

## ***Interactive comment on “Effects of two contrasting biochars on gaseous nitrogen emissions and intensity in intensive vegetable soils across mainland China” by Changhua Fan et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 10 February 2017

The study “Effects of two contrasting biochars on gaseous nitrogen emissions and intensity in intensive vegetable soils across mainland China” is a relevant piece of research. It shows N<sub>2</sub>O, NO and NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from a greenhouse experiment with 4 vegetable soils during 5 consecutive crops. Apart from the high value of the data itself, the results are interesting and open new research questions that the authors could follow in future works. The differences found in N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation in the different soils could be linked to different N<sub>2</sub>O formation pathways. Strong points: 1) It analyses several N gases. This is quite unique, since most studies just focus on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. 2) It uses 4 types of soil (with contrasting properties) and it follows gas emissions for

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



a whole year with 5 crop rotations. Weak points: 3) Only 3 replicates are used. This is a bit limited for pot studies. A minimum of 5-6 replicates should be used. Of course using more replicates limits the number of treatments that can be included, but it would give statistically stronger results. 1) The writing could be improved. The language is mostly correct, but the story line is sometimes missing, making it hard to follow. There's a lot of "biochar increases in this treatment and this soil and it decreases in this other soil. ..." Please summarize and integrate results. This would make the paper much more attractive. It is not necessary to comment on all the results, they are shown in the figures and tables. 2) I do not totally agree with summing up NH<sub>3</sub>, NO and NO<sub>x</sub> and naming it "gaseous N emissions". This misleads to think that these are all the N gas losses and the fact is that N<sub>2</sub> emissions have not been contemplated in the study and could be substantial. Specific comments: The title could be improved. It should state the main results. For instance: "Biochar mostly decreases NO and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions but slightly increases NH<sub>3</sub> emissions in intensive vegetable soils across mainland China". Or something similar. What is your main general conclusion? That should be your title. The abstract should also be better developed. For instance, it is not mentioned that wheat straw biochar performs better than the manure biochar regarding N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation. Line 89. Please also include the amount of biochar added to each pot, not only the Kg/Ha. Line 191: substitute "enhanced" for "increased". Line 259-260. Please do not link your N<sub>2</sub>O results with your DEA results. From Figure 1 we cannot know if biochar is decreasing total denitrified N or decreasing the N<sub>2</sub>O/N<sub>2</sub> ratio. Line 303: There a spelling mistake (bicohar)

Biochars should be characterized for elemental analysis (Corg, N, H, O). This is important since the atomic ratio H:Corg has been found to be a relevant index for N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation. The X axis in Figures 2 and 3 must be wrong. They start in 1/15 and they finish in 1/15. Does Figure 1 (DEA) only report N<sub>2</sub>O? Why Is N<sub>2</sub> not included?

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-487, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

