Anonymous Referee #1

Minor points L67 "may be"

R: Thanks. This has been revised. Line 67

L128 "was determined"

R: Thanks. This has been revised. Line 128

L163-164 How is the biochar used in this study different from others? Please provide detailed information.

R: This has been revised.

Another reason for this might be related to the properties of the biochar (C:N ratio of 51.84, 9.2 t ha^{-1}) used in this study when compared with agricultural soils in Finland (C:N ratio of 101.07, 9 t ha^{-1}) (e.g. Karhu et al., 2011) and in East Asia (C:N ratio of 79.65, 2 t ha^{-1}) (e.g. Kim et al., 2017). The lower C:N ratio of the biochar used in this study can incorporate more N fertilizer into the soils, which could reduce soil CH_4 uptake as N fertilizer can inhibit methanotrophic activities (see Kolb, 2009). Overall, the reason why BC addition did not result in increased soil moisture in this case is unclear. Further studies is needed to investigate the effects of biochar application on the factors influencing soil CH_4 oxidation.

Lines 161-170

L183 "and directly"

R: Thanks. This has been revised. Line 189

Technical Note

6 Manipulating interactions between plant stress responses and soil

7 methane oxidation rates

9 Xiaoqi Zhou[1,2,3], Chengyuan Xu[2,4], Shahla H Bai[2,5], Zhihong Xu[2], Simeon J Smaill[6*],

10 Peter W Clinton[6], Chengrong Chen[2,3]

12 [1]Tiantong National Station for Forest Ecosystem Research, Center for Global Change

13 and Ecological Forecasting, Shanghai Key Lab for Urban Ecological Processes and

14 Eco-restoration, Institute of Eco-Chongming, School of Ecological and Environmental

15 Sciences, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, China

16 [2] Environmental Futures Research Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Brisbane, 4111,

17 Australia

18 [3] Griffith School of Environment, Griffith University, Nathan, Brisbane, 4111, Australia

19 [4] School of Medical and Applied Sciences, Central Queensland University, Bundaberg,

20 QLD, 4760, Australia

21 [5] Faculty of Science, Health, Education and Engineering, University of the Sunshine

22 Coast, Maroochydore, DC Qld 4558, Australia

23 [6] Scion, PO Box 29237, Riccarton, Christchurch 8440, New Zealand

24

25 * Corresponding author: Dr. Simeon J Smaill

26 simeon.smaill@scionresearch.com

27

28

29

Abstract

31

It has recently been hypothesised that ethylene, released into soil by stressed plants, reduces the oxidation of methane by methanotroph. To test this, a field trial was established in which maize plants were grown with and without soil moisture stress, and the effects of addition aminoethoxyvinylglycine (AVG; an ethylene biosynthesis inhibitor), and biochar (increases soil water holding capacity and reduces plant stress) were determined following the static incubation of soil samples. AVG increased methane oxidation rates by 50% ($P=0.039$), but only in the absence of irrigation. No other treatment effects were observed. This result provides evidence for a positive feedback system between plant stress, ethylene production, and impacts on methanotrophic activity.

42

Keywords methane oxidation; plant stress; ethylene inhibition; methanotroph; positive feedback

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

1 Introduction

The atmospheric concentration of methane (CH_4) has almost tripled over the past 150 years, making a substantial contribution to climate change (Forster et al., 2007). Aerobic soils provide an important habitat for methanotrophic bacteria, and provide the only significant biological sink for atmospheric CH_4 (20-45 Tg CH_4 yr^{-1}) (Forster et al., 2007). However, CH_4 uptake by these soil ecosystems can be impacted by environmental stress (Kolb, 2009). A common plant physiological response to ecological stress, such as drought, is the production of ethylene (Morgan and Drew, 1997). In soils, however, ethylene may be inhibitory to methanotrophic activity (Jäckel et al., 2004; Pierek et al., 2006; Zhou et al., 2013), and thereby reduce CH_4 oxidation. This potential interaction needs to be understood, as it may constitute an important positive feedback loop between climate disruption, soil ecosystem disturbance, and reduced CH_4 removal from the atmosphere (Bousquet et al., 2006; Zhou et al., 2013).

To test our previous hypothesis that drought-induced *in planta* ethylene production reduces soil CH_4 oxidation rates (Zhou et al., 2013), we manipulated plant stress responses by adding the ethylene biosynthesis inhibitor aminoethoxyvinylglycine ([S]-trans-2-amino-4-(2-aminoethoxy)-3-butenoic acid hydrochloride; hereafter AVG) (Boller et al., 1979). In addition, the study tested the hypothesis that addition of biochar to soils may result in increased water holding capacity, reducing drought stress and thereby acting as a potential tool to maintain CH_4 oxidation (Karhu et al., 2011). This is illustrated conceptually in Fig. 1, in which the application of irrigation (IR) and biochar (BC) are able to maintain rates of CH_4 oxidation by reducing moisture stress and therefore ethylene production, whereas AVG prevents the production of ethylene after the plant experiences stress.

2 Material and methods

2.1 Study site

The study site was located in the Bjelke-Petersen *Research Station* at Kingaroy (26.53° S, 151.83° E) in the South Burnett Region of Queensland, Australia. Precipitation averages 789 mm per annum with erratic summer droughts frequent in the region. Soil at the field trial site soil is an acidic red ferrosol (pH 5.5) with high cation

89   exchange capacity (Isbell, 1993). The site has a long history of cultivation, supporting

90   peanut and maize rotations with winter fallows.

91   **2.2 Experiment design and management**

92   A full factorial, split plot design field trial was established as follows: two IR

93   treatments (IR and no IR) × two BC treatments (BC at 9.2 t ha^{-1} and no BC) × two

94   ethylene suppression treatments (AVG and no AVG). Each treatment had five replicates,

95   producing a total of 40 plots. Due to practical concerns regarding application and

96   maintenance, the IR treatments were established in two discrete areas that were spanned

97   by five blocks. A schematic of the trial site is given in the supplementary information

98   (Fig. S1).

99   The BC treatment was established through application of peanut shell BC to the

100 surface of the planting zone (~450 mm wide strip each row) in early 2013. The BC was

101 incorporated into the soil with a rotary hoe to a depth of 200 mm. The chemical

102 properties of the peanut shell BC are provided in the supplementary information (Table

103 S1).

104 The site was machine planted with maize cultivar Pioneer 32p55 (Dupont Pioneer

105 Australia) at a density of approximately 4 plants m^{-2} in late January, 2014. Compound

106 fertiliser (N:P$_2$O$_5$:K$_2$O 11.9:14.1:9.9) at 180 kg ha^{-1}, and urea at 100 kg ha^{-1}, were

107 applied at sowing. Trickle tapes, installed into plots receiving IR, were used to distribute

108 water equivalent to ~50 mm of rainfall whenever there was a continuous dry spell for

109 two weeks throughout the growing season (late January to late June).

110 To reduce the *in planta* production of ethylene, the commercial plant growth

111 regulator ReTain (containing 15% AVG, Valent Bioscience Cooperation, Walnut Creek,

112 CA, USA) was sprayed onto the crop four times from mid-April to mid-June (the peak

113 maize growth window) at intervals of three weeks. During each event, the treated rows

114 of maize received approximately 750 ml of ReTain solution (prepared at the label rate

115 of 1 g ReTain l^{-1} water) directly to the surface of the plants.

116 **2.3 Sample collection and analysis**

117 In late June 2014, six soil cores from 0 - 100 mm depth were collected from the maize

118 rooting zone of each plot using a 30 mm diameter soil auger. All samples were collected

from the two middle rows of maize in each plot, and the six soil cores from within each plot bulked to a single plot sample. After sieving to 2 mm, a 50 g (fresh mass) subsample of each sample was set aside for CH_4 oxidation rate measurements and the remaining material dried at 105°C for 48 hours to determine soil moisture content.

Soil CH_4 oxidation rates were determined using the laboratory incubation. Briefly, about 20 g soil subsamples were incubated in 1-litre glass jars at ambient atmospheric CH_4 concentration (assumed to be 1.9 ppm) for one week in the dark at 25°C. Headspace gas samples (approximately 30 ml) were collected through a rubber septum in the jar lid at the beginning and the end of the incubation, and concentrations of CH_4 was determined using GC-FID (GC-2010 Plus, Shimadzu, Japan). The CH_4 oxidation rates in each jar were calculated from differences in the headspace CH_4 concentration over the incubation time (Zhou et al., 2008), and adjusted to soil dry weight. Standards were measured once every 10 samples; the coefficient of variation in CH_4 oxidation rate was less than 5% and control jars had ambient CH_4 concentrations.

2.4 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out in R-3.2.3 (Zhou et al., 2017) using a multi-factor ANOVA model incorporating an error structure accounting for the split-plot design associated with the non-random assignment of the IR treatment. The multi-comparison analysis methods provided in the "easyanova 4.0" R package was used to test for treatment interactions.

3 Results

Over the course of the field trial, five dry spells occurred. Irrigation to the IR-plots resulted in delivery of 250 mm more water to this treatment than the controls. This resulted in significantly increased soil moisture ($P<0.001$) in IR soils (18.9%) compared with the non-irrigated soils (15.4%) at sampling time. Neither the AVG or BC treatments had any effect ($P>0.05$) on soil moisture.

No significant main effects were observed, but a significant interaction between irrigation and AVG application was detected (Table 1). Exploration of this interaction with multi-comparison analysis determined that CH_4 oxidation rates were increased by 50% following AVG application ($P=0.039$), but only in the absence of IR (Fig. 2). The

149 addition of biochar had no effect on CH_4 oxidation rates either as a main or interactive

150 effect.

4 Discussion

152 The increase in CH_4 oxidation with the AVG treatment either alone or in combination

153 with the BC treatment aligns with past studies assessing the effect of increased ethylene

154 concentrations on soil CH_4 oxidation rates (Jäckel et al., 2004; Xu et al., 2008). This

155 response also supports the hypothesis that *in planta* ethylene production in response to

156 stress decreases the capacity of soil to support methanotrophic activity (Zhou et al.,

157 2013).

158 The lack of effect of BC on CH_4 oxidation is at odds with the results of previous

159 work (e.g. Karhu et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2017). However, BC added in this study had

160 no influence on soil moisture content, and this is proposed to be a key mechanism for

161 BC to support CH_4 oxidation in drought conditions (Karhu et al., 2011). Another reason

162 for this might be related to the properties of the biochar (C:N ratio of 51.84, 9.2 t ha^{-1})

163 used in this study when compared with agricultural soils in Finland (C:N ratio of 101.07,

164 9 t ha^{-1}) (e.g. Karhu et al., 2011) and in East Asia (C:N ratio of 79.65, 2 t ha^{-1}) (e.g. Kim

165 et al., 2017). The lower C:N ratio of the biochar used in this study can incorporate more

166 N fertilizer into the soils, which could reduce soil CH_4 uptake as N fertilizer can inhibit

167 methanotrophic activities (see Kolb, 2009). Overall, the reason why BC addition did

168 not result in increased soil moisture in this case is unclear. Further studies is needed to

169 investigate the effects of biochar application on the factors influencing soil CH_4

170 oxidation.

171 The significant interaction between the AVG and IR treatments is more difficult to

172 reconcile. The IR treatment was intended to significantly increase soil moisture content

173 compared to the no IR treatment, reducing water stress and likely *in planta* ethylene

174 production. It was noted that increased soil moisture content can directly influence

175 methanotrophic activity, as water-driven increases in microbial activity can enhance

176 methanotroph, whereas water content that exceed field capacity can rapidly decrease

177 CH_4 oxidation rates by reducing gas mobility through soil pores (Le Mer and Roger.,

178 2001). Given the initial soil water content and scale of the increase with the IR treatment,

179   direct stimulation of CH_4 oxidation was considered the most likely outcome when

180   considering plant-independent effects. Consequently, it was anticipated that any effect

181   of AVG on CH_4 oxidation (putatively via reductions in ethylene production) would only

182   manifest without IR, as the IR treatment would make the AVG treatment redundant.

183   However, CH_4 oxidation rates in plots treated with the either IR or IR and AVG in

184   combination were not significantly greater than untreated control plots. It is possible

185   that the moisture addition associated with the IR treatment was insufficient to

186   substantially alleviate plant drought stress, driving an increase in ethylene production,

187   which could then account for the numerical difference between the AVG and IR

188   treatments (Fig. 2). The water addition may have also been insufficient to meaningfully

189   and directly stimulate methanotroph activity. However, it would be expected that the

190   combination of IR and AVG would produce CH_4 oxidation rates either the same, or

191   potentially greater than, those observed for AVG alone. This was not the case, and the

192   explanation for the significant interaction remains unknown. As discussed above, it is

193   possible for increased soil moisture content to inhibit CH_4 oxidation via decreased

194   porosity and gas diffusion (see Zhou et al., 2014), but given the IR treatment alone did

195   not reduce CH_4 oxidation rates relative to the control, this is not a feasible explanation

196   in this case.

197   The lack of data explicitly describing ethylene release into soil in response to the

198   treatments is a limitation to this trial. However, the quantification of ethylene in soil is

199   not trivial, particularly when conducted over time (i.e. continuous) and was outside the

200   resources available for this study. However, given the findings of this study, and

201   considering treatments were field-based, further investigations of the interactions

202   between AVG, plant stress, and CH_4 oxidation should be conducted. In these studies,

203   consideration should be given to collection and integration of ethylene data, particularly

204   given that this data may help shed light on the nature of any interactions between

205   treatments.

206   Overall, the findings of this study indicate that application of an ethylene

207   biosynthesis inhibitor to plant tissue can cause a measurable increase in the capability

208   of soil to oxidise CH_4 under moisture stressed conditions. This supports the hypothesis

that the stress-induced production of ethylene by plants can disrupt the activity of methanotrophs, as well as identifying a potential management pathway to help retain, or even enhance, the methanotrophic capability of soils in productive systems. Given the global importance of a positive feedback between environmental stress, plant ethylene production, and lowered microbial CH_4 oxidation activity, further work in this area is needed. In addition, methods to moderate impacts on the methanotrophic community, such as use of alternative forms or rates of biochar application, require investigation to enable provision of important ecosystem services.

Acknowledgements The research was jointly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 31600406), Shanghai Science and Technology Innovation Fund (No. 18391902300), Griffith University Research Fellowship, a Collaborative Research Network-the University of the Sunshine Coast Research Futures Project Seed Grant, New Zealand and the "Growing Confidence in Forestry's Future" research programme (C04X1306), which is jointly funded by the Ministry of Business Information and Employment (MBIE) and the Forest Growers Levy Trust, with the support of the NZ Forest Owners Association (FOA) and the NZ Farm Forestry Association (FFA).

References

Argueso C.T., Hansen M. and Kieber J.J.: Regulation of ethylene biosynthesis, J Plant Growth Regul., 26, 92-105, 2007.

Boller T., Herner R.C. and Kende H.: Assay for and enzymatic formation of an ethylene precursor, 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid, Planta 145, 293-303, 1979.

Bousquet P., Ciais P., Miller J.B., Dlugokencky E.J., Hauglustaine D.A., Prigent C., van der Werf G.R., Peylin P., Brunke E.G., Carouge C., Langenfelds R.L., Lathière J., Papa F., Ramonet M., Schmidt M., Steele L.P., Tyler S.C. and White J.: Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability, Nature, 443, 439-443, 2006.

Forster P., Ramaswamy V., Artaxo P., Berntsen T., Betts R., Fahey D.W., Haywood J., Lean J., Lowe D.C., Myhre G., Nganga J., Prinn R., Raga G., Schulz M. and van Dorland R.:Changes in

239   atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing. In: Solomon S et al. (eds) Climate Change

240   2007: The Physical Science Basis. Cambridge University Press, UK, pp 130–234, 2007.

241   Ho A., Reim A., Kim S.Y., Meima-Franke M., Termorshuizen A., de Boer W., van der Putten W.H.

242   and Bodelier P.L.E.: Unexpected stimulation of soil methane uptake as emergent property

243   of agricultural soils following bio-based residue application, Global Change Biol., 21, 3864-

244   3879, 2015.

245   Isbell R.F.: A classification system for Australian soils (third approximation) CSIRO Australia

246   Division of Soils Technical Report 2/1993, CSIRO Division of Soils and National Landcare

247   Program project, Townsville, 1993.

248   Jäckel U., Schnell S. and Conrad R.: Microbial ethylene production and inhibition of

249   methanotrophic activity in a deciduous forest soil, Soil Biol. Biochem., 36, 835-840, 2004.

250   Karhu K., Mattila T., Bergström I. and Regina K.: Biochar addition to agricultural soil increased

251   CH_4 uptake and water holding capacity - Rresults from a short-term pilot field study, Agric.

252   Ecosyst. Environ., 140, 309-313, 2011.

253   Kim J., Yoo G., Kim D., Ding W. and Kang H.: Combined application of biochar and slow-release

254   fertilizer reduces methane emission but enhances rice yield by different mechanisms, Appl.

255   Soil Ecol., 117-118, 57-62, 2017.

256   Kolb S.: The quest for atmospheric methane oxidizers in forest soils, Environ. Microbiol Rep., 1,

257   336–346, 2009.

258   Le Mer J. and Roger P.: Production, oxidation, emission and consumption of methane by soils: A

259   review, Eur. J. Soil Biol., 37, 25-50, 2001.

260   Morgan P.W. and Drew M.C.: Ethylene and plant responses to stress, Physiologia Plantarum, 100,

261   620–630, 1997.

262   Pierik R., Tholen D., Poorter H., Visser E.J.W., Voesenek L.A.C.J.: The Janus face of ethylene:

263   growth inhibition and stimulation, Trends Plant Sci., 11,176–183, 2006.

264   Xu X., Yuan B. and Wei J.: Vertical distribution and interaction of ethylene and methane in

265   temperate volcanic forest soils, Geoderma, 145, 231-237, 2008.

266   Zhou X.Q., Wang Y.F., Huang X.Z., Tian J.Q. and Hao Y.B.: Effect of grazing intensities on the

267   activity and community structure of methane-oxidizing bacteria of grassland soil in Inner

268   Mongolia, Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys, 80, 145-152, 2008.

269   Zhou X.Q., Smaill S.J. and Clinton P.W.: Methane oxidation needs less stressed plants, Trends Plant
270   Sci., 18, 657-659, 2013.

271   Zhou, X.Q., Dong, H.B., Chen, C.R., Smaill, S.J., Clinton, P.W.: Ethylene rather than dissolved
272   organic carbon controls methane uptake in upland soils, Global Change Biol 20, 2379-2380,
273   2014.

274   Zhou X.Q., Guo Z.Y., Chen C.R. and Jia Z.J.: Soil microbial community structure and diversity are
275   largely influenced by soil pH and nutrient quality in 78-year-old tree plantations,
276   Biogeosciences, 14, 2101-2111, 2017.

277
278
279
280
281

282

283

284

285

286

Table 1. Analysis of treatment effects on methane oxidation rates, accounting for the split-plot design of the trial.

Block	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(>F)
Residuals	4	25.27	6.318		

Block:IR	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(>F)
IR	1	0.057	0.057	0.01	0.925
Residuals	4	22.785	5.696		

Block:IR:BC	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(>F)
BC	1	0.946	0.946	0.245	0.634
IR:BC	1	0.815	0.815	0.211	0.658
Residuals	8	30.924	3.865		

Block:IR:BC:AVG	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F Value	Pr(>F)
AVG	1	4.77	4.768	1.796	0.199
IR:AVG	1	17.38	17.384	6.549	**0.021**
BC:AVG	1	6.19	6.186	2.33	0.146
IR:BC:AVG	1	0.42	0.422	0.159	0.695
Residuals	16	42.47	2.654		

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

Fig. 1. Conceptual outline of the proposed relationships between soil CH_4 oxidation rates and aboveground plant biomass with regard to the anticipated effects of the treatments applied in this study. a) Under environmental stress, *in planta* ethylene production is stimulated, resulting in ethylene exudation into the soil atmosphere and the inhibition of soil CH_4 oxidation by methanotrophs. b) The application of irrigation (IR) increases soil moisture while the application of biochar (BC) increases soil moisture holding capacity, both acting to reduce plant stress and prevent ethylene exudation into the soil atmosphere. c) The application of AVG disrupts ethylene production, and limiting or preventing the inhibition of CH_4 oxidation by the stressed plant.

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327 **Fig. 2.** Response of soil CH$_4$ oxidation rates to treatment with irrigation and AVG under

328 maize plants. Letter groupings indicate significant differences at P<0.05; error bars are

329 standard error of the mean. The biochar treatment did not influence results, so the data

330 presented are the means of both biochar and no biochar treatments.

331

332

333

334