ABSTRACT

MIAO, GUOFANG. A Multi-scale Study on Respiratory Processes in a Lower Coastal Plain Forested Wetland in the Southeastern United States. (Under the direction of Dr. John S. King and Dr. Asko Noormets).

Carbon cycling in wetlands is an important component of the carbon budget in terrestrial ecosystems. Environmental change and land conversion for agricultural use have been affecting wetlands in recent decades and might change their role from carbon sinks to sources. However, carbon dynamics in wetlands are less-well investigated than in upland systems and still absent in most regional- or global-scale studies. This research, as a part of a comprehensive study on carbon dynamics of a lower coastal plain forested wetland in the Southeastern USA, focused on respiration - a key determinant affecting the role of an ecosystem as carbon source or sink.

Ecosystem respiration, soil respiration and decomposition of coarse woody debris were investigated by quantifying CO$_2$ emissions of each in response to temperature and water table fluctuation. Soil respiration was intensively measured with an automated system to obtain high-frequency (30 minutes) temporal data as well as a survey system to characterize spatial variation. Stable isotope composition ($^{13}$C) of soil-respired CO$_2$ was also studied to understand the components of soil respiration. Ecosystem respiration was measured by an automated eddy-covariance flux system. Decomposition of coarse woody debris was measured monthly across the same survey area as soil respiration. To account for effects of microtopography on respiration and decrease up-scaling uncertainties, an ancillary study on microtopographic variation was also conducted.

Respiratory components under non-flooded conditions responded similarly to
temperature between this forested wetland and upland ecosystems in an exponential pattern and with comparable temperature sensitivities. Hydrology had additional effects on soil respiration and ecosystem respiration, with the relationship resembling a saturating pattern of Michaelis-Menten reaction; that is, the rate increased with the water table drawdown and was nearly constant at deeper water table depths. Soil respiration responded rapidly to flooding and decreased significantly, whereas ecosystem respiration responded slowly because the plants were tolerant to flooding.

Based on the exponential pattern of response to temperature and Michaelis-Menten pattern of response to water table depth, models were developed to estimate soil respiration and ecosystem respiration. Ecosystem respiration was estimated at 1331 to 1731 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$, and soil respiration ranged 593 to 1082 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ during the study period (2009-2011). The contribution of soil respiration to ecosystem respiration increased with the water table drawdown, with an annual average relative contribution of 0.67±0.11 (mean±SD) during non-flooded periods and 0.24±0.06 when flooded. Decomposition of coarse woody debris contributed much less to ecosystem respiration, but with large uncertainty related to biomass estimation.

$^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$) varied seasonally and exhibited a significant relationship with hydrology and microtopography. The $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ at mound microsites was depleted during summer and enriched in spring and autumn, whereas the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ at low-lying microsites exhibited the opposite pattern (i.e. enriched during summer and depleted in spring). This suggests that under warmer and drier conditions the relative contribution of root respiration to soil respiration increased at mound microsites, but soil organic carbon decomposition had a higher relative contribution at low-lying microsites.
Accounting for microtopographic difference and hydrologic effects will improve methods partitioning soil respiration and differentiating fast and slow turnover carbon pools.
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Figure 4-5 (a) Soil temperature and (b) water table depth effects on the $^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$) at HIGH and LOW microsites in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. Black dots represent the mean $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ under non-flooded conditions and grey dots represent flooded conditions. The bar is the standard error of $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$.

Figure 4-6 Comparison of the water table depth effects on the $^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$, mean±SD) between HIGH and LOW microsites under non-flooded conditions in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. The sample size was 31, 18, 16 and 19 for WTD<-13 cm at HIGH microsites, -13<WTD<0 cm at HIGH microsites, WTD<-13 cm at LOW microsites, and -13<WTD<0 cm at LOW microsites, respectively.

Figure 4-7 Relationship (a) between the soil organic carbon content (C$_{SOC}$) and the $^{13}$C composition of soil organic carbon ($\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$), and (b) ln(C$_{SOC}$/C$_{SOC,0}$) and $\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$ (see Equation 3) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. The dotted line in (b) is the regression from all the three soil fractions (F1, F2 and F3) in top- and sub-layers, and the solid line is the regression from the lighter two fractions (F1 and F2). The regression equation was y = -0.4x-29.8 ($R^2$=0.83, p<0.0001) for the dotted line and y = -0.6x-30.0 ($R^2$=0.61, p<0.0001) for the solid line.

Figure 4-8 Comparison of soil volumetric water content (mean±SD) between HIGH and LOW microsites under non-flooded conditions in a lower coastal plain forested wetland.
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Figure 5-1 Partial of carbon budget in the lower coastal plain forested wetland studied at Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge in eastern North Carolina, USA. The pools and fluxes in black text were estimated by models or measurements (see Chapter 2 and 3) across a full year. The aboveground live plant respiration was calculated as the difference between ecosystem respiration and the sum of soil respiration and CWD respiration. The belowground pools in grey and italics were rough estimates based on only few samples collected at random time.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION
Carbon storage in vegetation and soil, and carbon flow between pools in terrestrial ecosystems, have fundamental impacts on regional and global climate. Dynamic feedbacks in terrestrial ecosystems are one of the major uncertainties for balancing the carbon budget between anthropogenic emissions and increase in the atmosphere [Beer et al., 2010; Ciais et al., 1995; Schimel, 1995]. During recent decades, many studies have been conducted in different types of terrestrial ecosystems to quantify carbon stocks and fluxes and investigate the controlling mechanisms regulating potential feedback to climate. The difference in carbon dynamics among ecosystems is enormous due to geographic location, vegetation type, and associated interactions between ecological processes and physical environment [GLOBALVIEW-CO2, 2012].

While interest in wetlands carbon budgets is increasing [Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989; Bridgham et al., 2006; Brinson et al., 2002; Chmura et al., 2003; Erwin, 2009; Junk et al., 2013; Keller, 2011; P D Moore, 2002], studies on characterizing and parameterizing carbon dynamics in wetlands are still rare compared with upland ecosystems. Due to data scarcity, wetlands are absent in most regional- or global-scale research [Battin et al., 2009; Davidson, 2010; Luyssaert et al., 2007; Mahecha et al., 2010]. In existing global research networks, the proportion of wetlands represented is also small. For example, there were 25 wetland sites in the 545 sites in global FLUXNET networks (including the ‘permanent wetlands’ defined by IGBP-Land-Use and the results searched with words ‘wetland’, ‘peatland’, ‘mire’, ‘bog’, ‘fen’, and ‘marsh’). Eight sites were defined as forested, 5 shrub lands, 4 woody savannas and the rest were grassland, cropland or barren (information updated to Apr. 2013, Figure 1-
1). In the global soil respiration database (SRDB, version 20100517), there were only 135 data records for wetlands among a total of 3821 records.

1. Brief literature review on wetlands

A wetland is defined as an ecosystem that “depends on constant or recurrent, shallow inundation or saturation at or near the surface of the substrate”, with “the common diagnostic features of hydric soils and hydrophytic vegetation” \([NRC, 1995]\). Due to the slow decomposition rate and long-term accumulation resulting from the permanent or intermittent flooding, wetlands store large amounts of carbon in soil, which also causes wetlands to be one of the most sensitive ecosystems to climate change \([Ise et al., 2008]\). It has been estimated that wetland soils store 18-30% of the 1550 Pg (1 m deep) of total global soil organic carbon while covering only a small proportion of the total land area, recently estimated at 7 to 10 million km\(^2\) globally \([Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007; Trettin and Jurgensen, 2003]\).

1.1 Carbon storage and fluxes in wetlands

Generally, wetlands store more carbon in soils than in vegetation compared with upland ecosystems, although carbon allocation between vegetation and soils in wetlands is variable globally. In northern regions, early studies estimated 580 Mg C ha\(^{-1}\) (1 m deep) was stored in peat, whereas the carbon stored in vegetation ranged from 3.4 Mg C ha\(^{-1}\) in relatively open peat lands to 62 Mg C ha\(^{-1}\) in dense forested wetlands \([Gorham, 1991]\). This implies that almost 98.5% of total peat land carbon is stored in peat and only 1.5% in the vegetation \([Gorham, 1991]\). Previous studies specifically on forested wetlands estimated 65-280 Mg C
ha\(^{-1}\) (assuming carbon content of 50% in dry biomass) stored in vegetation [Lugo et al., 1990]. Soil carbon pools in forested wetlands varies with soil type and has been estimated at 180 to 500 Mg C ha\(^{-1}\) from wet mineral soil to peat [Trettin and Jurgensen, 2003].

Net primary production was estimated at 350 to 800 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) for global natural wetlands [Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989], and at 300 to 650 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) for some forested wetlands [Lugo et al., 1990]. It was also estimated in early studies that the average soil CO\(_2\) efflux is 94±16 (mean±SD) g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) in northern bogs and mires, and 200 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) in swamps and marshes [Raich and Schlesinger, 1992]. From the global SRDB, an average soil CO\(_2\) efflux from wetlands was 344±278 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) as compared to an average 816±516 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) in upland ecosystems [Bond-Lamberty and Thomson, 2010]. Individual studies indicate that wetlands have the potential of releasing an amount of CO\(_2\) to the atmosphere comparable to upland ecosystems of similar climate zones, with rates of soil CO\(_2\) efflux up to 1200 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) [Chimner, 2004; Raich and Schlesinger, 1992].

While there are still many uncertainties in estimating total CO\(_2\) emission from wetlands on a global scale, another uncertainty in carbon budgets of wetlands is methane (CH\(_4\)) emission from anaerobic respiration. Matthews and Fung [1987] estimated global wetland CH\(_4\) emission at 16 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\), with northern peat-rich bogs from 50°-70°N contributing 60% and tropical/subtropical peat-poor swamps from 20°N-30°S contributing ~25%. The greenhouse effect of this amount of CH\(_4\) is equivalent to the effect of 350 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) of CO\(_2\) emissions, calculated with the global warming potential of 21.8 mole CH\(_4\)/mole CO\(_2\) [Lelieveld et al., 1998].
This comparison between carbon input and output implies a net accumulation of carbon in wetlands. A recent estimate on sequestration in global wetland soils was 0.14 Pg C yr\(^{-1}\) with the estimated area of 6 million km\(^2\) [Bridgham et al., 2006]. For comparison, the recent estimates on CO\(_2\) emissions were 8.7 Pg C yr\(^{-1}\) from fossil fuel combustion and 1.2 Pg C yr\(^{-1}\) from land use change in 2008 [Le Quere et al., 2009]. The annual carbon sequestration of global wetlands was equivalent to 1.4% of the annual anthropogenic CO\(_2\) emissions. The mean residence time of soil organic carbon in wetlands was estimated about 500 years, much greater than a mean residence time of 32 years for global pool of soil organic carbon [Raich and Schlesinger, 1992]. Carbon accumulation and long residence time demonstrate the importance of wetlands in mitigating climate change.

1.2 Wetlands under climate change and land use change

The impacts of climate change, however, may alter the carbon dynamics of wetlands and offset their role as carbon sinks. Major changes in climate will exert different impacts on wetlands in different areas. The increase in temperature at high latitudes may cause greater evapotranspiration rate or a decrease in precipitation could result in less-frequent flooding or decrease flood duration of wetlands [Meehl et al., 2007]. Associated soil drying and drop in water table may turn existing wetlands from carbon sinks to sources by aerating large quantities of labile carbon stored in previously saturated soils, although the opposing effects between enhanced plant productivity and increased soil decomposition rate are still uncertain [Ise and Moorcroft, 2006; Kirschbaum, 2000; Moore, 2002]. Sea level rise, which has been estimated recently at 3.4±0.4 mm annually and is expected to accelerate over the coming
century, may cause losses of wetlands exacerbated by modified shorelines which restrict lateral landward wetland migration [Junk et al., 2013; Meehl et al., 2007; Webb et al., 2013].

The conversion of wetlands to agriculture and other land uses through drainage may impose additional climate forcing [Murray and Vegh, 2012]. Earlier studies suggested 0.03-0.37 Pg C yr\(^{-1}\) of carbon loss from drained organic soils from a drained area of 0.35 million km\(^2\) [Armentano, 1980]. Pendleton et al. [2012] recently estimated that the conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems is releasing 0.003-0.023 Pg C yr\(^{-1}\) with the estimated area of 0.34-1.15 million km\(^2\). This carbon emission is equivalent to 3-19% of the emission from deforestation globally [Pendleton et al., 2012]. Compared with the above estimated carbon accumulation rate of global wetlands, the carbon emission from the conversion and degradation of wetlands might offset a large proportion of the ecosystem service of wetlands as carbon sink. However, there is large variance between studies, implying large uncertainties in estimating the carbon budget of wetlands. While these previous studies suggest that wetland carbon emissions could have a significant impact on climate, more data and better understanding on the carbon dynamics in wetlands are necessary for future climate prediction and ecosystem services management.

### 1.3 Hydrologic effects and microtopography variation in wetlands

One of the most important physical characteristics among wetlands regardless of vegetation type and soil type is hydroperiod, the seasonal pattern of the water table depth [Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007]. The amplitude, frequency and duration of water table fluctuation determine the transition between aerobic and anaerobic status of soils and plant activities [Wheeler,
1999]. Hydrologic regime also interacts with microtopography, which is associated with plant distributions and soil chemical and physical properties [Frei et al., 2012; Van der Ploeg et al., 2012; Waddington and Roulet, 1996; Wheeler, 1999]. As a result, the carbon balance between CO$_2$ uptake, CO$_2$ emission and CH$_4$ emission will be altered along with the change of flooding conditions. Although only a few studies specifically investigated the microtopographic effects on carbon exchange in wetlands, most observed a general trend that topographically lower areas have lower CO$_2$ emissions and higher CH$_4$ emissions than topographically higher areas [Alm et al., 1999; Kim and Verma, 1992; Waddington and Roulet, 1996]. Waddington and Roulet [1996] found the net CO$_2$ exchange differed at microsites, with hollows acting as large sources of CO$_2$ and hummocks net sinks. Ignoring the heterogeneity of landscape features will result in bias in carbon balance estimates at a large scale [Dai et al., 2011].

2. Brief literature review on respiration

Respiration of a terrestrial ecosystem refers to the processes that release carbon into the atmosphere. The difference between the large amount of carbon from respiration and another large carbon flux, photosynthesis, determines the net carbon exchange. Small uncertainties in either flux could lead to significant bias of the net exchange [Trumbore, 2006; Valentini et al., 2000]. For example, Beer et al. [2010] estimated the global gross primary productivity (GPP) of terrestrial ecosystems at 123±8 Pg C yr$^{-1}$. Le Quéré et al. [2009] estimated the net land carbon sink in 2008 was 4.7±1.2 Pg C yr$^{-1}$.

In contrast to photosynthesis as the single process in which carbon enters terrestrial
ecosystems, respiration integrates a variety of plant and microbial processes (Figure 1-2). Every component may exhibit different sensitivities to changes in environmental drivers, which would influence estimates of carbon residence time and long-term responses of terrestrial ecosystems to climate change [Boone et al., 1998; Trumbore, 2006]. This complexity imposes greater uncertainties and difficulties in investigating the mechanisms of respiration and responses to climate change.

2.1 Modeling respiration

The number of studies on respiration has been increasing rapidly during recent decades [Baldocchi, 2008; Bond-Lamberty and Thomson, 2010]. With more measurements and larger data sets available, models for quantifying respiration have been developed from single-factor to multiple-factor with better parameterization of mechanisms involved [Conant et al., 2011; Davidson et al., 2006; Davidson et al., 2012; Moyano et al., 2013; Noormets et al., 2008].

Most models used in current studies were developed based on the empirical exponential relationship between respiration rate and temperature, e.g. the most widely used Q_{10} model modified from van’t Hoff equation and Arrhenius equation [Arrhenius, 1889; Davidson and Janssens, 2006; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994; Sierra, 2012; van’t Hoff, 1898]. In spite of the existence of interaction between temperature and water content, by which the confounding effects of water content can be partly represented by temperature effects, it has been well acknowledged that temperature alone is not sufficient for good simulation of respiration [Moyano et al., 2013; Noormets et al., 2008; Reichstein et al., 2002]. In addition, both
temperature and water content (related to precipitation) are the main physical manifestations of climate change. Predicted changes in climate might result in opposing feedbacks of respiration in a given ecosystem, leading to investigation on the effects of soil water content on respiration [Denman et al., 2007; Falloon et al., 2011; Melillo et al., 2002].

Biotic factors have additional effects on respiration although incorporating them into models is still in its infancy. Migliavacca et al. [2011] suggested that incorporating leaf area index, recent productivity or soil carbon content into models could improve simulation of ecosystem respiration. For soil respiration, substrate availability is being given more attention in models [Conant et al., 2011; Davidson et al., 2006; Davidson et al., 2012]. Due to the difficulties in directly measuring substrate availability, attempts to quantify it are still in the conceptual stage. One strategy is to modify the parameters which are constant in traditional models with the functions related to substrate availability. In other words, the traditional models are modified with dynamic parameters, e.g. the Dual Arrhenius and Michaelis-Menten kinetics (DAMM) model developed by Davidson et al. [Davidson et al., 2012].

The driver sensitivities of respiration may exhibit different patterns in varying temporal and spatial scales, which also complicates the quantification and prediction of respiration [Baldocchi et al., 2001; Savage et al., 2009]. It has been found that the extrapolation from short-term to long-term leads to an overestimation of ecosystem respiration for ecosystems in which the long-term temperature sensitivity exceeds the short-term sensitivity, whereas an underestimation occurs in those ecosystems with lower long-term temperature sensitivity.
than short-term \cite{Reichstein2005}.

2.2 Methods of partitioning respiration

Ecosystem respiration is usually partitioned by measuring individual components directly, such as the aboveground respiratory components and the belowground components (Figure 1-2), and estimating the remaining components by difference between the total and the measured components \cite{Chambers2004, Griffis2004}. The contribution from each component may differ between ecosystems and seasons.

For some ecosystems and especially forests with severe natural or anthropogenic disturbances, an increase in tree mortality potentially has important impacts on carbon balance. Therefore, coarse woody debris might become a main contributor to the carbon loss and has received more attentions as well \cite{Chambers2001, Harmon2004, Moore2013, Noormets2012}.

Soil respiration is the largest component of carbon emission from terrestrial ecosystems and also an integration of various components (Figure 1-2). The global annual soil CO$_2$ flux has been estimated to be 68±4 Pg C yr$^{-1}$ \cite{Raich1992}. Because of its importance, soil respiration partitioning methods have been well studied \cite{Hanson2000, Kuzyakov2006}. Briefly, the methods of partitioning soil respiration can be divided into invasive and noninvasive.

Different from ecosystem respiration, measuring individual components in soil implies significant soil disturbance and alteration to natural conditions. Incubating root and soil separately \textit{in vitro} breaks the root-soil interface, changes the soil atmosphere and the
interaction between root and microbial community [Baggs, 2006; Hanson et al., 2000; Kuzyakov, 2006]. Root-exclusion or trenching experiments in situ also change the interaction between root and soil, and may affect soil water content and nutrient cycling [Kuzyakov, 2006; Ross et al., 2001].

Isotope methods, both stable and radiocarbon isotopes, have long been recognized for their noninvasiveness and as tracers of ecological and physiological processes [Bowling et al., 2008; Brüggemann et al., 2011; Ehleringer et al., 2000; Ehleringer et al., 2002; Staddon, 2004; Trumbore, 2000]. The isotopic composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ can reflect the contribution from different carbon sources because each source, theoretically, has unique isotopic signature. However, the requirement of distinct isotopic signatures for all carbon sources still remains a challenge to the application of isotope methods for partitioning soil respiration. Continuous labeling as well as the use of $^{13}$C-depleted CO$_2$ in free air CO$_2$ enrichment experiments (FACE) provide external tracers for distinguishing autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration [Andrews et al., 1999; Meharg, 1994], but are complicated and expensive. Use of natural abundance of isotopes is still limited because soil encompasses the continuum from new carbon in the plant litter to progressively decayed organic matter [Dungait et al., 2012], from which the traditional statistical analysis is unable to separate the respiratory components from disparate sources [Formanek and Ambus, 2004].

Another noninvasive approach can be used to estimate heterotrophic respiration, based on the assumption that soil respiration is linearly related with root biomass. The intercept of this linear regression is estimated as heterotrophic respiration, i.e. the soil respiration in the
absence of roots [Baggs, 2006; Kucera and Kirkham, 1971; Kuzyakov, 2006; Rodeghiero and Cescatti, 2006]. However, this approach has been used rarely despite the advantage of minimal disturbance, perhaps because precise quantification of root biomass and its relationship with soil respiration is still problematic [Makita et al., 2012; Marsden et al., 2008].

2.3 Respiration in wetlands

Responses of respiration in wetlands to environmental drivers are similar to those in upland ecosystems, especially under aerobic conditions in intermittently flooded wetlands. Generally, the relationship between respiration and temperature exhibits an exponential pattern in wetlands (e.g. most wetland studies in SRDB). Soil water content effects, however, usually result in different seasonal patterns of respiration between wetlands and upland ecosystems.

For dry seasons or drought events, the aerobic respiration rate increases in wetlands when the water table sinks below the surface and oxygen and substrate availabilities increase correspondingly [Laiho, 2006; Mast et al., 1998; Schreader et al., 1998]. In upland ecosystems dry conditions represent a significant decrease in water content and respiration rate decreases [Law et al., 2001; Reichstein et al., 2002; Wen et al., 2010]. Integrating effects of both temperature and water content implies that in wetlands the warmer and drier conditions may stimulate respiration rate whereas in many upland ecosystems drier conditions likely offset the increase that would result from the warming. Therefore, similarity in temperature effects implies the possibility of applying the respiration models for upland ecosystems into wetlands, but soil water content determines the difference in model structure.
While significant effects of water table fluctuation on respiration have been found in most existing wetland studies, they are rather specific between sites and associated with vegetation type, nutrient availability and other factors [Laiho, 2006]. Some studies have shown that respiration was not affected by water table fluctuation [Parmentier et al., 2009; Updegraff et al., 2001], or responded differently between sites or microsites [Alm et al., 1999; Sulman et al., 2010].

3. Study site

This dissertation research was conducted in the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (ARNWR) located on the Albemarle-Pamlico peninsula in eastern North Carolina, USA (35°47′N, 75°54′W). ARNWR is the first and largest conservation holding in eastern North Carolina, established in 1984 to provide protection for pocosins [Bryant et al., 2008]. Astronomic tides are absent in this peninsula because of the specific combination of geomorphic features and lagoonal environment. Precipitation is the main source of water to this wetland [Moorhead and Brinson, 1995]. The mean annual temperature and precipitation, from climate records of an adjacent meteorological station (Manteo AP, NC, 35°55′N, 75°42′W) for the period 1981-2010, are 16.9°C and 1270 mm, respectively.

Sea level rise (SLR) has already begun in this area, of which the magnitude is larger than northern Atlantic coast [Kemp et al., 2009]. Management activities, such as installing riser-board structures and tide gates in old drainage ditches, have been adopted to enhance wetland functioning by preventing saltwater intrusion and flooding and help buffer these coastal ecosystems from SLR [Lawler et al., 2008]. The vulnerability of these ecosystems to the
changing climate, SLR and extreme storm events warrants research to understand mechanisms of response that will aid in development of management strategies to optimize conservation [Pearsall, 2005].

Major soil types are hydric soil, such as Pungo muck (41% of the land area), Belhaven muck (31.6%), Ponzer muck (4.6%), Hobonny muck (3.6%), Currituck muck (2.5%), Scuppernong muck (1.8%) and etc. There are also several mineral soil type, such as Hyde, Cape Fear, Udorthents (sands), Ousley fine sand and Baymeade fine sand (Figure 1-3) [Bryant et al., 2008; USDA Soil Conservation Service, 1992]. Large proportion of the vegetation types are mixed pine and hardwood forests (Figure 1-4) [Bryant et al., 2008]. Our study site was set in a mixed hardwood stand area in the center of the peninsular (star symbol in Figure 1-3 and 1-4).

4. Dissertation objectives and framework

The major objective of this research was to characterize respiratory processes, especially soil respiration, in a forested wetland in the lower coastal plain of the southeastern USA. Only CO₂ emission was investigated for each component and the following research questions were addressed:

(1) How do the respiratory components in this forested wetland respond to temperature and especially water table fluctuation?

(2) Could existing models mostly developed for upland ecosystems adequately represent the response of respiratory components to environmental drivers in this forested wetland?
(3) What is the best way to upscale estimates of respiratory components from small sampling locations to the ecosystem scale in this forested wetland with typical microtopographic variation?

(4) How much CO$_2$ is released annually from these respiratory components in this forested wetland to the atmosphere?

(5) What is the difference in these respiratory components between this forested wetland and other types of ecosystems, especially upland forests?

Chapter 2 explored questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 related to soil respiration. Soil CO$_2$ efflux was measured continuously with an automated system from summer 2009 to the end of 2010. Two environmental drivers, soil temperature and water table depth, were characterized to model soil respiration. A nested model accounting for water table depth effects was developed for characterizing aerobic soil respiration and provided a significantly better fit with observations. Two traditional models were also tested for modeling performance and compared with the nested model. To understand spatial variation due to microtopography and associated differences in hydrology and vegetation, the above studies were applied to three microsites along a microtopographic gradient, representing the mound area where trees grow, the low-lying non-vegetated area, and the transitional area between the mound and low-lying areas.

In Chapter 3, the study was expanded to other respiratory components, including ecosystem respiration ($R_e$), soil respiration ($R_s$) and coarse woody debris respiration ($R_{CWD}$). Measurements on $R_e$, $R_s$, and $R_{CWD}$ were conducted from 2009 to 2011. Analysis
similar to those in Chapter 2 (i.e. for questions 1, 2, 4 and 5) was also conducted for the other two components. The strategy of modeling soil respiration developed in Chapter 2 was applied for ecosystem respiration to account for water table depth effects. Because the spatial scale of measurements was different for the three components, question 3 was also addressed in this chapter. With a microtopography distribution analysis, soil respiration was upscaled from a single location to the ecosystem scale. The seasonal variation of contributions from soil respiration and coarse woody debris respiration to ecosystem respiration was investigated. I specifically studied the ratio of soil respiration to ecosystem respiration, characterizing its seasonal variation and response to water table fluctuation.

Chapter 4 used stable carbon isotope methods to address question 1 indirectly for the components of soil respiration. The $^{13}$C composition of soil CO$_2$ efflux is thought to reflect the relative contribution of components, and therefore the seasonal variation of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ implies the seasonal variation of the relative contribution. Gas samples of soil-respired CO$_2$ were collected at mound microsites and low-lying microsites in 2010 and 2011. The seasonal variation, spatial variation of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$, and also the hydrologic effects on these variations were investigated. The implications of the variations and hydrologic effects provided insights on how to improve the noninvasive method of partitioning soil respiration under natural conditions.

Chapter 5 synthesizes the individual study results according to the above five questions, mainly with respect to responses of respiratory components to hydrologic regime and effects on the carbon budget estimate. Implications for further studies are also discussed.
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Figures

Figure 1-1 Distribution of global wetlands (from the global wetlands 1993 dataset) and identified wetland flux sites in global FLUXNET work. Twenty-five sites were located in wetlands including the IGBP-Land-Use defined ‘permanent wetlands’. Searched words included: ‘wetland’, ‘peatland’, ‘mire’, ‘bog’, ‘fen’, and ‘marsh’ in site name. The vegetation types listed in Legend are defined by UMD-Land-Use (information from http://fluxnet.ornl.gov/).
Figure 1-2 Simplified conceptual model of respiratory processes in an ecosystem. The components in solid frames are investigated in this study. Ecosystem respiration, belowground respiration and coarse woody debris (CWD) respiration (text in bold and black) were directly measured. Aboveground respiration, root respiration, litter decomposition and soil organic carbon decomposition (text in black) were discussed based on the measured components or indirect measurements. The terms in dashed frames were not measured in this study but presented to illustrate the complexity of respiration.
Figure 1-3 Soil types in the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (copy from Figure 3 in Bryant et al., 2008). The red star symbol marks the site location of this study.
Figure 1-4 Vegetation types in the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (copy from Figure 4 in Bryant et al., 2008). The red star symbol marks the site location of this study.
CHAPTER 2. THE EFFECT OF WATER TABLE FLUCTUATION
ON SOIL RESPIRATION IN A LOWER COASTAL PLAIN FORESTED
WETLAND IN THE SOUTHEASTERN USA
Abstract

The anthropogenic and environmental pressures on wetland hydrology may trigger changes in carbon (C) cycling, potentially exposing vast amounts of soil C to rapid decomposition. However, modeling soil C dynamics in wetlands has been challenging because of the fast-changing hydrologic regimes. In the current study, we measured soil CO$_2$ efflux ($R_s$) continuously in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, to characterize its main environmental drivers. To account for spatial variation due to microtopography and associated differences in hydrology and vegetation, three microsites were positioned along a microtopographic gradient. There was a seasonal hysteresis in $R_s$ because of the transitions between flooded (FL) and non-flooded (NFL) conditions, and differed by microtopographic location. Efflux dynamics during FL were characterized with a quadratic temperature-based model, whereas during NFL a nested $Q_{10}$ model with dynamic parameters accounting for water table depth (WTD) effects provided a significantly better fit with observations compared to traditional models. The WTD effect was significant in both base respiration ($R_b$) and temperature sensitivity ($Q_{10}$). The diel variation of $R_s$ was high and independent of soil temperature and WTD, which both had small diel variations. The fit of the models to daily $R_s$ increased further, suggesting that the diel patterns in $R_s$ were likely associated with vegetation activity. With the NFL- and FL-CO$_2$ fluxes estimated separately, the site-average soil CO$_2$-C emission was approximately 960-1103 g C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ in 2010, of which 93% was released during NFL periods.
1. Introduction

It is estimated that wetland soils store 18-30% of the 1550 Pg of total global soil carbon while covering only 2-3% of the land area [Trettin and Jurgensen, 2003]. Information on soil carbon dynamics in wetlands, however, is very limited despite the large amount of C stored in these ecosystems. For example, in the global soil respiration database (SRDB version 20100517) [Bond-Lamberty and Thomson, 2010], there are only 135 data records for wetlands among the total of 3821 records. From this database, the global average annual soil CO₂ efflux (Rs, also representing the term of ‘soil respiration’ in this study) from wetlands was 344±278 (mean±SD) g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ as compared to an average 816±516 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ in upland ecosystems. The proportion of total efflux from wetlands is relatively small, but the large amount of C may play important roles in terrestrial feedbacks to climate change. A recent modeling study has shown that wetland soil decomposition is highly sensitive to climate change [Ise et al., 2008].

The hydrologic regime determines the difference in driving factors and mechanisms of temporal and spatial variation of Rs between wetlands and uplands. The hydroperiod confounds temporal variation on Rs in addition to the general seasonal variation regulated by temperature [Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007]. The water table depth (WTD) influences Rs through soil water content (SWC) or substrate availability to biological processes, and also through transitions between aerobic and anaerobic status [Wheeler, 1999]. This also implies the importance of microtopography in characterizing spatial heterogeneity of Rs in wetlands [Alm et al., 1999]. However, only few studies in the past included the microtopography factor
into the field experiment design, which could significantly affect the estimate of $R_s$ in ecosystem scale and wetland roles in global carbon cycle [Alm et al., 1999; Alm et al., 1997; Jauhiainen et al., 2005; Luken and Billings, 1985].

The mechanistic response of $R_s$ to its main environmental drivers remains poorly characterized for wetlands [Davidson et al., 2006; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994; Luo and Zhou, 2006]. The WTD effect has been qualitatively investigated by laboratory controlled studies [Blodau et al., 2004; Dinsmore et al., 2009; Moore and Dalva, 1993; Vicca et al., 2009]. Most published modeling studies, especially from intermittently flooded wetlands, have directly adapted the empirical models for $R_s$ from upland systems, substituting WTD for SWC [Studies included in SRDB; Bond-Lamberty and Thomson 2010]. However, adaptation of models across sites has been complicated by the confounding temperature effects, large spatial variability and methodological differences among studies [Chimner, 2004; Kim and Verma, 1992; Mäkiranta et al., 2009; Silvola et al., 1996]. It has been shown that without proper accounting of hydrologic effects or other confounding influences, using the short-term temperature sensitivity to project soil responses to global change could result in significant bias [Falloon et al., 2011; Subke and Bahn, 2010].

Efforts to quantify the effect of SWC or WTD on $R_s$ (as well as on ecosystem respiration) have included SWC- or WTD-sensitive temperature sensitivity (e.g. $Q_{10}$ in $Q_{10}$ model or activation energy in Arrhenius equation) [Mäkiranta et al., 2009; Reichstein et al., 2002], as well as SWC-sensitive base respiration ($R_b$) [Gaumont-Guay et al., 2006; Noormets et al., 2008]. While the dynamic characteristics of $Q_{10}$ and $R_b$ have been well recognized and
different factors were considered for its mechanisms [Pavelka et al., 2007; Sampson et al., 2007; Tjoelker et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2010], to date few studies have combined both into a single model and none have directly quantified their ability to capture the variability of $R_s$. In this study, we evaluate the WTD effect on both $Q_{10}$ and $R_b$ in a forested wetland, present a model with dynamic parameterization, and evaluate its performance in different microtopographic location.

The objectives of this study were to: (1) quantify the seasonal variation and spatial heterogeneity of $R_s$ in a seasonally-flooded coastal forested wetland on the lower coastal plain of North Carolina, USA; (2) develop a model for $R_s$ under aerobic conditions to account for the covarying effect of WTD and $T_s$, and quantify the effects of WTD- and temperature-sensitivity parameters on capturing variation at different timescale; and (3) quantify the total soil CO$_2$ emission by distinguishing aerobic and anaerobic emissions given the microtopographic heterogeneity.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Site description

The study site was located at the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (ARNWR), on the Albemarle-Pamlico peninsula of North Carolina, USA (35°47´N, 75°54´W). This peninsula differs from coastlines to the north and the south because of the specific combination of geomorphic features and lagoonal environment, which results in astronomic tides being absent and rainfall being the main source of water [Moorhead and Brinson, 1995]. The peninsula has a deeper organic layer than the adjacent mainland areas due to having formed
at the outlet of the Alligator River which carries organic sediments, and for lower intensity of drainage due to very low topographic relief.

Climate records from an adjacent meteorological station (Manteo AP, NC) show the mean (1971-2000) annual precipitation is 1298 mm. Average annual temperature is 16.8 °C with 6.8 °C in January and 26.5 °C in July. Major soil types at the site are poorly drained Pungo and Belhaven mucks. The amounts of organic matter in surface soils are approximately 20-100% and 40-100%, respectively (Web Soil Survey accessed on 12/14/2009). The soils are acidic with pH of 4.2-4.8 at surface horizons. The overstorey is predominantly composed of black gum (*Nyssa sylvatica*), swamp tupelo (*Nyssa biflora*) and bald cypress (*Taxodium distichum*), with occasional red maple (*Acer rubrum*), white cedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*) and loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*). The understory is predominantly fetterbush (*Lyonia lucida*), bitter gallberry (*Ilex galbra*), and red bay (*Persea borbonia*). Canopy height ranges from 15 to 20 m, with peak leaf area index of 3.5±0.3. Aboveground live biomass was estimated allometrically at 37.5±12.5 Mg C ha⁻¹ in 2009 and 2010. Average live fine root biomass to a depth of 30 cm was 3.1±1.0 Mg C ha⁻¹ during the same period.

2.2 Micrometeorology and water table measurement

Precipitation was measured with a model TE-525 tipping bucket rain gauge (Texas Electronic, TX, USA), air temperature and humidity with a model HMP45AC (Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland), soil temperature (*Tₙ*) at 5 and 20 cm with a model CS107 gauge (Campbell Scientific (CSI), UT, USA) and WTD with a pressure water level data logger (Infinities, Port Orange, FL, USA). Volumetric SWC (CS 616, CSI) was also measured as a
reference variable to WTD.

During the 1.5-year observation period, 2009 was a wet year, with 799 mm precipitation from July to December, while 2010 was a dry year, with only 673 mm during the second half of the year. The monthly mean WTD for July and August 2009 was 9.3 and 7.5 cm, respectively, at the water table probe location, while in July and August 2010 it was -13.8 and -6.7 cm (positive means water surface is above the ground and negative means below). The seasonal variation of soil temperature was not significantly different between 2009 and 2010 (Figure 2-1 a-c).

2.3 Soil CO$_2$ efflux measurement

Soil CO$_2$ efflux was measured with an automated soil respiration measuring system consisting of a portable infrared gas analyzer (LI-8100, Licor Inc.), multiplexer (LI-8150, Licor Inc.), and three permanent sampling chambers (8100-104, Licor Inc.), starting in June, 2009. Three permanently installed PVC collars were located along a gradient of microsites from an elevated mound at the base of a tree to a low-lying non-vegetated area. The former was elevated above water table for most of the year, whereas the latter were inundated for part of the year. The relative elevations of the three microsites of automatic measurements were 12.9, 1.2 and -3.8 cm relative to the elevation of water table probe location (Figure 2-1 b). Microsite HIGH was at the base of a tree, microsite LOW was in the middle of a 2-m diameter non-vegetated low-lying area and microsite MID was intermediate along the elevation gradient, and about half a meter away from the nearest tree.

Soil CO$_2$ efflux data were collected every 30 minutes from July 2009 to December 2010
with the automated system. On November 11, 2009, hurricane Ida resulted in 40-cm increase in the water table in 2 days, flooding the chambers and causing a 4-month data gap, as the system had to be repaired (dark grey areas in Figure 2-1 d-f). Measurements continued on March 17th, 2010, and were discontinued again on September 17th due to hurricane Igor until November 14th. Data gaps were also caused by system protection under high relative humidity inside the chambers, occasional power problems at night and excessive flux coefficient of variation. Data coverage was 28% of time in 2009 and increased to above 50% as the result of improved power system, and less frequent high-humidity shut-down due to dry spring and summer of 2010. The LOW chamber was used for other purposes after August 5, 2010.

Data were separated to non-flooded (NFL, white areas in Figure 2-1 d-f) and flooded (FL, light grey areas) subsets in terms of the WTD at each microsite, which corresponded to aerobic and anaerobic states, respectively. During the 1.5-year study, HIGH microsite had 90% of NFL records spanning all seasons in both 2009 and 2010. MID and LOW were not flooded only in spring and summer of 2010, with the percentages of 46% and 54% of the time, respectively. For the FL records, due to the continuous change of surface water depth resulting in the change of collar headspace, the volume of headspace at each microsite was calculated based on the level of WTD above ground and the CO₂ effluxes were adjusted accordingly.

2.4 Model development

Models were developed separately for FL and NFL conditions due to the distinct phase shift.
During NFL periods, with aerobic processes dominating the efflux, both T_s and WTD effects were evaluated. During anaerobic FL conditions, T_s was the only independent factor considered.

2.4.1 Non-flooded model

Many soil respiration studies used $Q_{10}$ model (Equation 1) for both upland and wetland ecosystems. Different improved versions have also been published by involving additional factors. For this forested wetland, we hypothesized that if the temperature response of aerobic $R_s$ was affected by WTD, the $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ would exhibit relationships with WTD. We therefore proposed a nested model (Equation 2).

\[ R_s = R_b Q_{10}^{\frac{T_s - T_b}{10}} \]  
\[ R_s = f_{R_b}(WTD) \left[ f_{Q_{10}}(WTD) \right]^{\frac{T_s - T_b}{10}} \]

where $f_{R_b}(WTD)$ and $f_{Q_{10}}(WTD)$ represent $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ as the function of WTD; $T_b$ is base temperature.

The functions of $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ were derived by separating out the continuous NFL data in terms of specific temperature or WTDs, i.e. minimizing the correlation between temperature and WTD, and then fitting their respective patterns. T_s at 5 cm depth was used. Base temperature was defined as the temperature with the broadest range of WTD and set at 24°C. This is higher than the mean temperature during the study period, which was 19°C. The $R_s$ with the range of temperatures constrained to within ±0.5°C, i.e. 23.5-24.5°C, were then
separated out as \( R_b \) data. With the data in a narrow range of temperature and the widest coverage of WTD, the relationship between \( R_b \) and WTD (i.e. \( f_{R_b}(WTD) \)) was analyzed.

Over the \( T_s \) range of one degree, \( R_s \) did not exhibit any pattern with temperature, whereas the variation with WTD exhibited a strong response (Figure 2-2). There was a pattern of increasing \( R_s \) as WTD dropped from 0 to -10 or -20 cm (varied by microsites) with nearly constant \( R_s \) at deeper WTD. As this pattern resembled the saturating pattern of Michaelis-Menten reaction, we simulated the dependence of \( R_b \) on WTD as (Equation 3):

\[
R_b = f_{R_b}(WTD) = \frac{V_{\text{max}}WTD}{K_m + WTD}
\]

where \( V_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum \( R_b \) rate at \( T_b \), and \( K_m \) the water depth at half maximum \( R_b \).

For quantifying temperature sensitivity of \( R_s \), data were binned by WTD in 5 cm intervals when WTD was shallower than 30 cm below ground (i.e. from -30 cm up to ground level). The interval was set greater when WTD was deeper due to the limited sample size. We assumed \( T_s \) was the primary driver of \( R_s \) within a given WTD class and estimated \( Q_{10} \) according to conventional \( Q_{10} \) model (Equation 1). Due to the interdependence between \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) [Janssens and Pilegaard 2003], two methods were used to derive \( Q_{10} \) of each group of data: (i) \( R_b \) was calculated with \( f_{R_b}(WTD) \) first and only \( Q_{10} \) was estimated by regression; and (ii) both \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) were estimated by regression. Ultimately, the WTD was averaged for each group and used to analyze the relationship between \( Q_{10} \) and WTD (i.e. \( f_{Q_{10}}(WTD) \)).

In contrast to \( R_b \) extracted from measurements directly, \( Q_{10} \) was estimated by regression,
which resulted in greater uncertainties of the relationship between $Q_{10}$ and WTD. At deeper WTD, the narrower $T_s$ range and the large diurnal $R_s$ variation resulted in poorer fit and less well-defined $Q_{10}$. The pattern of $Q_{10}$ varying with WTD, however, was mostly consistent between the two methods despite the estimation uncertainty (Table 2-1). We then simplified the dependence of $Q_{10}$ on WTD as an exponential function:

$$Q_{10} = f_{Q_{10}}(WTD) = \beta_1 \exp[\beta_2 (WTD + 10)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $\beta_1$ is $Q_{10}$ at WTD = -10 cm and $\beta_2$ is a fitted WTD-effect parameter. The $\beta_1$ indicates that $R_s$ at WTD = -10 cm increases ($\beta_1$-1) times for every 10 degree rise in temperature. The $\beta_2$ means that per unit decrease in WTD (i.e. -1 cm) would cause $Q_{10}$ to decrease by $[1 - \exp(\beta_2)]$.

By combining Equation 3 and 4, we derived the aerobic $R_s$ model accounting for the effect of WTD as Equation 5. The model was then fitted to the continuous NFL data sets at each microsite.

$$R_s = \frac{V_{max}}{K_m + WTD} \left\{ \beta_1 \exp[\beta_2 (WTD + 10)] \right\}^{\frac{T_s-24}{10}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

2.4.2 Performance comparison between models

Performance of the nested $Q_{10}$ model was compared with those of the conventional $Q_{10}$ (Equation 1, $T_b=24^\circ$C) and multiplicative model (Equation 6). The multiplicative model can be viewed as a special form of nested $Q_{10}$ model, i.e. only $R_b$ is dynamic and $Q_{10}$ is constant, and is sometimes used as an improved $Q_{10}$ model [Davidson et al., 1998; Tang et al., 2005b].
Both the coefficient of determination ($R^2$, Equation 7) and Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC, Equation 8) were calculated to evaluate the model performance [Anderson et al., 2000; Motulsky and Christopoulos, 2004]. $R^2$ describes how well the model fits the data. AIC introduces a penalty for additional parameters to assess if the model is truly better or an overfit of the data. All computations were done with MATLAB 7.11 R2010b (The MathWorks Inc., U.S.A.).

$$R_s = R_0 \exp\left[\beta(WTD + 10)\right]Q_{10}^{T-24}$$

(6)

$$R^2 = 1.0 - \frac{RSS}{TSS}$$

(7)

$$AIC = n \ln \frac{RSS}{n} + 2K$$

(8)

where RSS represents the residual sum of squares and TSS the total sum of squares. $n$ is the number of observations and $K$ is the number of parameters.

### 2.4.3 Modeling with two datasets

One of the uncertainties of modeling $R_s$ with 30-min data is from the variability at different time scales under which the factors influencing $R_s$ may vary [Baldocchi et al., 2001; Riveros-Iregui et al., 2007]. We hypothesized that the model fit would increase with daily data due to reduced lags and temperature-independent variability in the diel cycle. For reference, we then fitted equations 1, 5 and 6 to daily integrated $R_s$ data, where all 48 half-hourly records were present and had passed the quality assurance criteria. Both $R^2$ and AIC were calculated to compare model performance as well.
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2.4.4 Flooded model

We tested two temperature-dependent models for modeling FL CO₂ efflux: a diffusion model from aquatic ecosystems [Casper et al., 2000; Maberly, 1996], and a simple quadratic equation derived from regression between observed FL CO₂ efflux and Tₛ. Performance was similar between the two models; we then chose the simpler quadratic equation. The regression was done separately for three microsites (Table 2-2).

2.5 Gap filling and estimation of annual total soil CO₂-C emission

Missing 30-min flux data were gap-filled separately for NFL and FL periods. Non-flooded CO₂ efflux was gap-filled with the nested model (Equation 5). During FL periods, two criteria were used to fill the missing values. (i) If there were valid measurements during a given FL day, the missing flux values were simply set equal to the arithmetic mean of existing observed fluxes because of minimal diurnal fluctuation in FL fluxes. (ii) If there were no measurements during a day or continuous days, the missing values were filled with the quadratic equation (Equations in Table 2-2). The total annual CO₂-C loss was estimated as the sum of CO₂ efflux during NFL and FL periods. The NFL CO₂ efflux was also predicted based on Tₛ and/or WTD with the three models.

3. Results

3.1 Seasonal CO₂ efflux and spatial heterogeneity

Soil CO₂ efflux varied significantly by microsite and season (Figure 2-1 d-f). In general, the site was driest during summer (Jun., Jul. and Aug., Figure 2-1 b) with WTD below surface (mean WTD = -10 cm in summer 2010) and had the greatest CO₂-C release of the year.
During summer the individual peak efflux reached 21.0 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and the mean value at HIGH microsite was 8.5±3.7 (mean±SD) µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. The mean CO$_2$ flux at MID and LOW microsites was 5.7±3.1 and 3.8±1.6 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively. The maximum daily total CO$_2$-C loss was 12.9, 9.8 and 6.0 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ in HIGH, MID, and LOW microsites, respectively. Rain events during summer caused temporary flooding, resulting in uniformly low CO$_2$ efflux, with no significant difference between the three microsites. Flooded CO$_2$ flux during summer averaged 0.6 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and ranged from 0.1-3.5 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

Most of the soil surface was submerged during autumn (Sep., Oct. and Nov., mean WTD = 14 cm in 2010) and winter (Dec., Jan., and Feb., mean WTD = 12 cm). CO$_2$ flux was generally less than 1.0 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ during this time. The flux during winter was the lowest due to the combination of flooding and low temperature, and averaged about 0.3 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at all microsites. The water table drew down gradually in winter and the following spring (Mar., Apr. and May; mean WTD = 2 cm in spring 2011). The HIGH microsite was first exposed to the air in spring, and as a result CO$_2$ flux increased despite the similar temperatures in spring and autumn. The low-lying microsites were still submerged during spring and had comparable magnitude of CO$_2$ flux between spring and autumn. The respective mean CO$_2$ efflux at HIGH microsite during spring and autumn was 3.2 and 0.9 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively, whereas at MID it was 0.8 and 0.6 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

### 3.2 Nested Q$_{10}$ model and model parameters

The difference in Q$_{10}$ among the three microsites, determined by $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ in the nested
model, varied with WTD (Table 2-3 a, Figure 2-3 f). Higher β₁ implies higher Q₁₀ at WTD = -10 cm, and higher β₂ implies faster change of Q₁₀ with WTD. Both β₁ and β₂ were lower at HIGH than at LOW microsite, and as a result Q₁₀ was lower at HIGH than LOW microsite when WTD was relatively shallow (from -5 to -15 cm), but higher when WTD was deeper. When the WTD decreased from -5 to -15 cm, Q₁₀ decreased from 4.7 to 2.8 at HIGH microsite, whereas it decreased from 5.5 to 2.8 at LOW microsite. When the WTD decreased further from -15 to -25 cm, the Q₁₀ decreased from 2.8-1.6 and 2.8-1.4 at HIGH and LOW microsite, respectively.

The parameters in the nested model were much higher at MID than at the other two microsites (Table 2-3 a). While this modeled greater sensitivity to environmental drivers might be real at MID than other microsites, it is more likely that the weakly defined asymptotic relationship between Rₘ and WTD due to limited WTD range (Figure 2-2) led to parameter convergence at unrealistic values. To aid model convergence at the MID microsite, we interpolated the Vₘₐₓ and β₂ parameter values based on the HIGH and LOW microsites (Vₘₐₓ = 11 µmol C m⁻² s⁻¹ and β₂ = 0.06 m⁻¹, MID-2 in Table 2-3). With these two parameter corrections, the Kₘ was estimated as 8 cm below ground and β₁ as 6.1.

In contrast to the dynamic trends of spatial difference reflected in parameters of the nested model, the trends resulting from the conventional Q₁₀ and multiplicative models were fixed and differed between the two models (Table 2-3 a, Figure 2-3). The HIGH microsite had the lowest Q₁₀ and the highest Rₘ according to all models throughout most of the year. The Q₁₀ of the conventional Q₁₀ model was not significantly different between MID and
LOW microsites, while from the multiplicative model the MID microsite had lower $Q_{10}$ and more negative $\beta$, i.e. lower temperature sensitivity but greater WTD effect (p<0.01).

### 3.3 Comparison of model performances and two datasets

The conventional $Q_{10}$ model captured 50-60% of the $R_s$ variation with variability in $T_s$. The multiplicative model improved the performance by accounting for the effects of WTD, and increased $R^2$ to 70-80%. The nested model increased model fit by an additional 4-10%. For MID microsite, the $R^2$ decreased 5% with the manually-set values in the nested model, but was still high at 78% with increases of 26% and 4% relative to the conventional $Q_{10}$ and multiplicative models, respectively. The lower AICs of the nested model with both the 30-min and daily data also indicated that the nested model performed better than the conventional models, even as penalized for the higher number of parameters (Table 2-3). Moreover, the residual analysis showed that the nested model provided the most consistency with observations, although it was not entirely unbiased (Figure 2-4 d-f, j-l).

Differences in model parameters among the microsites were consistent at both 30-minute and daily timescale, but improvement in model performance differed by microsite (Table 2-3 b). Through the comparison of $R^2$, AIC and the distribution of residuals, modeling with daily data performed better at MID and LOW compared to HIGH microsites. The $R^2$ of 30-min data at LOW microsite was 91% while the daily data reached 96%, indicating that the two environmental drivers can account for nearly all of the seasonal variation at this location (Table 2-3 b, Figure 2-4). In contrast, at HIGH microsite the $R^2$ increased from 82% to 87%, with 13% still unaccounted for (Table 2-3 b). In other words, the diel variability independent
of $T_s$ and WTD was greatest at the HIGH microsite.

### 3.4 Estimation of annual total soil CO$_2$-C emissions

With the gaps filled separately for NFL and FL records, i.e. the nested model for NFL and the quadratic temperature-response equation for FL, the annual soil CO$_2$-C emissions at HIGH microsite was estimated at 1325 (95% CI: 1291-1365) g C m$^{-2}$ in 2010, while MID and LOW microsites released an estimated 621 (555-710) and 430 (319-694) g C m$^{-2}$, respectively. The NFL periods contributed most of the CO$_2$-C loss annually, ranging from 72 to 97% at the different microsites (Table 2-4).

The difference of cumulative $R_s$ between 2009 and 2010 was attributable to the differences in the number of FL and NFL days between the two years. From July to December, the percentage of NFL days at HIGH microsite was 51% (ca. 185 days) in 2009 and 85% (ca. 305 days) in 2010, which resulted in 308 and 704 g C m$^{-2}$ of CO$_2$-C emission. At MID and LOW microsites, the $R_s$ over the same period was approximately 2-3 times higher in the drier 2010 than in 2009.

The prediction of CO$_2$-C emission during NFL periods differed markedly between the three models (Table 2-5). Generally, the conventional Q$_{10}$ and multiplicative models overestimated $R_s$ compared to the nested model. However, the difference between the models may have been exaggerated by the unequal data coverage between the years. For example, 87% of the data at HIGH microsite came from 2010, and only 13% came from 2009. Thus, it should perhaps not be a surprise that the annual fluxes estimated with the conventional model and the multiplicative model differed by as much 105% and 48% from that with the nested
model in 2009. The annual estimates for 2010 by the three models were within 5% of each other.

4. Discussion

4.1 Temperature and WTD effects on soil respiration

In this southern forested wetland, the $T_s$-$R_s$ relationship exhibited seasonal hysteresis, but differed among the three microsites due to their elevation and associated hydrology. $R_s$ at HIGH microsite was higher earlier in the growing season than later. This pattern was similar to the hysteresis observed in $R_s$ in a boreal aspen forest and a mixed conifer and oak forest in California, which was attributed to high rates of fine-root production early in the growing season and/or the drought conditions during late summer [Gaumont-Guay et al., 2006; Vargas and Allen, 2008]. The opposite pattern, documented in some other boreal and temperate forests, has been attributed to higher microbial activity due to deeper soil warming [Drewitt et al., 2002; Goulden et al., 1998; Morén and Lindroth, 2000; Phillips et al., 2010].

In the current study, both root growth and soil warming may have contributed to the seasonal dynamics of $R_s$, but both are ultimately linked to WTD and flooding status. The higher WTD (i.e. FL conditions) during autumn resulted in the lower $R_s$, and lower WTD (i.e. NFL conditions) during spring and summer corresponded to higher $R_s$. Compared with the HIGH microsite, the difference in $R_s$ between spring and autumn at MID and LOW microsites was less pronounced as these microsites were flooded during both spring and summer (Figure 2-5).

The year-to-year difference in $R_s$ during NFL periods shown in the two growing seasons
of observation at HIGH microsite also suggested that WTD had significant effects on $R_s$. For example, the mean value of recorded $T_s$ was $21.8 \pm 0.9$ (mean±SD) °C in July of 2009 and $23.3 \pm 1.0$ °C in July of 2010, while the WTD at HIGH microsite was -3.3±2.7 cm and -29.1±6.4 cm, respectively. Correspondingly, $R_s$ was $2.3 \pm 2.3$ µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in 2009 and $10.0 \pm 2.8$ µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in 2010. Different fine root production rate during earlier period in each year might be one reason causing the year-to-year variation [Savage and Davidson, 2001]. The key mechanisms associated with WTD-driven regulation include aeration, enzyme activity and the composition of decomposer communities, but none of these were explicitly measured in the current study. [Freeman et al., 2001; Freeman et al., 2004; Jaatinen et al., 2007].

4.2 Quantifying driver effects during non-flooded periods

Due to the $T_s$-WTD interaction, some of WTD effect may be embedded in the simulation of $T_s$ effect. For example, the bifurcation in the modeled WTD-$R_s$ relationship was captured by the temperature-only conventional Q$_{10}$ model (Figure 2-6 d). However, the seasonal hysteresis and year-to-year difference (i.e. the bifurcation shown in $T_s$-$R_s$ relationship, grey dots in Figure 2-6 a), which is the WTD effect independent of $T_s$ effect, is usually omitted by temperature-only models (black dots in Figure 2-6 a).

In previous studies, several strategies have been adopted to model the seasonal hysteresis and couple the effects from multiple drivers into models. Most studies have used the residual method: (1) fitting temperature-only models first (e.g. conventional Q$_{10}$ model or Lloyd-Taylor model); (2) analyzing relationship between residuals and another driver (e.g. SWC);
(3) either adding or multiplying the additional-driver function to the temperature-only model, in which the residual pattern is generally site-specific [Davidson et al., 1998; Mäkiranta et al., 2009; Savage and Davidson, 2001; Vincent et al., 2006]. There have also been studies applying the same model to different ecosystems without site-specific analysis [Tang et al., 2005b; Vargas and Allen, 2008], which could also provide a better fit to observations like the multiplicative model we presented in this study. Few studies constructed dynamic $R_b$ and/or $Q_{10}$ separately through specific data classification and then combined them into one model [Noormets et al., 2008; Reichstein et al., 2002]. All these methods created empirical models, but the third one might be better connected with mechanisms as the dynamic pattern is derived directly from observations, whereas the residual method is based on indirect statistical results. Application of the third method has been limited by measurement technology and sample size at earlier periods, but the deployment of automated measuring system is currently reducing that limitation [Carbone and Vargas, 2008; Savage and Davidson, 2003].

The dynamic pattern of $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ (Table 2-1, Figure 2-2 and Figure 2-3) provides a comparison between methods. At a casual look, the multiplicative model seems to offer improved performance compared to the conventional $Q_{10}$ model in terms of increased $R^2$ and decreased AIC, but the pattern of WTD-$R_b$ relationship reflected in the model (Figure 2-3 b) was fundamentally in disagreement with observations (Figure 2-2). The multiplicative model also did not capture the $T_s$-$R_b$ relationship as well as the nested model (Figure 2-6 b-c), and its range of applicability seems restricted to WTD$>30$ cm (Figure 2-6 e). At deeper WTD,
the multiplicative model would predict further increase in \( R_s \), which is not supported by observations.

However, the dynamic \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) based on classification of observations was affected by the selection of \( T_b \) and the assumption of consistent mechanism of regulation within each class. For example, the WTD-\( R_b \) relationship may not follow Michaelis-Menten relationship at all \( T_b \) levels, and the processes of CO\(_2\) production and mechanisms of regulation may differ by depth. It is possible that the dynamic pattern may change if the criteria of data classification do. The robustness of the model can be tested further as the \( T_s \)-WTD parameter space gets filled more densely and in areas that are currently blank.

4.3 **Implication of \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) pattern in soil respiration modeling**

As the net soil CO\(_2\) efflux is the sum of multiple components with different regulatory mechanisms [Davidson et al., 2006], the pattern of the apparent mean \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) is determined by the response of respiration components to drivers and their relative contribution. For example, if two respiration components responded to driver variation oppositely and contributed equally to \( R_s \), the apparent \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) would both be constant. Thus, the mechanistic meaning of dynamic parameters fitted to the compound process of total \( R_s \) is to a degree speculative. It is also confounded by the nature of regression analysis, such as the statistically increased model performance with more parameters, or the interdependence between \( R_b \) and \( Q_{10} \) [Janssens and Pilegaard, 2003; Kirschbaum, 2006; Subke and Bahn, 2010].

Quantifying the role of individual parameters on improved performance may provide a
method for differentiating the biophysical basis from the statistical interaction between parameters. To our knowledge, none of previous studies improving Rs modeling through dynamic parameterization have explicitly compared the roles of individual parameters and explored the implications on mechanisms. In the current study, the improved performance of the multiplicative model with dynamic $R_b$ and constant $Q_{10}$ implicitly demonstrated the significance of $R_b$, while the small improvement with dynamic $Q_{10}$ involved in the nested model might imply the smaller contribution by $Q_{10}$. To explicitly quantify the role of dynamic parameters, we did additional regression analysis in which the effects of WTD on $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ were included into the nested model separately and in different order. The individual contribution of $R_b$ to model improvement was more significant than that of $Q_{10}$ for $R_s$ of this forested wetland ecosystem (Table 2-6).

The partitioning of $R^2$ indicated that dynamic $R_b$ contributed more than dynamic $Q_{10}$ to capturing the dynamics of $R_s$ at all three microsites. Although we derived consistent $Q_{10}$ pattern regardless of the $R_b$ pattern (Table 2-1), the small contribution of $Q_{10}$ to increased $R^2$ implies uncertainty in the dynamic $Q_{10}$ (Table 2-6). On one hand, this was expected as the statistical regression might obscure the dynamic pattern of $Q_{10}$. On the other hand, $Q_{10}$ might play a role in simulating the higher end of $R_s$ range (Figure 2-7), which corresponds to the deeper of WTD (deeper than -30 cm) and is usually statistically neglected because of its small weight in datasets. Also, the contribution of $Q_{10}$ to seasonal variation of $R_s$ in the forested wetland varied by microsite, likely reflecting different component processes.
4.4 Effect of time scale on model performance

As expected, model fit increased when applied to daily data, even though the smaller sample size led to higher uncertainty of parameter estimates (Table 2-3 b). The results confirmed the hypothesis that eliminating the diel variation would improve the simulation of seasonal variation. The greater improvement of performance at LOW than HIGH microsite (Table 2-3) may be caused by greater contribution of root respiration on diel cycle in the latter.

Compared with some upland ecosystems where diel variation of $R_s$ is related to high diel temperature variation [Ruehr et al., 2010], the forested wetland had small diel variation in $T_s$ due to the buffering influence of high water table. For example, the daily range of $T_s$ during the summer of 2010 was 0.54±0.17 °C (mean±SD), while the range of $R_s$ at HIGH, MID and LOW microsite was 8.0±2.1, 5.7±2.8 and 3.6±2.8 μmol C m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively. The diel variation of WTD was also small with the daily range at 1.7±0.6 cm excluding days with precipitation. This suggests that the diel variation in $R_s$ was relatively independent of the $T_s$ and WTD fluctuations, which were the primary drivers of the seasonal cycle. Plant processes which were not quantified in the current study may have dominated the diel dynamics. The role of new carbohydrate availability on $R_s$ dynamics has been demonstrated in upland ecosystems [Liu et al., 2006; Tang et al., 2005a], but the evidence is less clear in wetland ecosystems where the trees are acclimated to wet conditions [Lugo et al., 1990; Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007].

4.5 Annual soil CO$_2$-C emissions and spatial heterogeneity

The annual soil CO$_2$ emissions at MID and HIGH microsites (Table 2-4) were similar to
those reported for nearby pocosin and gum swamp ecosystems in North Carolina (672-1086 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) [Bridgham and Richardson, 1992], and a freshwater marsh in Louisiana (618 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) [Smith et al., 1983]. The smaller flux at LOW microsite was similar to the salt marsh in the same study from Louisiana (418 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)). Compared with upland systems, the magnitude of annual CO\(_2\)-C emissions at HIGH, MID and LOW microsite in 2010 were comparable with average soil CO\(_2\) efflux of tropical evergreen broadleaf forest (1540 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)), boreal deciduous broadleaf (650 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) and boreal evergreen needle-leaf forest (360 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)), respectively [Gower, 2003].

Such high spatial variation of \(R_s\) has been documented by earlier studies in other wetland ecosystems [Alm et al., 1999; Jauhiainen et al., 2005; Luken and Billings, 1985]. The range of 430-1320 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) observed in the current study highlights the need for spatially explicit estimates of soil CO\(_2\) efflux when scaling point data to the stand scale to estimate ecosystem C balance (Table 2-4). Given the areal contribution of different microtopographic positions in the landscape, 60% in HIGH, 23% in MID and 17% in LOW, result in the mean site-average efflux of 1015 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) with 95% confidence interval of 960 to 1103 g C m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\) in 2010, of which 93% was released during NFL periods. This estimate awaits further refinements in \(R_s\) data coverage, model development, and further quantification of the distribution of microsites.

The soil C emission from this southern forested wetland was much higher than that reported for northern wetlands and similar to some tropical wetlands. For example, the annual estimate is more than 2 times of the soil CO\(_2\) flux at the wetlands at Harvard and
Howland Forests (370-480 g CO₂-C m⁻² yr⁻¹) in northeast USA [Savage and Davidson, 2001], 2-4 times higher than those at a southern boreal peatland of Finland (220-320 g CO₂-C m⁻² yr⁻¹) [Alm et al., 1999], and 5-10 times higher than at a subarctic peatland (80-180 g CO₂-C m⁻² yr⁻¹) [Moore, 1986], but similar to a tropical peat swamp forest in Indonesia (900-1100 g CO₂-C m⁻² yr⁻¹) [Jauhiainen et al., 2005]. As 2010 was a dry year in this study area, the soil C emission estimation may be higher than its long-term average, but this also indicates its potential for high emissions under drier conditions.

4.6 Uncertainties and implication of this study

Explicit accounting for WTD effects on Q₁₀ showed that there is a positive relationship between them (Figure 2-3 f). In addition to being helpful for understanding temporal dynamics of Rₛ, this relationship allows us to explore the circumstances when site hydrology changes beyond currently observable conditions. The WTD-Q₁₀ relationship suggests that there exists a WTD below which Q₁₀<1, i.e. Rₛ will begin to decrease with temperature. While there is a recognized temperature optimum on physiological processes [Larcher, 2003], and a negative Tₛ-Rₛ relationship has sometimes been reported [Lellei-Kovács et al., 2011; Tang et al., 2005a], the possibility of Q₁₀≤1 is rarely considered in models. In the current study, only HIGH microsite had the records of WTD deeper than the modeled critical depth, i.e. about -35 cm. Although Rₛ was nearly constant with the increase of Tₛ at this relatively dry condition, the narrow temperature range (within 2.5°C) imposed large uncertainties.

With dynamic parameters, the model results suggested that the spatial differences in
temperature sensitivity of \( R_s \) are not consistent and the trend may be opposite at different WTD (Figure 2-3 f), which might be related to the varying contribution of respiration components [Högberg, 2010; Zhou et al., 2010]. Given the spatial differences in microtopography and vegetation coverage at HIGH and LOW microsites, we expected the contribution of autotrophic component to be higher at the HIGH microsite near the tree base. Thus, the smaller decline in \( Q_{10} \) with decreasing WTD at HIGH than LOW microsite might suggest smaller suppression/sensitivity of autotrophic than heterotrophic component.

These results suggest that the regression approach [Kucera and Kirkham, 1971], whereby heterotrophic respiration is estimated as the intercept with \( R_s \) regressed against root biomass, may work well at this ecosystem. Despite other method-specific challenges such as the lack of replication of microsites in the current study, this approach offers lower disturbance and higher universality than the various root exclusion techniques currently in use [Kuzyakov, 2006].

5. Conclusions

Soil CO\(_2\) efflux was measured continuously in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, from 2009 to 2010. The \( R_s \) in the forested wetland varied by more than 2-fold as a function of microtopographic position. During summer non-flooded conditions, \( R_s \) rates averaged at 8.5±3.7 (mean±SD) μmol CO\(_2\) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) in HIGH, 5.7±3.1 μmol CO\(_2\) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) in MID, and 3.8±1.6 μmol CO\(_2\) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) in LOW microsites. During submerged conditions, \( R_s \) rates decreased to less than 1 μmol CO\(_2\) m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) at all microsites. The seasonality of water table dynamics and flooding state overrode temperature effects on \( R_s \) at HIGH microsite,
resulting in seasonal hysteresis in the $R_s$-$T_s$ relationship. This was not the case at MID and LOW microsites, which had similar hydrologic conditions during both seasons.

The spatial variability and interacting effects of $T_s$ and WTD were successfully captured with a nested $Q_{10}$ model where both base respiration and temperature sensitivity varied with WTD. The WTD effect on $R_b$ followed Michaelis-Menten-reaction pattern, whereas $Q_{10}$ varied exponentially. The dynamic parameters also reflected the dynamic trends of spatial difference in temperature sensitivity of $R_s$ along with the WTD.

The diel range of $R_s$ (3.6-8.0 µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) was much higher and not attributable to $T_s$ and WTD, which had diel ranges of 0.54±0.17°C and 1.7±0.6 cm, respectively. The fit of the models to daily total CO$_2$ effluxes increased the model fit further, suggesting that the diel patterns were likely associated with vegetation activity.

With CO$_2$ effluxes estimated separately for flooded and non-flooded periods, and weighed by the areal contribution of different microsites, the total site mean annual soil CO$_2$ emission was 1015 (95% CI: 960-1103) g C m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, of which 93% was released during non-flooded periods.
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Tables and Figures

Table 2-1 Comparison of $Q_{10}$ (mean±SE) estimated from two methods for soil respiration ($R_s$) with different water table depth (WTD) at HIGH microsite. At each WTD class, it was assumed that soil temperature ($T_s$) was the primary driver of $R_s$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTD range (cm)</th>
<th>Mean WTD (cm)</th>
<th>Observed $T_s$ range (°C)</th>
<th>Method (i)*</th>
<th>Method (ii)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R_b$</td>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-45 - -30</td>
<td>-34.5</td>
<td>22.2-25.4</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>0.49±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-30 - -25</td>
<td>-27.2</td>
<td>15.1-25.5</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.96±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-25 - -20</td>
<td>-22.4</td>
<td>15.1-24.8</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.13±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20 - -15</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
<td>11.7-25.5</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>2.07±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-15 - -10</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>6.7-24.4</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>3.82±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10 - -5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>3.3-24.1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5.20±0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: $R_b$ was calculated first with $f_R (WTD) = \frac{V_{max} WTD}{K_m + WTD}$, and then $Q_{10}$ was estimated from conventional $Q_{10}$ model: $R_s = R_b Q_{10}^{\frac{10}{10-24}}$. When estimating $Q_{10}$, $R_b$ was set as constants.

**: Both $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ were estimated from conventional $Q_{10}$ model.
Table 2-2 Quadratic models for modeling soil CO\(_2\) effluxes (R\(_s\)) with soil temperature (T\(_s\)) during flooded periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model equation</th>
<th>R(^2)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>(R_s = -0.48 + 0.16T_s - 0.0047T_s^2)</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>(R_s = -0.06 + 0.06T_s - 0.0013T_s^2)</td>
<td>0.1669</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>6090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>(R_s = -1.02 + 0.19T_s - 0.0052T_s^2)</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-3a Model parameters (mean±SE) of soil respiration under non-flooded conditions from regression with 30-min data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Parameters</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>MID-2*</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional $Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_b$</td>
<td>µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>10.02 ± 0.05</td>
<td>6.97 ± 0.05</td>
<td>4.94 ± 0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.14 ± 0.10</td>
<td>11.48 ± 0.55</td>
<td>11.03 ± 0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6225</td>
<td>0.5195</td>
<td>0.6243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5435</td>
<td>5.4522</td>
<td>2.0875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>21819</td>
<td>8967</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_b$</td>
<td>µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>7.33 ± 0.06</td>
<td>5.12 ± 0.05</td>
<td>4.49 ± 0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.09 ± 0.05</td>
<td>4.57 ± 0.18</td>
<td>5.27 ± 0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0217 ± 0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0447 ± 0.0008</td>
<td>-0.0425 ± 0.0006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7187</td>
<td>0.7452</td>
<td>0.8590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6211</td>
<td>2.8923</td>
<td>0.4500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>18644</td>
<td>5617</td>
<td>-2718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nested $Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{max}$</td>
<td>µmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>13.58 ± 0.13</td>
<td>19.59 ± 0.53</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>7.63 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_m$</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>-7.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>-26.5 ± 1.23</td>
<td>-8.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-5.4 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63 ± 0.08</td>
<td>5.27 ± 0.21</td>
<td>6.07 ± 0.23</td>
<td>3.91 ± 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>m$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.0533 ± 0.0022</td>
<td>0.1651 ± 0.0060</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>0.0673 ± 0.0058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8219</td>
<td>0.8360</td>
<td>0.7819</td>
<td>0.9135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5597</td>
<td>1.8612</td>
<td>2.4750</td>
<td>0.2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>13713</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>4793</td>
<td>-4381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>10797</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-3b Model parameters (mean±SE) of soil respiration under non-flooded conditions from regression with daily data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Parameters</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>MID-2*</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional $Q_{10}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_b$</td>
<td>g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$10.58 \pm 0.38$</td>
<td>$7.55 \pm 0.37$</td>
<td>$4.77 \pm 0.30$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.65 \pm 0.57$</td>
<td>$12.94 \pm 4.31$</td>
<td>$9.06 \pm 3.64$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.6905$</td>
<td>$0.6928$</td>
<td>$0.5918$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.9281$</td>
<td>$3.2008$</td>
<td>$1.0448$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$139.14$</td>
<td>$70.61$</td>
<td>$3.520$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplicative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_b$</td>
<td>g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$8.13 \pm 0.53$</td>
<td>$5.47 \pm 0.36$</td>
<td>$4.82 \pm 0.17$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.57 \pm 0.37$</td>
<td>$4.79 \pm 1.27$</td>
<td>$5.62 \pm 1.41$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-0.0162 \pm 0.0032$</td>
<td>$-0.0389 \pm 0.0055$</td>
<td>$-0.0500 \pm 0.0055$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.7731$</td>
<td>$0.8633$</td>
<td>$0.8900$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.6569$</td>
<td>$1.4502$</td>
<td>$0.2900$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$114.45$</td>
<td>$24.85$</td>
<td>$-41.69$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nested $Q_{10}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{max}$</td>
<td>g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$13.11 \pm 0.91$</td>
<td>$19.97 \pm 2.26$</td>
<td>$11^*$</td>
<td>$8.21 \pm 0.68$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_m$</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>$-6.1 \pm 1.9$</td>
<td>$-26.4 \pm 5.2$</td>
<td>$-7.4 \pm 0.6$</td>
<td>$-5.9 \pm 1.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.64 \pm 0.76$</td>
<td>$5.10 \pm 0.79$</td>
<td>$6.39 \pm 1.30$</td>
<td>$4.33 \pm 1.04$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>m$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$0.0601 \pm 0.0197$</td>
<td>$0.2007 \pm 0.0250$</td>
<td>$0.065^*$</td>
<td>$0.0690 \pm 0.0473$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.8672$</td>
<td>$0.9701$</td>
<td>$0.9099$</td>
<td>$0.9577$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.1656$</td>
<td>$0.3229$</td>
<td>$0.9384$</td>
<td>$0.1151$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70.36$</td>
<td>$-62.83$</td>
<td>$-1.79$</td>
<td>$-74.09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>$86$</td>
<td>$59$</td>
<td>$36$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: In nested $Q_{10}$ model, the values of $V_{max}$ and $\beta_2$ were manually set.

**: See the meaning of each parameter at Equations 1, 5 and 6.
Table 2-4 Estimates of total annual soil carbon emission (mean and 95% confidence interval, g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$) from a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina in 2009 and 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of days (%)</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filled mean</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of days (%)</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filled mean</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of data in the whole dataset (%)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Q10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Lower</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI-Upper</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from the nested model results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Q10</td>
<td>105.4%</td>
<td>-15.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicative</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-6 Contribution of dynamic $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ to model performance by adding the water table depth effect into the conventional $Q_{10}$ model separately ($R_b$-dynamic-only (A) versus $Q_{10}$-dynamic-only (B)) and in different order (A→the nested model versus B→the nested model).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Increase in $R^2$</th>
<th>Increase in $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>B**</td>
<td>$Q_{10}\rightarrow A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>0.8083</td>
<td>0.7642</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>0.8099</td>
<td>0.6101</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>0.9103</td>
<td>0.7401</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A: the $R_b$-dynamic-only model, $R_s = \frac{V_{\max} WTD}{K_m + WTD Q_{10}^{10}}^\tau_{24}^{10}$

** B: the $Q_{10}$-dynamic-only model, $R_s = R_b \left\{ \beta_1 \exp\left[ \beta_2 (WTD + 10) \right] \right\}^{10}$
Figure 2-1 Seasonal variations observed in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, during the period 7/1/2009-12/31/2010 in (a) Air temperature (grey line) and soil temperature at 5 cm depth (T_s, black line), (b) Water table depth (WTD) at three microsites of varying elevation (HIGH: dashed line; MID: dash dot line; LOW: solid line), (c) Precipitation, and (d, e, f) CO_2 efflux (R_a) at HIGH, MID and LOW microsites, respectively (Non-flooded records: white area; Flooded records: light grey area; No measurements: dark grey area, filled with model results).
Figure 2-2 Relationship between basal respiration ($R_b$) and soil temperature ($T_s$) at 5 cm depth (a-c), between $R_b$ and water table depth (d-f) at HIGH (a, d), MID (b, e), and LOW (c, f) microsites. $R_b$ in this study was defined as respiration rate at 24°C. $R_s$ data during non-flooded periods with the range of $T_s$ constrained to within ±0.5°C, i.e. 23.5-24.5°C was separated out as $R_b$ data.
Figure 2-3 Comparison of water table depth (WTD)-$R_b$ (a-c) and WTD-$Q_{10}$ (d-f) relationships simulated by the three models: the conventional $Q_{10}$ model (a,d); multiplicative model (b,e); the nested model (c,f). Solid line is mean value and dashed line is standard error of the parameters.
Figure 2-4 Comparison of modeled (black dots) and measured (grey dots) soil respiration between the models using 30-min dataset (a-c: time series; d-f: residual distribution) and daily dataset (g-i: time series; j-l: residual distribution) from LOW microsite. Models include: the conventional $Q_{10}$ model (a,d,g,j), multiplicative model (b,e,h,k) and the nested model (c,f,i,l).
Figure 2-5 Relationship between soil CO\textsubscript{2} effluxes and drivers observed at HIGH, MID and LOW microsites during 10/1/2009-9/30/2010. Numbers in the figure represent month. (a) Seasonal pattern of interaction between soil temperature and water table depth. Lines represent the elevation of three microsites relative to water table probe location. (b) Soil CO\textsubscript{2} efflux at HIGH microsite exhibited a clear seasonal hysteresis: higher rate during spring/summer because of non-flooded condition versus lower rate during autumn under flooded condition. (c) and (d) Soil CO\textsubscript{2} efflux at MID and LOW microsites did not show the same seasonal pattern as HIGH microsite, because the two low-lying sites were flooded during both spring and autumn.
Table 2-1. Comparison of modeled (black dots) and measured (grey dots) driver effects on soil respiration ($R_s$) at HIGH microsite by the conventional $Q_{10}$ model (a,d,g,i), the multiplicative model (b,e,h,k) and the nested model (c,f,i,l). Only part of data was shown. a-c: Soil temperature effect on $R_s$; d-f: Water table depth effect on $R_s$; h-i: $R_s$ time series; j-l: modeled $R_s$ versus measured $R_s$ with solid 1:1 line and dotted regression line.
Figure 2-7 Comparison of modeled effluxes (µmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹) between Rₜ-dynamic-only model (see Table 6; y-axis) and the Rₜ-Q₁₀-both-dynamic model (i.e. the nested model; x-axis). The performance of the two models differed significantly at the higher efflux levels, indicating that the overall contribution of Q₁₀ to improving model performance was smaller than that of Rₜ, but influenced the simulation at the higher level of soil respiration range.
CHAPTER 3. PARTITIONING ECOSYSTEM RESPIRATION IN A COASTAL PLAIN FORESTED WETLAND IN THE SOUTHEASTERN USA: CONTRASTING TEMPERATURE AND HYDROLOGIC SENSITIVITY AND INFLUENCES ON ECOSYSTEM RESPIRATION
Abstract

Carbon cycling in wetlands, especially soil dynamics, is an important component of carbon budgets in terrestrial ecosystems. Environmental change and land conversion for agricultural use have been affecting wetlands in recent decades and might change their role from carbon sinks to sources. However, carbon dynamics in wetlands are less-well investigated than in upland systems and still absent in regional- or global-scale studies. We established an eddy covariance flux tower in a coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, and conducted measurements on ecosystem respiration ($R_e$), soil respiration ($R_s$) and decomposition of coarse wood debris ($R_{CWD}$) from 2009 to 2011. $R_e$ and $R_s$ were separately quantified for flooded and non-flooded periods considering the different mechanisms, and $R_{CWD}$ was separated by decay class. $R_s$ responded rapidly to water table fluctuation whereas the $R_e$ responded slowly due to buffering from flood-tolerant plants in the ecosystem. $R_s$ contributed most to $R_e$ during non-flooded periods but much less during flooded periods with the $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio of 0.67±0.11 (mean±SD) and 0.24±0.06, respectively. Aboveground plant respiration ($R_p$) may have been the main contributor to $R_e$ during flooded periods. The contribution from $R_{CWD}$ was relatively small but with great uncertainty related to the CWD biomass estimate. Seasonal variation of the $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio exhibited a linear relationship with the water table fluctuation. Overall, this forested wetland released more than 1000 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ y$^{-1}$ annually, comparable to many upland forests. The temperature sensitivity of respiratory components under non-flooded conditions was also similar to upland forests. However, the hydrologic regimes resulted in unique characteristics of carbon dynamics in this forested
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wetland, transiting between \( R_s : R_c \) ratio similar to boreal and temperate upland forests under non-flooded conditions and one similar to some tropical rainforests when flooded.

**Abbreviations**

- Ecosystem respiration: \( R_e \)
- Ecosystem respiration during flooded periods: \( R_{e-FL} \)
- Ecosystem respiration during non-flooded periods: \( R_{e-NFL} \)
- Soil respiration: \( R_s \)
- Soil respiration during flooded periods: \( R_{s-FL} \)
- Soil respiration during non-flooded periods: \( R_{s-NFL} \)
- Coarse woody debris: \( CWD \)
- Decomposition of coarse woody debris: \( R_{CWD} \)
- Aboveground live plant respiration: \( R_p \)
- Soil temperature: \( T_s \)
- Water table depth: \( WTD \)
1. Introduction

Carbon cycling in wetlands, especially soil dynamics, is an important component of carbon budgets in terrestrial ecosystems [Chmura et al., 2003; Gorham, 1991]. Early studies estimated that the mean residence time of soil organic carbon in wetlands is about 500 years, much greater than a mean residence time of about 32 years for the global pool of soil organic carbon [Raich and Schlesinger, 1992]. The long residence time results from the low decomposition rate under the permanently or intermittently flooded conditions, which is also the main reason that wetlands are generally viewed as carbon sinks [Bridgham et al., 2006; Mitsch et al., 2013]. Recently, awareness is growing that changes in climate and land use may be altering wetland carbon source-sink relationships. Sea level rise, high-energy waves and flooding associated with extreme storm events accelerates wetland soil erosion, threatening these globally important stores of carbon [Webb et al., 2013]. Further, the conversion of wetlands to agriculture and other land uses through drainage could also turn existing wetlands from carbon sinks to sources by aerating the large quantities of labile carbon stored in previously saturated soils [Armentano, 1980; Armentano and Menges, 1986; Laiho, 2006]. Unfortunately, the sensitivity of carbon dynamics in wetlands to environmental changes are much less well investigated than in uplands, which limits our ability to quantify their future role in the global carbon cycle. Due to the data scarcity, wetlands are still absent in most regional- or global-scale studies [Battin et al., 2009; Davidson, 2010; Luysaert et al., 2007; Mahecha et al., 2010].

Respiration is a key determinant affecting the role of an ecosystem as carbon source or
sink [Valentini et al., 2000]. At the ecosystem scale, it integrates a variety of plant and microbial processes, and every component may exhibit different sensitivities to changes in environmental conditions [Trumbore, 2006]. Therefore, partitioning ecosystem respiration (R\textsubscript{e}) and quantifying driver sensitivities for each component are crucial for predicting the long-term response of terrestrial ecosystems to climate change. Because of differences in carbon allocation and driver sensitivities, component processes may contribute to R\textsubscript{e} differently depending on ecosystem type [Aerts, 1997; Davidson et al., 2006; Harmon et al., 2004]. For example, decomposition of coarse woody debris (CWD, R\textsubscript{CWD}) in some loblolly pine plantations in the Southeast U.S. was reported to be approximately 20% of total ecosystem respiration [Noormets et al., 2012], whereas in a central Amazon forest it was predicted to be only 6% [Chambers et al., 2004].

Soil respiration has been the most widely investigated among R\textsubscript{e} components due to its large magnitude and sensitivity to a variety of controlling factors [Davidson and Janssens, 2006; Kirschbaum, 2010]. Its contribution to R\textsubscript{e}, i.e. the ratio of R\textsubscript{s} to R\textsubscript{e}, could be potentially used as an indicator to characterize carbon sequestration and ecosystem type. Boreal and temperate upland ecosystems generally store large amounts of carbon in both plants and soils, of which the R\textsubscript{s} contributes to R\textsubscript{e} comparably to plant respiration, with the ratio reported at 0.4-0.8 [Janssens et al., 2001; Lavigne et al., 1997; Law et al., 1999]. Tropical rainforests have much higher carbon storage in plants and low in soils compared to higher latitude forests, resulting lower contribution of R\textsubscript{s} to R\textsubscript{e} with a ratio of 0.3-0.4 [Chambers et al., 2004; Saleska et al., 2003]. In contrast, wetlands have much larger amounts of carbon stored in
soils than in plants, and permanently or intermittently flooded conditions change the driver sensitivity of both $R_s$ and plant respiration. As a result, the ratio could be different from other types of terrestrial ecosystems, but has not specifically investigated in previous wetland studies. In addition, the seasonal variation of the ratio and its driver sensitivity are receiving more attention and may provide useful information for constraining carbon cycle modeling [Davidson et al., 2006].

Eddy covariance (EC) methodology has been deployed worldwide to measure the $CO_2$ exchange of terrestrial ecosystems and estimate $R_e$ [Baldocchi, 2003]. Within the global FLUXNET network, 25 of the 547 sites are located in wetlands (as determined by searching the words ‘wetland, peatland, mire, bog, fen, and marsh’ and by IGBP-Land-Use defined ‘permanent wetlands’; information updated to Oct. 2011). 8 of the 25 sites are classified as forested wetlands, 5 are shrub land, 4 are woody savanna and rest are grassland, cropland or barren. In 2008, we established an EC flux tower in a forested wetland in the lower coastal plain of North Carolina, USA, and started continuous measurements from 2009 to 2011. We also conducted measurements on $R_s$ and $R_{CWD}$ across the study area for partitioning $R_e$. In this paper, we report data on $R_e$, $R_s$ and $R_{CWD}$, and present a comprehensive partitioning of these respiratory processes in this forested wetland through (1) characterizing the seasonal variation of $R_e$, $R_s$ and $R_{CWD}$; (2) contrasting the temperature and hydrologic sensitivities of each component; (3) characterizing the seasonal pattern of $R_s$:R$_e$ ratio. We hypothesized that the $R_s$:R$_e$ ratio in wetlands would exhibit different patterns from other ecosystems and be significantly affected by hydrologic factors. By comparing our results with previous studies
in upland ecosystems, we attempted to disclose some special characteristics of this forested wetland and proposed several mechanistic hypothesis for future studies.

2. Methods

2.1 Site description

The study site is located at the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (ARNWR), on the Albemarle-Pamlico peninsula of North Carolina, USA (35°47′N, 75°54′W). The mean annual temperature and precipitation, from climate records of an adjacent meteorological station (Manteo AP, NC, 35°55′N, 75°42′W) for the period 1981-2010, are 16.9°C and 1270 mm, respectively. The forest type is mixed hardwood swamp forest; the overstory is predominantly composed of black gum (*Nyssa sylvatica*), swamp tupelo (*Nyssa biflora*) and bald cypress (*Taxodium distichum*), with occasional red maple (*Acer rubrum*) and white cedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*); the understory is predominantly fetterbush (*Lyonia lucida*), bitter gallberry (*Ilex galbra*), and red bay (*Persea borbonia*). The canopy height ranges at 15-20 m, the leaf area index peaks at 3.5±0.3; and aboveground live biomass was estimated allometrically at 37.5±12.5 Mg C ha⁻¹. Major soil series are poorly drained Pungo and Belhaven mucks. The average carbon content of soil profile (50 cm deep) ranges from 60-120 Mg C ha⁻¹. The study site was established in November 2008, including the 35-meter instrumented tower for EC measurements, micrometeorological station, and 13 vegetation plots spread over a 4 km² area (Figure 3-1).

2.2 Micrometeorological measurements

A micrometeorological station was established at the center of the study area in November
2008. The measurements included air temperature \( T_a \) and relative humidity \( RH \), \( HMP45AC \), Vaisala, Finland, and photosynthetically active radiation \( PAR \), \( PARLITE \), Kipp & Zonen, Delft, Netherlands (KZ), soil temperature \( T_s \) at 5 and 20 cm \( (CS\ 107, \ Campbell\ Scientific\ Inc.,\ UT,\ USA\ (CSI)) \), volumetric soil water content \( (CS\ 616,\ CSI) \), soil surface heat flux \( (HFP01,\ KZ) \), and water table depth \( (WTD,\ Infinities,\ Orange,\ FL) \). Parameters measured above the canopy \( (at\ 30\ m)\) included \( T_a \) and \( RH \), \( HMP45,\ Vaisala \), \( PAR \), \( PARLITE \), net radiation \( (R_n,\ NRLITE,\ KZ) \), and precipitation \( (P,\ TE525,\ Texas\ Instruments) \). Water table depth was also monitored at the central 5 of 13 vegetation survey plots \( (WL\ 16,\ Global\ Water\ Instrumentation,\ TX) \).

The meteorological data from the adjacent meteorological station \( (Manteo\ AP,\ NC)\) was also analyzed through the observation period \( (2009-2011)\), and the monthly patterns in the three years were compared with the 30-year \( (1981-2010)\) normals to characterize the local climatic variation in recent decades.

### 2.3 Microtopography measurements

There is a distinct difference at the site in local hydrologic conditions between different microtopographic positions – mounds around tree bases are mostly above water table, and non-vegetated low-lying sites are submerged for more than 70% of a year. As these positions may have contrasting vegetation distribution, which is likely to have a direct influence on carbon cycling, we quantified the frequency distribution of different positions in the landscape. Three 30-m transects originating from the center of the plots towards 0°, 120° and 240° from due north were established in the 5 central vegetation survey plots (Figure 3-1). A
tripod-mounted laser level (RoboLaser Green RT-7210-1G, RoboToolz Inc., CA, USA) provided a horizontal reference line from which the distance to ground was measured every 40 cm along each transect. The elevation of different plots was normalized in relation to water table during a high water stage when over 90% of the study area was submerged.

The distribution of height-normalized elevation data across the 5 central plots approximated a gamma distribution (Figure 3-2). The mean value of this gamma distribution was calculated as the site average elevation, i.e. 8.7 cm relative to the water table probe location at the micrometeorological station. We then adjusted the WTDs to site average values and applied them to modeling $R_e$ and site average $R_s$. The site average microtopography was also used to separate data into flooded and non-flooded cases (i.e. when the WTD at the central water table probe exceeded 8.7 cm, the site was defined as flooded).

2.4 Automated and survey soil CO$_2$ efflux measurements

Soil CO$_2$ efflux was measured with both automated and manual survey systems. The automated system was deployed next to the micrometeorological station in the center of the study area, and handheld survey measurements were made in the 5 central plots (Figure 3-1). The automated system, consisting of a portable infrared gas analyzer (IRGA, LI-8100, Licor Inc.), multiplexer (LI-8150, Licor Inc.), and permanently installed 20 cm diameter PVC collars, monitored three micro-topographic locations with elevations relative to the water table probe of +12.9, +1.2 and -3.8 cm (named as HIGH, MID and LOW, the elevations shown as solid lines in Figure 3-2) from summer 2009 to 2010. Further details of the
automated $R_s$ measurements were described earlier [Miao et al., in review].

The survey $R_s$ system consisted of LI-8100 and a portable survey chamber (LI 8100-103, Licor Inc.). The survey measurements were conducted from early spring of 2010 to summer 2011. At each plot, six microsites were positioned in a 7 m diameter circle and installed with 20 cm diameter PVC collars. The collars were moved in early 2011 to minimize the artificial disturbance on soil. Thus 60 microsites in total were involved in survey measurements. Soil temperature at 5 and 10 cm depth and volumetric water content at top 12 cm were recorded at each measurement.

Elevation of each survey microsite was also measured relative to the local water table well. The WTD of each microsite at each measurement date was estimated based on their elevations and the WTD readings from respective plot probes. All the survey microsites were also classified into three groups which corresponded to the HIGH, MID and LOW microsites in the automated measurements. The cutoff points (the dashed lines ‘L’ and ‘H’ in Figure 3-2) were derived from the gamma microtopographic distribution and the assumption that $R_s$ is linearly related to the microtopography. The elevation of the two cutoff points was -1 and 5 cm.

2.5 **Coarse woody debris $CO_2$ efflux measurements**

Coarse woody debris $CO_2$ efflux was measured on four downed trees on each of the 5 central survey plots during the same periods as survey $R_s$ measurements. Some collars were replaced in early 2011 due to damage by severe flooding and animals. In all, 22 CWD sections were sampled, with 3, 6, 10 and 3 pieces in decay classes 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. The decay
classes were defined according to Harmon et al. [2004]. CWD CO$_2$ effluxes were measured with an EGM-4 environmental CO$_2$ monitor and SRC-1 closed system chambers (PP Systems International Inc., MA, USA) concurrently with the survey $R_S$ measurements. The temperature of the woody substrate at 5 cm depth was recorded at each measurement. Moisture was assessed qualitatively by the appearance of the substrate as submerged, saturated, moist, dry or very dry. Most of the CWDs were elevated above the surface and out of direct flooding. As CWD moisture was inversely correlated with temperature and assessed only in qualitative terms, it was not considered as an explicit driver when modeling the CO$_2$ efflux. Coarse woody debris biomass was measured at the end of 2010 and 2011 for scaling up $R_{CWD}$. The respective total CWD biomass was 163±104 and 306±204 g C m$^{-2}$ in 2010 and 2011.

2.6 Eddy covariance flux measurements

The EC flux system started from March 2009 and ran through the end of 2011. The net ecosystem CO$_2$ exchange (NEE) between forest canopy and atmosphere was calculated as the sum of turbulent exchange (measured using EC) and storage flux (measured with a 5-level CO$_2$ profile system). The instruments, mounted at 30 m, were about 16.7 m above the displacement height. The EC flux system consisted of LI-7500 open-path infrared gas analyzer (Licor Inc.), CSAT3 3-dimensional sonic anemometer (CSI), and CR1000 data logger (CSI). The 30-minute mean fluxes of CO$_2$ were computed as the covariance of vertical wind speed and the concentration of CO$_2$, using the EC_PROCESSOR software package (http://www4.ncsu.edu/~anoorme/ECP) [Noormets et al., 2010]. The CO$_2$ profile system
consisted of a LI-820 infrared gas analyzer and a multiport system. CO₂ concentrations at each level were recorded as 30-second averages every 5 minutes [Yang et al., 2007].

Nighttime NEE was assumed to represent Rₑ, and used for developing Rₑ models (see section 2.9). The data were first screened for low wind speed by applying the friction velocity threshold filter of 0.25 m/s when air temperature was lower than 20°C and 0.27 m/s when air temperature was higher than 20°C. Approximately 40-45% of nighttime data were excluded. After further data reductions due to atmospheric stability, power problems and extreme weather, the final percentage of nighttime NEE data of good quality were 18.0%, 18.8%, and 15.8% in 2009, 2010, and 2011, respectively. Despite the low percentage, the range of driver data covered by the good quality data was still representative for different seasons (Figure 3-3 a-d).

2.7 Upscaling of soil respiration

The automated and survey Rₛ data were used together to constrain the estimate of site average Rₛ because of their different representation of temporal and spatial variations. Automated Rₛ from the three microtopographic locations was gap filled first and then integrated [Miao et al., in review]. The site average Rₛ was derived based on the areal representativeness (Aᵢ) of each microsite given the frequency distribution of ground elevation.

\[ Rₛ = \sum_{i=LOW,MID,HIGH} Aᵢ Rₛ,i \]  

(1)

where i is the index for individual microtopographic locations. The Aᵢ was 60%, 23% and 17% for the HIGH, MID and LOW microsites, respectively.
To upscale from survey measurements, a response model of $R_s$ to $T_s$ and WTD was developed. We assumed that the microtopography information was contained in the spatial variation of survey measurements and the $T_s$-$R_s$ and WTD-$R_s$ relationship reflected in the survey data represented the response at the ecosystem scale. Therefore the survey $R_s$ was used as a whole without microtopographic classification and only separated to flooded ($R_{s-FL}$) and non-flooded ($R_{s-NFL}$) cases for deriving respective response models. The nested $Q_{10}$ model (model D in Table 3-1) developed in a previous study was adopted for $R_{s-NFL}$ [Miao et al., in review]; and a simple quadratic equation (Equation 2, $R^2=0.31$, $p<0.001$) was used for $R_{s-FL}$ which we assumed was controlled by physical diffusion [Miao et al., in review]. The site average $R_s$ was then estimated with the models and daily site average $T_s$ and WTD.

$$R_{s-FL} = 0.0032T_s^2 - 0.040T_s + 0.39$$

The temperature and hydrologic sensitivity of site average $R_s$ was also calculated from both automated and survey measurements. For automated measurements, the raw measurements of $R_{s,i}$ (without gap-filling) were used and also integrated with Equation 1. The integrated $R_s$ was subsequently regressed with the nested $Q_{10}$ model to obtain the $T_s$ and WTD sensitivity of $R_s$. Because the available data at each microsite was not synchronous, combination of raw data resulted in the narrower coverage of site average $R_s$, and the derived parameters were limited at certain conditions (Figure 3-3 e-f). In contrast, the data coverage from survey measurements was better (Figure 3-3 g-h), from which we assumed the driver sensitivity from survey measurements would better represent site average $R_s$. 
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2.8 Upscaling coarse woody debris respiration

Annual site $R_{CWD}$ was estimated as reported previously [Noormets et al., 2012]. The temperature response of $R_{CWD}$ was evaluated separately for each decay class based on chamber measurements, except for classes 1 and 2, which were combined because of similar efflux rates. $R_{CWD}$ was scaled up based on $Q_{10}$ function (model A in Table 3-1) with continuous daily CWD temperature, which was estimated based on the observed relationship between CWD CO$_2$ efflux measurements and soil temperature at the micrometeorological station. Site average $R_{CWD}$ per unit ground area was estimated as the product of areal coverage of CWD ($A_{CWD,i}$) and upscaled $R_{CWD}$ for each class ($R_{CWD,i}$). The $A_{CWD,i}$ was the ratio of CWD projected area to plot area and positively related with the CWD biomass.

$$R_{CWD} = \sum_{i=2}^{4} A_{CWD,i} R_{CWD,i}$$

2.9 Data gap filling for ecosystem respiration

To fill the data gaps in $R_e$, models were developed based on $T_s$ and WTD, separately for flooded ($R_{e-FL}$) and non-flooded ($R_{e-NFL}$) cases. To allow comparison of driver effects on $R_e$ with those on $R_s$, $T_s$ was used instead of $T_a$. Different from $R_{s-FL}$, $R_{e-FL}$ contains the aboveground live plant respiration ($R_p$) which is still active under flooded conditions. We therefore evaluated the $T_s$ and WTD effects on $R_{e-FL}$ with the same framework as on $R_{e-NFL}$, but used the reciprocal of WTD (i.e. 1/WTD) because the $R_{e-FL}$ responded negatively to the increase of WTD.

The conceptual framework was previously described [Miao et al. in review]. In short, the
main steps included: (i) defining base temperature ($T_b$) with the broadest range of WTD; (ii) evaluating WTD-dependence of $R_e$ at $T_b$, and determining whether base respiration ($R_b$) is dynamic or constant; (iii) evaluating temperature sensitivity ($Q_{10}$) in WTD bins, and determining $Q_{10}$ dynamic or constant; and (iv) combining $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ to form the full model. There are 4 possible combinations with dynamic or constant $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$, corresponding to 4 models, i.e. conventional $Q_{10}$ model, $R_b$-dynamic-only model, $Q_{10}$-dynamic model and nested $Q_{10}$ model (Table 3-1). The data collected in 2009 and 2010 were used for regression analysis and the data of 2011 for validation. To evaluate model performance, both the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and Akaike’s information criterion (AIC) were evaluated to assess the explanatory power of model parameters [Miao et al. in review]. Due to year-to-year differences in data coverage, the performance of the same model differed in regression performance and validation. The full model was chosen by optimizing model performance.

2.10 Component comparison and partitioning

Overall, we classified 7 respiratory components in this study: $R_s$-NFL, $R_s$-FL, $R_e$-NFL, $R_e$-FL and $R_{CWD}$ with 3 decay classes. Modeled parameters were compared to elucidate differences in temperature and hydrologic sensitivities between respiratory components. The comparison of seasonal variation of components and partitioning of $R_e$ was mainly based on the data in 2010 when the records for all the components were relatively complete. The 30-min gap-filled automated data ($R_e$ and $R_s$) were used to calculate daily and monthly variation. The survey data in daily scale were also transformed to monthly scale. Respiration partitioning were performed at both daily and monthly scales.
It has been suggested that the deviation of the total flux estimate is usually less in spite of the divergence between individual model results and measurements [Desai et al., 2008; Janssens et al., 2003]. We therefore analyzed the prediction of total carbon emissions for 2009 and 2011 by the respective models and compared them with the results of 2010 for preliminary quantification of inter-annual variation.

3. Results

3.1 Local climate and hydrologic regimes

The hydroperiod, which is the seasonal pattern of WTD in a wetland, is distinct in this forested wetland and varies with inter-annual variation in precipitation (Figure 3-4 b-c). WTD in this wetland generally started significant decreasing from the end of spring through summer, and then rapidly increased after autumn storms. The percentage of flooded and non-flooded ground area changed correspondingly (Figure 3-4 d). During the 3-year study period, 2009 was a relatively wet year while 2010 and 2011 were dry years. The WTD was shallower during summer of 2009 with an adjusted site average WTD = -3 cm (negative values mean water table was below soil surface), compared to 2010 and 2011 (WTD = -20 cm in both years). The amount of time with more than half of the area not flooded was 42%, 51% and 81% in 2009 (starting from 3/19), 2010 and 2011, respectively, illustrating that 2011 was by far the driest of the three years.

Data from the adjacent station indicated that the temperature during the 3-year study period was similar to the 30-year normal, but precipitation appeared to decrease over time. The average maximum air temperature was 20.8, 22.0 and 22.3°C in 2009, 2010 and 2011,
respectively, bracketing the 30-year normal of 21.2°C. The average minimum temperature was 12.2, 12.9 and 12.4°C in 2009, 2010 and 2011, respectively. The difference in minimum temperature between years and from the 30-year normal was smaller than that of maximum temperature (Figure 3-5 a). Annual precipitation was 1002, 758 and 960 mm in 2009, 2010 and 2011, respectively, and was lower than the recorded 30-year normal of 1270 mm (Figure 3-5 b).

### 3.2 Seasonal variation of soil, coarse woody debris and ecosystem respiration

Seasonality of $R_s$ from survey and automated measurements was consistent between years in terms of the average magnitude at different microtopographic categories although the spatial variation resulted in marked deviation within each category (Figure 3-6 a-c). In spring and autumn, when MID and LOW microsites were submerged, $R_s$ was lower than those at HIGH microsites under non-flooded conditions. Pronounced differences between microsites were present throughout the year in automated measurements, but decreased in magnitude during summer months in the survey measurements, when WTD<0 at all microsites. The approach of classifying microsites by two oversimplified cutoff points was also one of the causes of the decreased differences.

In 2010, the site average $R_s$ in spring (Mar.-May) and autumn (Sep.-Nov.) was 2.2±1.6 (mean±SD) g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ and 1.0±0.6 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, respectively. Highest $R_s$ occurred in summer (Jun.-Aug.) with a 3-year average of 6.4±2.8 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ and lowest in winter (Dec.-Feb.) at 0.6±0.4 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$. The wet summer of 2009 resulted in the low rate of $R_s$ of 2.8±1.4 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, and the coldest winter of 2010 corresponded to the extremely
Coarse woody debris also released highest amount of CO₂ during summer, and $R_{\text{CWD}}$ decreased with increasing CWD decay class (Figure 3-7 a-c). The unit rates was similar between 2010 and 2011, but the site average $R_{\text{CWD}}$ determined by scaling CWD biomass was significantly different between the two years. The 2-year average $R_{\text{CWD}}$ was 0.5±0.4 (mean±SD), 1.1±0.6, 0.7±0.5 and 0.2±0.2 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ from spring to summer, autumn and winter, respectively (Figure 3-7 d). Summer $R_e$ averaged 8.2±1.4 (mean±SD) g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ across all three years. Winter $R_e$ averaged 1.5±0.7 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹, and spring fluxes were higher than those in autumn with $R_e$ of 4.3±2.0 and 3.3±1.2 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹, respectively. These seasonal differences in $R_e$ were related to dynamics of WTD. Similarly, the inter-annual differences in summer fluxes correlated with dynamics of WTD, with the wettest summer in 2009 having lower $R_e$ (7.0±1.4 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹) compared to drier years in 2010 (8.8±0.6 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹) and 2011 (8.8±1.2 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹). The coldest winter of 2010 experienced the lowest $R_e$ at 1.1±0.3 g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ (Figure 3-8).

3.3 Temperature and hydrologic sensitivity of soil, coarse woody debris and ecosystem respiration

Relationships between $T_s$, WTD and $R_s$ differed significantly between flooded and non-flooded periods (Figure 3-9), and the magnitude of $R_{s-\text{FL}}$ was much lower than that of $R_{s-\text{NFL}}$, indicating different controlling mechanisms and the necessity of separating them for modeling. $T_s$ and WTD explained 60% of the variation in site average $R_{s-\text{NFL}}$ with automated
data, but only about 35% in the survey $R_s$ data (Table 3-2). With WTD in the model, the improved performance of modeling the variance in $T_s$-$R_s$ and WTD-$R_s$ relationships indicated that $T_s$ and WTD both had significant influences on $R_s$. In the $Q_{10}$-related parameters, $\beta_1$ (the $Q_{10}$ at WTD = -10 cm) was not statistically different between the automated data (3.16±0.12) and survey data (3.69±1.02), whereas $\beta_2$ (the WTD-sensitivity of $Q_{10}$) was much greater in the survey data. When WTD varied between -30 and -5 cm, the $Q_{10}$ of $R_s$-NFL ranged at 2.2-3.5 from the automated data and 0.7-5.7 from the survey data.

Temperature explained 25-45% of $R_{cwd}$ variation across decay classes. The tremendous variance in class 1-2 resulted in the greatest uncertainty and lowest performance when modeling with temperature (Table 3-2, Figure 3-10). $R_b$ decreased with increasing of decay class. Although the mean of $Q_{10}$ itself exhibited an opposite pattern to $R_b$, which might partly result from the interdependence between the two parameters, $Q_{10}$ was not significantly different between decay classes with the uncertainty involved and averaged at 2.5±0.1 (Table 3-2).

Similar to $R_s$, the response of $R_e$ to $T_s$ and WTD also differed between flooded and non-flooded periods (Figure 3-11). Temperature and WTD explained approximately 50% of $R_e$-NFL variation and 40% of $R_e$-FL variation. Based on the current data coverage and the models with best performance, the $R_b$ of $R_e$-NFL did not exhibit a significant relationship with WTD (Model C in Table 3-2), whereas that of $R_e$-FL did (Model B in Table 3-2). The constant $R_b$ of $R_{e-NFL}$, 8.8±0.3 μmol CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, was higher than the maximum $R_b$ of $R_{e-FL}$, 6.1±0.2 μmol CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. In contrast, the $Q_{10}$ of $R_{e-NFL}$ was to some extent exponentially related with
WTD, whereas that of $R_{e-FL}$ was not. The $Q_{10}$ of $R_{e-FL}$ averaged 2.5, similar to that of $R_{CWD}$ and smaller than the maximum values of $R_{e-NFL}$ and $R_{s-NFL}$. The $\beta_1$ of $R_{e-NFL}$ was 2.20±0.12 and smaller than that of $R_{s-NFL}$. The $\beta_2$ of 0.059±0.006 was in the medium range of values of $R_{s-NFL}$ from both survey and automated data. The modeled dynamic $Q_{10}$ of $R_{e-NFL}$ varied between 0.7 and 3.0 when WTD ranged from -30 to -5 cm, of which the high level was smaller than that of $R_{s-NFL}$. (Table 3-2).

3.4 Relative contributions to ecosystem respiration

The annual $R_s:R_e$ ratio was calculated to be 0.65 in 2010; it was 0.76 and 0.25 for flooded and non-flooded periods, respectively. The $R_s:R_e$ ratio also exhibited distinct seasonal variation. It started increasing in April from 0.38 to 0.64 in May, and reached peaked in June and July at 0.96 and 0.90, respectively. It began decreasing in August to 0.78. In September of 2010, while the site was flooded from Hurricane Irene, the $R_s:R_e$ ratio dropped to 0.34. Similarly, during late autumn and winter, the ratio was low at 0.27±0.05 (mean±SD, Figure 3-12).

The daily variation differed between $R_s$ and $R_e$. $R_s$ responded sharply to the WTD change, decreasing with increasing WTD, whereas $R_e$ did not show significant short-term response to WTD change but decreased when WTD reached a certain threshold above the soil surface (Figure 3-12). During summer, the drying-flooding cycle caused by rainfall events resulted in significant daily variation of $R_s:R_e$ ratio. For example, in July of 2010, several precipitation events caused rapid rise in WTD and the $R_s:R_e$ ratio varied between 0.5 and 1.0 with some values even above 1.0 (possibly due to the measurement error and estimate uncertainty).
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After mid-August in 2010, frequent heavy rainfall events occurred and shifting the system into a flooded condition. Daily $R_s$ decreased gradually with the increasing WTD and associated flooded area (Figure 3-2 d). During the same period, $R_e$ also started decreasing but more slowly than $R_s$. Correspondingly, the $R_s$: $R_e$ ratio decreased from 0.9-1.0 to 0.5 after mid-August. After Hurricane Irene, both $R_s$ and $R_e$ decreased significantly and the $R_s$: $R_e$ ratio averaged at 0.2 (Figure 3-10).

Model predictions of $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio were 0.45 in 2009 and 0.63 in 2011. Despite the distinct inter-annual difference in $R_s$:$R_e$, the respective ratios for flooded and non-flooded periods were similar between years. Through the 3-year study period, the average ratio was 0.24±0.06 (mean±SD) and 0.67±0.11 for flooded and non-flooded periods, respectively. The contribution of $R_{CWD}$ to $R_e$ was small compared to $R_s$, but with large inter-annual variability and upscaling uncertainties. Annual $R_{CWD}$:$R_e$ ratio was 0.06 and 0.21 in 2010 and 2011, respectively.

3.5 Total carbon emission estimate

Annual $R_e$ ranged 1331 to 1731 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ y$^{-1}$ through the 3-year study period. Annual $R_s$ was estimated at 593-1082 g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ y$^{-1}$, with the smallest soil CO$_2$ efflux occurring in the wet year of 2009. Estimate of $R_{CWD}$ differed tremendously between years, with totals of 94 (95% CI: 70-117) and 359 (261-458) g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ y$^{-1}$ in 2010 and 2011, respectively (Table 3-3).

For each component, carbon emissions during the non-flooded period were much greater than during flooded period, although the difference varied inter-annually depending on the
length of the respective periods (Table 3-3). However, the residual between \( R_e \) and the other two components (\( R_s \) and \( R_{CWD} \)), which we equated to \( R_p \), was much smaller between flooded and non-flooded periods in all three years. The percentage of non-flooded days during the growing season (April to October) was 57%, 72% and 71% in 2009, 2010 and 2011, respectively. Mean \( R_p \) in 2010 was 228 g CO\(_2\)-C m\(^{-2}\) for both flooded (95% CI: 172-261) and non-flooded (95% CI: 197-245) periods, respectively, and in 2011 was 129 (91-163) and 160 (118-179) g CO\(_2\)-C m\(^{-2}\). CWD biomass was not measured in 2009 and therefore we could not estimate total \( R_{CWD} \), but the difference between \( R_s \) and \( R_e \) were similar between flooded and non-flooded periods, with values of 356 (306-393) and 382 (360-397) g CO\(_2\)-C m\(^{-2}\), respectively. Because 2009 was a wet year (during summer there were a number of flooded days), it is reasonable to think that \( R_{CWD} \) during flooded and non-flooded periods might have been similar, implying that the aboveground live plant respiration was similar (Table 3-4).

4. Discussion

4.1 Seasonal hysteresis of respiratory processes

In wetlands, it is thought that hydroperiod exerts strong regulation on seasonal variation of carbon cycling in addition to temperature. At our site, we observed a seasonal hysteresis of \( R_s \) at HIGH microsites but not at MID and LOW microsites, which was related to the effect of microtopography and surface soil immersion [Miao et al. in review]. In the current study, our survey of microtopography indicates the higher percentage of HIGH microsites in this wetland relative to MID and LOW microsites. As a result, the site average \( R_s \) exhibited a similar hysteresis to that at the HIGH microsites. A hysteresis pattern was also observed in
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$R_e$, but with a magnitude different from $R_s$. The clockwise hysteresis pattern in $R_e$ and $R_s$ corresponded to the counter-clockwise pattern in WTD (Figure 3-13).

Difference in seasonal hysteresis was marked between $R_s$ and $R_e$ in 2010. In September when temperature was similar to June, $R_s$ responded immediately to flooding and decreased to $1.8\pm1.2$ (mean±SD) g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹, whereas the rate was $8.1\pm1.8$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ in June. In contrast, $R_e$ responded slowly and decreased to $5.2\pm1.1$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ in September, compared to the rate of $8.5\pm0.8$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ in June. Because the contribution from $R_{CWD}$ was small, the slower response of $R_e$ to WTD change was more likely attributed to change in $R_p$. Measuring $R_p$ directly is beyond the scope of this study, but most of the species in this forested wetland have been characterized as tolerant to very tolerant of flooding [Angelov et al., 1996; Hook, 1984]. Gravatt and Kirby [Gravatt and Kirby, 1998] evaluated the flood-tolerance of several tree species and suggested that short-term (<32 days) flooding events did not significantly decrease leaf and stem growth rates in tolerant species. During the fall, the effects of rising WTD may be combined with the commencement of the dormant season (e.g. decreasing temperature and day length), resulting in the significant reduction of $R_p$ [Gill, 1970]. As a result, the magnitude of $R_e$ decreased $3.8\pm0.9$ (mean±SD) g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹, from the rate of $6.7\pm0.6$ in May to $2.9\pm0.4$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ in October. This magnitude was similar to that in $R_s$ ($3.5\pm1.0$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹), from $4.3\pm1.0$ in May to $0.8\pm0.2$ g CO₂-C m⁻² d⁻¹ in October. The $R_s$ and $R_e$ were both consistently low from November to the following April (Figure 3-13).

While $R_s$ and $R_e$ are the focus of the current study and the aboveground processes are
beyond the scope, it has been studied in upland ecosystems that respiratory processes are affected by photosynthesis [Davidson and Holbrook, 2009; Janssens et al., 2001], and photosynthesis responds differently to temperature early and late in the growing season [Niu et al., 2011; Piao et al., 2008; Vesala et al., 2010]. To our knowledge, there are still no studies investigating the response of photosynthesis at different stages of the growing season in wetland ecosystems. The hydroperiod and plant adaptation to flooding conditions might result in remarkable difference between wetland and upland ecosystems. This question is also important for quantifying the fraction of autotrophic respiration in $R_s$ and $R_e$ and will be addressed in our future studies.

### 4.2 Temperature and hydrologic sensitivity of respiratory processes

Among the 7 components we classified, the $R_{s-FL}$ was most likely diffusion-limited [Greenway et al., 2006], which is a different mechanism from the main focus of the current study. The other 6 components were controlled mainly by autotrophic or heterotrophic respiration, and $Q_{10}$ or modified $Q_{10}$ models were developed to quantify the environmental controls. Because the best fitting models differed between components, it was difficult to make direct comparisons of temperature and hydrologic sensitivity of each component. Briefly, the $R_b$ of each component ranked as $R_{s-NFL} \sim R_{e-NFL} > R_{CWD}$ (class 1-2) $> R_{e-FL} > R_{CWD}$ (class 3) $> R_{CWD}$ (class 4), whereas the $Q_{10}$ ranked as $R_{s-NFL} \sim R_{e-NFL} > R_{e-FL} \sim R_{CWD}$ (all classes).

Estimates of $R_e$ had great uncertainty due to limited data coverage, but the difference in the $R_b$ and $Q_{10}$ patterns between $R_{e-NFL}$ and $R_{e-FL}$ provides some insight into differences in the
main sources of variation. The $R_{s-NFL}$ contributed 75-90% to the $R_{e-NFL}$, which likely explains the similarity in $Q_{10}$ between $R_{e-NFL}$ and $R_{s-NFL}$. The $R_{s-FL}$ only contributed 20-25% to the variation in $R_{e-FL}$, and the $R_{CWD-FL}$ contributed about 8%, implying that $R_p$ would be the main contributor to $R_{e-FL}$ (accounting for 67-72% of the variation). Therefore the driver sensitivity of $R_{e-FL}$, i.e. the constant $Q_{10}$, perhaps reflected the sensitivity of $R_p$ during flooded periods.

In contrast to $R_s$, on which the water table fluctuation had direct influence through the amount of available substrate, the carbon sources for $R_p$ are essentially from plant carbon storage and current photosynthesize [Chapin et al., 1990]. The WTD effect on temperature sensitivity of $R_p$, as a result, might be relatively buffered. Previous studies have also found that flooding did not change leaf size and patchy stomatal opening of swamp tupelo seedlings [Angelov et al., 1996]. In addition, we classified flooded periods based on a statistical average elevation, meaning that we integrated a certain proportion of HIGH and LOW microsites. Trees growing on HIGH microsites are less affected by flooding compared to MID and LOW microsites, and causing a less insignificant response to variation in WTD.

There was no apparent pattern for $R_b$ of $R_{e-NFL}$ and $R_{e-FL}$ in the current study. The performance of models with dynamic $R_b$ (model B and D in Table 3-2) for $R_{e-NFL}$ exhibited marked difference between the simulation and validation and needs further study.

In the current study, modeled driver sensitivities of $R_e$ and $R_s$ were derived from a wet year (2009) and a dry year (2010), making results representative of various environmental conditions. Nevertheless, because the modified $Q_{10}$ models for $R_s$ and $R_e$ are different from conventional $Q_{10}$ models, we could not compare the temperature sensitivity of respiratory
components explicitly between this forested wetland and other types of ecosystems. In addition, the selection of $T_a$ or $T_s$ at different depth could affect the $Q_{10}$ value, also limiting the comparison between ecosystems [Lasslop et al., 2012]. However, the $Q_{10}$ of $R_e$ in this forested wetland, 0.7-3.0 of $R_e$-NFL and 2.5 of $R_e$-FL, was within the range of responses to $T_s$ published for other forests. For example, a $Q_{10}$ of 2.5 was reported for a black spruce forest [Jarvis et al., 1997], of 2.2 for a northern hardwood forest in Massachusetts [Goulden et al., 1996], and at 2.3 for a pine ecosystem in Florida, USA [Clark et al., 1999]. Compared with other wetlands, our $Q_{10}$ was similar to that of a temperate bog (2.8) with a low density tree cover in Sweden [Lund et al., 2007], and a reed coastal wetland (2.5) in China [Han et al., 2013].

Environmental driver sensitivity of site average $R_e$-NFL from the survey data was comparable to that for $R_e$-NFL from automated measurements [Miao et al. in review]. This suggests the automated measurements are representative of each type of microsite and shows the value of comparison with replicated measurements. Compared with the $Q_{10}$ values reported from the global soil respiration database (SRDB version 20100517), the $Q_{10}$ of 2.2-3.5 of $R_e$-NFL (temperature range: 15-25°C and WTD range: -30 - -5 cm) was within the range of 2.6±1.1 over the temperature range of 10-20°C [Bond-Lamberty and Thomson, 2010]. The wider range of 0.7-5.7 from survey data (temperature range: 5-25°C) was also similar to the reported range of 3.0±1.1 over the temperature range of 0-20°C in SRDB.

The temperature sensitivity of $R_{CWD}$ was of the same order of magnitude as that of $R_e$ and $R_s$ (Table 3-2). The $R_{CWD} Q_{10}$ of 2.5 in this forested wetland was slightly higher than that
from an adjacent loblolly pine plantation, with the value of 1.7 for decay class 2 and 2.0 for decay class 3 [unpublished data]. Our values of $R_{CWD}$ $Q_{10}$ were also similar to the values reported in some ecosystems from warmer climate zones, such as 2.4 in tropical forests of the central Amazon [Chambers et al., 2001] and 2.5 in Austrian forests [Mackensen et al., 2003].

4.3 Hydrologic control on $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio

With the daily data derived from the gap-filled 30-min data, we analyzed environmental driver effects on the $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio. Under non-flooded conditions, the $R_s$:$R_e$ was positively related to $T_s$ and maintained the hysteresis pattern similar to that of $R_s$ and $R_e$. Interestingly, the ratio was linearly related to WTD (Figure 3-14). The intercept of the linear regression, $0.33\pm0.01$ (mean±SE), represented the $R_s$-NFL contribution to $R_e$-NFL at WTD = 0 cm; the slope of $-0.026\pm0.000$ indicated that $R_s$-NFL contribution increased 0.026 when WTD decreased 1 cm. The relationship under flooded conditions was not as clear as that under non-flooded conditions because of the greater uncertainties at the low level of CO$_2$ efflux and different mechanisms (e.g. diffusion limitation), which needs different experimental designs to elucidate. $R_s$-FL:$R_e$-FL was approximately constant at $0.25\pm0.08$ (mean±SD).

Furthermore, for $R_s$ or $R_e$ individually, there were additional $T_s$ or WTD effects that could not be explained by the interaction between $T_s$ or WTD, e.g. the independent WTD effect reflected in the $T_s$-$R_s$ and $T_s$-$R_e$ relationship (Figure 3-9 a, 3-11 a) and the $T_s$ effect in the WTD-$R_s$ and WTD-$R_e$ relationship (Figure 3-9 b, 3-11 b). Nevertheless, the $R_s$:$R_e$ ratio seemed exhibiting different pattern. The additional WTD effect still appeared in the $T_s$-($R_s$:$R_e$) relationship, but the $T_s$ effect was not significant in the WTD-($R_s$:$R_e$) relationship. It implied
that only WTD effect seemed sufficient to interpret the variations of the \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio, while \( T_s \) effect was the reflection of the interaction between \( T_s \) and WTD. This hypothesis would be useful to quantify the impact of climate change on carbon cycling in wetlands and needs further study to test.

Previous studies on upland forests found the negative relationship between the \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio and \( T_s \) or \( T_a \) [Davidson et al., 2006; Jassal et al., 2007]. Several mechanisms were attributed to this pattern, such as the lag between soil temperature and air temperature resulting in the difference between the aboveground and belowground processes. Also, water stress on plants at upland areas may have different effects on autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration [Davidson et al., 2006]. In contrast to upland forests where temperature is a main driver of \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio, our results indicates that \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio in this type of forested wetland is highly responsive to WTD. This might be due to a large contribution from heterotrophic respiration which is controlled by the WTD-induced availability of substrates [Freeman et al., 2001; Freeman et al., 2004; Jaatinen et al., 2007], whereas the autotrophic respiration of flood-tolerant species was not affected by WTD within a certain range.

As mentioned, the impacts from photosynthesis on the respiratory processes at our site are still unquantified. The conclusion that the WTD is the main driver to the \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio needs to be qualified by the recognition that there is still uncertainty from other confounding or unaccounted factors. In addition, if this wetland had a severe drought, WTD might decrease beyond the range reported here. It is likely that the relationship between \( \frac{R_s}{R_e} \) ratio and WTD changes because soil processes might respond differently from the current situation and
plants might have drought stress as well [Lugo et al., 1990; Alm et al., 1999; Sonnentag et al., 2010].

4.4 Uncertainties and implication of partitioning respiration in a forested wetland

Two sources of uncertainty specifically related to wetland ecosystems became apparent in the current study. In the first, accounting for variation in microtopography decreased unexplained variation of estimating site average $R_s$ by explicitly quantifying the percentage of individual microsites, and therefore the fraction of the soil surface in flooded vs. non-flooded condition. Our assumption of a linear relationship between $R_s$ and microtopographic position, however, is arbitrary and needs to be tested. CWD biomass and decay classes introduce uncertainty into estimates of $R_{CWD}$, which resulted in the marked differences between years in this study. Although most of CWDs was elevated above the soil surface, flooding in the LOW microtopographic positions still affected our CWD biomass survey in a wet year or season. An analysis on CWD spatial distribution would be useful to estimate the percentage of flooded and non-flooded CWDs and refine the $R_{CWD}$ estimate.

This study has illustrated how periodic flooding may complicate estimation of sources of respiration in forested wetlands. By adjusting respiration models to account for flooded and non-flooded conditions as influenced by variation in microtopography and WTD, we were able to estimate an annual $R_e$ of more than 1000 g C m$^{-2}$ y$^{-1}$, similar in magnitude to that of many upland forests [Valentini et al., 2000]. Temperature sensitivity of respiratory components ($R_e$, $R_s$ and $R_{CWD}$) was also similar to upland forests, demonstrating common environmental control over respiratory processes. On the other hand, the transition between
flooded and non-flooded conditions resulted in unique responses as well. $R_s$ was the main contributor to $R_e$ during non-flooded periods and the $R_s:R_e$ ratio was similar to that reported for boreal and temperate upland forests, while $R_p$ was likely the main contributor to $R_e$ during flooded periods, similar to many tropical rainforests.

$R_p$, which was assumed as residual between $R_e$ and $R_s$, was similar between non-flooded and flooded periods, even though the respective length of the two periods was different year to year (Table 3-4). It has been broadly acknowledged that the plants in wetlands have physiologically adapted to flooding conditions, but the question that how these adaptations affect carbon cycling is still less addressed. This requires long term studies and direct observations on plant growth as the current speculation was based on $R_s$ and $R_e$, each of which embedded uncertainties from the data gap filling and upscaling. Sensitivity of $R_p$ needs to be confirmed with direct measurements.

$R_s$ in the wet year of 2009 showed lower CO$_2$ efflux than in the dry years of 2010 and 2011, demonstrating that the wetter conditions acted as a negative feedback to the atmosphere. Whether such a response would acclimate at the ecosystem level over time requires further study. However, the decreasing precipitation of the three years relative to the 30-year climate normal (Figure 3-5 b) suggested that atmospheric CO$_2$-forcing may have been increasing in recent years due to the accelerated turnover of carbon stored in this system, which has serious implications for carbon storage in wetland ecosystems if drought-severity increases over most of the global land surface as projected [King et al., 2013]. Further study of this forested wetland is needed to fully determine net ecosystem exchange under future
climate conditions, accounting for effects on photosynthesis and methane production, as well as respiration.
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**Table 3-1** Performance comparison of models used for simulating ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) during non-flooded periods and flooded periods with soil temperature ($T_b$) and water table depth (WTD) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models*</th>
<th>Number of Parameter</th>
<th>Non-flooded ($w=WTD; w_0 = -10$)</th>
<th>Flooded ($w = 1/WTD; w_0 = 0.1$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Conventional $Q_{10}$ model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5000 1964</td>
<td>0.5281 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R = R_b Q_{10}^{(T_b-T_b)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B $R_b$-dynamic-only model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5556 1806</td>
<td>0.4949 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R = \frac{V_{max} w}{K_m + w} Q_{10}^{(T_b-T_b)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C $Q_{10}$-dynamic-only model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5250 1872</td>
<td>0.5335 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R = R_b \left{ \beta_1 \exp\left[ \frac{\beta_2 (w-w_0)}{10} \right] \right}^{(T_b-T_b)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Nested $Q_{10}$ model</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5556 1808</td>
<td>0.4959 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R = \frac{V_{max} w}{K_m + w} \left{ \beta_1 \exp\left[ \frac{\beta_2 (w-w_0)}{10} \right] \right}^{(T_b-T_b)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: The meaning of parameters in these models:
- $R$ - respiration rate; $R_b$ - basal respiration; $T_b$ - basal temperature; $Q_{10}$ - temperature response parameter.
- $V_{max}$ - maximum $R_b$ rate at $T_b$; $K_m$ - the water table depth at half $V_{max}$; $\beta_1$ - the $Q_{10}$ at $w = w_0$; $\beta_2$ - WTD response parameter.
**Table 3-2** Parameters of nonlinear regression for modeling ecosystem respiration (flooded $R_{e-FL}$ and non-flooded $R_{e-NFL}$ separately), soil respiration under non-flooded conditions ($R_{s-NFL}$) with soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD), and modeling decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$) with $T_s$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(mean±SE)</th>
<th>$R_b$ (μmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$Q_{10}$</th>
<th>$R_b$-related parameters</th>
<th>$Q_{10}$-related parameters</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_{s-NFL}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>9.7 - 5.6 $^a$</td>
<td>2.2 - 3.5 $^a$</td>
<td>11.3±0.2</td>
<td>-5.1±0.3</td>
<td>0.6427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>13.2 - 4.7 $^a$</td>
<td>0.7 - 5.7 $^a$</td>
<td>20.6±4.0</td>
<td>-16.9±6.6</td>
<td>0.3569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{CWD}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay class 1-2</td>
<td>6.5±0.7</td>
<td>2.40±0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay class 3</td>
<td>2.9±0.2</td>
<td>2.51±0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay class 4</td>
<td>2.2±0.3</td>
<td>2.61±0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{e-NFL}$</td>
<td>8.8±0.3</td>
<td>0.7 - 3.0 $^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20±0.12</td>
<td>0.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{e-FL}$</td>
<td>5.7 - 4.2 $^b$</td>
<td>2.50±0.09</td>
<td>6.1±0.2</td>
<td>0.015±0.004</td>
<td>0.3973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$: The dynamic basal respiration ($R_b$) and $Q_{10}$ during non-flooded period were derived based on WTD in the range of -30 - -5 cm, decreasing with the WTD rise.

$^b$: The dynamic $R_b$ during flooded period were derived based on WTD in the range of 5 - 30 cm, decreasing with the WTD rise.
### Table 3-3
Estimated annual carbon emission of ecosystem respiration (Re), soil respiration (Rs) and decomposition of coarse woody debris (RcWD) (g CO₂-C m⁻² yr⁻¹) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in 2010, with 95% confidence interval in parenthesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data gap filled</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>1560 (1471-1650)</td>
<td>1331 (1256-1406)</td>
<td>1559 (1464-1654)</td>
<td>1731 (1615-1846)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>341 (321-361)</td>
<td>503 (477-529)</td>
<td>342 (320-365)</td>
<td>260 (248-272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>1219 (1150-1288)</td>
<td>828 (779-877)</td>
<td>1217 (1144-1289)</td>
<td>1470 (1367-1574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Rs</td>
<td>1015 (960-1103)</td>
<td>593 (503-702)</td>
<td>1010 (936-1120)</td>
<td>1082 (1012-1179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>86 (45-150)</td>
<td>147 (84-223)</td>
<td>86 (40-155)</td>
<td>47 (17-80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>928 (915-953)</td>
<td>446 (419-479)</td>
<td>924 (896-965)</td>
<td>1035 (995-1099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Rs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>499 (266-856)</td>
<td>1179 (914-1600)</td>
<td>1318 (930-1751)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>90 (0-304)</td>
<td>64 (0-284)</td>
<td>49 (0-139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>409 (266-553)</td>
<td>1114 (914-1317)</td>
<td>1268 (930-1613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RcWD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>94 (70-117)</td>
<td>359 (261-458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28 (19-38)</td>
<td>84 (68-101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65 (52-79)</td>
<td>275 (193-357)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-4 Comparison of the residual between ecosystem respiration ($R_e$), soil respiration ($R_s$) and decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data gap filled</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1/1-12/31]</td>
<td>[3/19-12/31]</td>
<td>[1/1-12/31]</td>
<td>[1/1-12/31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>($R_e - R_s$)</td>
<td>($R_e - R_s$)</td>
<td>($R_e - R_s - R_{CWD}$)</td>
<td>($R_e - R_s - R_{CWD}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(510-547)</td>
<td>(703-753)</td>
<td>(417-458)</td>
<td>(210-342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(212-275)</td>
<td>(306-393)</td>
<td>(172-261)</td>
<td>(91-163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(235-336)</td>
<td>(360-397)</td>
<td>(197-245)</td>
<td>(118-179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days within a year</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-flooded days</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days in growing season (Apr.-Oct.)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-flooded days</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-1 Location and field settings of study site at the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (ARNWR) (35°47'N, 75°54'W) in eastern North Carolina, USA.
Figure 3-2 Histogram and fitted gamma distribution of microtopography in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. The three solid straight lines represent the elevations of the three microsites (LOW, MID, and HIGH from left to right) where the automated soil respiration ($R_s$) measurements were conducted. The two dotted straight lines represent the cutoff points used to calculate the areal representativeness of each microsite. Based on the assumption that $R_s$ is linearly related to the micro-topography, the average $R_s$ of microtopographic positions lower than ‘L’, where half is lower than LOW microsite and half is higher, equals to the $R_s$ of the LOW microsite. A similar definition was applied to point ‘H’, i.e. the average $R_s$ of positions higher than ‘H’ equals to the $R_s$ of the HIGH microsite. The positions between ‘L’ and ‘H’ were assumed to respire equally to the MID microsite.
Figure 3-3 Comparison of histogram between soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD) in full records (a, b) and those corresponding to available ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) data records (c, d), automated soil respiration ($R_s$) measurements (e, f), and survey $R_s$ (g, h).
Figure 3-4 Seasonal variations observed in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, during the period 3/19/2009-12/31/2011 in (a) Air temperature (grey) and soil temperature at 5 cm depth (Ts, black), (b) Precipitation, (c) Water table depth (WTD) with the site average elevation (solid line) relative to ground water probe location at ground meteorological station (dotted line), and (d) Percentage of non-flooded area calculated based on gamma distribution of micro-topography across the study area.
Figure 3-5 Comparison of (a) monthly air temperature (maximum and minimum), and (b) cumulative precipitation between the 30-year normal and the study periods (2009-2011) at Manteo, AP meteorological station in North Carolina, USA.
Figure 3-6 Time series of soil respiration ($R_s$) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland from 2009 to 2011. The data in 2009 and 2010 were gap-filled, and the data in 2011 were the results predicted by the nested $Q_{10}$ model we developed in a previous study [Miao et al. in review]. (a)-(c): Comparison between 30-minute automated (grey ‘+’) and monthly survey (black dots – mean values; error bar – standard deviation) measurements at (a) HIGH, (b) MID and (c) LOW microsites; (d): The daily mean (black line) and 95% confidence interval (shaded area) of site average $R_s$ (g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$).
Figure 3-7 Time series of decomposition of coarse woody debris (CWD) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland from 2010 to 2011. (a)-(c): Monthly measurements (black dots – mean values; error bar – standard deviation) at (a) decay class 1-2, (b) class 3 and (c) class 4; (d): The daily mean (black line) and 95% confidence interval (shaded area) of site average decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$, g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$).
Figure 3-8 Time series of ecosystem respiration ($R_e$, gap filled) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland from 2010 to 2011, the daily mean (g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, black line) and 95% confidence interval (shaded area).
Figure 3-9 Soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD) effects on soil respiration ($R_s$) observed by both automated (a-d) and survey (e-h) measurements. The $R_s$ under non-flooded conditions was modeled by the nested $Q_{10}$ model with $T_s$ and WTD; the $R_s$ under flooded conditions modeled by a quadratic equation with only $T_s$ involved. In a, b, c, e, f, and g, grey symbols represent for observations and black symbols for modeled results; d and h illustrate model performance.
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Figure 3-10 Observed (dots) and modeled (lines) temperature effect on the decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. Coarse woody debris is classified by decay class, with the smaller number representing newer debris.
Figure 3-11 Observed (grey symbols) and modeled (black symbols) soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD) effects on ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. In a, b, d, e, g and h were the data collected in 2009 and 2010 and used for model regression. In c, f and i were the data in 2011 and used for validation.
Figure 3-12 The daily (grey solid line) and monthly (black dotted line) (a) the ratio between soil respiration ($R_s$) and ecosystem respiration ($R_e$); (b) the ratio between the decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$) and $R_e$, in a lower coastal plain forested wetland.
Figure 3-13 The relationship between daily (a) soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD), (b) $T_s$ and ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) and (c) $T_s$ and site average soil respiration ($R_s$) in 2010, showing the seasonal hysteresis of $R_e$ and site average $R_s$, both of which was related to WTD but in a different magnitude. In (c), both automated and survey $R_s$ measurements were presented.
Figure 3-14 Soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD) effects on the ratio between soil respiration ($R_s$) and ecosystem respiration ($R_e$) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland.
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Abstract

Two years of study on natural $^{13}$C of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($^{13}$C$_{Rs}$) was conducted in a coastal plain forested wetland, of which the carbon dynamics are less-well investigated compared to upland forests, in southeastern USA. The study accounted for site microtopography, in which HIGH microsites where trees grow and the water table is below ground most of the time and non-vegetated LOW microsites which are flooded frequently after rainfall events. Seasonal variation of $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ was determined by microtopography and hydrologic effects jointly, differentiating the dominant component. The $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites was depleted during summer and enriched in spring and autumn, whereas the $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at LOW microsites exhibited the opposite pattern ($^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ was enriched during summer and depleted in spring). The more depleted $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites under drier conditions (-28.0±0.2‰, mean±SE) was similar to that at LOW microsites under near-saturated conditions (-28.3±0.3‰), which may be attributed to the increased relative contribution of root respiration ($R_{root}$, $f_{root}$) and litter decomposition ($R_{litter}$, $f_{litter}$) at those microsites, respectively. Conversely, the more enriched $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at LOW microsites under drier conditions (-27.2±0.4‰) may result from the stimulation of soil organic carbon decomposition ($R_{SOC}$), similar to the $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites under near-saturated conditions (-27.1±0.2‰) due to the inhibition of water on $R_{root}$. Through the spatial difference in $^{13}$C$_{Rs}$, we estimated the ratio of relative contribution of $R_{SOC}$ to $R_s$ ($f_{SOC}$) between HIGH and LOW microsites, i.e. $f_{SOC, HIGH}:f_{SOC, LOW}$ was 0.77±0.10 (mean±SE) under drier conditions and 1.56±0.23 under near-saturated conditions. Accounting for spatial (microtopographic) differences and hydrologic effects will improve
the stable isotope method for partitioning soil respiration between autotrophic and heterotrophic sources by decreasing uncertainty from the $\delta^{13}C$ of $C_{SOC}$ and the $^{13}C$ fractionation of $R_{SOC}$, providing more information to solve the unknown terms in traditional end-member mixing models.

**Abbreviations**

Stable carbon isotope $^{13}C$

$^{13}C$ signature or $^{13}C$ composition $\delta^{13}C$

Soil respiration (soil CO$_2$ efflux) $R_s$

$^{13}C$ composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$

Root respiration $R_{root}$

Relative contribution of root respiration to soil respiration $f_{root}$

Litter decomposition $R_{litter}$

Relative contribution of litter respiration to soil respiration $f_{litter}$

Soil organic carbon decomposition $R_{SOC}$

Soil organic carbon content $C_{SOC}$

$^{13}C$ signature of soil organic carbon $\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$

Relative contribution of soil organic carbon decomposition to soil respiration $f_{SOC}$
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1. Introduction

Wetlands store large amount of soil organic carbon (SOC) with the highest density of 72 kg C/m$^2$ (1 m deep) among all types of ecosystems due to the low decomposition rate [Lugo et al., 1990]. This carbon pool is vulnerable to global warming, with potentially positive atmospheric feedbacks [Ise et al., 2008]. Previous studies have found that soil respiration ($R_s$, defined as the soil CO$_2$ efflux from the ground surface) of wetlands has the potential of releasing an amount of CO$_2$ into the atmosphere comparable to upland ecosystems of similar climate zones [Chimner, 2004; Miao et al., in review; Raich and Schlesinger, 1992]. Because $R_s$ is a mixture of various carbon sources with differing sensitivities to environmental drivers and turnover rates, partitioning $R_s$ is necessary to improve understanding of mechanisms controlling SOC mean residence times and their feedbacks to climate change [Bird et al., 1996; Knorr et al., 2005; Liski et al., 1999].

Partitioning $R_s$ has been broadly investigated by invasive methods such as direct root-exclusion, trenching, shading and clipping or tree girdling etc, but artifacts are associated with these methods due to altered environmental conditions affecting interactions between roots and microbes. Partitioning $R_s$ under natural conditions with noninvasive methods, however, is still a current research challenge [Hanson et al., 2000; Kuzyakov, 2006]. Stable carbon isotope ($^{13}$C) have been recognized for their value as tracers of ecological and physiological processes, with great potential for elucidating SOC cycling with minimal disturbance to the soil system [Ehleringer et al., 2000; Staddon, 2004].

Several $^{13}$C approaches have been broadly adopted in recent years. Using $^{13}$C-labeled
sources (e.g. Högberg and Ekblad, 1996; Ekblad and Högberg, 2000) or growing C4-plants on C3-plant residue dominated soils or vice versa (e.g. Robinson and Scrimgeour 1995; Rochette et al. 1999) to obtain distinct $^{13}$C signatures ($\delta^{13}$C) of carbon sources for partitioning $R_s$ with end member mixing model are artificial. The former is limited for long-term investigation and the latter is restricted to extrapolate the study results to broader scales due to its unnatural system. Some studies used natural $\delta^{13}$C to partition $R_s$ by incubating roots, litter and soils separately, which also changes natural conditions, usually can only experiment for a short period, and the conclusion or implications differed greatly from each other [Formánek and Ambus, 2004; Millard et al., 2010]. Many studies also examine the soil carbon content ($C_{SOC}$) and $\delta^{13}$C of SOC ($\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$) in depth profiles, and use the $C_{SOC}$-$\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ relationship to demonstrate the long-term decomposition rate of SOC [Accoe et al., 2002; Garten Jr, 2006]. This method generally provides limited information on the response of dynamic processes to environmental changes.

The seasonal variation of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ in a natural ecosystem has been investigated as a component of ecosystem respiration to help interpret the isotopic variation of ecosystem-respired CO$_2$, i.e. the $^{13}$C exchange between atmosphere and biosphere [Bowling et al., 2008; Fung et al., 1997; Marron et al., 2009; Maunoury-Danger et al., 2013]. However, $R_s$ in these studies is usually regarded as a source to ecosystem respiration, not a product from different sources. Currently the component contributions to $R_s$ is still not the main objective in these studies. To date, still few studies on natural $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ investigated the seasonal variation of component contributions under natural conditions [Risk et al., 2012; Taneva and Gonzalez-
For comparison, there have been a number of studies on this issue with radiocarbon isotope method [Gaudinski et al., 2000; Schuur et al., 2009; Trumbore, 2000].

Application of the natural $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ is limited by several difficulties and uncertainties. The continuum of belowground carbon pools obscures to obtain distinguished $^{13}C$ signature of sources [Dungait et al., 2012; Phillips and Gregg, 2001]. The $^{13}C$ fractionation of each respiration component is still uncertain and would bias the fraction estimation by end-member mixing model [Dawson et al., 2002; Werth and Kuzyakov, 2010]. However, it is not convinced yet without sufficient studies that whether the information in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ variation is confounded by these uncertainties or it could be useful for designing relevant field or modeling experiments to partition $R_s$.

Our previous studies in a forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, found that the spatial variation in aerobic $R_s$ related to differences in microtopography and therefore hydrologic status, and related to plant distributions and the contributions from SOC decomposition ($R_{SOC}$) and plant-derived respiration ($R_{plant}$, including root respiration - $R_{root}$ and litter decomposition - $R_{litter}$) [Miao et al., in review]. The high mound microsites (HIGH) around tree bases may have higher contribution from $R_{root}$ than the non-vegetated low-lying (LOW) microsites. Accordingly, in the current study we hypothesized that the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites would be more depleted than at LOW microsites due to the higher contribution from $R_{root}$ (with more depleted $\delta^{13}C$). In addition, we hypothesized the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ would increase under warm and non-flooded conditions because of increased decomposition of the large stores of SOC in the organic soil.
The objectives of the current study were to provide baseline data on SOC dynamics in a forested wetland through natural δ¹³C and to explore the potentials of using natural δ¹³C to partitioning sources of Rs. We collected soil-respired CO₂ for ¹³C analysis and quantified the seasonal and spatial dynamics of δ¹³Cₐ, and attempted to partition the component contributions to Rs reflected by δ¹³Cₐ, mainly focusing on the aerobic Rs. We also analyzed the CₕSOC-δ¹³CₕSOC relationship for a preliminary estimate on long-term decomposition of SOC, which results from the cumulative effect of aerobic and anaerobic respiration in this intermittently flooded wetland.

2. Methods

2.1 Site description and field measurement design

This study was conducted in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in eastern North Carolina, USA (35°47′N, 75°54′W) in the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge. Mean annual temperature and precipitation from an adjacent meteorological station (Manteo AP, NC, 35°55′N, 75°42′W) for the period 1981-2010 were 16.9°C and 1270 mm, respectively. The forest type is mixed hardwood swamp forest. The overstory is predominantly composed of black gum (Nyssa sylvatica), swamp tupelo (Nyssa biflora) and bald cypress (Taxodium distichum), with occasional red maple (Acer rubrum) and white cedar (Chamaecyparis thyoides); the understory is predominantly fetterbush (Lyonic lucida), bitter gallberry (Ilex galbra), and red bay (Persea borbonia).

Aboveground carbon storage in live biomass was estimated allometrically at 37.5±12.5 Mg C ha⁻¹. Average carbon storage in live fine root biomass to a depth of 30 cm was 3.1±1.0
Mg C ha$^{-1}$ and annual leaf litter fall was estimated at 1.9±0.2 Mg C ha$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$. The soil types are poorly drained Pungo and Belhaven mucks. The soils are acidic with pH of 4.2-4.8 in surface horizons and the average carbon content of the soil profile (30 cm deep) ranges at 45-90 Mg C ha$^{-1}$.

Five 7-m-diameter survey plots in a 25-hectare square area centered on an eddy covariance tower were installed at the end of 2009, with one plot in the center and four plots at the four corners of the square. Six microsites were randomly selected within each 7-m-diameter plot, installed with 20-cm-diameter PVC static chambers to collect soil gas. We classified microsites as HIGH, where trees grew and the water table was below the soil surface most time of the year, and LOW, which were located in relatively non-vegetated areas that flooded frequently after rainfall events. Ten cm-tall chambers were installed at HIGH microsites and 25-cm-tall chambers at LOW microsites to avoid being submerged.

Soil CO$_2$ efflux was measured at all microsites. Gas samples for $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ analysis were collected from only one HIGH microsite and one LOW microsite at each plot, both of which were randomly selected at each sampling date. Sampling was conducted monthly from January 2010 to August 2011, covering two growing seasons. Chambers were moved to new microsites after 1-year of measurement to decrease bias caused by the disturbance to the soil. In total, 62 microsites were involved in Rs measurement, of which 22 were classified as HIGH and 40 were LOW.

### 2.2 Micrometeorology, water table depth and microtopography measurements

A ground meteorological station was built at the center plot where air temperature and
relative humidity (HMP45AC, Vaisala, Finland) at 2 m aboveground, soil temperature (T_s, CS 107, Campbell Scientific Inc. (CSI), UT, USA) at 5 and 20 cm belowground and volumetric soil water content (CS 616, CSI) at 20 cm belowground were recorded every 30 minutes. In each plot we installed a groundwater probe at the distance of 15-30 m away from the soil chambers to record water table depth (WTD) every 30 minutes. The microtopography of each microsite was measured with a tripod-mounted laser level (RoboLaser Green RT-7210-1G, RoboToolz Inc., CA, USA) providing a horizontal reference line. We then normalized the microtopography relative to the elevation of groundwater probe location at each plot. Water table depth of each microsite at each measuring date was calculated from the relative microtopography and the probe WTD readings (see Appendix B for details). The adjusted WTD was used to identify non-flooded and flooded conditions, defined as WTD<0 cm and WTD≥0 cm, respectively.

2.3 Gas sampling and δ^{13}C analysis of soil-respired CO_2

The design of gas sampling method to obtain δ^{13}C_{Rs} was based on the Keeling plot method which was developed from conservation of mass and is also an application of two-end member mixing models [Keeling, 1958; Pataki et al., 2003]. The mass in this method refers to the concentration and δ^{13}C of CO_2 in soil chamber headspace, and the two end members are the soil-respired CO_2 and the CO_2 in the background air.

The static chamber at each sampling microsite was sealed for approximately-16.5 minutes and gas samples were collected with a gas tight syringe (50 ml Luer-lock syringe, SGE Analytical Science Pty Ltd, Australia) every 5.5 minutes (Figure 4-1). Samples were
stored in evacuated 12-ml glass vials fitted with rubber septa (12-ml Exetainer® vials, Labco Limited, UK). Soil temperature at 5 and 10 cm depth and volumetric water content were recorded during sampling. Gas samples were sent to Cornell University Stable Isotope Lab (COIL, New York, USA) for CO₂ concentration and δ¹³C analysis. The δ¹³C values were corrected against Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite standard.

In the sealed chambers, the change in CO₂ concentration and δ¹³C can be simulated by Equation 1, in which Cₐ is the CO₂ concentration in the closed system at each sampling time; C₀ is the initial CO₂ concentration; δ¹³Cₐ and δ¹³C₀ are the corresponding δ¹³C of Cₐ and C₀. C₀ and δ¹³C₀ are constants. We assumed that Cᵣₛ originated from proportionally stable, integrated carbon sources over a short time periods (e.g. 15-20 minutes), and therefore the δ¹³Cᵣₛ during the sampling period was also stable. Cₐ, Cᵣₛ and δ¹³Cₐ were assumed to vary during the sampling period. By combining the two sub-equations in Equation 1, we could derive a linear equation (Equation 2) in which the left side is the varying δ¹³Cₐ; the right side includes the reciprocal of Cₐ, the slope term consisting of constants, and the δ¹³Cᵣₛ (the intercept). Therefore, to obtain the value of δ¹³Cᵣₛ, the Cₐ and δ¹³Cₐ of the gas samples collected every 5.5 minutes were used for linear regression.

\[
\begin{align*}
Cₐ &= C₀ + Cᵣₛ \\
(δ¹³Cₐ)Cₐ &= (δ¹³C₀)C₀ + (δ¹³Cᵣₛ)Cᵣₛ \\
(δ¹³Cₐ) &= \left\{C₀ \left[ (δ¹³C₀) - (δ¹³Cᵣₛ) \right] \right\} \frac{1}{Cₐ} + (δ¹³Cᵣₛ) \\
\end{align*}
\]

\( (1) \)

\( (2) \)

The uncertainty of intercept, i.e. δ¹³Cᵣₛ, is affected by the magnitude of soil CO₂ efflux
and the regression fitting [Phillips and Gregg, 2001]. To minimize the uncertainty, the data records whose regression $R^2$ was lower than 0.99 were excluded in our analysis (Figure 4-2). There were 89 (71%) acceptable data points of the total 125 collected.

### 2.4 Soil CO$_2$ efflux measurements

Soil CO$_2$ efflux at all microsites was manually measured with a portable IRGA (LI-8100, Licor Inc.) and a portable survey chamber (LI 8100-103, Licor Inc.). Soil temperature at 5 and 10 cm depth and volumetric soil water content at top 12 cm were recorded at each measurement. The data for which the deviation from the mean $R_s$ was greater than three standard deviations were considered as outliers. Only 5 data were excluded of the total 342 collected.

For both $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ and $R_s$ survey measurements, we combined the survey data collected from all microsites at the same day statistically to evaluate seasonal variation. When analyzing the effect of environmental drivers ($T_s$ at 5 cm and WTD), we used the raw data and inherent spatial variation.

### 2.5 Ancillary measurements

The long-term SOC decomposition rate was estimated through the $C_{SOC}-\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$ relationship. Soil cores were collected from three of the five survey plots with a peat sampler (Eijkelkamp Agrisearch Equipment, Giesbeek, NL). Due to the spatial differences in the soil profile, we distinguished soil layers by color instead of arbitrary, fixed depth. The black top-layer was identified as organic soil texture and the brown sub-layer as the mixture of organic and mineral (clay) texture. At each plot, several cores were collected, separated into the two
layers by color, and aggregated. The density (d)-fractionation method, adapted from Baisden et al. [2002] and Tu et al. [2006], was used to physically separate soil samples into three fractions (F1: \(d<1.0\), F2: \(1.0<d<1.6\), and F3: \(d>1.6\) g cm\(^{-3}\)). Each fraction of samples was grounded and analyzed for \(\delta^{13}C_{SOC}\) and \(C_{SOC}\).

The \(\delta^{13}C_{SOC}\) and \(\ln(C_{SOC}/C_{SOC,0})\) were then regressed based on the Rayleigh equation (Equation 3), which describes the gradual enrichment in \(\delta^{13}C_{SOC}\) during long-term decomposition, to calculate the slope \(\varepsilon\) defined as enrichment factor [Balesdent and Mariotti, 1996]. \(C_{SOC,0}\) and \(\delta^{13}C_{SOC,0}\) represents the initial values of \(C_{SOC}\) and \(\delta^{13}C_{SOC}\). \(C_{SOC,0}\) was approximated by the highest value of \(C_{SOC}\) in all the SOC samples, which was from the F1 of the top-layer. Modified from the fixed-depth profile method used in literature in which bulk SOC was analyzed [Accoe et al., 2002; Diochon and Kellman, 2008], this fractionation method attempts to account for both the soil structure and depth effects [McFarlane et al., 2013; Trumbore, 2000].

\[
\delta^{13}C_{SOC} = \delta^{13}C_{SOC,0} + \varepsilon \ln\frac{C_{SOC}}{C_{SOC,0}}
\]  

(3)

3. Results

3.1 Site meteorology

The meteorological conditions were similar between the two years of the study period (Figure 4-3). The annual mean air temperature was 16.4 and 17.1°C in 2010 and 2011, respectively, which was close to the 30-year normal of 16.9°C. Mean annual \(T_a\) was 15.0 and 15.5 °C in 2010 and 2011, respectively. Precipitation from January to August was similar
between the two years with the respective amounts of 614 and 547 mm. Mean WTD from water table probe from April to August, when most of the $^{13}$C data were collected, was also similar between 2010 and 2011, at -10.6 cm and -11.4 cm, respectively. Seasonal pattern of soil temperature from the survey microsites was consistent with the data from the ground meteorological station (Figure 4-3 a), indicating that the spatial difference in $T_s$ was small.

3.2 Seasonal and spatial variation of $\delta^{13}$C of soil-respired CO$_2$

The range of seasonal variation in $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ was approximately at 7.8‰, with significant differences between non-flooded ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$) and flooded ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-FL}$) periods. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was more depleted than $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-FL}$ (Table 4-1). The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was -27.8±1.5‰ (mean±SD), with a range of -30.6 to -25.9‰ (i.e. 4.7‰). The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-FL}$ was -24.0±2.8‰, with a range of -28.2 to -22.8‰ (i.e. 5.4‰). Both HIGH and LOW microsites had $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ records, and only LOW microsites recorded $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-FL}$ after September.

The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ exhibited different seasonal variation between microsites (Figure 4-4). At HIGH microsites, the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ decreased gradually from January to August, whereas $R_s$ increased gradually. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ increased after September while the $R_s$ decreased. This seasonal pattern was consistent for 2010 and 2011. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ was depleted during summer with the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ ranging -28.5 to -27.7‰ in 2010 and -28.4 to -28.0‰ in 2011, and was more enriched during other seasons with the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ of -27.4 to -25.9‰. The magnitude of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ values was also consistent for 2010 and 2011, although the overall $R_s$ was lower in 2011 than in 2010.

There were no available $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ data at LOW microsites in winter and early spring until
May, when the soil surface at LOW microsites became exposed to the air. In both 2010 and 2011, the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ exhibited increased from May to August when $R_s$ increased as well (Figure 4-4). The range of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ during summer at LOW microsites was -28.8 to -27.5‰ and -28.2 to -27.0‰ in 2010 and 2011, respectively. The increasing pattern of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ from May to August at LOW microsites was opposite to the decreasing pattern at HIGH microsites during the same period, but the range of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ values was similar in magnitude between microsites.

3.3 Hydrological effect on $\delta^{13}$C of soil-respired CO$_2$

Most of the acceptable data came from the middle of the growing season. As a result, $T_s$ was limited to the range of 15-25°C. The range in WTD was 0 to -30 cm at HIGH microsites, and from -5 to -20 cm at LOW microsites under non-flooded conditions, and from 5 to 15 cm under flooded conditions (Figure 4-5). There was a clear divergence in the $T_s$-$\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ relationship at HIGH microsites (Figure 4-5 a) when $T_s$ was between 15 and 25°C, which could be related to the difference in WTD (Figure 4-5 b). Due to the narrow $T_s$ range at LOW microsites, the $T_s$-$\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ relationship did not exhibit a clear pattern. In contrast, the response to WTD was well defined at both HIGH and LOW microsites.

The hydrologic effect on $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ was remarkable between the flooded and non-flooded conditions. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-FL}$ was more enriched at -24.7±0.6‰ (mean±SE) than the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ of -27.8±0.1‰ (p=0.0002). This effect also exhibited distinct pattern under non-flooded conditions with WTD=-13 cm marking the transition point. At HIGH microsites, the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was -27.1±0.2‰ when -13<WTD<0 cm (near-saturated conditions), and was -28.0±0.2‰ when WTD<-13 cm, the difference being statistically significant (p=0.006; Figure 4-6 a).
The difference at LOW microsites exhibited the opposite pattern. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was $-28.3\pm0.3‰$ when $-13<\text{WTD}<0$ cm, and was $-27.2\pm0.4‰$ when WTD$<-13$ cm, in which the case of shallower WTD was significantly more depleted ($p=0.02$; Figure 4-6 b).

3.4 The content and $\delta^{13}$C of soil organic carbon

With two layers and three fractions identified, the $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ at this forested wetland averaged $-29.0\pm0.7‰$ (mean$\pm$SD) and ranged from $-30.1$ to $-27.7‰$ (i.e. a range of 2.4‰). The C$_{SOC}$ averaged 19.4$\pm$18.0% and ranged from 0.2 to 57.8% (Table 4-1). The C$_{SOC}$ and $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ were not significantly different between F1 and F2; but F3, the fraction of highest density was significantly lower in C$_{SOC}$ and more enriched in $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ than the two lighter fractions. This also implied that two fractions (i.e. d$<1.6$ g cm$^{-3}$ and d$>1.6$ g cm$^{-3}$) could be sufficient to represent the fraction in this wetland soil. In F1 and F2, the sub-layer exhibited lower C$_{SOC}$ and more enriched $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ than the top-layer (Figure 4-7). The relationship between C$_{SOC}$ and $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ was well-fit by the Rayleigh equation (equation 3) across all the three fractions. The enrichment factor $\epsilon$ was $-0.4\pm0.0‰$ (mean$\pm$SE). The regression of the two lighter fractions derived the enrichment factor of $-0.6\pm0.1‰$.

4. Discussion

4.1 Overview of soil $\delta^{13}$C data in a forested wetland relative to other ecosystems

The average values of $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ ($-29.1\pm0.8‰$) and $\delta^{13}$C values of the three soil fractions in our forested wetland (Table 4-1) were more depleted than those reported in an earlier study for mid-latitude upland soils ($-27.7\pm0.6‰$, 20-40°N or S) and the average $\delta^{13}$C for forest soils ($-27.7\pm0.8‰$) [Bird et al., 1996]. Only two F3 samples from the sub-layer were similar to
values reported in the literature. This depleted trend could result from several causes. Firstly, the fractionation in photosynthesis and microbial decomposition may play roles in this difference between ecosystems [Ehleringer et al., 2000; Ehleringer et al., 2002]. Secondly, the δ\textsuperscript{13}C of atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} has been decreasing since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, reported as decreasing from -6.8‰ in 1940 to -7.8‰ in 1988 [Fung et al., 1997], and recently about -8.3‰ [GLOBALVIEW-CO2C13, 2009]. The impact from atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} on the decade scale of δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{SOC} variation is still uncertain. In the study of Bird et al. [1996], it was suggested that the top-layer of soil and lighter fractions were from recent plant residues which would decrease in parallel with the atmosphere.

The range of seasonal δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{Rs-NFL} variation in this forested wetland (4.7‰) was the same as reported for upland ecosystems (1-8‰) [Andrews et al., 1999; Kodama et al., 2008; Risk et al., 2012]. The average δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{Rs-NFL} (-27.8±1.5‰) was slightly more depleted than the δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{Rs} from a hardwood forest (-26.2±0.8‰) and a loblolly pine plantation (-26.9±1.8‰) in an adjacent area in North Carolina [Mortazavi et al. 2005]. It was also more depleted than the δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{Rs} from some other temperate forests [Kodama et al., 2008; Maunoury-Danger et al., 2013], but similar to that from some boreal forests [Risk et al., 2012]. As the product of R\textsubscript{root} and R\textsubscript{SOC}, the difference in δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{Rs} was also associated with the difference in δ\textsuperscript{13}C\textsubscript{SOC} between ecosystems and associated uncertainties of fractionation processes.

The enrichment factor (-0.4‰ and -0.6‰) from this wetland soil was lower than that reported from the soil in some upland forests and agricultural systems, for example, a northern forest (-0.8‰) [Natelhoffer and Fry, 1988], and an agricultural station (-2.3‰)
[Accoe et al., 2002]. ‘Enrichment factor’ concept is still being debated because of uncertainties of the enrichment mechanisms [Ehleringer et al., 2000; Werth and Kuzyakov, 2010]. However, the differences between this forested wetland, an upland forest and an agricultural ecosystem are consistent with current theoretical understanding. The lower enrichment factor at the forested wetland, compared to upland forests and agricultural fields can be attributed to lower decomposition rates in the former.

4.2 Difference between $\delta^{13}$C of soil-respired CO$_2$ and $\delta^{13}$C of soil organic carbon

The range of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ values was broader than for $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ (2.4‰). The minimum $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was similar to the $\delta^{13}$C of leaf litter (-30.6±0.6‰) in this wetland, whereas the maximum $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ (-25.9‰) was more enriched than the most enriched $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ (F3, -27.7‰). The average $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ was also more enriched than the average $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ (Table 4-1). If we assume that plant-derived carbon sources, i.e. plant litter and roots, were the new carbon source and SOC was the old carbon source, these differences demonstrate the potential limitation of end member mixing models on this system because the $\delta^{13}$C of products was out of the $\delta^{13}$C range of sources [Dawson et al., 2002; Phillips and Gregg, 2001]. This marked difference might partly result from the $^{13}$C fractionation of respiratory components. Previous studies have found that the $\delta^{13}$C of $R_{root}$ was more depleted (-2.1±2.2‰) than $\delta^{13}$C of root tissue for C3-plants and the $\delta^{13}$C of $R_{SOC}$ was more enriched (+0.7±2.8‰) than $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ [Werth and Kuzyakov, 2010]. In order to explain the observed difference, the $^{13}$C fractionation of $R_{SOC}$ in the current study must have been an enrichment and at the higher level of the average range in literature (+0.7±2.8‰) [Werth and Kuzyakov, 2010]. For
example, if F1 were the main old carbon source, the average $^{13}C$ fractionation must be greater than $+1.8\%$, i.e. the difference between the average $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ and the average $\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$ of F1 (Table 4-1).

4.3 $\delta^{13}C$ of soil-respired CO$_2$ reflecting the contribution of respiratory components

The observed either temporal or spatial variations in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ could be caused by any of several factors – heterogeneity of source material, proximity to source, chemical decomposition pathways, environmental conditions, and physical emission pathways of produced CO$_2$, to name a few. Earlier studies argued that gas transport is the main factor resulting in the more enriched $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ of dry soils than wet soils, rather than biological fractionation [Nickerson and Risk, 2009; Phillips et al., 2010]. If that were the case in the current study, the relationship between WTD and $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ should be consistent between HIGH and LOW microsites. However, the contrasting response of $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ to WTD suggests the biological control. Thus, the spatial variation in plant distribution has a quantifiable effect on contributions from different respiratory components.

As the major objective of this study is to investigate the temporal and spatial variation of $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ in a wetland, and explore the possibility of $\delta^{13}C$ utility for tracing the variation of component contributions to $R_s$ under natural conditions, directly monitoring the variation in contribution from each component is beyond the scope of the study. However, we compared our current results with previous studies and speculated possible mechanisms which would be useful for future experiment designs.

It is generally accepted that $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ reflects the contribution of belowground carbon pools
In the current study, the increase of $R_{root}$ or $R_{litter}$ would correspond to a depleted $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ and the enhanced $R_{SOC}$ would result in an enriched $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$. $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ decreased during warm season at HIGH microsites, which did not support our hypothesis of increased $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ during summer due to more active soil microbial activities. This may suggest that $R_{root}$ increased more than $R_{SOC}$ and contributed more to $R_{s}$ although both may increase during the warmer and drier season. This pattern was consistent with observations in a previous study at the Duke-FACE experiment [Andrews et al., 1999]. In that study, the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ from the elevated $CO_2$ treatment plots, where the atmosphere was labeled by $\delta^{13}C$-depleted $CO_2$, became increasingly depleted through the growing season when $R_s$ increased. In our study, when WTD was shallower (closer to soil surface), $R_{root}$ was decreased due to the near-saturated condition, resulting in the less depleted $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$. When the site became drier during summer, $R_{root}$ increased following the increased soil aeration, and as a result, $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ was more depleted.

The increase in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ at LOW microsites was consistent with our initial hypothesis and with mineralization of older soil carbon shown in other systems. Several studies with radiocarbon isotope method observed a drop of $^{14}C$ values resulting from an increase in the relative contribution of old soil carbon [Gaudinski et al., 2000; Schuur et al., 2009]. Corresponding to the drop of radioactive $^{14}C$ composition, the stable $\delta^{13}C$ would increase with the higher contribution of old carbon due to its enriched signature [Balesdent and Mariotti, 1996; Ladyman and Harkness, 1980], which is the pattern that we observed at LOW microsites, i.e. more enriched $\delta^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}$ when WTD dropped further below the soil.
4.4 Implication of spatial difference in $\delta^{13}$C of soil-respired CO$_2$

There was a significant interaction between microtopography and fluctuating WTD on $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$. Without separating WTD to two levels (i.e. WTD<-13 and -13<WTD<0 cm), there was no significant difference in $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs-NFL}$ between HIGH and LOW microsites ($p=0.4$), with the value of $-27.9\pm0.2\%$ (mean±SE) at HIGH microsites and $-27.7\pm0.2\%$ at LOW microsites. By separating the WTD levels, spatial differences between HIGH and LOW microsites imply different relative contributions of individual respiration components.

Based on the spatial difference in $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ and the fraction calculation with end member mixing models [Dawson et al., 2002], we were able to directly quantify the difference in relative contribution from $R_{SOC}$ between HIGH and LOW microsites without the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rso}$ information, the most uncertain term in end member mixing models. Assuming the $\delta^{13}$C of individual carbon sources and the $^{13}$C fractionation of respiratory components are homogeneous spatially within the forest stand, we could derive Equation 4 from a two-end member mixing model. In this equation, $f_{SOC}$ represents the fraction of $R_{SOC}$ in $R_s$, and $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rplant}$ for the $\delta^{13}$C of plant-derived respiration (the mixture of $R_{root}$ and $R_{litter}$ in this study).

The subscript 1 and 2 represent different microsites (e.g. HIGH and LOW).

$$f_{SOC,1} = \frac{\delta^{13}C_{R_{1},1} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}{\delta^{13}C_{Rsoc} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}$$

$$f_{SOC,2} = \frac{\delta^{13}C_{R_{2},2} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}{\delta^{13}C_{Rsoc} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{f_{SOC,1}}{f_{SOC,2}} = \frac{\delta^{13}C_{R_{1},1} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}{\delta^{13}C_{R_{2},2} - \delta^{13}C_{Rplant}}$$

(4)
If we assume no fractionation in the plant-derived respiration, the ratio of $f_{\text{SOC}}$ between HIGH and LOW microsites when $\text{WTD}<-13\text{cm}$ was estimated at $0.77\pm0.10$ (mean±SE). The ratio less than 1 indicated that under drier conditions $f_{\text{SOC}}$ was lower at HIGH microsites than at LOW microsites. The ratio at $-13<\text{WTD}<0\text{cm}$ was estimated at $1.56\pm0.23$, implying the opposite pattern that under near-saturated conditions $f_{\text{SOC}}$ was higher at HIGH microsites than LOW microsites. This equation can also be used to calculate the change of component contribution when WTD varies at a given microsite, for example, the ratio between the two hydrologic regimes, i.e. $\text{WTD}<-13\text{ cm}$ and $-13<\text{WTD}<0\text{ cm}$.

It was unexpected that the $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$ at HIGH microsites when $\text{WTD}<-13\text{ cm}$ was similar to the $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$ at LOW microsites when $-13<\text{WTD}<0\text{ cm}$ (both were more depleted). The $R_s$ was contrasting with the higher rate in the former case at drier condition than in the latter one at near-saturated condition. We attribute this more depleted $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$ to higher relative contribution from $R_{\text{root}}$ ($f_{\text{root}}$) at HIGH microsites, compared to higher relative contribution from $R_{\text{litter}}$ ($f_{\text{litter}}$) at LOW microsites. In other words, $f_{\text{SOC}}$ was the same at the two cases according to Equation 4, and the plant-derived respiration approximated to each other in both cases, both of which resulted in similar $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$. Likewise, $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$ at HIGH microsites when $-13<\text{WTD}<0\text{ cm}$ and the $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{Rs-NFL}}$ at LOW microsites when $\text{WTD}<-13\text{ cm}$ were similar to each other, which could be attributed to lower $f_{\text{root}}$ and higher $f_{\text{SOC}}$, respectively.

In order to test this hypothesis, we quantified leaf litter biomass from both HIGH and LOW microsites, and found that the amount of leaf litter was greater at LOW microsites ($p=0.056$, $n=12$). This accumulation of litter at LOW microsites was due to the interaction of
microtopography, vegetation and hydrology in this forested wetland with rapidly fluctuating WTD [Ehrenfeld, 1995; Hardin and Wistendahl, 1983]. Although previous studies have not specifically investigated the effect of microtopography on the distribution of leaf litter biomass within a forest stand, it has been found that forested wetlands generally have the highest depression storage among different types of terrestrial ecosystems [Richards et al., 2012]. This difference in leaf litter storage between microsites also helps explain the more depleted δ^{13}C_{Rs-NFL} at LOW microsites than at HIGH microsites when -13<WTD<0 cm at both microsites (Figure 4-6), and when both R_{root} and R_{SOC} decreased under near-saturated condition.

Due to the difficulties encountered in root sampling during the study period, we could not evaluate the effects of root distribution between HIGH and LOW microsites. However, several studies in other wetlands reported higher root biomass and annual fine root production in hummocks than in hollows [Jones et al., 1996; Sullivan et al., 2008], analogous to HIGH and LOW microsites of the current study. Future work will elucidate the role of root distributions on R_{s} and δ^{13}C_{Rs}.

In addition to the spatial distribution of belowground carbon sources, the difference in data coverage and environmental conditions during the study period at the two types of microsites might be also related to the spatial differences and is one source of the uncertainties. For example, the WTD range at LOW microsites was rather narrow compared to that at HIGH microsites. The surface soil VWC at both WTD levels (i.e. WTD<-13 cm and -13<WTD<0 cm) was generally lower at HIGH microsites than at LOW (Figure 4-8).
This may partly resulted from the depression storage of leaf litter as well, which could have significant impacts on leaf litter decomposition [Prescott, 2010; Richards et al., 2012], and subsequently cause the spatial difference in δ^{13}C_{Rs-NFL}.

4.5 Importance of microtopography

Microtopography is increasingly recognized as a key source of variability of biogeochemical processes in wetland ecosystems [Frei et al., 2012; Van der Ploeg et al., 2012]. Although the mechanistic link between microtopography and carbon cycling is still poorly characterized, mechanisms proposed above qualitatively demonstrate the importance of microtopography. Without accounting for effects of microtopographic position and hydrologic conditions, the contrasting contributions from R_{root}, R_{litter} and R_{SOC}, and their sensitivity to environmental drivers, may well mask the signals in each other.

We have observed significant differences in environmental sensitivity of R_s at different microsites at this forested wetland [Miao et al., in review], and ecosystem-level soil gas fluxes are integrate contributions from all microtopographic positions. The greater percentage of HIGH microsites where the total R_s is generally higher would result in large amount of site average CO_2 emission. If the total R_s were more attributed to R_{root} than to R_{SOC}, as shown by the depleted δ^{13}C_{Rs-NFL} during summer at HIGH microsites, the long-term positive feedback of soils in this system might be smaller than the trend reflected by the large amount of site average R_s because of the rapid carbon turnover in roots [Norby et al., 2002; Pendall et al., 2004]. However, the enriched δ^{13}C_{Rs-NFL} at LOW microsites still implies potential increase of net carbon release from SOC.
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4.6 Methodological potentials and challenges

Seasonal variation of $R_s$ at both HIGH and LOW microsites observed with the survey measurements of the current study was generally consistent with the pattern we observed with an automated $R_s$ system on a spatially-restricted but continuously monitored subset of sampling locations [Miao et al., in review]. Variation in microsite physical dimensions of the survey measurements may have introduced unexplained variation in $R_s$ compared to automated $R_s$ system. Therefore, the difference in the magnitude of total $R_s$ between the two types of microsites shown in survey measurements was not as clear as that in continuous measurements (Figure 4-4) [Miao et al., in review]. Despite this uncertainty in survey $R_s$ measurements, the clear difference in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ between microsites supported our hypothesis that (1) the spatial differences in $R_s$ observed in continuous measurements at microsites in different microtopography are related to the contribution of component processes, and (2) $R_{root}$ (i.e. autotrophic respiration) may contribute more to $R_s$ at HIGH microsites, whereas the $R_{SOC}$ and $R_{litter}$ (i.e. heterotrophic respiration) contributes more at LOW microsites. These results also support the validity of using the spatial difference for partitioning $R_s$. With only the $\delta^{13}C$ information, the relative change of the component contributions can be quantified with less uncertainty related to the $\delta^{13}C_{R_{soc}}$. This has important implications for ecosystems in which obtaining distinct $\delta^{13}C$ and $^{13}C$ fractionation rate of $R_{SOC}$ is difficult. When designing experiments with consistent measurements of both $R_s$ and $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ at representative microsites, it will be possible to quantify the absolute contributions of different respiration sources without disturbing the soil because spatial differences and hydrologic effects would
provide more information for solving the unknown terms in end member mixing models.

This methodology of using stable isotopes to distinguish component sources of $R_s$ may have application beyond forested wetlands. Many studies observed seasonal hysteresis in $R_s$ and suggested it may be related to the seasonal variation of component contributions. For example, higher $R_s$ early in the growing season compared to late in the year was attributed to high rates of fine root production [Gaumont-Guay et al., 2006; Vargas and Allen, 2008]. The opposite pattern has also been observed, higher $R_s$ late in the growing season, and it was suggested that microbial activity was stimulated by the warming of deeper soil layers [Drewitt et al., 2002; Goulden et al., 1998; Morén and Lindroth, 2000; S C Phillips et al., 2010]. These studies were unable to test these hypotheses, and few partitioning studies have explicitly discussed seasonal variation of contributions from different $R_s$ components. For comparison, these two opposing patterns corresponded to the seasonal variations we observed at HIGH and LOW microsites, respectively. While there are no studies yet, to our knowledge, to evaluate the component contributions through the spatial variation in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ within an ecosystem, we would suggest to test this method in other ecosystems. This type of spatial variation observed in our site would not be a specific characteristic in wetlands as the soil heterogeneity and corresponding plant distribution difference also clearly exists in upland or dryland ecosystems [Gibson, 1988; Parker and Van Lear, 1996; Richards et al., 2012].

Because it is difficult to directly measure the $\delta^{13}C$ of components such as $\delta^{13}C_{Root}$ or $\delta^{13}C_{Rsoc}$, the use of stable carbon isotopes to partition sources of $R_s$ described above is based
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on the assumption that the $\delta^{13}$C of respiratory components is stable over time, which is also an assumption of end member mixing models [Taneva and Gonzalez-Meler, 2011]. Further it has also been assumed that the $^{13}$C fractionation of respiration processes is also constant when partitioning $R_s$ based on the $\delta^{13}$C of carbon sources [Lin et al., 1999]. Both assumptions require further study/verification and remain challenge for the application of $^{13}$C methods to understand soil carbon dynamics [Kuptz et al., 2011].

5. Conclusions

The seasonal variation of $^{13}$C composition ($\delta^{13}$C) of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$) was investigated in a coastal plain forested wetland in southeastern USA from early 2010 to summer 2011, with the objective to provide insights on partitioning the varying contribution of individual respiratory components to total soil respiration. This study accounted for effects of microtopography by quantifying $R_s$ and $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ separately at HIGH and LOW microsites as affected by rapidly fluctuating WTD. Microtopography and hydrology interacted to significantly affect seasonal variation of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$, indicative of the contributions of different source components. The $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at a given microsite was significantly different between drier conditions ($WTD<13$ cm) and near-saturated conditions ($-13<WTD<0$ cm). Under a certain hydrologic regime, the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ also differed significantly between the two types of microsites. The more depleted $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites under drier conditions was similar to that at LOW microsites under near-saturated conditions, which may attribute to the increased relative contribution of root respiration and litter decomposition, respectively. On contrary, the more enriched $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ at LOW microsites under drier conditions may have resulted from
the stimulation of soil organic carbon decomposition, similar to the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ at HIGH microsites under wet conditions due to the inhibition from water on root respiration. This spatial difference and hydrologic effects would improve the stable isotope method to partition soil respiration by providing more information to solve the unknown terms in traditional end member mixing models and reducing the uncertainty from the $\delta^{13}C$ of soil organic carbon decomposition.
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Tables and Figures

**Table 4-1** $^{13}$C composition ($\delta^{13}$C) of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$), $\delta^{13}$C and content of three density fractions of soil organic carbon (SOC, $\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ and C$_{SOC}$) in a coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean±SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-flooded</td>
<td>-27.8±1.5</td>
<td>-30.6 to -25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>-24.0±2.8</td>
<td>-28.2 to -22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^{13}$C$_{SOC}$ (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean value*</td>
<td>-29.1±0.8</td>
<td>-30.1 to -27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (density&lt;1.0 g cm$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>-29.6±0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (1.0&lt;d&lt;1.6 g cm$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>-29.5±0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (density&gt;1.6 g cm$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>-28.2±0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_{SOC}$ (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean value*</td>
<td>19.4±18.0</td>
<td>0.2 to 57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1**</td>
<td>34.4±13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2**</td>
<td>26.9±13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3**</td>
<td>0.8±0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: The mean value is the arithmetic mean of fraction, not the value for bulk soil.
**: F1: The fraction of the density (d) < 1.0 g cm$^{-3}$; F2: the fraction of 1.0<d<1.6 g cm$^{-3}$; F3: the fraction of d>1.6 g cm$^{-3}$.
Figure 4-1 The sketch of the gas-sampling system used to collect soil-respired CO₂ on a monthly basis in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in North Carolina, USA, from 2010 to 2011. Gas was sampled at \( t = 0.5, 5.5, 11 \) and 16.5 minute after sealing the PVC collar. Every time before sampling with gas-tight syringe, the air was gently mixed for 0.5 minute with a syringe attached to the PVC cap (mixing port) in order to reduce the influence by the diffusion of air stored in the soil.
Figure 4-2 Examples of the Keeling plot method which assumes a linear relationship between the $\delta^{13}$C of atmospheric CO$_2$ (y axis) and the reciprocal of atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration (x axis). Black solid dots represent the real data points. Open circles represent the regressed intercept, i.e. the $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$, with the bar for standard error. (a) High data quality with high efflux and regression R$^2$>0.99. The intercept was -26.7±0.1‰. (b) Low data quality with low efflux and the regression R$^2$<0.99. The intercept was 28.7±1.2‰. Low quality data were excluded from data analysis.
Figure 4-3 Time series of (a) air temperature (grey line) and soil temperature, (b) Precipitation, (c) Water table depth, in a lower coastal plain forested wetland from Jan. 2010 to Aug. 2011. In (a), open circles represent the soil temperature at the survey microsites. The spatial difference in soil temperature was small in this forested wetland.
Figure 4-4 Seasonal variation of (a) $^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$), and (b) soil CO$_2$ efflux ($R_s$) from Jan. 2010 to Aug. 2010 at HIGH and LOW microsites in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. Black dots represent the mean values under non-flooded conditions and grey dots represent flooded conditions. The bar is the standard deviation demonstrating the spatial variation.
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Figure 4-5 (a) Soil temperature and (b) water table depth effects on the $^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$) at HIGH and LOW microsites in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. Black dots represent the mean $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$ under non-flooded conditions and grey dots represent flooded conditions. The bar is the standard error of $\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$.
**Figure 4-6** Comparison of the water table depth effects on the $^{13}$C composition of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$, mean±SD) between HIGH and LOW microsites under non-flooded conditions in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. The sample size was 31, 18, 16 and 19 for WTD<-13 cm at HIGH microsites, -13<WTD<0 cm at HIGH microsites, WTD<-13 cm at LOW microsites, and -13<WTD<0 cm at LOW microsites, respectively.
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Figure 4-7 Relationship (a) between the soil organic carbon content ($C_{SOC}$) and the $^{13}$C composition of soil organic carbon ($\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$), and (b) $\ln(C_{SOC}/C_{SOC,0})$ and $\delta^{13}C_{SOC}$ (see Equation 3) in a lower coastal plain forested wetland. The dotted line in (b) is the regression from all the three soil fractions (F1, F2 and F3) in top- and sub-layers, and the solid line is the regression from the lighter two fractions (F1 and F2). The regression equation was $y = -0.4x-29.8$ ($R^2=0.83$, $p<0.0001$) for the dotted line and $y = -0.6x-30.0$ ($R^2=0.61$, $p<0.0001$) for the solid line.
Figure 4-8 Comparison of soil volumetric water content (mean±SD) between HIGH and LOW microsites under non-flooded conditions in a lower coastal plain forested wetland.
CHAPTER 5.  CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
A Multi-Scale Study on Respiratory Processes in a Lower Coastal Plain Forested Wetland

Concerns over the role of wetlands in climate change and associated threats to coastal wetlands led to this research on carbon dynamics in a lower coastal plain forested wetland in Southeast USA. Comprehensive measurements were conducted for three growing seasons (2009-2011) to quantify carbon storage and parameterize carbon flow processes in this ecosystem. This dissertation focused on the process of respiration. Responses of respiratory components to environmental drivers were investigated, especially the responses to hydrologic regime. Models were developed to quantify three components, ecosystem respiration ($R_e$), soil respiration ($R_s$) and decomposition of coarse woody debris ($R_{CWD}$), using soil temperature ($T_s$) and water table depth (WTD) as predictor variables. Seasonal variation of $^{13}$C composition ($\delta^{13}$C) of soil-respired CO$_2$ ($\delta^{13}$C$_{Rs}$) was also investigated to understand partition of $R_s$ among components in soil.

1. Hydrologic and microtopographic effects on respiratory processes

Hydrologic regime (flooded or non-flooded conditions) determines the aerobic and anaerobic status of soil and fundamentally affects plant and microbial activities. As a result, the seasonal and inter-annual variations of CO$_2$ emission are closely related to the frequency and duration of flooding in wetlands. In the forested wetland of the current study, respiration during non-flooded periods contributed large proportion of total CO$_2$ emissions. In 2009, a wet year with 57% of non-flooded days in the growing season (Apr.-Oct.), $R_s$ of non-flooded periods released 75% of the total 593 (95% CI: 503-702) g CO$_2$·C m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$; $R_e$ of non-flooded periods released 62% of the total 1331 (1256-1406) g CO$_2$·C m$^{-2}$·yr$^{-1}$. In 2010, a relatively dry year with 72% of non-flooded days in the growing season, the contribution of non-
flooded periods was 93% and 78% for $R_s$ and $R_e$, respectively, with the respective total CO$_2$ emissions of 1015 (960-1103) and 1560 (1471-1650) g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$, respectively.

Contribution of non-flooded periods to $R_e$ was lower than $R_s$ because plants were tolerant to flooding and continued respiring during flooding period, whereas $R_s$ decreased instantaneously and significantly (Chapter 2 and 3).

Respiratory components under non-flooded conditions responded to temperature in this forested wetland similarly to upland ecosystems, in an exponential pattern with comparable temperature sensitivities. Hydrology had additional effects on $R_s$ and $R_e$, with the relationship resembling the saturating pattern of Michaelis-Menten (M-M) reaction, i.e. the rate increased with water table drawdown and was nearly constant at deeper WTD. To simulate $R_s$ and $R_e$, I developed nested models using traditional Q$_{10}$ model as the base and modifying the basal respiration rate with the M-M equation. These models accounting for water table depth effects provided better fits with observations compared to traditional models (Chapter 2 and 3), proving more appropriate for application to wetlands with fluctuating WTD.

Remarkable microtopographic effects existed in this forested wetland, and were reflected by both total soil CO$_2$ efflux and the $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$. Physically, low-lying microsites were flooded more frequently and for longer time periods than mound microsites. The annual CO$_2$ emission was correspondingly lower at low-lying microsites than at mounds. In 2010, soil released total 1325 (95% CI: 1291-1365) g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ at a HIGH microsite, and released 621 (555-710) and 430 (319-694) g CO$_2$-C m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ at a MID and a LOW microsite, respectively. Biologically, the difference in microtopography appears to result in the
difference in plant distribution and associated contributions from root respiration, litter and soil organic carbon decomposition. We did not test this hypothesis directly by quantifying the carbon storage in each component and the respective carbon fluxes, so this remains a challenge for future study of partitioning soil respiration. However, the difference in $\delta^{13}C_{Rs}$ between these two types of microsites supports the hypothesis indirectly. The relative contribution of root respiration to $R_s$ was higher at mound microsites than at low-lying microsites, whereas the contribution from heterotrophic respiration (i.e. litter and soil organic carbon decomposition) to $R_s$ was relatively higher at low-lying microsites (Chapter 4).

2. Carbon budget of the study wetland

The carbon budget for this forested wetland in 2010 was partially estimated (Figure 5-1), of which carbon storage terms need refinement in future studies. In general, soil stores more carbon than vegetation at this site, similar to other forested wetlands. While the absolute amount of carbon stocks seems lower than literature values, carbon fluxes through respiratory components were comparatively high relative to values reported for wetlands and similar to the CO$_2$ emissions from many upland forests (Chapter 2).

The annual average $R_s$:R$_e$ ratio was to some degree similar between this forested wetland and upland forests, but the seasonal variation of $R_s$:R$_e$ ratio and its response to hydrologic regime were unique to this intermittently flooded wetland. The $R_s$:R$_e$ ratio linearly increased along with the drawdown of water table, implying the overwhelming contribution of $R_s$ to $R_e$ under drier conditions. The ratio rapidly decreased when the hydrologic regime transited from non-flooded to flooded condition, and remained nearly constant at low values during
flooding, demonstrating the contribution of the dominant plant respiration under near-saturated and saturated conditions (Chapter 3).

3. Implications and suggestions for future work

3.1 Spatial variation in microtopography

Spatial variation of $R_s$ is related with a number of biotic and abiotic factors and its quantification is important to upscaling from single-location measurements to the ecosystem scale. In wetlands, microtopography plays a fundamental role in spatial variation of hydrology and associated CO$_2$ emissions. Therefore, **stratification of experiment locations in terms of microtopography** is necessary, e.g. the HIGH and LOW microsites in this study. Instead of randomly selecting microsites to investigate spatial variation, microtopography stratification can be a simplified approach to quantify the spatial variation of $R_s$ and help reduce upscaling uncertainties.

Results from the $\delta^{13}$C$_{R_s}$ study suggest a common pattern within a given type of microsites, that is, similar relative contribution from respiratory components to total respiration (Chapter 4). The consistency between automated and survey measurements illustrates the utility of microtopographic stratification to account for spatial variation in $R_s$ (Chapter 3). Although stratification alone is not sufficient to quantify the difference in absolute magnitude of $R_s$, associated uncertainty is likely decreased by characterizing the relationship between microtopography and $R_s$.

Microtopography is of importance not only for upscaling $R_s$, but also for partitioning unmeasurable components. Difference in $R_s$ between the two types of microsites may result
from the difference in quantity and biochemical quality of carbon sources, with the assumption that the dynamics of each carbon source are spatially homogeneous within microsite type. By quantifying the quantity of carbon sources (e.g. roots, microbial biomass, soil organic carbon) and the difference in \( R_s \) and \( \delta^{13}C_{Rs} \) between microsites, it is possible to partition the components of \( R_s \) noninvasively (Chapter 4). Furthermore, this approach may also be used to derive specific respiration rates for each carbon source under natural conditions, which are key parameters in ecosystem carbon cycle models but usually parameterized from lab incubation or by oversimplified assumptions.

### 3.2 Water table depth and substrate availability

Like most other wetland studies on \( R_s \), my study also indicated that using water table depth (WTD) to substitute for soil water content improves simulation of \( R_s \) based on the model structure developed for upland ecosystems. Water table depth affects not only soil water content, but also the availability of substrate including oxygen, nutrients, extra-cellular enzymes and soil microbial communities, which are all affected by WTD, leading to its use as a good predictor of \( R_s \).

To understand the mechanisms of WTD effects, further studies on the interaction between WTD, soil water content and substrate availability are necessary. Due to the continuous change of WTD in natural conditions in such systems, research is needed to analyze the soil profile of these variables. This necessity also applies to the above suggestions on microtopographic stratification, i.e. profiles of these variables need to be analyzed at each type of microsites.
Figure 5-1 Partial of carbon budget in the lower coastal plain forested wetland studied at Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge in eastern North Carolina, USA. The pools and fluxes in black text were estimated by models or measurements (see Chapter 2 and 3) across a full year. The aboveground live plant respiration was calculated as the difference between ecosystem respiration and the sum of soil respiration and CWD respiration. The belowground pools in grey and italics were rough estimates based on only few samples collected at random time.
Appendices

Appendix A. Microtopography calibration

Microtopography was measured for three purposes:

(1) Quantify microtopography distribution across the study area for upscaling.

(2) Stratify survey microsites based on microtopography.

(3) Quantify the WTD at each microsite during each survey measurement.

To upscale studies from single location to ecosystem scale, especially the water table depth effect on respiration processes, elevation data for microtopography distribution or survey microsites needed to be calibrated to a reference location. In this study, we used the ground water probe location at ground meteorological station (MET-probe) as the reference location. The ground water probe location at each survey plot (PLOT-probes) was also used in the calibration. Although the soil height varied with the change in WTD, we assumed the bias of soil height change is insignificant compared to the change in WTD.

Relative elevation between MET-probe and PLOT-probe locations

The relative elevation difference between MET-probe and PLOT-probe locations was derived based on the WTD readings at each probe when the study site was severely flooded (at very high WTD). We hypothesized that during a short period of flooding immediately after a heavy rain event (e.g. after Hurricane Irene in 2011) the water surface across the study area was uniform. Therefore, the difference in WTD readings between probes would be the relative elevation between probe locations.

The WTD data from all five probes (i.e. MET-probe and 4 PLOT-probes) were sorted out during the period of 9/2/2011 00:00-9/4/2011 23:30 (Figure A-1b). The consistent difference
between the WTD readings from all probes supported the above hypothesis. The relative elevations of PLOT-probes to MET-probe were then calculated from the WTD differences (Table A-1).

Microtopography calibration

The schematic strategy of microtopography calibration is shown in Figure A-2. The original elevation measurements ($h_{i,w_0}$) were referred to the water surface at each survey plot at the measurement period, then converted relative to the LOCAL-probe location surface ($h_{i,P}$, Equation A1), and eventually converted relative to the MET-probe location surface ($h_{i,M}$, Equation A2). Positive values of these terms mean the elevation of a specific microsite is higher than the reference surface. The subscripts ‘P, w_0, M’ represent the reference surface, i.e. PLOT-probe, water surface at microtopography measurement date, and MET-probe, respectively. The subscript ‘i’ represents a specific microsite ‘i’.

$$h_{i,P} = h_{i,w_0} + w_P$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

$$h_{i,M} = h_{i,P} + \Delta h_M$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

in which the meaning and values of $\Delta h_M$ and $w_P$ are described in Table A-1 and A-2. Because most of the PLOT-probes were installed after the survey dates, $w_P$ was estimated from Figure A-1a based on the WTD records at MET-probe at the measurement periods (i.e. $w_M$ in Table A-2).
Table A-1 Relative elevation of PLOT-probe locations to MET-probe location. Negative numbers represent the PLOT-probe location is lower than the MET-probe location, and positive represents higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probe</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>MET (PLOT 7)</th>
<th>PLOT 4</th>
<th>PLOT 5</th>
<th>Plot 9</th>
<th>Plot 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation (cm)</td>
<td>Δh&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.6±0.2</td>
<td>7.6±0.2</td>
<td>-5.7±0.2</td>
<td>-9.5±0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A-2 Water table depth at probe location during microtopography survey measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTD at MET-probe</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>MET (PLOT 7)</th>
<th>PLOT 4</th>
<th>PLOT 5</th>
<th>PLOT 9</th>
<th>PLOT 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey year</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey date</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>9/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsite ID</td>
<td>Δh_M</td>
<td>Microtopo. survey date</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h_{i,w}</td>
<td>h_{i,P}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 4</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>2/16/2011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2/17/2011</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/15/2011</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 9</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>2/27/2011</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table A-3** Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-site ID</th>
<th>Δh_M</th>
<th>Microtopo. survey date</th>
<th>w_M</th>
<th>w_P</th>
<th>h_i,w_0</th>
<th>h_i,P</th>
<th>h_i,M</th>
<th>h_i,w_0</th>
<th>h_i,P</th>
<th>h_i,M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plot 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>2/15/2011</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A-1 (a) Time series of water table depth (WTD) from all water table probes in 2011; (b) Difference in WTD between the 5 probes during the period 9/2-9/3/2011 after hurricane Irene (using the same legend as (a)). All WTD values were calibrated relative to the WTD at MET-probe.
**Figure A-2** Schematic chart showing the microtopography calibration for survey microsites.
Appendix B. Water table depth adjusting in survey data

Water table depth adjusting is more complicated due to its temporal variation than microtopography calibration. We used microtopography of each microsite and WTD readings from the PLOT-probes to adjust the WTD at each microsite for each survey measurements.

The MET-probe was installed in March 2009, while PLOT-probes were installed in November 2010 and May 2011 (Table A-2). The microtopography measurement of survey microsites was done in February 2011, and the respiration survey measurement was conducted from early 2010 to August 2011. Due to the asynchronous operation, the WTD in 2010 or data gaps in 2011 at the 4 remote survey plots were estimated through the following steps from the WTD reading at MET-probe which had the full WTD records from early 2009 to the end of 2011.

For the measurement dates when the WTD records of PLOT-probe \( (w_{t,P}) \) existed, the WTD of a specific microsite at a specific date was calculated by Equation B1. The meaning and calculation of \( h_{i,P} \) was described in Appendix A (Equation A1).

\[
w_{t,i} = w_{t,P} - h_{i,P} \quad \text{(B1)}
\]

For the measurement dates when the WTD records of PLOT-probe did not exist, firstly I had to estimate the WTD of PLOT-probe at the specific measurement date from the WTD of MET-probe \( (w_{t,M}) \), and then calculated the WTD of a specific microsite relative to the PLOT-probe with equation B1.
Table B-1 Water table depth at survey plots during R₄ survey measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plot 4</th>
<th>Plot 5</th>
<th>Plot 7</th>
<th>Plot 9</th>
<th>Plot 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( w_{tM} )</td>
<td>( w_{tP} )</td>
<td>( w_{tM} )</td>
<td>( w_{tP} )</td>
<td>( w_{tM} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4/17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>5/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>8/17</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-2 Water table depth at survey plots during $^{13}$C gas sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plot 4 $W_{t,M}$ $W_{t,P}$</th>
<th>Plot 5 $W_{t,M}$ $W_{t,P}$</th>
<th>Plot 7 $W_{t,M}$ $W_{t,P}$</th>
<th>Plot 9 $W_{t,M}$ $W_{t,P}$</th>
<th>Plot 10 $W_{t,M}$ $W_{t,P}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>-18.9</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10/30</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>11/28</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>7/14</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B-1 Schematic chart showing the water table depth adjustment at each measurement.
Appendix C.  Records in the field

Data tell stories behind woods, pictures tell stories behind data.
Top-left: A chamber under non-flooded conditions. Top-middle: A chamber under normal flooded conditions. Bottom: Chambers were submerged after Hurricane Ida in 2009. Right: Legs are attached onto chambers to help them stand firmly in water.
Change of water table level.

**Top:** During a normal rain, Sep. 10, 2009. **Bottom:** After Hurricane Ida, Nov. 15, 2009.
Timeline of the project at the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge (ARNWR) from 2009 to 2011.

**Arrows:** Regular field trips from 2009 to 2011. In total, 78 trips, 390 miles per trip, driving a pick-up truck most of the time. The total CO₂ emissions during the field trips were estimated approximately 21 tons of CO₂, with an average of 7 tons of CO₂ per year (calculated by the carbon footprint calculator of the Nature Conservancy). For comparison, soil respiration in ARNWR in 2010 released 2.2 tons of CO₂ (roughly estimated by multiplying the site average CO₂ flux with the refuge area).