



Peer Review The peer review history for this article is available as a PDF in the Supporting Information.

Key Points:

- Biogeochemical models simulate soil denitrification through multiple pools/processes, but the N budgets reported are incomplete
- Missing (unpublished) model outputs are critical for model evaluation, model intercomparison, and model development
- Ecosystem N modelers need to support and encourage the publication of all relevant N model outputs for denitrification modeling

Supporting Information:

Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

Correspondence to:

B. Grosz,
balazs.grosz@thuenen.de

Citation:

Grosz, B., Matson, A., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Clough, T., Davidson, E. A., Dechow, R., et al. (2023). Modeling denitrification: Can we report what we don't know? *AGU Advances*, 4, e2023AV000990. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023AV000990>

















Received 22 SEP 2023

Accepted 30 SEP 2023

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization: B. Grosz, A. Matson, K. Butterbach-Bahl, T. Clough, E. A. Davidson, R. Dechow, S. DelGrosso, E. Diamantopoulos, P. Dörsch, E. Haas, H. He, C. V. Henri, D. Hui, K. Kleineidam, D. Kraus, M. Kuhnert, J. Léonard, C. Müller, S. O. Petersen, D. Sihi, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati, J. Zhang, C. Scheer
Data curation: B. Grosz, E. Haas, C. V. Henri, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati

Modeling Denitrification: Can We Report What We Don't Know?

B. Grosz¹ , A. Matson² , K. Butterbach-Bahl^{3,4}, T. Clough⁵, E. A. Davidson⁶ , R. Dechow¹ , S. DelGrosso⁷, E. Diamantopoulos⁸ , P. Dörsch⁹ , E. Haas³ , H. He¹⁰, C. V. Henri¹¹ , D. Hui¹² , K. Kleineidam^{13,14} , D. Kraus³ , M. Kuhnert¹⁵ , J. Léonard¹⁶ , C. Müller^{13,14,17}, S. O. Petersen¹⁸, D. Sihi¹⁹ , I. Vogeler^{18,20} , R. Well¹ , J. Yeluripati²¹, J. Zhang¹⁸, and C. Scheer³

¹Thünen Institute of Climate-Smart Agriculture, Braunschweig, Germany, ²Wageningen Environmental Research, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands, ³Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research Atmospheric Environmental Research (IMK-IFU), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, ⁴Department of Agroecology, Center for Landscape Research in Sustainable Agricultural Futures—Land-CRAFT, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark, ⁵Department of Soil & Physical Sciences, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand, ⁶University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Frostburg, MD, USA, ⁷Soil Management and Sugar Beet Research Unit, USDA-ARS, Fort Collins, CO, USA, ⁸Faculty for Biology, Chemistry, and Earth Science, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany, ⁹Faculty of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resource Management, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås, Norway, ¹⁰Department of Geography, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada, ¹¹Department of Hydrology, Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS), Copenhagen, Denmark, ¹²Department of Biological Sciences, Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN, USA, ¹³Liebig Centre for Agroecology and Climate Impact Research, Justus Liebig University, Giessen, Germany, ¹⁴Institute of Plant Ecology, Justus Liebig University Giessen, Giessen, Germany, ¹⁵Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK, ¹⁶BioEcoAgro Joint Research Unit, INRAE, Université de Liège, Université de Lille, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Barenton-Bugny, France, ¹⁷School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, ¹⁸Department of Agroecology, Aarhus University, Tjele, Denmark, ¹⁹Department of Environmental Sciences, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA, ²⁰Grass Forage Science/Organic Agriculture, Christian Albrechts University, Kiel, Germany, ²¹Information and Computational Sciences Department, The James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen, UK

Abstract Biogeochemical models simulate soil nitrogen (N) turnover and are often used to assess N losses through denitrification. Though models simulate a complete N budget, often only a subset of N pools/fluxes (i.e., N₂O, NO₃⁻, NH₃, NO_x) are published since the full budget cannot be validated with measured data. Field studies rarely include full N balances, especially N₂ fluxes, which are difficult to quantify. Limiting publication of modeling results based on available field data represents a missed opportunity to improve the understanding of modeled processes. We propose that the modeler community support publication of all simulated N pools and processes in future studies.

Plain Language Summary Biogeochemical models calculate the entire N balance to describe soil N turnover. However, when findings are published, they often focus solely on environmentally harmful N losses like N₂O fluxes and NO₃⁻ leaching. We argue that it is crucial to publish and communicate the complete N cycle as calculated by the models. This practice is vital for advancing model development, ensuring quality control, facilitating model intercomparison, and generating new hypotheses for empirical field studies. We therefore encourage ecosystem modelers to report all results, even those that cannot be fully validated due to a lack of measurements. We particularly emphasize the importance of denitrification and reporting modeled N₂ fluxes.

1. The Denitrification Data Deficit

1.1. Importance of Denitrification (N₂O and N₂)

To meet the ever-increasing global demand for agricultural products, soil is often augmented using nitrogen (N) fertilizers (Erismann et al., 2011). This significantly impacts the N cycle of agricultural ecosystems and can cause N losses (Davidson, 2012; Galloway et al., 2008; Schlesinger, 2009; Six et al., 2002; Sutton & Bleeker, 2013). Gaseous N losses such as ammonia (NH₃), nitric oxide (NO), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and dinitrogen (N₂), as well as mineral N losses through nitrate (NO₃⁻) leaching, impair crop yields and N use efficiency, while contributing to air pollution, global warming, drinking water contamination, eutrophication and acidification of unmanaged

© 2023. The Authors.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Methodology: B. Grosz, D. Kraus, M. Kuhnert, J. Léonard, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati, J. Zhang, C. Scheer
Project Administration: K. Kleineidam, C. Müller, C. Scheer
Supervision: B. Grosz, A. Matson, K. Butterbach-Bahl, D. Kraus, M. Kuhnert, J. Léonard, C. Müller, S. O. Petersen, D. Sihi, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati, J. Zhang, C. Scheer
Writing – original draft: B. Grosz, A. Matson, K. Butterbach-Bahl, T. Clough, E. A. Davidson, R. Dechow, S. DelGrosso, E. Diamantopoulos, P. Dörsch, E. Haas, H. He, C. V. Henri, D. Hui, K. Kleineidam, D. Kraus, M. Kuhnert, J. Léonard, C. Müller, S. O. Petersen, D. Sihi, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati, J. Zhang, C. Scheer
Writing – review & editing: B. Grosz, A. Matson, K. Butterbach-Bahl, T. Clough, E. A. Davidson, R. Dechow, S. DelGrosso, E. Diamantopoulos, P. Dörsch, E. Haas, H. He, C. V. Henri, D. Hui, K. Kleineidam, D. Kraus, M. Kuhnert, J. Léonard, C. Müller, S. O. Petersen, D. Sihi, I. Vogeler, R. Well, J. Yeluripati, J. Zhang, C. Scheer

lands and waters (Galloway et al., 2008). Gaseous soil N losses are associated with the microbial processes of nitrification and denitrification. Nitrification is an aerobic process that oxidizes NH_3 to nitrite (NO_2^-) and NO_3^- , while denitrification is an anaerobic process that reduces NO_3^- to NO_2^- , NO , N_2O , and finally, N_2 (Groffman et al., 2009; Nömmik, 1956). Both processes can be a source of N_2O , a strong greenhouse gas, and reactant in the destruction of stratospheric ozone (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013; Canadell et al., 2021; Ravishankara et al., 2009), but denitrification is generally the more substantial N_2O -producing process.

Though our understanding of denitrification in terrestrial ecosystems has improved in recent decades (Galloway et al., 2004; Rohe et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2011; Surey et al., 2021; Zaehle, 2013), it is still far from complete. Agriculture is the main source of anthropogenic N_2O , but we don't completely understand the complex interaction of factors that control how much N is denitrified in arable soils, especially concerning N_2 production. This is a notable knowledge gap. Although N_2O is a greenhouse gas, and N lost as N_2O reduces N availability and the N-use efficiency of crops, the complete reduction to N_2 is a sink for N_2O that decreases the potential for NO_3^- leaching and returns N to the atmosphere, thereby closing the N cycle (Davidson & Seitzinger, 2006). Globally, denitrification rates are associated with large uncertainties, estimated to be 109–573 Tg yr^{-1} (Groffman et al., 2006; Scheer et al., 2020; Schlesinger, 2009), and the lack of data on total denitrification is one of the reasons that N balances can seldom be closed (Allison, 1955). Therefore, we must reduce that uncertainty through a better understanding of denitrification.

The N_2O fluxes of agricultural soils have been the target of intensive worldwide measurement campaigns over the last 20–30 years (Bouwman et al., 2002; Reay et al., 2012; Stehfest & Bouwman, 2006). These studies show that N_2O emissions are event-driven, with high variability both spatially and temporally, responding nonlinearly to environmental parameters, for example, temperature, oxygen (O_2), organic carbon (SOC), pH, freeze/thaw, and NO_3^- availability (Davidson & Swank, 1986; Firestone et al., 1979; Groffman et al., 2009; Rohe et al., 2021; Rummel et al., 2021; Surey et al., 2021; Thomas et al., 1994; Wagner-Riddle et al., 2017; Weier et al., 1993). That level of complexity is challenging to model. Laboratory studies under controlled conditions help isolate specific controlling factors' effects (Grosz et al., 2021; Müller & Clough, 2014; Weier et al., 1993), with both field and laboratory measurements being used to refine biogeochemical models under differing conditions (Deng et al., 2016; Hergoualc'h et al., 2021). However, in many cases, N_2O is neither the final product nor the main product of denitrification (Scheer et al., 2020). The end product is N_2 ; yet there is no simple field-appropriate method for measuring N_2 (Friedl et al., 2020). The small production from denitrification relative to the high atmospheric background makes measuring soil N_2 fluxes difficult. Therefore, very few in situ measurements of N_2 fluxes are available (Buchen et al., 2016; Ding et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022; Scheer et al., 2020; Sgouridis et al., 2016; Zistl-Schlingmann et al., 2019).

1.2. Considering N_2 Fluxes in Models

Almost all agronomic and ecological studies of N cycling include model calculations at some scale, with varying complexity. Models are ideally tested and calibrated using measured data, so measured N_2 fluxes are important for model users and developers, yet such data remains limited. Nevertheless, biogeochemical models developed for describing the N cycle of agricultural soils do predict both N_2O and N_2 emissions (Del Grosso et al., 2000; Li et al., 1992; Nylinder et al., 2011; Parton et al., 1996; Sihi et al., 2020). Some models (Del Grosso et al., 2000; Parton et al., 1996) have been partly parameterized with N_2 data that are no longer considered reliable (e.g., based on the acetylene inhibition technique (Weier et al., 1993)) and other model calibrations are simply incomplete. Given the lack of empirical data, approaches to describe soil N_2 are mostly process-oriented, with the sensitivity of both N_2 and N_2O to controlling factors constrained based solely on N_2O data (Grosz et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). In these models, having data from frequent measurements (beyond the common weekly or fortnightly intervals) is crucial. In Saha et al. (2021), a statistical machine learning model was trained on a 3-year, high-frequency N_2O data set and they were able to predict daily N_2O emissions well. However, in many cases, models are not able to consistently and satisfactorily predict daily N_2O emissions. Some models can simulate the cumulative annual emissions, but these approaches often fail to capture the timing and magnitude of observed emission peaks (Frolking et al., 1998).

The inaccuracy of predicted daily N_2O fluxes by biogeochemical models is a well-known problem (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013; Zimmermann et al., 2018), partly due to the incomplete understanding of the $\text{N}_2/\text{N}_2\text{O}$ product ratio of denitrification. Since the calibration data and approaches of different models vary, they may produce contrasting

Table 1
The Measured (Laboratory Experiment With ¹⁵N Labeling) and Modeled (DNDC, Coup, and DeNi) Average, Cumulative N₂, and N₂O Fluxes (g N ha⁻¹), for an Arable Sandy Soil From Fuhrberg, Germany (Grosz et al., 2021)

	Measured	DNDC	Coup	DeNi
N ₂ (g N ha ⁻¹)	52.63	0.019	155.8	4,607
N ₂ O (g N ha ⁻¹)	638.5	345.4	70.15	2,460

Note. The presented results in Table 1 did not cover the statements and results of the entire study by Grosz et al. (2021).

results regarding N₂ emissions, while still predicting similar N₂O emissions. Grosz et al. (2021) compared measured N₂ and N₂O emissions from a laboratory experiment with the results from three models: DNDC, Coup, and DeNi. Note that the models were not calibrated, and that DNDC—without the possibility to manipulate the source code—is not ideal for modeling laboratory experiments. Nevertheless, the modeled N₂O fluxes were not implausible from any of the three models (Table 1). In contrast, the modeled N₂ fluxes by DNDC were almost 3,000 times smaller than the measured data, while those from DeNi were overestimated by a factor of more than 100. While model calibration would have improved the results, this example shows that the additional N₂ flux information is critical for understanding model outputs and identifying potential issues in model estimates of denitrification.

Unfortunately, although many models estimate N₂ fluxes, there are only a few publications presenting modeled N₂ flux results (Del Grosso et al., 2000; Grosz et al., 2021; Leip et al., 2008; Parton et al., 1996). We argue that the publication of total denitrification rates (both N₂ and N₂O), even if N₂ fluxes are not validated, would significantly improve our understanding of different model approaches and aid model development. Models are often used under soil, climate or management conditions that are not fully covered by data sets used for model training and evaluation. Especially in these cases, publishing modeled N₂ fluxes would help to assess the quality and improve the comparability of process descriptions. Presenting only one metabolic intermediate of denitrification, namely N₂O flux, while neglecting N₂ flux, compromises data reliability. Moreover, in the future, as more measured N₂ and N₂O fluxes from field experiments become available, already published simulations of N₂ fluxes will facilitate the uptake and incorporation of new insights.

2. Additional Uncertainties in N Cycle Modeling

2.1. Unknown N-Balances

The inaccuracy of predicted daily N₂O fluxes by biogeochemical models (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013; Zimmermann et al., 2018) is not only due to uncertainties in N₂ fluxes, but also due to a lack of knowledge regarding other processes within the N cycle. N₂O fluxes are an integral part of the N cycle, but only represent 0.1%–3.1% of N losses during ecosystem N cycling (Bolan et al., 2004; Bouwman, 1996; Cameron et al., 2013; Clough et al., 2005; Firestone, 1982; Mosier et al., 1998; Thomson et al., 2012). Therefore, they are highly sensitive to other components of the N cycle, including N pools (NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻ or organic N), plant and microbial N immobilization, decomposition, and related N losses like NH₃, NO_x, and NO₃⁻ leaching. Without going into extensive detail, we emphasize the importance of publishing the full modeled N balance in modeling studies.

Publishing modeled N sources for N₂O fluxes provides information on what pathways the model is simulating (e.g., nitrification or denitrification). Under certain environmental conditions, a model may provide accurate N₂O fluxes even though the underlying processes are incorrect (i.e., be right for the wrong reason); a high degree of equifinality has been shown in previous studies (He et al., 2016). Nitrification is particularly important in this context because in addition to being a source of N₂O, it provides substrate (NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻) for denitrification. David et al. (2009) simulated an intensively cropped watershed in Illinois using measured water drainage and NO₃⁻ concentration and compared denitrification from six different models. Most of the models accurately simulated the measured NO₃⁻ leaching, but the denitrification rates varied widely among the models. This high variation in NO₃⁻ lost through denitrification would then impact each model's availability of soil NO₃⁻ for plant and microbial uptake, leaching, and later denitrification. These key differences between models do not become visible without publishing the complete N balance. Finally, having a complete picture of N pools and processes within a model exercise makes it possible to recognize knowledge gaps. In Giltrap et al. (2014), the APSIM and NZ-DNDC models were used for estimating water drainage, NO₃⁻ leaching, and plant N-uptake from a lysimeter experiment (Giltrap et al., 2014). An important conclusion of their work was that NO₃⁻ adsorption, a process that was not captured by the models, could influence the whole N cycle and the calculated N balance.

Unlike N₂, there are methods available for the measurement of the other N pools and processes mentioned here. However, given the cost and time that would be necessary to include such a wide array of supporting measurements, few studies (Delon et al., 2017; Janz et al., 2022 are exceptions) can realistically measure all

N fluxes in parallel, instead focusing on specific N pools and processes of interest. This makes it difficult to compare different studies and to use them for model calibration and evaluation. In a mass balance system, any changes in at one point within the system can significantly affect the entire calculation. This means that we cannot effectively model one or two selected elements of the N cycle separately, but require the whole N balance. And most models calculate the full N balance. We argue here, as we argued above for N₂ fluxes, that publishing unvalidated model output may provide valuable insights into model processes and support the development of models or sub-processes for N cycling.

2.2. Additional Soil Information and Sources of Uncertainty

Ecosystem N cycling does not exist in isolation. Other factors, such as the soil oxygen availability and distribution (Zhang et al., 2022) and labile organic carbon (Philippot et al., 2007), also affect denitrification modeling. Whether a model relates transport functions to water-filled pore space or soil gas diffusivity in order to understand and model soil aeration, can have a significant effect on the simulated N₂O and N₂ production (Balaine et al., 2013, 2016). Similarly, soil gas diffusivity may be used by the model to predict when N₂O and N₂ become entrapped in the soil, rather than released (Clough et al., 2000, 2001; Ding et al., 2022). Available C can strongly influence losses of N and N₂O emissions (Philippot et al., 2007), but accounting for the effects of labile C on N cycling is still a knowledge gap and needs to be better addressed in denitrification modeling (Grosz et al., 2021). Therefore, reporting both model carbon dioxide (CO₂) simulations as well as soil aeration, in addition to N cycling, would considerably improve our understanding of model outputs. Beyond that, we argue that modeling studies with a focus on the C cycle—as with N cycling studies—should report all of the modeled C stocks in soil and vegetation, even without validation (e.g., changes in microbial biomass C and N, rapid dynamics of DOC and DON), for transparency and for future studies. Moreover, in view of the coupling of elemental cycles (Gruber & Galloway, 2008) it is recommended to report not only results of one but rather of all modeled elements, since this would allow cross-checking of elemental mass balances and, for example, verify whether modeled changes in carbon stocks agree with associated mineralization-immobilization of N.

3. Recommendations

We argue that reporting the entire N balance, including unvalidated results like N₂ and other related parameters, should become standard when publishing the results of N model studies. Based on what we outlined above, this would: (a) illustrate the diversity and uncertainty of different modeling approaches, (b) show the robustness of modeled N balances, (c) identify data gaps, and (d) enhance future model development. We assume that the scarcity of “complete” modeled N balances in the soil denitrification literature stems from the reluctance of the scientific community to support the publication of unvalidated modeled output, especially given that the simulation results of these “neglected” N pools may be unrealistic. But this self-censorship of authors has resulted in a missed opportunity to share knowledge and improve our understanding of modeled processes. We recommend that future studies exercise transparency in publishing model outputs. We encourage authors to focus on the aspects of their model that were of particular interest (i.e., validated model developments), but, while clearly stating which variables were not validated by measurements, to include all related pools and parameters to the fullest extent possible. Presenting such results does put additional pressure on the authors, as the presented model outputs have to be sufficiently robust and coherent for publication. However, the publication of the modeled N-balance simulations is crucial for future model development; it would fundamentally improve the robustness of models, speed up fine-tuning, and ultimately advance our understanding of the N cycle.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Data Availability Statement

No data was used in this manuscript.

Acknowledgments

This study is the products of a workshop funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the research unit DFG-FOR 2337: Denitrification in Agricultural Soils: Integrated Control and Modelling at Various Scales (DASIM), and by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) under the “Make our Planet Great Again—German Research Initiative”, Grant 306060, implemented by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). This work was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme project VERIFY (grant agreement no. 776810). We would like to thank the contribution of all workshop participants of the II. DASIM Modeler Workshop.

References

- Allison, F. E. (1955). The enigma of soil nitrogen balance sheets. In *Advances in agronomy* (Vol. 7, pp. 213–250). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(08\)60339-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60339-9)
- Balaine, N., Clough, T. J., Beare, M. H., Thomas, S. M., & Meenken, E. D. (2016). Soil gas diffusivity controls N₂O and N₂ emissions and their ratio. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *80*(3), 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2015.09.0350>
- Balaine, N., Clough, T. J., Beare, M. H., Thomas, S. M., Meenken, E. D., & Ross, J. G. (2013). Changes in relative gas diffusivity explain soil nitrous oxide flux dynamics. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *77*(5), 1496–1505. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2013.04.0141>
- Bolan, N. S., Saggiar, S., Luo, J., Bhandral, R., & Singh, J. (2004). Gaseous emissions of nitrogen from grazed pastures: Processes, measurements and modelling, environmental implications, and mitigation. In *Advances in agronomy* (Vol. 84, pp. 37–120). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(04\)84002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(04)84002-1)
- Bouwman, A. F. (1996). Direct emission of nitrous oxide from agricultural soils. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, *46*(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00210224>
- Bouwman, A. F., Boumans, L. J. M., & Batjes, N. H. (2002). Emissions of N₂O and NO from fertilized fields: Summary of available measurement data: Summary of NO and N₂O measurement data. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *16*(4), 6–1–6–13. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GB001811>
- Buchen, C., Lewicka-Szczepak, D., Fuß, R., Helfrich, M., Flessa, H., & Well, R. (2016). Fluxes of N₂ and N₂O and contributing processes in summer after grassland renewal and grassland conversion to maize cropping on a Plaggic Anthrosol and a Histic Gleysol. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *101*, 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.06.028>
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E. M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R., & Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S. (2013). Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: How well do we understand the processes and their controls? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *368*(1621), 20130122. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0122>
- Cameron, K. C., Di, H. J., & Moir, J. L. (2013). Nitrogen losses from the soil/plant system: A review: Nitrogen losses. *Annals of Applied Biology*, *162*(2), 145–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12014>
- Canadell, J. G., Monteiro, P. M. S., Costa, M. H., Cotrim da Cunha, L., Cox, P. M., Eliseev, A. V., et al. (2021). Global carbon and other biogeochemical cycles and feedbacks. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 673–816). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.007>
- Clough, T. J., Sherlock, R. R., & Cameron, K. C. (2000). Entrapment and displacement of nitrous oxide in a drained pasture soil. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, *57*(2), 191–193. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009891717386>
- Clough, T. J., Sherlock, R. R., Cameron, K. C., Stevens, R. J., Laughlin, R. J., & Müller, C. (2001). Resolution of the ¹⁵N balance enigma? *Soil Research*, *39*(6), 1419. <https://doi.org/10.1071/SR00092>
- Clough, T. J., Sherlock, R. R., & Rolston, D. E. (2005). A review of the movement and fate of N₂O in the subsoil. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, *72*(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-004-7349-z>
- David, M. B., Del Grosso, S. J., Hu, X., Marshall, E. P., McIsaac, G. F., Parton, W. J., et al. (2009). Modeling denitrification in a tile-drained, corn and soybean agroecosystem of Illinois, USA. *Biogeochemistry*, *93*(1–2), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-008-9273-9>
- Davidson, E. A. (2012). Representative concentration pathways and mitigation scenarios for nitrous oxide. *Environmental Research Letters*, *7*(2), 024005. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/2/024005>
- Davidson, E. A., & Seitzinger, S. (2006). The enigma of progress in denitrification research. *Ecological Applications*, *16*(6), 2057–2063. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761\(2006\)016\[2057:TEOPID\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[2057:TEOPID]2.0.CO;2)
- Davidson, E. A., & Swank, W. T. (1986). Environmental parameters regulating gaseous nitrogen losses from two forested ecosystems via nitrification and denitrification. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *52*(6), 1287–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.52.6.1287-1292.1986>
- Del Grosso, S. J., Parton, W. J., Mosier, A. R., Ojima, D. S., Kulmala, A. E., & Phongpan, S. (2000). General model for N₂O and N₂ gas emissions from soils due to denitrification. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *14*(4), 1045–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GB001225>
- Delon, C., Galy-Lacaux, C., Serça, D., Loubet, B., Camara, N., Gardrat, E., et al. (2017). Soil and vegetation-atmosphere exchange of NO, NH₃, and N₂O from field measurements in a semi arid grazed ecosystem in Senegal. *Atmospheric Environment*, *156*, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.02.024>
- Deng, Q., Hui, D., Wang, J., Yu, C.-L., Li, C., Reddy, K. C., & Dennis, S. (2016). Assessing the impacts of tillage and fertilization management on nitrous oxide emissions in a cornfield using the DNDC model: Modeling N₂O emission in a cornfield. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, *121*(2), 337–349. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JG003239>
- Ding, K., Luo, J., Clough, T. J., Ledgard, S., Lindsey, S., & Di, H. J. (2022). In situ nitrous oxide and dinitrogen fluxes from a grazed pasture soil following cow urine application at two nitrogen rates. *Science of the Total Environment*, *838*, 156473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156473>
- Erisman, J. W., Galloway, J., Seitzinger, S., Bleeker, A., & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2011). Reactive nitrogen in the environment and its effect on climate change. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *3*(5), 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2011.08.012>
- Firestone, M. K. (1982). Biological denitrification. In F. J. Stevenson (Ed.), *Nitrogen in agricultural soils* (Vol. 1–22, pp. 289–326). American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil Science Society of America. <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr22.c8>
- Firestone, M. K., Smith, M. S., Firestone, R. B., & Tiedje, J. M. (1979). The influence of nitrate, nitrite, and oxygen on the composition of the gaseous products of denitrification in soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *43*(6), 1140–1144. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1979.03615995004300060016x>
- Friedl, J., Cardenas, L. M., Clough, T. J., Dannenmann, M., Hu, C., & Scheer, C. (2020). Measuring denitrification and the N₂O:(N₂O + N₂) emission ratio from terrestrial soils. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *47*, 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.08.006>
- Frolking, S. E., Mosier, A. R., Ojima, D. S., Li, C., Parton, W. J., Potter, C. S., et al. (1998). Comparison of N₂O emissions from soils at three temperate agricultural sites: Simulations of year-round measurements by four models. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, *52*(2/3), 77–105. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009780109748>
- Galloway, J. N., Dentener, F. J., Capone, D. G., Boyer, E. W., Howarth, R. W., Seitzinger, S. P., et al. (2004). Nitrogen cycles: Past, present, and future. *Biogeochemistry*, *70*(2), 153–226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-004-0370-0>
- Galloway, J. N., Townsend, A. R., Erisman, J. W., Bekunda, M., Cai, Z., Freney, J. R., et al. (2008). Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: Recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. *Science*, *320*(5878), 889–892. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1136674>
- Giltrap, D. L., Cichota, R., Vogeler, I., & Shepherd, M. (2014). Comparison of APSIM and NZ-DNDC models with plant n uptake and water and nitrate leaching data. In L. D. Currie & C. L. Christensen (Eds.), *Nutrient management for the farm, catchment and community, occasional report no. 27*. Fertilizer and Lime Research Centre, Massey University. Retrieved from http://tur-www1.massey.ac.nz/~flrc/workshops/14/Manuscripts/Paper_Giltrap_2014.pdf

- Groffman, P. M., Altabet, M. A., Böhlke, J. K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M. B., Firestone, M. K., et al. (2006). Methods for measuring denitrification: Diverse approaches to a difficult problem. *Ecological Applications*, 16(6), 2091–2122. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761\(2006\)016\[2091:MFMDDA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[2091:MFMDDA]2.0.CO;2)
- Groffman, P. M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Fulweiler, R. W., Gold, A. J., Morse, J. L., Stander, E. K., et al. (2009). Challenges to incorporating spatially and temporally explicit phenomena (hotspots and hot moments) in denitrification models. *Biogeochemistry*, 93(1–2), 49–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-008-9277-5>
- Grosz, B., Well, R., Dechow, R., Köster, J. R., Khalil, M. I., Merl, S., et al. (2021). Evaluation of denitrification and decomposition from three biogeochemical models using laboratory measurements of N₂, N₂O and CO₂. *Biogeosciences*, 18(20), 5681–5697. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-18-5681-2021>
- Gruber, N., & Galloway, J. N. (2008). An Earth-system perspective of the global nitrogen cycle. *Nature*, 451(7176), 293–296. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06592>
- He, H., Jansson, P.-E., Svensson, M., Meyer, A., Klemetsson, L., & Kasimir, Å. (2016). Factors controlling Nitrous Oxide emission from a spruce forest ecosystem on drained organic soil, derived using the CoupModel. *Ecological Modelling*, 321, 46–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.10.030>
- Hergoualc'h, K., Mueller, N., Bernoux, M., Kasimir, Å., Weerden, T. J., & Ogle, S. M. (2021). Improved accuracy and reduced uncertainty in greenhouse gas inventories by refining the IPCC emission factor for direct N₂O emissions from nitrogen inputs to managed soils. *Global Change Biology*, 27(24), 6536–6550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15884>
- Janz, B., Havermann, F., Lashermes, G., Zuazo, P., Engelsberger, F., Torabi, S. M., & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2022). Effects of crop residue incorporation and properties on combined soil gaseous N₂O, NO, and NH₃ emissions—A laboratory-based measurement approach. *Science of the Total Environment*, 807, 151051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151051>
- Leip, A., Marchi, G., Koeble, R., Kempen, M., Britz, W., & Li, C. (2008). Linking an economic model for European agriculture with a mechanistic model to estimate nitrogen and carbon losses from arable soils in Europe. *Biogeosciences*, 5(1), 73–94. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-5-73-2008>
- Li, C., Frolking, S., & Frolking, T. A. (1992). A model of nitrous oxide evolution from soil driven by rainfall events: 2. Model applications. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 97(D9), 9777–9783. <https://doi.org/10.1029/92JD00510>
- Liu, Y., Wang, R., Pan, Z., Zheng, X., Wei, H., Zhang, H., et al. (2022). Quantifying in situ N₂ fluxes from an intensively managed calcareous soil using the ¹⁵N gas-flux method. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 21(9), 2750–2766. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jia.2022.07.016>
- Mosier, A., Kroeze, C., Nevison, C., Oenema, O., Seitzinger, S., & van Cleemput, O. (1998). Closing the global N₂O budget: Nitrous oxide emissions through the agricultural nitrogen cycle: OECD/IPCC/IEA phase II development of IPCC guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventory methodology. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 52(2/3), 225–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/A:1009740530221>
- Müller, C., & Clough, T. J. (2014). Advances in understanding nitrogen flows and transformations: Gaps and research pathways. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 152(S1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859613000610>
- Nömmik, H. (1956). Investigations on denitrification in soil. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica*, 6(2), 195–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00015125609433269>
- Nylinder, J., Stenberg, M., Jansson, P.-E., Klemetsson, Å. K., Weslien, P., & Klemetsson, L. (2011). Modelling uncertainty for nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide emissions based on a Swedish field experiment with organic crop rotation. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 141(1), 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.02.027>
- Parton, W. J., Mosier, A. R., Ojima, D. S., Valentine, D. W., Schimel, D. S., Weier, K., & Kulmala, A. E. (1996). Generalized model for N₂ and N₂O production from nitrification and denitrification. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 10(3), 401–412. <https://doi.org/10.1029/96GB01455>
- Philippot, L., Hallin, S., & Schlöter, M. (2007). Ecology of denitrifying prokaryotes in agricultural soil (pp. 249–305). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(07\)96003-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(07)96003-4)
- Ravishankara, A. R., Daniel, J. S., & Portmann, R. W. (2009). Nitrous oxide (N₂O): The dominant ozone-depleting substance emitted in the 21st century. *Science*, 326(5949), 123–125. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1176985>
- Reay, D. S., Davidson, E. A., Smith, K. A., Smith, P., Melillo, J. M., Dentener, F., & Crutzen, P. J. (2012). Global agriculture and nitrous oxide emissions. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(6), 410–416. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1458>
- Rohe, L., Apelt, B., Vogel, H.-J., Well, R., Wu, G.-M., & Schlüter, S. (2021). Denitrification in soil as a function of oxygen availability at the microscale. *Biogeosciences*, 18(3), 1185–1201. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-18-1185-2021>
- Rummel, P. S., Well, R., Pfeiffer, B., Dittert, K., Floßmann, S., & Pausch, J. (2021). Nitrate uptake and carbon exudation—Do plant roots stimulate or inhibit denitrification? *Plant and Soil*, 459(1–2), 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04750-7>
- Saha, D., Basso, B., & Robertson, G. P. (2021). Machine learning improves predictions of agricultural nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions from intensively managed cropping systems. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(2), 024004. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abd2f3>
- Scheer, C., Fuchs, K., Pelster, D. E., & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2020). Estimating global terrestrial denitrification from measured N₂O:(N₂O + N₂) product ratios. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 47, 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.07.005>
- Schlesinger, W. H. (2009). On the fate of anthropogenic nitrogen. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(1), 203–208. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0810193105>
- Sgouridis, F., Stott, A., & Ullah, S. (2016). Application of the ¹⁵N gas-flux method for measuring in situ N₂ and N₂O fluxes due to denitrification in natural and semi-natural terrestrial ecosystems and comparison with the acetylene inhibition technique. *Biogeosciences*, 13(6), 1821–1835. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-1821-2016>
- Sihl, D., Davidson, E. A., Savage, K. E., & Liang, D. (2020). Simultaneous numerical representation of soil microsite production and consumption of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide using probability distribution functions. *Global Change Biology*, 26(1), 200–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14855>
- Singh, N., Pal, N., Mahajan, G., Singh, S., & Shevkani, K. (2011). Rice grain and starch properties: Effects of nitrogen fertilizer application. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 86(1), 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2011.04.039>
- Six, J., Feller, C., Denef, K., Ogle, S. M., De Moraes, J. C., & Albrecht, A. (2002). Soil organic matter, biota and aggregation in temperate and tropical soils—Effects of no-tillage. *Agronomie*, 22(7–8), 755–775. <https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:2002043>
- Stehfest, E., & Bouwman, L. (2006). N₂O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural vegetation: Summarizing available measurement data and modeling of global annual emissions. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 74(3), 207–228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-006-9000-7>
- Surey, R., Kaiser, K., Schimpf, C. M., Mueller, C. W., Böttcher, J., & Mikutta, R. (2021). Contribution of particulate and mineral-associated organic matter to potential denitrification of agricultural soils. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 9, 640534. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.640534>
- Sutton, M. A., & Bleeker, A. (2013). The shape of nitrogen to come. *Nature*, 494(7438), 435–437. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11954>

- Thomas, K. L., Lloyd, D., & Boddy, L. (1994). Effects of oxygen, pH and nitrate concentration on denitrification by *Pseudomonas* species. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, *118*(1–2), 181–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.1994.tb06823.x>
- Thomson, A. J., Giannopoulos, G., Pretty, J., Baggs, E. M., & Richardson, D. J. (2012). Biological sources and sinks of nitrous oxide and strategies to mitigate emissions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *367*(1593), 1157–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0415>
- Wagner-Riddle, C., Congreves, K. A., Abalos, D., Berg, A. A., Brown, S. E., Ambadan, J. T., et al. (2017). Globally important nitrous oxide emissions from croplands induced by freeze–thaw cycles. *Nature Geoscience*, *10*(4), 279–283. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2907>
- Weier, K. L., Doran, J. W., Power, J. F., & Walters, D. T. (1993). Denitrification and the dinitrogen/nitrous oxide ratio as affected by soil water, available carbon, and nitrate. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *57*(1), 66–72. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1993.03615995005700010013x>
- Zaehle, S. (2013). Terrestrial nitrogen–carbon cycle interactions at the global scale. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *368*(1621), 20130125. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0125>
- Zhang, J., Zhang, W., Jansson, P.-E., & Petersen, S. O. (2022). Modeling nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural soil incubation experiments using CoupModel. *Biogeosciences*, *19*(19), 4811–4832. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-4811-2022>
- Zimmermann, J., Carolan, R., Forrester, P., Harty, M., Lanigan, G., Richards, K. G., et al. (2018). Assessing the performance of three frequently used biogeochemical models when simulating N₂O emissions from a range of soil types and fertiliser treatments. *Geoderma*, *331*, 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.06.004>
- Zistl-Schlingmann, M., Feng, J., Kiese, R., Stephan, R., Zuazo, P., Willibald, G., et al. (2019). Dinitrogen emissions: An overlooked key component of the N balance of montane grasslands. *Biogeochemistry*, *143*(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-019-00547-8>