



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Comparison of N ₂ O and CO ₂ concentrations and fluxes in the soil profile between a Gray Lowland soil and an Andosol
Author(s)	Kusa, Kanako; Sawamoto, Takuji; Hu, Ronggui et al.
Citation	Soil Science & Plant Nutrition, 56(1), 186-199 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-0765.2009.00439.x
Issue Date	2010-02
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/44779
Rights	The definitive version is available at www.blackwellsynergy.com
Type	journal article
File Information	SSPN56-1_186-199.pdf



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Title of this paper

2 A comparison of N₂O and CO₂ concentrations and fluxes in the soil profile between a
3 Gray Lowland soil and an Andosol

4 Full names of the authors

5 Kanako Kusa¹, Takuji Sawamoto², Ronggui Hu³, Ryusuke Hatano⁴

6 Addresses of the institutions at which work

7 Graduate School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-8589, Japan

8 Full postal and e-mail address, facsimile and telephone numbers etc.

9 Corresponding author: Kanako Kusa

10 National Agricultural Research Center, Research team for using rice as feed in Kanto
11 area

12 3-1-1, Kannondai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8666, Japan.

13 Tel. 029-838-8817, Fax 029-838-8484, e-mail kusakana@affrc.go.jp

14 Footnote

15 Present addresses:

16 ¹National Agricultural Research Center, Tsukuba, 305-8666 Japan. ² Faculty of Dairy
17 Science, Rakuno Gakuen University, Ebetsu, 069-8501 Japan. ³College of Resource and
18 Environment, Huazhong Agricultural University, Wuhan, Hubei, 430070 China.

- 1 ⁴Laboratory of Soil Science, Graduate School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University,
- 2 Sapporo 060-8589 Japan.

For review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Abstract

2 We measured N₂O and CO₂ fluxes from the soil surface and in the soil through a depth
3 of 0.3 m, and their concentration profiles through a depth of 0.6 m in both a Gray
4 Lowland soil with macropores and cracks and an Andosol with undeveloped soil
5 structure in central Hokkaido, Japan. The objective of this study was to elucidate the
6 difference of N₂O production and flux in the soil profile between these two soil types. In
7 the Gray Lowland soil, the N₂O concentration above 0.4 m increased with an increase in
8 soil depth. In the Andosol, there were no distinctive N₂O concentration gradients in the
9 topsoil when the N₂O flux did not increase. However, the N₂O concentration at a depth
10 of 0.1 m significantly increased and this concentration was higher than the
11 concentration below 0.2 m when the N₂O flux greatly increased. The N₂O concentration
12 profiles were thus different between these two soils. The contribution ratios of the N₂O
13 produced in the top soil (0-0.3 m depth) to the total N₂O emitted from the soil to the
14 atmosphere in the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol were 0.86 and 1.00, respectively.
15 It indicates that the N₂O emitted from the soil to the atmosphere was mainly produced
16 in the top soil. However, the contribution ratio of the subsoil to the N₂O emitted from
17 the Gray Lowland soil was higher than that of the Andosol. There was a significant
18 positive correlation between the N₂O flux through a 0.3 m depth and that flux from the

1 soil to the atmosphere in only the Gray Lowland soil. These results suggest that N₂O
2 production in the subsoil of the Gray Lowland soil could have been activated by NO₃⁻
3 leaching through macropores and cracks, and subsequently the N₂O produced in the
4 subsoil could have been rapidly emitted to the atmosphere through the macropores and
5 cracks.

6 **Key words:** Andosol, carbon dioxide, gas concentration in soil profile, Gray Lowland
7 soil, nitrous oxide

8

For review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Increased nitrous oxide (N₂O) concentrations in the troposphere cause global warming
3 and contribute to the depletion of the stratospheric ozone (Prather *et al.* 2001).
4 Enhanced N₂O emissions from agricultural and natural ecosystems are believed to be
5 results mainly from the increased use of nitrogen (N) fertilizer. The contribution of
6 agricultural activities to global N₂O emission is estimated to be about 35% (FAO & IFA
7 2001, Prather et al. 2001). Therefore, elucidation of the mechanism of N₂O emission
8 from agricultural soil has been crucial to mitigate global N₂O emission. Nitrification
9 and denitrification by soil microbes are the dominant processes in the production of
10 N₂O in soils. These processes are strongly influenced by soil conditions such as
11 temperature, water content, nitrate (NO₃⁻) and ammonium (NH₄⁺) concentrations, and
12 organic matter content (FAO & IFA 2001). Marked increases in N₂O emission rates
13 have been observed immediately after the application of fertilizer and manure (Akiyama
14 et al. 2000, Akiyama & Tsuruta 2002, Jambert et al. 1997, Lessard et al. 1996, Skiba et
15 al. 1996). In addition, some studies reported that the high N₂O emission rates were
16 observed after heavy rain and irrigation (Koga et al. 2004, Kusa et al. 2002, Kusa et al.
17 2006, Lessard et al. 1996, Mosier & Hutchinson 1981), suggesting that N₂O emissions
18 from the soil to the atmosphere were influenced strongly by N dynamics and the

1 addition of water to soils. In a prismatic structured soil with interstitial pores, water
2 moves vertically through macropores, bypassing the soil matrix within peds (Hasegawa
3 1986, Hayashi & Hatano 1999, Inoue 1988). Gas movement is primarily associated with
4 macropores (Osozawa 1998). Also, rainwater or snowmelt water is likely to mix with
5 the soil solution in the topsoil and drain directly through the macropores in the subsoil
6 when large drainage takes place in prismatic structured soil (Hayashi & Hatano 1999).
7 However, in an Andosol characterized by the absence of cracks and fissures after drying,
8 rainwater moves mainly by a matrix flow (Hasegawa & Eguchi 2002) and the
9 movement of gas through macropores becomes minor (Osozawa 1998). Therefore, the
10 movement of NO_3^- and the production and movement of N_2O in soils are influenced by
11 the soil structure. The concentration profiles of soil N_2O have been used to estimate the
12 depth of N_2O production in soils (Goodroad & Keeney 1985, Hosen et al. 2000). A
13 comprehension of N_2O movement in the soil profile is necessary to explain the
14 production and emission of N_2O in the soil.

15 Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is also one of the greenhouse gases produced by the respiration
16 of soil microbes and roots in soils. Soil microbes and roots are distributed mainly in the
17 **top soil** (Nakamoto 1993, Osozawa 1998). Therefore, most of the CO_2 emitted is
18 produced in the **top soil** (de Jong & Schappert 1971). Also, comparisons of N_2O and

1 CO₂ concentrations and fluxes among different soils in the soil profile could be useful to
2 elucidate the influence of soil type on the mechanisms of N₂O production and fluxes in
3 the soil profile. In this study, we measured N₂O and CO₂ fluxes from the soil surface,
4 and both N₂O and CO₂ concentrations and fluxes in the soil profiles in a Gray Lowland
5 soil with macropores and an Andosol without macropores, where N₂O emissions during
6 the pluvial period and after heavy rains were higher than those observed immediately
7 after fertilizer application (Kusa *et al.* 2002, Kusa *et al.* 2006). The objective of this
8 study was to elucidate the difference of N₂O production and flux in the soil profile
9 between these two soil types.

11 MATERIALS AND METHODS

12 Experimental sites

13 The experimental sites were a 2.0×10^4 m² onion (*Allium cepa* L.) field in Mikasa City
14 (43° 14' N, 141° 50' E) and a 1.8×10^4 m² maize (*Zea mays* L.) field at the National
15 Agricultural Research Center for Hokkaido Region in Sapporo City (43° 00' N, 141° 24'
16 E) located in central Hokkaido, Japan. In the onion field, the soil was Humic Gray
17 Lowland soil (Japanese Society of Pedology 2003); the soil texture at a 0–0.48 m depth
18 was silty clay (SiC) and there were interstitial pores in the subsoil (Table 1). Saturated

1 hydraulic conductivity was low at a depth of 0–0.28 m, and was higher at a depth below
2 0.28 m (Table 1) because of the presence of macropores (Hayashi & Hatano 1999).
3 Subsurface drains were installed at a 0.8–1.0 m depth and the groundwater table was at
4 0.7–0.8 m depth throughout the year. Chemical fertilizer was applied to the field at a
5 rate of about 300 kg N ha⁻¹ at the end of April. Onion seedlings were transplanted at the
6 beginning of May and harvesting was carried out in both early and mid-September
7 (Kusa *et al.* 2002). In the maize field, the soil was Silandic Andosol (Japanese Society
8 of Pedology 2003). The soil texture at a depth of 0–0.30 m was clay loam (CL) which is
9 rich in humus. An impermeable layer lay 1.3 m below ground level, and consequently
10 the groundwater table temporarily rose to near the ground surface level during the
11 snowmelt period and after heavy rains (Kanazawa *et al.* 1999). Respective saturated
12 hydraulic conductivity at a depth of 0–0.30 m was lower than that at 0.30–0.47 m (Table
13 1). Composted cattle manure was applied to the field at a rate of 300 kg N ha⁻¹ (fresh
14 weight 3.0 kg m⁻²) every year in mid-May. After furrowing, chemical fertilizer was
15 applied to the rows at a rate of 130 kg N ha⁻¹. The row width was 0.75 m and inter-row
16 width was 0.25 m. Maize was sown in mid-May and harvested at the end of September.
17 The monitoring of gas emission rates and other factors in the maize field were
18 conducted only between the plants in each row (Kusa *et al.* 2006). For 3 years

1 (1998–2000), N₂O and CO₂ fluxes were usually measured every week on the same day
2 during the snow-free season (Gray Lowland soil: from the end of May to October,
3 Andosol: from June to the end of September) and additionally, N₂O fluxes were
4 measured every week during the snow-free season from 1995 to 1997 in the Gray
5 Lowland soil (Table 2, 3).

6

7 **N₂O and CO₂ concentration in the soil profile**

8 After the polyvinyl chloride pipes (soil-air sampling tubes: the inside diameter was
9 0.013 m, the outside diameter was 0.016 m) were installed in the soil, silicon stoppers
10 which were threaded with rubber tubes with three-way cocks were connected to the top
11 of the soil-air sampling tubes. The depths of the soil-air sampling tubes installed were
12 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5 and 0.6 m. Twenty soil-air sampling tubes were installed
13 each at a depth of 0.05 and 0.1 m and ten tubes were installed at various depths between
14 0.2 to 0.6 m. Gas samples of the enclosed atmosphere in the soil-air sampling tubes
15 were withdrawn using a 10 mL syringe; all gas samples from the same depth were
16 transferred into a 1 L Tedlar®Bag and were mixed. The ambient air above the soil
17 surface was also sampled to obtain the concentration at a 0 m depth. The N₂O
18 concentrations in the gas samples were measured using a gas chromatograph equipped

1 with an electron capture detector (GC-14B; Shimadzu Corp., Kyoto, Japan). The CO₂
2 concentrations were analyzed using an infrared gas analyzer (ZFP-5; Fuji Electric Co.,
3 Ltd., Tokyo, Japan).

5 **Measurement of soil physical properties and rainfall**

6 The soil temperature was measured at a depth of 0.1 m using a digital thermometer.
7 Three undisturbed soil samples (0–0.05 m and 0.05–0.1 m) were collected using three
8 100 mL steel cylinders at each sampling date; the air-filled porosity, water-filled pore
9 space (WFPS) and the relative gas diffusion coefficient (D/D_0) were measured using the
10 method reported by Osozawa (1998).

11 To obtain the air-filled porosity and gas diffusion coefficient in the soil profile,
12 undisturbed soil samples were collected once using three 100 mL steel cylinders from
13 the Gray Lowland soil in October, 1996 and from the Andosol in May, 1998 (Gray
14 Lowland soil: 0.05–0.1, 0.15–0.2, 0.23–0.28, 0.32–0.37, 0.43–0.48, and 0.54–0.59 m,
15 Andosol: 0.13–0.18, 0.31–0.36, 0.40–0.45, and 0.58–0.63 m). The air-filled porosity
16 and D/D_0 of these samples were measured at a water suction of –0.098 (water saturated),
17 –0.31, –0.98, –3.1, –9.8, and –31 kPa. The D/D_0 of the water saturated sample was
18 assumed as 0. Regression curves were obtained from the relationship of the soil water

1 suction to the D/D_0 (Table 4) and air-filled porosity. Two tensiometers were installed at
 2 depths of 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, and 0.5 m and the soil water suction was measured at each
 3 sampling date (Hasegawa & Kasubuchi 1988). The changes in the air-filled porosity and
 4 the D/D_0 in the soil profile were calculated using the value obtained from the soil water
 5 suction and the regression curves.

6 Rainfall data for the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol sites were recorded at the
 7 Iwamizawa Weather Station (43° 12.6' N, 141° 47.3' E) (Sapporo District
 8 Meteorological Observatory 1995-2000) and the National Agricultural Research Center
 9 for Hokkaido Region, respectively.

11 **N₂O and CO₂ fluxes in the soil profile and from the soil surface to the atmosphere**

12 N₂O and CO₂ fluxes through a depth of 0.3 m in the soil profile were calculated using
 13 the following equation, using Fick's law (gradient method; Granli & Bøckman 1994) as
 14 follows:

$$F_{0.3} = D \times \rho \times \frac{dC}{dz} = \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right) \times D_0 \times \left(\rho \times \frac{C_{0.4} - C_{0.2}}{z} \times \frac{273}{273 + T} \right) \quad (1)$$

15 where $F_{0.3}$ is the gas flux ($\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m, D is the gas
 16 diffusion coefficient ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$), ρ is the gas density ($\rho_{\text{CO}_2} = \rho_{\text{N}_2\text{O}} = 1.98 \times 10^6 \text{ (mg m}^{-3}\text{)}$),
 17 $[dC/dz]$ is the gas concentration gradient ($\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-3}$), D/D_0 is the relative gas diffusion

1 coefficient at a depth of 0.3 m (these values were calculated from the regression curves
 2 of the soil water suction $-D/D_0$ of the Ap horizon at a depth of 0.23-0.28 m in the Gray
 3 Lowland soil and at a depth of 0.13-0.18 m in the Andosol, Table 4), D_0 is the N_2O or
 4 CO_2 -air inter-diffusion coefficient ($m^2 s^{-1}$), $C_{0.2}$ and $C_{0.4}$ are the gas concentrations at a
 5 depth of 0.2 and 0.4 m ($m^3 m^{-3}$), respectively, z is the distance from 0.4 to 0.2 m, and T
 6 is the soil temperature between 0.2 and 0.4 m ($^{\circ}C$) which was presumed to be $20^{\circ}C$. D_0
 7 under the air pressure 1 atm and the soil temperature $20^{\circ}C$ were calculated using the
 8 following equation (Pritchard & Currie 1982):

$$D_0 = D_s \times \left(\frac{273+20}{273} \right)^{1.79} \quad (2)$$

9 where $D_s(N_2O)$ and $D_s(CO_2)$ ($m^2 s^{-1}$, in standard condition) represent 0.143×10^{-4} and
 10 0.139×10^{-4} , respectively (Pritchard & Currie 1982).

11 In our previous paper (Kusa *et al.* 2008), we revealed that the gradient method was
 12 useful in measuring the N_2O fluxes from the soil surface into the atmosphere (flux from
 13 the soil surface). However, there were differences in the CO_2 and extremely high N_2O
 14 fluxes between chamber and gradient methods when the production and consumption of
 15 these gases were active in the soil above the installed location of the soil-air sampling
 16 tube. Therefore, the N_2O and CO_2 fluxes from the soil surface were measured by a
 17 closed-chamber method. Cylindrical stainless steel chambers, 0.3 m in diameter and

1 0.35 m high for the Gray Lowland soil and 0.2 m in diameter and 0.2 m high for the
2 Andosol, were used. Fifteen minutes after placement of the chamber, a gas sample was
3 taken from the enclosed atmosphere. The mean gas emission rates of four replications in
4 the Gray Lowland soil and of two replicates in the Andosol were calculated. The gas
5 sampling method and the calculation of gas fluxes were described in detail in our
6 previous papers (Kusa *et al.* 2002, 2008). The cumulative gas fluxes during the study
7 period were calculated through linear interpolation.

9 **Mass balance analysis**

10 Hosen *et al.* (2000) showed that N₂O consumption in the top soil (above 0.24 m) does
11 not have much effect on the N₂O emission rate. Although CO₂ can be dissolved in the
12 soil water, Osozawa (1998) reported that the CO₂ runoff volume by water percolation
13 was very small. Therefore, mass balance analyses were conducted to estimate the N₂O
14 and CO₂ productions of topsoil (0–0.3 m) by the following equation:

$$15 \quad P = F_0 - F_{0.3} + (M_e - M_s)$$

16 where P is the N₂O and CO₂ production (mg m⁻²) in the topsoil during the study period,
17 and F_0 and $F_{0.3}$ are the cumulative N₂O and CO₂ fluxes (mg m⁻²) from the soil surface
18 through a depth of 0.3 m during the study period. M_s and M_e signify the mass of N₂O

1 and CO₂ (mg m⁻²) respectively, in the topsoil at the beginning and end of the
2 investigation which is the product of air-filled porosity (m³ m⁻³), gas concentration (mg
3 m⁻³), and depth (m). The contribution ratios of the gas production (P/F_0) in the topsoil
4 to the gas emitted from the soil surface to the atmosphere were estimated.

5

6 **RESULTS**

7 **Seasonal patterns of rainfall and soil physical properties**

8 The frequency of rainfall in both Gray Lowland and Andosol sites increased after July
9 every year (Figs. 1 and 2). The mean values of WFPS from 1998 to 2000 at depths of
10 0–0.05 and 0.05–0.1 m were 45 and 59 % in the Gray Lowland soil and 48 and 57 % in
11 the Andosol, respectively (Figs. 3 and 4). At a depth of 0–0.1 m, the values of D/D_0
12 were below 0.02 when the values of WFPS were above 60%. The values of D/D_0 in the
13 Andosol were higher than those of the Gray Lowland soil when the values of WFPS
14 were below 60% (Fig. 5). The mean values of soil water suction at depths of 0.2, 0.3,
15 and 0.6 m from 1998 to 2000, were –15.6, –10.9, and –3.2 kPa in the Gray Lowland soil
16 and –10.5, –9.9, and –3.6 kPa in the Andosol. There were no significant differences in
17 WFPS (paired t-test: 0–0.05 m $|t|=2.02$, $p = 0.05$, $n = 61$ and 0.05–0.1 m $|t|=1.07$,
18 $p=0.29$, $n=59$) and soil water suction (paired t-test: 0.2 m $|t|=1.82$, $p = 0.08$, $n = 24$,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 0.4 m $|t|=1.28$, $p=0.21$, $n=24$ 0.6 m $|t|=0.11$, $p=0.91$, $n=21$) between the Gray Lowland
8
9
10 2 soil and the Andosol. The soil water suction increased with an increase in soil depth.
11
12 3 The value of WFPS increased while the soil water suction decreased after rainfall (Figs.
13
14
15 4 1–5). Also, the soil temperature at a depth of 0.1 m increased from spring to summer
16
17
18 5 and decreased after summer (Figs. 3 and 4).
19
20
21
22 6 In 1998–2000, the mean values of soil air porosity at a depth of 0–0.05, 0.05–0.1, 0.3,
23
24
25 7 and 0.6 m were 32, 23, 5.5, and 4.9 % in the Gray Lowland soil and 35, 29, 8.7, and
26
27
28 8 7.6 % in the Andosol, respectively. The values of soil air porosity in the Andosol were
29
30
31 9 higher than those of the Gray Lowland soil (paired t-test: depth of 0–0.05 m $|t|=2.65$,
32
33
34 10 $p=0.01$, $n=61$, depth of 0.05–0.1 m $|t|=4.60$, $p<0.01$, $n=59$, depth of 0.3 m $|t|=1.84$,
35
36
37 11 $p=0.08$, $n=18$, depth of 0.6 m $|t|=3.48$, $p<0.01$, $n=21$). The mean values of D/D_0 at
38
39
40 12 depths of 0–0.05, 0.05–0.1, 0.3, and 0.6 m (1998–2000) were 0.097, 0.048, 0.003, and
41
42
43 13 0.003 in the Gray Lowland soil and 0.150, 0.080, 0.004, and 0.003 in the Andosol,
44
45
46 14 respectively (Fig. 6). The values of D/D_0 above 0.3 m in the Andosol were higher than
47
48
49 15 those in the Gray Lowland soil, but there was no significant difference at a depth of 0.6
50
51
52 16 m (paired t-test: depth of 0–0.05 m $|t|=4.41$, $p<0.01$, $n=61$, depth of 0.05–0.1 m $|t|=5.12$,
53
54
55 17 $p<0.01$, $n=57$, depth of 0.3 m $|t|=2.39$, $p=0.03$, $n=18$, depth of 0.6 m $|t|=1.03$, $p=0.31$,
56
57
58 18 $n=24$).

Concentration and flux of N₂O in the soil profile

The cumulative N₂O flux from the soil to the atmosphere during the study period from 1995 to 2000 ranged from 310 to 1190 mg N m⁻² in the Gray Lowland soil and that cumulative flux from 1998 to 2000 ranged from 630 to 1980 mg N m⁻² in the Andosol (Table 2). There was no significant difference in the cumulative N₂O flux between the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol from 1998–2000 (t-test: $|t|=1.11$, $p=0.33$, $n=3$). Also, a significant increase in N₂O fluxes occurred during the increasing frequency of rainfall in the Gray Lowland soil (Fig. 1a) and after heavy rainfall (above 80 mm day⁻¹) in the Andosol (Fig. 2a).

In both the soils, the N₂O concentrations at a depth of 0.05 m were always higher than those of the ambient air, which is about 0.3 ppmv ($10^{-6} \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} = \text{ppmv}$). A significant increase in soil N₂O concentrations occurred after July in the Gray Lowland soil, when the frequency of rainfall increased and after heavy rainfall occurred (above 80mm day⁻¹) in the Andosol. These increases in concentration were greater than those that took place in June after fertilizer applications (Figs. 1 and 2). The seasonal pattern of the N₂O concentration in the soil was similar to the N₂O flux from the soil to the atmosphere. The mean values of the N₂O concentration in the soil at depths of 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 0.5, and 0.6 m were 2.2, 5.8, 15, 22, 54, 62, and 59 ppmv in the Gray Lowland soil and
8
9
10 2 8.4, 18, 7.7, 7.2, 11, 16, and 10 ppmv in the Andosol, respectively. The maximum
11
12
13 3 concentrations of N₂O at these depths were 21, 37, 83, 140, 240, 430, and 370 ppmv in
14
15
16 4 the Gray Lowland soil, and 93, 250, 55, 18, 59, 110, and 35 ppmv in the Andosol,
17
18
19 5 respectively. In the Gray Lowland soil, the N₂O concentrations above 0.4 m increased
20
21
22 6 with an increase in soil depth, however, there was no increase in concentration below a
23
24
25 7 0.4 m depth (Fig. 7). Furthermore, the N₂O concentration gradients of the soil profile
26
27
28 8 increased from August to October (Figs. 1 and 7). In the Andosol, there were no N₂O
29
30
31 9 concentration gradients in the topsoil in June when the N₂O flux did not increase.
32
33
34 10 However, the N₂O concentration at a depth of 0.1 m significantly increased (above 40
35
36
37 11 ppmv), and this concentration was higher than that at a depth of 0.2 m when the N₂O
38
39
40 12 flux greatly increased (September 1998, July 1999, July 2000, and September 2000)
41
42
43 13 (Figs. 2 and 8).

44
45
46
47 14 The mean value of N₂O fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m in the Gray
48
49
50 15 Lowland soil was 0.026 mg N m⁻² h⁻¹ and it was about ten times higher than that in the
51
52
53 16 Andosol (0.002 mg N m⁻² h⁻¹). The N₂O fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m
54
55
56 17 were much lower than those from the soil to the atmosphere (Figs. 1 and 2). There was a
57
58
59 18 significant positive correlation between the N₂O flux at a depth of 0.3 m and the N₂O
60

1 flux from the soil to the atmosphere in the Gray Lowland soil ($r= 0.54, p<0.01, n=90$).

2 However, there was no significant correlation in the Andosol.

3 The cumulative N₂O flux in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m during the study period

4 ranged from 56 to 160 mg N m⁻² (mean value: 87 mg N m⁻²) in the Gray Lowland soil

5 and from 1.3 to 7.8 mg N m⁻² (mean value: 5.1 mg N m⁻²) in the Andosol (Table 2). The

6 cumulative N₂O flux of the Gray Lowland soil was significantly higher than that of the

7 Andosol in 1998 to 2000 (t-test: $|t|=3.21, p<0.05, n=3$). In both the soils, the cumulative

8 N₂O fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m were lower than those from the soil to

9 the atmosphere. The N₂O produced in the soil above a depth of 0.3 m during the study

10 period were 240–1030 mg N m⁻² (mean value: 590 mg N m⁻²) in the Gray Lowland soil

11 and 640–1980 mg N m⁻² (mean value: 1350 mg N m⁻²) in the Andosol (Table 2). The

12 contribution ratios of the N₂O produced in the topsoil (above the depth of 0.3 m) to the

13 emitted N₂O from the soil to the atmosphere were 0.77–0.91 in the Gray Lowland soil

14 and 0.99–1.01 in the Andosol (Table 2). These contribution ratios of the Gray Lowland

15 soil were significantly higher than those of the Andosol from 1998 to 2000 (t-test:

16 $|t|=6.40, p < 0.01, n = 3$). In other words, the proportion of the N₂O produced in the

17 subsoil (below a depth of 0.3 m) to the N₂O emitted from the soil to the atmosphere was

18 9–23 % in the Gray Lowland soil and 0–1 % in the Andosol.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Concentration and flux of CO₂ in the soil profile

2 The cumulative CO₂ fluxes from the soil to the atmosphere in the Gray Lowland soil
3 and the Andosol during the study period were 360–430 g C m⁻² and 340–540 g C m⁻²,
4 respectively (Table 3). There was no significant difference in the CO₂ emission from the
5 soil into the atmosphere between the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol (t-test: $|t|=0.20$,
6 $p=0.85$, $n=3$). In both the soils, the CO₂ flux increased in July and August with an
7 increase in soil temperature (Figs. 3 and 4).

8 The mean values of the CO₂ concentration in the soil at depths of 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3,
9 0.4, 0.5, and 0.6 m were 2.1, 3.5, 7.6, 12, 20, 21, and 21×10³ ppmv in the Gray Lowland
10 soil and 3.5, 6.4, 10, 13, 17, 22, and 21×10³ ppmv in the Andosol, respectively. In both
11 the soils, CO₂ concentrations at a depth of 0.05 m were always higher than that of the
12 ambient air (0.36×10³ ppmv). The CO₂ concentration gradient in the soil profile also
13 increased from July to September with an increase in soil temperature. The seasonal
14 pattern of CO₂ concentration in the soil was similar to that of the CO₂ flux from the soil
15 surface (Figs. 3 and 4). The CO₂ concentration in the soil above a depth of 0.4 m
16 increased with an increase in depth; however, the concentration below a depth of 0.4 m
17 did not increase (Figs. 7 and 8).

18 The mean value of CO₂ fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m was 5.5 mg C m⁻²

1 h⁻¹ in the Gray Lowland soil and 2.6 mg C m⁻² h⁻¹ in the Andosol. The CO₂ fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m were much lower than those from the soil to the atmosphere (Figs. 3 and 4). There was no significant correlation between the CO₂ flux in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m and CO₂ flux from the soil to the atmosphere in both the soils.

2 The range of the cumulative CO₂ flux in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m during the study period through a depth of 0.3 m was 16–44 g C m⁻² (mean value 27 g C m⁻²) in the Gray Lowland soil and 3.7–7.1 g C m⁻² (mean value 5.2 g C m⁻²) in the Andosol, and this cumulative CO₂ flux of the Gray Lowland soil was higher than that of the Andosol from 1998 to 2000 (t-test: $|t|=2.51$, $p=0.07$, $n=3$) (Table 3). In both soils, the cumulative CO₂ fluxes in the soil through a depth of 0.3 m were lower than those from the soil to the atmosphere. The CO₂ produced in the soil above a depth of 0.3m during the study period was 330–410 g C m⁻² (mean value 370 g C m⁻²) in the Gray Lowland soil and 320–530 g C m⁻² (mean value 410 g C m⁻²) in the Andosol. The contribution ratios of the CO₂ produced in the topsoil (above the depth of 0.3 m) to the CO₂ emitted from the soil into the atmosphere were 0.89–0.96 in the Gray Lowland soil and 0.99 in the Andosol (Table 3). These contribution ratios of the Andosol were significantly higher than that of the Gray Lowland soil from 1998 to 2000 (t-test: $|t|=2.88$, $p=0.04$,

1 $n=3$). In other words, the proportions of the CO₂ produced in the subsoil (below the
2 depth of 0.3 m) to the CO₂ emitted from soil to the atmosphere were 4–11% in the Gray
3 Lowland soil and 1% in the Andosol.

4

5 **DISCUSSION**

6 **The N₂O concentration in the soil profile**

7 In both Gray Lowland and Andosol soils, the seasonal pattern of the N₂O flux from the
8 soil surface was similar to that of the N₂O concentration in the soil from depths of 0.05
9 to 0.6 m (Figs.1 and 2). In the Gray Lowland soil, the N₂O concentration gradient from
10 the surface soil to a depth of 0.6 m increased when the N₂O flux significantly increased
11 (Figs. 1 and 7). On the other hand, the N₂O concentration gradient of the surface soil
12 increased when the N₂O flux significantly increased in the Andosol (Figs. 2 and 8).
13 Therefore, it suggests that the N₂O produced in the soil profile was emitted into the
14 atmosphere. In several studies, a similar N₂O flux from the soil into the atmosphere and
15 a concentration gradient in the soil profile was reported after fertilizer application and
16 irrigation (Mosier & Hutchinson 1981, Goodroad & Keeney 1985, Lessard et al. 1996,
17 Li et al. 2002, Müller et al. 2004, Clough et al. 2006, van Groenigen et al. 2005, Hirose
18 & Tsuruta 1996). In our previous paper, we reported that a significant amount of N₂O

1 emission from the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol occurring during the increasing
2 frequency of rainfall and after heavy rainfall was derived from the denitrification
3 process (Kusa *et al.* 2002, Kusa *et al.* 2006). In some reports, it was suggested that the
4 effect of soil moisture to the N₂O production by the denitrification process was greater
5 than that of the NO₃⁻ concentration in the soil. This is because N₂O could be produced
6 by denitrification in the subsoil (below the depth of 0.2 m) with high soil moisture
7 levels and a low NO₃⁻ concentration (Li *et al.* 2002, Müller *et al.* 2004, Van Groenigen
8 *et al.* 2005). In both the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol, a significant increase in the
9 N₂O flux with an increase in soil moisture and after heavy rainfall, and with the
10 increasing N₂O concentrations in the top soil and the decreasing soil water suction
11 occurred at the same time (Figs. 1 and 2). These results suggest that denitrification is the
12 main process attributed to the production of N₂O in the soil.

13 The maximum N₂O concentrations around a depth of 0.1 m were reported to be
14 0.9–180 ppmv (Mosier & Hutchinson 1981, Goodroad & Keeney 1985, Arah *et al.* 1991,
15 Lessard *et al.* 1996, Li *et al.* 2002, Jacinthe & Lal 2004, Müller *et al.* 2004, van
16 Groenigen *et al.* 2005, Itahashi *et al.* 1998). In our study, the maximum N₂O
17 concentration at a depth of 0.1 m in the Gray Lowland soil was 37 ppmv (this N₂O flux
18 was 1.5 mg N m⁻² h⁻¹) (Fig. 1), this value remained within the reported maximum N₂O

1 concentrations (Mosier & Hutchinson 1981, Goodroad & Keeney 1985, Arah et al. 1991,
2 Lessard et al. 1996, Li et al. 2002, Jacinthe & Lal 2004, Müller et al. 2004, van
3 Groenigen et al. 2005, Itahashi et al. 1998) and it was similar to the report from a corn
4 field in Colorado (the N₂O concentration at the depth of 0.1 m was about 40 ppmv and
5 the N₂O flux was about 2.3 mg N m⁻² h⁻¹) (Mosier and Hutchinson 1981). On the other
6 hand, the maximum N₂O concentrations around a depth of 0.1 m were about 0.4–4.2
7 ppmv in the Japanese Andosols, when maximum N₂O fluxes (0.04–0.2 mg N m⁻² h⁻¹)
8 were measured just after fertilizer application (Tsuruta 1997, Yoh et al. 1997, Li et al.
9 2002, Hirose & Tsuruta 1996). The N₂O concentrations in Japanese Andosols were
10 lower than those in other soils (Mosier & Hutchinson 1981, Goodroad & Keeney 1985,
11 Arah et al. 1991, Lessard et al. 1996, Jacinthe & Lal 2004, Müller et al. 2004, van
12 Groenigen et al. 2005), and this result is consistent with the values reported by Akiyama
13 and Tsuruta (2003), who concluded that N₂O emissions from Japanese Andosols were
14 lower than those from other soils in Japan and the world. The reason for low N₂O
15 concentrations in Japanese Andosols was pointed out to be the high gas diffusivity due
16 to high porosity and low N₂O production by denitrification (Li *et al.* 2002). However,
17 the Andosol of our study site showed that the maximum N₂O concentration at a depth of
18 0.1 m was 250 ppmv and this concentration was higher than the other reported values,

1 especially from Japanese Andosols (Figs. 1 and 2). Therefore, a lot of N₂O could have
2 possibly been emitted from the Japanese Andosols which had high groundwater levels
3 and a high soil moisture level after heavy rainfall (as in our study site). This is because
4 the N₂O concentration in the soil surface might have increased due to denitrification
5 after heavy rain on these soils.

6 The N₂O concentration profiles in the soils were different between the Gray Lowland
7 soil and the Andosol (Figs. 7 and 8). N₂O concentration profiles of some studies
8 (Mosier & Hutchinson 1981, Arah et al. 1991, Burton & Beauchamp 1994, Yoh et al.
9 1997, Li et al. 2002, Müller et al. 2004, Jacinthe & Lal 2004, van Groenigen et al. 2005)
10 were similar to the profile in the Gray Lowland soil of our study site, where the
11 concentration in the soil increased in the deeper layer. In Japanese Andosols, it was
12 reported that N₂O concentrations in the soil surface (depth of 0.1 to 0.2 m) were higher
13 than that in the deeper layers (Hirose & Tsuruta 1996, Itahashi et al. 1998, Tsuruta 1997).
14 Although this result is consistent with our study, the N₂O concentration profile in the
15 soil varied according to the seasons and was different among the Japanese Andosols
16 (Yoh et al. 1997, Verchot et al. 1999, Li et al. 2002). In this way, there are no consistent
17 results about the N₂O concentration profiles in the soil.

18

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **The CO₂ concentration in the soil profile**

2 In both soil types, the CO₂ concentration in the soil increased from spring to summer
3 and decreased in autumn. The seasonal pattern of this concentration was similar to that
4 of the CO₂ flux from the soil to the atmosphere (Figs. 3 and 4). The CO₂ concentrations
5 at a depth of 0.05 m were always higher than that of the ambient air. Similar types of
6 results have been frequently reported (de Jong & Schappert 1971, Hendry et al. 1999,
7 Jacinthe & Lal 2004, Osozawa 1998). Also, it is reported that the peak of the CO₂
8 concentration in the soil profile gradually dropped from a depth of 0.2–0.4 m with
9 growing plants and the CO₂ concentration increased with the depth at both fallow and
10 cultivated soils after the autumn season (de Jong & Schappert 1971, Hendry et al. 1999,
11 Jacinthe & Lal 2004, Osozawa 1998). Similar results were confirmed in our study sites
12 (Figs. 3, 4, 7, 8).

14 **N₂O and CO₂ concentrations and fluxes after rainfall**

15 The CO₂ concentration in the soil was greatly influenced by rain. This is because, at
16 first, the CO₂ concentration in the surface soil increased just after rainfall when the soil
17 porosities were filled by rainwater. Thus, the CO₂ concentration in the surface soil could
18 have been vertically diffused after drainage and evaporation from the soil surface,

1 resulting in a decrease in CO₂ concentrations around the soil surface (Osozawa 1998).
2 In the Andosol, the CO₂ concentration at a 0.1 m depth increased after heavy rainfall
3 (the precipitation during a week before the day of investigation exceeded 80 mm in July
4 1999, July 2000, and September 2000), but the CO₂ fluxes decreased (Figs. 3, 4). This
5 could possibly be due to the fact that the gas diffusion from the soil into the atmosphere
6 could have been restricted by rainfall, as reported by Osozawa (1998). This is because
7 the D/D₀ of the surface soil at this time was below 0.02 (Figs 3, 4, and 5), which might
8 have restricted gas diffusion from the soil into the atmosphere (Hatano 1997). However,
9 the N₂O concentrations in the surface soil and N₂O flux from the soil surface increased
10 at the same time (Figs. 1, 2). Therefore, it suggests that anaerobic conditions with
11 increasing soil moisture levels and the restriction of gas diffusion could have
12 accelerated the production of N₂O by denitrification, in the surface soil.

14 **The effect of soil structure to production and emission of N₂O**

15 N₂O production in the lower soil profile was reported in several studies when NO₃⁻
16 leached from the surface layer after rain (Goodroad & Keeney 1985, Müller et al. 2004,
17 van Groenigen et al. 2005). It suggests that a N₂O production spot in the soil could be
18 greatly influenced by water movement and the NO₃⁻ concentration in the soil. In the

1 Gray Lowland soil of our study, the NO_3^- in the surface soil leached through macropores
2 after rain (Hayashi & Hatano 1999), and the total N concentration of the groundwater
3 rapidly increased after applications of slurry in the grassland (Kanazawa et al. 1999)
4 adjoining the Andosol site of our study. Therefore, it seemed that the NO_3^- in the surface
5 soil leached with rain water in both soils. In the Gray Lowland soil of our study site, the
6 NO_3^- concentrations of the soil solution at a depth of 0.7 m were always below 3 mg N
7 L^{-1} , while the concentrations of the pipe drain were always around 10 mg N L^{-1}
8 (Hayashi & Hatano 1999), therefore the subsoil around the macropores could have been
9 in contact with high concentrations of NO_3^- . On another front, it was reported that the
10 NO_3^- concentrations in the soil solution at a depth of 0.8 m and those in the seepage
11 water were at the comparable level in the other Andosol in Hokkaido, Japan (Suzuki &
12 Shiga 2004). Hasegawa and Eguchi (2002) reported the rainwater moved mainly by a
13 matrix flow in an Andosol without cracks and fissures in Tsukuba, Japan. Therefore, the
14 NO_3^- concentration in the surface soil could have been higher than in the subsoil,
15 because water and NO_3^- infiltrated from the surface soil to the subsoil by matrix flow.
16 This suggests that the activity of N_2O production in the subsoil of the Gray Lowland
17 soil was higher than that in the Andosol. It corresponded with the difference in N_2O
18 concentration profiles in the soil (Figs 1 and 2) and with the contributing ratio of N_2O

1 production in the top soil between both soils (Table 2).

2 An important factor regarding N₂O emission from the soil into the atmosphere is that it
3 was not only the activity of N₂O production in the soil, but also the gas diffusivity.
4 Under the usual upland soil moisture conditions, the gas diffusivity of an Andosol with
5 high porosity is higher than in a Gray Lowland soils, however the gas movement
6 through macropores and cracks were not active in an Andosols (Osozawa 1998). On the
7 one hand, the gas movement through macropores and cracks is dominant in a Gray
8 Lowland soil (Osozawa 1998). Although the gas diffusivity estimated by the value of
9 D/D_0 in the surface soil (0–0.1m) disturbed by the plowing of the Andosol was higher
10 than that of the Gray Lowland soil (Fig. 6), there were no differences in the value of
11 D/D_0 at a depth of more than 0.3 m between the Andosol and the Gray Lowland soil.
12 However, the value of D/D_0 , which measured by 100 mL core, could not take into
13 account the gas flowing through macropores and cracks. It suggests that the gas flowing
14 in the subsoil of the Gray Lowland soil with macropores and cracks was higher than the
15 value of D/D_0 . It is considered that the gas diffusivity around macropores and cracks in
16 the subsoil of the Gray Lowland soil might be higher than in the Andosol. Therefore,
17 mobility of N₂O in the subsoil around the macropores and cracks of the Gray Lowland
18 soil might be higher than that in the Andosol. Additionally, the N₂O produced in the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 subsoil of the Andosol without macropores and cracks might have been reduced to N₂
8
9
10 2 before it was emitted to the atmosphere. These results **indicate** that the difference in
11
12
13 3 water mobility, NO₃⁻, O₂, and N₂O in the soils, especially the subsoil, between the Gray
14
15
16 4 Lowland and the Andosol might be the reason for variation in the seasonal pattern of
17
18
19 5 N₂O fluxes, the N₂O concentration profile in the soil, and the ratio of contribution of the
20
21
22 6 subsoil to N₂O production in the soil between both soils (Figs. 7– 9, Table 2).

23
24
25 7 The CO₂ emitted from the soil into the atmosphere is produced by the respiration of
26
27
28 8 plant roots and soil microbes (Smith et al. 2003). In spite of the differences in soil type,
29
30
31 9 CO₂ could be produced in the top soil, because plant roots and soil microbes were
32
33
34 10 distributed in the **top soil** (Nakamoto 1993, Osozawa 1998). More than 90 % of the CO₂
35
36
37 11 emitted from the soil to the atmosphere was produced in the top soil in both the soil
38
39
40 12 types (Table3). Unlike N₂O, there was no significant correlation between the CO₂ flux
41
42
43 13 **through** a 0.3 m depth and that from the soil into the atmosphere in both soils. In this
44
45
46 14 way, our results corresponded to the previous reports (Nakamoto 1993, Osozawa 1998,
47
48
49 15 Smith et al. 2003).

50
51
52
53
54 16

55 56 57 17 **Conclusions**

58
59
60 18 In the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol, N₂O and CO₂ were mainly produced in the

1 top soil (0–0.3m depth). The seasonal patterns of the CO₂ concentration profile were
2 similar in both the soil types. However, the N₂O concentration profile in the soil was
3 different between the two soils. Additionally, the ratio of contribution of the subsoil to
4 the N₂O production in the soil of the Gray Lowland soil was higher than that of the
5 Andosol, because the N₂O production in the subsoil around macropores and cracks of
6 the Gray Lowland soil might have been activated by the leaching of NO₃⁻ through
7 macropores and cracks. Subsequently the N₂O produced in the subsoil could have been
8 rapidly emitted from the soil into the atmosphere through macropores and cracks. This
9 suggests that the variations in the N₂O concentration profile between the two soils are
10 caused by the differences in soil structure. This is especially because of the presence of
11 macropores and cracks in the soil structure, which influenced the production and
12 movement of N₂O in the soil.

13

14 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

15 We thank Dr. Ohashi, Dr. Yoshida, Dr. Hayakawa, Dr. Kanazawa, and Dr. Tsuruta for
16 their contribution in operating the gas chromatograph and for their valuable suggestions.
17 This study was partly supported by the Japanese Grant-in Aids for Science Research
18 from the Ministry of Education (08456038) and by a Global Environment Research

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Fund from the Environment Agency (Ministry) of Japan B-51 (6)

2

3

For review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 REFERENCES

- 8
9
10 2 Akiyama H, Tsuruta H 2002: Effect of chemical fertilizer from on N₂O, NO and NO₂
11
12
13 3 fluxes from an Andosol field. *Nutr. Cycling Agroecosyst.*, 63, 219-230.
14
15
16 4 Akiyama H, Tsuruta H 2003: Effect of organic matter application on N₂O, NO and NO₂
17
18
19 5 fluxes from an Andisol field. *Global Biogeochem. Cycl.*, 17, 1100.
20
21
22 6 Akiyama H, Tsuruta H, Watanabe T 2000: N₂O and NO emissions from soils after the
23
24
25 7 application of different chemical fertilizers. *Chemosphere Global Change Sci.*, 2,
26
27
28 8 313-320.
29
30
31 9 Arah JRM, Smith KA, Crichton IJ, Li HS 1991: Nitrous oxide production and
32
33
34 10 denitrification in Scottish arable soils. *J. Soil Sci.*, 42, 351-367.
35
36
37 11 Burton DL, Beauchamp EG 1994: Profile nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide
38
39
40 12 concentrations in a soil subject to freezing. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 58, 115-122.
41
42
43 13 Clough TJ, Kelliher FM, Wang YP, Sherlock RR 2006: Diffusion of ¹⁵N-labelled N₂O
44
45
46 14 into soil columns: a promising method to examine the fate of N₂O subsoils. *Soil Biol.*
47
48
49 15 *Biochem.*, 38, 1462-1468.
50
51
52 16 de Jong E, Schappert HJV 1971: Calculation of soil respiration and activity from CO₂
53
54
55 17 profiles in the soil. *Soil Sci.*, 113, 328-333.
56
57
58 18
59
60 18 FAO, IFA 2001: *Global estimates of gaseous emissions of NH₃, NO and N₂O from*

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 *agricultural land.*, Food and Agriculture Organization and International Fertilizer
8
9
10 2 industry Association, Rome.
11
12
13 3 Goodroad LL, Keeney DR 1985: Site of nitrous oxide production in field soils. *Biol.*
14
15
16 4 *Fertil. Soils*, 1, 3-7.
17
18
19 5 Granli T, Bøckman CO 1994: Nitrous oxide from agriculture. *Norwegian Journal of*
20
21
22 6 *agricultural science*, pp 7-128
23
24
25 7 Hasegawa S 1986: Soil water movement in upland fields converted from paddy fields.
26
27
28 8 *Soil Phy. Con. Plant. Grow. Jpn.*, 53, 13-19.
29
30
31 9 Hasegawa S, Eguchi S 2002: Soil water condition and flow characteristics in the subsoil
32
33
34 10 of a volcanic ash soil: Findings from field monitoring from 1997 to 1999. *Soil Sci. Plant*
35
36
37 11 *Nutr.*, 48, 227-236.
38
39
40 12 Hasegawa S, Kasubuchi T 1988: Measurement of soil water suction by use of handy
41
42
43 13 digital manometer. *Soil Phy. Con. Plant. Grow. Jpn.*, 58, 49-51.
44
45
46 14 Hatano R 1997: Soil Physical Quality In: Kazutake K (ed) *Current Soil Science* pp
47
48
49 15 96-118. Asakura Shiyoten, Tokyo.
50
51
52 16 Hayashi Y, Hatano R 1999: Annual nitrogen leaching to subsurface drainage water from
53
54
55 17 a clayey aquic soil cultivated with onions in Hokkaido, Japan. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 45,
56
57
58 18 451-459.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 Hendry MJ, Mendoza CA, Kirkland RA, Lawrence JR 1999: Quantification of transient
8
9
10 2 CO₂ production in a sandy unsaturated zone. *Water resources research*, 35, 2189-2198.
11
12
13 3 Hirose T, Tsuruta H 1996: Measurement of NO and N₂O fluxes from the soils with the
14
15
16 4 application of ammonium- and nitrate-fertilizers. *Res. Rep. Div. Environ. Planning*
17
18
19 5 *NIAES*, 12, 113-118.
20
21
22 6 Hosen Y, Tsuruta H, Minami K 2000: Effects of the depth of NO and N₂O production in
23
24
25 7 soil on their emission rates to the atmosphere: analysis by a simulation model. *Nutr.*
26
27
28 8 *Cycling Agroecosyst.*, 57, 83-98.
29
30
31 9 Inoue H 1988: Flow in the soil of agricultural fields with shrinkage crack. *Trans. Jpn.*
32
33
34 10 *Soc. Irr. Drain. Recla, Eng.*, 137, 25-34.
35
36
37 11 Itahashi S, Tsuruta H, Akiyama H, Hosen Y, Eguchi S 1998: NO and N₂O emission
38
39
40 12 from nitrogen fertilized soil (3) -Vertical distributions of gas concentrations in soils
41
42
43 13 applied with calcium nitrate, coated calcium nitrate, or coated urea-. *Res. Rep. Div.*
44
45
46 14 *Environ. Planning NIAES*, 14, 47-76.
47
48
49
50 15 Jacinthe PA, Lal R 2004: Effects of soil cover and land-use on the relations
51
52
53 16 flux-concentration of trace gases. *Soil Sci.*, 169, 243-259.
54
55
56 17 Jambert C, Serca D, Delmas R 1997: Quantification of N-losses as NH₃, NO, N₂O and
57
58
59 18 N₂ from fertilized maize fields in southwestern France. *Nutr. Cycling Agroecosyst.* , 48,
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 91-104.
8
9
10 2 Japanese Society of Pedology 2003: *Unified Soil Classification System of Japan-2nd*
11
12
13 3 *Approximation (2002)*. Hakuyushiya, Tokyo.
14
15
16 4 Kanazawa K, Miyaji N, Kusaba T, Ban K, Hayakawa Y, Hatano R 1999: Groundwater
17
18
19 5 pollution by cattle slurry stored in unlined lagoon. *JARQ.* , 33, 7-13.
20
21
22 6 Koga N, Tsuruta H, Sawamoto T, Nishimura S, Yagi K 2004: N₂O emission and CH₄
23
24
25 7 uptake in arable fields managed under conventional and reduced tillage cropping
26
27
28 8 systems in northern Japan. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 18, GB4025.
29
30
31 9 Kusa K, Hu R, Sawamoto T, Hatano R 2006: Three years of nitrous oxide and nitric
32
33
34 10 oxide emissions from a silandic Andosols cultivated with maize in Hokkaido, Japan.
35
36
37 11 *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 52, 103-113.
38
39
40 12 Kusa K, Sawamoto T, Hatano R 2002: Nitrous oxide emissions for 6 years from a gray
41
42
43 13 lowland soil cultivated with onions in Hokkaido, Japan. *Nutr. Cycling Agroecosyst.*, 63,
44
45
46 14 239-247.
47
48
49
50 15 Kusa K, Sawamoto T, Hu R, Hatano R 2008: Comparison of the closed-chamber and
51
52
53 16 gas concentration gradient methods for measurement of CO₂ and N₂O fluxes in two
54
55
56 17 upland field soils. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 54, 777-785.
57
58
59 18 Lessard R, Rochette P, Gregorich EG, Pattey E, Desjardins RL 1996: Nitrous oxide
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 fluxes from manure-amended soil under maize. *J. Environ. Qual.*, 25, 1371-1377.
8
9
10 2 Li X, Inubushi K, Sakamoto K 2002: Nitrous oxide concentrations in an andisol profile
11
12 3 and emissions to the atmosphere as influenced by the application of nitrogen fertilizers
13
14 4 and manure. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, 35, 108-113.
15
16
17
18 5 Müller C, Stevens R, Laughlin R, Jäger H-J 2004: Microbial processes and the site of
19
20 6 N₂O production in a temperate grassland soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 36, 453-461.
21
22
23
24
25 7 Mosier AR, Hutchinson GL 1981: Nitrous oxide emissions from cropped fields. *J.*
26
27 8 *Environ. Qual.*, 10, 169-173.
28
29
30
31 9 Nakamoto T 1993: Some problem about root of plant (6) -distribution of root system.
32
33 10 *Agriculture and Horticulure.*, 68, 1328-1332.
34
35
36
37 11 Osozawa S 1998: A simple method for determining the gas diffusion coefficient in soils
38
39 12 and its application to soil diagnosis and analysis of gas movement in soil. *Bulletin*
40
41 13 *NIAES*, 15, 1-66.
42
43
44
45
46 14 Prather M, Ehhalt D, Dentener F, Derwent R, Dlugokencky E, Holland E, Isaksen I,
47
48 15 Katima J, Kirchhoff V, Matson P, Midgley P, Wang M 2001: Atmospheric chemistry and
49
50 16 greenhouse gases. In: Houghton JT, Ding Y, Griggs DJ, Noguer M, van der Linden PJ,
51
52 17 Dai X, Maskell K, Johnson CA (eds) *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis.*
53
54 18 *Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.*, pp. 241-287. Cambridge University Press,
2 Chambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 3 Pritchard DT, Currie JA 1982: Diffusion coefficients of carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide,
4 ethylene and ethane in air and their measurement. *J. Soil Sci.*, 33, 175-184.
- 5 Sapporo Distinct Meteorological Observatory 1995-2000: *Monthly climate data in*
6 *Hokkaido, Japan*, Sapporo Distinct meteorological Observatory, Sapporo.
- 7 Skiba U, McTaggart IP, Smith KA, Hargreaves KJ, Fowler D 1996: Estimates of nitrous
8 oxide emissions from soil in the UK. *Energy Convers. Mgmt.*, 37, 1303-1308.
- 9 Smith KA, Ball B, Conen F, Dobbie KE, Massheder J, Rey A 2003: Exchange of
10 greenhouse gases between soil and atmosphere: interactions of soil physical factors and
11 biological processes. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 54, 779-791.
- 12 Suzuki K, Shiga H 2004: The Maximum Permissible Amount of Nitrogen Input into an
13 Andosol Upland Field in Abashiri Area Assessed by Percolate Nitrate Concentrations.
14 *Jpn. J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 75, 45-52.
- 15 Tsuruta H 1997: Emission rates of methane from rice paddy fields and of N₂O from
16 fertilized upland fields estimated from intensive field measurement for three years
17 (1992-1994) all over Japan. *Res. Rep. Div. Environ. Planning NIAES*, 13, 101-130.
- 18 van Groenigen JW, Georgius PJ, van Kessel C, Hummelink EWJ, Velthof GL, Zwart

1 KB 2005: Subsoil ^{15}N - N_2O concentrations in a sandy soil profile after application of
2 ^{15}N -fertilizer. *Nutr. Cycling Agroecosyst.*, 72, 13-25.

3 Verchot LV, Davidson EA, Cattânio JH, Ackerman IL, Erickson HE, Keller M 1999:
4 Land use change and biogeochemical controls of nitrogen oxide emissions from soils in
5 eastern Amazonia. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 13, 31-46.

6 Yoh M, Toda H, Kanda K, Tsuruta H 1997: Diffusion analysis of N_2O cycling in a
7 fertilized soil. *Nutr. Cycling Agroecosyst.*, 49, 29-33.

8 9 **Captions**

10 **Table 1** Soil texture, structure, and saturated hydraulic conductivity of the study site

11 **Table 2** Cumulative flux, production, and mass balance of N_2O during the study period

12 **Table 3** Cumulative flux, production, and mass balance of CO_2 during the study period

13 **Table 4** The regression curves of the soil water suction (pF)– D/D_0 used to the
14 calculation of the gas fluxes in the soil profile.

15 **Figure 1** The seasonal patterns of (a) rainfall and N_2O fluxes from the soil surface and
16 through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (b, c) N_2O concentration in soil air (at 0.05,
17 0.1, 0.3, and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil water suction (at 0.2, 0.3, and 0.6 m depths) in the
18 Gray Lowland soil from 1995 to 2000. Chemical fertilizer was applied at the end of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 April. The surface fluxes were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2002.

2 **Figure 2** The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and N₂O fluxes from the soil surface and
3 through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (b, c) N₂O concentration in soil air (at 0.05,
4 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil water suction (at 0.2, 0.3 and 0.6 m depths) in the
5 Andosol from 1998 to 2000. Chemical fertilizer was applied in mid-May. The surface
6 fluxes were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2006.

7 **Figure 3** The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and WFPS of the soil surface, (b) CO₂
8 fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (c) CO₂
9 concentrations of soil air (0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil temperature at a 0.1 m
10 depth from the Gray Lowland soil from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05 m) and the soil
11 temperature were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2002.

12 **Figure 4** The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and WFPS in the soil surface, (b) CO₂
13 fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (c) CO₂
14 concentrations in soil air (at 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil temperature at a 0.01
15 m depth from the Andosol from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05m), the surface fluxes
16 and the soil temperature were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2006.

17 **Figure 5** The relationships between the relative gas coefficient (D/D₀) and soil
18 moisture (WFPS) from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05m) was reported by Kusa *et al.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 1 2002 and 2006.
8

9
10 2 **Figure 6** Seasonal patterns of the relative gas coefficient (D/D_0) for the Gray Lowland
11
12 3 soil and the Andosol in 1998.

13
14
15
16 4 **Figure 7** Monthly average concentrations of N_2O and CO_2 in the soil profile from the
17
18 5 Gray Lowland soil from 1995 to 2000 (N_2O) and from 1998 to 2000 (CO_2).

19
20
21
22 6 **Figure 8** Monthly average concentrations of N_2O and CO_2 in the soil profile from the
23
24 7 Andosol from 1998 to 2000.
25
26
27

28 8
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Soil texture, structure, and saturated hydraulic conductivity of the study site

Horizon	Depth (m)	Texture	Structure			Saturated hydraulic conductivity (m s ⁻¹)
			Grade	Size	Type	
<i>Humic Gray Lowland soil</i>						
Ap	0-0.28	SiC	Strong	Medium	Subangular blockly	1.0*10 ⁻⁷
B	0.28-0.48	SiC	Strong	Medium	Subangular blockly	1.8*10 ⁻⁶
C1	0.48-0.68	HC	Strong	Coarse	Prismlike	4.6*10 ⁻⁶
C2	0.68-1.0+	SiC	-	-	Massive	2.2*10 ⁻⁴
<i>Andosol</i>						
Ap	0-0.3	CL	-	-	Granular	3.3*10 ⁻⁶
AB	0.3-0.37	LiC	Moderate	Medium	Subangular blockly	2.2*10 ⁻⁵
B	0.37-0.47	LiC	Moderate	Medium	Subangular blockly	2.3*10 ⁻⁵
BC1	0.47-0.75	CL	Weak	Coarse	Subangular blockly	4.3*10 ⁻⁵
BC2	0.75-0.9	LiC	Weak	Coarse	Subangular blockly	ND
C	0.9-1.0+	SL	-	-	Massive	ND

Table 2 Cumulative flux, production, and mass balance of N₂O during the study period

Year	Period	Cumulative N ₂ O flux during study period		Mass of N ₂ O in the topsoil (above 0.3m)		N ₂ O production by topsoil (P) (mg N m ⁻²)	Contribution ratio of topsoil (P/F ₀)
		Surface flux (F ₀) (mg N m ⁻²)	Through 0.3 m (F _{0.3}) (mg N m ⁻²)	Beginning (Ms) (mg N m ⁻²)	End (Me) (mg N m ⁻²)		
<i>Gray Lowland soil</i>							
1995	6/13-10/28	760±140	86±6	0.35	0.55	670	0.89
1996	7/2-10/31	310±33	71±4	0.26	1.02	240	0.77
1997	6/13-10/23	450±200	56±5	0.32	0.56	390	0.88
1998	6/23-10/27	430±76	65±4	0.20	0.83	370	0.85
1999	5/26-10/20	930±250	80±7	0.69	0.64	850	0.91
2000	5/30-10/24	1190±450	160±10	0.21	0.70	1030	0.86
	Average	680±96	87±3	0.34	0.72	590	0.86
<i>Andosol</i>							
1998	6/15-9/29	630±88	1.3±0.1	0.23	8.37	640	1.01
1999	6/6-9/13	1980±230	6.2±0.6	0.12	0.30	1980	1.00
2000	7/17-9/18	1430±140	7.8±1.1	0.20	0.33	1420	0.99
	Average	1350±94	5.1±0.4	0.18	3.00	1350	1.00

F₀ was measured by chamber method and F_{0.3} was measured by gradient method.

±, standard deviation

Table 3 Cumulative flux, production, and mass balance of CO₂ during the study period

Year	Period	Cumulative CO ₂ flux during the study period				CO ₂ production by topsoil		Contribution ratio of topsoil (P/F ₀)
		Surface flux (F ₀) (g C m ⁻²)	Through 0.3 m (F _{0.3}) (g C m ⁻²)	Beginning (Ms) (g C m ⁻²)	End (Me) (g C m ⁻²)	(P)	(g C m ⁻²)	
<i>Gray Lowland soil</i>								
1998	6/23-10/27	360±29	22±1	0.32	0.23	330		0.94
1999	5/26-10/20	410±26	44±2	0.12	0.13	370		0.89
2000	5/30-10/24	430±27	16±1	0.12	0.16	410		0.96
	Average	400±16	27±1	0.22	0.22	370		0.93
<i>Andosol</i>								
1998	6/15-9/29	380±9	4.8±0.1	0.34	0.70	380		0.99
1999	6/6-9/13	540±9	7.1±0.3	0.25	1.31	530		0.99
2000	7/17-9/18	340±6	3.7±0.3	0.53	0.47	320		0.99
	Average	420±5	5.2±0.1	0.37	0.83	410		0.99

F₀ was measured by chamber method and F_{0.3} was measured by gradient method.

±, standard deviation.

Table 4 The regression curves of the soil water suction (pF)–D/D₀ in the soil profile.

Depth (m)	Regression curve	R ²	Mean square of residual
<i>Gray Lowland soil</i>			
0.15–0.20	$Y = 4.6 \times 10^{-4}x^3 - 2.2 \times 10^{-3}x^2 + 3.5 \times 10^{-3}x + 6.0 \times 10^{-5}$	0.973	5.0×10^{-8}
0.23–0.28	$Y = 1.0 \times 10^{-3}x^3 - 3.7 \times 10^{-3}x^2 + 4.9 \times 10^{-3}x - 2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	0.972	2.0×10^{-7}
0.32–0.37	$Y = 9.8 \times 10^{-4}x^3 - 3.5 \times 10^{-3}x^2 + 4.7 \times 10^{-3}x - 2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	0.999	7.8×10^{-9}
0.43–0.48	$Y = 1.1 \times 10^{-3}x^3 - 3.8 \times 10^{-3}x^2 + 5.3 \times 10^{-3}x - 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$	0.991	1.4×10^{-7}
0.54–0.59	$Y = 4.0 \times 10^{-3}x^3 - 1.1 \times 10^{-2}x^2 + 9.5 \times 10^{-3}x - 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$	0.994	4.3×10^{-7}
<i>Andosol</i>			
0.13–0.18	$Y = -8.0 \times 10^{-5}x^3 + 2.2 \times 10^{-3}x^2 - 3.4 \times 10^{-3}x + 1.3 \times 10^{-3}$	0.998	1.0×10^{-7}
0.31–0.36	$Y = -5.2 \times 10^{-4}x^3 + 4.2 \times 10^{-3}x^2 - 6.7 \times 10^{-4}x - 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$	0.993	1.3×10^{-6}
0.40–0.45	$Y = -9.6 \times 10^{-4}x^3 + 5.8 \times 10^{-3}x^2 - 1.6 \times 10^{-3}x - 1.1 \times 10^{-3}$	0.983	2.9×10^{-6}
0.58–0.63	$Y = -5.0 \times 10^{-5}x^3 + 8.6 \times 10^{-4}x^2 + 1.8 \times 10^{-3}x - 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$	0.993	3.5×10^{-7}

Y denotes the value of D/D₀, x denote the soil water suction (pF), $pF = \log(-10.2 \varphi)$, φ is the soil water suction (kPa)




Figure 1 The seasonal patterns of (a) rainfall and N₂O fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (b, c) N₂O concentration in soil air (at 0.05, 0.1, 0.3, and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil water suction (at 0.2, 0.3, and 0.6 m depths) in the Gray Lowland soil from 1995 to 2000. Chemical fertilizer was applied at the end of April. The surface fluxes were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2002.

281x185mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 2 The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and N₂O fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (b, c) N₂O concentration in soil air (at 0.05, 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil water suction (at 0.2, 0.3 and 0.6 m depths) in the Andosol from 1998 to 2000. Chemical fertilizer was applied in mid-May. The surface fluxes were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2006.

161x185mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 3 The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and WFPS of the soil surface, (b) CO₂ fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (c) CO₂ concentrations of soil air (0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil temperature at a 0.1 m depth from the Gray Lowland soil from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05 m) and the soil temperature were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2002.

161x180mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 4 The seasonal pattern of (a) rainfall and WFPS in the soil surface, (b) CO₂ fluxes from the soil surface and through a 0.3 m depth in the soil profile, (c) CO₂ concentration in soil air (at 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 m depths), (d) soil temperature at a 0.01 m depth from the Andosol from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05m), the surface fluxes and the soil temperature were reported by Kusa *et al.* 2006.

161x187mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 5 The relationships between the relative gas coefficient (D/D_0) and soil moisture (WFPS) from 1998 to 2000. WFPS (0-0.05m) was reported by Kusa *et al.* 2002 and 2006.
149x72mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 6 Seasonal patterns of the relative gas coefficient (D/D_0) for the Gray Lowland soil and the Andosol in 1998.
152x76mm (150 x 150 DPI)

review




Figure 7 Monthly average concentrations of N₂O and CO₂ in the soil profile from the Gray Lowland soil from 1995 to 2000 (N₂O) and from 1998 to 2000 (CO₂).
197x121mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Figure 8 Monthly average concentrations of N_2O and CO_2 in the soil profile from the Andosol from 1998 to 2000.
144x106mm (150 x 150 DPI)