

News and Views

On the ‘temperature sensitivity’ of soil respiration: Can we use the immeasurable to predict the unknown?

Jens-Arne Subke^{a,1,2}, Michael Bahn^{b,*,2}^aStockholm Environment Institute, Department of Biology, University of York, York YO10 5DD, UK^bInstitute of Ecology, University of Innsbruck, Sternwartestr. 15, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 May 2010

Accepted 26 May 2010

Available online 9 June 2010

Keywords:

Decomposition

Ecosystem modelling

Priming effect

 Q_{10}

Rhizosphere

Soil CO₂ efflux

Soil respiration

Soil temperature

Soil organic matter

Belowground carbon allocation

ABSTRACT

The temperature dependence of soil respiration (R_S) is widely used as a key characteristic of soils or organic matter fractions within soils, and in the context of global climatic change is often applied to infer likely responses of R_S to warmer future conditions. However, the way in which these temperature dependencies are calculated, interpreted and implemented in ecosystem models requires careful consideration of possible artefacts and assumptions. We argue that more conceptual clarity in the reported relationships is needed to obtain meaningful meta-analyses and better constrained parameters informing ecosystem models. Our critical assessment of common methodologies shows that it is impossible to measure *actual* temperature response of R_S , and that a range of confounding effects creates the observed *apparent* temperature relations reported in the literature. Thus, any measureable temperature response function will likely fail to predict effects of climate change on R_S . For improving our understanding of R_S in changing environments we need a better integration of the relationships between substrate supply and the soil biota, and of their long-term responses to changes in abiotic soil conditions. This is best achieved by experiments combining isotopic techniques and ecosystem manipulations, which allow a disentangling of abiotic and biotic factors underlying the temperature response of soil CO₂ efflux.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

1. Background

Soil CO₂ efflux (or soil respiration, R_S) is considered the largest source of CO₂ from terrestrial ecosystems. Recent estimates indicate global soil CO₂ emissions in the range of $98 \pm 12 \text{ Pg y}^{-1}$, with annual increases of 0.1 Pg that have been suggested to be temperature-associated (Bond-Lamberty and Thomson, 2010). At a global, regional and local scale, soil temperature (T_S) and soil moisture have been considered the most important abiotic parameters determining R_S and its underlying processes (Kutsch et al., 2009). Empirical response functions are commonly used to derive annual estimates of R_S based on sporadic field measurements (e.g. Savage et al., 2008), whilst short-term (i.e. diurnal) deviations from an average abiotic response of R_S have been interpreted as effects of photosynthesis on R_S (Tang et al., 2005). Although temperature is undoubtedly one of the most important environmental factors

affecting respiratory processes on a physiological scale, we argue that its *direct* influence on soil CO₂ efflux can at best be approximated, which calls for more care in the interpretation and extrapolation of what is often assumed to be a T_S – R_S relationship. The response of R_S to climate change is a critical component in predicting possible feedbacks between the global carbon cycle and the climate system, and simplistic temperature-based extrapolations will not advance our ability to forecast these changes (Davidson et al., 2006). In the following we demonstrate that several of the assumptions, on which the T_S – R_S relationship and its interpretation have often been based, are somewhat arbitrary and deserve careful reconsideration.

2. Incubation experiments – effects of substrate supply and depletion on the apparent temperature sensitivity of soil C turnover

Lab incubations of soil samples indicate generally consistent temperature response functions, illustrating the fact that in principle the decomposition process in homogeneous soils can be well described using soil temperature (e.g. Reichstein et al., 2005). Experimental warming of incubated soils has been found to lead

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +43 512 507 5905; fax: +43 512 507 2975.

E-mail addresses: js51@york.ac.uk (J.-A. Subke), michael.bahn@uibk.ac.at (M. Bahn).¹ Tel.: +44 (0) 1904 432991; fax: +44 (0) 1904 432898.² Both authors have contributed equally to this manuscript.

only to a transient increase in soil CO₂ production, with an apparent compensation for the increase in temperature by a reduction of temperature sensitivity (commonly expressed as Q_{10} , representing the respiration rate change over a temperature shift by 10 °C). However, there is good evidence that such apparent thermal acclimation is caused by the depletion of substrate pools in the soil rather than an intrinsic ability of soils to “adapt” to changes in temperature conditions (Hartley and Ineson, 2008; Kirschbaum, 2004). The apparent acclimation does not however indicate *per se* that an intrinsic temperature sensitivity of R_S is altered, as a range of environmental constraints to decomposition are temperature dependent in themselves and physico-chemical mechanisms of SOM stabilization and destabilization are confounded with the kinetic properties of substrates and enzymes (Davidson and Janssens, 2006). Furthermore, decomposition of more recalcitrant soil organic matter (SOM), whilst being of lower magnitude, may display a higher Q_{10} (Conant et al., 2008). It is therefore necessary to express soil CO₂ efflux rates in warming experiments or lab incubation studies in relation to pool sizes of different substrate qualities. Furthermore, soil incubation experiments generally do not account for the fact that belowground carbon allocation (Litton et al., 2007) and its effects on root and rhizosphere respiration (Curiel Yuste et al., 2004) as well as priming of SOM decomposition (Fontaine et al., 2004; Kuzyakov, 2002) may alter soil C turnover and CO₂ emissions at any given temperature.

3. Inherent problems related to *in situ* testing of temperature dependent and – independent effects on soil CO₂ efflux

Whilst R_S measurements in the field have the advantage of including all CO₂ sources of intact soils (i.e. SOM decomposition as well as root and rhizospheric CO₂ flux), the interpretation of annual or seasonal temperature relations requires some caution. Belowground C allocation in plants, which contributes around 40–60% of R_S seasonally in most biomes (Subke et al., 2006), shows immense seasonal variation in the majority of ecosystems. Fig. 1 illustrates how the coincidence of peak rhizospheric CO₂ flux with seasonal maxima in T_S results in an apparently high T_S – R_S response, owing to increased plant C supply to the soil during summer (Fig. 1; see also Davidson et al., 2006; Reichstein and Beer, 2008).

A further problem for identifying temperature-related and temperature-independent effects on R_S *in situ* relates to the fact that in ecosystems T_S is rarely constant across the soil profile (Fig. 2), and its change with depth may vary from diel to seasonal timescales. Accordingly, the choice of the soil depth used for inferring the temperature sensitivity of R_S may strongly influence the shape of the temperature response curve, and thus Q_{10} (Fig. 3; Pavelka et al., 2007; Reichstein and Beer, 2008). It has been shown that commonly used temperature measurement depths in field experiments are likely to result in an underestimation of temperature sensitivity and that an arbitrary selection of a reference depth can produce an unrealistic range of Q_{10} values (Graf et al., 2008). Even the maximum R^2 depth method, which helps identify a reference depth yielding a minimum bias, can only provide rough approximates, which may change if there are shifts in respiratory activity or diffusivity across the soil profile. Errors in apparent Q_{10} as related to temperature measurement depth are further increased by a pronounced and heterogeneous horizon of respiration activity, a low thermal and CO₂ diffusivity of the soil and a low annual temperature amplitude (Graf et al., 2008).

Also the assessment of ‘temperature-independent’ effects on a diel timescale from observed hysteresis in the T_S – R_S relationship (Fig. 3B; see also Liu et al., 2006; Tang et al., 2005; Vargas and Allen, 2008) faces the major drawback that it does not consider shifts in




Fig. 1. Heuristic example of seasonal soil CO₂ efflux dynamics, based on simulated data representative of a temperate ecosystem setting with clear seasonality. (A) Seasonal flux contributions from heterotrophic decomposition (R_H ; solid black line), root derived CO₂ (roots and rhizosphere; R_R , dashed red line), and resulting total soil CO₂ efflux (R_S ; dotted blue line). (B) Same monthly fluxes as in panel A, plotted against typical monthly temperatures, and showing exponential regression fits. R_R flux dynamics are governed by plant productivity changes over the season, and cause a strong apparent temperature “response” of R_S , with an excellent exponential fit ($R^2 = 0.95$), but only a fraction of the flux response is directly influenced by temperature changes. For examples of actual field data, please see partitioning studies (e.g. Gaumont-Guay et al., 2008; Fig. 5 in Moyano et al., 2008) illustrating the same temperature response relations as described here.

phase and amplitude in T_S with soil depth, and may thus be confounded by an arbitrary selection of the soil depth at which temperature is measured and to which CO₂ efflux is related (Bahn et al., 2008; Reichstein et al., 2005). Moreover, besides temperature, a range of further factors may strongly influence an apparent diurnal T_S – R_S relationship, or any deviation from it (compare also Fig. 2): 1) soil moisture and CO₂ diffusivity at a single point in space and time, and their respective diurnal changes; 2) the vertical distribution of roots and microbes, their specific respiration rates and T_S responses; 3) changes in the quality of SOM and its accessibility to microbes and enzymes across the soil profile. 4) Effects of fresh photoassimilates on root and rhizosphere respiration, incl. priming effects (see above), may potentially also cause deviations from a simple diurnal T_S – R_S relationship. However, due to a range of likely confounded effects (see above) it is not possible to consistently infer such ‘temperature-independent’ effects of photosynthesis on R_S . Conversely, changes in abiotic and biotic conditions across the soil profile may alter both the (immeasurable) actual and the (generally reported) apparent temperature response of soil respiration.




Fig. 2. Abiotic and biotic changes throughout the soil profile. (A) Soil temperature (red lines; solid = mid-day, dashed = midnight) and moisture (blue dotted line). (B) Soil organic matter content (triangle width) and quality (shading indicates differences in complexity and molecular weight of carbon compounds). (C) CO₂ production (white bars: root and rhizospheric sources, dark brown bars: heterotrophic sources, light brown bar: mineral weathering). (D) CO₂ diffusion between different depths resulting from CO₂ production. The image in panel C is reproduced with kind permission from USDA – Natural Resources Conservation Service, Lincoln, Nebraska.

4. Outlook and conclusions

We conclude that any measurable temperature response function will likely fail to predict effects of climate change on R_s . For improving our understanding of R_s in changing environments a shift in focus from simplistic abiotic response relationships to modelling of ecosystem processes including biotic and abiotic interactions is needed. In particular, we require a considerable improvement in our understanding of assimilate allocation to belowground, phloem transport processes, assimilate storage dynamics in different plant organs, and exudation controls in the rhizosphere (Bahn et al., 2010). Ecosystem models have started to incorporate these more complex interactions, and consider issues of C allocation between plant and soil (Sitch et al., 2008 and citations therein), but significant challenges remain. Experimentally, a range of recent isotopic labelling experiments have provided critical new insights into soil C turnover processes (see e.g. review by Paterson et al., 2009). For future experimental work, we think that a combination of isotopic tracer studies with environmental manipulations (e.g. soil or ecosystem warming, throughfall-displacement, or pollution/deposition experiments) hold the best promise to elucidate C pathways and identifying specific mechanisms under changed environmental conditions by tracing C molecules from assimilation to their respiratory “use”. To be able to account for long-term effects of warming on soil carbon losses, such experiments should also consider the physico-chemical stabilization and destabilization of SOM fractions, as we urgently require an integration of slow and fast components of soil C turnover (Bahn et al., 2010) in order to obtain more realistic estimates of soil CO₂ efflux in a warmer climate.




Fig. 3. (A) Simulated temperature data exemplifying diurnal fluctuations at different soil depths (scaled on left-hand axis – see panel B for colour code of temperature depth) and simulated concurrent soil CO₂ efflux (R_s ; green line and right-hand axis) calculated assuming a Q_{10} of 2 and prescribed distributions of organic matter in the soil profile. (B) Apparent temperature dependencies for the same data, showing calculated Q_{10} values. Note how the reduction in range and time shift in temperature dynamics with increasing soil depth cause an apparent increase in temperature sensitivity and the occurrence of hysteresis “loops”.

Acknowledgements

The UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) is acknowledged for support of JAS (grant ref. NE/E004512/1). MB acknowledges financial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF P18756-B16, P22214-B17).

References

- Bahn, M., Rodeghiero, M., Anderson-Dunn, M., Dore, S., Gimeno, C., Drösler, M., Williams, M., Ammann, C., Berninger, F., Flechard, C., Jones, S., Balzarolo, M., Kumar, S., Newesely, C., Priwitz, T., Raschi, A., Siegwolf, R., Susiluoto, S., Tenhunen, J., Wohlfahrt, G., Cernusca, A., 2008. Soil respiration in European Grasslands in relation to climate and assimilate supply. *Ecosystems* 11, 1352–1367.
- Bahn, M., Janssens, I.A., Reichstein, M., Smith, P., Trumbore, S.E., 2010. Soil respiration across scales: towards an integration of patterns and processes. *New Phytologist* 186, 292–296.
- Bond-Lamberty, B., Thomson, A.M., 2010. Temperature-associated increases in the global soil respiration record. *Nature* 464, 579–582.
- Conant, R.T., Drijber, R.A., Haddix, M.L., Parton, W.J., Paul, E.A., Plante, A.F., Six, J., Steinweg, J.M., 2008. Sensitivity of organic matter decomposition to warming varies with its quality. *Global Change Biology* 14, 868–877.
- Curjel Yuste, J., Janssens, I.A., Carrara, A., Ceulemans, R., 2004. Annual Q_{10} of soil respiration reflects plant phenological patterns as well as temperature sensitivity. *Global Change Biology* 10, 161–169.
- Davidson, E.A., Janssens, I.A., 2006. Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon decomposition and feedbacks to climate change. *Nature* 440, 165–173.
- Davidson, E.A., Janssens, I.A., Luo, Y.Q., 2006. On the variability of respiration in terrestrial ecosystems: moving beyond Q_{10} . *Global Change Biology* 12, 154–164.
- Fontaine, S., Bardoux, G., Abbadie, L., Mariotti, A., 2004. Carbon input to soil may decrease soil carbon content. *Ecology Letters* 7, 314–320.
- Gaumont-Guay, D., Black, T.A., Barr, A.G., Jassal, R.S., Nesic, Z., 2008. Biophysical controls on rhizospheric and heterotrophic components of soil respiration in a boreal black spruce stand. *Tree Physiology* 28, 161–171.
- Graf, A., Weihermüller, L., Huisman, J.A., Herbst, M., Bauer, J., Vereecken, H., 2008. Measurement depth effects on the apparent temperature sensitivity of soil respiration in field studies. *Biogeosciences* 5, 1175–1188.
- Hartley, I.P., Ineson, P., 2008. Substrate quality and the temperature sensitivity of soil organic matter decomposition. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 40, 1567–1574.
- Kirschbaum, M.U.F., 2004. Soil respiration under prolonged soil warming: are rate reductions caused by acclimation or substrate loss? *Global Change Biology* 10, 1870–1877.
- Kutsch, W.L., Bahn, M., Heinemeyer, A. (Eds.), 2009. *Soil Carbon Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Kuzyakov, Y., 2002. Review: factors affecting rhizosphere priming effects. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 165, 382–396.
- Litton, C.M., Raich, J.W., Ryan, M.G., 2007. Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Global Change Biology* 13, 2089–2109.
- Liu, Q., Edwards, N.T., Post, W.M., Gu, L., Ledford, J., Lenhart, S., 2006. Temperature-independent diel variation in soil respiration observed from a temperate deciduous forest. *Global Change Biology* 12, 2136–2145.
- Moyano, F.E., Kutsch, W.L., Rebmann, C., 2008. Soil respiration fluxes in relation to photosynthetic activity in broad-leaf and needle-leaf forest stands. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 148, 135–143.
- Paterson, E., Midwood, A.J., Millard, P., 2009. Through the eye of the needle: a review of isotope approaches to quantify microbial processes mediating soil carbon balance. *New Phytologist* 184, 19–33.
- Pavelka, M., Acosta, M., Marek, M.V., Kutsch, W., Janous, D., 2007. Dependence of the Q_{10} values on the depth of the soil temperature measuring point. *Plant and Soil* 292, 171–179.
- Reichstein, M., Beer, C., 2008. Soil respiration across scales: the importance of a model-data integration framework for data interpretation. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science-Zeitschrift Fur Pflanzenernahrung Und Bodenkunde* 171, 344–354.
- Reichstein, M., Subke, J.A., Angeli, A.C., Tenhunen, J.D., 2005. Does the temperature sensitivity of decomposition of soil organic matter depend upon water content, soil horizon, or incubation time? *Global Change Biology* 11, 1754–1767.
- Savage, K., Davidson, E.A., Richardson, A.D., 2008. A conceptual and practical approach to data quality and analysis procedures for high-frequency soil respiration measurements. *Functional Ecology* 22, 1000–1007.
- Sitch, S., Huntingford, C., Gedney, N., Levy, P.E., Lomas, M., Piao, S.L., Betts, R., Ciais, P., Cox, P., Friedlingstein, P., Jones, C.D., Prentice, I.C., Woodward, F.I., 2008. Evaluation of the terrestrial carbon cycle, future plant geography and climate-carbon cycle feedbacks using five Dynamic Global Vegetation Models (DGVMs). *Global Change Biology* 14, 2015–2039.
- Subke, J.A., Inghima, I., Cotrufo, M.F., 2006. Trends and methodological impacts in soil CO_2 efflux partitioning: a meta-analytical review. *Global Change Biology* 12, 921–943.
- Tang, J.W., Baldocchi, D.D., Xu, L., 2005. Tree photosynthesis modulates soil respiration on a diurnal time scale. *Global Change Biology* 11, 1298–1304.
- Vargas, R., Allen, M.F., 2008. Diel patterns of soil respiration in a tropical forest after Hurricane Wilma. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences* 113.