

TECHNICAL COMMENT

CARBON CYCLE

Comment on “The whole-soil carbon flux in response to warming”

Jing Xiao,¹ Fangjian Yu,¹ Wanying Zhu,¹ Chenchao Xu,¹ Kaihang Zhang,¹ Yiqi Luo,² James M. Tiedje,³ Jizhong Zhou,^{2,4} Lei Cheng^{1,*}

In a compelling study, Hicks Pries *et al.* (Reports, 31 March 2017, p. 1420) showed that 4°C warming enhanced soil CO₂ production in the 1-meter soil profile, with all soil depths displaying similar temperature sensitivity (Q₁₀). We argue that some caveats can be identified in their experimental approach and analysis, and that these critically undermine their conclusions and hence their claim that the strength of feedback between the whole-soil carbon and climate has been underestimated in terrestrial models.

Hicks Pries *et al.* (1) used a deep soil warming experiment to examine CO₂ production in response to warming across the soil profile in a coniferous temperate forest. They found that a 2-year in situ warming of 4°C significantly enhanced the whole-soil CO₂ production by 34 to 37%, and that all soil layers exhibited similar temperature sensitivity with a mean apparent Q₁₀ of 2.7 ± 0.3. We argue that although the idea of subsoil carbon dynamics in response to warming is worth testing (2, 3), their conclusions are critically undermined by the experimental approach and analysis.

Hicks Pries *et al.* buried heating rods at a depth of 2.4 m (with additional circular heating cables near the surface at radii of 0.5 and 1 m) to warm the 1-m soil profile evenly by 4°C. This method differed from the majority of previous studies, in which soil temperature was elevated through heating surface air and/or topsoil layers to simulate the magnitude of rise in surface air temperature (2, 3). Although it is expected that ongoing and future air warming would increase the temperature of the soil profile, the magnitude of temperature elevation likely attenuates with depth. This happens because net energy inputs from air and subsequent heat conduction driven by a thermal gradient would inevitably invoke temperature variation in deep soils lagging behind that of surface soils under a dynamic climate system. Such a thermal lag effect is also ascribed to low thermal diffusivity and thickness of the soil profile (4). In an alpine meadow with clipping to simulate animal grazing under 4°C surface air warming, for instance, the magnitude of temperature elevation decreased by 88% and 77%, respectively, at 60- and 100-cm soil depths (5). In a boreal forest under 3.4°C soil warming at

a depth of 10 cm, the magnitude of temperature elevation declined by 40% and 53%, respectively, at 75- and 100-cm soil depths (6). These previous findings imply that Hicks Pries *et al.*'s experimental warming approach may cause higher temperature elevations in deeper soil layers (e.g., <50 cm) than expected under air warming, thus overestimating the whole-soil CO₂ production.

To examine temperature sensitivity of CO₂ production across the soil profile, Hicks Pries *et al.* used the following equation to calculate the apparent Q₁₀, a factor by which the CO₂ production rate increases with a 10°C rise, of each soil layer:

$$Q_{10} = \left(\frac{R_H}{R_C} \right)^{\frac{10}{T_H - T_C}} \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1. Soil CO₂ production of different soil depths in response to warming. (A) Soil CO₂ production (mean ± SE, *n* = 3) at different soil layers in control plots (blue circles) and heated plots (red circles). *P* < 0.05 denotes a significant effect of warming. Data are from soil CO₂ measurements of Hicks Pries *et al.* but excluding the “outliers” and “unrealistic high values” in their Q₁₀ analysis. (B) The mean apparent Q₁₀ of each soil layer according to a linear regression model. Hicks Pries *et al.* estimated the mean apparent Q₁₀ by averaging the Q₁₀ values of each sampling point but excluded many data points because of high variation. Our method allows for a more accurate calculation of temperature sensitivity through an unbiased estimation of ln(Q₁₀) with low deviation. Error bars were computed from SE of the fitted parameters. The apparent Q₁₀ of the two upper depths (2.62^{+0.38}_{-0.33}) is significantly higher than that of the three deeper depths (1.20^{+0.21}_{-0.18}), *P* < 0.001. Data are from the Hicks Pries *et al.* analysis of soil CO₂ production. All paired soil CO₂ data except for those equal to zero are included in the current analysis.

¹College of Life Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China. ²Department of Microbiology and Plant Biology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA. ³Center for Microbial Ecology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA. ⁴Institute for Environmental Genomics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA. *Corresponding author. Email: lcheng@zju.edu.cn

reanalyzed the mean soil CO₂ production using the original data sets by omitting those not included in the estimation of the mean apparent Q₁₀ in figure 2B of Hicks Pries *et al.* In contrast to Hicks Pries *et al.*, results from the current analysis show that CO₂ flux from the whole-soil profile remained unchanged under warming (Fig. 1A, $P = 0.15$). This result indicates that the omission of many data points in the Hicks Pries *et al.* analysis could lead to inconsistent conclusions about the response of the whole soil to warming.

We argue that the exclusion of many data points in the Hicks Pries *et al.* analysis could be problematic because their data were collected from a time-series experiment. In their study, soil CO₂ measurements had been conducted repeatedly on the same object (i.e., each soil layer) over 2 years; thus, measurements at different time points were not independent of each other (8). Actually, soil CO₂ production decreased significantly over time in the whole-soil profile ($P < 0.001$). Moreover, two CO₂ measurements taken at adjacent time points were more highly correlated than two taken several time points apart [the fittest covariance structure: first-order autoregressive with heterogeneous variance ARH(1), $\phi = 0.994$]. If such repeated and self-correlated CO₂ measurements were treated erroneously as if they were random samples, as in the analysis of Hicks Pries *et al.*, the exclusion of a large number of data points could lead to serious power loss in statistical analysis (7).

To avoid the occurrence of many “abnormal” Q₁₀ values, we propose a different method to estimate the mean apparent Q₁₀ of each soil depth. In the Hicks Pries *et al.* analysis, many anomalous Q₁₀ values appeared because any variation in soil CO₂ data collection would be amplified exponentially by a power of $10/(T_H - T_C)$. To ameliorate error propagation, we use a least-squares regression model to estimate the apparent Q₁₀ (9) by reformatting Eq. 1 as follows:

$$\ln \frac{R_H}{R_C} = \frac{\ln(Q_{10})}{10} \cdot (T_H - T_C) \quad (2)$$

Using Eq. 2, the apparent Q₁₀ for each soil layer can be estimated through performing a linear regression between $\ln(R_H/R_C)$ and $(T_H - T_C)$. Meanwhile, the potentially confounding effects of seasonal changes, emphasized in Hicks Pries *et al.*, could be minimized because the same paired data are used. In our analysis, only those data points with CO₂ production equal to zero were not included. Tests of difference in Q₁₀ between soil depths were conducted based on a generalized linear model by introducing a dummy variable of depth. Interestingly, we found that the mean apparent Q₁₀ of the two surface soil layers (mean Q₁₀ = 2.62) was significantly higher than that of the three deeper soil layers (mean Q₁₀ = 1.20) (Fig. 1B, $P < 0.001$). These results are in conflict with those of Hicks Pries *et al.* and suggest that the surface soil layers were more responsive to

warming, with a much higher temperature sensitivity relative to the deep layers.

Hicks Pries *et al.* concluded their analysis with a claim that the strength of the carbon-climate feedback in terrestrial models has been underestimated because these models have ignored the warming effects on subsoil (e.g., >50 cm) and usually include relatively low apparent Q₁₀ values of soil CO₂ production. Given the above caveats with respect to how this experiment was carried out and how the data were interpreted, we believe that their recommendation lacks a solid foundation.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. C. E. Hicks Pries, C. Castanha, R. C. Porras, M. S. Torn, *Science* **355**, 1420–1423 (2017).
2. L. Cheng *et al.*, *ISME J.* **11**, 1825–1835 (2017).
3. T. W. Crowther *et al.*, *Nature* **540**, 104–108 (2016).
4. T. Mimouni, L. Lei, L. Laloui, *Acta Geotech.* **10**, 197–208 (2015).
5. M. Xu *et al.*, *J. Arid Land* **7**, 189–204 (2015).
6. R. L. Rich *et al.*, *Glob. Change Biol.* **21**, 2334–2348 (2015).
7. D. M. Hawkins, *Identification of Outliers* (Springer, 1980).
8. R. C. Littell, G. A. Milliken, W. W. Stroup, R. D. Wolfinger, O. Schabenberger, *SAS for Mixed Models* (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, ed. 2, 2006).
9. M. D. Mahecha *et al.*, *Science* **329**, 838–840 (2010).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank M. S. Torn for stimulating discussions. Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) grants 31670501, 31422010, and 31370487 and by Zhejiang Provincial NSFC grant LR14C030001.

6 June 2017; accepted 21 December 2017
10.1126/science.aao0218

Comment on "The whole-soil carbon flux in response to warming"

Jing Xiao, Fangjian Yu, Wanying Zhu, Chenchao Xu, Kaihang Zhang, Yiqi Luo, James M. Tiedje, Jizhong Zhou and Lei Cheng

Science **359** (6378), eaao0218.
DOI: 10.1126/science.aao0218

ARTICLE TOOLS

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/359/6378/eaao0218>

REFERENCES

This article cites 7 articles, 2 of which you can access for free
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/359/6378/eaao0218#BIBL>

PERMISSIONS

<http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. 2017 © The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.