are very complex and shift in space and time. The present study analyzed effects of a single dose of P fertilizer on trace gas fluxes in an approximately 50-years old secondary forest over a period of 18 months. It is simply too daring to extrapolate results from this special forest site to acid forest soils in general. Please do not speculate so much.

Line 127: change to: "In each block, plots were randomly assigned to a reference (Ref) and a P treatment."

Line 164-165: How often and when did you measure trace gas fluxes? Did you take water samples (NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ concentrations) at the same time? A different sampling time may explain the lack of correlation between N₂O emissions and NO₃⁻ concentrations.

Line 251-254: Why do you use different units ($\mu\text{g N m}^{-2} \text{ hr}^{-1}$; $\text{kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for the same variable?

Line 282: change to atmospheric

Line 362: Your study does not demonstrate that chronically high N deposition has transformed TSP soil to a regional hotspot for N₂O and CH₄ emissions. You have not measured that.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Figures: Please provide information about sample size and if you use SD or SE in all of your figures.

Reference: Jones et al. (2016) Biogeosciences, 13, 4151–4165 Koehler et al. (2009) Global Change Biology, 15, 2049 -2066

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-470, 2016.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

