

## ***Interactive comment on “Biochar’s effect on soil nitrous oxide emissions from a maize field with lime-adjusted pH treatment” by R. Hüppi et al.***

**Dr. Gattinger**

andreas.gattinger@fibl.org

Received and published: 7 September 2015

The authors conducted a very important piece of research, because field studies aiming at elucidating the biochar’s role in mitigating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and searching for the underlying mechanisms at the same time are very scarce. The paper is of good scientific quality, is generally well written and the results are presented clearly. However, there are a few issues which need to be addressed in a revised version of the paper:

1. The treatment effect: In its current version the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions doesn’t follow any significant treatment effect. This is due to the experimental design, where the treatments were defined according to its potential pH effect: “control”, “biochar”, “lime”. In fact with the application of either biochar or lime, soil pH could be significantly increased

C432

relative to the control. However, for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions the variations from the limed plots were that high that a final treatment effect on level  $p = 0.05$  could not be determined. If the standard error of the N<sub>2</sub>O flux curves from liming would have been in the same range as the flux curves determined for the control or biochar plots, there would have been an effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Anyhow, high variations from N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from field measurements are a quite common feature. Therefore, I suggest to report the data in two ways. First, as it is now, along with the observed phenomena. Second, following an experimental design which considers only the treatments “control” and “biochar”. For this, the statistical analyses need to be revised, as the treatment “lime” will be removed from the statistical model. This, however, impacts on the objectives and hypotheses, thus they need to be adapted as well. It could be done in a way by saying that this experiment follows two lines: one is to observe any biochar effect on N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation, the other one goes for causative research (pH effect) by adding a lime treatment to the experiment. Considering the suggestions made by R. Fuss will be straight forward to improve the statistical approach in general. Adapting the paper in that way impacts on the overall context, meaning that the impact of biochar alone may deserve more attention in the discussions section and that statements for a possible pH effect should be done more cautiously. As a further consequence from the re-arrangement of the paper, I suggest another title: “Effect of biochar and liming on soil nitrous oxide fluxes from a maize field.”

2. Crop yields: The authors present crop yields from maize and its N and P uptake in figures 5 to 7. I suggest to replace the term “plant” by “aboveground biomass” to make it clearer. Furthermore, as already suggested by R. Fuss, I would report N<sub>2</sub>O effects as 1) area-scaled and b) as yield-scaled N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. This illustrations should ideally follow the same line as explained above, namely for the pH effect (control, biochar, lime) and for biochar effect (control, biochar). The yield-scaled illustration of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions provides an even stronger argument for a possible GHG mitigation effect of biochar as it impacts apart from N<sub>2</sub>O suppression also on crop growth. These aspects needs stronger consideration in the discussion of the revised paper as well.

C433

---

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., 2, 793, 2015.

C434