

# ***Interactive comment on “Variations in soil carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and stoichiometry along forest succession in southern China” by Shuai Ouyang et al.***

**Shuai Ouyang et al.**

xiangwh2005@163.com

Received and published: 12 December 2017

We are grateful to the anonymous referee for the constructive comments and helpful suggestions. Based on the comments, we will revise the manuscript. Our point-by-point responses to the comments are presented below.

Q: This manuscript is an intensive study of soil stocks of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus, as well as their stoichiometric ratios, along gradients of soil depth and forest succession. The scale of the dataset is impressive, with these nutrient stocks measured in 100 subplots in each of three forest types at three separate depths. However, the paper is weakened by three factors: an absence of rigorous hypotheses/predictions, poorly

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



described methods, and statistical analyses that come across as ‘fishing expeditions’ rather than hypothesis tests. Below I provide suggestions for improving each of these aspects.

Re. Thanks for the positive comments and valuable suggestions on our manuscript. Based on the comments, we will propose three new hypotheses, provide clear description of methods, and use the variance inflation factor (VIF) method to remove strongly multicollinear variables (see the responses below).

Q:1. Framing of the manuscript – the authors justify their study by discussing potential changes in nutrient stocks and C:N:P ratios along gradients of succession. However, they fail to provide any justification for why these parameters should change with forest succession, and they do not appear to have any directional hypotheses. I understand why this may be so: throughout the process of succession, an ecosystem will experience changes in both abiotic and biotic conditions, which could be expected to have interacting influences on belowground processes. For example, as the canopy closes, soils may experience less insolation and more buffering from temperature extremes; meanwhile, the plant community may shift in such a way that the average chemical quality of litter inputs changes. Given the complexity of these processes, is there any reason to expect that soil stocks of C, N, and P (or their ratios) should exhibit generalizable, directional shifts along successional gradients? If so, what should we expect these patterns to be? If not, then how do the results of this particular study shape our understanding of feedbacks between plant communities and soil properties during succession?

Re. Good comments! In introduction section, we will review how and why soil stocks of C, N, and P (or their ratios) change with forest succession in the published literatures and describe the gap of this change patterns in subtropical areas of China. We will propose three hypotheses: (1) whether concentrations and storage of soil organic carbon (SOC) and total nitrogen (TN) increase but phosphorus (TP) decrease as forest succession; (2) how forest succession affects stoichiometry of soil C, N, and P and alters

BGD

Interactive  
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



nutrient limitation; and (3) what main factors influence SOC, TN, and TP concentrations and storage.

Q:2. Experimental design: Much of the statistical analyses focus on relating C, N, and P stocks to stand-level attributes (e.g. tree community diversity) as well as topography and soil texture. Nowhere in the manuscript are these measurements described. Were they taken from another study? Were these measurements taken at the level of the 10x10 m subplot, or at the level of the three 1 ha forest plots? If the latter, the multivariate models are severely overfitted. This brings me to my third point:

Re. Sorry for our unclear description. All the measurements (including stand characteristics, topography and soil properties) were taken at the level of 10×10 m subplot within the three forests. We will add the detailed description of the measurements.

Q:3. Statistical issues: Several aspects of the statistics appear to be poorly thought out. For example, in Table 3, correlation coefficients are reported between stocks of a single nutrient (e.g. SOC) and then the ratio of SOC and TN (C:N). By definition, these variables will be highly correlated—one is derived from the other. In Tables 4 and 5, the authors report a multiple regression with no fewer than fourteen explanatory variables, several of which MUST be highly collinear (e.g. the Shannon index and species richness). This comes across as a fishing expedition, not a rigorous hypothesis test, and it is nearly impossible to interpret the results of such an analysis. Similarly, why analyze both C, N, and P concentrations AND stocks? Does the concentration data provide any insight that the stock does not?

Re. Good suggestions! We will not use the Pearson correlation method to analyze the data and delete the Table 3. In order to figure out the factors that significantly affects the change of SOC, TN, and TP with forest succession, we will use the variance inflation factor (VIF) method to remove strongly multicollinear variables before using multiple regression models. Because nutrient concentrations and storage exhibited similar change pattern, we will select the concentrations of SOC, TN, and TP to analyze

the affecting factors. We will use one table to present the statistical analysis results, rather than two tables. Table 5 will be deleted.

Q:The discussion is extensive, and makes a great deal of generalizations that are probably unwarranted (e.g. 'a low C:N ratio implies that soil organic matter is accumulating slower than it is decomposing;' 'a C:N ratio lower than 10 indicates that less organic matter is being merged into the soil.' These simplistic statements belie an understanding of how plant litter C is incorporated into SOM). Individual significant correlations are discussed, but there is no synthesis that relates these patterns back to the specific successional trajectory of this forest ecosystem.

Re. We will rewrite the discussion section (see our response to the comments from Reviewer 1). We will delete the unwarranted sentences and Pearson correlation analysis. Based on the new hypotheses, we will focus on the successional trajectory to discuss the change patterns of SOC, TN, and TP as well as the influencing factors.

Q:There is a large amount of data here, and there is absolutely the potential to say something valuable about soil nutrient cycling in relation to succession. However, the manuscript must be thoroughly revised in order to do the dataset justice.

Re. Thanks for the positive comments. We will revise the manuscript thoroughly and hope the revision is acceptable.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-408>, 2017.

BGD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

