## **SHORT COMMUNICATION**

## RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DENITRIFICATION, CO, PRODUCTION AND AIR-FILLED POROSITY IN SOILS OF DIFFERENT TEXTURE AND DRAINAGE

PETER M. **GROFFMAN\*** and **JAMES M. TIEDJE** 

**Departments of Crop and Soil Science and Microbiology and Public Health. Michigan State University, East Lansing. MI 48824, U.S.A.** 

## *(Accepted 30 September 1990)*

There is great interest in developing predictive models of **denitrification and other microbial processes in soil. These models are needed for further understanding the importance of microbial processes in nutrient cycling in natural and managed ecosystems. Results from such models could have implications for fertilizer-use efficiency. water quality and**  atmospheric chemistry questions. Models must be based on **quantitative relationships bctwccn specific proccsscs and environmental variables dcrivcd from field experiments. Moreover, these models must be capable of depicting microbial aclivity over temporal and spatial scales rclcvant to ccosyslcm nutrient cycling, water qualily and fcrtilizcr-use cllicicncy.** 

Microbial process models are frequently based on re**lalionships bctwccn microbial activity and soil moisture and tcmpcralurc. Tcmpcrature is an important regulator of all biochemical proccsscs.** *and* **moisture directly afTccls both microbial respiration and oxygen svailabilicy. Most models link lcmpcralurc and moisture rclalionships** 10 **other models and mcasuremcnts of soil N and C dynamics 10 account for**  multifactor controls under field conditions (Rolston *et al..* **1984; Schlcntner and van Clove, 1985; Schimel** *et ul.,* **1988; Parton** ct ul.. **1988).** 

**Using relationships between moisture and temperature and microbial processes as a basis for modeling is complicatcd by the high spatial and temporal variability of microbial processes in general. and denitrificalion in particular (Schimel** *et (II..* **1988). The inability to establish strong predictive relationships between denitrification and cnvironmenral variables raises two distinct questions: (I) Do we ncyd more sophisticated sampling and statistical techniques to deal with high variability? or (2) Is our understanding of how the process is regulated in nature incomplete?** 

**WC have presented data from a landscape scale study of dcnitrification that found distinct patterns of annual dcnitrification activity in forest soils of different texture and drainage (GrofTman and Tiedje. 1989a. b). These palterns should be useful for several types of denitrification modeling efforts. At the field scale, we should be able to establish relationships between hourly or daily denitrification rate**  and measurable factors such as soil moisture, temperature, **soil nitrate and CO: production. These factors can then be**  used to drive field scale models of denitrification activity. **We can also determine if relationships between denitrification and environmental factors vary with texture and drainage. If so. this variability can bc incorporated into** 

**landscape scale models. Finally. we can analyze weaknesses in the relationships between denitrification and environmental factors to determine how we can improve our models either lhrough more sophisticated sampling and statistical techniques, or through better understanding of denitrification in lhe environment.** 

**The methods used in this study were dctailcd in Groffman**  and Tiedje (1989a). Three catenas of different soil texture **(loam, clay loam, sand) consisting of well-, somcwhal**poorly and poorly-drained soils were located within 80 km **of East Lansing, Mich., U.S.A. (42.5" lat. N. 84.3" long. W). Soils wcrc sampled I2 times bctwccn April and Novcmbcr**  1985. There were seven sample dates (once a week) from **mid-April through May and monthly samplings from June through Novcmbcr. Soils were sampled to IScm dcprh using a 2cm dia punch auger conlaining plexiglass**  inserts. At each sampling date, five cores were taken at four locations (located at the corners of a randomly-selected  $5 \times 5$  m square) within each site (20 cores total per soil series **per sampling date).** At **each of the four localions, bulk samples for soil moisture were laken within the area where soil cores wcrc taken. Soil moisture data was combined with bulk dcnsily values from each soil core to compute air-filled porosity. For slatistical calculalions. data from each sampling location were aggregated so that there were four replicate values for air-filled porosity, denitrifcation and CO, production for each soil for each sampling date.** 

**Denitrificalion and CO, production were measured using the soil core Iechnique described by Groffman and Tiedje (1989a). In this method. soil cores were exposed for 6 h, to the presence of acetylene (C,H,), at room temperature. within 24 h of sampling. The headspace of the cores was**  sampled at 2 and 6 h. Gas samples were stored in evacuated **glass vials and were later analyzed for N?O and CO, by gas chromatography. Acetylene was added** to **all cores to inhibit N,O rcduclion lo N,. Our measurements of N,O and CO, production thus represent the ralc of total N gas production by dcnitrificalion and CO, production from all forms of soil respiration respectively. Acetylene does not affect rcspir**ation during short incubations of soil that has not been treated with C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> (Terry and Duxbury, 1985; Topp and Germon, 1986). Rates of denitrification and CO<sub>2</sub> production were corrected for field temperatures using a  $Q_{10}$  factor of **2 (Rolston** *et 01..* **1984).** 

**Relationships between dcnitrification. CO, production and air-filled porosity were computed by linear regression. Logarithmic (base IO) transformations were done to normalize data where appropriate. Except where noted, only regressions with a slope that was significant at P < 0.10 or less are reported.** 

**<sup>&#</sup>x27;Current address: Department of Natural Resources Science. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881. U.S.A.** 

**air-filled porosity analysis and air-filled porosity air-filled porosity** 

Soil	<b>Slope</b>	Vertical intercent		Soil	Horizontal intercent	Transforme intercept
Somewhat poorly-drained loam	$-0.03$	1.08	0.47	Somewhat poorly-drained loam	63	70
Poorly-drained loam	$-0.04$	2.03	0.44	Poorly-drained loam	54	63
Well-drained clay loam	$-0.02$	1.21	0.14	Well-drained clay loam	72	89
Somewhat poorly-drained clay loam	$-0.02$	0.61	0.16	Poorly-drained clay loam	71	113
Poorly-drained clay loam	$-0.01$	1.27	0.11	The value on the horizontal axis when the vertical axis equals		

**Although there was considerable scatter in the relationships studied. several interesting patterns were evident. Relationships between denitrification and air-filled porosity differed by texture but not by drainage (Table I. Fig. 1). The loam soil regressions had steeper slopes and higher co**efficients of determination  $(r^2)$  than the more fine-textured **clay loam soils. Horizontal axis intercepts also difl'ercd by texture (Table 2). In the clay loam soils, denitrihcation activity was zero at higher air-filled porosity values than in loam soils. intercepts in plots of log-transformed data were**  calculated for a value of  $-1$  on the vertical axis, due to the **greater detail at low values produced by the log transformation. A regression line calculated using all of the loam soils**  was significantly different (P < 0.01) from a regression line **calculated using all of the clay loam soils. Sand soils showed no significant relationships between denitrilication and either air-Iillcd porosity or soil water,** 

**Differences in relationships bctwccn dcnitrification and air-filled porosity among the soils of different texture wcrc likely caused by the effects of soil texture on oxygen**  availability. Fine-textured soils have smaller pores that more casily become anaerobic than the larger pores present in **loam and sand soils (Papcndick and Campbell, 19X0). Even when clay loam soils were well-ecratcd. anaerobic micrositcs wcrc likely to be present and dcnitrification ocxurrcd at relatively high air-filled porosity values. In coarse-textured soils, anacrobiosis is more directly controlled by the absol-UIC amount of water present than in Iinc-tcxturcd soils. This control is illustrated by the fact that the loam soils had more**  strongly negative slopes and higher r<sup>2</sup>-values than the clay **loam soils in regressions of dcnitrification rate vs air-tilled porosity.** 

**The lack ofany significant relationships between denitritication and air-Illled porosity in the sand soils was due to**  very low denitrification activity. The well- and somewhat poorly-drained sand soils always had high air-filled porosity, and levels of soil nitrate were low (Groffman and Tiedje, 19891a). Denitrifier populations in these soils were small **(Groffman and Tiedje. 1989b) and drnitrihcation events were insignificant and infrequent.** 

Relationships between CO<sub>2</sub> production and air-filled **porosity differed by drainage but not by texture (Fig. 2,** 

Table 1. Regression parameters of log<sub>10</sub> denitrification rate vs Table 2. Horizontal axis intercepts of plots of denitrification rate vs

Vertical ntercept		Soil	Horizontal intercept	Transformed <sup>1</sup> intercept
1.08	0.47	Somewhat poorly-drained loam	63	70
2.03	0.44	Poorly-drained loam	54	63
1.21	0.14	Well-drained clay loam	72	89
0.61	0.16	Poorly-drained clay loam	71	113
$\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$	- - -			

**'The value on the horizontal axis when the vertical axis quals -** I **in a plot of log,, denitrification rate vs air-tilled porosity,** 

**Table 3). In both the clay loam and loam catenas, the regression for the well-drained soil had a positive slope. while the poorlydrained soil regression had a negative**  slope. The somewhat poorly-drained soils and the sand soils **had no signilicant relationships between CO, production and air-filled porosity.** 

Previous investigations of CO<sub>2</sub> production-moisture re**lationships have produced a range of contradictory results. While some studies have found a parabolic relationship**  between moisture and CO<sub>2</sub> production (Douglas and **Tedrow, 1959; Linn and Doran, 1984). other investigators have found either positive (Fromcnt, 1972; Pal and**  Broadbent, 1975; Orchard and Cook, 1983; Schlentner and van Cleve, 1985; Coxson and Parkinson, 1987) or negative **(Kuccra and Kirkham. 1971; DeSanto ef a/.. 1976;**  Kowalenko et al., 1978) relationships between these factors. **Other investigators have found variable or non-significant relationships bctwccn soil moisture and CO, production (Miller and Johnson, 1964; Reincrs, 1968; de Jong et af., 1974; Buyanovsky et al.. 1986). In gcncral, wet forest soils tend to exhibit high CO, production at moisture contents near or above saturation (Schlcntncr and van Clcvc, 1985; Coxson and Parkinson, 1987). possibly due to the dcvclop mcnt of microbial populations tolerant of tow aeration status (Grifftn, 1980). Miller and Johnson (1964) showed that the dcvclopmcnt of these populations can bc fairly rapid (weeks).** 

**Microbial adaptation lo in siru moisture conditions was probably a factor in this study. It is logical that populations in wet soils should bc mom active under wet conditions and vice-versa. The fact that the soils of intermediate moisture (somewhat poorly drained) showed no significant moisture-CO\* production relationships strengthens this argument since these soils should have a mixed population that shows no strong overail adaptation to either wet or dry conditions.** 

CO, production and denitrification in our soils were **probably affected by the pattern of available carbon production. Freezing and thawing events. drying and rcwetting cycles, and litterfall arc processes that increase carbon**  availability and are known to stimulate both CO<sub>2</sub> pro**duction and denitrification (Birch, 1958; de Jongef al., 1974; Orchard and Cook, 1983; Edwards and Kilham, 1986;** 



**Fig. I. Log,, dcnitrification rate vs air-filled porosity for poorly-drained loam and clay loam soils with regression lines drawn through the points.** 



**Fig. 2. Respiration rate in poorly- and well-drained loam soils with regression lines drawn through the points.** 

**Tiwari et ul., 1987; Skoglund er al., 1988; Groflman and Tiedje. 1988: Christensen and Ticdje. 1990). Freeze-thaw cycles were especially common in the poorly-drained soils in early spring and fall when the soils were very wet and both denitrification and CO, production were high (GroRman and Tiedje. 1989a). Increased C availability from freezethaw cycles and litterfall during spring and fall may exert selective pressure on microorganisms to be active in very wet soils.** 

**Drying and rewetting cycles likely affected carbon availability. dcnitrification and CO: production during late spring and summer. Approximately 2 cm of rain fell before**  the June sampling date, causing a pulse of CO<sub>2</sub> production **at several sites. Eliminating this date greatly improved the**  significance and  $r^2$ -value of the regression for  $CO_2$  pro**duction versus air-tilled porosity for the poorly-drained clay loam soil. In general. many of the outlying values in plots of both CO: production and dcnitrification with air-filled**  porosity could be attributed to wetting and drying events. **dc Jong et al. (1974) concluded that annual variation in soil respiration was mainly caused by the number of wetting and drying cycles.** 

**Dcnitritication-CO? production relationships were closely**  tied to CO<sub>2</sub> production-air-filled porosity relationships **(Table 4). In the poorly-drained soils that respired vigorously under wet conditions, there was a significant rclationship between dcnitritication and CO: production. Aerobic respiration may have played an important role in stimulat-**

Table 3. Regression parameters of CO<sub>2</sub> production rate vs air-filled **porosity analysis** 

Soil	Slope	Vertical intercept	,,
Well-drained loam	0.11	$-1.09$	0.14
Poorly-drained loam Well-drained clay loam	$-0.15$ 0.16	9.60 $-3.18$	0.14 0.32
Poorly-drained clay loam <sup>1</sup>	$-0.06$	5.26	0.11

'Data from one sampling date that was affected by drying and rewetting effects are not included for this soil.

Table 4. Regression parameters of log<sub>10</sub> denitrification rate vs **rcrptrnlion mlc analysis** 

Soil	Slope	Vertical intercept	,,
Well-drained loam	$-0.27$	$-0.45$	$0.02$ <sup>1</sup>
Poorly-drained loam	1.04	$-0.05$	0.19
Well-drained clay loam	$-0.31$	0.18	0.03 <sup>2</sup>
Poorly-drained clay loam	0.35	0.82	0.10

' **Regression no1 significant a1 P < 0. IO.** 

**'Regression not rignificam at** *P <* **0.10. Regression with unloggcd data war significant at** *P < 0.10.* 

**ing denitritication through consumption of oxygen. Conversely, denitrification may have produced a significant**  percentage of the CO<sub>2</sub> in these soils. In the drier soils, there **were weak negative relationships between denitrification**  and CO<sub>2</sub> production, suggesting that aerobic respiration and **denitritication were not strongly linked. In general. CO, production and denitrification should be significantly correlated when respiration significantly reduces oxygen supply in soil. This often occurs when respiration rates are very high (Rice er al.. 1988; Parkin and Robinson, 1989) or when soils**  are very wet and oxygen diffusion is slow (given adequate **NO; supply).** 

**Despite the considerable scatter in the relationships observed. there arc several useful conclusions that can be drawn from our results. First, the data show that relationships between denitritication and air-filled porosity vary with soil texture, and that relationships between respiration and air-filled porosity vary with soil drainage class. Denitrification and CO, production models centered around moisture-activity relationships should incorporate texture and drainage information and should account for the variable response with these factors.** 

**More importantly, the data suggest that our undcrstand**ing of regulation of denitrification and CO<sub>2</sub> production **under field conditions is incomplete. Moisture did not account for the majority of variability in activity in any of the soils studied. and although our results do not permit quantitative analysis of temperature-activity relationships, temperature was not a strong controller of activity. Rates of**  both denitrification and CO<sub>2</sub> production were highest in the **early spring and declined into the summer, suggesting negative relationships between temperature and activity. Soil nitrate was also not a strong predictor of activity (GrofTman and Tiedje. 1989a). These results suggest that factors other than temperature and moisture, likely related to C and N dynamics in soil, need to be considered when modeling dcnitrification. Whcatley and Williams (1989) and Thompson (1989) found similar seasonal patterns and a similar lack of relationships between temperature, moisture and denitrification activity. They also concluded that C availability may be a more important regulator of dcntritication activity under field conditions than has previously been thought.** 

Previous investigators (Parton et al., 1988) have effec**tivcly accounted for available N dynamics in denitrification models. and our data suggest some approaches for addressing available C dynamics. Adaptation of microbial populations to** *in situ* **conditions (e.g. cold and wet soils), and factors controlling carbon supply to those populations, appear to strongly influence microbial activity in the field. Better understanding of microbial community dynamics, and explicitly addressing events such as freeze-thaw and wet-dry cycles. should improve our ability to effectively model denitrification in soil.** 

*Acknowledgements-We* **thank Delbert Mokma for help with site selection. John Golphin for help with laboratory analysis. and Don Zak.** *Saran* **Christensen and Stephen Simkins for valuable reviews of this manuscript. This research was supported by a U.S. National Science**  Foundation research grant.

## **REFERENCES**

- **Birch H. F. (1958) The effect of soil drying on humus decomposition and nitrogen availability.** *Plum and Soil 10,* **9-31.**
- **Buyanovsky G. A.. Wagner G. H. and Gantzer C. J.** (1986) **Soil respiration in a winter wheat ecosystem.** *Soil Science Society of America Journal SO, 338-344.*
- **Christensen S. and Tiedje J. M. (1990) Brief and vigorous N,O production by soil at spring thaw. lournal** *o/Soil Science 41,* **l-4.**
- **Coxson D. S. and Parkinson D. (1987) Winter respiratory activity in aspen woodland forest floor litter and soils.** *Soif Biology % Biochemistry 19, 49-59.*
- **DeSanto A. V.. Alfani A. and Sapio S. (1976) Soil metabolism in beech forests of Monte Tabumo (Campania Appenines).** *Oikos 27,* **144-152.**
- **Douglas L. A. and Tedrow 1. F. C. (1959) Organic matter decomposition rates in arctic soils.** *Soil* **Science 8s. 305-312.**
- **Edwards A. C. and Killham K. (1986) The effect of frcczc/thaw on gaseous nitrogen loss from upland soils.**  *Soil U.se und Munugemenr* **2, 06-9** I.
- Froment A. (1972) Soil respiration in mixed oak forest. *Oikos* 23, 273-277.
- **GrillIn D. M. (19X0) Water potential as a sclcctive factor**  in the microbial ecology of soils. In Water Potential *Reiutions in Soil M ic~rohioh~gy.* **pp, I41 -15** I. *Speciul Pubhcu~ion Number* **9, Soil Scicncz Society of America, Madison.**
- **Grollinan P. M. and Tiedjc 1. M. (1988) Dcnitrilication hysteresis during wetting and drying cycles in soil.** *Soil Science Society of America Journal 52, 1626-1629.*
- Groffman P. M. and Tiedje J. M. (1989a) Denitrification in **north tcmpcratr forest soils: spatial and temporal patterns at the landscape and seasonal scales.** *Soif Biufogy & Bja~~~;\*r~r~~iry* **2 I, 6 I 3-620.**
- Groffman P. M. and Tiedje J. M. (1989b) Denitrification **in north temperate forest soils: relationships between**  denitrification and environmental parameters at the land**scape scale.** *Soil Biology & Biochemistry 21, 621-626.*
- *de Jong E., Schappert H. J. V. and MacDonald K. B. (1974)* **Carbon dioxide evolution from virgin and cultivated soil as affected by management practices and climate.**  Canadian Journal of Soil Science 54, 299-307.
- Kowalenko C. G., Ivarson K. C. and Cameron D. R. (1978) Effect of moisture content, temperature, and nitrogen **fertilization on carbon dioxide evolution from field soils.**  Soil Biology & Biochemistry 10, 417-423.
- **Kucera C. L. and Kirkham D. R. (1971) Soil respiration studies in tallgrass prairie in Missouri. Ecology 52, 912-915.**
- Linn D. M. and Doran J. W. (1984) Effect of water-filled **pore space on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide production in tilled and non-tilled soils. Soil** *Science Sociefy o/ Amrricu Jortrnul 48, 1267-1272.*
- Miller R. D. and Johnson D. D. (1964) The effect of soil **moisture tension on oarboa dioxide evolution. nitrifi***cation.* **and nitrogen mineralization.** *Soil* **Science Sociery of** *America Proceedings 28, 644-647.*
- **Orchard V. A. and Cook F. J. (1983) Relationship between soil respiration and soil moisture. Soil Biology & Bioc&misrr~ IS, 447-453.**
- Pal D. and Broadbent F. E. (1975) Influence of moisture on rice straw decomposition in soils. Soil Science Society of *America Proceedings 39, 59-62.*
- Papendick R. I. and Campbell G. S. (1980) Theory and **measurement of water potential. In Wafer** *Potemial Re-Iations in Soil Microbiology, pp. 1-22. Special Publication Number 9.* **Soil Soiena Society of America, Madison.**
- **Parkin T. B. and Robinson 1. A. (1989) Stochastic models of soil denitrification.** *Applied and Enviranmpnfai Microbiology 55, 72-77,*
- **Parton W. J.. Mosier A. R. and Schimel D. S. (1988) Rates and pathways of nitrous oxide production in a shortgrass**  steppe. *Biogeochemistry* 6, 45-58.
- **Rciners W. A. (1968) Carbon dioxide evolution from the**  floor of three Minnesota forests. Journal of Ecology 58, **497-519.**
- **Rice C. W., Sierxega P. E.. Tiedje J. M. and Jacobs L. W. (1988) Stimulated denitriflcation in the microenvironment of a biodegradable organic waste injected into soil. Soil**  Science Society of America Journal 52, 102-108.
- **Rolston D. E., Rao P. S. C.. Davidson J. M. and Jessup**  R. E. (1984) Simulation of denitrification losses of nitrate **fertilizer applied to uncropped. cropped, and manureamended held plots.** *Soil Science* **137, 270-279.**
- **Schimcl D. S.. Simkins S., Rosswall T.. Nosier A. R. and**  Parton W. J. (1988) Scale and the measurement of **nitrogen-gas fluxes from terrestrial ecosystems. In Sea/es**  *and Global Chunge (r.* **Rosswall, R. G. Woodmansce and P. G. Risser. Eds), pp. 179-194. Wiley. Chichester.**
- **Schlcntncr R. E. and van Cieve K. (1985) Relationships**  *bctwecn CO,* **evolution from soil. substrate tcmpcraturc, and substrate moisture in four mature forest types in interior Alaska.** *Cunudian fournul o/Forest Research 15, 97-106.*
- **Skoglund T.. Lomcland S. and Gokseyr J. (1988) Respiratory burst after freezing and thawing of soil: experiments**  with soil bacteria. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 20, *85 (-856.*
- **Thompson R. B.** *(1989)* **Denitrificalion in slurry treated soil: occurrence at low temperatures, relationships with soil nitrate and reduction by nitrilication inhibitors.** *Soil*  Biology & Biochemistry 21, 875-882.
- **Terry R. E. and Duxbury J. M. (1985) Acetylene decomposition in soils.** *Soil Science Society oj America Journaf 49, 90-93.*
- **Tiwari S. C.. Tiwari B. K. and Mishra R. R. (1987) The influence of moisture regimes on the population and**  activity of soil microorganisms. Plant and Soil 101, **133-136.**
- **Topp E. and Gcrmon J. C. (1986) Acetylene metabolism and stimulation of denitrification in an argicultural soil.**  Applied and Environmental Microbiology 52, 802-806.
- Wheatley R. E. and Williams B. L. (1989) Seasonal changes **in rates of potential denitrification in poorly-drained reseeded blanket peat.** *Soil Biology & Biochemistry 21, 355-360.*