

1 **Soil microbial respiration in arctic soil does not acclimate to**  
2 **temperature**

3  
4  
5 **Authors:**

6 Iain P. Hartley<sup>1,\*</sup>, David W. Hopkins<sup>1,2</sup>, Mark H. Garnett<sup>3</sup>, Martin Sommerkorn<sup>4</sup> and  
7 Philip A. Wookey<sup>1</sup>

8  
9 **Affiliations:**

10 <sup>1</sup> School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling,  
11 FK9 4LA, UK

12  
13 <sup>2</sup> Scottish Crop Research Institute, Invergowrie, Dundee, DD2 5DA, UK

14  
15 <sup>3</sup> NERC Radiocarbon Laboratory, Scottish Enterprise Technology Park, Rankine  
16 Avenue, East Kilbride, Glasgow G75 0QF

17  
18 <sup>4</sup> Macaulay Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen, AB15 8QH, UK

19  
20 **E-mails:**

21 Iain P. Hartley: [i.p.hartley@stir.ac.uk](mailto:i.p.hartley@stir.ac.uk)

22 David W. Hopkins: [d.w.hopkins@scri.ac.uk](mailto:d.w.hopkins@scri.ac.uk)

23 Mark H. Garnett: [M.Garnett@nercrl.gla.ac.uk](mailto:M.Garnett@nercrl.gla.ac.uk)

24 Martin Sommerkorn: [M.Sommerkorn@macaulay.ac.uk](mailto:M.Sommerkorn@macaulay.ac.uk)

25 Philip A. Wookey: [philip.wookey@stir.ac.uk](mailto:philip.wookey@stir.ac.uk)

26  
27 **Running title:** Thermal acclimation of microbial respiration

28  
29 **Keywords:** Acclimation, adaptation, arctic, carbon cycling, climate change, CO<sub>2</sub>,  
30 respiration, microbial community, soil, temperature

31  
32 **Article type:** *Letter*

33  
34 **Number of words in abstract:** 169

35  
36 **Number of words in article:** 4497

37  
38 **Number of references:** 50

39  
40 **Number of figures:** 2

41  
42 **Number of tables:** 0

43  
44 **Correspondence author (\*):**

45 Iain P. Hartley, School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of  
46 Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK; E-mail: [i.p.hartley@stir.ac.uk](mailto:i.p.hartley@stir.ac.uk)

47 Tel: +44 1786 467757; Fax: +44 1786 467843

1 **Abstract**

2

3 Warming-induced release of CO<sub>2</sub> from the large carbon (C) stores present in  
4 arctic soils could accelerate climate change. However, declines in the response of soil  
5 respiration to warming in long-term experiments suggest that microbial activity  
6 acclimates to temperature, greatly reducing the potential for enhanced C losses. As  
7 reduced respiration rates could be equally caused by substrate depletion, evidence for  
8 thermal acclimation remains controversial. To overcome this problem, we carried out  
9 a cooling experiment with soils from arctic Sweden. If acclimation causes the  
10 reduction in respiration observed in warming experiments, then it must also  
11 subsequently increase rates post cooling. We demonstrate that thermal acclimation did  
12 not occur. Rather, over the following 90 days, cooling resulted in a further reduction  
13 in respiration which was only reversed by extended re-exposure to warmer  
14 temperatures. We conclude that, over the time scale of a few weeks to months,  
15 warming-induced changes in the microbial community in arctic soils will amplify the  
16 instantaneous increase in the rates of CO<sub>2</sub> production.

17

18

19

20 Key words: Adaptation, acclimation, arctic, carbon cycling, climate change, CO<sub>2</sub>,  
21 respiration, microbial community, soil, temperature

22

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2

3 Rising global temperatures are likely to increase the rate of soil organic matter  
4 decomposition resulting in a substantial release of CO<sub>2</sub> (Raich & Schlesinger 1992;  
5 Kirschbaum 1995), and this phenomenon has the potential to accelerate climate  
6 change by up to 40% (Cox *et al.* 2000). In fact, the importance of soil C-cycling is  
7 recognized in the updated IPCC scenarios (IPCC 2007). However, increasingly,  
8 ecologists are recognizing that in order to predict long-term trends in ecosystem C  
9 fluxes and biological feedbacks, greater emphasis needs to be placed on measuring  
10 potential acclimation and adaptation responses (Oechel *et al.* 2000; Enquist 2007).  
11 Critically, acclimation has the potential to reduce the projected soil-C losses  
12 associated with global warming (Luo *et al.* 2001).

13         Respiratory thermal acclimation has been defined as “the subsequent  
14 adjustment in the rate of respiration to compensate for an initial change in  
15 temperature” (Atkin & Tjoelker 2003). When many plant species are exposed to  
16 higher temperatures for a prolonged period of time, physiological acclimation results  
17 in a reduction in respiration rates allowing for the maintenance of a positive C balance  
18 (Atkin & Tjoelker 2003). Similarly, thermal acclimation of respiration has been  
19 demonstrated for both ectomycorrhizal (Malcolm *et al.* 2008) and arbuscular  
20 mycorrhizal fungi in soils (Heinemeyer *et al.* 2006), and the fungal symbiont in  
21 lichens (Lange & Green 2005). Further, although cooling reduces respiration rates,  
22 prolonged exposure often results in a subsequent increase in plant respiration rates,  
23 allowing for the maintenance of critical metabolic processes (Armstrong *et al.* 2006).  
24 Many physiological modifications have been observed in microbial communities  
25 present at low temperatures which allow for continued growth (D’Amico *et al.* 2006),

1 and this may suggest that there is potential for up-regulation of activity following  
2 extended exposure to the cold.

3 In soils, although increased rates of respiration have been observed in many  
4 warming experiments (Rustad *et al.* 2001), the magnitude of the initial positive  
5 response to temperature often declines over time (Rustad *et al.* 2001; Eliasson *et al.*  
6 2005). Because alterations in microbial community structure accompany soil warming  
7 in both the field (Zhang *et al.* 2005) and the laboratory (Zogg *et al.* 1997; Andrews *et*  
8 *al.* 2000; Pettersson & Bååth 2003; Pietikäinen *et al.* 2005), as well as in response to  
9 seasonal changes in temperature (Schadt *et al.* 2003; Lipson & Schmidt 2004;  
10 Wallenstein *et al.* 2007), the reduction in the initial positive response of soil  
11 respiration to warming may be the result of acclimation<sup>1</sup> of microbial respiration (Luo  
12 *et al.* 2001; Balser *et al.* 2006; Luo 2007; Wan *et al.* 2007).

13 Investigating temperature responses of soil respiration and microbial activity is  
14 complicated by the fact that the effect of experimental soil warming is confounded by  
15 the depletion of the most readily-decomposable soil C fractions. This could equally  
16 explain the reduction in respiration rates observed in long-term studies (Rustad *et al.*  
17 2001; Eliasson *et al.* 2005). Consequently, the main evidence for thermal acclimation  
18 of soil microbial respiration remains questionable (Kirschbaum 2004; Eliasson *et al.*  
19 2005; Knorr *et al.* 2005; Hartley *et al.*, 2007b).

20 Identifying the potential for thermal acclimation of microbial respiration in  
21 arctic regions is particularly important due to the high rates of global warming already  
22 being experienced at high latitudes (ACIA 2005), the general sensitivity of  
23 communities close to environmental extremes to changing conditions, and the large  
24 amounts of C stored in these systems (Post *et al.* 1982). In addition, substantial

---

<sup>1</sup>As the long-term response of microbial respiration to changes in temperature almost certainly involves a genetic component, acclimation is probably an inappropriate term for this response. We will return the issue of terminology in the discussion section.

1 changes in microbial communities have been observed between seasons in tundra  
2 soils (Schadt *et al.* 2003; Lipson & Schmidt 2004; Wallenstein *et al.* 2007) raising the  
3 possibility of acclimation of microbial respiration in these systems. Accurate  
4 predictions of the long-term rates of C and nitrogen cycling in arctic soils, which in  
5 turn may determine total ecosystem C storage (Hobbie *et al.* 2000), plant productivity  
6 (van Wijk *et al.* 2005) and species composition (Weintraub & Schimel 2005), require  
7 a much greater understanding of microbial acclimation responses.

8         Here we present the results from one of the first studies to investigate the  
9 effect of an extended period of cooling on microbial respiration, utilizing organic soils  
10 taken from a sub-arctic tundra heath system in northern Sweden. If thermal  
11 acclimation is responsible for the down-regulation of microbial activity observed at  
12 high temperatures, then microbial activity must be gradually up-regulated when  
13 temperatures are reduced. This is because, as a compensatory response, acclimation  
14 must be reversible; otherwise temporary exposure to higher temperatures would result  
15 in a permanent down-regulation of respiration, preventing the recovery of rates even  
16 when temperature have declined, for example between summer and winter. In support  
17 of this logic, changes in soil microbial community structure have been observed both  
18 when soil temperatures increase (Andrews *et al.* 2000; Lipson & Schmidt 2004) and  
19 decrease (Schadt *et al.* 2003; Monson *et al.* 2006), and the thermal optimum for the  
20 activity of key C-cycling enzymes has been to shown increase and decrease with  
21 seasonal changes in temperature (Fenner *et al.* 2005). Furthermore, thermal  
22 acclimation of plant respiration, in response to seasonal and experimental changes in  
23 temperature, is dynamic and reversible, occurring both in response to warming and  
24 cooling (Atkin & Tjoelker 2003; Atkin *et al.* 2005; Zaragoza-Castells *et al.* 2008).

1           Therefore, the use of experimental cooling allowed us to minimize the  
2 confounding factor of warming-induced substrate depletion (substrate depletion will  
3 occur at a slightly faster rate in the control soils, but total carbon losses should be  
4 sufficiently small to avoid confounding the results) whilst still determining whether  
5 soil microbial respiration acclimates to temperature. We demonstrate that (i) soil  
6 microbial respiration does not acclimate to temperature, (ii) the short-term  
7 temperature sensitivity of respiration is unaltered by the prevailing temperature  
8 regime, and (iii) when soil temperatures were reduced for an extended period of time,  
9 changes in the microbial community resulted in a further decrease in the baseline rate  
10 of respiration, lowering rates of CO<sub>2</sub> production beyond the instantaneous response to  
11 temperature.

12

## 13 **METHODS**

14

### 15 **Soil sampling and incubation**

16

17 On 13<sup>th</sup> September 2006, twenty-six soil cores (68 mm diameter and 100 mm deep)  
18 were removed from an area of tundra heath above the tree-line (at an altitude of  
19 approximately 750 m), about 200 km north of the Arctic Circle, near Abisko, northern  
20 Sweden (68°18'07''N, 18°51'16''E). The mean annual temperature at this site is -1°C  
21 with mean January and July temperatures of -12 and 11°C, respectively (van Wijk *et*  
22 *al.* 2005). The dominant plant species are ericaceous shrubs, mainly of the genera  
23 *Vaccinum* and *Empetrum*, with some dwarf birch (*Betula nana* L.) also present. The  
24 soils have an organic horizon of between approximately 5 and 20 cm deep (mean  
25 depth = 11 cm), overlying well-drained medium to coarse-grained till deposits with

1 some large boulders and intermittent pockets of mineral soil. In this study, only the  
2 organic horizon was sampled. This soil is well-suited for investigating the long-term  
3 response of soil microbial respiration to changing temperatures because it contains a  
4 large amount of C, but does not experience waterlogging (except briefly during spring  
5 melt), and field conditions can thus be well replicated in the laboratory. Further,  
6 issues such as the mineral protection of SOM changing with temperature are avoided  
7 (Rasmussen *et al.* 2006).

8         The soils were transported to the University of Stirling using cooled air cargo.  
9 The water content of the soil was raised to water holding capacity (WHC) and  
10 samples were placed in an incubator (MIR-153, SANYO, Loughborough, UK) at  
11 10°C ( $\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ ) for 110 days to allow respiration rates to stabilize as the most labile C  
12 pool was depleted and for the microbial community to adjust to this temperature.  
13 Sixteen cores were then transferred to a separate incubator (same make and model) set  
14 at 2°C ( $\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ ). Of these 16 cores, 10 were then maintained at 2°C for 90 days (*high-*  
15 *low* treatment), and the other 6 cores were returned to the 10°C incubator after 60 days  
16 at 2°C (the *high-low-high* treatment). The remaining 10 cores were maintained at 10°C  
17 for the whole 200-day incubation (*constant high* treatment). Soil samples were  
18 maintained at WHC throughout by frequent addition of distilled water. Data loggers  
19 (Tinytag® Plus, Gemini Data Loggers Ltd., Chichester, UK) connected to thermistor  
20 probes (PB-5001, Gemini Data Loggers Ltd., Chichester, UK) confirmed that the  
21 temperatures in the incubators remained stable. The incubation temperatures used are  
22 within the range regularly experienced by the soil during the growing season, and soil  
23 temperatures were not reduced below 0°C to avoid changes in substrate availability  
24 caused by the alterations in the proportion of liquid water present (Mikan *et al.* 2002;  
25 Monson *et al.* 2006) and freeze-thaw effects.

## 1 **Respiration measurements**

2

3 Respiration measurements were carried out using an infra-red gas analyzer (EGM-4,  
4 PP Systems, Hitchin, UK) connected to an incubation chamber (700 ml Lock &  
5 Lock® container, Hana Cobi Plastic Co Ltd., Seoul, Korea) in a closed loop  
6 configuration. The rate of CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation in the headspace was logged every 1.6  
7 seconds until a 35 ppm increase in CO<sub>2</sub> concentration had occurred. Therefore,  
8 measurements were made close to ambient CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Respiration rates were  
9 expressed as  $\mu\text{g C g C}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ .

10 Finally, at the end of the incubation, the short-term temperature sensitivity of  
11 respiration (between 2 and 10°C) in six replicates taken from the *high-low* and  
12 *constant high* treatments was measured. The samples were transferred to an incubator  
13 at 2°C, and one day later respiration rates were measured. The incubator temperature  
14 was then raised to 6°C and subsequently 10°C, before being reduced back to 6°C and  
15 then 2°C. The soils were maintained at each new temperature for approximately 24  
16 hours. Mean respiration rates were calculated at each temperature to allow changes in  
17 baseline rates of respiration over the five-day experiment to be included in the Q<sub>10</sub>  
18 calculation (Fang *et al.* 2005). Changes in baseline rates of respiration could have  
19 been caused by changes in soil moisture (although samples were watered each day),  
20 or growth of microbial biomass in the previously cooled soils (Monson *et al.* 2006).  
21 The aim of this temperature manipulation was to determine whether the direct or  
22 instantaneous response of respiration to temperature had been altered by the cooling  
23 treatment and, therefore, we wanted to account for any changes in baseline rates.  
24 Respiration rates were natural log transformed and plotted against temperature. Linear



1 regressions were then used to calculate the slope (K) of the relationship and Q<sub>10</sub>  
2 values calculated using Equation 1.

3

$$4 \quad Q_{10} = e^{10K} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

5

### 6 **Substrate-induced respiration**

7

8 At the end of the experiment, soil from all 26 samples was sieved through a 2 mm  
9 mesh, large root fragments were removed and sub-samples dried for moisture and C  
10 content (loss on ignition) determination. After all samples had been incubated at 10°C  
11 over-night, a solution containing 15 mg of glucose per gram of soil C was added to a  
12 5 g (fresh wt.) sub-sample of each soil, with the corresponding volume (1 cm<sup>3</sup>) of  
13 distilled water added to a further 5 g sub-sample. Total CO<sub>2</sub> production after 24 hours  
14 at 10°C was measured using gas chromatography (Model 90-P, Varian Aerograph,  
15 Palo Alto, CA, USA). The difference between the two treatments was considered to  
16 represent substrate-induced respiration (SIR), which is considered to be proportional  
17 to the size of microbial biomass (Anderson & Domsch 1978).

18

### 19 **Statistics**

20

21 Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS (SPSS Science, version 15,  
22 Birmingham, UK). Before cooling, one-way ANOVAs were used to determine  
23 whether there were any significant differences between the respiration rates of the  
24 soils in the different temperature treatment groups. Post-cooling, for the *high-low* and  
25 *high-low-high* samples, linear regressions were used to determine whether the

1 respiration rates changed significantly over the following 60 days. After the *high-low-*  
2 *high* samples were returned to 10°C, repeated measures ANOVAs and paired *t*-tests  
3 were used to determine whether there were significant differences between dates, both  
4 immediately before and after the cooling treatment was applied, and between the  
5 *high-low-high* and *constant high* treatments. At the end of the incubation, independent  
6 samples *t*-tests were used to determine whether the short-term temperature sensitivity  
7 of respiration differed significantly between the *high-low* and *constant high* soils, and  
8 paired *t*-tests were used to determine whether respiration rates differed between the  
9 increasing and decreasing phase of the manipulation. An independent samples *t*-test  
10 was used to determine whether the rate of SIR differed between samples that were at  
11 10°C at the end of the experiment (as there was no significant difference between the  
12 two treatments, *constant high* and *high-low-high* soils were grouped together)  
13 compared with the soils that were at 2°C at the end of the incubation (the *high-low*  
14 soils).

15

## 16 **RESULTS**

17

### 18 **Respiration rates**

19

20 Before cooling, there were no significant differences in respiration rates measured at  
21 10°C between the soils in the three temperature treatments ( $P = 0.622$ ; Fig. 1a). On  
22 day 110, the *high-low* and *high-low-high* cores were cooled from 10°C to 2°C and the  
23 following day the respiration rates had declined by about 67%. Over the following 60  
24 days, rather than an increase in the rate of respiration indicative of acclimation,  
25 respiration rates declined significantly by on average 28% (Fig. 1b). The effect of

1 temperature manipulation on the rate of respiration can be expressed using  $Q_{10}$   
2 functions (Equation 1):

$$3 \quad R_T = R_0 * Q_{10}^{(T/10)} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

4

5 Where  $R_T$  is the respiration rate at temperature (T),  $R_0$  is the respiration rate at 0°C  
6 and  $Q_{10}$  is the proportion change in the rate of respiration given a 10°C change in  
7 temperature. The equations corresponding to the mean effect of cooling for 1 and 60  
8 days across both the *high-low* and *high-low-high* soils are as follows:

$$9 \quad R_T = 2.18 * 4.01^{(T/10)} \quad \text{Day 1}$$

$$10 \quad R_T = 1.44 * 6.06^{(T/10)} \quad \text{Day 60}$$

11

12 The reduction in the baseline rate of respiration caused by the cooling treatment has  
13 increased the apparent temperature sensitivity of respiration by ~50% (i.e.  $Q_{10}$  values  
14 have increased from 4.01 to 6.06).

15 However, in the *high-low* treatment, about 50 days after cooling, respiration  
16 rates stabilized with there being no significant subsequent change in rates between  
17 days 157 and 200 (linear regression:  $P = 0.404$ ; Fig. 1). In contrast, over the entire  
18 incubation period, the respiration rate of the *constant high* cores did not change  
19 significantly (linear regression:  $P = 0.359$ ) indicating that the gradual reduction in  
20 respiration rates only occurred when soil temperatures were reduced. These results  
21 demonstrate that sustained exposure to low temperatures amplified the negative effect  
22 of cooling on soil respiration rates.

1           On day 171, the *high-low-high* cores were returned to 10°C and respiration  
2 rates increased by approximately 72%. However, this rate was significantly less than  
3 that measured on day 109, immediately before the temperature reduction (paired  
4 *t*-test:  $P = 0.037$ ; Fig. 1c). This indicated that the reduction in respiration rates  
5 observed at 2°C was still apparent when samples were returned to 10°C. Over the  
6 following 28 days (i.e. days 172-200) the respiration rate increased by approximately  
7 22% with the rate measured on day 193 differing significantly from the rate measured  
8 on day 172 ( $P = 0.028$ ; Fig. 1c). Further, the increase in respiration rates during this  
9 period only occurred in the *high-low-high* samples and not in the *constant high*  
10 samples ( $P = 0.026$ ; Fig. 1c). Thus, extended exposure to 10°C was required for the  
11 respiration rates to recover to their pre-cooling levels.

12

### 13 **Temperature sensitivity of respiration**

14

15 At the end of the 200-day incubation period, the response of the *constant high* and  
16 *high-low* samples to short-term changes in temperature was investigated. Overall,  
17 respiration rates were highly temperature sensitive, but there was no significant  
18 difference between treatments (Fig. 2;  $P = 0.149$ ) suggesting that extended exposure  
19 to 2°C had not resulted in microbial respiration becoming more (or less) temperature  
20 sensitive.

21           However, the response of respiration to the increasing phase of the  
22 temperature manipulation was significantly higher in the *high-low* soils than in the  
23 *constant high* soils (*high-low*:  $Q_{10} = 4.736 \pm 0.248$ ; *constant high*:  $Q_{10} = 3.959 \pm 0.189$ ;  
24  $P = 0.032$ ). This appeared to have been caused by a significant increase in the baseline  
25 rate of respiration in the *high-low* soils as demonstrated by significantly (or

1 marginally significantly) higher rates of respiration on the declining phase of the  
2 temperature manipulation (Fig. 2; 6°C: P = 0.053, 2°C: P = 0.001). No corresponding  
3 significant increase in the rate of respiration was observed in the *constant-high*  
4 treatment. The Q<sub>10</sub> values calculated for the declining phase of the manipulation were  
5 similar and not significantly different (*high-low*: Q<sub>10</sub> = 3.859±0.214; *constant high*:  
6 Q<sub>10</sub> = 3.655±0.197; P = 0.497).

7

### 8 **Substrate-induced respiration**

9

10 A significantly greater rate of SIR (measured at 10°C in all cases) was observed in the  
11 soil samples that were at 10°C at the end of the experiment compared to those that  
12 were at 2°C (*t*-test: P = 0.027; 75.3 vs. 66.7 µg C g<sup>-1</sup> soil C h<sup>-1</sup>).

13

## 14 **DISCUSSION**

15

### 16 **Thermal acclimation**

17

18 Our soil-cooling experiment produced no evidence that microbial respiration  
19 acclimates to temperature. The length of incubation carried out in our experiment  
20 should have allowed for thermal acclimation of microbial respiration to occur given  
21 that changes in microbial communities have been observed between seasons in tundra  
22 soils (Schadt *et al.* 2003; Lipson & Schmidt 2004; Wallenstein *et al.* 2007), and in  
23 response to temperature changes in laboratory experiments of a similar duration  
24 (Pettersson & Bååth 2003). Therefore, our results provide support for the modeling  
25 studies (Kirschbaum 2004; Eliasson *et al.* 2005; Knorr *et al.* 2005) that have proposed

1 that the decline in the initial positive response of soil respiration to increased  
2 temperatures in long-term warming studies is due to substrate depletion and not  
3 acclimation of microbial respiration.

4 Unlike plants it appears that the respiration of free-living, heterotrophic soil  
5 microbes does not acclimate to temperature. This is perhaps not surprising given the  
6 fundamental differences that exist between autotrophic and heterotrophic organisms.  
7 Whilst physiological acclimation serves to maintain a positive C balance in plants  
8 when shifted to a higher growth temperature (Atkin & Tjoelker 2003), it is unclear  
9 what advantage microbes would gain from reduced activity once temperature  
10 constraints have been relaxed. Thermal acclimation has been observed in mycorrhizal  
11 fungi (Heinemeyer *et al.* 2006; Malcolm *et al.* 2008) and the fungal component of  
12 lichens (Lange & Green 2005), but the activity of these microbes is tightly linked to,  
13 and controlled by (Heinemeyer *et al.* 2006), the rate of photosynthesis in their  
14 symbiotic partners. As such, these organisms are not representative of free-living  
15 heterotrophic microbes in soils.

16 Previously, it has been shown that the temperature sensitivity of microbial  
17 activity may increase in microbial communities adapted to low temperatures (Monson  
18 *et al.* 2006), and that it may be the temperature response rather than the baseline rate  
19 of respiration that changes when systems acclimate to temperature (Luo *et al.* 2001;  
20 Wan *et al.* 2007). However, we found little evidence for the microbial respiration  
21 being more temperature sensitive in the cooled soils. The apparent down-regulation of  
22 the temperature response, that was observed in previous studies (Luo *et al.* 2001; Wan  
23 *et al.* 2007), was based on changes in seasonal  $Q_{10}$ s in intact plant-soil systems. These  
24 results could have been caused by seasonal changes in the contributions of roots  
25 versus soil microbes to total belowground respiration. Hartley *et al.* (2007a)

1 demonstrated that rhizosphere respiration responded less to soil warming than  
2 microbial respiration in bare soil. As the contribution of the more temperature  
3 insensitive flux, rhizosphere respiration, is likely to be greatest during mid season, a  
4 time when soil temperatures are likely to be highest, this could explain the apparent  
5 reduction in the temperature sensitivity of respiration in warmed plots (i.e. differences  
6 between warmed and ambient plots are expected to be lowest during the time of year  
7 when rhizosphere respiration contributes the most to belowground respiration). Our  
8 results indicate that it is unlikely that the development of a microbial community  
9 which responds little to changes in temperature can explain the lower seasonal  $Q_{10}$ s  
10 measured in the warmed plots in previous studies (Luo *et al.* 2001; Wan *et al.* 2007).  
11 In our study, by carrying out our measurements in the absence of a rhizosphere, we  
12 avoided the possibility of microbial responses being mediated through changes in  
13 plant activity.

14

### 15 **Adaptation enhancing a positive feedback**

16

17 Our study goes further than demonstrating that thermal acclimation does not occur in  
18 these sub-arctic soils. Exposure to low temperatures for an extended period reduced  
19 the rate of respiration beyond the initial short-term response (Fig. 1b) and, similarly,  
20 extended exposure to moderate temperatures resulted in an increase in activity beyond  
21 the instantaneous response to temperature (Fig. 1c). Further, as the rate of SIR  
22 (measured at 10°C in all cases) was significantly lower in the cooled soils, it appears  
23 the microbial community had been affected. Whether the lower SIR rate in the cooled  
24 soil was due to a reduction in microbial biomass *per se* or reflected a shift in  
25 microbial community structure is debatable. However, the results from our study

1 suggest that the microbial community was altered by the cooling and that this resulted  
2 in a further reduction in respiration rates. Therefore, at the low to moderate  
3 temperatures experienced in many soils, such as the arctic soil investigated here, when  
4 global warming increases soil temperatures it seems probable that C losses will be  
5 enhanced by changes in microbial community functioning.

6 In support of this suggestion, a soil-warming study demonstrated that, during  
7 winter months, microbial activity in warmed plots was higher than in control plots  
8 even when measurements were made at a common temperature; it was concluded that  
9 warming had produced a more active microbial community (Hartley *et al.* 2007a).  
10 Further, it has been demonstrated that the temperature optimum for the activity of key  
11 microbial enzymes in organic soils may shift with time of year (Fenner *et al.* 2005),  
12 and that thermal tolerances of bacterial community activity gradually change in  
13 response to temperature manipulations (Pettersson & Bååth 2003). Rather than a  
14 compensatory response, it appears that, in the longer term, changes in the microbial  
15 community may result in a further increase in activity as temperatures rise. Therefore,  
16 soil-C losses from cold environments, and during winter periods, are likely to be  
17 enhanced by climate change due to changes in soil microbial communities amplifying  
18 the instantaneous response to temperature.

19 Here we return to the issue of terminology; the changes in the microbial  
20 community which resulted in the decreasing rate of respiration for the 60-day period  
21 after cooling, and the increase in the rate of respiration following warming of the  
22 *high-low-high* soils, should be termed adaptation as it almost certainly contains a  
23 genetic component. We reiterate that the term acclimation is probably never  
24 appropriate when referring to a change occurring at the level of the whole community.



1 If a compensatory response is observed then perhaps the term “compensatory  
2 adaptation” would be more appropriate.

3         Previously, studies which have modeled mineralization kinetics based on the  
4 results of incubation studies have suggested that substrate pool sizes may increase at  
5 higher temperatures (MacDonald et al. 1995; Waldrop & Firestone 2004; Rasmussen  
6 *et al.* 2006). Molecules that decompose in reactions with large activation energies are  
7 likely to decompose especially slowly at low temperatures (Davidson & Janssens  
8 2006; Hartley & Ineson 2008), but may become more available at increased  
9 temperatures, potentially explaining the increased pool sizes and shifts in substrate  
10 utilization patterns observed in these studies (e.g. Waldrop & Firestone 2004). Within  
11 this context, in the study presented here, the gradual reduction in respiration rates  
12 post-cooling may reflect a loss of the most labile pool of substrates which are most  
13 available to microbes at low temperatures. This may in turn have induced the changes  
14 in the microbial community that occurred (reflected by the reduction in SIR). On  
15 return to the warmer temperature, thermal constraints on substrate availability may  
16 have been relaxed and the microbes again adapted to their prevailing environment.

17         This is just one potential explanation for the reduction in respiration rates that  
18 occurred post-cooling and the changes in the microbial community. However, it is  
19 clear that thermal acclimation of microbial respiration did not occur, and adaptive  
20 responses of soil microbes to increasing temperatures may accelerate decomposition  
21 rates, at least at the low to moderate temperatures experienced in many soils.

22  
23  
24  
25

## 1 **Timescale of the response of microbial respiration to warming**

2

3 In light of the findings of this study we can perhaps consider three separate processes  
4 which may determine the rate of soil C losses from arctic soils over different  
5 timescales. Firstly, in agreement with the study of Mikan *et al.* (2002), we found a  
6 strong instantaneous response of microbial respiration to changes in temperature  
7 (Fig. 2). When changes in the baseline rate of respiration were accounted for it  
8 appeared that the temperature sensitivity of respiration was not affected by the  
9 thermal regime the microbes had experienced.

10 Secondly, cooling reduced the baseline rate of respiration as the microbial  
11 community was altered by the new temperature, and this medium-term response to the  
12 temperature manipulation was reversible. It should be mentioned that there was some  
13 evidence of a faster response of the microbial community to the warming than the  
14 cooling treatment. It took almost 60 days for the full cooling effect to occur whilst  
15 rates had fully recovered within 30 days of warming in the *high-low-high* samples. In  
16 addition, there was some evidence of an almost immediate, partial up-regulation of  
17 the baseline rate of respiration in the *high-low* soils during the short-term temperature  
18 manipulation. Therefore, at a timescale of about 1 month, respiration rates are likely  
19 to increase in warmer arctic soils as changes in the microbial community result in an  
20 increase in the baseline rate.

21 Thirdly, at the decadal time scale, there may be a change in both total SOM  
22 stocks as warming stimulates C loss, and also a change in the composition of SOM as  
23 substrate pools with shorter turnover times are preferentially lost (Ågren & Bosatta,  
24 2002; Kirschbaum 2004; Eliasson *et al.* 2005; Knorr *et al.* 2005). These changes will  
25 result in a subsequent decline in the rates of microbial respiration.

1           Finally, *in situ*, if higher decomposition rates increase soil nutrient availability  
2 (Schmidt *et al.* 2002; Pregitzer *et al.* 2008), increased plant productivity may partly or  
3 fully offset these C losses, and so determine the extent to which rates of microbial  
4 respiration decline. However, further research is required to estimate the importance  
5 of this potential feedback.

6

7 **CONCLUSION**

8

9 Compensatory thermal acclimation of soil microbial respiration did not occur in our  
10 experiment. Rather, the effect of temperature on microbial community functioning  
11 increased respiration rates beyond the instantaneous effect of temperature. This  
12 response may enhance substantially soil-C losses, at least at low to moderate  
13 temperatures. Taking into account the rapid rate of climate change predicted for high-  
14 latitude ecosystems, and the high temperature sensitivity of decomposition measured  
15 at low temperatures, the large C stores in arctic and alpine soils may be especially  
16 vulnerable. Given that they contain over 20% of soil C, increased decomposition in  
17 these ecosystems has the potential to accelerate climate change. Finally, our study  
18 highlights the need to consider not only the instantaneous responses of processes to  
19 changes in abiotic factors, but also any adaptive responses that may subsequently  
20 occur at the community or ecosystem level. This remains a major challenge for  
21 understanding and predicting ecological responses and biological feedbacks to climate  
22 change.

23

24

25

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2

3 This work was carried out within the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)  
4 funded Arctic Biosphere Atmosphere Coupling at Multiple Scales (ABACUS) project  
5 (a contribution to International Polar Year 2007-2008). We thank Lorna English and  
6 Laura-Lee Shillam for their help with the microbial biomass analyses. This  
7 manuscript was improved in response to the helpful comments of three referees.

8

9 **REFERENCES**

10

11 ACIA (2005). *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge University Press,  
12 Cambridge.

13

14 Ågren, G.I. & Bosatta, E. (2002) Reconciling differences in predictions of  
15 temperature response of soil organic matter. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 34, 129-132.

16

17 Anderson, J.P.E. & Domsch, K.H. (1978). Physiological Method for Quantitative  
18 Measurement of Microbial Biomass in Soils. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 10, 215-221.

19

20 Andrews, J.A., Matamala, R., Westover, K.M. & Schlesinger, W.H. (2000).  
21 Temperature effects on the diversity of soil heterotrophs and the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of soil-respired  
22  $\text{CO}_2$ . *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 32, 699-706.

23

1 Armstrong, A.F., Logan, D.C., Tobin, A.K., O'Toole, P. & Atkin, O.K. (2006).  
2 Heterogeneity of plant mitochondrial responses underpinning respiratory acclimation  
3 to the cold in *Arabidopsis thaliana* leaves. *Plant Cell Environ.*, 29, 940-949.  
4  
5 Atkin, O.K., Bruhn, D., Hurry, V.M., Tjoelker, M.G. (2005). The hot and the cold:  
6 unravelling the variable response of plant respiration to temperature. *Funct. Plant*  
7 *Biol.*, **32**, 87-105.  
8  
9 Atkin, O.K. & Tjoelker, M.G. (2003). Thermal acclimation and the dynamic response  
10 of plant respiration to temperature. *Trends Plant Sci.*, 8, 343-351.  
11  
12 Balsler, T.C., McMahon, K.D., Bart, D., Bronson, D., Coyle, D.R., Craig, N., Flores-  
13 Mangual, M.L., Forshay, K., Jones, S.E., Kent, A.E. & Shade, A.L. (2006). Bridging  
14 the gap between micro - and macro-scale perspectives on the role of microbial  
15 communities in global change ecology. *Plant Soil*, 289, 59-70.  
16  
17 Cox, P.M., Betts, R.A., Jones, C.D., Spall, S.A. & Totterdell, I.J. (2000). Acceleration  
18 of global warming due to carbon-cycle feedbacks in a coupled climate model. *Nature*,  
19 408, 184-187.  
20  
21 D'Amico, S., Collins, T., Marx, J.C., Feller, G. & Gerday, C. (2006). Psychrophilic  
22 microorganisms: challenges for life. *EMBO rep.*, 7, 385-389.  
23  
24 Davidson, E.A. & Janssens, I.A. (2006). Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon  
25 decomposition and feedbacks to climate change. *Nature*, 440, 165-173.

1

2 Eliasson, P.E., McMurtrie, R.E., Pepper, D.A., Stromgren, M., Linder, S. & Ågren,  
3 G.I. (2005). The response of heterotrophic CO<sub>2</sub> flux to soil warming. *Glob. Change*  
4 *Biol.*, 11, 167-181.

5

6 Enquist, B. J. (2007). Journal Club - An Ecologist wonders how biotic feedback  
7 matters to global-change research. *Nature*, **450**, 139.

8

9 Fang, C.M., Smith, P., Moncrieff, J.B. & Smith, J.U. (2005). Similar response of  
10 labile and resistant soil organic matter pools to changes in temperature. *Nature*, 433,  
11 57-59.

12

13 Fenner, N., Freeman, C. & Reynolds, B. (2005). Observations of a seasonally shifting  
14 thermal optimum in peatland carbon-cycling processes; implications for the global  
15 carbon cycle and soil enzyme methodologies. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 37, 1814-1821.

16

17 Hartley, I.P., Heinemeyer, A., Evans, S.P. & Ineson, P. (2007a). The effect of soil  
18 warming on bulk soil vs. rhizosphere respiration. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 13, 2654-2667.

19

20 Hartley, I.P., Heinemeyer, A., & Ineson, P. (2007b). Effects of three years of soil  
21 warming and shading on the rate of soil respiration: substrate availability and not  
22 thermal acclimation mediates observed response. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 13, 1761-1770.

23

1 Hartley, I.P. & Ineson, P. (2008) Substrate quality and the temperature sensitivity of  
2 soil organic matter decomposition. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, doi:  
3 10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.01.007.  
4  
5 Heinemeyer, A., Ineson, P., Ostle, N. & Fitter, A.H. (2006). Respiration of the  
6 external mycelium in the arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis shows strong dependence  
7 on recent photosynthates and acclimation to temperature. *New Phytol.*, 171, 159-170.  
8  
9 Hobbie, S.E., Schimel, J.P., Trumbore, S.E. & Randerson, J.R. (2000). Controls over  
10 carbon storage and turnover in high-latitude soils. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 6, 196-210.  
11  
12 IPCC (2007) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge  
13 University Press, Cambridge, 2007.  
14  
15 Kirschbaum, M.U.F. (1995). The temperature-dependence of soil organic-matter  
16 decomposition, and the effect of global warming on soil organic-C storage. *Soil Biol.*  
17 *Biochem.*, 27, 753-760.  
18  
19 Kirschbaum, M.U.F. (2004). Soil respiration under prolonged soil warming: are rate  
20 reductions caused by acclimation or substrate loss? *Glob. Change Biol.*, 10, 1870-  
21 1877.  
22  
23 Knorr, W., Prentice, I.C., House, J.I. & Holland, E.A. (2005). Long-term sensitivity of  
24 soil carbon turnover to warming. *Nature*, 433, 298-301.  
25

1 Lange, O.L. & Green, T.G.A. (2005). Lichens show that fungi can acclimate their  
2 respiration to seasonal changes in temperature. *Oecologia*, 142, 11-19.  
3  
4 Lipson, D.A. & Schmidt, S.K. (2004). Seasonal changes in an alpine soil bacterial  
5 community in the Colorado Rocky Mountains. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 70, 2867-  
6 2879.  
7  
8 Luo, Y. (2007) Terrestrial Carbon–Cycle Feedback to Climate Warming. *Annu. Rev.*  
9 *Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, 38, 683-712.  
10  
11 Luo, Y., Wan, S.Q., Hui, D.F. & Wallace, L.L. (2001). Acclimatization of soil  
12 respiration to warming in a tall grass prairie. *Nature*, 413, 622-625.  
13  
14 MacDonald, N.W., Zak, D.R. & Pregitzer, K.S. (1995). Temperature effects on  
15 kinetics of microbial respiration and net nitrogen and sulfur mineralization. *Soil Sci.*  
16 *Soc. Am. J.*, 59, 233-240.  
17  
18 Malcolm, G.M., López-Gutiérrez, J.C., Koide, R.T. & Eissenstat, D.M. (2008)  
19 Acclimation to temperature and temperature sensitivity of metabolism by  
20 ectomycorrhizal fungi. *Glob. Change Biol.*, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01555.x.  
21  
22 Mikan, C.J., Schimel, J.P. & Doyle, A.P. (2002). Temperature controls of microbial  
23 respiration in arctic tundra soils above and below freezing. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 34,  
24 1785-1795.  
25



1 Monson, R.K., Lipson, D.L., Burns, S.P., Turnipseed, A.A., Delany, A.C., Williams,  
2 M.W. & Schmidt, S.K. (2006). Winter forest soil respiration controlled by climate and  
3 microbial community composition. *Nature*, 439, 711-714.  
4

5 Oechel, W.C., Vourlitis, G.L., Hastings, S.J., Zulueta, R.C., Hinzman, L. & Kane, D.  
6 (2000). Acclimation of ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in the Alaskan Arctic in response to  
7 decadal climate warming. *Nature*, 406, 978-981.  
8

9 Pettersson, M. & Bååth, E. (2003). Temperature-dependent changes in the soil  
10 bacterial community in limed and unlimed soil. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.*, 45, 13-21.  
11

12 Pietikäinen, J., Pettersson, M. & Bååth E. (2005). Comparison of temperature effects  
13 on soil respiration and bacterial and fungal growth rates. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.*, 52,  
14 49-58.  
15

16 Post, W.M., Emanuel, W.R., Zinke, P.J. & Stangenberger, A.G. (1982). Soil carbon  
17 pools and world life zones. *Nature*, 298, 156-159.  
18

19 Pregitzer, K.S., Burton, A.J., Zak, D.R. & Talhelm, A.F. (2008). Simulated chronic  
20 nitrogen deposition increases carbon storage in Northern Temperate forests. *Glob.*  
21 *Change Biol.*, 14, 142-153.  
22

23 Raich, J.W. & Schlesinger, W.H. (1992). The global carbon dioxide flux in soil  
24 respiration and its relationship to vegetation and climate. *Tellus B*, 44, 81-99.  
25

1 Rasmussen, C., Southard, R.J. & Horwath, W.R. (2006). Mineral control of organic  
2 carbon mineralization in a range of temperate conifer forest soils. *Glob. Change Biol.*,  
3 12, 834-847.  
4  
5 Rustad, L.E., Campbell, J.L., Marion, G.M., Norby, R.J., Mitchell, M.J., Hartley,  
6 A.E., Cornelissen, J.H.C. & Gurevitch, J. (2001). A meta-analysis of the response of  
7 soil respiration, net nitrogen mineralization, and aboveground plant growth to  
8 experimental ecosystem warming. *Oecologia*, 126, 543-562.  
9  
10 Schadt, C.W., Martin, A.P., Lipson, D.A. & Schmidt, S.K. (2003). Seasonal dynamics  
11 of previously unknown fungal lineages in tundra soils. *Science*, 301, 1359-1361.  
12  
13 Schmidt, I.K., Jonasson, S., Shaver, G.R., Michelsen, A. & Nordin, A. (2002).  
14 Mineralization and distribution of nutrients in plants and microbes in four arctic  
15 ecosystems: responses to warming. *Plant Soil*, 242, 93-106.  
16  
17 van Wijk, M.T., Williams, M. & Shaver, G.R. (2005). Tight coupling between leaf  
18 area index and foliage N content in arctic plant communities. *Oecologia*, 142, 421-  
19 427.  
20  
21 Waldrop, M.P. & Firestone, M.K. (2004). Altered utilization patterns of young and  
22 old soil C by microorganisms caused by temperature shifts and N additions.  
23 *Biogeochem.*, 67, 235-248.  
24

1 Wallenstein, M.D., McMahon, S. & Schimel, J. (2007). Bacterial and fungal  
2 community structure in Arctic tundra tussock and shrub soils. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.*,  
3 59, 428-435.  
4

5 Wan, S., Norby, R.J., Ledford, J. & Weltzin, J.F. (2007). Responses of soil respiration  
6 to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, air warming, and changing soil water availability in a model old-field  
7 grassland. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 13, 2411-2424.  
8

9 Weintraub, M.N. & Schimel, J.P. (2005). Nitrogen cycling and the spread of shrubs  
10 control changes in the carbon balance of arctic tundra ecosystems. *Bioscience*, 55,  
11 408-415.  
12

13 Zogg, G.P., Zak, D.R., Ringelberg, D.B., MacDonald, N.W., Pregitzer, K.S. & White,  
14 D.C. (1997). Compositional and functional shifts in microbial communities due to soil  
15 warming. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 61, 475-481.  
16

17 Zaragoza-Castells, J., Sánchez-Gómez, D., Hartley, I.P., Matesanz, S., Valladares, F.,  
18 Lloyd, J. & Atkin, O.K. (2008). Climate-dependent variations in leaf respiration in a  
19 dry-land, low productivity Mediterranean forest: the importance of acclimation in  
20 both high-light and shaded habitats. *Funct. Ecol.*, **22**, 172-184.  
21

22 Zhang, W., Parker, K.M., Luo, Y., Wan, S., Wallace, L.L. & Hu, S. (2005). Soil  
23 microbial responses to experimental warming and clipping in a tallgrass prairie. *Glob.*  
24 *Change Biol.*, 11, 266-277.  
25


1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2


3 **Figure 1** The mean soil respiration rates in the three different temperature treatments  
4 (*constant high* —▲—, *high-low* ...▼..., *high-low-high* --○--). Error bars represent  
5  $\pm 1$ SE (*constant high* and *high-low*: n = 10; *high-low-high*: n = 6). The main panel (a)  
6 shows the whole of the incubation period during which respiration measurements  
7 were made. The timing of the reduction in temperature from 10°C to 2°C in the *high-*  
8 *low* and *high-low-high* treatments is indicated as is the subsequent return to 10°C in  
9 the *high-low-high* treatment. Panels (b) and (c) highlight the periods of key interest.  
10 Panel (b) shows the decline in the rate of respiration at 2°C over the first 60 days at  
11 the lower incubation temperature in the *high-low* and *high-low-high* treatments.  
12 Linear regressions are fitted to each temperature treatment separately although there is  
13 no significant difference between the two fitted lines (*high-low* (dotted line):  
14  $y = -0.0112x + 4.00$ ,  $R^2 = 0.817$ ; *high-low-high* (dashed line):  $y = -0.0135x + 4.36$ ,  
15  $R^2 = 0.815$ ). Panel (c) shows the rate of respiration at 10°C in the *high-low-high* and  
16 *constant high* samples immediately after the *high-low-high* samples were returned to  
17 10°C. The horizontal dashed line indicates the mean rate of respiration in the *high-*  
18 *low-high* samples on day 109 immediately before the *high-low-high* samples were  
19 transferred to 2°C. Initially the rate of respiration in the *high-low-high* samples was  
20 significantly less than on day 109 (paired t-test: P = 0.037) and significantly lower  
21 than in the *constant high* treatment (t-test: P = 0.044), but these differences were  
22 subsequently lost as the respiration rates in the *high-low-high* samples increased. A  
23 significant interaction term between time and temperature treatment (repeated  
24 measures ANOVA; P = 0.026) indicated that the increase in respiration rates only  
25 occurred in the *high-low-high* samples.

1 **Figure 2** The response of respiration to the short-term changes in temperature in the  
2 *high-low* and *constant high* samples. Mean respiration rates on both the increasing and  
3 decreasing phase of the temperature manipulation are shown. Error bars represent  
4 +1SE (n = 6). In the *high-low* samples, there was a significant increase in the rate of  
5 respiration measured at 2°C on the declining phase of the manipulation relative to the  
6 rate measured on the increasing phase (labeled “\*”). The mean Q<sub>10</sub> values  
7 (proportional change in the rate of respiration given a 10°C change in temperature),  
8 calculated from mean respiration rates at each temperature, were 4.25±0.224 for the  
9 *high-low* treatment and 3.80±0.186 for the *constant high* treatment. There was no  
10 significant difference between these two Q<sub>10</sub> values (*t*-test: P = 0.149).

1 Figure 1



1 Figure 2



2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10