



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Response to comments by Hoffmann et al. on “Upland grasslands in Northern England were atmospheric carbon sinks regardless of management regime”*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/137333/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Eze, S, Palmer, SM and Chapman, PJ orcid.org/0000-0003-0438-6855 (2019) Response to comments by Hoffmann et al. on “Upland grasslands in Northern England were atmospheric carbon sinks regardless of management regime”. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 264. pp. 366-368. ISSN 0168-1923

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.08.023>

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Response to comments by Hoffmann et al. on “Upland grasslands in Northern England were atmospheric carbon sinks regardless of management regime”

Samuel Eze^a, Sheila M. Palmer^a, Pippa J. Chapman^a

^aSchool of Geography, Faculty of Environment, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, Leeds, UK

Hoffmann et al. suspected a likely overestimation of carbon (C) sink reported in our paper (Eze et al., 2018) entitled “Upland grasslands in Northern England were atmospheric carbon sinks regardless of management regime”. They attributed this to potential sources of error associated with the estimation of C fluxes from closed-chamber measurements.

Hoffmann et al. questioned the negative winter time gross primary productivity (GPP) values we calculated. It is true that GPP refers to the C gained by plants and GPP measurements are expected to yield positive values. However, GPP is not actually measured but calculated as a residual between measured net ecosystem exchange (NEE) and ecosystem respiration (ER). Negative GPP values are sometimes generated during winter months when low temperatures limit the activities of plants including photosynthesis. This was the case for the winter GPP calculated in our study. However, this is not a unique phenomenon to our study. In the literature, negative winter GPP values are sometimes reported as zero (see footnote to Table 1 in Kato et al., 2006 and paragraph 34 in Schaefer et al., 2012), whereas other authors report the negative values (e.g. Table 1 in Kato et al., 2006). We chose to report the negative GPP values as calculated (Figure 3 in Eze et al., 2018), although these were not significantly different from zero. These winter months’ GPP values, calculated from measured NEE and ER values, could not have led to an over-estimation of annual GPP fluxes as they were estimated using a gap-

filling saturation function based on mean daily photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) data (as described in section 2.4.1 in Eze et al., 2018).

Hoffmann et al. considered our statement that the grasslands were atmospheric C sinks as a misleading interpretation of NEE for net ecosystem C balance (NECB), as we did not include any estimate of C export from the sites in terms of cutting or removal through livestock grazing. As highlighted by Hoffmann et al. NECB accounts for all possible ecosystem C imports (e.g. supplementary livestock feed and organic manure) and exports (e.g. harvested plant biomass, C offtake in meat and milk, leaching and erosion C losses) and is therefore a better measure of C sink/source of an ecosystem than NEE. However, the focus of our study was on NEE. Very few studies account for the overall C balance of managed ecosystems. For example, five studies (Ammann et al., 2007; Soussana et al., 2007; Elsgaard et al., 2012; Chang et al., 2015; Jones et al., 2017) referenced in Eze et al. (2018) investigated the NECB in managed grasslands. Four out of these five studies did not account for C losses via leaching and erosion, and none of the studies estimated C export in milk and meat. Some of the studies (e.g. Ammann et al., 2007; Chang et al., 2015) had to rely on modelling in order to estimate some components of the C cycle. This shows that NECB is a common limitation in many C flux studies and is a gap in C cycle understanding that is challenging to address because: 1) researchers have to rely on good record-keeping by farmers for information on biomass harvest, meat and milk offtake; 2) internal cycling of C by animals is hard to quantify; and 3) accurately monitoring C loss via erosion and leaching is more challenging than measuring gaseous C fluxes.

Using the carbon use efficiency (CUE) values of between 0.35 and 0.65, which were values extracted by Amthor and Baldocchi (2001) from earlier studies (Andrew et al., 1974 and Risser et al. 1981) of Shortgrass Prairies of northeastern Colorado and Tallgrass Prairies of northeastern Oklahoma in the USA, Hoffmann et al. calculated the annual autotrophic respiration (R_a) at our sites and showed that the R_a of one of the sites was greater than the

annual ER by $3 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ y}^{-1}$ (see Table 1, Hoffman et al.). This led them to imply that: (i) the heterotrophic respiration (R_h) at our site was at best zero, which is unlikely; (ii) our reported annual ER and GPP were biased. A wider range of CUE values (0.2 to 0.7) has been reported for global grasslands (e.g. see Fig 2 in Yang et al., 2017; Iersel, 2003 and Amthor, 2000) than those used by Hoffman et al. in their calculations of NPP, R_a and R_h for our sites. In addition, a value for biomass production efficiency (a proxy for CUE) of 0.78 has been reported for alpine grasslands (see Supplementary Table 1 in Campioli et al., 2015).

CUE displays a wide range in values as it is influenced by climate, management, and other environmental factors, with higher values found in cooler regions (Yang et al., 2017). Alpine grasslands are much more similar to the upland grassland sites in our study in terms of shallow soil depth (Garcia-Pausas et al., 2017) than Prairie grasslands characterized by deep (often greater than 100 cm) weathered Mollisols (Kucharik, 2007). Hence, using a range of higher CUE values (0.7 and 0.78) we have reworked the calculations of Hoffmann et al. (Table 1), which shows that the R_h at our sites is neither negative nor zero, but is low as would be expected in these upland grasslands with shallow soil (<20 cm) and cool temperate climate.

Table 1: Cross-check of partitioned annual flux estimates (modified from Hoffmann et al.) using CUE of 0.7 and 0.78.

Referenc e	Site	Modellin g frequenc y	g C m ⁻² y ⁻¹						CUE
			GPP	ER	NEE	NPP	Ra	Rh	
Eze et al. (2018)	Nidderdale-hay meadow	daily	-1024	359	-665	717 799	307 225	52 134	0.70 0.78
	Nidderdale-silage pasture		-1053	366	-687	737 821	316 232	50 134	0.70 0.78
	Ribblesdale-hay meadow		-863	410	-453	604 673	259 190	151 220	0.70 0.78
	Ribblesdale- permanent pasture		-980	416	-564	686 764	294 216	122 200	0.70 0.78

Hoffmann et al. suggested three possible reasons for their suspected bias in our annual C fluxes: 1) low data coverage; 2) low frequency of flux measurements; and 3) the use of daily climate data in modelling. We acknowledge that these three factors could potentially lead to underestimation of ER, however, we could not account for them in our study for the following reasons:

1. We conducted flux measurements (NEE and ER) once every month for a period of one year using closed chambers. This resulted in a total of 12 measurements per plot over one year ($n = 96$ per site and year), which were used for modelling annual C fluxes. This methodology and frequency of sampling has been used by many others (e.g. Luo et al., 2007; Quin et al., 2015; Salimon et al., 2004; Zhou et al., 2006). The sites we studied were located in upland areas that were under normal farm operations. The difficulties in accessing these sites and not being able to make flux measurements at times when farm machinery was on-site limited our data coverage. These restrictions are not unique to our study alone but characterize studies in relatively remote upland sites under active land management.
2. We acknowledge the valid point made by Hoffmann et al. that our annual flux estimates may have been different if we had captured rapid changes resulting from management activities, such as cutting of grass and application of manure. As stated in point 1, the frequency of C flux measurement was limited by farm operations. Access to study sites was not allowed during periods of biomass harvest especially when machinery was on site. Transportation to the study site was also difficult. The frequency of measurements was therefore restricted to once every month.
3. To estimate annual C fluxes, we applied temperature- and PAR-dependent functions on daily PAR and mean daily soil temperature data. We only had access to daily PAR data, hence for consistency in time steps we had to use mean daily soil temperature data

to estimate annual ER. As indicated by Hoffmann et al., it may have been more accurate to model GPP and ER using hourly or half-hourly data, but these were not available to us, and is likely to be the case for many other studies attempting to quantify annual GHG fluxes from terrestrial ecosystems.

While our approach is consistent with many other studies, as mentioned above, we also acknowledge the potential for error due to unavoidable operational and data limitations. Hence in principle we support the call for campaign flux measurements at higher frequency made by Hoffman et al. However, more work is needed in a variety of managed ecosystems to determine the reduction in uncertainty that is achievable by more intensive campaigns, with or without gap-filling using eddy-covariance methods as suggested by Lucas-Moffat et al. (2018).

References

- Ammann C, Flechard CR, Leifeld J, Neftel A, Fuhrer J (2007) The carbon budget of newly established temperate grassland depends on management intensity. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 121, 5–20.
- Amthor JS (2000) The McCree-de Wit-Penning de Vries-Thornley Respiration Paradigm: 30 Years Later. *Ann. Bot.* 86, 1 – 20.
- Amthor JS, Baldocchi DD (2001) Terrestrial higher plant respiration and net primary production. In: Roy J, Saugier B, Mooney A (eds.) *Terrestrial Global Productivity*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 33–59.
- Andrews R, Coleman DC, Ellis JE, Singh JS (1974) Energy flow relationships in a shortgrass prairie ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the First International Congress of Ecology*, pp. 22-28, Pudoc, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Campioli M, Vicca S, Luysaert S, Bilcke J, Ceschia E, Chapin III FS, Ciais P, Fernández-Martínez M, Malhi Y, Obersteiner M, Olefeldt D, Papale D, Piao SL, Peñuelas J,

- Sullivan PF, Wang X, Zenone T, Janssens IA (2015) Biomass production efficiency controlled by management in temperate and boreal ecosystems. *Nature Geosci.* 8, 843 – 846.
- Chang J, Ciais P, Viovy N, Vuichard N, Sultan B, Soussana J (2015) The greenhouse gas balance of European grasslands. *Global Change Biol.* 21, 3748-3761.
- Elsgaard L, Gorres C, Hoffmann CC, Blicher-Mathiesen G, Schelde K, Petersen SO (2012) Net ecosystem of CO₂ and carbon balance for eight temperate organic soils under agricultural management. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 162, 52 – 67.
- Eze S, Palmer SM, Chapmann PJ (2018) Upland grasslands in northern England were atmospheric carbon sinks regardless of management regimes. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 256-257, 231-241.
- Garcia-Pausas J, Romanyà J, Montané F, Rios AI, Tauli M, Rovira P, Casals P (2017) Are Soil Carbon Stocks in Mountain Grasslands Compromised by Land-Use Changes?. In: Catalan J., Ninot J., Aniz M. (eds) *High Mountain Conservation in a Changing World. Advances in Global Change Research*, vol 62. Springer, Cham.
- Iersel MWV (2003) Carbon use efficiency depends on growth respiration, maintenance respiration, and relative growth rate. A case study with lettuce. *Plant Cell & Environ.* 26, 1441 – 1449.
- Jones SK, Helfter C, Anderson M, Coyle M, Campbell C, Famulari D, Marco CD, van Dijk N, Tang YS, Topp CFE, Kiese R, Kindler R, Siemens J, Schrumpp M, Kaiser K, Nemitz E, Levy PE, Rees RM, Sutton MA, Skiba UM (2017) The nitrogen, carbon and greenhouse gas budget of a grazed, cut and fertilised temperate grassland. *Biogeosci.* 14, 2069–2088.

- Kato T, Tang Y, Gu S, Hirota M, Du M, Li Y, Zhao X (2006) Temperature and biomass influences on interannual changes in CO₂ exchange in an alpine meadow on the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *Global Change Biol.* 12, 1285-1298.
- Kucharik CJ (2007) Impact of prairie age and soil order on carbon and nitrogen sequestration. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 71, 430 – 441.
- Lucas-Moffat AM, Huth V, Augustin J, Brümmer C, Herbst M, Kutsch WL (2018) Towards pairing plot and field scale measurements in managed ecosystems: Using eddy covariance to cross-validate CO₂ fluxes modeled from manual chamber campaigns. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 256–257, 362–375.
- Luo X, Wan S, Luo Y (2007) Source components and interannual variability of soil CO₂ efflux under experimental warming and clipping in a grassland ecosystem. *Global Change Biol.* 13, 761 – 775.
- Quin SLO, Artz RRE, Coupar AM, Woodin SJ (2015) *Calluna vulgaris*-dominated upland heathland sequesters more CO₂ annually than grass-dominated upland heathland. *Sci. Total Environ.* 505, 740 –747.
- Risser PG, Birney EC, Blocker HD, May SW, Parton WJ, Wiens JA (1981) *The True Prairie Ecosystem*. Hutchinson Ross, Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania.
- Salimon CI, Davidson EA, Victoria RL, Melo AWF (2004) CO₂ flux from soil in pastures and forests in southwestern Amazonia. *Global Change Biol.* 10, 833 – 843.
- Schaefer K, Schwalm CR, Williams C, Arain MA, Barr A, Chen JM, Davis KJ, Dimitrov D, Hilton TW, Hollinger DY, Humphreys E, Poulter B, Raczka BM, Richardson AD, Sahoo A, Thomton P, Vargas R, Verbeeck H, Anderson R, Baker I, Black TA, Bolstad P, Chen J, Curtis PS, Desai AR, Dietze M, Dragoni D, Gough C, Grant RF, Gu L, Jain A, Kucharik C, Law B, Liu S, Lokipitiya E, Margolis HA, Matamala R, McCaughey

- JH, Monson R, Munger JW, Oechel W, Peng C, Price DT, Ricciuto D, Riley WJ, Roulet N, Tian H, Tonitto C, Tom M, Weng E, Zhou X (2012) A model-data comparison of gross primary productivity: Results from the North America Carbon Program site synthesis. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, G03010, doi: 10.1029/2012JG001960.
- Soussana JF, Allard V, Pilegaard K, Ambus P, Amman C, Campbell C, Ceschia E, Clifton-Brown J, Czobel S, Domingues R, Flechard C, Fuhrer J, Hensen A, Horvath L, Jones M, Kasper G, Martin C, Nagy Z, Neftel A, Raschi A, Baronti S, Rees RM, Skiba U, Stefani P, Manca G, Sutton M, Tuba Z, Valentini R (2007) Full accounting of the greenhouse gas (CO₂, N₂O, CH₄) budget of nine European grassland sites. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 121, 121–134.
- Yang Y, Wang Z, Li J, Gang C, Zhang Y, Odeh I, Qi J (2017) Assessing the spatiotemporal dynamics of global grassland carbon use efficiency in response to climate change from 2000 to 2013. *Acta Oecologica*, 81, 22 – 31.
- Zhou X, Sherry RA, An Y, Wallace LL, Luo Y (2006) Main and interactive effects of warming, clipping, and doubled precipitation on soil CO₂ efflux in a grassland ecosystem. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles.* 20, GB 1003, doi:10.1029/2005GB002526.