~~Years~~Duration of extraction determines CO_2 and CH_4 emissions from an actively extracted peatland in eastern Québec, Canada

Laura Clark[1], Ian B. Strachan[2,1], Maria Strack[3], Nigel T. Roulet[1], Klaus-Holger Knorr[4], Henning Teickner[4]

[1]Department of Geography, McGill University, Montreal, H3A 0B9, Canada
[2]Department of Natural Resource Sciences, McGill University, Ste Anne de Bellevue, H9X 2V8, Canada
[3]Department of Geography and Environmental Management, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, N2L 3G1, Canada
[4]Ecohydrology & Biogeochemistry Group, Institute of Landscape Ecology, University of Münster, Heisenbergstr. 2, 48149 Münster, Germany

Correspondence to: Ian B. Strachan (ian.strachan@queensu.ca); Department of Geography and Planning, Queen's University, Kingston, K7L 3N6, Canada

Abstract. Draining and extracting peat alters ~~a peatland's~~ the conditions that controls ~~of on~~ CO_2 and CH_4 emissions. Carbon (C) emissions from peatlands undergoing horticultural peat extraction are not well constrained due to a lack of measurements. We determine the effect that production duration (years of extraction) has on the CO_2 and CH_4 emissions from an actively extracted peatland over three years of measurements (2018-2020). We studied five sectors identified by the year when extraction began (1987, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2016). Greater~~Higher~~ average CO_2 and CH_4 emissions were measured from the drainage ditches (CO_2: 2.05 ± 0.12 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}; CH_4: 72.0 ± 18.0 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}) compared to the field surface (CO_2: 0.9 ± 0.06 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}; CH_4: 9.2 ± 4.0 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}) regardless of sector. For peat fields, CO_2 fluxes were highest in the youngest sector, which opened in 2016 (1.5 ± 0.2 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}). The four older sectors all had similar mean CO_2 fluxes (~0.65 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}) that were statistically different from the mean 2016 CO_2 flux. A spatial effect on CO_2 fluxes was observed solely within the 2016 sector, where CO_2 emissions were highest from the centre of the peat field and declined towards the drainage ditches. These observations occur due to operators' surface contouring to facilitate drainage. The domed shape and subsequent peat removal resulted in a difference in surface peat age hence different humification and lability. ^{14}C dating confirmed that the ~~remaining~~ peat contained within the 2016 sector was younger than peat within the 2007 sector and that peat age is younger toward the centre of the field in both sectors. Humification indices derived from mid-infrared spectrometry (MIRS) (1630/1090 cm^{-1}) indicated that peat humification increases with increasing years of extraction. Laboratory incubation experiments showed that

Commented [IS1]: R2: suggests "Year of extraction determines..."

Commented [IS2R1]: Later we use "production duration". Why do we not simply use that in the title?

Commented [NRP3R1]: Production duration indicates a time period. Year of extraction does not. Could also say duration of extraction

Commented [MS4]: See what you think about this edit. In your previous edit, I thought that it read that the way in which the environment controlled CO2 and CH4 would be changed, but I think you just meant that the controls themselves (e.g., moisture, veg, temp) would be changed.

Commented [IS5]: R2: suggest rephrasing

Commented [NRP6R5]: Find

Commented [IS7]: R2: replace higher with greater to not confuse with depth.

Commented [IS8R7]: 10 instances changed

Commented [NRP9R7]: Moore is always on this - higher vs greater. Changes are find

CO_2 production potentials of surface peat samples from the 2016 sector increased toward the centre of the field and were greaterhigher than for samples taken from the 1987 and 2007 sectors. Our results indicate that peatlands under extraction are a net source of C where emissions are high in the first few years after opening a field for extraction and then decline to about half the initial value and remain at this level for several decades, and the ditches remain a 2 to 3 times greater source than the fields, but represent < 3.57% of the total area of a field.

1 Introduction

1.1 CO_2 and CH_4 Production in Natural Peatlands

Peatlands are important carbon (C) sequestering ecosystems containing one-third of global soil carbon C stores (Limpens et al., 2008; Yu, 2012). Generally, peatlands are sinks of carbon dioxide (CO_2) and sources of methane (CH_4), although this can vary interannually and is dependent on environmental conditions (Bubier et al., 1993; 2003; 2005; Lafleur et al., 2003; Moore et al., 1990). Carbon is removed from the atmosphere in the form of CO_2 by surface vegetation via photosynthesis, which is then stored in peat soils as incompletely decomposed organic matter (Strack et al., 2008). Carbon dioxide is released from peatlands as a by-product of plant (autotrophic) and soil (heterotrophic) respiration, otherwise known as ecosystem respiration (ER). Respiration is, among other factors, dependent on labile C, soil temperature and moisture content (Strack et al., 2008). Organisms in the soil break down complex molecules into low-molecular-weight substances, which are oxidized into CO_2 (Killham, 1994). Litter decomposition rates decrease over time because the remaining material becomes increasingly difficult for microbes to break down (Strack et al., 2008). The decomposition rate is influenced by the quantity and quality of peat and environmental conditions, including peat moisture, temperature, acidity, and the availability of alternative electron acceptors for organic matter oxidation (Killham, 1994). Carbon dioxide production rates indicate biogeochemical peat quality (e.g., nutrient contents, humification, etc.) because they describe the rate at which microorganisms decompose organic matter. High-quality peat contains large amounts of labile C available to decompose (e.g., carbohydrates, proteins, amino acids), leading to higher greater rates of CO_2 production (Schlesinger & Andrews, 2000; Wardle et al., 2004). Decomposition rates are the largest greatest in the youngest peat and have been found to decrease with peat age (Hogg, 1992).

Commented [IS10]: As per R2

Commented [NRP11R10]: Fine

Commented [IS12]: As per R2

Commented [NRP13R12]: Well in the sentence before it we say "carbon dioxide (CO2) " so I would side on using CO2 throughout after this. I guess it is the start of a sentence. I would defer to the editor for the standard of Biogeoscience

Commented [IS14]: R1: clarify what we mean by this

Commented [NRP15R14]: "the biogeochemical quality (e.g nutrients, humification, etc.) …"

Commented [IS16]: As per R2

Commented [NRP17R16]:

Controlled by peat water saturation and microbial activity, CH_4 emissions from peatlands are spatially and temporally variable (Moore et al., 1990; 1994; Roulet et al., 1997). Methane is produced in the anoxic layers of peatlands via methanogenesis (Lafleur, 2009; Yavitt and Seidmann-Zager, 2006) and can be consumed in the oxic peat layers through a process known as methanotrophy (Turetsky et al., 2014). The greater the oxic layer thickness, the greater the opportunity for CH_4 oxidation, typically occurring within 25 cm of the oxic-anoxic boundary (Segers, 1998). Methane produced in the peat is released into the atmosphere through diffusion, ebullition, or plant-mediated transport via root tissue (Holden, 2005; Rosenberry et al., 2003; Whalen, 2005).

1.2 Peatland Disturbance

In Canada, 34,000 ha of bog have been harvested which represents 0.03% of that country's bog-covered surface. ~~-~~Agriculture is the single large~~s~~st disturbance, followed by forestry, mining, roads, and peat extaction~~;~~: the latter represents < 3% of Canadian peatland disturbances (Harris et al., 2022). ~~.~~Globally, ~~-~~there ~ 460 Mha of peatlands; 50 Mha have been disturbed (Leifled & Menichetti, 2018), mostly by agriculture. ~~there some 460 Mha of peatlands, if which around 50 Mha have been disturbed (Leifled & Menichetti, 2018). Agriculture, xx.~~Peat extraction intrinsically alters the C exchange dynamics of a peatland. In preparation for extraction, a peatland is drained by cutting ditches to lower the water table (WT), and all vegetation is removed. When the surface peat is sufficiently dry, in Canada, vacuum harvesters begin to extract a thin layer of surface peat. The process of harvesting incr~~r~~ases the density and decreases the porosity in the top 20 cm on the peat profile (Lai, 2021). Following the end of extraction activities, peatlands disturbed by vacuum harvesting in this manner are often unable to naturally revegetate and regain their original ecosystem functions due to shifts in peat hydrophysical properties (McCarter and Price, 2015) and because the viable seed bank is primarily removed during extraction (Waddington et al., 2009).

If left unrestored, drained peatlands act as large sources of C to the atmosphere (Hirashi et al., 2014; Joosten et al., 2002; McNeil & Waddington, 2003; Rankin et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2014; Waddington et al., 2002). Drainage lowers the WT, creating a thicker oxic layer of peat (~~Abdalla et al., 2016; Waddington et al., 2009~~Poulin et al., 2005). This results in ~~higher~~ greater respiration rates and increases the volume within which CH_4 oxidation can occur (Abdalla et al., 2016; Holden, 2005; Sundh et al., 2000; Turetsky et al., 2014). Therefore, while CO_2 emissions to the atmosphere rise, CH_4 emissions are

Commented [IS18]: R1: wanted us to place the harvesting in Canadian and global context

Commented [NRP19R18]: Ok I have these numbers from the EF work HH and I ate doing - will insertnn

Commented [IS20R18]: NEED TO FOLLOWUP WITH NIGEL

Commented [NRP21R18]: dDONE

Leifeld and Harris added to references.

Commented [IS22]: As per R2

Commented [NRP23R22]: Fine

Commented [NRP24]: Addresses R2's comment on porosity

Commented [IS25]: R2: also peat structure/porosity?

Commented [MS26R25]: Added McCarter and Price to address this.

Commented [IS27]: As per R2

Commented [NRP28R27]: Fine

decreased by an average of 84% (Abdalla et al., 2016). Methane emissions become localized in the former drainage ditches that can become new anoxic zones due to the saturated conditions, warm temperatures, and large amounts of labile C normally found in the ditches~~e areas~~ (Rankin et al., 2018; Schrier-Uijil et al., 2010; Sundh et al., 2000; Waddington & Day, 2007; Waddington et al., 2009).

Carbon emissions and controls on C exchange from undisturbed peatlands have been well-documented and researched (e.g. Bubier et al., 1993; ~~2003;~~ 2005; Kohler et al., 2011~~Lafleur et al., 2003;~~ Moore et al., 1990; Nilsson et al., 2008; Pelletier et al., 2007; 2011; Roulet et al., 2007; Strachan et al., 2016; Updegraff et al., 1995~~; Valentine et al., 1994~~). Post-extracted, unrestored peatlands are persistent sources of C to the atmosphere (Rankin et al., 2018); however, restoration can successfully revert disturbed peatlands from net C sources to net C sinks as a result of increased vegetative uptake of CO_2 (Nugent et al., 2018; Strack & Zuback, 2013). Until recently, research has focused on understanding the impacts of disturbance on the gas exchange after the disturbance has ended or has been conducted on sites where extraction has been halted (Ahlholm and Silvola, 1990; Aslan-Sungur et al., 2016; Bergman et al., 1998; Nykanen et al., 1995; Oleszczuk et al., 2008; Sundh et al., 2000; Waddington and Price, 2000; Waddington et al., 2002; Wilson et al., 2015). To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies~~y~~ conducted in a drained peatland undergoing active vacuum extraction. Thus, little is currently known about how C emissions from vacuum-harvested peatlands are altered during the active extraction process. This study aims to quantify the CO_2 and CH_4 emissions from a peatland undergoing active extraction and to link this with peat quality and environmental factors to better understand how C exchange changes over time.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Site Description

In situ fluxes of CO_2 and CH_4 were measured at an active horticultural peat production site approximately five km southeast of Rivière-du-Loup, QC (47~~.47~~°47'2~~1~~6"N, 69~~.31~~°31'02~~26~~"W). The site was i~~I~~nitially a treed ombrotrophic bog system, with depths of peat in excess of 4.5 m (Anrep, 1914). Physical and chemical properties of the peatland are provided in Table S1. The ~~this~~ location was prepared for peat extraction in 1985, using standard industry methods resulting in partially drained peat devoid of vegetation. ~~The density and porosity of the peat in the top 0.4 m was between ~ 110 to 140 kg m^{-3} and 0.82 and 0.87,~~

Commented [IS29]: R2: wants to add "...in North-American undisturbed peatlands"

Commented [IS30R29]: I think they are mistaking "these areas" for geographic. These areas is referring to the ditches. We need to clarify.

Commented [NRP31R29]: Yes made the edit

Commented [IS32]: R2: all studies from Canada. Either state "canadian studies" or provide citations from studies elsewhere.

Commented [NRP33R32]: Will find some references. Could cut this list down to the multiyear studies ?

Commented [NRP34R32]: Included to European long term studies, deleted Lafleur et al. 2003 (included in Roulet et al 2007), and Valentine et al. 1994 (does not add much).

Commented [NRP35R32]: DONE

Commented [IS36]: R2: too many

Commented [IS37R36]: I don't have a problem with this.

Commented [NRP38R36]: Keep list - representative of relevant previous work.

Commented [IS39]: R1: Suggests incorporating Salm et al on milled peatlands

Commented [IS40]: R1: would like more to have more background data about the sectors of the site, like peat layer thickness, and some general parameters such as pH, peat decomposition. Laura didn't report any of this in her thesis. Did Rachel or OiYin have such data? I know that P-O did some sampling with us a while ago and we also had a map of depth at some point…?

Commented [IS41]: R2: also wants this background info. Please add peat depths,
bulk density, nutrient composition, C content etc. presence of vegetation in the ditches

Commented [NRP42R41]: Will do this from Kendall and Lai's thesis

Commented [IS43R41]: FOLLOW UP WITH NIGEL

Commented [NRP44R41]: DONE – this material may fit in better a little further down but will leave it for Ian to move.

Commented [NRP45]: I looked up to coordinates on Google Earth and adjusting them to be halfway down the road acorss the President complex.

Commented [IS46]: R1: co-ord wrong.

Commented [IS47R46]: Agree. I pulled this from Google Maps. I will look at the tower coords.

Commented [NRP48R46]: Google Earth gives to the second - look up

Commented [NRP49]: Added to the references.

and below 0.4 m dropped to 70 to 80 kg m^{-3} and 0.92 to 0.94, respectively (Lai, 2022). Kendall (2020) reports the carbon and nitrogen content of the top 0.3 of peat (dry) was 519 ± 28 and 12.6 ± 1.,6 mg g^{-1}, for a C:N ratio of ~ 43 ± 5. Phosphorus content was 217 ± 9 µg g^{-1}, and the lignin and holocellullouse was 358 ± 18.0 and 528 ± 13.8 mg g^{-1}. n, N, P, Below 0.4 m the carbon and nitrogen content of dry peat were 499 ± 20 and 10.5 ± 2.1 mg g^{-1}, with a C:C;N ratio of ~ 49 ± 10. The phosphorus content was 189 ± 12 µg g^{-1}, and the lignin and holocellulouse were 459 ± 75.1 and 600 ± 66.1 mg g^{-1}. The bare peat is sectioned into individual "fields" 500 m in length and 30 m in width via drainage ditches. These individual fields are combined into "sectors" classified by the year peat extraction began (Figure 1). In eastern Canadian peat production sites, each field is domed; the elevation of the middle of the field is highest and slopes down toward the drainage ditches to assist in precipitation drainage. A gravel service road approximately 1 km in length runs down the middle of the site, separating the peatland into two halves. Large piles of loose peat and wood debris removed from the surface of the fields are stored on either side of this main road, between the gravel and the beginning of the individual fields. The storage piles are continuously moved and resized to transport the peat to a handling facility or to form new peat piles to prevent overheating and combustion. The site has been in operation for 36 years and was undergoing active extraction at the time of this study. Large machinery such as tractors and vacuum harvesters frequently drove over the surface of the fields during the measurement period. Measurements were taken from fifteen fields, each with an area of 0.015 km^2 1.5 ha. Peat harvesting normally occurs from June through September when the harrowed peat is dry enough; therefore, it but is dependent on the spring temperature and summer rainfall patterns. Measurements were taken over three years in August 2018, June through August 2019, and July through September 2020.

The climate of the study area is cool-temperate with a mean annual temperature of 3.5 °C and mean precipitation of 963.6 mm (period 1981 – 2010 averages for St. Arsene, QC (47º 57' 00" N, 69º 23' 00" W) the nearest closest weather station with 30 years of records ; (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2021)). The normal mean temperatures for June, July, and August, are 14.9, 17.6, and 16.7 °C, respectively (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2021). , and tThe corresponding mean monthly precipitation totals values are 92.6, 95.0, and 94.2 mm, respectively (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2021).

Commented [IS50]: As per R1

Commented [NRP51R50]: Fine

Commented [IS52]: R2: why these times?

Commented [NRP53R52]: Harvesting - peat is dry enough to get equipment on after snowmelt;

Measurements - tried to maximize time for measurements to cover the summer and shoulder season but were dealing withe the constraints of covid restrictions

Commented [NRP54R52]: ADDed a comment on the dry haoorwed layer – that is what really determines it.

Commented [IS55]: As per R1

Commented [NRP56R55]: A Canadianism? Will check.

Commented [NRP57]: Checked – this data is for St. Arsene and it is for 1981 – 2010 – added the coordinates. Larua has put the website link in the references already

The volumetric soil moisture (VSM), water table depth (WTD) and peat temperatures at the 2007 site hasve been summarized by Lai (2022). The VSM in the top 3 cm harrowed layer was ~ 10%, but ~~at 0.08 m below the surfgace it was between 50 and 60% most of the summer, and~~ was > 70% below 0.25 m. -The WTD was highest in June (0.15 m) and dropped through the summer to 0.7 m in late August/~~,~~ September. -The WTD then ~~increase~~rose towards the surface~~d~~ in the autumn in response to rain, and dropped again over the winter. -Peat temperatures followed a ~~normal~~ typical annual~~m~~ pattern;~~,~~ ~~D~~during most of the summer they were around 20 ~~°°~~C at 0.05 m and ~~. The soils~~ dropped to 0 ~~°°~~C in mid-winter.

2.2 Chamber Measurements

The closed chamber method (discussed in detail in Rankin et al. 2018) was used to measure fluxes of CO_2 and CH_4 from the peat surface. Fluxes of CO_2 and CH_4 were measured from five different sectors at this site, representing ~~production~~ extraction beginning in 1987, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016 (Figure 1). Within these sectors, random measurements were taken from five transects 50 m apart perpendicular to the lateral drainage ditches, alternating across three consecutive fields (Figure 2a). Each transect contained four measurement locations: 0 (representing in the ditch itself), and 2, 5, and 15 m (field centre) away from the drainage ditch, thus capturing spatial variability in the fluxes across the field (Figure 2b). To optimize coordination of sampling with the field operations, the 1987 (oldest) sector age was under-sampled relative to the other four sectors in 2020 because our previous measurements indicated that this sector had CO_2 and CH_4 flux values similar to other fields, except the most recently open field (2016).

Commented [NRP58]: I added this in response Purre's request for a summary ot VSM, WTDs and temps. They made the request in the review section, but I think it fits better here as background.

Commented [IS59]: As per R2

Commented [NRP60R59]: Fine

Commented [IS61]: R2: whose measurements?

Commented [NRP62R61]: Fine



Figure 1: Location of measured sectors within the study site. Image modified from Google Maps (Imagery ©2022 CNES/Aribus, Imagery©2022 CNES/Airbus, Landsat, Copernicus, Maxar Technologies, Map data© 2022) (https://www.google.ca/maps/@47.7910172,-69.5156644,3144m/data=!3m1!1e3!5m1!1e4), accessed July 6, 2022). The field labels for the year the sectors were opened for peat extraction. ~~Since~~ As the first C measurements began in 2018, the 2016, 2013, 2010, 2007 and 1987 sectors represent 2, 5, 8, 11, and 31 years respectively.

Commented [IS63]: As per R2

Commented [NRP64R63]: Fine



Figure 2: (a) Sampling transects and (b) measurement locations within transects with an estimated elevation increase at the field centre. The field contouring results in about 50 cm difference in surface peat elevation between the centre of the field and the edge of the field.

Collars could not be left in place between measurements because we were measuring from active peat extraction fields that had harvest machinery driving on them. Therefore, at each measurement location on the peat field, a metal collar was inserted approximately 5 cm into the surface of the field. An opaque aluminum chamber (64 x 64 cm) was then placed on top of the collar. Air was cycled between the chamber and a trace gas analyzer. Measurements each summer were made from June through September at varying intervals depending on weather and industry operations. In 2018, a PP Systems EGM-4 IRGA was used. In the first two weeks of measurements in 2019, a Los Gatos Research Ultraportable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer was used and in the remainder of 2019 and in 2020, a LI-COR Biosciences LI-7810 Trace Gas Analyzer was used. A one-way

Commented [IS65]: Clarified as per R2 request
Commented [NRP66R65]: Fine
Commented [IS67]: R2: give size of collars
Commented [IS68R67]: Isn't this obvious for the chambers?
Commented [NRP69R67]: Fine and yes
Commented [IS70]: R2: did the insertion influence the measurements? How long before first measurement?
Commented [NRP71R70]: Waited approximately five minutes. No obvious effect - with the LICOR we get a time series and therefore no obvious jumps in conc. Vs time
Commented [IS72]: R2: T inside the chamber? No cooling system so how much T increase above ambient? How is this accounted for?
Commented [IS73R72]: If true...wouldn't this cause overestimation? Therefore our results are upper amounts.
Commented [NRP74R72]: The chambers were opaque and reflective surface. Little heating over the few minutes of measurements. Unlike clear chambers for NEP.

Yes, if anything it results in over estimates. He et al shows this.
Commented [IS75]: R1: How often? Number of measurements per sector?
Commented [IS76R75]: We could add a table of measurements by sector or simply provide rough numbers. Laura has these.
Commented [NRP77R75]: Was it not 4 transects at 3 distances so it would be a minimum of 12. But Laura should answer.
Commented [IS78]: As per R1
Commented [NRP79R78]: Fine

ANOVA ($\alpha = 0.05$) was conducted between the fluxes from the different analyzers for the 2016 sector 2 m position and 2007 sector 15 m position. There were no significant differences between the means of the fluxes measured with the three analyzers from the 2016 ($p = 0.552$, $F_{2,85} = 0.599$) or 2007 ($p = 0.06$, $F_{2,87} = 2.848$) sectors. A measurement lasted four minutes, after which the chamber was lifted for a minimum of 30 seconds to allow the CO_2 and CH_4 to return to ambient concentrations. The measurements taken in the drainage ditches required a different chamber because the ditches were too narrow to accommodate the field chamber. The ditch chamber was cylindrical (35 cm in height, 27 cm diameter) and was composed of translucent plastic covered in opaque reflective tape. The same measurement procedure was followed for the ditch measurements. A battery-powered fan was installed on the interior of each of the field and ditch chambers to ensure adequate air mixing during measurements. The chamber and collar were removed from the field after each measurement was completed and moved between measurement locations.

The interior height of the field chamber above the peat surface, including the collar, was measured at all four corners at each sampling location. The height of the ditch chamber, including the collar, was measured at three different points around the perimeter. Peat volumetric water content (%VWC) was measured at three separate locations at each measurement location using a CSI Hydrosense II soil moisture sensor inserted from 0 to -10 cm. For each measurement, ~~p~~Peat temperature was taken at depths of 2, 5, 10, 15, and 20 cm below the surface to attain a temperature profile at each measurement location.

Commented [IS80]: R1: was T profile measured in each campaign?

Commented [NRP81R80]: I believe it was - Laura?

2.2.1 Data Analysis and Chamber Flux Calculation

~~The measured concentrations of CO_2 and CH_4 were stored in the internal memory of the gas analyzers and downloaded to a computer at the end of each sampling day.~~ Trace gas flux (F) in mg m^{-2} d^{-1} was determined as the change in concentration over time using the equation

Commented [IS82]: As per R1

Commented [NRP83R82]: Fine

$$F = \frac{f_x \cdot \left(\frac{V_c}{R(273 \quad a)}\right) \cdot n \cdot t}{S} \quad (1)$$

where f_x is the rate (ppmv min^{-1}), V_c is the chamber volume (m^3), R is the ideal gas constant (0.0821 L atm K^{-1} mol^{-1}), T_a is the air temperature (°C) inside the chamber, n is the molecular mass of each gas (CO_2 = 0.044 kg mol^{-1}; CH_4 = 0.016 kg mol^{-1}), S is the surface area of the collar (m^2), and t is the number of minutes in a day (1440 minutes). Change in concentration over

Commented [IS84]: R2: Tair from inside chamber?

Commented [NRP85R84]: Ambient

time for both CO_2 and CH_4 were plotted for each measurement location, and the flux was kept if a linear increase or decrease was observed to ensure that low values were not disproportionately discarded. In 2018, 49% of CO_2 and 55% of CH_4 measurements were rejected. In 2019, 21.8% of CO_2 and 26% of CH_4 measurements were rejected, and in 2020, 11.6% of CO_2 and 37.6% of CH_4 measurements were rejected.

All statistical analyses were performed in the R software package (R Core Team, 2021), and figures were produced using the R package ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016). A one-way ANOVA of CO_2 and CH_4 fluxes between the field surface and drainage ditches was performed, and a two-way ANOVA between sector age and measurement position was performed, excluding drainage ditch measurements, with $\alpha = 0.05$. An interaction test was conducted to determine the relationship between sector age and measurement position and a Tukey post-hoc test was conducted to show the specific interactions. Linear regressions were performed between surface VWC, temperature measurements, and CO_2/CH_4 flux.

2.3 Peat Incubation

2.3.1 Field sampling

In order to investigate differences in peat substrate quality among sectors and field positions, incubations were performed with peat samples taken from the 1987, 2007, and 2016 sectors, spanning continuous extraction of ~3 to 30 years~~the largest number of production ages available at the research site~~. Samples were taken at the second chamber measurement transect from each of the three-sector ages (Figure 2a). Within each transect, approximately 1 kg of peat was obtained at 2, 5, and 15 m away from the drainage ditches both from the surface and from a depth of 10 cm. Additional samples were taken from a depth of 50 cm, at a distance of 2 m from the ditch and from a depth of 80 cm, 15 m away from the ditch (Figure 3). The 50 and 80 cm positions were estimated to be parallel at depth, based on an elevation difference of approximately 50 cm resulting from the field doming. Samples were kept in sealed plastic bags during transport from the field and frozen upon arrival at the lab. Four samples (Figure 3) were taken from both the 2007 and 2016 sectors for ^{14}C dating performed by a 3MV accelerator mass spectrometer (AMS) at the AEL AMS Laboratory at the University of Ottawa. After physical and chemical pre-treatments, the samples were combusted, producing CO_2 for graphitization (https://ams.uottawa.ca/analytical-methods-radiocarbon-laboratory/). Carbon dating was calibrated using the OxCal .4.4 (Bronk Ramsey, 2009) and IntCal 2020 (Reimer et al., 2020) curves.

Commented [IS86]: R2: why high rejection rate in 2018?

Commented [NRP87R86]: Beginners luck? Laura?

Commented [IS88R86]: Likely the instrument (PP systems) which has lower manual sample rate as it doesn't record like the Li-Cor/Los Gatos

Commented [IS89]: R2: wants us to delete this

Commented [IS90R89]: I don't think deletion is necessary

Commented [NRP91R89]: Agree with Ian - might change the wording saying "span continuous extraction of ~ 3 to 30 years " - R doesn't seem to link age of sector with length of extraction

Commented [IS92]: As per R1

Commented [NRP93R92]: Fine



Figure 3: Sampling locations (2 m, 5 m and 15 m from ditches) and depths (cm) from the 1987, 2007, and 2016 sectors. Those with red circles were also sampled for ^{14}C dating at the 2007 and 2016 sectors. Horizontal lines indicate approximate ditch surface with peat extending below these points.

Commented [IS94]: R2: assumes that peat depth is 85-90 cm.

Commented [IS95R94]: NO. This is the ditch surface. The actual peat depth is much greater. This will be clarified when we give the peat depth earlier in the description.

Commented [NRP96R94]: Yes I agree. I will find the GSC map for PT President. I have it on my home laptop.

2.3.2 Incubation Experiment Methodology and Analysis

Incubations were performed in 250 mL mason jars fit with air-tight lids and a short plastic tube fixed with a stopcock valve, sealed with epoxy. Nine replicates and an additional blank were used for each sampling position. 30 g of peat was weighed and placed into each jar after woody debris were removed. To keep moisture conditions between the samples similar, 30 mL of distilled water was added to the jars and mixed with the peat to create a slurry. This is not meant to represent field conditions but to obtain rates reflecting potential, standardized decomposability/respiration rates. The estimated VWC of the slurries was 80 – 90%. The height and diameter of peat in the jar was recorded to calculate the headspace volume for each sample. Jars were kept at a constant temperature of 23 °C.

5 mL of the headspace from the jars were sampled at 0, 6, 12, 24, 48, and 72 hours. After the initial 72-hour samples were taken, the lids were removed, the jars were left open for 12 hours, resealed, and sampling was repeated for an additional

72 hours. This was done to account for increased respiration rates that may have occurred during the first sampling period from cellular rupture after the samples were thawed. 5 mL of ambient air was backfilled into each jar after each sample was taken.

The concentrations of the gas samples were analyzed using two gas chromatographs (GC) (Shimadzu 2014 GHG GC & SRI 8610 C GHG GC). The carrier gas was N_2, the SRI column temperature was 70 °C and the flame ionization detector (FID) was at 110 °C. Three standards of 5000 ppm CO_2 and 5 ppm CH_4 were run through the GC before injecting the 5 mL gas samples at each sampling interval. Gas samples were analyzed within six hours of withdrawal from the jars. Samples were consistently run on the same GC throughout the course of the experiment. Gas concentrations from fifteen samples of ambient air were run on both GCs and were compared every 72 hours throughout the course of the experiment to cross calibrate between the readings of the two machines. The Shimadzu 2014 GHG GC had an average (± SD) ambient CO_2 reading of 609.2 ppm (± 152.0) and the SRI 8610 C GHG GC had an average ambient CO_2 reading of 589.5 (± 132.6) ppm. CO_2 and CH_4 concentrations were corrected for dilution from backfilling of ambient air and for variation in ambient concentrations of CO_2 and CH_4 using the blank measurements. CO_2 and CH_4 production were calculated as a change in concentration over time. 10% of data was discarded after quality control, where values with $r^2 < 0.8$ were rejected. A three-way ANOVA was used to determine the variance of means between sector age, position, and depth.

Commented [IS97]: R2: why 2 GC's

Commented [IS98R97]: Busy lab - availability

Commented [NRP99R97]: One for each gas? Yes very busy.

2.4 Peat Quality Analysis

Samples were prepared for Fourier transform mid-infrared (FT-MIR) spectrometry corresponding to the sampling locations used in the peat incubations. All samples were oven-dried at 60 °C for 48 hours and ground into a fine powder using a mortar and pestle, after which they were run through a 50 µm mesh sieve. Once prepared, the samples were analyzed using FTIR spectroscopy (Agilent Cary 660 FTIR spectrometer; 32 scans per spectrum, 2 cm^{-1} resolution). To this end, a mixture of approximately 2 mg sample and 200 mg potassium bromide (KBr) (FTIR grade, Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA) were pressed. A KBr background spectrum was subtracted from the raw absorbance spectra. Finally, the spectra were baseline corrected (Beleites and Sergo, 2020: https://github.com/cbeleites/hyperSpec) using the R package ir (Teickner, 2020: https://github.com/henningte/ir) and further processed with the R package 'irpeat' (Teickner & Hodgkins, 2021). A

Humification index (HI) was computed as ratio of the absorbances at ~1650 cm^{-1} (indicative of lignins and other aromatics) and ~1090 cm^{-1} (indicative of polysaccharides representing the labile fraction), as described in detail in Broder et al. (2012). Larger ratios (1650/1090 cm^{-1}) indicate a greater degree of humification, assuming a residual enrichment of refractory moieties and preferential degradation of more labile fractions (Broder et al. (2012)).

3. Results

3.1 CO_2 Fluxes

~~**3.1.1 Fields and Drainage Ditches**~~

The average (± SD) CO_2 flux from all sectors, field locations and ditches combined was 1.2 (± 2.1) g C m^{-2} d^{-1} (see also Table S2). The mean CO_2 flux from all fields combining all sector ages and excluding the drainage ditch measurements was 0.9 (± 1.6) g C m^{-2} d^{-1}. The mean CO_2 flux from the drainage ditches across all sectors was 2.05 (± 2.2) g C m^{-2} d^{-1}. A significant difference was present ($F_{1,1272} = 79.47$, $p <$ ~~2 x 10^{-16}~~ 0.001) between the CO_2 emissions from the drainage ditches and the field surface.

The base of the drainage ditches was closer to the WT than the surface of the fields and, as a result, was frequently saturated. The C cycling dynamics within the ditches are different than those at the surface of the field and thus, the results from the drainage ditches will not be directly compared to those from the field surface.

~~**3.1.2 Sectors**~~

~~The average (± SD) CO_2 flux from all locations within the 1987, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016 sectors, excluding the drainage ditch measurements, were 0.6 (± 0.7), 0.7 (± 0.5), 0.6 (± 0.4), 0.7 (± 0.4), and 1.5 (± 2.7) g C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively (Figure 4 and 5).~~ Measurements of CO_2 flux from the sectors ranged from ~~The highest measured flux was~~ 37.1 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} ~~and~~ to ~~the lowest measured flux was~~ -0.3 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}. A single value of -36.5 gC m^{-2} d^{-1} was deemed to be an outlier and removed from the 1987 sector flux data. A two-way ANOVA between sector age and measurement position was performed and the outcomes for sector age and measurement position, as well as any interactions, will be discussed separately ~~in the following sections~~below. The two-way ANOVA showed that the 2016 sector had significantly ~~higher~~ greater CO_2 emissions than all other sectors ($F_{4,942} = 12.80$, $p < 0.05$)~~.~~ (Figure 4; Table S1). The 1987, 2007, 2010, and 2013 sectors exhibited similar fluxes

Commented [IS100]: R1: general comments. "I would like to have the short analysis of all measured variables (peat temperatures at different depth, peat volumetric water content), e.g. average values with standard deviations or some table, per sections. The the rest of the results sectors can be easier to discuss;
In different parts 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.4.1 sentences with long lists of nummerical results are given (marked in yellow in uploaded pdf), although the results are also presented in easier to understand figure. I would prefer the numerical results as a table (maybe in annexes), to make understanding these values easier. "

We could add Summary tables in Supplemental section. Her first comment would involve some simple analysis to get the averages/StDevs. The second comment we could summarize from the existing provided data in this paper.

Commented [NRP101R100]: Yes easy to do. If Laura sends the T and moisture data we can do this. I can summarize the wtd data.

Commented [IS102R100]: Still to do

Commented [NRP103R100]: I have provided the summary of the physical data of Lai 2022 in the site description. I think if we put it in the results we need to provide a diagram or two, and would have to provide more details in the methods. See lines 123 to 128 and let me know what you think.

Commented [IS104]: As per R1

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Subscript

over time, with no significant difference between their means, although the 2010 and 2013 sectors were only measured in 2020.



Figure 4: The box and whisker plots (median, upper and lower quartiles, and outliers) of CO_2 fluxes from the drainage ditch and the three field locations combined (2, 5 and 15 m) by the year a sector was opened.

~~3.1.3 Measurement Positions Within Fields~~

When measurements are averaged by field position (2, 5, and 15 m away from the drainage ditches) across all five sectors, the mean CO_2 fluxes (± SD) were 0.7 (± 0.7), 0.9 (± 1.0), and 1.2 (± 2.4) g C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively (Figure 5). A statistically significantly different mean CO_2 flux from the 15 m position compared to both the 2 m and the 5 m positions ($F_{2,942} = 6.90$, $p < 0.05$) was found.



Figure 5: The box and whisker plots of CO_2 flux by sector and measurement location from the edge of the ditches in a field (i.e. 2, 5 and 15 m).

~~3.1.4 Spatial Variation Within Fields and Between Sectors~~

CO_2 emissions at different distances from the ditches differed for different age sectors (~~,~~ $F_{8,942} = 3.41$, $p < 0.001$). The mean CO_2 emissions from the 15 m position in the 2016 sector significantly differed from every other sampling position and sector. Within the 2016 sector, the means of the CO_2 emissions from the 15 m position were statistically different from those of the 2 m position ($F_{8,942} = 2.22$, $p < 0.001$). No statistical difference emerged between the means of 2016 15 m and 2016 5 m positions. Within the 2016 sector, a difference was only found between the middle and edge of the fields. No differences were noted within or between the other four sectors. Across the whole data set, ~~there was no~~ correlations between VWC ($r = -0.2$, $p < 0.001$) or soil temperature ($r = 0.19$; $p = 0.037$) and CO_2 flux were significant but~~y~~ only described a small amount of the variation.

Commented [IS105]: R2: number of samples not given. High rejection...etc.

Commented [IS106R105]: Aren't the sample sizes given in the F value reporting?

Commented [NRP107R105]: Yes - insert N

Commented [IS108]: R1 would like P values - Laura?

Commented [NRP109R108]: I assume the p was a fixed value - e.g. 0.8 every below that was rejected. But make you say you did not reject values that were near zero - i.e. conc did not change consistently with time. Random over time around zero.

Commented [IS110R108]: Values inserted and text reworded

3.2 CH_4 Fluxes

~~3.2.1 Fields and Drainage Ditches~~

Variation in CH_4 emissions was much ~~more significant~~greater than that of CO_2 between the field and drainage ditches. The mean CH_4 flux (± SD) from the drainage ditches in all sectors was 84.2 (± 325.4) mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} (see also Table S2).~~.~~ The mean CH_4 flux (± SD) from the total field surface was 9.2 (± 103.0) mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}. ~~The maximum CH_4 flux from the fields and ditches were 2518.5 and 2737.8 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively, and the minimum fluxes were -74.7 and -5.8 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively. A single value of 10822 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} was deemed an outlier and removed from the 2016 drainage ditch flux data.~~ Drainage ditches were much larger sources of CH_4 to the atmosphere than the exposed peat at the field surface (Figure 6). A high standard error was present in both the field and the drainage ditch measurements, although the drainage ditches showed more variation. The mean CH_4 emissions from the drainage ditches were statistically ~~higher~~ greater than that of the fields ($F_{1,905}$ = 15.6, $p < 0.001$).

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm



Figure 6: The box and whisker plots of the CH_4 fluxes from drainage ditches and all locations from field surface according to the age of the sector.

~~3.2.2 Sectors~~

There were no significant differences in mean CH_4 among sectors from fields ~~between sectors~~ or from ditches (Table S1). The maximum CH_4 flux from the fields and ditches were 2518.5 and 2737.8 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively, and the minimum fluxes were -74.7 and -5.8 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively. A single value of 10822 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} was deemed an outlier and removed from the 2016 drainage ditch flux data.

~~The average CH_4 flux (± SD) from the drainage ditches from each sector was 32.9 (± 155.0), 113.6 (± 421.0), 46.7 (± 58.4), 14.3 (± 54.7), and 128.4 (± 398.6) mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} from the 1987, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016 sectors, respectively. The average CH_4 flux (± SD) from the field surface was 2.4 (± 26.9), 5.0 (± 22.6), 11.7 (± 61.3), 2.0 (± 13.6), and 21.9 (± 195.9) mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} from the 1987, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016 sectors respectively. None of the sectors were statistically different from each other.~~

~~3.2.3 Spatial Variation Within Fields and Between Sectors~~

Combining the sectors and stratifying data by measurement position, the average (± SD) CH_4 fluxes from the 2, 5, and 15 m positions on the fields were 13.4 (± 167.8), 8.5 (± 45.9), and 5.3 (± 33.4) mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}, respectively. Lower CH_4 emissions were seen mid-field, but there were no statistically significant differences between the means of the three field measurement positions (Figure 7). Across the whole data set, ~~no relationship was found~~relationships between VWC (r = -0.077, p<0.001) or temperature (r = 0.084, p=0.033) and CH_4 flux were significant but described only a small part of the variation.

Formatted: Subscript

Commented [IS111]: R1 would like P values - Laura?

Commented [NRP112R111]: These may be fixed at 0.05

Commented [IS113R111]: Values inserted and text reworded



Figure 7: Box and whisker plots of the CH_4 flux by measurement distance from the ditch within each age sector.

3.3 Peat Age and Quality

The ^{14}C dating results of peat samples from the 2007 and 2016 sectors revealed distinct differences in peat age across and within sectors (Figure 8). The elevation difference across the field introduced an age difference between the peat closest to the drainage ditches and the peat at the center. The results indicated that peat age ($\Delta^{14}C$) decreased toward the centre of the field, with elevation, in both the 2007 (-163.46 ± 3.27‰ and -104.10 ± 3.54‰ for 2 and 15 m, respectively) and 2016 (-94.06 ± 3.56‰ and 30.03 ± 4.00‰ for 2 and 15 m, respectively) sectors. Mid-field, at a depth of 80 cm from the surface, the age difference was also apparent between sectors (-276.62 ± 2.88‰ and -154.39 ± 3.29‰ from the 2007 and 2016 sectors, respectively) (Figure 8).



345

Figure 8: Incubation sampling locations with respective ^{14}C ages, all depths approximate. The horizontal line is drawn to show that these elevations are approximately equal.

FT-MIR analysis results indicated that the humification degree increased with years of extraction. Assessing samples from the surface and 10 cm depths, the sector average HI (± SD) were 1.05 (± 0.08), 0.82 (± 0.08), and 0.70 (± 0.09) from the 1987, 2007, and 2016 sectors, respectively. The 50 and 80 cm samples were excluded from this analysis because the deep samples were older and more humified than the surface peat as a result of their depth in the profile, however, they were included in the ^{14}C dating. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the average HI from the 1987 and 2007 sectors ($F_{(2,21)} = 26.73$, $p < 0.001$) and from the 1987 and 2016 sectors ($F_{(2,21)} = 26.73$, $p < 0.001$).

3.4 Production Potential

3.4.1 CO_2

Carbon dioxide production potentials ranged from 0.50 – 1.39, 0.28 – 0.88, and 0.40 – 1.36 µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from the 1987, 2007, and 2016 sectors, respectively. ~~The highest CO_2 production potential came from the 1987 sector at the 2 m position, 50~~

Commented [IS114]: R2: what does horizontal line indicate?

Commented [NRP115R114]: Reference line? Delete to avoid confusion

Commented [IS116]: R2: 50 and 80 cm samples excluded but appear in Fig 8

Commented [IS117R116]: They were excluded from FTIR but not from C14 dating.

Commented [NRP118R116]: Yes - be specific in the sentence

Formatted: Superscript

Commented [IS119]: R2: hard to digest the numbers. Could this be summarized in fig/table?

Commented [IS120R119]: Similar to R1 comment about the flux section. Can we create something in Supplementary info?

Commented [NRP121R119]: Will look at this

Commented [NRP122R119]: Ian has done a good job in addressing the summary request of R2.

~~cm depth (1.39 µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}), while the smallest was observed from the 2007 sector at the 5 m position, 10 cm depth (0.28 µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}). The average (± SD) production potentials from the 1987 sector surface 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 0.6 (± 0.1), 0.9 (± 0.1), and 0.5 (± 0.1) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 1987 sector 10 cm depth 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 1.1 (± 0.2), 0.8 (± 0.2), and 0.5 (± 0.1) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (±SD) production potential from the 1987 sector deep samples was the same – 1.4 (± 0.2) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from 2 m, 50 cm depth and 1.4 (± 0.3) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from 15 m, 80 cm depth. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 2007 sector surface 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 0.7 (± 0.1), 0.5 (± 0.1), and 0.7 (± 0.1) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 2007 sector 10 cm depth 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 0.5 (± 0.1), 0.3 (0.1), and 0.5 (± 0.1) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 2007 sector deep samples were 0.9 (± 0.2) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from the 2 m, 50 cm depth and 0.8 (± 0.3) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from the 15 m, 80 cm depth. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 2016 sector surface 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 0.7 (± 0.2), 0.8 (± 0.1), and 1.4 (± 0.2) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (± SD) production potentials from the 2016 sector 10 cm depth 2, 5, and 15 m positions, respectively, were 0.4 (± 0.1), 0.5 (± 0.1), and 1.2 (± 0..3) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1}. The average (± SD) production potential from the 2016 sector deep samples were 0.6 (± 0.2) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from 2 m, 50 cm depth and 0.7 (± 0.2) µg CO_2 g^{-1} h^{-1} from 15 m, 80 cm depth.~~ Carbon dioxide production from the 1987 sector samples did not appear to follow any clear pattern or trend due to the position on the field or depth (Figure 9A). However, statistically, significant differences can be seen among depths of the surface and 10 cm from the 2 and 5 m positions and the 5 and 15 m positions. Carbon dioxide production within the 2007 sector also did not appear to follow a trend or pattern (Figure 9B). Notable statistically significant differences within the 2007 sector emerged at a depth of 10 cm between the 5 and 15 m positions. The 2016 sector samples, however, exhibited a clear increase in CO_2 production with increasing distance from the drainage ditches at the surface and 10 cm depths (Figure 9C). From these depths, the 2 and 15 m positions and the 5 and 15 m positions were statistically different ($F_{6,366}$ = 19.5, $p < 0.001$). From all three sectors, CO_2 production potentials were similar between the 50 and 80 cm depths, although the absolute values varied between the sectors.



Figure 9: CO_2 production potentials of all samples from the A) 1987, B) 2007, and C) 2016 sectors

3.4.2 CH_4

As expected, given the oxic conditions of the incubations, no incubations showed a consistent increase in CH_4 concentration for the experiment, and all CH_4 r^2 values were < 0.8.

4.0 Discussion

The net ecosystem exchange (NEE) of undisturbed peatlands ranges between -10 to -60 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Koehler et al., 2010; Roulet et al., 2007; Sagerfors et al., 2008), whereas our study site is a net source of C to the atmosphere, similar to values

reported from disturbed and post-extraction, unrestored peatlands. Aslan-Sungur et al. (2016) reported CO_2 fluxes of 246, 244, and 663 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} in 2011, 2012, and 2013 respectively, from a peatland site, drained for mining and agricultural use. Salm et al. (2012) report net CO_2 emissions of 480 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} for ~~mined~~extracted peatlands in Estonia. Rankin et al. (2018) reported annual CO_2 emissions of 173 - 259 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} from a 20-year post-extracted, unrestored peatland. For our study site, using the mean daily emission of 0.7 g C m^{-2} for six months and ~0.5 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} for the six coldest months would yield an estimate of 200-250 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1}, which is in line with previous results (Alm et al., 2007; Aslan-Sungur et al., 2016; Nykanen et al., 1995; Wilson et al., 2015).

A ~~higher~~ greater respiration rate from the drainage ditches is consistent with findings from previous studies at post-extraction (Waddington et al., 2010) and unrestored (Rankin et al., 2018) peatland sites. The CO_2 emissions from the drainage ditches alone are similar in magnitude to emissions from natural peatlands (~12 ± 21 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Abdalla et al., 2016)).

Our measured CH_4 fluxes correspond to published values from other drained peatland sites (Manning et al., 2019; Waddington et al., 1996). Korkiakoski et al. (2020) reported that a drained peatland site in Finland even became a CH_4 sink over the growing season, measuring atmospheric emissions following precipitation events. Although our site is not a net sink, some uptake of CH_4 by the field surface was measured consistently over all three years of study from all sector ages. We likely have under-sampled gas fluxes after rainfall events, which may influence temporal variation in CH_4 emissions.

4.1 Environmental Variables

Peat fibre content, indicated by visual analysis and industry specification, does not appear to influence respiration rates greatly. According to industry quality classifications, the 1987 sector contains the most fibric peat, while the 2007 through 2016 sectors do not vary significantly in fibre content (Dr. P-O. Jean, Premier Tech, Pers. Comm). Thus, thise physical characteristic of the peat structure does not predict variation in CO_2 production within fields or between sectors. Temperature is widely documented to be a driver of CO_2 production (Blodau, 2002; Holden, 2005; Moore & Dalva, 1993; Yavitt et al., 1997); however, surface temperature exerts little ~~to no~~ influence over our measured CO_2 flux (r = 0.19). It is possible that other drivers, such as substrate quality, may have a larger impact on CO_2 emissions. Surface VWC also does not appear to have an influence on CO_2 flux (r = -0.2), possibly due to increased respiration rates in the deeper aerated peat that would offset a decline in CO_2 production from desiccation (Dimitrov et al., 2010; Marwanto & Agus, 2014; Waddington et al., 2002). Average

Formatted: Superscript
Formatted: Superscript
Formatted: French (France)
Field Code Changed
Commented [IS123]: R1: Salm et al 2012 to be used
Commented [NRP124R123]: Ok
Formatted: French (France)
Formatted: French (France)
Field Code Changed
Commented [IS125]: R1 would like a citation here
Commented [NRP126R125]: This would be a pers coom to PO Jean
Commented [IS127]: As per R1
Commented [NRP128R127]: Fine
Commented [IS129]: R1: did deeper T correlate with CO2?
Commented [IS130R129]: Laura may have looked at this - she can comment. We can simply say so.
Commented [NRP131R129]: Ok
Commented [MS132R129]: Not sure how you want to respond here. I assume Laura didn't measure more than 20-30 cm deep and my guess is also no correlation here. Probably fine to just say we didn't measure deep peat temperatures, but given the link between CO2 production and the peat age, most CO2 is likely produced near the surface, so that's why we looked at that. Then no changes are needed in the text.

VWC in the upper 10 cm is lower than values documented from other disturbed peatlands (Manning et al., 2019; Waddington et al., 2002), but values from actively extracted peatland sites are difficult to find in the literature.

4.2 Chamber Measurement CO_2 Fluxes

An expected result was the overarching observation that the most recently opened 2016 sector had ~~higher~~ greater CO_2 emissions than the older sectors. It can be best explained by the relative age and thus the degree of decomposition of the surface peat. Since this sector was most recently opened, aerated peat in the upper profile is younger than sites where peat extraction has occurred for many years, exposing older peat present deeper in the profile. The range of water table depths across a field from beside the ditch to the centre of the field in the summer are 0.2 to 0.5 and 0.3 to 0.8 m, respectively. The peat water content was between 40 to 50% at 0.1 m below the surface and > 70 to 80% below 0.3 m depth (Lai 2022). Further, the elevation gradient that results from the practice of contouring the field surface exposes older peat deeper in the soil profile to the surface near the ditches, leaving younger peat in the middle of the fields (Figure 8).

As ~~harvesting~~peat extraction continues, older, more humified peat with less nutrients are now the surface peat ~~Nutrients and microbial biomass have been lost over time in the older sectors as peat at depth is continuously exposed to the surface~~ (Croft et al., 2001; Glatzel et al., 2004). The decrease in CO_2 production could also be a result of an accumulation of inhibitory compounds such as lignins, phenolics, or humic substances, that hinder extracellular enzyme activity (Hogg et al., 1992). This is supported by the HI (1650/1090 cm^{-1}), which shows an increase in humification with time since extraction began. In addition, the reduced water contents due to drainage most likely lead to secondary decomposition of the peat in the top 0.3 to 0.5 m of peat in the field undergoing extraction (Biester et al., 2014). In an incubation study of peat samples from 2- and 7-year post-extraction peatlands, Waddington et al. (2001) concluded that CO_2 production did not change from peat below a depth of 35 cm. The authors did not find a significant difference in CO_2 production between the young and old cutover sites and argue that peat age strongly influences CO_2 production more than gas transport through peat layers (Waddington et al., 2001).

Spatial variation within fields further illustrates the effect of peat age on respiration. The site average CO_2 flux is similar to average values from post-extraction, unrestored sites while the 2016 sector 15 m position emits more CO_2 than is recorded in the literature for post-extraction, unrestored sites (Rankin et al., 2018; Strack & Zuback, 2013). The 2016 sector

Commented [IS133]: As per R1 and R2

Commented [NRP134R133]: Fine - Mooreism

Formatted: Subscript

displays a clear linear increase in CO_2 flux with increasing distance from the ditch, but this effect declines and plateaus in the older sectors. Spatial variation in CO_2 emissions is not apparent in the older extracted sectors because the surface peat is older, and the respiration rates are correspondingly lower. The peat at the 2 m position in the 2016 sector has a similar ^{14}C age to the middle of the 2007 sector (Figure 8) and also displays a similar mean CO_2 flux to the 2007 15 m position (0.57 and 0.72 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} for 2016 and 2007, respectively).

Previous studies have compared trace gas production from natural and cutover peatlands (Croft et al., 2001; Glatzel et al., 2004; Waddington et al., 2001; Waddington et al., 2002; Waddington & Price, 2000); however, none have compared the spatial variation in respiration rates between peat age based on depth and production year at an extracted peatland. Our results indicate that in the first few years of peat extraction, the residual labile C contained in the surface peat encourages C mineralization and high levels of CO_2 production. This is clearly observed in the high emissions from the center of the youngest field, opened two years prior to our initial measurements. An obvious decline in respiration within the 2016 sector is demonstrated over a horizontal distance of 10 m (Figure 5), with an estimated 15 cm difference in depth and an age difference of ~ 450 years, driven by the easily available C consumed by microbes. Over approximately three to four years, based on measurements from the sector that opened in 2013, respiration rates plateau. Peat quality appears to decline with extraction length, as indicated by the HI (1650/1090 cm^{-1}). Soil moisture and temperature, typical drivers of CO_2 production, have ~~a~~ relatively ~~lower~~ less influence on respiration rate, further indicating peat age (i.e., peat quality due to secondary decomposition) and corresponding lability to be the primary control.

4.3 Peat Substrate Age and Decomposability

The CO_2 production potential from the incubation experiments mirrors those observed in our field chamber fluxes, suggesting that peat samples from the field site behave similarly under field conditions when experimentally controlling for moisture and temperature. In high-latitude peatlands, deeper peat has been shown to be more resistant to decomposition than more recently formed peat (Hogg et al., 1992). Supporting our field measurement results, the CO_2 production potential of incubated peat from the 2016 sector increases with distance from the ditch and decreasing peat age in the top layers of peat (surface and 10 cm depths; Figure 9C). Increased CO_2 production potential with younger peat supports the conclusion that the

2016 sector contains C in the substrate that is more readily available for decomposition. This is not observed from the older sectors that have undergone extraction for longer durations of time, also in accordance with our field measurements.

Decreased CO_2 production potential from older, lower quality peat is consistent with what has previously been presented in the literature for temperate peatlands. Research has shown that CO_2 production potential declines with depth (Bridgham & Richardson, 1992; Waddington et al., 2001), helping to explain the consistent behaviour of the deep peat samples from the 2007 and 2016 sectors. This was an expected outcome as these samples were parallel to each other at depth and had similar (within ~100 years) ^{14}C ages (Figure 9). Research has shown that intra- and inter-community CO_2 production potential from well-humified peat does not vary significantly (Bridgham & Richardson, 1992). McKenzie et al. (1998) reported that CO_2 and CH_4 production potential declined with depth from different locations at two flooded peatland sites, which they attribute to differences in peat quality as a result of age.

Moreover, previous studies found decreased CO_2 production potential from peat in extracted peatlands compared to natural and restored sites (Croft et al., 2001; Glatzel et al., 2004). Glatzel et al. (2004) observed lower rates of respiration from surface peat at a production site, compared to natural and restored sites, finding the degree of humification~~, determined by Glatzel~~ to be an important control on CO_2 production. Waddington et al. (2001) also found that CO_2 production was lower in block-cut sites compared to a natural peatland and that the most active CO_2 production was in the surface layers. Croft et al. (2001) found lower microbial biomass in a vacuum-harvested production site, leading to lower CO_2 production, and found that microbial populations increased following restoration.

Commented [MS135]: Can this just be removed?

Commented [IS136R135]: Yes

4.4 Chamber CH_4 Fluxes

A measured difference in CH_4 fluxes between the field surface and drainage ditches was an expected outcome, as this has been demonstrated in many previous studies (Manning et al., 2019; Minkkinen et al., 1997; Minkinnen & Laine, 2006; Rankin et al., 2018; Schrier-Uijl et al., 2010; Strack & Zuback, 2013; Sundh et al., 2000; Waddington & Day, 2007). The drainage ditches act as localized anoxic zones that exhibit ideal moisture and temperature conditions for CH_4 production. ~~Higher~~ Greater CH_4 fluxes, particularly if standing water is present, from the drainage ditches, could be explained by microbial breakdown of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) or the lateral transport of dissolved CH_4 produced in the anoxic peat field layers (Billett & Moore, 2008; Teh et al., 2011; Cory et al., 2014; Logue et al., 2016).

~~The lack of correlation between surface soil moisture and CH_4 emissions was a surprising and unanticipated outcome.~~ Drainage has been documented to decrease CH_4 emissions (Abdalla et al., 2016; Basiliko et al., 2007; Korkiakoski et al., 2020; Waddington & Price, 2000), but soil moisture is widely accepted to have a significant influence on CH_4 emissions (e.g., Abdalla et al., 2016; Basiliko et al., 2007; Manning et al., 2019; Moore & Dalva, 1993; Moore & Roulet, 1993). VWC measurements likely do not correlate well with CH_4 flux as they were taken in the surface peat that is disconnected from the moisture profile as a result of harrowing.

WTD measurements taken from June 2019 through August 2020 by Lai (2022) indicate that during the summer months, the WT decreases toward the edge of the field, measuring approximately 0.6 m from the surface at a distance of 1 m from the ditches, due to the drainage of water into the base of the drainage ditches. Between June and October, at a distance of ~ 13.5 m away from the drainage ditches, the WT remained at ~ 0.8 m below the surface, except after a few large rain events. The peat water content above the water table in the field centre ranged from ~50% at 0.1 m depth below the surface to >70 to 80% at 0.3 m depth. These measurements indicate little difference in the potential oxidation path length from the field edge to the centre, further supporting our assertion that peat age is the primary control over CO_2 production.

Vegetation removal also plays a role in the decline of CH_4 transmission to the atmosphere compared to natural or restored sites. The absence of vegetation removes the input of labile C to the anoxic layer usually facilitated by sedge roots in natural peatlands (Joabsson et al., 1999; Dorodnikov et al., 2011) and the transport of CH_4 to the surface via vascular plants ceases (Korkiakoski et al., 2020).

Our results indicate that the field surfaces from all sectors are not significant sources of CH_4 to the atmosphere. At the same time, the drainage ditches produce almost seven times more CH_4 on average (9.2 and 72.0 mg C m^{-2} d^{-1} for the field and drainage ditches, respectively) during the warm seasons; ditches are frozen for five-six months of the year. Ultimately, no other significant trends or correlating variables were found to explain variation in our measured CH_4 fluxes. ~~Additional measurements, such as flux measurements after precipitation events, may help explain the drivers of CH_4 emissions at this site.~~

Commented [IS137]: R2: not surprising if dataset too small or havent covered temporal variation

Commented [NRP138R137]: I agree - CH4 is complicated by production and oxidation. Tight relationships occur in wet, saturated sites.

Commented [IS139]: R2: add presence/absence of vegetaion in drainage ditches in methods

Commented [NRP140R139]: Ok

Commented [IS141R139]: Ditches routinely re-cut by industry restricting any vegetation colonization.

Commented [IS142]: R2: also other times of year outside of extraction

Commented [IS143R142]: I think the reviewer isn't from Canada therefore isnt thinking about the winter that we have

Commented [NRP144R142]: Delete sentence and state ditches frozen five months of the year.

5. Summary and Conclusion

We were able to determine that peatlands undergoing active peat extraction are net sources of C to the atmosphere, with average CO_2 and CH_4 flux values similar to those of post-extraction, unrestored peatland sites. The newly open sectors are a greater source of CO_2 to the atmosphere for the first few years, but then the emissions become independent of the duration of ~~harvesting~~extraction. This suggests that two different emission factors, one for newly opened, and one for older sectors might be appropriate. ~~The newly opened sectors are significantly higher sources of CO_2 to the atmosphere, and fluxes decline over several years to become consistent sources over the remaining period of extraction.~~ The spatial-age effect across the domed fields, where CO_2 emissions increase with increasing distance from the drainage ditches, also declines and plateaus. CH_4 emissions do not appear to exhibit a clear spatial or temporal pattern between sector ages or measurement positions, although lower CH_4 fluxes are observed from the centre of the peat fields. The drainage ditches are sources of CH_4 to the atmosphere, while the field surfaces ~~do not show large amounts of CH_4 production~~have very low CH_4 emission. In the fields of this study, the ditch spacing was every 30 m, so the ratio of the ditch to field surface area was ~~1~~530:1. The CO_2 from the field and ditches was not substantially different, the two surfaces contribute roughly proportional to their area in a sector (e.g. fields and ditches contributed 9~~7~~3% and 3~~7~~%, respectively to the overall flux from a sector). Conversely, the CH_4 was significantly greater from the ditches than the fields, so the ditches emitted disproportionately more CH_4 than their relative area (field emitted 79% and ditches 21% of the overall CH_4 flux from a sector~~The CO_2 from the fields and ditches was not substantially different, so the two surfaces' contribution was proportional to their area in a sector (e.g. fields and ditches contributed 92 to 8% to the overall flux from a sector). Conversely, the CH_4 was significantly greater for ditches than fields, so the ditches emitted disportionately more CH_4 than their relative area (fields emitted 65% and ditches 35% of all CH_4 from a sector~~). Laboratory incubations did not show ~~a significant level~~measurable ~~of~~ CH_4 production ~~potential~~ from the peat samples, at an estimated 80-90 % moisture content. Under constant moisture and temperature conditions, the CO_2 production potential of peat from the 1987, 2007, and 2016 sector ages displayed the same behaviour as CO_2 emissions under field conditions. CO_2 production potential increased with distance from the ditch from the top peat layers in the youngest 2016 sector, but this pattern was not displayed from the older 1987 or 2007 sectors. CO_2 production potential of peat samples at depths of 50 and 80 cm was similar between all three sector ages, although a significant amount of variation was observed between the sector age. Peat

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt, Subscript

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Commented [IS145]: R2: is this relevent for EF's

Commented [IS146R145]: That's kind of the whole point...

Commented [NRP147R145]: I think R2 is asking its relevance to EFs based on land-use class. Our results show that its not just land-use but how long after the change. I would suggest something like "The newly open sectors are a greater source of CO2 to the atmosphere for the first four to five years, but then the emissions become independent of the duration of harvesting. This suggests that two different emission factors, one for newly open, and then for older sectors might be appropriate."

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Commented [NRP148]: This was rewritten for the CSPMA comment – I had the wrong ditch spacing in the original calculation. I had use 1 m to 15 m where it is 1 m to 30 m – does not affect the statement but the numbers are more correct

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

age, which appears to be a good indicator of quality difference, was determined to be the primary driver of CO_2 production across the field width and sectors.

The quantification of C emissions from these sites allows for more accurate estimates of peat production's overall impact on atmospheric C accumulation. The results of this study provide the industry with scalable numbers of CO_2 and CH_4 ~~production~~ emission to determine potential mitigation tactics and move forward with the continued sustainable and responsible management of this resource.

Commented [IS149]: As per R1

Commented [NRP150R149]: Fine

Formatted: Subscript

Author Contributions

LC was responsible for the collection of the field and laboratory data, analysis and the initial draft preparation; IBS was the primary supervisor of LC, reviewed and edited the manuscript and contributed to the methodological design; MS was co-supervisor of LC, reviewed and edited the manuscript and contributed to the methodological design; NTR reviewed and edited the manuscript, contributed to the methodological design and is the PI on the project that funded the study. KHK and HT contributed to laboratory analyses and FT-MIR data evaluation and reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This research funded through a Collaborative Research and Development (CRDJ 525896-18) grant to NTR, IBS and MS from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada, the Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association (CSPMA)~~,~~ and ~~several Canadian peat companies (Berger Peat Moss Lrd., Lambert Peat Moss, Premier Tech. Scotts Canada, and Sun Gro Horticulture Canada)~~its members. The authors wish to thank the operations staff at Premier Tech Horticulture (PTH) for facilitating access to the field site and Dr. Frédéric Caron and Dr. Pierre-Olivier Jean of PTH for their scientific

discussions. Field and lab assistance was provided by Naomi Weinberg, Madison Meades, Karina Volpato, Maria Gheta, Isabel Strachan, Jan Bahrke, Hedda Lil Müller, and Mike Dalva.

References

Abdalla, M., Hastings, A., Truu, J., Espenberg, M., Mander, Ü., and Smith, P.: Emissions of methane from northern peatlands: A review of management impacts and implications for future management options, Ecol. Evol., 6(19), 7080-7102, doi:10.1002/ece3.2469, 2016.

Ahlholm, U., and Silvola, J.: CO2 release from peat-harvested peatlands and stockpiles, Proceedings of PEAT 90 versatile peat, International Conference on Peat Production and Use, 2, 1990.

Alm, J., Shurpali, N. J., Minkkinen, K., Aro, L., Hytönen, J., Laurila, T., and Mäkiranta, P.: Emission factors and their uncertainty for the exchange of CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O in Finnish managed peatlands, Boreal Environ. Res., 12, 191-209, 2007.

~~Armentano, T., and Menges, E.: Patterns of change in the carbon balance of organic soil-wetlands of the temperate zone, J. Ecol., 74, 755-774, doi:10.2307/2260396, 1986.~~

Anrep, A.V.,: Investigations of Peat Bogs and Peat Industry of Canada 1911-12, Bulletin No. 9, Department of Mines, Government Printing Bureau, 118 pp., 1914, doi.org/10.4095/307364

Aslan-Sungur, G., Lee, X., Evrendilek, F., and Karakaya, N.: Large interannual variability in net ecosystem carbon dioxide exchange of a disturbed temperate peatland, Sci. Total Environ., 554, 192-202, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.153, 2016.

Commented [IS151]: As per R1

Basiliko, N., Blodau, C., Roehm, C., Bengtson, P., and Moore, T. R.: Regulation of decomposition and methane dynamics across natural, commercially mined, and restored northern peatlands, Ecosys., 10(7), 1148-1165, doi:10.1007/s10021-007-9083-2, 2007.

Bergman, I., Svensson, B. H., and Nilsson, M.: Regulation of methane production in a Swedish acid mire by pH, temperature and substrate, Soil Biol. Biochem., 30(6), 729-741, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(97)00181-8, 1998.

Biester, H., K. H. Knorr, J. Schellekens, A. Basler and Hermanns, YM: Comparison of different methods to determine the degree of peat decomposition in peat bogs, Biogeosciences 11(10): 2691-2707, 2014.

Billett, M., and Moore, T.: Supersaturation and evasion of CO2 and CH4 in surface waters at Mer Bleue peatland, Canada, Hydrol. Processes, 22(12), 2044-2054, doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6805, 2008.

Blodau, C.: Carbon cycling in peatlands A review of processes and controls, Environ. Rev., 10(2), 111-134, 2002.

Bridgham, S. D., and Richardson, C. J.: Mechanisms controlling soil respiration (CO_2 and CH_4) in southern peatlands, Soil Biol. Biochem., 24, 1089-1099, doi.org/10.1016/0038-0717(92)90058-6, 1992.

Broder, T., Blodau, C., Biester, H., and Knorr, K.-H.: Peat decomposition records in three pristine ombrotrophic bogs in southern Patagonia, Biogeosci., 9(4), 1479-1491, 2012.

Bronk Ramsey, C. ~~B.~~: Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon date, Radiocarbon 51(1): 337-360, 2009.

~~Bubier, J. L., Bhatia, G., Moore, T. R., Roulet, N. T., and Lafleur, P. M.: Spatial and temporal variability in growing-season net ecosystem carbon dioxide exchange at a large peatland in Ontario, Canada, Ecosys., 6, 353-367, 2003.~~

~~Bubier, J. L., Moore, T. R., Bellisario, L., Comer, N. T., and Crill, P. M.: Ecological controls on methane emissions from a northern peatland complex in the zone of discontinuous permafrost, Manitoba, Canada, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 9(4), 455-470, doi:10.1029/95GB02379, 1995.~~

Bubier, J., Moore, T., and Roulet, N.: Methane emissions from wetlands in the mid-boreal region of northern Ontario, Canada, Ecology, 74(8), 2240-2254, 1993.

Bubier, J., Moore, T., Savage, K., and Crill, P.: A comparison of methane flux in a boreal landscape between a dry and a wet year, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19(1), doi:10.1029/2004GB002351, 2005.

Cory, R. M., Ward, C. P., Crump, B. C., and Kling, G. W.: Sunlight controls water column processing of carbon in arctic fresh waters, Science, 345(6199), 925-928, doi:10.1126/science.1253119, 2014.

Croft, M., Rochefort, L., and Beauchamp, C. J.: Vacuum-extraction of peatlands disturbs bacterial population and microbial biomass carbon, Appl. Soil Ecol., 18(1), 1-12, doi:10.1016/S0929-1393(01)00154-8, 2001.

Dorodnikov, M., Knorr, K.H., Kuzyakov, Y., and Wilmking, M.: Plant-mediated CH4 transport and contribution of photosynthates to methanogenesis at a boreal mire: a ^{14}C pulse-labeling study, Biogeosci., 8, 2365-2375, 2011.

Dimitrov, D. D., Grant, R. F., Lafleur, P. M., and Humphreys, E. R.: Modeling the effects of hydrology on ecosystem respiration at Mer Bleue bog, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 115(G04043), doi.org/10.1029/2010JG001312, 2010.

Environment and Climate Change Canada: Canadian Climate Normals 1981 – 2010 Station Data, https://climate.weather.gc.ca/climate_normals/results_1981_2010_e.html, 2021.

Commented [IS152]: As per R1

Commented [NRP153R152]: Fine

Glatzel, S., Basiliko, N., and Moore, T.: Carbon dioxide and methane production potentials of peats from natural, harvested and restored sites, eastern Québec, Canada, Wetlands, 24(2), 261-267, 2004.

Harris, L. I., K. Richardson, K. A. Bona, S. J. Davidson, S. A. Finkelstein, M. Garneau, J. McLaughlin, F. Nwaishi, D. Olefeldt, M. Packalen, N. T. Roulet, F. M. Southee, M. Strack, K. L. Webster, S. L. Wilkinson and Ray, J.C.,: The essential carbon service provided by northern peatlands. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 20(4): 222-230. doi.org/10.1002/fee.2437

Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M., and Troxler, T.: 2013 supplement to the 2006 IPCC guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories: Wetlands, IPCC, Switzerland, 2014.

Hogg, E. H., Lieffers, V. J., and Wein, R. W.: Potential carbon losses from peat profiles: effects of temperature, drought cycles, and fire, Ecolog. Appl., 2(3), 298-306, 1992.

Holden, J.: Peatland hydrology and carbon release: why small-scale process matters, Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. A, 363(1837), 2891-2913, doi:10.1098/rsta.2005.1671, 2005.

Joabsson, A., Christensen, T. R., and Wallén, B.: Vascular plant controls on methane emissions from northern peat forming wetlands, Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 14(10), 385-388, 1999.

Joosten, H., and Clarke, D.: Wise use of mires and peatlands. In: International Mire Conservation Group and International Peat Society, 304pp, 2002.

Kemdall, R.,A.: Microbial and substrate decomposition factors in Canadian commercially extracted peatlands. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, McGill University, 102 pp,, 2020.

Killham, K.: Soil Ecology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1994.

Koehler, A. K., Sottocornola, M., and Kiely, G.: How strong is the current carbon sequestration of an Atlantic blanket bog?, Global Change Biol., 17(1), 309-319, 2011.

Korkiakoski, M., Ojanen, P., Penttilä, T., Minkkinen, K., Sarkkola, S., Rainne, J., . . . and Lohila, A.: Impact of partial harvest on CH_4 and N_2O balances of a drained boreal peatland forest, Agric. For. Meteorol., 295, 108168, doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.108168, 2020.

Lafleur, P. M.: Connecting atmosphere and wetland: trace gas exchange, Geography Compass, 3(2), 560-585, doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00212.x, 2009.

~~Lafleur, P. M.: Interannual variability in the peatland-atmosphere carbon dioxide exchange at an ombrotrophic bog, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 17, 1036-1050, doi.org/10.1029/2002GB001983, 2003~~

Lai, Oi Yin: Peat Moisture and Thermal Regimes for Peatlands Undergoing Active Extraction, M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, McGill University, 65 pp, 2022.

Leifeld, J. and Menichetti, L.,: The underappreciated potential of peatlands in global climate change mitigation strategies. Nature Communications 9(1): 1071, 2018. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-03406-6.

~~Leifeld, J. and Menichetti, L.,: The underappreciated potential of peatlands in global climate change mitigation strategies. Nature Communications 9(1): 1071, 2018. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-03406-6.~~

Limpens, J., Berendse, F., Blodau, C., Canadell, J., Freeman, C., Holden, J., and Schaepman-Strub, G.: Peatlands and the carbon cycle: from local processes to global implications–a synthesis, Biogeosci., 5(5), 1475-1491, 2008.

Logue, J. B., Stedmon, C. A., Kellerman, A. M., Nielsen, N. J., Andersson, A. F., Laudon, H., and Kritzberg, E. S.: Experimental insights into the importance of aquatic bacterial community composition to the degradation of dissolved organic matter, ISME J., 10, 533–545, doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.131, 2016.

~~Lundegardh, H.: Carbon dioxide evolution of soil and crop growth, Soil Sci., 23(6), 417-453, Retrieved from https://journals.lww.com/soilsci/Fulltext/1927/06000/CARBON_DIOXIDE_EVOLUTION_OF_SOIL_AND_CROP_GROWTH.1.aspx, 1927.~~

Manning, F. C., Kho, L. K., Hill, T. C., Cornulier, T., and Teh, Y. A.: Carbon emissions from oil palm plantations on peat soil, Frontiers in Forests and Global Change, 2, doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2019/00037, 2019.

Marwanto, S., and Agus, F.: Is CO2 flux from oil palm plantations on peatland controlled by soil moisture and/or soil and air temperatures? Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change, 19(6), 809-819, 2014.

McCarter, C.P.R. and Price, J.S.: The hydrology of the Bois-des-Bel peatland restoration: hydrophysical properties limiting connectivity between regenerated *Sphagnum* and remnant vacuum harvested peat deposit, Ecohydrology, 8, 173-187, 2015.

McKenzie, C., Schiff, S., Aravena, R., Kelly, C., and St. Louis, V.: Effect of temperature on production of CH_4 and CO_2 from peat in a natural and flooded boreal forest wetland, Climatic Change, 40, 247-266, 1998.

Commented [IS154]: As per R1

Commented [NRP155R154]: Fine

McNeil, P., and Waddington, J.: Moisture controls on Sphagnum growth and CO_2 exchange on a cutover bog, J. Appl. Ecol., 40(2), 354-367, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2664.2003.00790.x, 2003.

Minkkinen, K., and Laine, J.: Vegetation heterogeneity and ditches create spatial variability in methane fluxes from peatlands drained for forestry, Plant and Soil, 285(1), 289-304, 2006.

Minkkinen, K., Laine, J., Nykänen, H., and Martikainen, P. J.: Importance of drainage ditches in emissions of methane from mires drained for forestry, Can. J. For. Res., 27(6), 949-952, 1997.

Moore, T., and Dalva, M.: The influence of temperature and water table position on carbon dioxide and methane emissions from laboratory columns of peatland soils, Eur. J. Soil Sci., 44, 651-664, doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.1993.tb02330.x, 1993.

Moore, T., Heyes, A., and Roulet, N. T.: Methane emissions from wetlands, southern Hudson Bay lowland, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 99(D1), 1455-1467, doi:10.1029/93JD02457, 1994.

Moore, T., and Roulet, N.: Methane flux: water table relations in northern wetlands, Geophys. Res. Lett., 20(7), 587-590, doi:10.1029/93GL00208, 1993.

Moore, T., Roulet, N., and Knowles, R.: Spatial and temporal variations of methane flux from subarctic/northern boreal fens, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 4(1), 29-46, doi:10.1029/GB004i001p00029, 1990.

Nilsson, M., J. Sagerfors, I. Buffman, H. Laudon, T. Ericksson, A. Grelle, P. Weslien and Lindroth, A.,: Contemporary carbon accumulation in a boreal oligotrophic minerogenic mire – a significant sink after accounting for all C-fluxes. Global Change Biology 14: 2317-2332, 2008. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01654.x

Nugent, K. A., Strachan, I. B., Strack, M., Roulet, N. T., and Rochefort, L.: Multi-year net ecosystem carbon balance of a restored peatland reveals a return to carbon sink, Global Change Biol., 24(12), 5751-5768, 2018.

Nykanen, H., Alm, J., Lang, K., Silvola, J., and Martikainen, P. J.: Emissions of CH_4, N_2O and CO_2 from a virgin fen and a fen drained for grassland in Finland, J. Biogeography, 351-357, 1995.

Oleszczuk, R., Regina, K., Szajdak, L., Höper, H., and Maryganova, V.: Impacts of Agricultural Utilization of Peat Soils on the Greenhouse Gas Balance. In: Peatlands and Climate Change, M. Strack (ed.), p.70-97, 2008.

Pelletier, L., Garneau, M., and Moore, T.: Variation in CO_2 exchange over three summers at microform scale in a boreal bog, Eastmain region, Québec, Canada, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 116(G3), doi:10.1029/2011JG001657, 2011.

Pelletier, L., Moore, T., Roulet, N., Garneau, M., and Beaulieu-Audy, V.: Methane fluxes from three peatlands in the La Grande Riviere watershed, James Bay lowland, Canada, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 112(G1), doi:10.1029/2006JG000216, 2007.

Poulin. M., Rochefort, L., Quinty, F., and Lavoie, C.: Spontaneous revegetation of mined peatlands in eastern Canada, Can. J. Bot. 83(5), 539-557, doi: 10.1139/b05-025, 2005.

R Core Team : A language and environment for statistical computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021.

Rankin, T., Strachan, I., and Strack, M.: Carbon dioxide and methane exchange at a post-extraction, unrestored peatland, Ecolog. Eng., 122, 241-251, doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.06.021, 2018.

Formatted: English (Canada)

Formatted: English (Canada)

Formatted: English (Canada)

Reimer, P. J., W. E. N. Austin, E. Bard, A. Bayliss, P. G. Blackwell, C. Bronk Ramsey, M. Butzin, H. Cheng, R. L. Edwards, M. Friedrich, P. M. Grootes, T. P. Guilderson, I. Hajdas, T. J. Heaton, A. G. Hogg, K. A. Hughen, B. Kromer, S. W. Manning, R. Muscheler, J. G. Palmer, C. Pearson, J. van der Plicht, R. W. Reimer, D. A. Richards, E. M. Scott, J. R. Southon, C. S. M. Turney, L. Wacker, F. Adolphi, U. Büntgen, M. Capano, S. M. Fahrni, A. Fogtmann-Schulz, R. Friedrich, P. Köhler, S. Kudsk, F. Miyake, J. Olsen, F. Reinig, M. Sakamoto, A. Sookdeo and Talamo, S.:The IntCal20 Northern Hemisphere Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curve (0–55 cal kBP), Radiocarbon 62(4): 725-757, 2020.

Rosenberry, D. O., Glaser, P. H., Siegel, D. I., and Weeks, E. P.: Use of hydraulic head to estimate volumetric gas content and ebullition flux in northern peatlands, Water Resour. Res., 39(3), doi:10.1029/2002WR001377, 2003.

Roulet, N. T., Crill, P., Comer, N., Dove, A., and Boubonniere, R.: CO_2 and CH_4 flux between a boreal beaver pond and the atmosphere, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 102(D24), 29313-29319, doi:10.1029/97JD01237, 1997.

Roulet, N. T., Lafleur, P. M., Richard, P. J., Moore, T. R., Humphreys, E. R., and Bubier, J.: Contemporary carbon balance and late Holocene carbon accumulation in a northern peatland, Global Change Biol., 13(2), 397-411, 2007.

Sagerfors, J., Lindroth, A., Grelle, A., Klemedtsson, L., Weslien, P., and Nilsson, M.: Annual CO_2 exchange between a nutrient-poor, minerotrophic, boreal mire and the atmosphere, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 113(G1), 2008.

Schlesinger, W. H., and Andrews, J. A.: Soil respiration and the global carbon cycle, Biogeochem., 48(1), 7-20, 2000.

Schrier-Uijl, A., Kroon, P., Hensen, A., Leffelaar, P., Berendse, F., and Veenendaal, E.: Comparison of chamber and eddy covariance-based CO_2 and CH_4 emission estimates in a heterogeneous grass ecosystem on peat, Agricul. For. Meteorol., 150(6), 825-831, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.11.007, 2010.

Segers, R.: Methane production and methane consumption: a review of processes underlying wetland methane fluxes, Biogeochem., 41(1), 23-51, 1998.

Smith P., Bustamante, M., Ahammad, H., Clark, H., Dong, H., … and Tubiello, F.: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). In: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Edenhofer, O., et al. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.

Strachan, I. B., Pelletier, L., and Bonneville, M.-C.: Inter-annual variability in water table depth controls net ecosystem carbon dioxide exchange in a boreal bog, Biogeochem., 127(1), 99-111, doi:10.1007/s10533-015-0170-8, 2016.

Strack, M., Waddington, J., Turetsky, M., Roulet, N., and Byrne, K.: Northern Peatlands, Greenhouse Gas Exchange and Climate Change. In: Peatlands and Climate Change, Strack M. (ed) pp 44-69, 2008.

Strack, M., and Zuback, Y.: Annual carbon balance of a peatland 10 yr following restoration, Biogeosci., 10(5), 2885-2896, doi:10.5194/bg-10-2885-2013, 2013.

Sundh, I., Nilsson, M., Mikkelä, C., Granberg, G., and Svensson, B. H.: Fluxes of methane and carbon dioxide on peat-mining areas in Sweden, AMBIO: J. Human Environ., 29(8), 499-503, 2000.

Teh, Y. A., Silver, W. L., Sonnentag, O., Detto, M., Kelly, M., and Baldocchi, D. D.: Large greenhouse gas emissions from a temperate peatland pasture, Ecosystems, 14(2), 311-325, 2011.

Teickner, H., and Hodgkins, S. B. : irpeat: Simple functions to analyse mid infrared spectra of peat samples, 2021.

Turetsky, M. R., Kotowska, A., Bubier, J., Dise, N. B., Crill, P., Hornibrook, E. R., . . . Nykänen, H.: A synthesis of methane emissions from 71 northern, temperate, and subtropical wetlands, Global Change Biol., 20(7), 2183-2197, doi:10.1111/gcb.12580, 2014.

Updegraff, K., Pastor, J., Bridgham, S. D., and Johnston, C. A.: Environmental and substrate controls over carbon and nitrogen mineralization in northern wetlands, Ecological Appl., 5(1), 151-163, doi:10.2307/1942060, 1995.

~~Valentine, D. W., Holland, E. A., and Schimel, D. S.: Ecosystem and physiological controls over methane production in northern wetlands, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 99(D1), 1563-1571, doi:10.1029/93JD00391, 1994.~~

Waddington, J., and Day, S.: Methane emissions from a peatland following restoration, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 112(G3), 2007.

Waddington, J. M., Plach, J., Cagampan, J. P., Lucchese, M., and Strack, M.: Reducing the carbon footprint of Canadian peat extraction and restoration, AMBIO: J. Human Environ., 38(4), 194-200, doi:10.1579/0044-7447-38.4194, 2009.

Waddington, J., & Price, J. S. (2000). Effect of peatland drainage, harvesting, and restoration on atmospheric water and carbon exchange. *Physical Geography, 21*(5), 433-451. doi: 10.1080/02723646.2000.10642719

Waddington, J., Rotenberg, P., and Warren, F.: Peat CO_2 production in a natural and cutover peatland: implications for restoration, Biogeochem., 54(2), 115-130, 2001.

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Commented [IS156]: As per R1

Commented [NRP157R156]: Fine

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

~~Waddington, J., and Roulet, N.: Carbon balance of a boreal patterned peatland, Global Change Biol., 6(1), 87-97, 2000.~~

Waddington, J., Roulet, N., and Swanson, R.: Water table control of CH_4 emission enhancement by vascular plants in boreal peatlands, J. Geophys. Res.: Atmospheres, 101(D17), 22775-22785, 1996.

Waddington, J., Strack, M., and Greenwood, M.: Toward restoring the net carbon sink function of degraded peatlands: Short-term response in CO_2 exchange to ecosystem-scale restoration, J. Geophys. Res.: Biogeosci., 115(G1), 2010.

Waddington, J., Warner, K., and Kennedy, G.: Cutover peatlands: a persistent source of atmospheric CO_2, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 16(1), 1-7, doi:10.1029/2001GB001298, 2002.

Wardle, D. A., Bardgett, R. D., Klironomos, J. N., Setälä, H., Van Der Putten, W. H., and Wall, D. H.: Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota, Science, 304(5677), 1629-1633, 2004.

Whalen, S.: Biogeochemistry of methane exchange between natural wetlands and the atmosphere, Environ. Eng. Sci., 22(1), 73-94, doi:10.1089/ees.2005.22.73, 2005.

Wickham, H.: ggplot2 : Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2016.

Wilson, D., Dixon, S., Artz, R., Smith, T., Evans, C., Owen, H., and Renou-Wilson, F.: Derivation of greenhouse gas emission factors for peatlands managed for extraction in the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, Biogeosci., 12(18), 5291-5308, 2015.

Yavitt, J.B., and Seidmann-Zager, M., Methanogenic conditions in northern peat soils, Geomicrobiol. J., 23, 119-127, 2006.

Commented [IS158]: As per R1

Commented [NRP159R158]: Fine

Yavitt, J. B., Williams, C. J., and Wieder, R. K.: Production of methane and carbon dioxide in peatland ecosystems across North America: Effects of temperature, aeration, and organic chemistry of peat, Geomicrobiol. J., 14, 299-316, doi.org/10.1080/01490459709378054, 1997.

Yu, Z.: Northern peatland carbon stocks and dynamics: a review, Biogeosci., 9(10), 4071-4085, doi:10.5194/bg-9-4071-2012, 2012.