Interpreting diel hysteresis between soil respiration and temperature
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Abstract

Increasing use of automated soil respiration chambers in recent years has demonstrated complex diel relationships between soil respiration and temperature that are not apparent from less frequent measurements. Soil surface flux is often lagged from soil temperature by several hours, which results in semielliptical hysteresis loops when surface flux is plotted as a function of soil temperature. Both biological and physical explanations have been suggested for hysteresis patterns, and there is currently no consensus on their causes or how such data should be analyzed to interpret the sensitivity of respiration to temperature. We used a one-dimensional soil CO₂ and heat transport model based on physical first principles to demonstrate a theoretical basis for lags between surface flux and soil temperatures. Using numerical simulations, we demonstrated that diel phase lags between surface flux and soil temperature can result from heat and CO₂ transport processes alone. While factors other than temperature that vary on a diel basis, such as carbon substrate supply and atmospheric CO₂ concentration, can additionally alter lag times and hysteresis patterns to varying degrees, physical transport processes alone are sufficient to create hysteresis. Therefore, the existence of hysteresis does not necessarily indicate soil respiration is influenced by photosynthetic carbon supply. We also demonstrated how lags can cause errors in Q₁₀ values calculated from regressions of surface flux and soil temperature measured at a single depth. Furthermore, synchronizing surface flux and soil temperature to account for transport-related lags generally does not improve Q₁₀ estimation. In order to calculate the sensitivity of soil respiration to temperature, we suggest using approaches that account for the gradients in temperature and production existing within the soil. We conclude that consideration of heat and CO₂ transport processes is a requirement to correctly interpret diel soil respiration patterns.
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Introduction

Soil respiration, which is often the largest flux of CO₂ leaving terrestrial ecosystems (Ryan & Law, 2005; Jassal et al., 2007; Gaumont-Guay et al., 2008), is likely to be an important determinant of ecosystem carbon balance under future climate scenarios. The temperature sensitivity of soil respiration is one of the more basic characteristics that ecologists would like to quantify in order to predict fluxes in changing environments. However, regressions between soil respiration and temperature often have relationships that do not agree with theoretical models, such as the commonly used Arrhenius or van’t Hoff type expressions (see Davidson et al., 2006a for a detailed discussion). Models based on simple reaction kinetics do not capture the biological and physical complexities of soil systems, including heat and gas transport dynamics (Risk et al., 2002; Pumpanen et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2006b; Pavelka et al., 2007). While there is much agreement that more sophisticated, mechanistic models are required to describe and predict soil respiration, many suggestions have focused on improving descriptions of biological production (Trumbore, 2006; Carbone & Vargas, 2008), and the complexities of soil physical processes have not received the same level of attention.

In recent years, automated soil respiration chambers have gained widespread use, providing temporally dense datasets that reveal complex relationships between soil respiration and temperature that are not apparent with less frequent survey measurements. Many researchers who analyze data from automated chambers have observed diel hysteresis, evidenced by semielliptical shapes in regression plots of soil temperature and soil respiration (see examples in Riveros-Iregui et al., 2007; Bahn et al., 2008; Carbone & Vargas, 2008). These ellipses result from phase lags between the diel
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signals of soil temperature and soil respiration, but there is no consensus on what causes phase lags, or how best to analyze lagged data in order to determine the temperature sensitivity of soil respiration (Pavelka et al., 2007; Graf et al., 2008; Gaumont-Guay et al., 2008).

Two main lines of reasoning have been proposed to explain the origins of phase lags. The first is the covariate argument, that environmental factors which oscillate out of phase with soil temperature, such as carbon supply from recent photosynthesis, modify CO₂ emissions (Tang et al., 2005; Sty et al., 2007; Vargas & Allen, 2008; Kuzyakov & Gavrichkova, 2010). The second is the heat transport argument, that soil temperature measured at an arbitrary depth is out of sync with surface efflux, due to shifts in the phase and amplitude of soil temperature with depth (Pavelka et al., 2007; Graf et al., 2008). This argument is based on the fact that soil CO₂ production in an integrated response a to nonuniform temperature profile, so temperatures measured at discrete soil depths are likely to differ in both magnitude and phase from the average temperature forcing soil CO₂ production. The covariate and heat-transport explanations are not mutually exclusive, and both factors are likely to play important roles in diel soil respiration dynamics. An additional factor that has not been discussed extensively is that gas diffusion through soil imposes a lag between the time of CO₂ production at depth and release from the soil surface.

An excellent example of how these potential explanations can act simultaneously is the multiple influences that soil moisture can have on diel soil respiration patterns. Lags between soil respiration and temperature, and the semielliptical forms produced when these variables are plotted against each other, have been shown to vary seasonally with soil moisture (Tang et al., 2005; Riveros-Iregui et al., 2007; Carbone et al., 2008; Vargas & Allen, 2008). All of the processes mentioned above – substrate supply, heat transport, and CO₂ diffusion – are influenced by soil moisture and can provide partial explanations for seasonal changes in diel hysteresis. Additionally, hysteresis patterns can also change day-to-day under conditions where soil moisture is fairly constant, and so diel influences from factors not wholly related to moisture should also be considered, such as photosynthetic carbon supply (Liu et al., 2006; Bahn et al., 2009), and disturbances such as atmospheric turbulence (Flechard et al., 2007).

Having multiple drivers which vary on a diel basis complicates the goal of measuring the temperature sensitivity of respiration in situ. Determining the temperature response of surface flux requires first disentangling the effects of temperature from other diel environmental drivers, and second, relating surface flux rates to nonuniform CO₂ production and temperature profiles. In this study, we aimed to provide a conceptual framework and a modeling tool for addressing both parts of this process.

To evaluate the influences of temperature on surface flux in the absence of any other controlling factors, we first determined the theoretical diel relationship between soil temperature and surface flux resulting from purely physical transport processes. Using basic principles of gas diffusion and heat transport, we simulated the expected lag times and hysteresis patterns between soil temperature and surface flux. We then performed a series of sensitivity analyses to determine the impacts on lag times of variations in soil physical factors, such as thermal diffusivity and gas diffusivity, and environmental factors, such as air temperature variation. To show the challenges and possibilities for distinguishing temperature from other diel signals, we continued by simulating increasingly complex field scenarios, modeling simultaneous changes in temperature and other environmental variables, including atmospheric CO₂ and carbon substrate supply. These simulations demonstrate how both physical and biological drivers might influence hysteresis patterns under field conditions.

To understand how transport processes impact calculations of the temperature sensitivity of soil respiration, we also used simulations to examine the accuracy of Q₁₀ values calculated from regressions of surface flux and soil temperature. We identify several short-comings at diel timescales with this commonly used regression approach, and suggest potential alternatives.

**Methods**

**Model description**

We modified the one-dimensional soil CO₂ transport model described by Nickerson & Risk (2009) so that it had the following functionality: (1) a CO₂ transport component governed by Fick’s First law of diffusion, (2) a heat transport component that shifts and dampens oscillating air temperatures with increasing soil depth, and (3) a simple CO₂ production function that adjusts production rate in each soil layer by the depth and temperature of the layer.

The modeled environment assumes a well-mixed atmospheric boundary layer and a soil profile of length L (m) that is divided into 100 uniform layers. Each layer has specific values for total porosity, volumetric water content, and air-filled porosity. Air-filled porosity is used in turn to calculate both gas diffusivity (D_{CO₂}) and thermal diffusivity (Dₜ), based on empirical relationships from the literature (details below). D_{CO₂} and Dₜ, along with CO₂ and temperature gradients, determine the rate of CO₂ and heat transport, respectively. For the purposes of these instructive simulations, soil physical
properties and diffusivities were assumed to be constant throughout the soil profile.

The CO$_2$ transport component of the model allows gas exchange between neighboring soil layers following concentration gradients. Flux rates between layers are determined with the discrete, one-dimensional form of Fick’s First Law:

$$F_{ij} = -D_{ij} \frac{\Delta C_{ij}}{\Delta z_{ij}},$$

where $D_{ij}$ is the effective CO$_2$ diffusion coefficient between two soil layers (layer $i$ and layer $j$), $\Delta C_{ij}$ is the difference in layer CO$_2$ concentrations (µmol m$^{-3}$), and $z_{ij}$ is the difference in the depths (m) of the two layers. Temperature corrections for diffusivity are calculated for each layer at each model time step (1 s) as follows:

$$D_i = D_0 \left( \frac{T_i}{T_0} \right)^{1.75},$$

where $D_0$ is soil diffusivity at reference temperature $T_0$ (273 K) and $T_i$ is the ambient temperature (K) of layer $i$.

At each model time step, a new CO$_2$ concentration in each layer ($C_i$) is calculated as function of the layer depth:

$$C_i(z, t) = C_i(z, t-1) \theta \times L/N + F(z - 1) - F(z) + \gamma(z),$$

where $C_i(z, t-1)$ is the layer concentration at the previous time step, $\theta$ is the soil air-filled pore space, $F(z - 1)$ is flux from the layer below (which is generally positive, representing a flux in, but the sign depends on concentration gradients), $F(z)$ is the flux from the present layer, $\gamma(z)$ is layer CO$_2$ production (µmol m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$), $L$ is the total depth of the soil column and $N$ is the total number of soil layers.

Unless otherwise noted, biological CO$_2$ production decreases with soil depth according to the following exponential function (Nickerson & Risk, 2009):

$$\gamma(z, T_{ave}) = \frac{\Gamma_0}{\sum_{z=0}^{L} \exp \left( \frac{z}{d_p} \right)} \exp \left( \frac{-z}{d_p} \right).$$

where $T_{ave}$ is the average temperature of the atmospheric and profile, $\Gamma_0$ is total soil CO$_2$ production at the average temperature (µmol m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$), $z$ is the layer depth, and $d_p$ is the exponential folding layer, or the layer at which the proportion of total soil production remaining is $1/e$ ($0.37$). By manipulating $d_p$, CO$_2$ production can be confined mostly to shallow soil layers, or spread more evenly across the soil profile. A basal value for total soil CO$_2$ production is defined by the user and partitioned with Eqn (4) to give layer-specific basal production. At each time step, layer production is adjusted in response to the current layer soil temperature $T(z, T)$ using a modified van’t Hoff relationship:

$$\gamma(z, T) = \gamma(z, T_{ave}) \times \left( \frac{T(z, T)}{T_{ave}} \right)^{\frac{(T(z, T) - T_{ave})^{10}}{10}}.$$

The heat transport component of the model approximates air and soil temperature as sinusoidal curves (Hillel, 1998), where soil temperature is shifted and damped from the air temperature curve as a function of depth:

$$T(0, t) = T_{ave} + A_o \sin(\omega t),$$

$$T(z, t) = T_{ave} + A_o [\sin(\omega t - z/d_T)] e^{-z/d_T},$$

where $T(0, t)$ is the temperature at the soil surface ($z = 0$), $A_o$ is the amplitude of the surface temperature fluctuation (1/2 of the total daily range), and $\omega$ is the radial frequency, which converts time to radians. For a sine wave oscillating on a period of 1 day (86 400 s), $\omega = 2\pi/86 400$. The constant $d_T$ is the thermal damping depth, and is defined as the depth at which temperature amplitude decreases to the fraction 1/e. Thermal damping depth (m) is related to thermal diffusivity ($D_T$) as follows:

$$d_T = \sqrt{2D_T/\omega}. $$

Model implementation

Simulations were performed to examine (1) the impacts of model parameters on lag times and hysteresis patterns and (2) how lags affect calculation of soil respiration temperature sensitivity. We defined a set of default soil physical and environmental conditions for simulations (Table 1), based on measurements of a sandy loam soil from the HJ Andrews Experimental Forest in the western Cascades of Oregon, USA (44.2’N, 122.2’W). Further description of the site and soil is provided by Pyper et al. (2008). Default environmental conditions are characteristic of early summer. For sensitivity analyses, we varied each of these parameters across a large range of realistic values. Soil depth was modeled as 100 cm for all scenarios.

Realistic values for $D_{CO_2}$ at different soil moisture contents were modeled using the relationship described by Moldrup et al. (2000), which expresses soil gas diffusivity as a function of air-filled porosity and soil moisture release characteristics:

$$D_p = D_0 \times (2 \varepsilon^{100} + 0.04 \varepsilon^{100}) \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{100} \right)^{2.3/b},$$

where $D_p$ is soil gas diffusivity, $D_0$ is gas diffusivity in free air ($1.39 \times 10^{-6}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ for CO$_2$ at 273 K and 1 atm), $\varepsilon$ is the ambient

Table 1 Default parameters for model simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Default value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil porosity (v/v)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-filled porosity ((\Theta))</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal diffusivity ($D_T$)</td>
<td>6.41 x 10^{-7} m$^2$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas diffusivity ($D_{CO_2}$)</td>
<td>1.29 x 10^{-6} m$^2$s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production exponential folding depth ($d_p$)</td>
<td>10 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average air and soil temperature ($T_{ave}$)</td>
<td>15 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air temperature amplitude ($A_o$)</td>
<td>7.5 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total basal CO$_2$ production ($T_o$)</td>
<td>1.5 µmol m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric CO$_2$ production ($T_a$)</td>
<td>385 ppm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviations from these values are noted in text or figures.
air-filled porosity, \( e_{100} \) is the air-filled porosity at \(-100\) cm H\(_2\)O tension (~10 kPa), and \( b \) is the slope from a log plot relating volumetric water content to soil water potential. We used coefficients determined from 12 intact soil cores taken from the HJ Andrews Experimental Forest. Moisture-release coefficients were determined by treating cores on pressure plates at pressures ranging from 10 to 50 kPa.

To parameterize \( D_t \) at different moisture levels, we used a published dataset for a sandy-loam soil of \( D_t \) measurements from intact soil cores across air-filled porosities ranging 0–0.60 (Ochsner et al., 2001). To interpolate between measured porosities we fit the data with a second-order polynomial.

Simulations were initiated with a spin-up period for modeled CO\(_2\) flux to stabilize. The spin-up period was deemed sufficiently long when daily maximum soil surface flux values were constant for at least 5 consecutive model days. To minimize spin-up time, simulations were initialized with the steady-state solution proposed by Cerling et al. (1991) for a uniform profile. The model was solved by Euler integration with a computation time step for all simulations of 1 s, and model output was recorded every 300 s.

Two synthetic tests were conducted to examine the performance of the CO\(_2\) transport component under steady-state and transient conditions. The steady-state test served to assess numerical errors associated with discretizing the soil profile into layers. This test entailed modeling uniform production profiles across a range of gas diffusivities, and comparing the modeled concentration profiles to Cerling’s steady-state solution. We found soil concentration errors due to discretization to be <0.5% across all diffusivity levels. The transient test examined time lag errors related to iterating the model in discrete time steps. We varied CO\(_2\) concentration at the upper boundary layer (atmosphere) as a sinusoidal wave, and compared the phase lags between peak CO\(_2\) concentrations in the atmosphere and soil with the theoretical phase lag described by Beltrami (1996):

\[
\delta = \frac{z}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi \times D_{CO2}}{\tau}}, \tag{10}
\]

where \( \delta \) is the phase lag (s), \( z \) is soil depth (m), \( \tau \) is the period over which atmospheric CO\(_2\) oscillates (1 day or 86,400 s), and \( D_{CO2} \) is the effective CO\(_2\) diffusivity of soil (m\(^2\) s\(^{-1}\)).

Comparison of apparent and actual \( Q_{10} \) values

We examined how varying model parameters affected calculation of \( Q_{10} \) values with a widely used regression approach, which relates the natural logarithm of surface flux to soil temperature at an arbitrary depth (Pavelka et al., 2007):

\[
\ln R = aT + \beta, \tag{11}
\]

where \( R \) is surface flux, \( T \) is soil temperature, and \( a \) and \( \beta \) are coefficients estimated from linear least squares regression. The \( Q_{10} \) of surface flux was calculated as

\[
Q_{10} = e^{10 \beta}. \tag{12}
\]

We call these \( Q_{10} \) values from post hoc calculations ‘apparent \( Q_{10} \) values’ to contrast them with the input \( Q_{10} \) used to parameterize the model (generally 2.0). It should be noted that in these simulations a small amount of diel variation in surface flux resulted from the temperature sensitivity of CO\(_2\) diffusivity [Eqn (2)], rather than from the temperature sensitivity of CO\(_2\) production. The variation in surface flux resulting from the temperature sensitivity of \( D_{CO2} \) was negligible, however, accounting for <±1% change in respiration when temperature was varied ±15 °C over a 24 h period (see the supporting information for more details).

Results

Impacts of transport-related lags on regressions of surface flux and soil temperature

Owing to the attenuation and phase shift of soil temperatures with increasing depth, the relationship between modeled surface flux and soil temperature varied with soil temperature measurement depth (Fig. 1). Plots of surface flux against soil temperature produced hysteresis loops which changed in three respects with increasing depth: their rotational direction (see arrows in Fig. 1), their roundness or narrowness (minor radius), and the orientation of their principal axes. All three of

Fig. 1 Diel hysteresis between surface flux and soil temperature at several depths, and apparent \( Q_{10} \) values calculated from least squares regression (see text for details). Solid points show time = 12 h and arrows indicate the direction of hysteresis over time. Gray line represents the fitted mean that would produce an apparent \( Q_{10} \) equal to the input value of 2. \( D_t = 5 \times 10^{-2} \) m\(^2\) s\(^{-1}\) (same data as bottom panel of Fig. 3). Negative lags indicate surface flux reaching a maximum before temperature whereas positive lags indicate temperature peaking first.

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Global Change Biology, 17, 515–527
these qualities were functions of the lag time between surface flux and soil temperature. At depths where soil temperature reached a daily maximum before surface flux (e.g. at soil depths above 5 cm in Fig. 1), hysteresis loops rotated clockwise, while at deeper depths where soil temperatures peaked after surface efflux, the loops rotated counter clockwise.

The narrowness, or minor radius, of hysteresis loops, as well as the orientation, can be described as functions of lag time using principles of harmonic motions. As adapted from Beltrami (1996), two sine waves that are offset by a lag give the equation of an ellipse when superimposed perpendicularly:

$$R = R_A \frac{T}{T_A} \cos \delta + R_A \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{T^2}{T_A}\right)} \sin \delta,$$

where $R_A$ and $T_A$ are the amplitudes of respiration rate and temperature, respectively, $R$ and $T$ are instantaneous respiration rate and temperature, respectively, and $\delta$ is the lag, or the difference in phase between the temperature and respiration waves (expressed in radians). When the lag is a full period (equivalent to 0 or 24 h), the expression of an ellipse simplifies to a straight line with positive slope. For a 1/2 period (12 h), the expression simplifies to a straight line with negative slope. For lags of 1/4 period (6 h), the result will be a horizontal ellipse. Our results show it is possible to observe any of these orientations within a soil profile. Lags up to and exceeding 24 h occurred for deep reference soil temperatures, particularly at low thermal diffusivities, which slow propagation of temperature through the soil. With a reference soil temperature at 30 cm depth, lags exceeded a full 24 h period when values of $D_T$ became $<2 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$.

Even at soil depths where there was no time lag between temperature and surface flux, regressions did not produce close estimates of respiration temperature sensitivity. For the example in Fig. 1, surface flux was nearly synchronized with 5 cm soil temperature and little hysteresis was apparent. However, the least squares estimate of $Q_{10}$ was 1.53, which is substantially smaller than the actual $Q_{10}$ of 2.0 used to parameterize the model, shown in gray. The closest approximation of the input $Q_{10}$ occurred at 15 cm depth, despite pronounced hysteresis at this depth. This depth also is not associated with an area where most production occurs. The production profile for this simulation declined exponentially with depth, with more than two-thirds of CO$_2$ production occurring above 10 cm ($d_p = 10$ cm). There was no discrete soil depth where temperature was synchronized with surface flux and approximated the correct $Q_{10}$ value.

We found that in general, the strength of correlation ($R^2$) between surface flux and soil temperature measured at an arbitrary depth was strongly influenced by transport-related lags (Fig. 2a), and $R^2$ was a poor statistic for predicting what soil depth would return an accurate $Q_{10}$ (Fig. 2b). To examine the influence of lag time on $R^2$ and $Q_{10}$ values estimated from regressions of surface flux and soil temperature, we varied thermal diffusivity in the model, which as described below was the model parameter with the largest impact on lag time (Fig. 4a). We then examined regressions between surface flux and soil temperature using reference depths of 5, 10, 15, and 20 cm. We found $R^2$ had a predictable and regular relationship with lag time, regardless of the reference temperature depth (Fig. 2).

![Fig. 2](image_url)

**Fig. 2** Impact of phase lags on $R^2$ and apparent $Q_{10}$ calculated from regressions of surface flux and soil temperature. (a) $R^2$ for regressions with soil temperature at reference depths of 5 cm (○), 10 cm (△), 15 cm (●), and 20 cm (■). Lag time was varied by changing thermal diffusivity from $1 \times 10^{-8}$ to $9 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$, as in Fig. 4a. (b) Apparent $Q_{10}$ as a function of phase lag, normalized by the actual $Q_{10}$ used to parameterize the model. (c) Same as (b), but surface flux data was shifted to be in-phase with soil temperature before calculating apparent $Q_{10}$. Apparent $Q_{10}$ approached infinity with increasing phase lag, so only normalized values <2.5 are shown for clarity.

2a). $R^2$ peaked at 0 and 12 h lag, which is when the expression for an ellipse simplifies to a straight line, and reached a minimum at 6 and 18 h lag, which is when the expression produces a horizontal ellipse. As described above [Eqn (13)], the narrowness, or minor radius of hysteresis loops can be described as a function of lag time, and as hysteresis loops become more round the strength of correlation decreases, and as they become more narrow the strength of correlation increases.

The apparent $Q_{10}$ values calculated from regressions were also related to lag time, but the form of the relationship was different from the form of the $R^2$ relationship (Fig. 2b). As a result, the conditions providing the highest $R^2$ values did not produce the most accurate $Q_{10}$ values. The most accurate $Q_{10}$ estimates coincided with conditions which produced lag times of 3–4 h, and corresponded with a wide range of $R^2$ values. The $Q_{10}$ and lag relationship differed slightly for each reference depth because the slope of least squares regression, and therefore the $Q_{10}$, is also influenced by the amplitude of soil temperature variation at the reference soil depth [Eqn (13)].

Attempting to remove the lag by shifting surface flux data to be in-phase with soil temperature data before calculating the regression did not systematically improve estimates of $Q_{10}$ values (Fig. 2c). Calculated $Q_{10}$ values increased exponentially with the magnitude of the phase adjustment. For adjustments exceeding a few hours, this approach produced $Q_{10}$ values many times greater than the $Q_{10}$ used to parameterize the model. This indicates that knowing the lag time that is due to heat and gas transport does not readily help to determine meaningful $Q_{10}$ values. Even after adjusting for transport-related lags, the problem remains that no single reference soil depth consistently approximates the average temperature across the whole soil production profile.

These examples demonstrate that it is best to consider temperatures across the production profile to understand temperature–respiration relationships; however, for practical purposes, temperature measurements in field studies are often restricted to one or a few discrete soil depths. In order to strengthen conceptual links between processes that take place across the entire soil production profile, and patterns that may be observed in field data, for the remainder of this article we show most results using an arbitrary soil temperature depth of 10 cm. Also, because our simulations use an exponential relationship between temperature and CO$_2$ production, the time offsets between daily maximum respiration and temperature differ slightly from the time offsets between minimum values. For simplicity, we only report lag times between maxima, and note when trends differ for lag times between minima.

**Sensitivity of lag time to thermal diffusivity**

Thermal diffusivity ($D_T$) influenced the speed with which changes in air temperature propagated through soil, and the depth to which diel variations in air temperature were detectable (Fig. 3). As $D_T$ was increased in the model, changes in air temperature propagated through soil more quickly, which shortened lags between soil temperatures and surface flux. Variations in $D_T$ had a larger effect on lag times than any other single factor we examined, although the effect was nonlinear (Fig. 4a). Lag times varied sixfold for values of $D_T$ within the range of 1–10$^{-7}$ m$^2$s$^{-1}$, which is the approximate range for mineral soils experiencing normal field moisture levels (Ochsner et al., 2001). Lag times increased substantially for lower $D_T$ values in the range of 1–10$^{-8}$ m$^2$s$^{-1}$, which corresponds with the range for organic soils (Hillel, 1998).

**Sensitivity to CO$_2$ diffusivity, production depth**

In contrast to $D_T$, large changes in simulated $D_{CO2}$ had a relatively small effect on lags between surface flux and

---

Fig. 3 Effect of thermal diffusivity, $D_T$, on soil temperatures at several depths (solid lines) and surface CO$_2$ flux (dotted line). Soil temperature depths from darkest to lightest are: soil surface, 10, 20, and 30 cm depth. See Table 1 for values of other input parameters.
soil temperature (Fig. 4a), but $D_{CO_2}$ nevertheless had unique and complex impacts that are important for interpreting temperature–respiration relationships. We found that lags could occur not only between surface flux and soil temperature, but also between soil CO$_2$ concentrations and temperature measured at the same depth (Fig. 5a). Lags between soil CO$_2$ and temperature at the same depth were particularly pronounced at low $D_{CO_2}$. Low gas diffusivity increased the residence time of soil CO$_2$, causing delayed responses in CO$_2$ concentration to soil temperature changes. While lags between CO$_2$ concentration and soil temperature decreased as $D_{CO_2}$ was increased in the model, lags between surface flux and soil temperature sometimes showed the opposite response $D_{CO_2}$ impacts on surface flux lags depended on both the distribution of CO$_2$ production, and the depth of the reference soil temperature. When production was concentrated near the surface (Fig. 5b), the phase of the surface flux sine wave shifted closer to the waves of near-surface temperatures as $D_{CO_2}$ increased, but also shifted farther away from the waves of deep soil temperatures. At reference soil depths near the surface, lags between surface flux and soil temperature decreased with increasing $D_{CO_2}$, but at deeper reference depths lags increased. In contrast, when CO$_2$ production was uniformly distributed throughout the soil (Fig. 5c), a greater proportion of CO$_2$ came from deep soil layers, and increasing $D_{CO_2}$ caused the phase of the surface flux sine wave to shift closer to deep soil temperatures and to shift farther from air and near-surface temperature.

We also explored the sensitivity of lags to variations in production depth when $D_{CO_2}$ was held constant. Figure 4a shows changes in the depth of CO$_2$ production with respect to the exponential folding depth, $d_p$, where a higher $d_p$ indicates production is spread more evenly across the soil profile and a lower $d_p$ indicates production is confined more to the shallow subsurface. Changes in production within the shallow subsurface (e.g. an increase in $d_p$ from 5–10 cm) had greater impacts on lag time than changes in production deeper within the soil (e.g. an increase in $d_p$ from 60 to 70 cm), because most diel variability in soil temperature occurred at shallow depths. Even at very high $D_T$, diel temperature oscillations occurred primarily within the top few centimeters of soil. For example, for the maximum $D_T$ plotted in Fig. 4a ($D_T = 9 \times 10^{-7} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$), temperature amplitude decreases to approximately one-third by 16 cm depth. CO$_2$ production deep in the soil profile varied little throughout the day because it experienced a relatively constant temperature environment, so increasing production from deep soil did little to shift diel respiration oscillations.
Sensitivity to basal respiration rate and other environmental variables

Further sensitivity analysis revealed the general principle that variables which caused nonuniform changes in temperature or respiration across the soil profile tended to impact lag times. For example, changing the diel amplitude of air temperature \( A_0 \) tended to impact lags by altering temperature variation at shallow soil depths to a greater extent than deeper soil depths. Also, changing the temperature sensitivity of CO2 production by altering \( Q_{10} \) in the model affected lags by altering the proportional contribution from soils of different temperatures (Fig. 4b). See also the supporting information.

In contrast, increases in the basal CO2 production rate did not influence lags. Changing basal production rate alone did not alter the proportional contribution from each soil layer to surface flux.

Effects of soil moisture on phase lags

To model the physical effects of soil moisture on lags, we allowed both \( D_T \) and \( D_{CO2} \) to vary simultaneously as functions of air-filled porosity (Fig. 6a and b). \( D_T \) and \( D_{CO2} \) have different relationships with soil moisture: heat propagates more quickly through water than through air-filled pore spaces, whereas CO2 propagates more quickly through air-filled pores than through water. As simulated soil moisture was decreased, this caused an increase in \( D_{CO2} \) and a decrease in \( D_T \) but both had the same effect of increasing lag time between surface flux and 10 cm soil temperature (Fig. 6a), for reasons described above. As the lag time between surface flux and 10 cm soil temperature increased under dry conditions, hysteresis loops also became less linear and more elliptical in shape.

To demonstrate some of the potential impacts of moisture on biological activity, we added an additional level of complexity to the moisture simulation by decreasing basal CO2 production rate as a linear function of soil dryness (Fig. 6c and d). While this simple linear approximation may not be realistic for very high soil moistures, it is likely to represent respiration responses to drier soil moisture conditions. As soil moisture was decreased in the model, the diel amplitude of surface flux decreased, and hysteresis appeared to become more linear and horizontal (Fig. 6d). This occurred as a result of the magnitude and daily range of respiration changing, rather than a change in the orientation of the ellipses. Lags, which control the shape and orientation of hysteresis loops, remained unaffected by altered production rates (Fig. 6c). As mentioned above, simulated changes in basal production rate alone did not affect lag times unless the distribution of production was also changed.

Diel variation in atmospheric CO2

Concentrations of atmospheric CO2 within and near plant canopies often vary on a diel basis, due to plant gas exchange taking up CO2 during the day and releasing CO2 at night (Liu et al., 2006). We simulated diel oscillations in atmospheric CO2 as a sinusoidal wave with a daily range of 50 ppm. Data from the HJ Andrews Experimental Forest indicated that daily minimum CO2 concentration at the soil surface may be lagged from maximum temperature by as much as \( \pm 5 \) h, so we hypothesized that diel changes in atmospheric CO2 could modify surface flux and contribute to diel hysteresis between surface flux and temperature. Our simulations indicated, however, that atmospheric CO2 has a negligible effect on flux rates, particularly when compared with effects of temperature variation. When air and soil temperature were held constant, varying atmospheric CO2 alone changed surface flux rates by \( <0.5\% \). In contrast, when diel temperatures varied even moderately, CO2 production required little
temperature sensitivity to swamp the effects of atmospheric CO2 variations.

**Changing substrate supply**

Several lines of evidence have indicated close links between canopy carbon supply and soil respiration rates, including phloem girdling studies (Högberg et al., 2001; Tedeschi et al., 2006), studies across natural gradients of root activity (Tang et al., 2005), lag analyses between canopy variables and soil respired $\delta^{13}$CO$_2$ (Fessenden & Ehleringer, 2003; McDowell et al., 2004; Ekblad et al., 2005; Kodoma et al., 2008), and isotopic labeling studies of photosynthate (Högberg et al., 2008; Bahn et al., 2009). We simulated potential impacts of diel variations in subsurface photosynthate supply on hysteresis in the respiration vs. temperature relationship. There is much uncertainty regarding the specifics of phloem loading to roots and how much respiration responds to fluctuations in carbon supply, and we used a simple approach of modeling diel variation in photosynthate supply as a linear function of photosynthetic active radiation (PAR), increasing basal soil CO2 production rate from 1.5 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at night to 3 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in response to peak PAR over a 12 h photoperiod (Fig. 7a). As phloem transport may delay the supply of carbon substrates belowground, we also simulated a range of time offsets between peak PAR and

---

**Fig. 6** (a) Effect of moisture on thermal diffusivity (●), CO2 diffusivity (●), and the lag time between surface flux and 10 cm soil temperature ( ■) for a uniform sandy-loam soil. (b) Surface flux hysteresis for moisture-dependent conditions shown in (a). From lightest to darkest: 5%, 15%, 25%, 35%, 45%, and 55% water content (v/v). (c) Changes in total basal CO2 production (○) were added to simulations, but had no effect on lag times ( ■). (d) Corresponding surface flux hysteresis. From lightest to darkest: 5–55% water content (v/v), as in (b).

**Fig. 7** Potential responses of soil respiration to diel changes in photosynthate supply. (a) Diel changes in photosynthetic active radiation (PAR) (dashed black), air temperature (dashed gray), 10 cm soil temperature (solid gray), and surface CO2 flux (solid black). In this example, subsurface carbon supply peaked 16 h after PAR. (b) Hysteresis between surface flux and 10 cm soil temperature for various offsets between peak PAR and peak subsurface carbon supply: 16 h offset [solid black, same as in (a)], 20 h offset (dashed dark gray), and 26 h offset (dot-dashed light gray).
peak subsurface photosynthate supply (6–26 h). Some studies have suggested lags in soil respiration responses of less than a day (Tang et al., 2005), while others have suggested lags ranging 1–8 days (Högberg et al., 2001; McDowell et al., 2004; Mencuccini & Höltta, 2010); however, for illustrative purposes we focused on potential short-term responses to photosynthesis over the course of approximately 1 day. Because the timing and magnitude of impacts from photosynthetic carbon supply are likely to vary substantially (Kuzyakov & Gavrichkova, 2010), our goal was to emphasize only the gross patterns that could result from the combined influences from photosynthetic carbon supply and physical transport processes.

Diel variations in substrate supply substantially modified surface flux and produced hysteresis relationships with complex shapes (Fig. 7b). Although the shapes were quite variable depending on the timing of peak substrate supply, there were some consistencies among the curves that may be useful for interpreting field data. The hysteresis loops were consistently flatter on the bottom, corresponding with periods when PAR-dependent substrate supply ceased and respiration responded only to soil temperature. For large time offsets between substrate supply and soil temperature, soil respiration also exhibited double peaks over the course of the day, peaking once in response to maximum carbon supply and again in response to maximum temperature (Fig. 7a).

Discussion

The heat and CO₂ transport model described here demonstrates that purely physical drivers can have strong influences on diel dynamics of surface flux, and if transport-related lags are not accounted for, these influences may obfuscate the interpretation of the temperature sensitivity of soil respiration. Interpreting diel dynamics has two distinct but related challenges, discussed below: first, distinguishing the effects of temperature variation from other factors, and second, determining the temperature sensitivity of respiration given nonuniform soil temperature and production profiles.

Effects of soil moisture

Soil moisture can have multiple biological and physical influences on soil respiration, making it challenging to distinguish temperature and nontemperature influences on soil respiration across moisture conditions. We examined potential impacts of moisture on diel respiration dynamics both with and without biological responses to moisture. When only soil physical processes were represented in the model, decreasing soil moisture caused phase lags between surface flux and soil temperature to increase, and also caused diel hysteresis to become more pronounced (Fig. 6a and b). These purely physical trends are consistent with field observations in several studies. Under oak canopies, Tang et al. (2005) observed increasing lag times between surface flux and soil temperature at 8 cm depth as soils dried, although they attributed the lag to the influence of tree photosynthesis on respiration of the rhizosphere rather than to gas and temperature transport processes (discussed more below). Similarly, in mixed conifer forests (Vargas & Allen, 2008) and in shrub ecosystems (Carbone et al., 2008), the periods of most pronounced diel hysteresis coincided with the driest parts of the growing season.

The results from the these field studies seem to conflict with findings of Riveros-Iregui et al. (2007), who observed less pronounced hysteresis between soil CO₂ concentrations and temperature at 20 cm depth as soil dried. We found, however, that transport-related lags could occur not only between surface flux and soil temperature, but also in the type of measurements made by Riveros-Iregui et al., between CO₂ concentrations and soil temperatures measured at the same depth (Fig. 5a). Lags between soil CO₂ and temperature at the same depth consistently decreased as DCO₂ was increased in the model, opposite of how lags between surface flux and shallow soil temperatures behaved (Fig. 5b). In addition, we showed a potential biological explanation for decreased hysteresis with drying. When CO₂ production declined at low moistures, the magnitude and diel range of surface flux and subsurface concentrations decreased (Fig. 6c and d), which caused hysteresis to appear less pronounced and more linear at low moisture.

These examples demonstrate the difficulty of teasing apart moisture-dependent biological and physical processes that are potential drivers of diel respiration patterns. For example, it would be logical to interpret an increase in lag between surface flux and soil temperature as the soil dries as a product of substrate limitations (Carbone et al., 2008). Substrate limitations are indeed coupled with soil moisture, since low moisture can reduce canopy production and allocation of photosynthate belowground (Irvine et al., 2002, 2005), and also reduce diffusion of carbon substrates through soil (Davidson et al., 2006a). But increasing lags can also result from moisture influences on DT and DCO₂ (Fig. 6a), so it is unlikely that changes in lag times and diel hysteresis would be due to substrate limitations alone. Similarly, declines in the amplitude and apparent tem-
Detecting effects of factors other than temperature on diel surface flux patterns

Numerical simulations provide a theoretical limit to the impact of soil physical processes on lag times. We found that phase lags between surface flux and a reference temperature at 10 cm depth are between 1 and 4 h for mineral soils across a wide range of soil physical and environmental conditions (Figs 4 and 6). Lag times greater than this may be indicative of other biological factors influencing soil respiration. For example, Tang et al. (2005), found an approximately four hour lag between soil surface flux and temperature at 8 cm depth under an oak tree canopy, and no lag in an adjacent area of dead annual grasses. This large difference in lag times is unlikely to be a result of physical processes alone, since soil temperature data indicate $D_T$ was similar in the two locations. As Tang et al. concluded, photosynthetic carbon supply may have influenced the different diel patterns in these two locations.

Asymmetrical time series or hysteresis patterns also provide a tool for detecting impacts of environmental factors other than temperature. The simulations of diel changes in substrate supply (Fig. 7) demonstrated that asymmetrical hysteresis patterns can develop in response to processes that are limited to a portion of the day only, such as photosynthesis. This example also demonstrated that double peaks can form in diel time series of surface flux when peak carbon supply is offset by a long period from peak temperature. Carbone et al. (2008) also observed daily double peaks in field measurements of shrub and grassland ecosystems, particularly during parts of the growing season when soil respiration was most active. Asymmetrical diel patterns such as these cannot be accounted for by temperature alone and must be attributed to influences from more than one factor.

At a minimum, by measuring both air and soil temperature, or still better, measuring soil temperature at more than one depth, one can calculate soil thermal diffusivity to obtain a rough estimate of theoretical lags between soil temperature and surface flux due to heat transport. The time difference between peak temperatures measured at several soil depths can be used to constrain $D_T$ (Beltrami, 1996), which was shown to influence expected lag times more than any other single factor we examined. Even without more detailed information on other parameters, an estimate of $D_T$ can provide a rough approximation of expected lag times (e.g. Fig. 4). Because soil moisture has a large influence on $D_T$, such estimates may be particularly helpful for researchers trying to account for changes in diel respiration–temperature relationships over a range of moisture conditions.

The heat and gas transport model used in this study can be extended to simulate field studies, and may provide an approach to tease apart influences of temperature from other factors that have diel periodicity. Detailed environmental data and soil physical parameters are required to drive the model; however, such data are becoming increasingly available. The transport equations are limited, however, to conditions where soil heat transport is dominated by conduction and CO$_2$ transport is dominated by diffusion. More complex transport functions would be required to simulate heat transport in flows of soil water, or to simulate mass flow of CO$_2$ in response to pressure gradients. The model also emphasizes physical processes, and was less rigorous for representing biological relationships. Our approach for simulating diel variation in photosynthetic carbon supply was simplistic compared to the vegetation-specific model of phloem transport by Mencuccini & Höltta (2010), but could be readily coupled to such plant physiological models.

Impacts of diel dynamics on interpretation of temperature sensitivity

A related issue to distinguishing temperature and non-temperature respiration responses is describing the temperature sensitivity of soil respiration from diel datasets. Without any change to the true temperature sensitivity of soil respiration, phase lags can alter the orientation of regressions between surface flux and soil temperature, and impact least squares fits to the data. The fact that the apparent temperature sensitivity of soil respiration differs depending on the depth where temperature is measured has been described by others (Pavelka et al., 2007; Graf et al., 2008). Less widely appreciated, perhaps, is the fact that $Q_{10}$ estimates are related to the orientation of hysteresis loops, and can themselves be described as functions of lag times [Eqn (13) and Fig. 2].

There are several inherent problems with estimating respiration temperature sensitivity by regressing surface flux and soil temperature. The first problem is identifying an appropriate soil temperature reference depth, because $R^2$ relates primarily to how close the phases of surface flux and soil temperature are to one another (Fig. 2a), and does not predict the depth...
which returns the most accurate $Q_{10}$ value. Furthermore, the depth where soil temperature produces the most accurate $Q_{10}$ can be below the portion of the soil profile where most CO$_2$ production occurs (Fig. 1). Neither the depth where $R^2$ is highest nor the depth where apparent $Q_{10}$ is most accurate have mechanistic significance, they are coincidently associated with phase lags that produce interesting ellipses when surface flux and soil temperature are plotted perpendicularly. Using transport models, it may be possible to predict the depth that produces the most accurate $Q_{10}$ value. Graf et al. (2008) attempted this approach to determine the depth where $Q_{10}$ should be measured, using a physical model of soil respiration similar to the one presented here. In simulations spanning several model years, they examined the sensitivity of $Q_{10}$ uncertainty to soil physical and environmental parameters. Their simulations demonstrated two important points that are consistent with our results from diel simulations: that shallow depths underestimate $Q_{10}$ values, and that the depth of maximum correlation between surface flux and soil temperature is different than the depth returning the input $Q_{10}$. These results suggest that transport effects do not only create analysis challenges in diel datasets, but at longer timescales as well.

The underlying problem with estimating temperature sensitivity from surface flux is that surface flux is an integrated response to temperature across the soil profile, not just to soil temperatures at a single depth. Reichstein et al. (2005) presented a potential alternative for estimating soil respiration $Q_{10}$ values, by using a statistical model that represents surface flux as the summation of fluxes from different depths, and includes soil temperature measured at each depth. Using temperatures from two depths, the authors were able to explain more than 95% of the diel variation in surface flux data, as compared with only 80% when using soil temperature from a single depth. The multiple-source model also calculated higher $Q_{10}$ values than a single-source model. Results from our study and Graf et al. indicate $Q_{10}$ values are generally underestimated with a single, shallow reference temperature, so the dual source model may estimate $Q_{10}$ more accurately.

An alternative approach used by Risk et al. (2008) involved quantifying CO$_2$ production within the soil profile, and estimating temperature sensitivity by comparing production and temperature at the same depth. Fluxes within the soil can be determined from changes in CO$_2$ concentration over time. Soil profiling systems that are well-suited to this approach are becoming more widespread, and future work should further assess the potential for this approach and its limitations under non-steady-state conditions.

Even these alternative approaches are not immune, however, to influences from environmental variables other than temperature. Given that factors other than temperature are likely to influence diel patterns of soil respiration under field conditions, we recommend caution in interpreting any apparent relationship between soil respiration and temperature at diel timescales as a true measure of temperature sensitivity.

In conclusion, high-frequency soil respiration measurements have important potential for identifying influences from multiple environmental factors. However, heat and gas transport creates lags between surface flux and soil temperature that can easily be misinterpreted and obscure the direct impacts of temperature. Analysis approaches that represent surface flux as the summation of fluxes across a nonuniform soil profile may provide a means for handling transport-related lags and more accurately determining the temperature sensitivity of soil respiration.
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