# Carbon-isotopic composition of soil-respired carbon dioxide in static closed chambers at equilibrium

# Germán Mora<sup>1\*</sup> and James W. Raich<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geological and Atmospheric Sciences, Iowa State University, 253 Science I Hall, Ames, IA 50011, USA <sup>2</sup>Department of Ecology, Evolution and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, 253 Bessey Hall, Ames, IA 50011, USA

Received 14 March 2007; Revised 19 April 2007; Accepted 24 April 2007

The carbon-isotopic composition ( $\delta^{13}$ C) of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> has been employed to evaluate soil carbon-cycling processes and the contribution of soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to canopy and tropospheric air. These evaluations can be successful only when accurate isotope values of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> are available. Here, we tested the robustness of  $\delta^{13}$ C values of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> obtained after long incubations in static closed chambers that were initially flushed with soil air. The rationale of this approach is that the equilibrium carbon-isotope values of chamber-headspace CO<sub>2</sub> are theoretically equal to those of CO<sub>2</sub> produced within the soil. Static closed chambers were installed in replicated grass monocultures, and measurements of headspace CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and  $\delta^{13}$ C values were performed at regular time intervals for 24 h in July 2005. The results revealed no significant effects of grass species on headspace CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations or  $\delta^{13}$ C values (repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), P > 0.1). As predicted by theory, isotope values asymptotically approached equilibrium conditions, which in our experimental setting occurred after 10 h. This good match between model predictions and our results suggests that an accurate determination of  $\delta^{13}$ C values of CO<sub>2</sub> produced within soils is obtained through the isotopic measurement of chamber-headspace CO<sub>2</sub> once equilibrium conditions have been reached with the underlying soils. An additional advantage of this approach is that only one sample per chamber is required, which, combined with the low uncertainties of these measurements, facilitates the investigation of the spatial (landscape) variability of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>. Copyright © 2007 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

The carbon-isotopic composition of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> (the flux out of a soil) is an important parameter that has been used to evaluate soil carbon dynamics<sup>1–4</sup> and the role of soils in ecosystem carbon budgets in local,<sup>5,6</sup> regional,<sup>7</sup> and global investigations.8 Despite the importance of accurately determining  $\delta^{13}$ C values of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>, no consensus exists about the best methodology to measure this value. One of the most commonly employed methods includes the use of static closed chambers. Specifically, a chamber is inserted into the soil profile or is installed on top of the soil and, when closed, creates a headspace where soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> is allowed to accumulate. In the transient approach of this method, headspace air samples are taken at regular short-term intervals, and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and carbon-isotope ratios are both determined on the collected samples.<sup>4,6</sup> A two end-member mixing model is then employed to estimate the  $\delta^{13}$ C value of the soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>, under the assumption that atmospheric and soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> contribute CO<sub>2</sub> to the chamber headspace. This estimation follows the approach

\*Correspondence to: G. Mora, Department of Geological and Atmospheric Sciences, Iowa State University, 253 Science I Hall, Ames, IA 50011, USA. E-mail: gmora@iastate.edu

Contract/grant sponsor: NSF; contract/grant number: DEB-343766.

developed by Keeling,<sup>9,10</sup> in which the isotopic composition of the non-atmospheric end-member (soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>, in the current case) corresponds to the intercept of the least-squares linear relationship established by regressing the isotopic composition of sampled CO<sub>2</sub> against the inverse concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>. Although this approach requires a fairly significant number of samples to establish a linear relationship with a high r<sup>2</sup> value, the uncertainty associated with the intercept is large.<sup>11,12</sup> Ultimately, this uncertainty in the determination of the  $\delta^{13}$ C value of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> generates a large uncertainty in estimations of soil contributions to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>13</sup>

An alternative approach is to allow headspace  $CO_2$  to reach isotopic equilibrium with soil  $CO_2$ , which is advantageous because the isotopic composition of headspace  $CO_2$ at equilibrium equals that of the  $CO_2$  produced within the soils.<sup>14</sup> Despite its advantage, no study so far has established the robustness of the isotope results obtained through this equilibrium approach. The purpose of the present study is to



Copyright © 2007 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.



evaluate the uncertainty associated with measurements of the carbon-isotope composition of soil-respired  $CO_2$  in closed static chambers under equilibrium conditions.

#### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The CO<sub>2</sub> in soil pore spaces (or soil CO<sub>2</sub> as defined by Dörr and Münnich<sup>15</sup> and Cerling et al.<sup>16</sup>) derives mainly from atmospheric sources and the respiration of heterotrophic and autotrophic organisms. In general, the isotopic composition of soil CO<sub>2</sub> reflects that of the plants growing on those soils,<sup>17</sup> but it typically deviates from plant  $\delta^{13}$ C values as a result of a number of processes. For instance, the microbial degradation of plant material produces CO<sub>2</sub> with an isotopic composition that is different from that of the plant material.<sup>18</sup> In addition,  $\delta^{13}$ C values of soil organic matter (SOM) typically vary with soil depth<sup>19</sup> due to preferential degradation,<sup>20,21</sup> past changes in  $\delta^{13}$ C value of atmospheric  $CO_{2r}^{22}$  or, in some cases, past changes in the type (C3 vs. C4) of vegetation cover.<sup>23</sup> As a result, the  $\delta^{13}$ C values of SOM may differ from those of standing vegetation, and the  $\delta^{13}$ C values of CO<sub>2</sub> produced by the decay of SOM may differ both from those of the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by the respiration of roots and rhizosphere organisms, and from SOM itself. Moreover, the movement of CO<sub>2</sub> through the soil column produces a kinetic isotope effect associated with the faster diffusivity of <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> than that of <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>3</sub>.<sup>24</sup> As a result, soil CO<sub>2</sub> is preferentially enriched in  $^{13}$ C by a theoretical value of 4.4‰ relative to the CO<sub>2</sub> originally produced by biological activity. Thus, the carbonisotopic composition of soil-produced CO2 must be determined directly, in situ, if the information derived is to be useful for understanding soil carbon-cycling process.

Cerling<sup>24</sup> modeled the isotopic composition of soil  $CO_2$  considering the biological production of (respired)  $CO_2$  and the kinetic isotope effect associated with diffusion in the following terms:

$$\partial C/\partial t = D \ \partial^2 C/\partial z^2 + \Phi$$
 (1)

where C is CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, t is time, D is the effective diffusion coefficient of CO<sub>2</sub>, z is soil depth, and  $\Phi$  is biological CO2 production. As indicated by Amundson et al.,<sup>14</sup> this model serves to explain a number of observations, including the increase of soil CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations with depth, the variability of soil CO<sub>2</sub> isotope values with depth, particularly near the soil/atmosphere interface, and the <sup>13</sup>C-enrichment of soil CO<sub>2</sub> relative to that produced during the metabolic activity of roots and soil microorganisms. This isotope enrichment results from the kinetic isotope effect produced by the diffusion of CO<sub>2</sub> though the soil. Because the same isotope effect occurs during the passage of CO<sub>2</sub> from soil pores to the atmosphere, soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> is enriched in <sup>12</sup>C relative to soil CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>15,16</sup> An important aspect highlighted by Amundson et al.14 on the basis of finite difference solutions of Eqn. (1) is that the carbon-isotopic composition of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> at equilibrium must be equal to that of CO2 produced by soil microorganisms and roots. This property then permits the determination of the isotopic composition of biologically produced CO<sub>2</sub> in soils from measurements of equilibrium  $\delta^{13}$ C values of soilemitted (respired) CO2. In this study, we employ this

equilibrium approach to determine the isotopic composition of soil-respired  $CO_2$  in static chambers that are flushed with soil air. On the basis of theoretical considerations, we will determine whether the results from this approach reflect the isotope value of the  $CO_2$  produced within the soil.

#### **EXPERIMENTAL**

The study was conducted in C3 grass monocultures located in Marshall County, Iowa, USA (42.00°N, 93.25°W). The climate is strongly continental with a mean annual temperature of 8.7°C and a mean annual precipitation is 880 mm, most of which occurs during the growing season. We established a randomized block field experiment on Nodaway soils where tilled corn crops were formerly planted. The experimental setup consisted of four  $45 \text{ m} \times 15 \text{ m}$  blocks containing  $15 \text{ m} \times 15 \text{ m}$  plots that were planted with one of the following grass species in August 2001: Bromus inermis, Dactylis glomerata or Phalaris arundinacea. The chambers employed in this experiment to collect soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> consisted of PVC (polyvinyl chloride) tubes of 10.16 cm diameter and 25 cm in height. The tubes contained numerous holes of 6 mm in diameter that were drilled in the lower 12.5 cm of each tube to allow the growth of roots. The PVC tubes were pounded into the ground with a hammer, encompassing existing grasses, in each plot in June 2002, leaving about 5 cm above the soil (headspace). The bottom of the PVC tubes was left open throughout the experiment.

Samples of soil-respired CO2 were collected on July 3 and 4, 2005, with the aid of 10-mL septum-capped vials (Labco Ltd., High Wycombe, UK), which have proven to be reliable in isotope studies of soil and canopy CO2.<sup>25,26</sup> Between 24 and 48 h before collection, a small amount (~2g) of anhydrous magnesium perchlorate was introduced into the vials to keep the system dry and to prevent any isotopic exchange of the collected CO<sub>2</sub> with moisture. Prior to capping the vials, they were manually flushed with helium at a flow rate of 20 mL/min for 1.5 min to remove atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Isotopic analyses of these flushed vials (n = 5) yielded no signal, thus indicating the absence of CO<sub>2</sub> in the vials. Helium-flushed vials were then transported to the field. Prior to collecting soil gas samples, the field chambers were capped with a specially designed PVC cap, containing a sampling port that was created by drilling an opening into the cap and attaching a Swagelok fitting with epoxy resin adhesive (907 Miller-Stephenson Chemical Co., Danbury, CT, USA). The caps were then sealed with high-vacuum grease to prevent the entrance of atmospheric air and the leakage of soil-emitted gases. Once the chamber had been tightly capped, air in the headspace was flushed with soil air with the aid of a manual pump. When the flushing was complete, a Swagelok screw with septum was screwed on to the sampling port. The helium-filled vials were then attached to the Swagelok fitting with the aid of a sharp 1.1 mm diameter hollow needle, which allows the free exchange of gas between the vial and the chamber headspace. In lab tests, the helium-flushed vials were attached with the same hollow needle to 2-L glass flasks containing both 5% and 0.3% CO<sub>2</sub>, of known  $\delta^{13}$ C values, in helium. After 2 h, the measured  $\delta^{13}$ C values and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the vials were not significantly different (n = 4, *P* = 0.195, paired *t*-test) from those in the flasks, thus indicating that no isotope fractionation and no concentration bias occurred through the use of the hollow needles.

The vials were allowed to collect soil-respired  $CO_2$  for 2, 4, 8, 12 and 24 h. At each time the chamber headspace was flushed with soil air, i.e. the initial conditions were reset to time = 0 h before each subsequent sample collection. In addition, two air samples were collected in the field 2.5 m above the ground by opening the flushed vials in line with the prevailing wind direction for 1 min. The carbon-isotopic composition of the collected CO<sub>2</sub> and its concentration were measured within 48 h of collection, using a Finnigan GasBench II fitted to a Finnigan Delta Plus XL isotope-ratio mass spectrometer (Finnigan, Bremen, Germany). For carbon-isotope normalization, the samples were analyzed against two calibrated lab standards. CO2 concentrations were determined on the basis of the m/z 44 signal in the isotope-ratio mass spectrometer in a similar fashion to that described by Steinmann et al.27 Calibration was accomplished with vials filled with three different CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (0.3, 5 and 10%). The overall analytical uncertainty was better than 6% for CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and 0.12% for  $\delta^{13}$ C values (against the internationally accepted Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (VPDB) standard, which has a defined value of 0‰).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

No significant effects of grass species on headspace CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations or  $\delta^{13}$ C values were found at a given sampling time (repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), P > 0.1, Fig. 1). Consequently, the results for the species were combined for analysis (Table 1). Values of  $\delta^{13}$ C for soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> asymptotically decreased through time from -18.24% (95% confidence interval (CI) = 0.15) to -24.42% (95% CI = 0.24) in the studied plots (Fig. 1). Similarly, CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations increased through time from 0.22% (95% CI = 0.03) to 1.62% (95% CI = 0.06) (Fig. 1). The  $\delta^{13}$ C for near-surface atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> was -7.63% and its abundance was 386 ppmv.

The observed gradual decrease of isotope values for soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> with time, coupled with a gradual increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, is consistent with theoretical<sup>24</sup> and modeling<sup>14</sup> evaluations of the factors that control the isotopic composition of soil-respired CO2. Increasing CO2 concentrations result from a greater contribution of respired CO<sub>2</sub> over atmospheric inputs, which also explain the decreasing trend in  $\delta^{13}$ C values through time. Other field experiments with shorter (<2 h) collection times of soil-respired  $CO_2^{6,12}$ have also yielded increasing headspace concentrations and decreasing isotope values through time. However, our results show that the  $\delta^{13}$ C values of respired CO<sub>2</sub> asymptotically reach an equilibrium value over time (Fig. 1), changing by less than 0.05% per hour after 10 h of collection (Fig. 2). This rate of change was calculated from the first derivative of the asymptotic curve presented in Fig. 1. As indicated by theoretical considerations,<sup>4,14,16</sup> the importance of this equilibrium  $\delta^{13}$ C value is that it equals that of the CO<sub>2</sub> produced





**Figure 1.** Variation in (A) carbon isotopic composition of  $CO_2$  and (B)  $CO_2$  concentrations over time in static closed chambers installed in three grass monocultures. At each time period n = 12, with n = 4 per species. Vertical bars on each symbol represent ± 1 standard error. The curve in (A) represents a spline fit of the data ( $r^2 = 0.978$ ). Note that the  $\delta^{13}C$  values of chamber  $CO_2$  reach an equilibrium value of -24.42‰ after 10 h. This value falls between those of soil organic matter (-21.39‰, n=6) and of grass leaves (-27.37‰, n=12).

in the soil by roots and microorganisms. In our experimental setting, SOM exhibits an average  $\delta^{13}$ C value of -21.39% (95% CI = 0.32, n = 6), while leaves of the planted grasses show an average  $\delta^{13}$ C value of -27.37% (95% CI = 0.19, n = 12). The obtained equilibrium  $\delta^{13}$ C value of -24.42% (95% CI = 0.24) falls between the two sources of biologically produced CO<sub>2</sub>, thus providing support to the possibility of using this approach to evaluate belowground carbon dynamics.

Although the study of the isotopic composition of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> often involves its collection in pre-flushed chambers,<sup>6,28,29</sup> Ohlsson *et al.*<sup>12</sup> demonstrated that the level of flushing has an important effect on transient  $\delta^{13}$ C values of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>, and proposed that flushing creates an initial disturbance to the diffusion process, which affects the transient  $\delta^{13}$ C values that form the raw data of Keeling plot analyses. Because of this potential effect, Ohlsson *et al.*<sup>12</sup> suggested that non-flushed chambers should be employed to determine the isotopic composition of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>. We



**Table 1.** Average CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (in %) and their average carbon-isotopic compositions (in %) through time (in hours) in static closed chambers that were installed in plots planted with three different grass species. Values in parentheses represent standard errors (n = 4 for each species and n = 12 for all three species)

Hour	Bromus inermis		Dactylis glomerata		Phalaris arundinacea		All three species	
	δ <sup>13</sup> C (‰)	CO <sub>2</sub> (%)	δ <sup>13</sup> C (‰)	CO <sub>2</sub> (%)	δ <sup>13</sup> C (‰)	CO <sub>2</sub> (%)	δ <sup>13</sup> C (‰)	CO <sub>2</sub> (%)
2	-18.19 (0.12)	0.22 (0.007)	-18.12 (0.18)	0.22 (0.004)	-18.40 (0.05)	0.22 (0.002)	-18.24 (0.08)	0.22 (0.001)
4	-22.25 (0.16)	0.43 (0.008)	-22.15 (0.12)	0.41 (0.006)	-22.34(0.03)	0.44 (0.004)	-22.25 (0.07)	0.43 (0.004)
8	-24.09(0.11)	1.03 (0.010)	-23.72(0.22)	1.01 (0.028)	-24.16 (0.02)	1.03 (0.024)	-23.99 (0.10)	1.03 (0.012)
12	-24.31 (0.20)	1.44 (0.022)	-23.96 (0.31)	1.39 (0.051)	-24.46(0.04)	1.45 (0.045)	-24.24 (0.13)	1.43 (0.023)
24	-24.44 (0.22)	1.63 (0.060)	-24.13 (0.27)	1.59 (0.054)	-24.68 (0.05)	1.62 (0.053)	-24.42 (0.13)	1.62 (0.030)

argue, however, that flushed chambers can also be used for this purpose but only when measurements are performed at or near equilibrium conditions. In retrospect, pre-flushing the chamber headspaces is not a requirement since the initial conditions should have no influence on the isotopic equilibrium that is obtained after long incubations, but we did not specifically test that deduction. As predicted by theoretical considerations,<sup>24</sup> numerical models,<sup>14</sup> and empirical data (this study), this approach then permits the determination of the carbon-isotopic composition of biologically produced CO<sub>2</sub>, without the need for a correction factor. The disadvantages are that achievement of isotope equilibrium conditions requires longer collection times, particularly for soils with low respiration rates, thus precluding the study of belowground processes operating on short time scales (e.g., hourly), and that samples with very high CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (>1.6% in our case) are generated. Moreover, preliminary measurements may be needed to determine the minimum length of the incubation period that is needed in other locations, but both modeling<sup>14</sup> and our empirical data suggest that 10-12h should be sufficient. The advantages, however, are that only one sample per chamber is needed, thus reducing costs; that the obtained isotope values represent those of the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by belowground



**Figure 2.** Rate of change in the carbon-isotopic composition of chamber headspace  $CO_2$  through time, which was obtained from the first-derivative of the line in Fig. 1. Note that after 10 h, the isotope values varied within the analytical uncertainty of our measurements.

Copyright © 2007 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

metabolic processes, and possibly those of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>; and that the overall uncertainty of these isotope values originates from an analytical error, which is typically <0.1‰. In contrast, the standard error associated with a Keeling-type approach is in most cases no better than 0.3‰.<sup>12</sup> As pointed out by Phillips and Gregg,<sup>13</sup> improved precision in the determination of the isotopic value of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> permits the estimation of soil contributions to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> with high confidence, even if only a small difference in isotope values exists between the soil and plant sources. For example, this equilibrium approach facilitates evaluation of the spatial variability of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>  $\delta^{13}$ C values, which would then allow a better assessment of soil carbon dynamics and the role of soils in carbon budgets.

## CONCLUSIONS

Our study of the accumulation of  $CO_2$  in static closed chambers installed in grass monocultures revealed that the variability of chamber-headspace  $CO_2 \delta^{13}C$  values over time is consistent with the predictions of a numerical model developed by Amundson *et al.*,<sup>14</sup> indicating that  $\delta^{13}C$  values for soil-respired  $CO_2$  gradually decrease with time as the system reaches equilibrium conditions. This theoretical model also indicates that this isotope value equals that of the biologically produced  $CO_2$  in soils. Our results suggest that measurements of  $\delta^{13}C$  values of headspace  $CO_2$  in static closed chambers performed at or near equilibrium accurately reflect those of the  $CO_2$  produced by belowground metabolic processes.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments and Jin Zhang, Humberto Carvajal, and Mark Mathison for their assistance in the field and in the lab. This work was supported by NSF grant DEB-343766.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Rochette P, Flanagan LB, Gregorich EG. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1999; 63: 1207.
- Hanson PJ, Edwards NT, Garten CT, Andrews JA. Biogeochemistry 2000; 48: 115.
- 3. Ehleringer JR, Buchmann N, Flanagan LB. *Ecol. Appl.* 2000; **10**: 412.
- Soe ARB, Giesemann A, Anderson TH, Weigel HJ, Buchmann N. Plant and Soil 2004; 262: 85.

- 5. Broadmeadow MSJ, Griffiths H, Ehleringer JR, Hall AE, Farquhar GD. Stable Isotopes and Plant Carbon-Water Relations.
- Academic Press: San Diégo, 1993. 6. Flanagan LB, Brooks JR, Varney GT, Berry SC, Ehleringer JR. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 1996; 10: 629.
- 7. Nakazawa T, Sugawara S. J. Geophys. Res. 1997; 102: 3843.
- 8. Ciais P, Tans PP, Trolier M, White JWC, Francey RJ. Science 1995; 269: 1098.
- 9. Keeling CD. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 1958; 13: 322.
- 10. Keeling CD. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 1961; 24: 277
- 11. Pataki DE, Ehleringer JR, Flanagan LB, Yakir D, Bowling DR, Still CJ, Buchmann N, Kaplan JO, Berry JA. Global Biogeo-chem. Cycles 2003; 17: 1022. DOI: 10.1029/2001GB001850
- Ohlsson KEA, Bhupinderpal S, Holm S, Nordgren A, Löv-dahl L, Högberg P. Soil Biol. Biochem 2005; 37: 2273.
- 13. Phillips DL, Gregg JW. Oecologia 2001; 127: 171.
- 14. Amundson R, Stern L, Baisden T, Wang Y. Geoderma 1998; 82: 83.
- 15. Dörr H, Münnich KO. Radiocarbon 1980; 22: 909.
- 16. Cerling TE, Solomon DK, Quade J, Bowman JR. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 1991; 55: 3403.
- 17. Fritz P, Mozeto AA, Reardon FJ. Chem. Geol. 1985; 58: 89.

- Šantrůčková H, Bird MI, Lloyd J. Func. Ecol. 2000; 14: 108.
  Nadelhoffer KJ, Fry B. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1988; 52: 1633.
- Benner R, Fogel ML, Sprague EK, Hodson RE. Nature 1987; 20. 320: 708.
- 21. Bird M, Kracht O, Derrien D, Zhou Y. Aust. J. Soil Sci. 2003; 41:77
- 22. Fung I, Field CB, Berry JA, Thompson MV, Randerson JT, Malmstrom CM, Vitousek PM, Collatz GJ, Sellers PJ, Randall DA, Denning AS, Badeck F, John J. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 1997; **11**: 507
- 23. Mora G, Pratt LM. Quat. Sci. Rev. 2002; 21: 985.
- 24. Cerling TE. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 1984; 71: 229.
- 25. Tu KP, Brooks PD, Dawson TE. Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 2001; 15: 952.
- Midwood AJ, Gebbing T, Wendler R, Sommerkorn M, Hunt JE, Millard P. Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 2006; 20: 3379.
- Steinmann KTW, Siegwolf R, Saurer M, Korner C. Oecologia 2004; 141: 489.
- Buchmann N, Ehleringer JR. Agricult. Forest Meteor. 1998; 28. **89**: 45.
- 29. Andrews JA, Harrison KG, Matamala R, Schlesinger WH. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1999; 63: 1429.

