

Interactive comment on “Denitrification, carbon and nitrogen emissions over the Amazonian wetlands” by Jérémy Guilhen et al.

Jérémy Guilhen et al.

jeremy.guilhen@gmail.com

Received and published: 10 April 2020

On behalf of all the co-authors we thank the referee for the review and associated comments that helped us improve the manuscript.

The manuscript (ms) under review presents a new approach to estimate the emissions of CO₂ and N₂O from the various floodplains along the Amazon River during 2011 and 2015. The approach combines satellite data (-> estimate of the water surface) and in situ data with an empirical assessment of the nitrate reduction rate (i.e. denitrification) in the upper soil which in turn results in production and emissions of both carbon dioxide (CO₂) and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Although the presented results are of interest for a wider community, I have some concerns about the approach used for NO₃⁻ reduction.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Therefore, I can recommend publication only after major revisions.

Specific comments: "- The NO₃⁻ loss in the floodplains is solely attributed to denitrification. However, NO₃⁻ loss in soils can also take place during dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA) (see e.g. Rutting et al., Biogeosci, 8, 2011). So, I am wondering whether this could affect the estimate of CO₂ and N₂O emissions. Please discuss. You may need to adjust the equations (1) to (4) to account for DNRA. Please replace denitrification with 'nitrate (or NO₃⁻) reduction' throughout the text."

In the current study, we consider the denitrification process during flood events. In these conditions NO₃⁻ is the limiting for both denitrification and DNRA. Moreover the DNRA contribution to N₂O emissions is about 1% (Rütting et al., 2011 from Cole (1988)) which is negligible considering the other sources of uncertainties at this scale. The environmental conditions for DNRA occurring (e.g NO₃⁻ limiting, high redox soil and high C/N) are not met in this case, thus the contribution of DNRA should be lower. Therefore, we are confident on our choice not to address the DNRA in this study. But this may be an issue that needs to be addressed for N₂O budget at global scale in non-limiting conditions.

"- The amount of N₂O produced is calculated with a constant N₂O/N₂ ratio of 0.1. You can do so but, unfortunately, there is no reference given for it (P6L22). Moreover, it should be discussed whether this ratio is constant or variable in the Amazonian wetlands. In other words, how representative is the selected value of 0.1? This is an important point because the choice of this ratio directly determines the magnitude of the N₂O emissions and the variability of this ratio determines the 'error bar' of the N₂O emission estimates."

We thank the reviewer for this essential comment that was discussed in the first stages of this work between co-authors. Indeed, a constant value of N₂O/N₂ can be argued and can be still accepted as mentioned by the referee. We actually based our estimates of this value from (Weier et al., 1992; Pérez et al., 2000).

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

We choose to keep a 0.1 ratio for N₂O/N₂ production. Our spatial resolution is coarse as we consider the flooded area over a 25 km x 25 km thus we don't take into account the landscape peculiarities. N₂O/N₂ ratio ranges from 0.05 to 0.2 and it is likely that several different ratios should be found within one pixel. Nevertheless, without any precise measurement on the actual ratio value and the different proportions we decided to set up an effective ratio of 0.1 (which is the most common for Amazonian wetlands : Pérez et al., 2000) for the whole watershed in order to not under/over estimate the emissions. In the manuscript, we only discuss about N₂O values calculated from a 0.1 ratio (for better comprehension) but we added "error bars" corresponding to a 0.05 and 0.2 ration in the graphs. Comments in § 2.4.1 P6 L20 and § 4.5 P 17-18 were added to explain these choices.

"- I am wondering why nitrification as a source of N₂O under low O₂ is ignored. Please discuss."

Several studies showed that under anoxic conditions denitrification is the only source of N₂O emissions (see Bollmann and Conrad 1998, Global Change Biology). The scoop of our paper is to specifically focus on denitrification and associated emissions, thus we did not take into account nitrification.

"- Title: Please note that the term 'carbon emissions' also includes emissions of methane and other C-containing gases which are not subject of the ms. Moreover, NO₃⁻ could be lost during dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA), see my comment above. To this end, I suggest to modify the title to 'Nitrate reduction and associated carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide emissions from the Amazonian wetlands'."

We suggest to the editor a tittle change to "Denitrification with associated nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide emissions from the Amazonian wetlands"

"- The central and lower panels of Figure 6 are meaningless. They show exactly the same graphs but scaled with a factor of 5 (for CO₂, see equation (4)) and 0.1 (for N₂O);

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

N₂O/N₂=0.1). Please remove. "

Fig.6 was changed to represent N₂O emissions over the basin and the floodplains. Comments in the caption and the text P9 L6-8 were added to explain that denitrification, CO₂ and N₂O emission follow the same patterns with different values.

"- Please avoid using colloquial terms such as 'paramount' (see P2L11; P4L2; P18L9) or 'hot moments' (see Section 3.1). They should not be used in the context of a scientific text. "

We understand the worries of the reviewer on the potential use of colloquial terms though it was not the intention of the co-authors. Concerning the term "hot-moment" : It was inspired from (McClain et al., 2003 Biogeochemical Hot spots and Hot Moments at the Interface of Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecosystems.): "A hot-moment corresponds as a short period of time with disproportionately high reaction rates relative to longer intervening time periods.". The term is also widely used in the literature. We choose to maintain it in the ms as it conveys our exact message. Concerning the choice of paramount : it has been replaced by "essential" or synonyms. Ex: During the last decade, process-based models have become key tools in estimating carbon and nitrogen budgets in the context of global multi-source changes. Future studies will concentrate in extending the current approach to other tropical basins, needless to say that local observations will be essential for the validation of such exercise and preferably over the same period of analysis.

"- Please have the text proofread by a native English speaker. There are many sentences and phrases which are odd. - There are several (annoying) typos: mole should read mol (various places throughout the text); 'og' should read 'of' in the caption of Fig. 5; N₂O should read N₂O (Fig. 5); 3rd column/2nd line in Tab. 1: there is something wrong with the exponent; 'anomalies' should read 'anomalies'(P13L15), etc. - Please replace NO₃ with NO₃⁻ (in the equations as well as throughout the text and figures)"

The manuscript was thoroughly revised to improve the writing and to correct the typos.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-3>, 2020.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper






Fig. 1.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

