



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Interaction of straw amendment and soil NO₃- content controls fungal denitrification and denitrification product stoichiometry in a sandy soil

Senbayram, Mehmet; Well, Reinhard; Bol, Roland; Chadwick, David R.; Jones, David L.; Wu, Di

Soil Biology and Biochemistry

DOI:

[10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.09.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.09.005)

Published: 01/11/2018

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Senbayram, M., Well, R., Bol, R., Chadwick, D. R., Jones, D. L., & Wu, D. (2018). Interaction of straw amendment and soil NO₃- content controls fungal denitrification and denitrification product stoichiometry in a sandy soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 126, 204-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.09.005>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Interaction of straw amendment and soil NO₃⁻ content controls fungal**
2 **denitrification and denitrification product stoichiometry in a sandy soil**

3

4 Mehmet Senbayram^{a,b}, Reinhard Well^a, Roland Bol^c, David R. Chadwick^d, David L. Jones^{d,e}, Di
5 Wu^{d,*}

6

7 ^a *Thünen Institute of Climate-Smart Agriculture, Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas,*
8 *Forestry and Fisheries, Bundesallee 65, 38116 Braunschweig, Germany*

9 ^b *Institute of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science, University of Harran, Osmanbey, 63000,*
10 *Sanliurfa, Turkey*

11 ^c *Institute of Bio- and Geosciences, Agrosphere (IBG-3), Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH,*
12 *52425 Jülich, Germany*

13 ^d *School of Natural Sciences, Bangor University, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW, UK*

14 ^e *UWA School of Agriculture and Environment, University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA*
15 *6009, Australia*

16

17

18 Corresponding author: Di Wu

19 Corresponding author address: School of Natural Sciences,
20 Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW, UK

21 Corresponding author Tel: +44 1248 383062

22 Corresponding author E-mail: w.di@fz-juelich.de

23

24 **Abstract**

25 The return of agricultural crop residues are vital to maintain or even enhance soil fertility. However,
26 the influence of application rate of crop residues on denitrification and its related gaseous N
27 emissions is not fully understood. We conducted a fully robotized continuous flow incubation
28 experiment using a Helium/Oxygen atmosphere over 30 days to examine the effect of maize straw
29 application rate on: i) the rate of denitrification, ii) denitrification product stoichiometry
30 (N_2O/N_2O+N_2 ratio), and iii) the contribution of fungal denitrification to N_2O fluxes. Five
31 treatments were established using sieved, repacked sandy textured soil; i) non-amended control, ii)
32 nitrate only, iii) low rate of straw + nitrate, iv) medium rate of straw + nitrate, and iv) high rate of
33 straw + nitrate (n=3). We simultaneously measured NO , N_2O as well as direct N_2 emissions and
34 used the N_2O ^{15}N site preference signatures of soil-emitted N_2O to distinguish N_2O production
35 from fungal and bacterial denitrification. Uniquely, soil NO_3^- measurements were also made
36 throughout the incubation. Emissions of N_2O during the initial phase of the experiment (0-13 days)
37 increased almost linearly with increasing rate of straw incorporation and with (almost) no N_2
38 production. However, the rate of straw amendment was negatively correlated with N_2O , but
39 positively correlated with N_2 fluxes later in the experimental period (13-30 days). Soil NO_3^- content,
40 in all treatments, was identified as the main factor responsible for the shift from N_2O production to
41 N_2O reduction. Straw amendment immediately lowered the proportion of N_2O from bacterial
42 denitrification, thus implying that more of the N_2O emitted was derived from fungi ($18\pm 0.7\%$ in
43 control and up to $40\pm 3.0\%$ in high straw treatments during the first 13 days). However, after day
44 15 when soil NO_3^- content decreased to <40 mg NO_3^- -N kg^{-1} soil, the N_2O ^{15}N site preference
45 values of the N_2O produced in the medium straw rate treatment showed a sharp declining trend 15
46 days after onset of experiment thereby indicating a clear shift towards a more dominant bacterial
47 source of N_2O . Our study singularly highlights the complex interrelationship between soil NO_3^-

48 kinetics, crop residue incorporation, fungal denitrification and $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ ratio. Overall we
49 found that the effect of crop residue applications on soil N_2O and N_2 emissions depends mainly on
50 soil NO_3^- content, as NO_3^- was the primary regulator of the $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ product ratio of
51 denitrification. Furthermore, the application of straw residue enhanced fungal denitrification, but
52 only when the soil NO_3^- content was sufficient to supply enough electron acceptors to the
53 denitrifiers.

54

55 **Keywords:** Organic carbon; Denitrification product ratio; Greenhouse gas; Nitrogen cycling; Site
56 preference

57

58 **1. Introduction**

59 Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is a potent greenhouse gas with ca. 300 fold higher global warming potential
60 than carbon dioxide (CO₂) and is also involved in the destruction of the stratospheric ozone layer
61 (Ravishankara et al., 2009). Globally, soils are the largest anthropogenic source of N₂O, which is
62 produced by several microbial and chemical processes (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). Increasing
63 evidence suggests that biological denitrification (fungal and bacterial) is the dominant process
64 responsible for the soil-driven increase in atmospheric N₂O (Baggs, 2011). Microbial
65 denitrification includes all or parts of the sequential reduction of NO₃⁻ to NO₂⁻, NO, N₂O and N₂,
66 which occurs under oxygen limited situations in soil (e.g., high water-filled pore space) (Weier et
67 al., 1993). Due to the large background N₂ concentration in air and the large spatial and temporal
68 heterogeneity of N₂ production, fluctuations in soil-borne N₂ fluxes are hard to determine.
69 Therefore, a comprehensive and quantitative understanding of the controlling factors of
70 denitrification in soil is still missing (Davidson and Seitzinger, 2006; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013).

71 Soil carbon (C) availability is one of the most critical factors regulating denitrification rate, as labile
72 C is the electron donor for all of the reduction steps from NO₃⁻ to N₂ (Burford and Bremner, 1975).
73 Most laboratory studies have tested the effect of readily available C substrates (e.g. glucose) on
74 denitrification pathways and its product stoichiometry (Weier et al., 1993; Mejjide et al., 2010;
75 Giles et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2017), however, only a few studies have used complex plant/animal
76 residues (Miller et al., 2008; Köster et al., 2015). Straw incorporation in agricultural soils can
77 improve soil quality (e.g. porosity, water-holding capacity, cation exchange capacity), increase
78 land productivity and helps to sequester more C. However, concerns have also been raised about
79 the effect of straw addition on soil N₂O emissions, as both positive and negative influences have
80 been reported (Pan et al., 2017; Koebke et al., 2018; Xiao et al., 2018). This discrepancy may be

81 partly because, in addition to many other factors (e.g. moisture, oxygen, pH, temperature), labile
82 soil C content alters the relative availability of reductant vs. oxidant compounds, which in turn also
83 affects the final end products of denitrification, i.e. NO, N₂O or N₂. The higher ratio of electron
84 donors (available organic C)/acceptors (N oxides) as a result of organic matter application to soil
85 may favor N₂O reduction (Smith and Arah, 1990) due to electron donor abundance (Hutchinson
86 and Davidson, 1993). The common hypothesis is that additional labile C amendment could promote
87 denitrification rates in moist soils (Zhong et al., 2018) and also may enhance elemental N₂ losses
88 via promoting sequential reduction of NO₃⁻, NO₂, NO and N₂O to N₂ (Smith and Arah, 1990;
89 Hutchinson and Davidson, 1993; Mathieu et al., 2006). Although a number of studies have
90 indicated that N₂O emissions from soils can be lowered under conditions favoring N₂O reduction
91 to N₂ (Firestone, 1982; Weier et al., 1993), it is still not clear how straw application in conjunction
92 with mineral fertilizer would affect both production and reduction rate of N₂O. Furthermore, the
93 N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) product ratio of denitrification is regulated by the complex interrelationship
94 between a number of soil parameters, e.g. NO₃⁻ concentration, available C content and O₂
95 availability (Blackmer and Bremner, 1978; Senbayram et al., 2012). For example, several studies
96 have shown that higher soil NO₃⁻ concentration in soil can inhibit N₂O reductase activity, since
97 NO₃⁻ is preferred over N₂O as a terminal electron acceptor (Firestone, 1982; Weier et al., 1993;
98 Qin et al., 2017b). In this context, it is still not yet clear whether the amendment of soil with labile
99 C would directly promote N₂O reduction to N₂ or whether its effect on the N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) product
100 ratio depends on other soil parameters, e.g. NO₃⁻ content.

101 In addition to bacteria, fungi are also capable of denitrification and N₂O production. Denitrifying
102 fungi generally lack N₂O reductase, thus the gaseous emission from fungi is in the form of N₂O
103 rather than N₂ (Laughlin et al., 2002). The possibility of significant contributions of fungi to soil
104 N₂O production has been demonstrated in several studies, which reported fungal contributions of

105 between 40% and 89% of the emitted N₂O in different terrestrial ecosystems (Laughlin et al., 2002;
106 Chen et al., 2014; Zhong et al., 2018). Since several studies have shown that organic C supply in
107 moist soils could increase both fungal/bacterial biomass ratio and fungal N₂O production (Laughlin
108 et al., 2002; Hayden et al., 2012; Zhong et al., 2018), we hypothesize that fungal denitrification
109 may be a dominant source for N₂O emission in NO₃⁻ rich, crop residue amended, moist soil.

110 The different enzyme types of bacteria and fungi are known to produce a different intramolecular
111 ¹⁵N distribution in the linear asymmetric N₂O molecule, so-called ¹⁵N site preference (SP). It has
112 been found that the SP value of N₂O produced by bacterial denitrification ranges from -9‰ to
113 +9‰, whereas nitrification and fungal denitrification produce N₂O with a SP range from +34‰ to
114 +40‰ (Toyoda et al., 2017). This non-destructive, low cost gas sampling approach has been used
115 previously to distinguish the different sources of N₂O production pathways in both lab and field
116 scale studies (Decock and Six, 2013; Rohe et al., 2017).

117 Direct measurements of small amounts of N₂ produced from denitrification in soils are challenging
118 due to the high atmospheric N₂ background and a lack of sufficiently sensitive equipment. Various
119 approaches have been used to indirectly measure N₂ production from soil, e.g. the commonly used
120 acetylene inhibition technique (Weier et al., 1993; Miller et al., 2008) and ¹⁵N isotope labeling (Cai
121 et al., 2001). However, neither are ideal, introducing their own artifacts (Terry and Duxbury, 1985;
122 Groffman et al., 2006; Nadeem et al., 2013). In recent years, several automated soil incubation
123 systems have been established for continuous direct N₂ measurement, based on the replacement of
124 the soil atmosphere by He (Bol et al., 2003; Cardenas et al., 2003; Molstad et al., 2007; Liu et al.,
125 2010; Köster et al., 2013; Qin et al., 2017b). In this study, we conducted our incubation experiment
126 with a newly-designed fully robotic continuous flow incubation system (ROFLOW) that enables
127 us to determine directly very low (≥ 10 g N₂-N ha⁻¹) soil N₂ fluxes using sealed vessels and steel

128 components (<10 ppm N₂ background concentration). Furthermore, the system is uniquely
129 equipped with a filter membrane at the base for soil water sampling and moisture adjustment (Fig.
130 1), which allows simultaneous monitoring of soil NO₃⁻ dynamics during experiments.

131 We studied a sandy textured arable soil with low ammonium (NH₄⁺) content and examined i)
132 whether or not there is a potential for higher N₂O emission when straw in conjunction with nitrate
133 (NO₃⁻) based fertilizer is incorporated into soil, ii) does the straw amendment directly regulate the
134 N₂O/N₂O+N₂ product ratio of denitrification, and iii) will the straw amendment increase the
135 contribution of fungal denitrification to N₂O fluxes? This was achieved through the use of a unique
136 experimental platform that allowed online simultaneous measurements of NO, N₂O and N₂ fluxes,
137 and soil water sampling for NO₃⁻. Furthermore, we coupled this with N₂O isotopomer
138 measurements to distinguish N₂O production between fungal and bacterial denitrification.

139

140 **2. Materials and methods**

141 *2.1. Soil*

142 The soil was collected from farmland in Fuhrberg, Lower Saxony, Germany (52° 33' 6" N, 9° 50'
143 49" E). Winter wheat had been grown prior to soil sampling. The sandy textured soil was classified
144 as a Gleyic Podzol (sand 90.1%, silt 3.1%, clay 5.9%) and contained 0.1% total N, 0.5 mg NH₄⁺-
145 N kg⁻¹ soil, 43.7 mg NO₃⁻-N kg⁻¹ soil and 1.8% organic carbon with a pH of 5.6 (H₂O). The upper
146 5 cm of soil and roots were removed and soil was collected from the first 10 cm below the removed
147 layer. The soil was sieved to <10 mm, air-dried and stored at 4 °C before packing into cores. Prior
148 to the experiment, soil was wetted to ca. 40% water holding capacity (WHC) for a week and stored
149 at room temperature to minimize the drying-wetting effect.

150 *2.2. Robotized soil incubation experiment and trace gas measurements*

151 The incubation experiment was carried out at Thünen Institute of Climate-Smart Agriculture
152 Braunschweig, Germany in the ROFLOW system using a make-up atmosphere containing 80% He
153 and 20% O₂ (Köster et al., 2013). The cylindrical incubation vessels consisted of acrylic glass with
154 an inner diameter of 140 mm and 150 mm height. Each incubation vessel was equipped with a
155 polyamide filter membrane (EcoTech, Bonn, Germany - hydrophilic; pore size 0.45 µm) at the
156 bottom, which allowed adjustment of the soil moisture and the removal of the soil water samples.
157 The experiment consisted of five treatments ($n=3$); i) non-amended control treatment (CK) with no
158 addition, ii) treated with 20 mmol KNO₃ (KNO₃), iii) low rate of straw + 20 mmol KNO₃ (LS+N),
159 iv) medium rate of straw + KNO₃ (MS+N) and iv) high rate of straw + KNO₃ (HS+N). The pre-
160 incubated soils were mixed by hand with 1, 2.5 or 5 g kg⁻¹ dry soil maize straw (0.78% total N and
161 44.05% total C) in the LS+N, MS+N, and HS+N treatments, respectively prior to the experiment
162 and 1 kg dry soil was packed into each vessel (with a density of 1.25 g cm⁻³). Oven-dried maize
163 straw was ground through a 2 mm mesh sieve for homogeneity. By applying a vacuum from the
164 top of each vessel, the repacked soil cores were flooded from the bottom of the vessels with either
165 20 mmol KNO₃ solution (in KNO₃, LS+N, MS+N, and HS+N) or distilled water (in CK) and then
166 drained to 28.3% gravimetric water content (67% WFPS) by applying a vacuum to the ceramic
167 plate. The incubation vessels were then sealed and the atmospheric air in the vessels was replaced
168 by a pure He/O₂ mixture (to remove any CO₂, NO, N₂O or N₂ in the soil pores or headspace) by
169 applying a vacuum from the top and filling with He/O₂ mixture in three cycles that were completed
170 within 6 h. Subsequently, the headspace of each vessel was flushed continuously with a gas mixture
171 of He (80%) and O₂ (20%) at a flow rate of ca. 25 mL min⁻¹. The temperature of the incubation
172 room was set at 20°C during the 30 days of incubation.

173 The airflow from each vessel was directed sequentially to a gas chromatograph by two multi-
174 positional valves (VICI, Houston, USA), where the gas sample was analyzed a thermal
175 conductivity detector (TCD) for N₂, O₂, and CO₂, and an electron capture detector (ECD) for N₂O
176 quantification. The sample outlet of GC was connected to the inlet of the online NO analyzer (Eco-
177 Physics, Dürnten, Switzerland). A microcontroller unit (Arduino Mega 2560 REV3) was
178 programmed to control the system via giving/receiving signals i) to/from the multi-positional VICI
179 valves for setting the target position, ii) to/from the GC for ready signal or start/stop method and
180 iii) to the computer to start/stop data acquisition (for a schematic overview of the system see Fig.
181 1).

182 *2.3. Mineral N analysis*

183 Soil samples were collected at the end of the incubation period from each vessel. The soil samples
184 were extracted with 2 M KCl solution (1:5 w/v) by shaking for 1 hour. Additionally, ca. 15 ml of
185 soil solution was collected on two occasions from each vessel during the incubation period (during
186 moisture adjustment at the beginning of the incubation and 13 days after onset of treatments) by
187 opening the valve at the bottom of the membrane filter and applying slight overpressure from the
188 top. The KCl extracts and soil solution were then filtered through Whatman 602 filter paper and
189 stored at -20°C until analysis. The concentrations of NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ in soil extracts and soil
190 solution were measured using a continuous flow analyzer (Smartchem 200S/N1104238, WESTCO,
191 France).

192

193 *2.4. Isotope analysis and N₂O source partitioning*

194 Additional gas samples for isotopic analysis were taken from each incubation vessel by attaching
195 120-mL serum bottles to the outlets in flow-through mode (Well et al., 2008) for around 2 h. The

196 N₂O δ¹⁵N^{bulk}, δ¹⁵N^α, and δ¹⁸O isotope signatures were then determined by analyzing *m/z* 44, 45,
 197 and 46 of intact N₂O⁺ molecular ions, and *m/z* 30 and 31 of NO⁺ fragment ions (Toyoda and
 198 Yoshida, 1999) on an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bremen,
 199 Germany) at Thünen Institute Braunschweig, Germany. The SP value of the produced N₂O (SP₀),
 200 i.e. prior to its partial reduction to N₂, was calculated using a Rayleigh-type model, assuming that
 201 isotope dynamics followed closed-system behavior (Lewicka-Szczebak et al., 2017). The model
 202 can be described as follows:

$$203 \quad SP_{N_2O-r} = SP_0 + \eta_r \ln \left(\frac{C}{C_0} \right) \quad (1)$$

204

205 In this equation, SP_{N₂O-r} is the SP value of the remaining substrate (i.e. residual N₂O), SP₀ is the
 206 SP value of the initial substrate (i.e. produced N₂O before reduction occurred), η_r is the net isotope
 207 effect associated with N₂O reduction, and C and C₀ are the residual and the initial substrate
 208 concentration (i.e. C/C₀ expresses the N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) product ratio). In this study an η_r of -5‰ was
 209 used based on previously reported average values (Lewicka-Szczebak et al., 2014). For source
 210 partitioning, the end-member values (SP_{fD}) were defined as 37‰ for nitrification and fungal
 211 denitrification, and -5‰ (SP_D) for bacterial denitrification (Toyoda et al., 2017). The source
 212 partitioning of N₂O production was based on the two end-member isotopic mass balance equation:

$$214 \quad SP_0 = SP_D \times f_{D-SP} + SP_{fD} \times f_{fD-SP} \quad (2)$$

215

216 It should be noted that distinguishing the N₂O produced between nitrification and fungal
 217 denitrification based on SP values is impossible because of the overlapping SP signature from those
 218 pathways (Frame and Casciotti, 2010; Lewicka-Szczebak et al., 2014; Toyoda et al., 2017). In this
 219 equation, f_{D-SP} and f_{fD-SP} represent the contribution of bacterial denitrification and

220 nitrification+fungal denitrification to total N₂O release calculated on the basis of SP₀ values,
221 respectively. In the present study, however, considering that the specific experimental conditions
222 were set up to favor denitrification, i.e. i) N was applied in the form of NO₃⁻; ii) initial soil NH₄⁺
223 content was under detection limits (<0.5 mg NH₄⁺-N kg⁻¹ soil) with constantly low NH₄⁺ content
224 during incubation; and iii) high soil moisture (67% WFPS), the contribution of nitrification and
225 nitrifier denitrification were assumed to be negligible (See Discussion). Thus, only the most
226 plausible scenario (bacterial denitrification vs fungal denitrification) was discussed for the SP₀
227 source partitioning calculation.

228

229 *2.5. Calculations and statistical analysis*

230 The cumulative gas emissions were calculated by linear interpolation between measured fluxes.
231 Statistically significant differences were tested using Tukey's honest significant difference post-
232 hoc tests at a 5% significance level by SPSS 21.

233

234 **3. Results**

235 *3.1. Soil mineral N*

236 Soil NH₄⁺ concentrations in all treatments were very low (1-3 mg kg⁻¹ soil) at the end of the
237 experiment (Table 1). Soil NO₃⁻ concentrations decreased over time in all treatments and the
238 observed rate of decrease was more rapid with an increasing rate of straw application (Fig. 2A).
239 Soil NO₃⁻ contents at the end of the 30-day incubation period followed the trend: KNO₃ > LS+N =
240 CK > MS+N > HS+N (Table 1). Soil NO₃⁻ was completely depleted in the HS+N treatment after
241 13 days, whereas 84%, 59% and 12% of the soil NO₃⁻ were depleted in MS+N, LS+N and KNO₃
242 at the end of the incubation, respectively.

243

244 3.2. Emission of NO, N₂O, N₂ and CO₂

245 Significant NO emission peaks were observed in straw-amended treatments (HS+N, MS+N and
246 LS+N) immediately after onset of the experiment, whereas the NO emissions from the CK and
247 KNO₃ treatments remained low throughout the experiment. Here the maximum NO emission rates
248 were 7 (±2), 38 (±18) and 22 (±6) g NO-N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ in the LS+N, MS+N and HS+N treatments,
249 respectively. Total emissions of NO over the 30 day incubation were significantly greater in the
250 HS+N and MS+N treatments than in the LS+N, with the lowest seen in KNO₃ and CK, indicating
251 the importance of labile C on NO formation and losses (Table 2).

252 The daily N₂O flux rate increased over time in all treatments, reaching a maximum at around day
253 7 and then decreased afterwards with different declining rates between the treatments (Fig. 2B-F).
254 Maximum daily N₂O emission rates were 269 (±13), 414 (±27), 631 (±24), 734 (±64), and 899
255 (±36) g N₂O-N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ in the CK, KNO₃, LS+N, MS+N and HS+N treatments, respectively. In
256 the HS+N treatment, fluxes of N₂O decreased sharply after day 10, and remained low throughout
257 the experimental period, whereas the N₂O flux rates decreased gradually in all the other treatments,
258 but were less pronounced for decreasing rates of added straw. At the end of the incubation period,
259 N₂O fluxes were below the detection limit in the HS+N and MS+N treatments, but significant N₂O
260 fluxes were still detected in all the other treatments.

261 The decrease in N₂O fluxes followed almost the same trend as the decrease in NO₃⁻ concentrations
262 in different treatments. From our measurements, when soil NO₃⁻ concentrations decreased below
263 40 mg NO₃⁻-N kg⁻¹ soil, the emission of N₂O also decreased. Thus, we can separate the experiment
264 into two Phases; Phase I (0-13 days – no limitation of NO₃⁻ in any treatments) and Phase II (13-30
265 days – NO₃⁻ limited, specifically in high straw rate treatments). As shown in Table 2, emission of
266 N₂O in Phase I increased almost linearly with higher rates of straw incorporation in N fertilized
267 soils. However, application of KNO₃ only slightly increased N₂O fluxes during this period

268 compared to CK. In Phase II, almost no N₂O emissions were detected in the HS+N treatment, and
269 the cumulative emissions during this phase were now negatively correlated with the rate of straw
270 amendment. Here, the highest cumulative N₂O fluxes were measured in the LS+N and the KNO₃
271 treatments and the lowest from the HS+N treatment. Overall, application of N fertilizer alone
272 significantly increased the cumulative N₂O emissions by 80% compared with the CK, while this
273 increase was 125%, 85% and 49% in the LS+N, MS+N and HS+N treatments, respectively (Table
274 2).

275 Fluxes of N₂ in the CK and the KNO₃ treatments were consistently low throughout the experimental
276 period and increased only slightly during the last 10 days of incubation, being more pronounced in
277 the CK than in the KNO₃ treatment. In straw amended treatments, N₂ emissions were very low
278 during the first 10 days of incubation, but peaked over a relatively short period in the HS+N
279 treatment at 13 day (Fig. 2B-F). Subsequently, the N₂ emissions increased gradually over time in
280 all straw treatments and the rate of increase was larger at higher rates of straw application. Here,
281 the increase in N₂ emission rates was closely associated with the decrease in N₂O emissions and
282 soil NO₃⁻ concentrations (Fig. 2). Emissions of N₂ became dominant in the HS+N and the MS+N
283 treatments in Phase II. Total N₂ fluxes were more than 10-fold higher in Phase II than in Phase I in
284 all treatments. Between the treatments, the highest cumulative N₂ emissions were observed in
285 HS+N and MS+N, while the lowest were from the CK and KNO₃ (Table 2). The N₂O/(N₂O+N₂)
286 ratio decreased significantly in all treatments in Phase II compared to Phase I. However, this
287 decrease in N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) ratio was lowest in both KNO₃ and LS+N treatments and highest in the
288 HS+N. In the MS+N treatment, the emission of N₂O (48%) was very similar to the emission of N₂
289 (52%) in Phase II, while in contrast it had been 99% N₂O and only 1% N₂ in Phase I.

290 Daily fluxes of CO₂ increased significantly over time in Phase I and remained relatively constant
291 in Phase II (Fig. 3). Cumulative CO₂ fluxes were almost doubled in the HS+N treatment compared

292 to CK, whereas an increase of about 70% was observed in MS+N compared to CK and KNO₃
293 treatments.

294 3.3. N₂O SP values and source partitioning

295 The SP₀ values ranged from -4‰ to 4‰ on day 1 in all treatments, being lowest in KNO₃ treatment
296 (-4‰ ±0.3) and highest in straw amended treatments (4‰ ±4.6 in HS+N) (Fig. 2). Addition of
297 straw in combination with KNO₃ increased SP₀ values from the first day (P <0.05) up to 8‰. The
298 SP₀ values increased gradually over time in all treatments until day 13 and the rate of increase was
299 higher with higher levels of straw amendment. After day 13, different SP₀ value dynamics were
300 observed in different treatments, indicating multiple N₂O sources. The SP₀ values continued to
301 increase in the CK, KNO₃ and LS+N treatments until the end of the incubation, reaching maximum
302 value of 30.5 ‰, whereas the SP₀ values sharply decreased in the MS+N treatment, reaching -2.6
303 ‰ at day 29. It was not possible to detect SP₀ values in the HS+N treatment after day 13 due to
304 extremely low N₂O concentrations (less than 100 ppb).

305 To calculate the proportion of each N₂O emitting process, source partitioning based on the two-
306 end-member model was used. During the initial period of the experiment, very low SP₀ values
307 suggest that almost all emitted N₂O originated from bacterial denitrification, however, the share of
308 fungal denitrification derived N₂O increased almost linearly over time in all treatments. In later
309 periods, specifically in Phase II, the SP₀ values showed a decreasing trend in the MS+N treatment
310 (no N₂O was emitted in HS+N), which paralleled the decreasing trend in N₂O emission and soil
311 NO₃⁻ content. This clearly indicates that when soil NO₃⁻ content decreases, bacterial denitrification
312 recovers and even then may dominate again in parallel to the increase in N₂O reduction rates. The
313 contribution of fungal denitrification to the cumulative N₂O emitted during the incubation period
314 varied between 29% and 40% between the treatments, being significantly greater in the straw

315 amended soils (Fig. 4A). Note, we acknowledge that the SP_0 source partitioning approach provides
316 only an estimation about the source of emitted N_2O due to the i) overlapping SP signals of different
317 processes, ii) variability of isotopologue enrichment factors of N_2O reduction, and iii) variation in
318 SP signals between different microbial strains (see Discussion). Nevertheless, the technique
319 provides useful insights of the effects of straw addition on the underlying soil microbial processes.

320

321 **4. Discussion**

322 *4.1. Sources of N_2O as affected by straw amendment and soil NO_3^- kinetics*

323 Using SP values and the two end-member approach enables an estimation of the relative
324 contributions of fungal and bacterial denitrification to N_2O emission, which are occurring
325 simultaneously in amended soils. However, this approach is only valid if i) the N_2O reduction
326 fractionation effect on SP values can be corrected, and ii) the N_2O derived from nitrification and
327 nitrifier denitrification were negligible. In the present study, the following conditions were set to
328 fit this specific case. Firstly, the direct measurement of N_2 production enabled us to calculate the
329 initial SP values (SP_0) by considering the N_2O reduction fractionation effect (Lewicka-Szczebak
330 et al., 2017), which minimizes the possibility of overestimation of fungal
331 denitrification/nitrification (Wu et al., 2016). Secondly, a sandy soil with very low NH_4^+ content
332 and high soil moisture (WFPS=67%) was chosen, and N was applied in the form of NO_3^- to
333 suppress N_2O formation from nitrification during the incubation period. Nevertheless, in the
334 present experiment fungal denitrification may still be overestimated due to the possible
335 contribution of nitrification derived N_2O related to the mineralization of the organic matter during
336 the experiment. However, in our recent study, the contribution of mineralization related N_2O
337 formation from various straw treatments was found to be < 5% of the emitted N_2O in a fertilized

338 sandy soil over 40 days of incubation (Koebeke et al., 2018). Therefore, we believe that the present
339 experimental set up enabled a reliable estimation of fungal and bacterial denitrification derived
340 N₂O using the N₂O SP source partitioning approach.

341 During the initial period of the experiment, the very low SP₀ values (-4 to 4‰) suggested that
342 almost all emitted N₂O originated from bacterial denitrification. However, the linear increase in
343 SP₀ values until day 13 in all treatments indicated that the share of fungal denitrification derived
344 N₂O increased over time. Dominancy of bacterial N₂O during the early phase of the experiment
345 with a subsequent shift (almost linear increase over time) towards fungal activity is in agreement
346 with previous studies (Laughlin and Stevens, 2002; Zhong et al., 2018). This indicated that bacterial
347 activity started almost immediately after the start of the experiment, whereas the fungal
348 colonization and activity increased somewhat slower, but became dominant in the latter phase.
349 Similarly, Henriksen and Breland (2002) found that bacterial activity dominated immediately after
350 residue incorporation in soils, whereas biological activity gradually shifted towards a dominance
351 of fungal activity in later phases. The observed higher proportion of fungal N₂O production in straw
352 amended treatments is consistent with previous studies in which the fungal N₂O production was
353 increased under an enhanced organic C supply in moist soil (Laughlin et al., 2002; Zhong et al.,
354 2018).

355 The sharp decrease in SP₀ values after day 15 in the MS+N treatment indicated a clear shift of N₂O
356 source from fungal denitrification to bacterial denitrification, which was in parallel with the
357 decreasing trend in N₂O emission and soil NO₃⁻ content. Unlike bacterial denitrifiers, fungi
358 generally lack nitrous oxide reductase (*nos*), which means fungal denitrification mainly relies on
359 the availability of NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ as electron acceptors (Baggs, 2011). We therefore presume the
360 shift from fungal to bacterial N₂O in high straw amended treatments is attributed to the depletion
361 of electron acceptors in soil (NO₃⁻, and NO₂), causing a decrease in denitrifying fungal community.

362 As most denitrifying bacteria have *nos* and thus can use N₂O as an electron acceptor, bacterial
363 denitrification recovered and dominated again when soil NO₃⁻ concentrations became limited.
364 In the present study, the contribution of fungal denitrification to N₂O emission was similar to the
365 18% fungal contribution in control soil measured by Herold et al. (2012) (where the acetylene
366 inhibition technique was used), 40-51% in residue added soils reported by Zhong et al. (2018)
367 (acetylene inhibition technique was used), and 36%-70% in NO₃⁻ treated coastal sediments reported
368 by Wankel et al. (2017) (isotopomer and stable isotope labelling was used). On the other hand,
369 Laughlin and Stevens (2002) reported a much greater contribution of fungi to N₂O production (89%)
370 in grassland soils where soil organic C content was expected to be high. In this context, we conclude
371 that the application of crop residues could enhance N₂O emission through fungal denitrification,
372 however, only when soil NO₃⁻ content is sufficiently high for supplying enough electron acceptors
373 to denitrifying organisms. However, in straw amended soils, a depletion of NO₃⁻ in soil may cause
374 a shift from fungal to bacterial denitrification derived N₂O. Nevertheless, we should note that in
375 view of the uncertainties of the SP approach, and that there are limited comparisons of studies using
376 the same approach to estimate fungal N₂O production there is still a need to confirm these results
377 in future studies.

378

379 *4.2. N₂O production and reduction as affected by straw amendment and soil NO₃⁻ kinetics*

380 Straw application can increase the rate of the denitrification (microbial or fungal) (Baggs, 2011;
381 Qin et al., 2017a; Xiao et al., 2018), mainly due to the extra substrate supply (electron donors as
382 energy source) (Giles et al., 2017). During the initial period of our experiment (in Phase I), total
383 gaseous N (NO+N₂O+N₂) and CO₂ fluxes increased almost linearly with the higher straw
384 application rate, thereby showing a significant relationship between respiration and denitrification
385 rates (Burford and Bremner, 1975; Miller et al., 2008; Xiao et al., 2018).

386 Contradictory observations have been reported on the impact of crop straw incorporation on N₂O
387 emissions (Chen et al., 2014; Shan and Yan, 2013). This discrepancy may be partly because of the
388 effect of labile C on the end product of bacterial or fungal denitrification (N₂O or N₂), which may
389 vary under different conditions (Qin et al., 2017b). In our study, gaseous N fluxes during Phase I
390 were dominated by N₂O, with minor NO fluxes and almost no N₂ emissions even in the straw
391 treatments. In Phase I, application of KNO₃ alone slightly increased N₂O fluxes compared to CK,
392 whereas N₂O fluxes increased more than 3-fold in HS+N indicating that labile organic C was likely
393 limiting and controlling the rate of the N₂O production (Fig. 2). It has been suggested that addition
394 of crop residues would decrease N₂O emissions by lowering N₂O/N₂ ratio and stimulating
395 microbial immobilization in soil (Mathieu et al., 2006; Frimpong and Baggs, 2010). It is striking
396 that in contrast to the expected outcome, even with excess organic C input (5 g straw kg⁻¹ dry soil
397 in HS+N), high NO₃⁻ content in soil would still inhibit N₂O reduction, causing very high N₂O
398 emission and also relatively high NO fluxes. Compared to N₂O fluxes, the NO fluxes in straw
399 amended soils were very low. However, compared to CK and KNO₃, straw amendment did induce
400 significant NO losses during the initial phase of the experiment. Because straw amendment also
401 enhanced fungal denitrification during this phase, the increase in NO fluxes may be attributed to
402 the leakage from fungal denitrification. We may speculate that NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ reducing fungal
403 strains developed faster than the NO reducers shortly after amendments causing such leakage,
404 however, further research at the molecular level is needed to prove this hypothesis.

405 In the present study, the increase in N₂ fluxes became greater when soil NO₃⁻ contents decreased
406 below 40 mg NO₃⁻-N kg⁻¹ soil (in Phase II), and N₂ fluxes dominated when concentrations
407 decreased below 30 mg NO₃⁻-N kg⁻¹ soil in the HS+N and MS+N treatments (Fig. 4B). This is
408 likely because the supply of NO₃⁻ at the denitrifying microsites became lower than the demand for
409 terminal electron acceptors, which is in agreement with earlier reports (Weier et al., 1993;

410 Senbayram et al., 2012; Qin et al., 2017a). It should be noted that measured total soil NO_3^-
411 concentration was likely much higher than the concentrations in the soil microsites where
412 denitrification occurs (Myrold and Tiedje, 1985). In this context, further research is needed perhaps
413 with new measurement approaches to better quantify the direct relationship between NO_3^-
414 concentration and the product stoichiometry of denitrification in soil hotspots.

415 In contrast to a number of studies (Cookson et al., 1998; Mathieu et al., 2006), our results showed
416 that N_2O reduction was found not to be directly affected by C supply. Higher labile C seems to
417 favor N_2O reduction only when soil NO_3^- content decreases to a threshold concentration, which
418 seemed to occur when the bulk NO_3^- concentration ranged between 20 and 50 mg N kg^{-1} soil in our
419 study. This is possibly because, NO_3^- is usually preferred over N_2O as a terminal electron acceptor
420 and N_2O can escape from the soil whenever NO_3^- supply is greater than the reducing demand of
421 denitrifiers (Swerts et al., 1996). We believe that the present study explains the contradictory
422 reports of straw addition on N_2O fluxes as i) firstly we show in Phase I, straw addition triggered
423 N_2O fluxes (when NO_3^- is high) with no N_2O reduction effect, and ii) secondly in Phase II, almost
424 all N_2O was reduced to N_2 when soil NO_3^- content decreased below a certain level. In support of
425 our findings, Xiao et al. (2018) recently showed that crop residue application drastically stimulated
426 N_2O fluxes when applied with KNO_3 , compared to other nitrogen forms.

427

428 **5. Conclusion**

429 Based on the results in this experiment, there are four key take-home messages;

430 i) Straw amendment in moist sandy soil enhances soil denitrification rate and triggers
431 gaseous N losses.

432 ii) When soil NO_3^- content is high, denitrification produces almost solely N_2O with little
433 NO and N_2 emissions from straw amended soils. Thus, our data suggests that straw

434 application, even at very high rates, does not directly affect the product stoichiometry
435 of denitrification ($N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ product ratio).

436 iii) The effect of crop residue application on soil N_2O emissions is related to the soil NO_3^-
437 content, since NO_3^- appears to be the ultimate regulator of the $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ product
438 ratio of denitrification.

439 iv) Application of straw residue predominantly enhances fungal denitrification when soil
440 NO_3^- content is sufficient, however, when soil NO_3^- is low, bacterial denitrification
441 dominates.

442
443 Thus, the present study suggests that in agricultural systems where large amount of organic
444 plant residues are incorporated into soil, risk of N_2O emissions can be minimized by keeping
445 soil NO_3^- concentrations under site-specific threshold values (e.g. using NO_3^- -free N fertilizers
446 and/or fertilizers containing nitrification inhibitors). Another way of mitigating N_2O in these
447 soils could be to develop management practices which slow down fungal growth after residue
448 amendment as the present study suggests that fungal denitrification seems to be an important
449 processes contributing to N_2O losses in residue-amended soils. Further field validations are
450 needed to test the efficiency of these hypotheses. Overall, our study shows the importance of
451 continuous direct measurement of N_2 fluxes alongside N_2O and NO fluxes and soil NO_3^-
452 concentrations, and the use of the N_2O ^{15}N site preference approach in improving our
453 understanding of the complex interrelation between crop straw incorporation and gaseous
454 denitrification N losses.

455

456

457 **Acknowledgements**

458 This study was co-funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the project
459 “Fluxes and mechanisms of permanent nitrogen removal and N₂O production in a heavy
460 nitrogen loaded regions of China” and research unit DFG-FOR 2337: “Denitrification in
461 Agricultural Soils: Integrated Control and Modeling at Various Scales (DASIM)”. This work
462 was also supported by the UK-China Virtual Joint Centre for Agricultural Nitrogen (CINAg,
463 BB/N013468/1), which is jointly supported by the Newton Fund, via UK BBSRC and NERC,
464 and the Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology. We thank Martina Heuer and Jennifer
465 Ehe for stable isotope analysis, Ute Tambor for Nmin, Dr. Dominika Lewicka-Szczebak for
466 isotopomers data analysis and Dr. Jan Reent Köster for NO analysis.

467

468 **References**

- 469 Baggs, E.M., 2011. Soil microbial sources of nitrous oxide: recent advances in knowledge,
470 emerging challenges and future direction. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*
471 3, 321–327.
- 472 Bateman, E.J., Baggs, E.M., 2005. Contributions of nitrification and denitrification to N₂O
473 emissions from soils at different water-filled pore space. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 41,
474 379–388.
- 475 Bol, R., Toyoda, S., Yamulki, S., Hawkins, J.M.B., Cardenas, L.M., Yoshida, N., 2003. Dual
476 isotope and isotopomer ratios of N₂O emitted from a temperate grassland soil after fertiliser
477 application. *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry* 17, 2550–2556.
- 478 Burford, J.R., Bremner, J.M., 1975. Relationships between the denitrification capacities of soils
479 and total, water-soluble and readily decomposable soil organic matter. *Soil Biology and*
480 *Biochemistry* 7, 389–394.
- 481 Butterbach-Bahl K., Baggs, E.M., Dannenmann M., Kiese R., Zechmeister-Boltenstern S., 2013.
482 Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their
483 controls? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 368, 20130122.
- 484 Cai, Z., Laughlin, R.J., Stevens, R.J., 2001. Nitrous oxide and dinitrogen emissions from soil under
485 different water regimes and straw amendment. *Chemosphere* 42, 113–121.
- 486 Cardenas, L.M., Hawkins, J.M.B., Chadwick, D., Scholefield, D., 2003. Biogenic gas emissions
487 from soils measured using a new automated laboratory incubation system. *Soil Biology and*
488 *Biochemistry* 35, 867–870.
- 489 Chen, H., Mothapo, N.V., Shi, W., 2014. The significant contribution of fungi to soil N₂O
490 production across diverse ecosystems. *Applied Soil Ecology* 73, 70–77.

491 Cookson, W.R., Beare, M.H., Wilson, P.E., 1998. Effects of prior crop residue management on
492 microbial properties and crop residue decomposition. *Applied Soil Ecology* 7, 179–188.

493 Davidson Eric A., Seitzinger Sybil, 2006. The enigma of progress in denitrification research.
494 *Ecological Applications* 16, 2057–2063.

495 Decock, C., Six, J., 2013. How reliable is the intramolecular distribution of ¹⁵N in N₂O to source
496 partition N₂O emitted from soil? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 65, 114–127.

497 Firestone, M.K., 1982. Biological Denitrification. Nitrogen in Agricultural Soils, agronomy
498 monograph. Crop Science Society of America, pp. 289–326.

499 Frame, C.H., Casciotti, K.L., 2010. Biogeochemical controls and isotopic signatures of nitrous
500 oxide production by a marine ammonia-oxidizing bacterium. *Biogeosciences* 7, 2695–
501 2709.

502 Frimpong, K.A., Baggs, E.M., 2010. Do combined applications of crop residues and inorganic
503 fertilizer lower emission of N₂O from soil? *Soil Use and Management* 26, 412–424.

504 Giles, M.E., Daniell, T.J., Baggs, E.M., 2010. Compound driven differences in N₂ and N₂O
505 emission from soil; the role of substrate use efficiency and the microbial community. *Soil*
506 *Biology and Biochemistry* 106, 90-98.

507 Groffman, P.M., Altabet, M.A., Böhlke, J.K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M.B., Firestone, M.K.,
508 Giblin, A.E., Kana, T.M., Nielsen, L.P., Voytek, M.A., 2006. Methods for measuring
509 denitrification: diverse approaches to a difficult problem. *Ecological Applications* 16,
510 2091–2122.

511 Hayden, H.L., Mele, P.M., Bougoure, D.S., Allan, C.Y., Norng, S., Piceno, Y.M., Brodie, E.L.,
512 DeSantis, T.Z., Andersen, G.L., Williams, A.L., Hovenden, M.J., 2012. Changes in the
513 microbial community structure of bacteria, archaea and fungi in response to elevated CO₂

514 and warming in an Australian native grassland soil. *Environmental Microbiology* 14, 3081–
515 3096.

516 Henriksen, T.M., Breland, T.A., 2002. Carbon mineralization, fungal and bacterial growth, and
517 enzyme activities as affected by contact between crop residues and soil. *Biology and*
518 *Fertility of Soils*, 35. 41-48.

519 Herold, M.B., Baggs, E.M., Daniell, T.J., 2012. Fungal and bacterial denitrification are differently
520 affected by long-term pH amendment and cultivation of arable soil. *Soil Biology and*
521 *Biochemistry* 54, 25–35.

522 Hutchinson, G.L., Davidson, E.A., 1993. Processes for Production and Consumption of Gaseous
523 Nitrogen Oxides in Soil. *Agricultural Ecosystem Effects on Trace Gases and Global*
524 *Climate Change ASA Special Publication 55*, pp. 79–93, American Society of Agronomy,
525 Crop Science Society of America, and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI.

526 IPCC, 2013. Annex II: Climate System Scenario Tables, in: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical*
527 *Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
528 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

529 Koebke, S., Senbayram, M., Pfeiffer, B., Nacke, H., Dittert, K., 2018. Post-harvest N₂O and CO₂
530 emissions related to plant residue incorporation of oilseed rape and barley straw depend on
531 soil NO₃⁻ content. *Soil & Tillage Research*. 179, 105–113.

532 Köster, J.R., Cárdenas, L.M., Bol, R., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Senbayram, M., Well, R.,
533 Giesemann, A., Dittert, K., 2015. Anaerobic digestates lower N₂O emissions compared to
534 cattle slurry by affecting rate and product stoichiometry of denitrification – An N₂O
535 isotopomer case study. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 84, 65–74.

536 Köster, J.R., Well, R., Dittert, K., Giesemann, A., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Mühling, K.-H.,
537 Herrmann, A., Lammel, J., Senbayram, M., 2013. Soil denitrification potential and its

538 influence on N₂O reduction and N₂O isotopomer ratios. *Rapid Communications in Mass*
539 *Spectrometry* 27, 2363–2373.

540 Laughlin, R.J., Stevens, R.J., 2002. Evidence for fungal dominance of denitrification and
541 codenitrification in a grassland Soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 66, 1540–
542 1548.

543 Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Well, R., Koester, J.R., Fuss, R., Senbayram, M., Dittert, K., Flessa, H.,
544 2014. Experimental determinations of isotopic fractionation factors associated with N₂O
545 production and reduction during denitrification in soils. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*
546 134, 55–73.

547 Liu, B., Morkved, P.T., Frostegard, A., Bakken, L.R., 2010. Denitrification gene pools,
548 transcription and kinetics of NO, N₂O and N₂ production as affected by soil pH. *FEMS*
549 *Microbiology Ecology* 72, 407–417.

550 Mathieu, O., Henault, C., Leveque, J., Baujard, E., Milloux, M.-J., Andreux, F., 2006. Quantifying
551 the contribution of nitrification and denitrification to the nitrous oxide flux using ¹⁵N
552 tracers. *Environmental Pollution* 144, 933–940.

553 Meijide, A., Cardenas, L.M., Bol, R., Bergstermann, A., Goulding, K., Well, R., Vallejo, A.,
554 Scholefield, D., 2010. Dual isotope and isotopomer measurements for the understanding of
555 N₂O production and consumption during denitrification in an arable soil. *European Journal*
556 *of Soil Science* 61, 364–374.

557 Miller, M.N., Zebarth, B.J., Dandie, C.E., Burton, D.L., Goyer, C., Trevors, J.T., 2008. Crop
558 residue influence on denitrification, N₂O emissions and denitrifier community abundance
559 in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 40, 2553–2562.

560 Molstad, L., Dörsch, P., Bakken, L.R., 2007. Robotized incubation system for monitoring gases
561 (O₂, NO, N₂O N₂) in denitrifying cultures. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 71, 202–
562 211.

563 Myrold, D.D., Tiedje, J.M., 1985. Establishment of denitrification capacity in soil: Effects of
564 carbon, nitrate and moisture. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 17, 819–822.

565 Nadeem, S., Dorsch, P., Bakken, L.R., 2013. Autoxidation and acetylene-accelerated oxidation of
566 NO in a 2-phase system: Implications for the expression of denitrification in ex situ
567 experiments. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 57, 606–614.

568 Pan, F., Chapman, S.J., Li, Y., Yao, H., 2017. Straw amendment to paddy soil stimulates
569 denitrification but biochar amendment promotes anaerobic ammonia oxidation. *Journal of*
570 *Soils and Sediments* 17, 2428–2437.

571 Qin, S., Ding, K., Clough, T.J., Hu, C., Luo, J., 2017a. Temporal in situ dynamics of N₂O reductase
572 activity as affected by nitrogen fertilization and implications for the N₂O/(N₂O + N₂)
573 product ratio and N₂O mitigation. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 53, 723–727.

574 Qin, S., Hu, C., Clough, T.J., Luo, J., Oenema, O., Zhou, S., 2017b. Irrigation of DOC-rich liquid
575 promotes potential denitrification rate and decreases N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) product ratio in a 0-2
576 m soil profile. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 106, 1–8.

577 Ravishankara, A.R., Daniel, J.S., Portmann, R.W., 2009. Nitrous Oxide (N₂O): The dominant
578 ozone-depleting substance emitted in the 21st Century. *Science* 326, 123–125.

579 Rohe, L., Well, R., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., 2017. Use of oxygen isotopes to differentiate between
580 nitrous oxide produced by fungi or bacteria during denitrification. *Rapid Communications*
581 *in Mass Spectrometry* 31, 1297–1312.

582 Senbayram, M., Chen, R., Budai, A., Bakken, L., Dittert, K., 2012. N₂O emission and the
583 N₂O/(N₂O + N₂) product ratio of denitrification as controlled by available carbon substrates
584 and nitrate concentrations. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 147, 4–12.

585 Shan, J., Yan, X., 2013. Effects of crop residue returning on nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural
586 soils. *Atmospheric Environment* 71, 170–175.

587 Smith, K.A., Arah, J.R.M., 1990. Losses of nitrogen by denitrification and emissions of nitrogen
588 oxides from soils. In: *The Fertiliser Society Proceedings* 299, London

589 Swerts, M., Merckx, R., Vlassak, K., 1996. Influence of carbon availability on the production of
590 NO, N₂O, N₂ and CO₂ by soil cores during anaerobic incubation. *Plant and Soil* 181, 145–
591 151.

592 Terry, R.E., Duxbury, J.M., 1985. Acetylene decomposition in soils. *Soil Science Society of*
593 *America Journal* 49, 90–94.

594 Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N., 1999. Determination of nitrogen isotopomers of nitrous oxide on a
595 modified isotope ratio mass spectrometer. *Analytical Chemistry* 71, 4711–4718.

596 Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N., Koba, K., 2017. Isotopocule analysis of biologically produced nitrous
597 oxide in various environments. *Mass Spectrometry Reviews* 36, 135–160.

598 Wankel, S.D., Ziebis, W., Buchwald, C., Charoenpong, C., de Beer, D., Dentinger, J., Xu, Z.,
599 Zengler, K., 2017. Evidence for fungal and chemodenitrification based N₂O flux from
600 nitrogen impacted coastal sediments. *Nature Communication* 8, 15595.

601 Weier, K., Doran, J., Power, J., Walters, D., 1993. Denitrification and the Dinitrogen Nitrous-Oxide
602 Ratio as Affected by Soil-Water, Available Carbon, and Nitrate. *Soil Science Society of*
603 *America Journal* 57, 66–72.

604 Well, R., Flessa, H., Xing, L., Xiaotang, J., Römheld, V., 2008. Isotopologue ratios of N₂O emitted
605 from microcosms with NH₄⁺ fertilized arable soils under conditions favoring nitrification.

606 Soil Biology and Biochemistry, Special Section: Enzymes in the Environment 40, 2416–
607 2426.

608 Wu, D., Cardenas, L.M., Calvet, S., Brueggemann, N., Loick, N., Liu, S., Bol, R., 2017. The effect
609 of nitrification inhibitor on N₂O, NO and N₂ emissions under different soil moisture levels
610 in a permanent grassland soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 113, 153–160.

611 Wu, D., Köster, J.R., Cárdenas, L.M., Brüggemann, N., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Bol, R., 2016. N₂O
612 source partitioning in soils using ¹⁵N site preference values corrected for the N₂O reduction
613 effect. Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry 30, 620–626.

614 Xiao, Y., Zhang, F., Li, Y., Li, T., Che, Y., Deng, S., 2018. Influence of winter crop residue and
615 nitrogen form on greenhouse gas emissions from acidic paddy soil. European Journal of
616 Soil Biology 85, 23–29.

617 Zhong, L., Bowatte, S., Newton, P.C.D., Hoogendoorn, C.J., Luo, D., 2018. An increased ratio of
618 fungi to bacteria indicates greater potential for N₂O production in a grazed grassland
619 exposed to elevated CO₂. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 254, 111–116.

620

621

622 **Table 1** Soil nitrate (NO_3^-) and ammonium (NH_4^+) concentrations at the end of the experiment in
 623 non-amended control (CK), KNO_3 (KNO_3), low rate of straw + KNO_3 (LS+N), medium rate of
 624 straw + KNO_3 (MS+N) and high rate of straw + KNO_3 (HS+N) treatments. Means denoted by a
 625 different letter in the same column differ significantly according to the Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests
 626 at $\alpha=0.05$.

627

628	Parameter	NO_3^- (mg N kg ⁻¹ dry soil)	NH_4^+ (mg N kg ⁻¹ dry soil)
629	CK	33±8.3 ^b	2±1.1 ^a
	KNO_3	81±5.6 ^a	1±0.3 ^a
630	LS+N	37±4.8 ^b	3±0.8 ^a
631	MS+N	15±8.6 ^c	2±1.2 ^a
632	HS+N	0±0.0 ^d	3±0.1 ^a

633

634

635 **Table 2** Cumulative emissions of N₂O, N₂, NO and CO₂ at Phase I (0-13 days) and during the
 636 whole incubation period (0-30 days) in non-amended control (CK), KNO₃ (KNO₃), low rate of
 637 straw + KNO₃ (LS+N), medium rate of straw + KNO₃ (MS+N) and high rate of straw + KNO₃
 638 (HS+N) treatments. Means (n=3) denoted by a different letter in the same column differ
 639 significantly according to the Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests at $\alpha=0.05$.

640

641

	N ₂ O	N ₂ O	N ₂	N ₂	NO	NO	CO ₂	CO ₂
	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(g N ha ⁻¹)	(kg C ha ⁻¹)	(Kg C ha ⁻¹)
	Day 0-13	Total	Day 0-13	Total	Day 0-13	Total	Day 0-13	Total
CK	2448±145 ^d	4555±606 ^b	38±1.0 ^b	697±93.0 ^b	1.4±0.1 ^c	1.7±0.1 ^c	77±19.3 ^a	156±35.4 ^b
KNO ₃	4033±106 ^c	8115±792 ^a	45±7.8 ^b	564±78.7 ^b	1.6±0.0 ^c	1.9±0.1 ^c	71±14.9 ^a	160±23.8 ^b
LS+N	5616±151 ^b	10192±771 ^a	103±18.4 ^{ab}	819±62.8 ^{ab}	25.0±5.7 ^{bc}	25.3±5.7 ^{bc}	74±18.6 ^a	176±41.8 ^b
MS+N	6907±567 ^a	8797±1378 ^a	81±3.0 ^b	1656±139.7 ^{ab}	71.2±11.6 ^a	71.6±11.6 ^a	120±19.3 ^a	252±17.8 ^{ab}
HS+N	7594±302 ^a	7604±295 ^a	197±45.3 ^a	2049±597.0 ^a	42.3±11.9 ^{ab}	42.7±12.0 ^{ab}	131±14.6 ^a	307±30.7 ^a

642

643

644

645 **Figure captions:**

646 Figure 1. Simplified diagram of the robotized continuous flow incubation system (ROFLOW) used
647 in the experiment. The system is controlled by a Arduino-based microcontroller unit (Arduino
648 Mega attached with 16 position relay). This control unit adjusts the position of VICI valves, gives
649 signals to the GC (start/stop method) and the computer (start and stop data acquisition).

650

651 Figure 2. (A) NO_3^- dynamics, and (B-F) daily emissions of N_2O , N_2 , NO and SP_0 values during
652 the incubation period (30 days) in non-amended control (CK), KNO_3 (KNO_3), low rate of straw +
653 KNO_3 (LS+N), medium rate of straw + KNO_3 (MS+N) and high rate of straw + KNO_3 (HS+N)
654 treatments. Error bars shows the standard error of each treatments (n=3).

655

656 Figure 3. Soil daily cumulative CO_2 emissions during the incubation (30 days) in non-amended
657 control (CK), KNO_3 (KNO_3), low rate of straw + KNO_3 (LS+N), medium rate of straw + KNO_3
658 (MS+N) and high rate of straw + KNO_3 (HS+N) treatments. Error bars shows the standard error
659 of each treatment (n=3). Means denoted by a different letter differ significantly according to the
660 Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests at $\alpha=0.05$.

661

662 Figure 4. (A) Contribution of fungal and bacterial denitrification derived N_2O emissions to the
663 cumulative N_2O fluxes, and (B) the ratio of $\text{N}_2\text{O}/(\text{N}_2\text{O}+\text{N}_2)$ during the Phase I (0-13 days), Phase
664 II (13-30 days), and whole incubation period (0-30 days) in non-amended control (CK), KNO_3
665 (KNO_3), low rate of straw + KNO_3 (LS+N), medium rate of straw + KNO_3 (MS+N) and high rate
666 of straw + KNO_3 (HS+N) treatments. Error bars shows the standard error of each treatment
667 (n=3). DAO indicates days after onset of the treatments.

668

669

670