# Chemical properties of organic amendments influence nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural soils

**Anaïs Charles** 

Department of Natural Resource Sciences McGill University, Montreal April, 2016

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

© Anaïs Charles, 2016

### ABSTRACT

Prediction of organic amendment's (OA) potential to emit soil nitrous oxide (POA-N<sub>2</sub>O) is difficult because of the variable composition of OAs and of complex interactions with soil properties and environmental conditions. The objectives of this thesis were (1) to conduct a meta-analysis of in-field N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following OA application to agricultural soils to assess the global emission factor (EF) for all organic sources (EF<sub>org</sub>) and its modulation by environmental and management-related factors; (2) to determine how experimental conditions affect the POA- $N_2O$  and select optimal conditions for laboratory-based assessment; (3) to measure the immediate (P1), short- (P2) and medium-term (P3) POA-N<sub>2</sub>O with the selected laboratory-based incubation method and then, relate P1, P2, and P3 to the physico-chemical characteristics of more than 131 OAs. The meta-analysis conducted on 256 EFs from 43 sites in 12 countries yielded an  $EF_{org}$  equal to 0.57 ± 0.30%, which is lower than the IPCC default EF of 1% for synthetic fertilizer (SF). Three groups of OAs with similar EFs were identified: the highrisk group including animal manures, waste waters and biosolids  $(1.09 \pm 0.17\%)$ ; the mediumrisk group including composts with fertilizers and crop residues with fertilizers  $(0.46 \pm 0.22\%)$ ; and the low-risk group including composts, crop residues, paper mill sludge and pellets (0.25  $\pm$ 0.20%). The EF was modulated by the C/N ratio of the OA, soil properties and precipitation. The EFs were on average 2.8 times greater in fine-textured soils than coarse-textured soils. The comparative incubation study showed that  $O_2$ -limited conditions in headspace of a sealed-jar system increased the magnitude of  $N_2O$  fluxes by 1.1 to 2.3-fold compared to open-jar systems. Intermittent aerations of a sealed-jar system relying on repeated measurement periods was then selected to assess P1 (48h), P2 (2<sup>nd</sup> wk), and P3 (3<sup>rd</sup> wk). In O<sub>2</sub>-limited conditions created in a Kamouraska clay soil, maximum P1 was reached for crop residues (CR) with C/N ratio < 15 and liquid manure. Liquid manure (LM) P1 was five-fold greater than solid manure (SM) P1, whereas P2 and P3 were higher in SM- than in LM-amended soils. Physico-chemical properties of OAs explained 23%, 27%, 27%, 56%, and 60% of the variability in P1 response for SM, LM, vegetal compost, poultry manure and CR, respectively. P1 was correlated to the concentrations of water-extractable organic C and volatile fatty acids, NO<sub>3</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, S, equivalent alkalinity and pH

of OAs (P < 0.05). In contrast, none of those chemical characteristics were correlated to P2 and P3, suggesting that the increased N<sub>2</sub>O emissions supported by the OA-C and N substrates occurred within 48 h of adding these OAs to soil. Further investigations are necessary to test the influence of other specific conditions, e.g., soil texture, water content, OA application techniques on POA-N<sub>2</sub>O and their interactions with OA properties.

# RÉSUMÉ

Prédire le potentiel d'émission de N<sub>2</sub>O des amendements organiques (PAO-N<sub>2</sub>O) au champ est difficile en raison de la composition physico-chimique variable des amendements organiques (AOs) et des interactions complexes avec le sol et les conditions environnementales. Cette thèse a pour objectifs de (1) définir le facteur d'émission (FE) par défaut des AOs (FE<sub>org</sub>) à l'aide de la méta-analyse des émissions de  $N_2O$  au champ et l'influence des paramètres environnementaux et agronomiques exercée sur EForg, (2) de déterminer quelle sont les conditions expérimentales qui affectent le PAO-N<sub>2</sub>O et de sélectionner des conditions optimales pour sa mesure en incubation, (3) de mesurer dans les conditions optimales identifiées le PAO-N<sub>2</sub>O immédiat (P1), à court (P2) et à moyen (3) terme afin de corréler P1, P2 P3 aux propriétés physico-chimiques de 131 AOs testés. La méta-analyse mondiale effectuée sur 256 FE mesurés sur 43 sites répartis à travers 12 pays a permis d'établir un EF<sub>org</sub> égal à 0.57 ± 0.30% de l'azote total appliqué, ce qui est plus bas que le FE par défaut proposé actuellement par le GIEC basé sur les émissions au champ suite à l'application de fertilisants de synthèse (FS). Trois sousgroupes d'AOs se distinguent, à savoir: le groupe à risque élevé d'émissions de N2O qui comprend les fumiers, eaux usées et biosolides (1.09  $\pm$  0.17%); le groupe à risque moyen qui comprend les composts + FS ainsi que les résidus de culture + FS (0.46 ± 0.22%); et le groupe à faible risque qui comprend les composts, les résidus de cultures, les boues de pâtes et papier et les granules (0.25 ± 0.20%). Le rapport C/N des AO, les propriétés du sol ainsi que les précipitations sont des modérateurs significatifs de FE<sub>org</sub>, avec des valeurs 2.8 fois supérieures dans les sols à texture fine comparés aux sols à texture grossière. La comparaison des méthodes d'incubation a démontré que des conditions limitées en oxygène dans les pots scellés

augmentaient jusqu'à 2.3 fois l'amplitude des flux de N<sub>2</sub>O par rapport à des conditions standards (pots ouverts). Une méthode instaurant des périodes limitées en O2 en intermittence avec des conditions standards a donc été sélectionnée pour mesurer P1 (48 h), P2 (2<sup>ème</sup> sem), and P3 (<sup>3ème</sup> sem). Sous ses conditions imposées à une argile de la série Kamouraska, les valeurs maximales de P1 ont été mesurées suite à l'application de résidus de culture (RC) possédant un rapport C/N< 15, et suite à l'application de lisiers de ferme (LF). Le P1 des LF était 5 fois plus élevé que celui des fumiers solides (FS), alors que l'inverse a été observé pour les variables P2 et P3. Les propriétés physico-chimiques des AOs expliquaient 23%, 27%, 27%, 56%, and 60% de la variabilité de P1 pour les FS, les LF, le compost végétal, le fumier de poulet et les RC, respectivement. P1 a été corrélé aux contenus en carbone organique extrait à l'eau, en acides gras volatiles,  $NO_3^-$ ,  $NH_4^+$ , S, à l'alcalinité équivalente et au pH des AOs (P < 0.05). Par contre, aucune corrélation n'a été établie entre ces propriétés et les variable P2 and P3, suggérant que l'augmentation des émissions de N<sub>2</sub>O générée par l'apport d'AO étaiet de courte durée. D'autres recherches sont nécessaires pour tester l'influence d'autres facteurs spécifiques, tels que la texture du sol, le contenu en eau, le mode d'application des AOs, sur le PAO-N<sub>2</sub>O et leurs interactions avec les propriétés des AOs.

# **DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to my better half, Nicolas, for his tremendous patience, love, support and wise counselling throughout this process. This is the thesis you never wanted to do, the thesis for which you worked as hard as I did, even if it had nothing to do with potatoes! You're definitely the most passionate agronomist I know, but also and especially a great dad. Je t'aime.

### PREFACE AND CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS

This thesis is composed of a general introduction that includes the overall objectives and hypotheses, four chapters written in manuscript format according to the guidelines of the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Office of McGill University, followed by a general conclusion and contributions to knowledge.

The first chapter is a literature review which summarizes the previous research in the thesis research field.

The second chapter is a meta-analysis of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural fields receiving organic amendments. This chapter is a manuscript in preparation for submission to Global Change Biology. The third and fourth chapters are experimental results based on original laboratory experiments. Connecting paragraphs between these chapters shows the progression from one experiment to the other. The third and fourth chapters are manuscripts in preparation for submission to Soil Biology and Biochemistry. The candidate was the senior author of each manuscript and co-authors were Philippe Rochette, Joann K. Whalen, Denis A. Angers, Martin H. Chantigny and Normand Bertrand.

The candidate was fully responsible for conducting the meta-analysis in chapter 2. The candidate (1) gathered publications relevant to the objectives, (2) established inclusion criteria to meet meta-analysis objectives, (3) screened studies in a standardized manner to minimize bias as much as possible, (4) created the appropriate template for the database that contained response variables of soil nitrous oxide emissions, explanatory factors and other relevant parameters, (5) built the database with data extracted from selected studies (except some

VI

studies and data information which were done by Philippe Rochette and his team), (6) conducted exploratory analyses, statistical analysis, and interpretation, (7) wrote the manuscript.

The candidate was fully responsible for designing the experiments in chapters 3 and 4. Laboratory incubations, including pre-tests, were conducted at the Quebec Research and Development Centre of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

In chapter 3, a comparative laboratory study was conducted with four different incubations to assess the influence of laboratory conditions on soil nitrous oxide emissions following the addition of organic amendments, and whether these conditions are optimal to measure the soil nitrous oxide emitting potential of a large number of organic amendments with contrasting chemical properties. The candidate therefore requested and received soil samples and crop data from the various sites. The candidate was fully responsible for the conception of the experimental design, setup, and planning with the coordination of the research team, for conducting subsequent laboratory analyses (with Normand Bertrand), statistical analyses, data interpretation and writing the manuscript.

In chapter 4, laboratory experiments were strategic and followed from the findings in chapter 3. The candidate was fully responsible for collecting organic amendments from farms, compost facilities, sewage treatment plants, research units and commercial suppliers, for their storage, and preparation for chemical analyses (that were conducted at the Institut de recherche et de développement en agroenvironnement in Quebec City), for the conception of experimental design, setup, and planning with the coordination of the research team, for conducting

VII

subsequent laboratory analyses (with Normand Bertrand), data collection (with Normand Bertrand), analysis and interpretation, and writing the manuscripts.

Funding for the thesis research project was provided by the Sustainable Agricultural Environment Systems (SAGES) program of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). The candidate also received financial assistance from Centre Sève. Dr. Joann K. Whalen and Dr. Philippe Rochette provided advisory guidance and editorial assistance with all the manuscripts. Dr. Denis Angers and Dr. Martin Chantigny greatly facilitated access to training and technical assistance with chapters 2, 3 and 4. They provided advisory guidance concerning the experiments in chapters 3 and 4. Normand Bertrand provided tremendous technical assistance and expertise with chapters 2, 3 and 4.

The manuscripts are presented in the following order:

Chapter 2. Anaïs Charles, Philippe Rochette, Joann K. Whalen, Denis A. Angers, Martin H. Chantigny, Normand Bertrand. 2016. Global nitrous oxide emission factors from agricultural soils after addition of organic amendments: a meta-analysis (In preparation for Global Change Biology).

Chapter 3. Anaïs Charles, Philippe Rochette, Joann K. Whalen, Denis A. Angers, Martin H. Chantigny, Normand Bertrand. 2016. Assessing the potential of organic amendments to induce soil nitrous oxide emissions in controlled conditions: a comparative study (In preparation for Soil Biology and Biochemistry).

VIII

Chapter 4. . Anaïs Charles, Philippe Rochette, Joann K. Whalen, Denis A. Angers, Martin H. Chantigny, Normand Bertrand. 2016. Associating the potential of organic amendments for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with their physical-chemical characteristics. (In preparation for Soil Biology and Biochemistry).

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my supervisors, Dr. Philippe Rochette and Dr. Joann K. Whalen, I owe a particular debt of gratitude for mentoring me throughout this process. To Philippe, I convey thanks for selecting me for this Ph.D. project and for his confidence. Your advice and comments on the manuscripts, as well as the countless times that we discussed this project meant so much to me. Thank you for providing all the necessary tools that I needed to make this thesis a success, but also and especially for having left a certain share of creativity to me while sharing the fruits of your own. To Joann, I say a heartfelt thanks to you for your guidance. Your comments and suggestions after reading my manuscripts were invaluable. I have learnt so much from both of you and I will forever be grateful.

I would like to thank my thesis committee members, Dr. Andrew VanderZaag, Dr. Grant Clark, Dr. Asim Biswas, Dr. Arif F. Mustafa, for all of their guidance through this process; your feedback have been absolutely invaluable.

To Dr. Denis Angers and Dr. Martin Chantigny, I express my deepest gratitude for their availability, as well as their advisory guidance concerning the experiments. You greatly facilitated my access to training and technical assistance for which I feel blessed and grateful.

I am very grateful for the effectiveness and tremendous work of Normand Bertrand of AAFC who worked with me on all the experiments. I will never forget the half a tonne of manure we cook together with dry ice... One day you told me: "Don't panic, it took me six months". Finally it took me six years... :) You're the boss.

Special thanks to Nicole Bissonnette, Marie-Eve Bernard, Mathieu Bernier-Therrien, Marie-France Dallaire, Linda Gaulin, Alain Larouche, Mario Laterrière, Gabriel Lévesque, Marie-Pier Lizotte, Simon-Pierre Parent, Catherine Pinsonneault, Johanne Tremblay and Lincey Viel for their excellent laboratory assistance.

Sincerest thanks to Dr. Léon-Étienne Parent for his precious help with meta-analyses workshops, his scientific guidance and his willingness to increase student's knowledge and understanding of agroecosystems. Thanks to Dr. Serge-Étienne Parent and Hélène Crépeau for their strong analytical and technical talent to properly apply complex technical and biological concepts and to carefully examine, absorb, and question the scientific developments I presented to them with the statistical analysis. I will never forget your precious help!

Special thanks to Dr. Patrick Dubé, laboratory manager of the IRDA for his excellent laboratory assistance in analyses of amendment composition. My thanks to Hélène Moore, agronomist for Club de Fertilisation de la Beauce Inc, to Nicolas Samson, to the CRESAD, to Marianne Brassard from Compost Québec, to the R4 Compost Manager Alexis Fortin, to Dr. Noura Ziadi, Dr. Gilles Bélanger, Annie Robichaud, and Danielle Mongrain for their collaboration in the amendment sampling campaign!

Thanks to my student colleagues from the Soil Ecology Research Group at McGill University, I want to say thank you for commenting on the manuscripts.

Thank you to the Sustainable Agricultural Environment Systems (SAGES) program of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) for funding this project and to all the scientists and technical staff

XI

of AAFC who were involved in this project. Additional financial support was provided by Centre Sève, thank you.

I am also very grateful to Dr. Annie Claessens, Dr. Patrice Audy, and Dr. Anne Vanasse who hired me in the past three years and with whom I grew in confidence and felt more positive about the future. Thanks a lot Annie for you moral support and your consideration. Thanks also to Dr. Isabelle Royer who made time for kindness and humanity that makes all the difference!

My heartfelt thanks to master supervisor, Dr. Antoine Karam, for the opportunity to come to Canada and for welcoming me so warmly to his research team at the Université Laval and to Quebec City, this beautiful city, and its great restaurants! ;)

Special thanks to my colleagues Maxime Bastien, Judith Nyiraneza, Márcio Martins, Ben Thomas, Heather McShane, Marie-Noëlle Thivierge, Vicent Poirier, Mervin St. Luce, Marie-Eve Bernard, Émilie Maillard, David Pelster, and Cédric Le Guillou for their moral support and happy memories.

I am also very grateful to Dr. Alain Charles, Dr. Edward Alexander Cooper, Dr. Frédéric Bompard, Dr. François Gilbert, Dr. Claude Raffanel, Dr. Line Blackburn, Dr. Georges Paya, Dr. Yannik Boutin, Dr. Yvonne Molgat, Éric Bédard, Marilou Gauvin, all the CHUL and the CHU hospital staff and medical staff at La Cité Méciale who took all necessary measures to help me to cope with my Graves' disease.

My heartfelt thanks to my friends for your moral and festive support! A special dedication to the Ministère des Loisirs et des Sports de Val-Bélair; the Zombie Island mates; Arnaud De

XII

Coninck - my favorite supervisor of the maize root washing traineeship ;o) - and his family Alice, Léandre and Flavien; Bertrand, Adriana and their splendid Goran; M&M and their lovely Arya; Mélanie and Marc-Alex with their lovely little ones; AL and Laurent with their lovely children; Faouzi and Lalie with their lovely Liam; as well as los aficionados de Quebec: Karine Parisé & La Barca Flamenca! Isabelle J., Line M., Pascale L., Angèle P., Sylvie O., Patricia, Pascale B., Vivi, Edgardo, Ayman, Alain, France, and so many others! Particular thanks to Bob Benson, my master, for his teaching and all the eagerness he sows around him.

Finally, to my parents, Marie-Luce et Alain Charles, and my Aunt Georgette, who always believed in me and for their tremendous sacrifices. I love you so... To my sister Emma and her better half Nathalie, and their family, for their endless love. To my sister Claire and her husband Jon, and their family, for their love and their tremendous IT-material-moral-spiritual'spirits' support to persevere under difficult circumstances. To my in-laws from Quebec City, André and the SamCam's for providing moral support and great memories. I can do no more than reaffirm my love to all of you. To my daughter Gabrielle who puts me to the test every day with a twinkle in her eyes and so much love to give. You're so strong! I love you so!

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTII
RÉSUMÉIII
DEDICATIONV
PREFACE AND CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORSVI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSX
TABLE OF CONTENTSXIV
LIST OF TABLESXVIII
LIST OF FIGURESXX
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONSXXI
LIST OF EQUATIONSXXIII
LIST OF APPENDICESXXIV
GENERAL INTRODUCTION
FORWARD TO CHAPTER 1
CHAPTER 1 LITERATURE REVIEW
1.1 Abstract
1.2 Introduction8
1.3 The multiple roles of OAs in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to $N_2O$ production11
1.4 The physico-chemical composition and diversity of OAs applied to agricultural soils14
1.5 Soil $N_2O$ emission responses to OA properties in field and controlled conditions15
1.6 Land application of organic amendments and other $N_2O$ controlling factors17
1.6-1. Impact of climatic factors17
1.6-2. Impact of soil properties19
1.6-3. Impact of management practices20
1.7 Conclusions
FORWARD TO CHAPTER 2
CHAPTER 2
Global nitrous oxide emission factors from agricultural soils after addition of organic amendments: a meta-analysis.
2.1 Abstract

2.1 Abstract	
2.2 Introduction	

2.3 Material and Methods
2.3-1 Global database
2.3-3 Systematic review
2.3-4 Meta-analysis approaches
2.3-4.1 Random-effect model of Borenstein (REMB)
2.3-4.2 Residual maximum likelihood (REML)35
2.4 Results and Discussion
2.4-1 Systematic Review
2.4-1.1 Database
2.4-1.2 Emission Factors
2.4-2 Meta-analyses40
2.4-2.1 Comparison of REML with REMB procedures40
2.4-2.2 In-depth testing of the N $_2$ O coverage REML-weighted function
2.4-2.3 New insights with the $N_2O$ coverage weighted REML procedure
2.4-3 Proposition of global EFs with the $N_2O$ coverage weighted REML procedure
2.4-5 Emission Factors and Controlling Factors45
2.4-5.1 Physico-chemical Properties of Organic Amendments
2.4-5.2 Climate
2.4-5.3 Soil properties47
Texture and drainage47
Soil organic carbon and nitrogen48
2.5 Conclusion
FORWARD TO CHAPTER 3
CHAPTER 3
Assessing the potential of organic amendments to induce soil nitrous oxide emissions in controlled conditions: a comparative study.

3.1 Abstract	. 62
3.2 Introduction	64
3.3 Material and Methods	66
3.3.1 Soil properties and preparation	66
3.3.2 Amendment properties and preparation	66

3.3.3 Soil preincubation, addition of amendments and experimental design	67
3.3.4 Incubation methods with oxic/anoxic phases	68
3.3.4.1 The opened/sealed-jar method ( $O^w/S^+$ )	69
3.3.4.2 The sealed-jar methods (S/S <sup>+</sup> and S/S <sup>-</sup> )	69
3.3.5 Measurement of headspace gases ( $N_2O$ , $CO_2$ and $O_2$ )	70
3.3.5.1 Frequency of gaseous measurements	70
3.3.5.2 Techniques for N <sub>2</sub> O, CO <sub>2</sub> and O <sub>2</sub> measurements	71
3.3.5.2.1 Techniques for gaseous measurements with the opened-jar method	71
3.3-5.2.2 Techniques for gaseous measurements with the sealed-jar method	72
3.3-5.3 Gaseous measurements – Analytical procedures	72
3.3-6 Indices of the potential of OAs to induce soil $N_2O$ emissions	73
3.3-7 Soil analysis	74
3.3-8 Statistical analysis	74
3.4 Results	75
3.4-1 Oxic phase	75
3.4-1.1 $N_2O$ emissions and cumulative losses	75
3.4-1.2 Variation in the N <sub>2</sub> O emission factor	75
3.4-1.3 $N_2O$ Emission factor, OA properties and soil measurements	76
3.4-2 Anoxic phase	77
$3.4-2.1 N_2O$ emissions and cumulative losses	77
3.4-2.2 Variation in the $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ and $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ indices	78
3.4-2.3 $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ , $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ , OA properties and soil measurements	78
3.5 Discussion	79
3.5-1 Sealed vs. opened jars during the oxic phase	79
3.5-2 Duration of the oxic phase	82
3.5-3 The use of C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	85
3.6 Conclusion	85
Figure 1. Emissions of N2O from fertilized soils as influenced by incubation methods (n=4)	96
FORWARD TO CHAPTER 4	99
CHAPTER 4	100
Associating the potential of organic amendments for soil N2O emissions with their phys chemical characteristics.	ico-

4.1 Abstract	
4.2 Introduction	
4.3 Material and Methods	
4.3-1 Soil sampling and preparation	
4.3-2 Experimental design	
4.3-3 Amendment sampling, storage, preparation and analyses	
4.3-4 Incubation protocol	
4.3-5 Headspace gas sampling technique	110
4.3-6 Gaseous flux calculations	111
4.3-7 Immediate, short- and medium-term POA-N $_2$ O	
4.3-8 Statistical analyses	
4.4 Results and discussion	114
4.4-1 Emissions of $N_2O$ from control and synthetic N treatments	114
4.4-2 The immediate potential of OAs to induce soil $N_2O$ emissions, P1	115
4.4-2.1 Crop residues	
4.4-2.2 Farm manures and sludges	
4.4-2.2.1 Liquid manure	
4.4-2.2.2 Solid manure	119
4.4-2.3 Composts	
4.4-2.4 Organic-based Meals and pellets	
4.4-2.5 Variability of P1	
4.4-3 Short- (P2) and medium-term (P3) potentials of OAs to emit soil $N_2O$	
4.5 Conclusions	126
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	135
CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE	139
REFERENCES	141
APPENDICES - CHAPTER 2	165
APPENDICES - CHAPTER 3	
APPENDICES - CHAPTER 4.	

## LIST OF TABLES

#### Chapter 2.

Table 1. Quantitative variables included in the meta-analysis of $N_2O$ emission factors (EF) from
organic sources of fertilizer, alone and combined with synthetic sources
Table 2. Studies and GPS coordinates of experimental sites included in the $N_2O$ EF database 51
Table 3. Global estimates of $N_2O$ emission factors according to fertilization type
Table 4. Significance of fertilization sources on global N <sub>2</sub> O emission factors with two statistical
models
Table 5. Sensitivity analyses using spatial and temporal $N_2O$ coverage information within the
weighting procedure of the REML approach54
Table 6. Significance of environmental and management-related factors on global $N_2O$ emission
factors with the weighted REML approach55

### Chapter 3.

Table 5. Comparative classification of organic amendments within methods using $N_2O_{72h}$ or
N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>OXIC</sub>
Table 6. Correlations between emission factors of $N_2O$ and organic amendments properties 93
Table 7a. Comparative evaluation of the oxic phases conducted in the tested incubation
methods
Table 7b. Comparative evaluation of the anoxic phases conducted in the tested incubation
method
Chapter 4.

Table 1. Selected physico-chemical properties of a Kamouraska clay soil (0-20 cm) used for the
development of a standard method for soil N $_2$ O emission
Table 2. The immediate, medium-term and long-term potentials of organic amendments to
emit N $_2$ O from the incubated Kamouraska clay soil129
Table 3. Linear robust regressions relating P1 <sup>a</sup> to organic amendment properties

# LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 1
-----------

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the terrestrial nitrogen cycle
Figure 2. The multiple roles of organic amendments in the microbially-mediated reactions
leading to N <sub>2</sub> O production
Chapter 2
Figure 1. Global estimates of $N_2O$ emission factors according to the type of fertilization
Figure 2. Global $N_2O$ emission factors (% of N applied) according to mineral nitrogen content of
inputs
Figure 3. Nitrous oxide emission factors of crop residues as a function of C/N ratio
Figure 4. Global $N_2O$ emission factors according to the C/N ratio of inputs
Figure 5. Modulation of global $N_2O$ emission factors by mineral nitrogen content of inputs
organic sources, alone and combined with synthetic inputs, and soil texture
Chapter 3
Figure 1. Emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O from fertilized soils as influenced by incubation methods (n=4) 96
Figure 2. Relationships between the $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ index and soil nitrate build-up during the oxic
phase
Figure 3. Relationships between the $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ index and soil CO <sub>2</sub> fluxes at the end of the oxic
phase
Chapter 4
Figure 1. Collection of amendments and organic-based tested for their potentials to induce soil
N <sub>2</sub> O emissions in controlled conditions (n = 147)
Figure 2. Carbon: Nitrogen ratio as predictor of immediate potential of crop residue to induce
soil N <sub>2</sub> O emissions* (P1)
Figure 3. P1 <sup>*</sup> prediction using robust regressions based on organic amendment properties 133
Figure 4. Type of organic amendment (OA) influenced the immediate potential of organic
amendments to emit N <sub>2</sub> O from the incubated Kamouraska clay soil

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- **AR**, alfalfa residues **BD**, Bulk density **BR**, biogas residues **BSD**, Biosolid BSD-CR-S, biosolid and crop residues combined with S BSD-S, biosolid combined with IF **BSI**, biological stability index C, carbon  $C_2H_2$  acetylene **CMPT**, compost CMPT-S, compost combined with IF **CO<sub>2</sub>** carbon dioxide **CR-S**, crop residues combined with IF **E D/A**, electron donors/acceptors **EA**, equivalent alkalinity **EF**, Emission factor of nitrous oxide **EF**org, the global EF for all organic sources FertiClass, nature of organic sources ± IF FertiRiskClass, N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of OAs ± IF FertiType, the type of fertilization (organic, organic + synthetic, synthetic) FM, farm manure **FOM**, fresh organic matter H<sub>2</sub>O, water IDsite, unique identifier number of sites **IDstudy**, unique identifier number of studies IF, inorganic fertilizer
- L, lignin LM, liquid manure LM-CR, liquid manure combined with IF LM-S, liquid manure combined with IF MAT, mean annual temperature MBN, microbial biomass nitrogen MLS, organic-based meals **n**, number of replicates N, nitrogen N<sub>2</sub> dinitrogen N<sub>2</sub>O, nitrous oxide N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>0-72h</sub>, emission factor of nitrous oxide calculated for the first 72 h of the incubation N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXMAX</sub>, emission factor of nitrous oxide calculated for the anoxic incubation period **N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXRATE</sub>**, the anoxic emission rate of nitrous oxide N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>c</sub>, cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from control plots N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>cov</sub>Weight, the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weight (see the Equation table) **N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>f</sub>**, cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from fertilized plots N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>OXIC</sub>, the emission factor of nitrous oxide calculated for the oxic incubation period

NH<sub>3</sub>, ammonia **NH**₄<sup>+</sup>, ammonium NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>3</sub> ammonium nitrate NO<sub>2</sub>, nitrite, NO<sub>3</sub>, nitrate NO<sub>x</sub>, nitrogen oxides **O**, opened-jar methods **O**<sub>2</sub>, oxygen **OA**, organic amendment **Org N**, organic forms of nitrogen **O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>**, it refers to the opened-jar method with the use of acetylene in the anoxic phase. P1 is the immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (the first 48 h after application) P2 is the short-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (1 wk after the application) P3 is the medium-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (2 wks after the application) PLTS, pellets **PM**, poultry manure **PMS**, paper mill sludge PMS-CR, paper mill sludge combined with crop residues POA-N<sub>2</sub>O is the potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions **REMB**, random-effect model (Borenstein, 2009) **REML**, residual maximum likelihood

RSD, relative standard deviation

S, sulphur

(method) S refers to the sealed-jar methods

(Fertitype) S refers to synthetic fertilizers

- S/S<sup>-</sup> refers to the sealed-jar method without the use of acetylene during the anoxic phase
- S/S<sup>+</sup> refers to the sealed-jar method with the use of acetylene during the anoxic phase
- $SD_f$  is the standard deviations of cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions from the fertilized plot
- SD<sub>c</sub> is the standard deviations of cumulative
  N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the control plot
  SDG, sludge

SF, synthetic fertilizer

SM, solid (animal) manure

- SMC, sheep manure compost
- SM-S, solid manure combined with S

SOC, soil organic carbon

SOM, soil organic matter

TAP, total annual precipitation

VEF, the variance of EF

VFA, volatile fatty acids

WEOC, water extractable organic carbon

WFPS, water-filled pore space

WSR, wheat straw residues

WW, waste water

# LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation (1)	Emission factor of nitrous oxide from fertilized/manured soils	p. 31
		p. 73
	$EE = N_2 O \cdot N_{fertilized} - N_2 O \cdot N_{unfertilized}$	
	$EF = \frac{1}{N_{input_{fertilized}} - N_{input_{unfertilized}}}$	
Equation (2)	Variance of EF	p. 33
	$V_{EF} = \left(100/N_{input_{fertilized}}\right)^2 \times \left(SD_f^2/n_f + SD_c^2/n_c\right)$	•
Equation (3)	The weighted REML function with spatiotemporal coverage of N <sub>2</sub> O	p. 36
	$N_2O_{cov}Weight_i = SamplingEvent_i \times GasSurface_i$	•
Formation (4)	The revised weighted DEMI function of the equation (2)	
Equation (4)	I ne revised weighted REIVIL function of the equation (3)	p. 36
	revised-Weight <sub>i</sub> =N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>cov</sub> Weight <sub>max</sub> × $\left[1 + \left(\frac{N_2O_{cov}Weight_i}{N_2O_{cov}Weight_{max}}\right)/1000\right]$	
Equation (5)	Regression function to predict N <sub>2</sub> O EF of crop residues	p. 46
	EF (% of N applied) = EXP[-0.706*ln(C/N ratio + 1) + k)-1]	
		. 74
Equation (6)	Soll-surface gaseous fluxes	p. /1
	$F_{gas} = \frac{dC_{gas}}{dt} \times \frac{V}{M} \times \frac{Mm}{Mv}$	
Equation (7)	Biological stability index of an organic amendment	p. 109
	BSI = 211.2 - (2.009 x % SOL) - (2.378 x % HEM) + (0.840 x % LIG) - (2.216	5 x % CF)

# LIST OF APPENDICES

Table A2-1 a Selection procedure for papers from the Scopus research database      165
Table A2-1 b Selection procedure for papers from the CAB Abstract research data base 166
Table A2-2. Properties of organic and synthetic sources reported in the database, classified by
FertiTypes and FertiClasses
Table A2-3. Properties of organic sources combined or not with synthetic sources
Table A2-4. Measures of association for soil parameters reported in the database
Figure A2-1. Summary of the procedure for document selection from the Scopus and CAB
Abstracts research databases 170
Figure A2-2. Distribution of $N_2O$ emission factor and its variance
Figure A2-3. Adjustment of the random-effects model according to Borenstein (2009),
comparing the model performance following different weighting procedures
Figure A2-4. The influence of study duration on $N_2O$ response variables
Figure A2-5. The influence of total number of flux measurements on $N_2O$ response variables.
Figure A2-6. The influence of total surface area within closed chambers used for flux
measurements on $N_2O$ variables
Figure A2-7.Revising the REML weighting procedure with detection of superior weight studies.
Table A3-1. Fate of mineral N in the Kamouraska soil under four different incubation methods
Figure A3-1. Soil $N_2O$ emissions under $O_2$ –limited concentrations with the S methods 179
Figure A3-2. Fluxes of soil $N_2O$ emissions after fertilization with the opened-jar method 180
Table A4-1. High level of collinearity between chemical properties of crop residues indicated by
Pearson's correlations (n=64) 181
Table A4-2. Robust regression model relating P1 <sup>CR*</sup> to chemical properties of crop residues

Table A4-3. Multiple robust regressions relating P1 <sup>*</sup> to properties of organic amendments 183
Fig. A4-1. Variations in chemical properties according to the organic amendment categories 184
Fig. A4-2. Variability in $N_2O$ emissions 72h after organic amendment addition 185
Fig. A4-3 Dioxygen and $N_2O$ concentrations in jar headspace of unamended controls and soils
mixed with reactive amendments 186
Figure A4-4. Variations in chemical properties according to manure type (liquid vs. solid) 187
Figure A4-5. Variations in chemical properties according to liquid manure type
Figure A4-6. Variations in chemical properties according to manure nature (animal type) 189
Figure A4-7. Variations in chemical properties according to the type of organic-based meal 190
Figure A4-8. Variations in chemical properties according to pellet type
Figure A4-9. Variations in chemical properties according to compost age
Figure A4-10. Variations in chemical properties according to compost type

## **GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) is the 4<sup>th</sup> most important contributory anthropogenic factor to atmospheric warming (Foster et al., 2007). Moreover, this greenhouse gas is currently the dominant ozone-depleting substance and is not regulated by the Montreal protocol (Ravishankara et al., 2009). Anthropogenic activities since the Industrial Revolution and agricultural intensification since the Green Revolution have led to greater use of fertilizer and manure, which strongly contribute to the continuing increase of atmospheric N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations (Davidson, 2009). In Canada, agricultural soils alone represent 55% of total agricultural N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Helgason et al., 2005).

The ever-increasing costs of synthetic fertilizers for crop production have increased interest in recycling nutrients present in organic by-products (Larney and Pan, 2006). Organic amendments (OAs) are soil physical conditioners and a valuable source of plant-available nutrients, and include livestock manures and slurries, as well as, urban waste composts, composts from on-farm organic residues or green waste and food industries (Chaves et al., 2005). The increased use of OAs in agricultural systems is a logical way to recycle organic wastes from farms, industries and municipalities, while reducing costs related to the use of synthetic fertilizers. However, some OAs are more susceptible to nitrogen (N) loss than synthetic fertilizers and their use could enhance soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. The ready metabolism of OAs by soil microorganisms is key to understanding the pattern and rate of N<sub>2</sub>O emission from soils receiving OAs. Microbially-mediated reactions in agricultural soils are the dominant source of N<sub>2</sub>O, mainly from nitrification and denitrification, although other microbial metabolic pathways are involved in N<sub>2</sub>O formation or consumption (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013).

1

Generally, nitrification contributes to  $N_2O$  production under aerobic conditions and denitrification is the predominant reaction under anaerobic conditions (Wrage et al., 2001). Nitrification is the conversion of ammonium ( $NH_4^+$ ) to nitrite ( $NO_2^-$ ) and then nitrate ( $NO_3^-$ ). Denitrification is the reduction of soil  $NO_3^-$  to the following N gases: nitric oxide (NO),  $N_2O$  and dinitrogen ( $N_2$ ). Nitrous oxide produced from nitrification requires sufficient soil  $NH_4^+$ , while  $N_2O$  resulting from denitrification is a free intermediate compound controlled by the availability of carbon (C),  $NO_3^-$  and other N oxides because it is an alternative anaerobic process to aerobic respiration (Hénault and Germon, 1995).

Like fertilizers, OAs contain mineral forms of N ( $NH_4^+$  or  $NO_3^-$ ) that are immediately available for soil nitrifiers and denitrifiers after their addition. In addition, mineralization of organic N contained in OAs releases ammonium ( $NH_4^+$ ), with subsequent nitrification ( $NO_3^-$ ) processes leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production. As an organic C substrate for microbial growth, OAs may also stimulate microbial N assimilation, which can increase competition for  $NH_4^+$  between heterotrophic microorganisms and autotrophic nitrifiers (Chen et al., 2013), resulting in temporary reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O production. Under anaerobic conditions, organic C provided by OAs enhances denitrification and N<sub>2</sub>O production (Miller et al., 2008). Finally, OAs modulate O<sub>2</sub> availability in soil microsites because the labile C input enhances soil respiration; as well, animal slurries reduce gas diffusivity by saturating soil micropores in the short-term. Given the multiple ways that OAs impact the activity of microorganisms involved in N<sub>2</sub>O production, their influence on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions cannot be predicted from simple measures such as the total N application rate, which is a reasonably good estimator in the case of synthetic fertilizers (Kim et al., 2008).

For greenhouse gas inventory purposes, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recommends using the fertilizer-induced emission factor (EF<sub>1</sub>) as the worldwide default value, regardless of the fertilizer source. The EF<sub>1</sub> is estimated to be a loss of 1% of fertilizer N and was derived from published data regarding gaseous losses from soils amended with synthetic N fertilizers (Bouwman et al., 2002). Calculating the contribution of agricultural soils to national N<sub>2</sub>O using the Tier 1 IPCC methodology (EF<sub>1</sub>) can result in erroneous conclusions (overestimation or underestimation of emissions) because it does not account for the additional biochemical reactions (decomposition, mineralization, and immobilization) associated with fertilizer sources. In the past two decades, numerous field studies reported emission factors of OAs that differed from EF<sub>1</sub> by orders of magnitude, equal to or less than 0.03% (Lemke et al., 1999; Chantigny et al., 2001; Baggs et al., 2002; Wulf et al., 2002; Ball et al., 2004; Dittert et al., 2005; Thorman et al., 2007; Bhandral et al., 2008; Chantigny et al., 2010; Dalal et al., 2010; Velthof et al., 2011; Ding et al., 2013; Abalos et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2011; Li et al., 2013a; Senbayram et al., 2014) or superior to 3% (Hansen et al., 1993; Chang et al.,1998; Tilsner et al., 2003; Ball et al., 2004; Meijide et al., 2007; Mkhabela et al., 2008; Chantigny et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2010; Velthof et al., 2011; Pelster et al., 2012; Carmo et al., 2013; Aita et al., 2014; Senbayram et al., 2014). However, at the time that  $EF_1$  was adopted, there was insufficient information about gaseous N losses from organic materials to specify an EF for OAs. As signatory countries to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change move to define region- and site-specific EF values (Tier 2 and Tier 3 methodologies) for calculating the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from their agricultural soils, the lack of quantitative information on how OAs contribute to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions emerges as a research gap of global significance. One

way to determine EF for OAs would be to compile and analyse a global database from field studies where OAs were applied and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions measured from agricultural soils.

Given that an EF for OAs cannot be determined readily from field studies with diverse OA sources, climate conditions (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013), soil properties (Drury et al., 2004; Pelster et al., 2012) and agricultural management practices (Drury et al., 2004; Velthof and Mosquera, 2011), the mechanistic basis for OA contribution to N<sub>2</sub>O production should be determined in controlled laboratory studies. In soils mixed with OA under controlled conditions, the  $N_2O$  emissions generally increased with increasing mineral N content, water-soluble organic C, VFA and with decreasing C/N ratio and lignin content (Paul and Beauchamp, 1989a; Lou et al., 2007; Huang et al., 2004; Chaves et al., 2005; Velthof et al., 2003; Velthof and Mosquera, 2011). Accordingly, high  $N_2O$  emissions were associated with OA containing high levels of inorganic N and easily decomposable N and C, such as pig (Velthof et al., 2003) and sheep slurries (Cardenas et al., 2007) and N-rich crop residues (Chaves et al., 2005). Generally, the addition of OAs with C/N ratio > 20 results in temporary net nutrient immobilization (Enwezor, 1976), although this is modulated by the chemical nature of the organic C compounds within the OA. Water-soluble organic C could directly stimulate denitrification because it is quickly decomposed (Hadas et al., 2004), whereas complex polymers such as lignin and ligno-cellulose are less likely to be short-term predictors of denitrification because they undergo slow decomposition (Vanlauwe et al., 1996). Mixing materials having a high C/N ratio (wheat straw residues, saw dust, composts) with manure, slurries or N-rich crop residues also reduced soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Huang et al., 2004; Chantigny et al. 2001) although contrasting results have been reported by Li et al. (2013a). Consequently, it is difficult to make generalizations; even

under controlled conditions, the potential of OAs to induce soil  $N_2O$  emissions (POA- $N_2O$ ) is affected by many other factors including soil type, the duration of the experiment and  $O_2$ availability during the incubation (Bertora et al., 2008; Cabrera et al., 1994a; Flessa and Beese, 2000; Helgason et al., 2005; Lou et al., 2007; Velthof et al., 2003). Thus, there is a need to determine how experimental conditions affect soil  $N_2O$  emissions following application of OAs and provide recommendations for a standard methodology to assess POA- $N_2O$ .

The global objective of this study was to assess the significance and contribution of OA type and chemical properties on net  $N_2O$  emissions from agricultural soils.

The specific objectives were:

Objective 1: conduct a meta-analysis of soil N<sub>2</sub>O experiments where OAs were applied to agricultural soils in field conditions to compare EF for OAs and OAs combined with synthetic fertilizers at the global scale, to categorize the global EF according to OA types and properties, and to determine how the global EF for OAs was influenced by environmental and management-related factors.

Hypothesis 1-i. The global EF for OAs is lower than  $EF_1$  and that the global EF for OAs could be refined according to OA types.

Hypothesis 1-ii. Other main modulators of global EF are soil texture and climatic factors.

Objective 2: determine how experimental conditions affect soil  $N_2O$  emissions following application of OAs and select an appropriate incubation method to measure the POA- $N_2O$  on a wide range of OAs with contrasting chemical properties.

5

Hypothesis 2-i. Varying soil redox potentials during the incubation provides better estimates of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O than under a constant redox potential regime.

Hypothesis 2-ii. The sealed-jar method is the most appropriate method for routine measurement of the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O under controlled conditions.

Objective 3: conduct a three-wk incubation to assess the immediate (P1), short- (P2) and medium-term (P3) POA-N<sub>2</sub>O, and then, relate P1, P2, and P3 to the physico-chemical characteristics of more than 131 OAs.

Hypothesis 3-i. P1 will be correlated to available C (water-extractable organic C and volatile fatty acids), and mineral N (NO3- and NH4+) contents of OAs, while P3 will be correlated to C/N and Lignin/N ratios of OAs.

Hypothesis 3-ii. Significant differences will be detected in POA-N<sub>2</sub>O estimates among OA categories with the lowest and the highest POA-N<sub>2</sub>O attributed to the composts and the liquid manure, respectively.

## FORWARD TO CHAPTER 1

Chapter one is a literature review discussing the influence of OA properties on net N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following the application of OAs to agricultural soils. The review examines the multiple roles of OAs in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production, the physico-chemical composition and diversity of OAs applied to agricultural soils, soil N<sub>2</sub>O emission responses to OA properties in field and controlled conditions, land application of organic amendments, and the other factors that contribute to N<sub>2</sub>O production in agricultural following OA addition.

### **CHAPTER 1 - LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### 1.1 Abstract

Given the multiple ways that OAs impact the activity of microorganisms involved in N<sub>2</sub>O production, their influence on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions cannot be predicted from simple factors such as the total N application rate. The effects of OA properties on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are affected by other important environmental and biological factors, such as climatic conditions (temperature, precipitation), soil properties (texture and organic C content), and management practices. Comparison of individual studies is difficult because variable amounts and nutrient concentrations of OAs were applied, different application techniques were employed, and the duration of individual experiments varied; however, liquid OAs containing high amounts of labile N and C with low C/N ratios (<15) appeared to be at equal risk or more risky than synthetic fertilizers, while more stabilized OAs containing higher lignin content or higher C/N ratio appear to be at lower risk than synthetic N sources.

#### **1.2 Introduction**

Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) is a potent greenhouse gas, with 298 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) (Forster et al., 2007). Nitrous oxide is also a major source of ozone-depleting nitrogen oxides (NO and NO<sub>2</sub>) in the stratosphere (Ravishankara et al., 2009). Agricultural sources of N<sub>2</sub>O make a prominent contribution to the global budget with 23–31% of all global N<sub>2</sub>O sources related to nitrogen (N) fertilizer use and manure management (4.3– 5.8 Tg N<sub>2</sub>O–N yr<sup>-1</sup>) (Syakila et al., 2011).

In Canada, animal production contributes to more than half of the agricultural greenhouse gas emissions, taking into account the 300 Mt of manure applied each year to Canadian croplands, including managed grasslands (Kebreab et al.,2006; Coote and Gregorich, 2000). Total Canadian N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural sources averaged 58.1 Gg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup> between 1990 and 2005 and 68% were attributed to direct emissions, i.e., when N<sub>2</sub>O is emitted directly to the atmosphere from cultivated soils and fertilized and/or grazed grassland systems (Rochette et al., 2008b). More specifically, organic-N sources contributed one third of the total emissions from agricultural soils (Rochette et al., 2008b), caused by difficulties in synchronizing N supply and crop N uptake (Snyder et al., 2014).

Organic amendments (OAs) include livestock manures and slurries, i.e., the decomposed mixture of dung and urine of farm animals along with litter, crop residues (green manure), composts (from on-farm organic residues, urban waste, green waste and food industries), biosolids and sludges (sewage, paper mill) (Baggs et al., 2000; Yang et al., 2002; Chaves et al., 2005; Cogger et al., 2006; Velthof et al., 2010; Gonzalez-Rosas et al., 2012; Velthof et al., 2015). Organic amendments are soil physical conditioners in agriculture and a valuable source of plant-available nutrients such as N. However, their mismanagement leads to water quality problems and air pollution while increasing *N* loss to the environment, e.g., nitrate leaching and N gas emissions (Fig.1).

For greenhouse gas inventory purposes, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recommends using the fertilizer-induced emission factor ( $EF_1$ ) as the worldwide default value, regardless of the fertilizer source. The  $EF_1$  is estimated to be a loss of 1% of

9

synthetic fertilizer N and was derived from published data regarding gaseous losses from soils amended with synthetic N fertilizers (Bouwman et al., 2002). However, contradictory results that have been reported in many yield studies suggest that N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manured soils can be higher than, equal to, or lower than those observed from soils receiving N fertilizers (Helgason et al., 2005; Ellert and Janzen, 2008; Rochette et al., 2008c). Nitrous emission responses to manure application often correlate with manure types (liquid vs. solid; swine, dairy or beef cattle, sheep) and chemical composition (C and N content and availability, C/N ratio) (Chantigny et al., 2013; Helgason et al., 2005; Li et al., 2013a), although this is not always the case (Li et al., 2013b; Rochette et al., 2008c). Indeed, the magnitudes and patterns of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are strongly influenced by factors other than the chemical properties of OAs, such as climate, soil properties and management practices (Baggs et al., 2000; Ball et al. 2004; Rochette et al., 2008c; Bhandral et al., 2008; Pelster et al., 2012). Although considerable progress has been made in understanding the influence of OA properties on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural fields, we still cannot reliably predict N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors from agricultural soils following OA application.

This literature review discusses the multiple roles of OAs in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production, the physico-chemical composition and diversity of OAs applied to agricultural soils soil N dynamics, soil N<sub>2</sub>O emission responses to OA properties in field and controlled conditions, and the influence of other factors controlling N<sub>2</sub>O emission following land application of organic amendments.

#### 1.3 The multiple roles of OAs in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production

OAs have multiple roles in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production (Fig. 2). Mineralization of organic N contained in OAs releases ammonium ( $NH_4^+$ ), with subsequent ammonia oxidation and nitrification producing gaseous N losses and yielding NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> that is susceptible to reactions that lead to  $N_2O$  production. As an organic C substrate for microbial growth, OAs may also stimulate microbial N assimilation, which can increase competition for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> between heterotrophic microorganisms and autotrophic nitrifiers (Chen et al., 2013), resulting in temporary reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O production. In soils with high N availability but low organic C, OAs may stimulate nitrifier denitrification, the oxidation of ammonia to nitrite  $(NO_2)$  and its subsequent reduction to NO and N<sub>2</sub>O by autotrophic ammonia oxidizing microorganisms under low  $O_2$  availability (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). In anaerobic conditions, organic C provided by OAs enhances denitrification. The ratio of N<sub>2</sub>O to N<sub>2</sub> produced during denitrification increases with increasing soil NO<sub>3</sub> availability, which is influenced by the microbial consumption and production of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> due to C and N substrate availability in OAamended soils (Terry et al., 1980; Weier et al., 1993; Miller et al., 2008). Finally, OAs modulate O<sub>2</sub> availability in soil microsites because the labile C input enhances soil respiration and some, such as animal slurries, reduce gas diffusivity by saturating soil micropores in the short-term. As a result, the direct impact of OAs on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is related to their mineral N content, while the indirect impact involves organic matter decomposition and mineralization in soils (Horwath, 2007).

In agricultural soil ecosystems, organic matter in decomposition also includes organic inputs from the addition of livestock manures, slurries, sludge or compost for agronomic
purposes (Horwath, 2007). The degradation of these organic inputs is accompanied by the synthesis of new compounds (Sorensen, 1972). In fact, soil heterotrophic microorganisms use organic carbon as a nutrient and energy source involved in soil respiration and nitrogen mineralization (Fontaine et al., 2003). Soil organic matter (SOM) is made up of decayed organic materials (plant residues, livestock by-products, soil microorganisms, soil fauna) and the byproducts of decomposition causing humification which consists of the production of humic substances resulting from oxidation and hydrolysis reactions of organic compounds leading to new chemical compounds with increased C and H and lower O content compared to the original materials (Horwath, 2007; Zech et al., 1997). Humified carbon decomposes slowly because the acquisition of energy by soil microorganisms from such substrate is slow (Fontaine et al., 2003). Fresh organic matter (FOM) is defined contrary to SOM and is composed of organic amendments added into cultivated soils, such as green manure or straw. FOM incorporation enhances SOM mineralization (Fontaine et al., 2003). Organic inputs into soil actually induce a short-term change in SOM turnover called the "priming effect" by Bingeman et al. (1953) and determined by concomitant changes in carbon dioxide  $(CO_2)$  efflux rates or N mineralization rates (Jenkinson et al., 1985; Kuzyakov, 2000). The guantity and guality of OA and microbial turnover determine the outcome of decomposition processes in soils (Horwath, 2007). For example, the addition of easily assimilated compounds into soils (glucose, fructose and mineral nutrients) have little or no effect on SOM mineralisation, contrary to the effect of ryegrass, cellulose or wheat straw (Bingeman et al., 1953; Dalenberg and Jager, 1989; Wu et al., 1993; Shen and Bartha, 1997). Indeed, Blagodatskaya and Kuzyakov (2008) mentioned that the addition of fresh available substrates to soil promotes an apparent priming effect, such as a

rapid increase in soil respiration caused by a triggering effect<sup>1</sup> (several minutes to hours) or a pool substitution with an acceleration of microbial turnover (several days or weeks). Conversely, as reported by Jenkinson et al. (1985), FOM with a large C/N ratio induced real acceleration of SOM mineralization. Indeed, microbial responses to the addition of C-rich substrates, without N, result in decomposing SOM to acquire N with production of a real priming effect in using "the energy of most available compounds to synthesize enzymes hydrolyzing the low available compounds". Blagodatskaya and Kuzyakov (2008) reported that easy C sources in decomposition (glucose, fructose and alanine) induce a greater priming effect than less available substrates such as plant residues, manure or slurry. Moreover, availability of easy carbon and nitrogen sources influence the preferential substrate utilization of organic matter (the FOM versus the SOM) by the soil microbial community (Blagodatskaya and Kuzyakov, 2008). Indeed, if N is lacking when carbon sources are added, microorganisms supplement this shortage by increasing SOM decomposition. Conversely, most changes in N mineralization following N inputs into soil should be considered as apparent priming effects due to N displacement reactions or pool substitution. For example, in sandy soils incubated in controlled conditions, Zhu-Backer et al. (2015) noticed that 2.4 times more N<sub>2</sub>O emitted was derived from synthetic N sources when chemical fertilizers was applied with green waste compost rather than applied alone. However, N<sub>2</sub>O derived from soil N was suppressed by compost application.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Kuzyakov et al. (2003) define the triggering effect as "an acceleration of internal microbial metabolism with quick increase in the respiratory activity promoted by trace amounts of substrate".

#### 1.4 The physico-chemical composition and diversity of OAs applied to agricultural soils

Composition of OAs is highly variable compared to that of synthetic N fertilizers. Carbon and N components of solid manures (SM) are influenced by animal type (Chadwick, 1999), feed (Cardenas et al., 2007; Velthof et al., 2005), and by the manure management system (Chadwick, 2005). For example, poultry manures have a lower C/N ratio than other manure types (Aulakh et al., 2000) and alteration of the legume vs. non legume proportion in the animal diet modulated sheep manure C/N ratio accordingly (Cardenas et al., 2007). Liquid and solid management systems produce manures with contrasting chemical characteristics. Liquid manures (LM) generally contain less bedding materials than solid manure (SM), resulting in lower C/N ratios (Rochette et al., 2008c). Solid-liquid separation concentrates the dry matter, C content, and fibre fractions in the solid fraction, leaving a large proportion of the simple organic compounds that are readily degraded by soil microorganisms in the liquid fraction (Bertora et al., 2008). Conversely, anaerobic digestion of LM reduces dry matter, C content, and fibre fraction but results in an incomplete decomposition and produces volatile fatty acids (VFA), a C source for soil denitrifiers (Paul and Beauchamp, 1989a; Kirchmann and Lunwall, 1993). The storage of farm manure (FM), i.e., the decomposed mixture of dung and urine of farm animals along with litter, may partially or completely compost the material, depending on how long the FM is stockpiled, to what depth the manure pile is built, and whether the pile is aerated or not (Chadwick, 2005; Guo et al., 2012). Composting is a thermophilic decomposition process that degrades raw organic materials to CO<sub>2</sub>, resulting in an immobilization of inorganic N and in production of stable organic matter (Yang et al., 2002; Nada, 2015). Chemical and physical

properties of composts applied to soil vary according to the organic matter source and composting conditions (Yang et al., 2002; Guo et al., 2012; Nada, 2015).

## 1.5 Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emission responses to OA properties in field and controlled conditions

In soils mixed with OA under controlled conditions, the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions generally increased with increasing mineral N content, water-soluble organic C, VFA and with decreasing C/N ratio and lignin content (Paul and Beauchamp, 1989a; Velthof et al., 2003; Huang et al., 2004; Chaves et al., 2005; Lou et al., 2007; Velthof, G.L., Mosquera, 2011). Accordingly, high N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were associated with OA containing high levels of inorganic N and easily decomposable N and C, such as pig (Velthof et al., 2003) and sheep slurries (Cardenas et al., 2007) and N-rich crop residues (Chaves et al., 2005). Generally, addition of OAs with C/N ratio > 20 result in temporary net nutrient immobilization (Enwezor, 1976), although this is modulated by the chemical nature of the organic C compounds within the OA. Water-soluble organic C is quickly decomposed (Hadas et al., 2004), whereas complex polymers such as lignin and lignocellulose undergo slow decomposition (Vanlauwe et al., 1996). Mixing materials having a high C/N ratio (wheat straw residues, saw dust, composts) with manure, slurries or N-rich crop residues also reduced soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Chantigny et al., 2001; Huang et al., 2004). However, Li et al. (2013b) reported that the C/N ratio of plant residues was not a good predictor of OAinduced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions even if net N mineralization was correlated to the C/N ratio of plant residues. Moreover, plant material addition affected soil  $N_2O$  emissions differently under aerobic and  $oxygen(O_2)$ -limited conditions, which confirmed POA-N<sub>2</sub>O is not directly related to the net N mineralization potential of OAs (Li et al., 2013b). This is likely due to (1) inorganic N content of OAs directly available to soil nitrifiers and denitrifiers, and to (2) the fact that the net

N mineralization from an OA declines with time as readily-mineralizable organic N substrates are depleted, and denitrifiers would compete with other heterotrophic microorganisms for a limited amount of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and soluble C (Marschner et al., 2015). Consequently, it is difficult to make generalizations; even under controlled conditions, the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O is affected by many other factors including soil type, OA characteristics, the incubation duration and O<sub>2</sub> availability during the incubation (Cabrera et al., 1994b; Flessa and Beese, 2000; Velthof et al., 2003; Helgason et al., 2005; Lou et al., 2007; Bertora et al., 2008).

In previous field studies, emission factors for animal slurries varied from 0.009% to 7.0% of N applied (Chantigny et al., 2001; Vallejo et al., 2006; Meijide et al., 2007; Meijide et al., 2009; Chadwick et al., 2010; Chantigny et al., 2010; Sanchez-Martin et al., 2010; Tenuta et al., 2010; Velthof et al., 2011; Aita et al., 2014; Plaza-Bonilla et al., 2014; Senbayram, 2014). Combined with synthetic N sources, EF for animal slurries in field experiments underwent higher variations ranging from -0.18% to more than 11%, according to animal type and application technique (Dittert et al., 2005; Chantigny et al., 2010; Collins et al., 2011; Velthof et al., 2012). EF for anaerobic digested slurries varied depending on their type and were equal to 0.9%, 0.1%, 0.05%, and -0.014% for anaerobically digested thin pig slurry fraction, pig slurry (liquid fraction), dairy effluent, and digested fiber, respectively (Meijide et al., 2009; Collins et al., 2011). The EF of composts reported in previous field experiments were generally lower than other OAs and varied from -0.85% to 1.1% of N applied (Thorman et al., 2007; Meijide et al., 2009; Dalal et al., 2010; Cai et al., 2013; Ding et al., 2013). In a 2-yr field experiment conducted on a fine-textured soil, EF of synthetic N fertilizers, raw pig slurry, paper

sludges, and pig slurry-derived biosolids were equal to 4.2%, 2.5%, 0.9%, and -.04% of N applied, respectively (Chantigny et al., 2013).

OAs with large amounts of labile C and available N, such as liquid dairy cattle, liquid swine, or poultry manure, generally increased soil N<sub>2</sub>O production rates more than mineral fertilizers (Loro et al., 1997; Petersen, 1999; Rochette et al., 2000; Velthof et al., 2003; van Groenigen et al., 2004; Dong et al., 2005; Gregorich et al., 2005) but not always (Lopez-Fernandez et al., 2007; Chantigny et al., 2010). Labile C and mineral N content of manures were positively correlated to N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates according to Chadwick et al. (2000), Rochette et al. (2004), and Velthof and Mosquera (2011), but contrasting results have been reported by other authors (Chantigny et al., 2007; Sanchez-Martin et al., 2010). These inconsistencies may be related to other factors affecting microbial communities and C and N mineralization rates such as soil properties, climate and management practices (Baggs et al., 2000; Ball et al., 2004; Bhandral et al., 2008; Rochette et al., 2008).

# 1.6 Land application of organic amendments and other N<sub>2</sub>O controlling factors

## 1.6-1. Impact of climatic factors

Numerous field studies reported the significant impact of rainfall on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Ball et al., 2004; Rochette et al., 2004; Baggs et al., 2000). This impact was of major importance when rainfall occurred shortly after the application of mineral N, as noted by Ball et al. (2004) who reported the highest N<sub>2</sub>O flux recorded (up to 4.9 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>) caused by heavy rainfall subsequent to NPK fertilizer application in silage grass production. The potential of pig slurry to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions was also subject to high modulation by rainfall and climatic

conditions, because it contains high amount of NH4<sup>+</sup> that are rapidly nitrified and subject to denitrification in presence of easily available C from slurry (Rochette et al., 2004). Abundant rainfall may also impact N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils receiving OAs on a longer term, following their mineralization and the release of  $NO_3^-$  into the soil, as noted by Velthof et al. (2003) in controlled conditions simulating dry-wet soil cycles. During winter and spring, soil freeze/thaw events create anaerobic zones in soils with high water content and the formation of ice layers, and may promote  $N_2O$  peaks which usually last for several days (Christensen and Tiedje, 1990). Despite its limited duration, the phenomenon represents a significant fraction of the total annual emissions from agricultural lands (Wagner-Riddle and Thurtell, 1998) and may exceed 50% of the annual emissions (Flessa et al., 1995). Indeed, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from liquid dairy manure-amended soils have been reported by Singurindy et al. (2009) at soil temperatures below 0° C and continued even after complete soil freezing. Chantigny et al. (2002) demonstrated that pig slurry and alfalfa residues stimulated more soil microbial activity during thaw events compared to maize residues and cattle manure and the differences were partly explained by the low C/N ratio of those OAs. Nitrogen transformations occurred in soils during winter and nitrification has been reported in soil below zero (Chantigny et al., 2002). Climatic factors modulate the potential of OAs immediately after their application, during the growing season, as well as during the non-growing season. Precipitations or freeze/thaw events increased the potential of OAs to emit soil N<sub>2</sub>O because O<sub>2</sub> movement decreases in soil at higher moisture contents and the addition of OAs increases the O<sub>2</sub> demand during oxidation of readily available C. Even if upland soils rarely reach moisture conditions that exceed the optimum for N<sub>2</sub>O emission, a decline in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions has been reported under very wet soil conditions, possibly owing to the rapid initialization of strictly anaerobic conditions, resulting in the formation of  $N_2$  (Butterback et al., 2013). Thus, the interactions between rainfall and OAs regarding soil  $N_2O$  emissions could be positive or negative.

Denitrification rates are also affected by rising temperature, because of temperaturesensitive enzymatic processes. Indirectly, temperature-induced increases in soil respiration promote soil anaerobiosis. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions by comparing independent studies because temperature is often confounded by other modulators in field conditions, such as irrigation practices and application methods of OAs (Vallejo et al., 2005; Meijide et al., 2007; Aïta et al., 2014).

# 1.6-2. Impact of soil properties

Soil organic carbon (SOC), is another soil parameter implicated in soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Giles et al., 2012). Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are often limited by soil C availability. In low-C soils, for example, N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates were found to be correlated with soluble organic C, whereas emission rates in C-rich soils were correlated with NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> availability (Pelster et al., 2012). Based on field experiments, Pelster et al. (2012) suggest that, compared with synthetic N sources, manure application only increase soil N<sub>2</sub>O flux in soils with low C content. Several studies reported that soil texture impacted the potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. For example, compost application in sandy soils increased N<sub>2</sub>O emitted from both heterotrophic denitrification and ammonia oxidation, but not in clay loam soil, probably due to the high capacity of fine-textured soil to buffer changes in biochemical properties such as nitrifier activity or pH (Zhu-Backer et al., 2015).

Soil pH influenced N<sub>2</sub>O production pathways. Goodroad and Keeney (1984) and Mørkved et al. (2007) noted that the N<sub>2</sub>O product ratios of nitrification (N<sub>2</sub>O/(NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> + NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>)) is lower in alkaline than in acid soils. The increased soil pH due to the addition of OAs can lead to  $NO_2^-$  accumulation (Hawkins et al., 2010), which promotes N<sub>2</sub>O production from NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> via nitrifier denitrification (Zhu et al., 2013a).

# 1.6-3. Impact of management practices

On both grassland and cropland, incorporation of OAs, especially pig slurry (injection) increased the average emission factor of N<sub>2</sub>O in comparison to surface application (Chantigny et al., 2010; Velthof and Mosquera, 2011; Aïta et al., 2014). In field experiments, the potential of crop residues to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions was also highly modulated by tillage practices and the combined application with synthetic N sources. Particular attention should be accorded to mulching of legume species (Nadeem et al., 2012), to incorporation of non-legume species as green manure when amended with farm manure simultaneously with conventional tillage (Koga N., 2013), and managed grasslands, particularly when fertilized simultaneously with ploughing (Mori and Hojito, 2007; Velthof et al., 2010). Tillage has also been proven to decrease emissions with a 2-to-3-fold reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions using full inversion tillage rather than chemical fallow for equivalent soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N in a poorly drained soil (MacDonald et al., 2011).

# **1.7 Conclusions**

Nitrous oxide EFs of OAs differ from EFs of synthetic fertilizers, and can be lower or higher than the EF<sub>1</sub> IPCC default value. Liquid OAs containing high amounts of labile N and C with low C/N ratios (<15) appear to be at equal or higher risk of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions than synthetic fertilizers, while more stable OAs containing more lignin or having higher C/N ratios appear to be at lower risk than synthetic N sources. The variability in EF of OAs from agricultural fields is confounded by environmental and management-related factors. Key factors appear to be soil properties, climatic conditions and management practices such as tillage and application techniques. Improved emission inventories require information about the potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (POA-N<sub>2</sub>O) and about the relationship between POA-N<sub>2</sub>O and the chemical characteristics of OAs.



# Figure 1. Schematic representation of the terrestrial nitrogen cycle.

Figure adapted from Robertson and Groffman, 2007.

Processes mediated by soil microbes appear in bold and gases appear in brackets.

NH4<sup>+</sup>, ammonium NH3, ammonia NO3<sup>-</sup>, nitrate NO2<sup>-</sup>, nitrite N2O, nitrous oxide NO<sub>x</sub>, nitrogen oxides N2, dinitrogen





Figure adapted from Chen et al, 2013.

Org N, organic forms of nitrogen;  $NH_4^+$ , ammonium;  $NO_3^-$ , nitrate;  $NO_2^-$ , nitrite;  $N_2O$ , nitrous oxide;  $N_2$ , dinitrogen; MBN, microbial biomass nitrogen; E<sup>-</sup>D/A, oxidation / reduction potential Five major effects (positive or negative) of organic amendments on soil  $N_2O$  production

- (E1) + Stimulate mineralization of organic N
- (E1) Stimulate microbial N assimilation
- (E2) + Stimulate ammonia oxidation and nitrification
- (E3) + Increase denitrification rate from organic C substrate addition
- (E4) +/- Alter the denitrification ratio of N<sub>2</sub>O to N<sub>2</sub> (relative abundance of organic C and nitrate)
- (E5) + Modulate O<sub>2</sub> availability in soil microsites (increased water content and soil respiration)
- (E1) (E4) (E5) + Stimulate nitrifier denitrification (under low O<sub>2</sub> and C but high N availability)

# FORWARD TO CHAPTER 2

The literature review revealed that emission factor of N<sub>2</sub>O (EF) of OAs differs from EF of synthetic fertilizers (SF), and can be lower or higher than the EF<sub>1</sub> IPCC default value. Liquid OAs containing high amounts of labile N and C with low C/N ratios (<15) appear to be at equal or higher risk of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions than synthetic fertilizers, while more stable OAs containing more lignin or having higher C/N ratios appear to be at lower risk than synthetic N sources. The variability in EF of OAs from agricultural fields is confounded by environmental and management-related factors. Key factors appear to be soil properties, climatic conditions and management practices such as tillage and application techniques. These hypotheses can be tested using meta-analysis techniques. The objective of this work was to conduct a meta-analysis of soil N<sub>2</sub>O experiments where OAs were applied to agricultural soils in field conditions to quantify the effect of OA type on the global N<sub>2</sub>O EF, and to identify other main controlling environmental and management-related factors.

# **CHAPTER 2**

Global nitrous oxide emission factors from agricultural soils after addition of organic amendments: a meta-analysis.

# 2.1 Abstract

Agricultural soils receiving synthetic fertilizers and organic amendments containing nitrogen (N) contribute a large part to anthropogenic nitrous oxide ( $N_2O$ ) emissions. As a source of nitrate that undergoes reduction to N<sub>2</sub>O, organic amendments also change soil C availability and redox potential, which influences the N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor (EF) of organically-amended soils. The objective of this study was to conduct a meta-analysis of N<sub>2</sub>O EF from agricultural soils receiving organic amendments. A global survey of peer-reviewed literature resulted in the selection of 38 studies including 422 observations at 43 sites in 12 countries. The analysis yielded a global EF for all organic sources,  $EF_{org}$ , equal to 0.57 ± 0.30%, which is lower than the IPCC default EF of 1 for synthetic fertilizer. Three groups of organic amendments with similar EFs were identified: the high-risk group including animal manures, waste waters and biosolids  $(1.09 \pm 0.17\%)$ ; the medium-risk group including composts + fertilizers, and crop residues + fertilizers (0.46 ± 0.22%); and the low-risk group including composts, crop residues, paper mill sludge and pellets (0.25 ±0.20%). The EF was higher when soils received organic amendments in combination with synthetic fertilizers, such as liquid manures + fertilizers (2.14 ± 0.53%), composts + fertilizers  $(0.37 \pm 0.24\%)$ , and crop residues + fertilizers  $(0.59 \pm 0.27\%)$ . The EF was modulated by amendment (C/N ratio), soil (texture, drainage, organic C and N) and climatic (precipitation) factors. For example, EFs were on average 2.8 times greater in fine-textured than coarsetextured soils. We recommend site-specific EFs that consider organic amendment chemistry, soil characteristics, climate conditions and whether the organic amendment is applied alone or in combination with synthetic fertilizers.

**Keywords:** greenhouse gas inventory, farming systems, fertilization, organic by-products, modeling, weighting procedure

### 2.2 Introduction

Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) is an important greenhouse gas, with 298 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) (Foster et al., 2007). Nitrous oxide emissions are also a major source of ozone-depleting nitrogen oxides (NO and NO<sub>2</sub>) in the stratosphere (Ravishankara et al., 2009). Agricultural sources of N<sub>2</sub>O make a prominent contribution to the global budget. For example, Syakila et al. (2011) estimated agricultural emissions owing to N fertilizer use and manure management (4.3– 5.8 Tg N<sub>2</sub>O–N yr<sup>-1</sup>) represented 23–31% of all global N<sub>2</sub>O sources (19 Tg N year<sup>-1</sup> in 2006). Human population growth and increasing global prosperity demands greater N fertilizer inputs to sustain the global food supply, and also generates more N-rich organic waste that is returned to agricultural soils as organic amendments (OAs). As a result, the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils are predicted to increase in the future, which is cause for concern.

Most N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils are the result of nitrification and denitrification of mineral N following application of synthetic fertilizers and OAs. In Canada, 34% of direct soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are attributed to OAs such as animal manure and crop residues (Rochette et al., 2008a). OAs have multiple roles in the microbially-mediated reactions leading

to N<sub>2</sub>O production, resulting in positive or negative effects. Mineralization of organic N contained in OAs releases ammonium  $(NH_4^+)$ , with subsequent nitrification  $(NO_3^-)$  processes leading to N<sub>2</sub>O production. As an organic C substrate for microbial growth, OAs may also stimulate microbial N assimilation, which can increase competition for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> between heterotrophic microorganisms and autotrophic nitrifiers (Chen et al., 2013), resulting in temporary reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O production. In soils with high N availability but low organic C, OAs may stimulate nitrifier denitrification, the oxidation of ammonia to nitrite  $(NO_2)$  and its subsequent reduction to NO and N<sub>2</sub>O by autotrophic ammonia oxidizing microorganisms under low O<sub>2</sub> availability (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). Under anaerobic conditions, organic C provided by OAs enhances denitrification and N<sub>2</sub>O production. The ratio of N<sub>2</sub>O to N<sub>2</sub> produced during denitrification increases with increasing soil NO3<sup>-</sup> availability, which is influenced by the microbial consumption and production of NO3<sup>-</sup> due to C and N substrate availability in OAamended soils (Terry and Tate, 1980; Weier et al., 1993; Miller et al., 2008). Finally, OAs such as animal slurries modulate O<sub>2</sub> availability in soil microsites because the labile C input enhances soil respiration; as slurries are mostly water (up to 97% moisture content), their addition saturates soil micropores in the short-term. Given the multiple ways that OAs impact the activity of microorganisms involved in  $N_2O$  production, their influence on soil  $N_2O$  emissions cannot be predicted from simple measures such as the total N application rate, which is a reasonably good estimator of the EF from synthetic fertilizers (Kim et al., 2008).

Although simplified EF values are used in calculating the contribution of agricultural soils to national  $N_2O$  inventories following the Tier 1 methodology of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC EF<sub>1</sub>), they can result in erroneous conclusions. There are four major

weaknesses associated with simplified EF<sub>1</sub> values: (1) they assume a linear relationship between total N input and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, not considering that biological thresholds for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions might exist (Kim et al., 2013; Shcherbak et al., 2014); (2) they are the average of EFs that vary by two orders of magnitude (from 0.03% to 3%); (3) the dataset used to generate the EF<sub>1</sub> is biased towards mid-latitude and temperate regions (Bouwman et al., 2002a); and (4) the simplified EF<sub>1</sub> values do not account for differences between N inputs from synthetic fertilizer and organic amendments on N<sub>2</sub>O emission across soil types, agronomic systems and environmental conditions (Buckingham et al., 2014; Rochette et al., 2008a). As signatory countries to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change move to define region- and sitespecific EF values (Tier 2 and Tier 3 methodologies) for calculating the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from their agricultural soils, the lack of quantitative information on how OAs contribute to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions emerges as a research gap of global significance.

Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils receiving OAs can be summarized at global and regional scales using systematic reviews (Bouwman et al., 2002a; Novoa and Tejeda, 2006; Aguilera et al., 2013; Buckingham et al., 2014) or meta-analyses techniques (Liu and Powers, 2012; Chen et al., 2013; Shan and Yan, 2013; Bouwman et al., 2002b). Manure-amended soils had a mean global N<sub>2</sub>O EF of 0.8%, i.e. 20% lower than the default IPCC EF<sub>1</sub>, with an uncertainty range of -40% to +70% in the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, using Residual Maximum Likelihood (REML)-based models and 846 N<sub>2</sub>O cumulative emissions measurements (Bouwman et al., 2002b). In the United-Kingdom, the DNDC mechanistic model generated an EF for manure ranging from +0.01 to +1.53% with an average of 0.43%  $\pm$  0.34 (standard deviation) (Cardenas et al., 2013). A meta-analysis of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from OAs in soils of the Mediterranean region presented an average

EF of 0.97 ± 1.17% for solid OAs (e.g., crop residues, manure, composted municipal solid waste, composted cattle and sheep manure, and composted solid fraction of digested pig slurries), and an average EF of 1.75 ± 1.34% for liquid manure (Aguilera et al., 2013). Still, another metaanalysis suggested that the EF for pig slurry was similar to EF<sub>1</sub> (Liu and Powers, 2012). Decomposing crop residues generate N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, and a global EF of 1.055% was calculated using a simple linear regression of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emitted on residue-N applied (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Novoa and Tejeda, 2006). However, sensitivity analysis revealed that removing the two highest observations would decrease the EF to 0.6%, indicating the uncertainty of the estimate. A global meta-analysis by Chen et al. (2013) also concluded that crop residues produced comparable or greater N<sub>2</sub>O emissions than synthetic fertilizer, whereas Shan and Yan (2013) reported that crop residue addition with synthetic fertilizer inhibited N<sub>2</sub>O emissions by 11.7% compared to synthetic fertilizers alone. The variability in EF of agricultural soils receiving OAs warrants more investigation to determine how key factors, such as the OA type and its properties, soil and climate conditions, modulate the EF responsible for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

The aim of this study was to provide a comprehensive and quantitative analysis of a dataset containing 422 EFs reported in 38 studies that measured soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions after OA addition in perennial and annual cropping systems. The analysis was done using three approaches: (1) a systematic review, (2) a random-effect model according to Borenstein (2009), and (3) a REML model. These analyses allowed us to compare EF for OAs and OAs combined with synthetic fertilizers, to categorize the global EF according to OA types and properties, and to determine how the global EF for OAs was influenced by environmental and management-related factors.

### 2.3 Material and Methods

#### 2.3-1 Global database

The systematic literature review aimed to gather publications relevant to the objectives, while minimizing publication bias as much as possible (Buckingham et al., 2014). A detailed review of literature was carried out until June 13 2014 with Scopus (1960 to 2014) and *CAB Abstracts* (1910 to 2014) research databases using the key words listed in the Table A2-1a and A2-1b combined with Boolean Operators. It retrieved 1064 papers published in peer-reviewed journals (Fig. A2-1). The following inclusion criteria were applied to screen studies in a standardized manner, which resulted in the retention of 38 studies:

- N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes were measured from agricultural soils for at least 30 d (modelling outputs excluded, grazing pasture and paddy soils excluded).
- 2) Unamended soils that received no fertilizer/amendment addition were used as control.
- 3) Soils were amended with organic by-products with or without synthetic fertilizers.
- 4) Information on chemical properties of amendments and application rates was available to estimate the relative contribution of the applied materials (e.g., total N input) to cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes.

We retained field experiment data only and excluded experiments done under controlled conditions such as disturbed soil and undisturbed soil column incubations. Studies without spatial replication or no replicates reported were excluded from the analysis. Using these criteria, 537 observations from the selected 38 studies were used to create the metafile with 422 observations from amended plots and 115 observations from control plots.

For each observation from amended plots, cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions were entered into the database and EF were calculated as another response variable following equation (1):

$$EF = \frac{N_2 O \cdot N_{fertilized} - N_2 O \cdot N_{unfertilized}}{N_{input_{fertilized}} - N_{input_{unfertilized}}}, \text{ where}$$
(1)

 $N_2O$ - $N_{fertilized} - N_2O$ - $N_{unfertilized}$  is the difference between cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the fertilized plot and the unfertilized control plot and  $N_{input_{fertilized}}$  is the total amount of N applied in the fertilized plot, and  $N_{input_{unfertilized}}$  is zero.

Where cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were not reported, the value was estimated by linear integration of the average daily fluxes over the measurement period. Graphical data (means and variation estimates) were digitized using the Datathief III software (v. 1.5). Selected explanatory variables (Table 1) were included in the database to explain the variation in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions due to amendment additions. Studies were grouped according to their cropping system (grassland vs. cropland). Methodological aspects (e.g., sampling events, number and surface of closed chambers) and results from the variance analysis (e.g., number of replicates, variability estimate and degree of freedom) were used to weight studies in the meta-analysis. Those steps produced a robust dataset with minimal bias that was suitable to evaluate the response of EF to OAs and other relevant factors with a Systematic review, a meta-analysis using a random-effect model and a meta-analysis with a REML model.

### 2.3-3 Systematic review

First, the OA effects on cumulative fluxes of N<sub>2</sub>O and EF were studied using a general matrix containing results from the 38 selected studies (Table 2). The box plot representation was selected for raw data illustration because this non-parametric tool does not require any assumptions of the underlying statistical distribution. Box plots graphically appraised the degree of dispersion and skewness in the data, and showed outliers of cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O flux and EF in a transparent manner, through their quartiles. Fertilizer type was grouped (Table 1) into: (i) organic (O), (ii) organic combined with synthetic (OS), and (iii) synthetic (S), hereafter referred to as "FertiType". The FertiType S does not exhaustively represent global soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following synthetic fertilizer application since the observations came from studies where soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were measured on sites where OAs and synthetic fertilizer effects were jointly assessed. Then, FertiType was sub-divided in categories, "FertiClass", according to the nature of amendments (Table 3).

Because OAs applied to agricultural soils depend upon national, regional and local factors (type and scale of farming systems, farm storage facilities and equipment, livestock production with manure availability, availability of non-manure-based amendments (Thangarajan et al., 2013), the database was expanded to include explanatory variables that might influence the EFs for soil N<sub>2</sub>O such as climate, soil properties and cropping systems with their common management practices (Table 1). Soil texture classes were fine-, medium- and coarse-textured soils (Shirazi and Boersma, 1984; CRAAQ, 2010) criteria. The modulation of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions by EFs at FertiType and FertiClass levels could then be evaluated while

considering the variation induced by environmental and management-related factors when sufficient data were available.

2.3-4 Meta-analysis approaches

Meta-analysis was performed with two different random-effect models: the random effect model proposed by Borenstein et al. (2009) (REMB) and the Residual Maximum Likelihood method (REML) which is also appropriate for analysis of global meta-data related to soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and EFs (Bouwman et al., 2002b).

2.3-4.1 Random-effect model of Borenstein (REMB)

The REMB is a classical meta-analytic approach (Borenstein, 2009) that (1) calculates a between-study variance, assigning lower weights to large studies and higher weights to small studies than the fixed-effect model, (2) attributes more weight to EFs with lower variance (weighting procedure), but (3) considers all observations being from independent studies (does not appraise the random effect of sites and types of fertilization).

Because weighted meta-analysis requires information on variance and the number of replications of N<sub>2</sub>O observations (n), this limited the analysis to 409 observations (316 fertilized and 93 control plots). For each observation, EF was selected to compute the effect size unit as raw mean difference following Eq. 1. Standard deviations (SD) of EF were rarely provided and variance of EF ( $V_{EF}$ ) was calculated from SD of cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes and number of replicates (n) following equation (2):

$$V_{EF} = \left(100/N_{input_{fertilized}}\right)^2 \times \left(SD_f^2/n_f + SD_c^2/n_c\right), \text{ where}$$
<sup>(2)</sup>

 $SD_f$  and  $SD_c$  are the standard deviations of cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the fertilized and the control plots, respectively, and  $n_f$  and  $n_c$  are the number of replicates of the fertilized and control plots, respectively. Observations without any reported measure of variance (25% of the datasets) were not included, nor was missing data approximated, as missing values were not at random and imputation techniques may lead to underestimation of the effect (Uijl et al., 2012).

The meta-analysis was carried out using MetaWin version 2 (Rosenberg et al., 1999). The REMB assumed that differences among studies within a class were due to both sampling error and random variation. To test the importance of the sources of variation, studies were subdivided into groups according to some of the explanatory variables (Table 1). Normality and publication bias were investigated using the normal quantile. The data had an asymmetric distribution that was skewed to the right (Fig. A2-2a). The long right tail suggested publication bias towards population of EFs differing from zero (Wang and Bushman, 1998). Power transformations using Box Cox transformation failed to normalize the data distributions, thus analyses were conducted on non-transformed data.

We compared different weighting procedures and found that weighting N<sub>2</sub>O EF by the inverse of variance gave the best model performance (Fig. A2-3). Thus, we gave more weight to studies with little variance. However, variance tends to scale with EF (Fig. A2-2b) and variability scaled with cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Fig. A2-2c). Therefore, weighting based on variance could bias the analysis towards situations with low N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

Cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions are disproportionately influenced by a few 'hot events' during the growing season. Molodovskaya et al. (2012) demonstrated that up to 51% of

cumulative annual N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are caused by short-term events (rainfall) that promote high sporadic pulses of N<sub>2</sub>O with large variance (<7% of the total observation time). Even automated measurement approaches, which provide better temporal coverage than periodic sampling, are susceptible to i) underestimate N<sub>2</sub>O emissions because integration of point-in-time observations missed a number of transient high-flux events (Scott et al., 1999), and ii) overestimate N<sub>2</sub>O emissions because they neglect temperature-dependent diurnal variations (Yao et al., 2009) when integrating transient high-flux events. Given the high spatiotemporal variability in soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, assigning more weight to studies with low variance does not necessary favor more accurate estimates of N<sub>2</sub>O EF. Moreover, 26% of the observations in the dataset had to be excluded from the random-effect model because they did not report the variability associated with the mean N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, which reduces the statistical power of the model.

## 2.3-4.2 Residual maximum likelihood (REML)

Finally, we used the Residual Maximum Likelihood (REML) model, which is appropriate for analyzing unbalanced datasets with missing values (Bouwman et al., 2002b). This model has four main advantages: (1) it provides efficient estimates of treatment effects in unbalanced designs; (2) the interdependency of EFs obtained from the same study is taken into account; (3) all observations of the database are included in the analysis, (4) different weighting schemes can be tested. In this study we adapted the REML weighted procedure to account either for the variance of mean or the spatiotemporal coverage of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (number of sampling days, "SamplingEvent", and total surface of gaseous measurements, "GasSurface" as a product of the total number of chambers and the chamber surface) (Fig. A2-4, A2-5, and A2-6). We compared four weighting schemes :

- the unweighted procedure (equal weight for each observation) according to Bouwman et al., 2002b;

- the weighted procedure similar to the REMB using the inverse of N<sub>2</sub>O EF variance;

- a new weighted procedure using the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weight (N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>cov</sub>Weight) for each observation *i* (Fig. A2-7a and A2-7b), according to equation (3), as follows;

# $N_2O_{cov}Weight_i = SamplingEvent_i \times GasSurface_i$ (3)

- a revised- $N_2O$  coverage weighting procedure that tests the influence of superior weight studies defined as studies whose weight of  $N_2O$  observations was twice greater than the average weight of all  $N_2O$  observations (0.24%), according to <u>equation (4)</u>;

revised-Weight<sub>i</sub>=N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>cov</sub>Weight<sub>max</sub> × 
$$[1+(N_2O_{cov}Weight_i/N_2O_{cov}Weight_{max})/1000]$$
 (4)

where  $N_2O_{cov}Weight_{max}$  is equal to 885600, the maximum weight of a non superior weight study in the dataset. All weighting schemes were automatically rescaled so that their sums equaled 1 ( $\sum_i Weight_i = 1$ ), resulting in expressions of dispersion in the same scale as the original data (Fig. A2-7).

A linear mixed-effects model was performed using the "Proc Mixed" procedure of the SAS software, version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The fertilizer type variable (FertiClass) was the fixed-effect component of the model. The unique study and site identifiers (IDstudy,

IDsite), as well as FertiClass or FertiType, appeared in the random-effect component to account for the dependency of several effect sizes reported in the same study (Bouwman et al., 2002b; Sauvant et al., 2008). Once model parameters were estimated, the homogeneity of variance and normality of the residuals were analyzed graphically. Normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov) were also performed. No power transformation improved data distribution, yet heterogeneity was corrected by controlling the covariance structure imposed upon the residuals or errors using the REPEATED statement. In particular, the GROUP= optional statement permitted different categories of fertilization effect to have different structure parameters. Statistical results were considered to be significant at the 0.05  $\alpha$  level. Statistical significance of selected explanatory factors was tested separately, as datasets were not complete for every explanatory factor.

## 2.4 Results and Discussion

## 2.4-1 Systematic Review

## 2.4-1.1 Database

The selected studies (n=38) provided N<sub>2</sub>O measurements from 43 sites located in 12 countries (Table 2). Europe contributed 48% (n=201) of the 422 observations, North America 32% (n=137), Asia 13% (n=55), South America 6% (n=24), and Australia 1%, (n=5). In Europe, more than 70% of reported EFs came from agricultural soils receiving OA application only, hereafter referred to as FertiType O. A similar trend was observed in North America (62%) but not in Asia and South America where FertiType O measurements represented 18% and 33%, respectively, of the total EFs. In Australia, four out of five of the EFs were for FertiType O and no

observations were available for EFs from agricultural soils receiving OA application combined with synthetic fertilizers, hereafter referred to as FertiType OS. Germany, Brazil and United-Kingdom provided 100% of N<sub>2</sub>O EF for biogas residue (BR), biosolids applied with crop residues and S (BSD-CR-S), and paper mill sludge combined or not with S (PMS ± S), respectively. While more than 90% of the N<sub>2</sub>O EF for liquid manure (LM) came from studies in Europe and North America, 92% of the N<sub>2</sub>O EF for crop residues alone was determined in China. This is evidence of the interdependency between types of fertilization and geographical areas providing N<sub>2</sub>O EF, which may create bias in the interpretation of results, as discussed later.

Our dataset is particularly strong in reporting EF for OAs, with 60% of the EF reported for FertiType O (n=251), 17% for FertiType OS (n=72), and 23% for FertiType S (n=99) (Table 3). This is five times more information on OAs since the last global meta-analysis conducted by Bouwman et al. (2002b) that reported 45 and 25 EFs in FertiTypes O and OS, respectively. More observations permit us to detail the EFs by "FertiClasses", listed in Table 3. The LM FertiClass represented 35% of all EFs, about five times more than solid manures (SM) or composts (CMPT) and two-fold more than the FertiClass OS. The dominant OAs were LM in 53% of studies, SM in 29% of studies and CMPT in 21% of studies. A smaller proportion of studies concerned the use of LM-S (16%) and CMP-S (13%), BSD-S (10%), crop residues (CR) (8%) and of remaining amendments ( $\leq$  5%). Proposing a global EF for FertiType O from the current database is biased towards EFs from the N-rich, wet LM and barely consider EFs from moderately decomposed, drier CMPT and Pellets. Most observations (n=393) in the database came from regions with a temperate climate, so present a similar bias towards temperate climates as Bouwman et al. (2002a). While 67% (n=198) of the EFs from FertiType O were derived from studies in cool and moist conditions, the EFs from FertiType OS were studied under warm and dry conditions (n=31) with all EFs from LM addition alone occurring in a cool temperate moist climate (n=23). Therefore, the impact of FertiType is partly confounded with that of climate.

## 2.4-1.2 Emission Factors

Global EF averaged 0.82% for the FertiType O, 1.50% for FertiType OS and 1.34% for FertiType S (Table 3). FertiType medians were roughly two times lower than means, indicating the presence of outlier observations in a positive skew distribution of EF (Fig. 1). Global EFs ranged from - 0.99 to 12.80% of N applied (Fig. 1), and both extreme values were measured following the application of ammonium nitrate (Ball et al., 2004; Dittert et al., 2005). Similarly, Bouwman et al. (2002b) reported minimum and maximum EF values of -1.71% and 14.7% following the application of synthetic N fertilizers.

FertiClasses tended to form three natural groups identified in Table 3 as follows: the high-risk group with EF around 1.0%, the medium-risk group with EF around 0.5%, and a low-risk with EF around 0.2%. Boxplot analyses suggest EF<sub>1</sub> should be revised according to the type (organic, synthetic, both) and the nature of fertilization. Distribution of the EF population among percentile categories at the FertiType and FertiClass levels led to visualization and identification of FertiClasses that to deviate from the central tendency with regards to N<sub>2</sub>O EFs (Fig. 1).

In the FertiType O group, 74% of the reported EF estimates (n=251) were smaller than 1%, the IPCC EF<sub>1</sub> value. LM represented more than 70% of the EFs superior to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the FertiType O (2.27% of N applied), but less than 30% were inferior to the  $10^{th}$  percentile (0.04% of N applied). Conversely, more-stabilized amendments such as CMPT, CR, and PMS ± CR did not promote any EF superior to the  $90^{th}$  percentile but yielded more than 58% of the EF inferior to the  $10^{th}$  percentile of the FertiType O.

In FertiType OS, approximately half of the observations were below EF<sub>1</sub>. At the FertiClass level, 80% of the observations from agricultural soils amended with CMPT and CR combined with fertilizers had global EFs lower than EF<sub>1</sub>. In contrast, 68% of the observations from agricultural soils receiving LM-S had global EFs greater than EF<sub>1</sub> (data not shown).

In FertiType OS, the combined application of OA and synthetic N fertilizer increased the EF quartiles by 2.2-fold. After adjusting for the soil texture bias (since there were an unequal number of studies from fine-textured (53%) and coarse-textured (27%) soils), it was found that the combined application of OA and synthetic N fertilizers increased the EF quartiles by a factor of 1.8.

#### 2.4-2 Meta-analyses

The REMB and REML models both confirmed the significant impact of fertilization sources (FertiType, FertiClass, FertiRiskClass) on global N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Table 4).

#### 2.4-2.1 Comparison of REML with REMB procedures

At the FertiType level, EF estimates of the REMB procedure ranged between the mean and the median of raw data (Table 3) and the FertiType O (0.54%) was significantly lower than

FertiTypes S (0.72%) and OS (0.77%). Conversely, EF estimates of the unweighted REML were closed to raw means and no significant differences were detected between FertiTypes (Table 3). The REMB and the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML agreed, but the REML model generated higher EF estimates for the FertiType OS (1.15%) and S (1.76%), probably because (1) the REMB had to exclude observations from FertiClasses with no associated variance, (2) the REML did not compute a between-study variance. Indeed, the REML procedure using the inverse of variance in weighting procedure provided identical EF estimates to those obtained with a fixed-effect meta-analysis model (no between-study variance), which is not recommended by Borenstein (2009) for biological and environmental studies such as EF from agricultural soils receiving OAs and other fertilizers.

Interestingly, synthetic sources were attributed an estimate 1.3 times greater than the raw mean with the new N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted procedure of the REML. Even if FertiType S does not exhaustively represent global N<sub>2</sub>O EF following fertilizer application, this weighted REML procedure strongly indicated higher EF were measured after synthetic fertilizer application in studies with better spatiotemporal coverage of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

# 2.4-2.2 In-depth testing of the $N_2O$ coverage REML-weighted function

Three superior weight studies were identified in the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML and reported measurements from the highest surfaces reported in the selected literature (i.e., between 1 and 1.5 meter square of total monitored surface per treatment). Two studies used automated closed chamber system. Thornton et al. (1998) roughly accounted for 20.6% of the entire database (sum of all weights equal to 100%) with a reported EF of 0.73% following

application of 336 kg N/ha of urea on a silty clay loam (Fig. A2-7). Ball et al. (2004) was attributed on average 4.83 times more weight than other studies, including two outliers (12.80% and -0.18% of N applied) of equal weight (around 1.7%) measured after application of 120 N kg / ha of NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>3</sub> on a clay loam (Fig. A2-7). In Parnaudeau et al. (2009), eight chambers were installed on two replicates of each treatment allowing 2.3 times more weight than average for waste water EFs.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to test the robustness of the weighted REML procedure and the potential gains of the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted function (Table 5). In absence of superior weight studies (31 observations deleted), the global EF estimate for OAs still fall within the range of those proposed by Bouwman et al. (2002b) with a 24.6% increase recorded that reached 0.71%. FertiType S estimate was not significantly different from the Fertitype O and fell in accordance with the IPCC EF<sub>1</sub> reaching 1.01% (Table 5). Additional analyses conducted separately on the three superior weight studies (data not shown) concluded (1) Thornton's study leverage was strongly negative on FertiType S estimate and rise the estimate from 1.01 to 1.76%; (3) Parnaudeau's study leverage was strongly negative on FertiType O.

In a second sensitivity analysis, we revised the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage factor (see <u>section 2.3-4.2</u>) to moderate the influence of superior weight studies whose weight of N<sub>2</sub>O observations was twice greater than the average weight of all N<sub>2</sub>O observations. The revised N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted function pointed out the EF estimates for organic sources were quite consistent

among the REMB and weighted REML procedures (0.54 to 0.64%) even if the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedure did not compute a between study variance (Table 5). We concluded differences between REMB and the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedures were mainly due to exclusion of observations with no associated variance, rather than computation of a between-study variance in the REMB procedure. The N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedure appeared as better than REMB for distinguishing FertiType with regards to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

# 2.4-2.3 New insights with the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedure

The N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedure was judged more appropriate to generate EF estimates, especially for FertiClasses tested on a limited number of sites and studies such as BSD-S (Table 3). Indeed, the REMB does not take into account a substantial interdependence among the reported EFs (IDstudy and IDsite) but consider each observations of the database as study- and site-independent introducing more bias for Fertitype and FertiClasses less represented.

Interestingly, the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML pointed out lower EF following CMPT±SF and SM application in studies with better spatiotemporal coverage of emissions. CMPT and CMPT-S were attributed a global EF equal to  $0.00 \pm 0.17\%$  and  $0.37 \pm 0.24$ , respectively (Table 3). A *t* test revealed addition of CMPT±S would not affect soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (*Pr* > 0.05). Sensitivity analyses pointed out the large EF estimates for LM-S were quite consistent among the weighted REML procedure (1.81 to 2.14%). Risk grouping of FertiClasses, allowed to generate new EFs for underrepresented FertiClasses (BSD-CR-S, WW, BR, SM-S, PMS-CR, PLTS, CR, LM-CR and PMS) that could not be included at first in the modeling process (Table 3). 2.4-3 Proposition of global EFs with the N<sub>2</sub>O coverage weighted REML procedure

Our proposition for a global EF for OAs applied to agricultural soils are based on the  $N_2O$  coverage weighted REML. The global EF for OAs, hereafter referred to as "EF<sub>org</sub>", was equal to 0.57 ± 0.30%. This is lower than the EF<sub>org</sub> of 0.8% proposed by Bouwman et al. (2002b) probably because (1) our database contained five times more information on OAs, and because (2) the new  $N_2O$  coverage weighted function of the REML allowed considering the intrinsic spatio-temporal variability of  $N_2O$  emissions from agricultural soils receiving OAs. No global EF is proposed for organic sources combined with synthetic fertilizers because the dataset was biased toward LM-S application, which represented most of the OA plus synthetic fertilizer observations.

At the FertiClass level, the following EFs were estimated for OA combined with synthetic fertilizer: LM-S had an EF of 2.14%  $\pm$  0.53, CMPT-S had an EF of 0.37%  $\pm$  0.24 and CR-S had an EF of 0.59%  $\pm$  0.27. The CR-S estimate is consistent with Novoa and Tejeda (2006) whose metaanalysis involved unamended plots as control that were unfertilized or fertilized with synthetic N fertilizer. Considering the three risk classes of OAs led to estimates of EFs equal to 1.09%  $\pm$ 0.17 for the high-risk class, 0.46%  $\pm$  0.22 for the medium-risk class, and 0.25%  $\pm$  0.20% for the low-risk class (Table 3). We are not aware of any other attempt to estimate the EFs for OAs based on risk classes, but note that the EF for the low-risk class was about half of the global EF for OAs, implying that use of the global EF for OAs would greatly over-estimate the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils that received Pellets (sewage sludge),CMPT (animal, vegetal, and municipal wastes), PMS, CR (maize or barley straw, lettuce or calabrese residues), PMS-CR, and even LM-CR.

### 2.4-5 Emission Factors and Controlling Factors

### 2.4-5.1 Physico-chemical Properties of Organic Amendments

Pig slurries that contained greater mineral N content (>10% d. w.), more water content (>95%) and low C/N ratio (< 5) had larger EFs than more viscous animal slurries (dry matter < 15%), SM (dry matter > 15%) or more stabilized products (C/N ratio > 30) (Table 3 and A2-3). These findings agree with other reports (Velthof et al., 2003; Chantigny et al., 2010; Senbayram et al., 2012). For instance, pig slurry contains high amounts of NH<sub>4</sub> and easily decomposable organic C that can, in concert, directly stimulate soil denitrifiers and decrease O<sub>2</sub> concentration; thereby further stimulating N<sub>2</sub>O production through denitrification (Velthof et al., 2003; Chantigny et al., 2010). Senbayram et al.(2012) pointed out that application of OAs with high contents of labile C may trigger denitrification-derived N<sub>2</sub>O emission in N-fertilized agricultural soils, coupled with a substantial increase of N<sub>2</sub>O/(N<sub>2</sub>O + N<sub>2</sub>) product ratio of denitrification in presence of large amount of nitrate from synthetic sources.

Chemical properties of OAs such as the mineral N content and C/N ratio were evidently important in predicting their N<sub>2</sub>O EF. More than 20% of OAs containing less than 0.3% d.w. of mineral N yielded EFs below the range proposed for the IPCC EF<sub>1</sub>(0.03 to 3% of N applied) (Fig. 2). Conversely, the OAs with greater mineral N content tended to have EFs above the maximum EF<sub>1</sub> value. For organic amendments whose mineral N content is less than 0.3% d.w, 4 of the 7 the EF estimates below 0.03% concerned surface application of cattle/co-fermented slurries, while injection of pig slurry combined with synthetic fertilizers promoted 100% of out of range EF<sub>1</sub> above 3% for fertilization sources containing more than 25% d.w. of mineral N (Table A2-3). Thus, mineral N alone cannot depict differences in composition between animal manures, due to litter type, and animal species and nutrition. Animal litter is a mixture of bedding material, excreta, and waste feed generated during animal production (Cabrera et al., 1994a). Manure showed contrasting N-mineralization patterns where N concentration varied among biochemical fractions (Tremblay et al., 2010). The manure-N mineralization increased in the presence of low-molecular-weight compounds such as sugar, starch, protein, uric acid N, and water-soluble organic N and decreased with lignin and polyphenol content (Morvan et al. 1997; Pansu et al. 2003). In general, the degradability of organic C and N of cattle manure is lower than that of pig and poultry manure (Chadwick et al., 2000a).

Also, the EFs decreased as the C/N ratio of OAs decreased (Fig. A2-8), which agrees with controlled laboratory studies on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils receiving OAs (Rizhiya et al., 2011). We conducted linear regressions based on log-transformed EF data to predict the N<sub>2</sub>O EFs of crop residues from their C/N ratio according to <u>equation (5)</u> with 78.4% of variance in EF explained by the model (Fig. 3):

## EF (% of N applied) = EXP[-0.706\*ln(C/N ratio + 1) +2.121+(0.145/2)-1] (5)

According to the above equation, CRs with C/N higher than or equal to 21.3 would not significantly increase soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following their addition. According to higher N<sub>2</sub>O observations reported in the literature (Fig. 4), OA with C/N higher than or equal to 45.9 would not significantly increase soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following their addition. For OAs with C/N lower than 25, the C/N of OAs explained only a part of the variations in EF, suggesting the influence of other environmental and management-related factors (Fig. 4).

## 2.4-5.2 Climate

Climate type and annual mean air temperature (MAT) had no significant effect of on global EF (Table 6), probably because our database is biased toward temperate climates and underrepresented tropical and arid climates. There was a significant effect (P < 0.001) of total annual precipitation (TAP) on global EF, where the EF estimate from FertiType O increased by a factor of 5 as TAP increased from 0-250 mm to 500-1000 mm (Table 6). This is consistent with the fact that soil moisture generating temporary anoxic conditions is a major driver of N<sub>2</sub>O production from denitrification in microsites where a high oxygen demand from intense respiratory activity exceeds the oxygen supply (Parkin, 1987; Linn and Doran, 1984). It is notable that the EF estimates declined by a factor of 2 when TAP exceeded 1000 mm (Table 6), suggesting that N<sub>2</sub> was the end product of denitrification in agricultural soils receiving OAs under these conditions of higher soil moisture.

## 2.4-5.3 Soil properties

## Texture and drainage

Soil texture modulates soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in agricultural soils receiving OAs and synthetic fertilizers (Pelster et al., 2012). Similar to Bouwman et al. (2002b), our results showed that N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were greater in fine-textured than coarse-textured soils (Table 5). In FertiType O, the EF increased by a factor of 2.8 in fine-textured than coarse-textured soils (Table 6). In FertiType OS, the EFs differed significantly between fine-textured and medium-textured soils. This may be a function of mineral N availability for microbially-mediated denitrification since the magnitude of EF response to increasing mineral N content of soil amendments is regulated by soil texture (Fig. 5), with greater EF estimates occurring in situations where mineral N content of fertilizer inputs was higher in fine-textured than in medium- and coarse-textured soils. When LM was
injected with synthetic fertilizers, the EF estimates were > 3% (Chantigny et al., 2010; Wei et al. 2010; Senbayram et al., 2014), exceeding the IPCC  $EF_1$  value.

Soil drainage that refers to the soil's natural ability to allow water to pass through it, was another significant modulator of EFs in agricultural soils receiving OAs and synthetic fertilizers (Table 6). The effect of soil drainage is related to texture because fine-textured soils hold water, while coarse-textured soils allow water to pass through quickly. The effect of soil drainage is also influenced by climate conditions and the presence of drainage structures. The attribution of a drainage class (poor, well, n/a) to reported EFs was based on explicit details provided by authors in selected studies. The EFs in poorly drained soils were two times larger than in welldrained soils in presence of OAs. For the FertiType S, the EFs were 7-fold greater in poorly drained than in well-drained soils. These differences reflect the impact of soil oxygen and moisture status on N<sub>2</sub>O production and diffusion/emission in agricultural soils, which was also noted by Bouwman et al. (2002b).

#### Soil organic carbon and nitrogen

Soil organic carbon (SOC), is another soil parameter implicated in soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Giles et al., 2012) that was considered in this study (Table 1). Regardless of the FertiType applied, SOC had a significant effect on EF (Table 6) and this was more important in FertiType S (P < 0.001) than FertiType O and OS (P < 0.01), which corroborates previous findings (Pelster et al., 2012) stating that N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are often limited by soil C availability. In synthetically fertilized soils, the SOC could be an indicator of the concentrations of C substrates accessible to nitrifying and denitrifying microorganisms that produce N<sub>2</sub>O. The soil C/N ratio was also related to the EFs in synthetically fertilized soils (Table 6), which is consistent with findings reported by Wei et al.

(2010). In contrast, the C/N ratio or organic C content of OAs is a better representation of the C substrate availability because the labile C substrates that originate from OAs are more readily metabolised than those that originate from the native SOC, since a large proportion of the SOC is physically protected and associated with soil minerals (see Table A2-4).

#### 2.5 Conclusion

Three analytical approaches were able to distinguish and estimate EF for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from OAs, alone and combined with synthetic fertilizers. The weighted REML model proved the most robust and could handle missing observations in the dataset and account for the intrinsic spatio-temporal variability of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils receiving OAs. In estimating the EFs for  $N_2O$  emissions from agricultural soils, we demonstrated that the IPCC EF<sub>1</sub> value was too high when considering the N<sub>2</sub>O contribution from agricultural soils amended with composts, but too low to represent the EF of N<sub>2</sub>O in agricultural soils receiving liquid manure (mostly pig slurry) combined with synthetic fertilizers. We propose a global default EF for organic sources, EForg, equal to 0.57 ± 0.30% and encourage the use of FertiClasses or FertiRiskClass categories to account for the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from specific OA sources or groups of OAs with similar characteristics. Finally, we confirm that variations in N<sub>2</sub>O EFs in OA-amended soils are influenced mainly by the mineral N content and the C/N ratio of OAs, rainfall (expressed as TAP), soil texture and drainage. The database assembled and the approach followed in this study could therefore be used to update the IPCC EFs for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions resulting from the application of OAs to agricultural soils.

49

Variables	Acronyms	Units	 DA* (%)
Posponso variables	/ lonolity inc	Unito	
Cumulative N-O emissions from control plate	NO	ka N ha <sup>-1</sup>	100
Cumulative $N_2O$ emissions from fertilized plots	$N_2 O_c$ $N_2 O_c$	kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>	100
Emission factor of $N_2 O$	FF	% of total N applied	100
Explanatory variables			
Fertilization			
Type of fertilization	FertiType		100
organic	0		
organic combined with synthetic	5		
Total application rate of nitrogen (N)	Total N input	ka ha <sup>-1</sup>	100
Application rate of organic N sources	rotarit input	kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	100
Application rate of fertilizers N		kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	100
Incorporation depth of amendments		cm	
Number of split (0 if single application)			
Type of amendments	FertiClass		100
Chemical properties of amendments			
C/N ratio	NUL +		40
	NH <sub>4</sub>	mg kg	37
μπ Lond was tome			34
Cropland (paddy fields oveluded)			100
Grassland (grazing pasture excluded)			
Cron type			100
Soil tillage			85
Soil Drainage			77
Soil Texture			01
Soil properties			51
Organic C content	SOC	%	80
N content		%	72
C/N ratio			74
рН			82
Bulk density	BD	g cm <sup>-3</sup>	50
Climate			
Climate type			100
I otal annual precipitation		mm	92
Mean annual temperature	IVIA I	SC SC	70
Measurement techniques			100
Number of $N_2O$ sampling events		dovo	100
Number of closed chambers		uays	100
Closed chamber surface		cm <sup>2</sup>	100
Statistical narameters		0.17	
Number of replicated plots	n		100
Standard deviations of $N_2O_c$	sd <sub>c</sub>	kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>	75
Standard deviations of $N_2 O_f$	$sd_{f}$	kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>	75

Table 1. Quantitative variables included in the meta-analysis of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors (EF) from organic sources of fertilizer, alone and combined with synthetic sources.

\*DA, percentage of data reported in selected studies that was available for each variable listed above.

Table 2. Studies and	geographical	coordinates of	experimental	sites	included i	n the	N <sub>2</sub> O EF
database.							

IDstudy <sup>*</sup>	Authors	Year	Country/Province	IDsite <sup>**</sup>	Latitude	Longitude
1	Hansen et al.	1993	Norway	1	62.9740	8.7247
2	Lessard et al.	1996	Canada, ON	2	45.4116	-75.6982
3	Chang et al.	1998	Canada, AB	3	49.6935	-112.8418
4	Thornton et al.	1998	USA, AL	4	34.9323	-86.5719
				5	53.1134	-114.4677
5	Lemke et al.	1999	Canada, AB	6	53,4274	-113.4578
-			,	7	53.4115	-113.1210
6	Chadwick et al.	2000a	UK, England	8	50.7396	-3.9991
7	Chantigny et al.	2001	Canada	9	46.7770	-71.1452
8	Baggs et al.	2002	UK, Scotland	10	56.3216	-3.0099
9	Wulf et al.	2002	Germany	11	50.7327	7.0963
10	Tilsner et al.	2003	Germany	12	49.9416	11.5710
11	Ball et al.	2004	UK. Scotland	13	55.8437	-3.1951
12	Dittert et al.	2005	Germany	14	53.9210	9.8822
13	Valleio et al	2006	Spain	15	40 4817	-3 3641
14	Chantiony et al	2007	Canada OC	16	46 8033	-71 2428
15	Meiiide et al	2007	Spain	17	40,3010	-3 4381
	molfae et al.	2001	Opam	19	50 7695	-3 9013
16	Thorman et al.	2007	UK, England	18	53 2245	-1 1124
17	Bhandral et al	2008	Canada BC	20	49 2401	-121 7657
18	Ellert and Janzen	2000	Canada	21	49 7020	-112 7727
10	Mkhabela et al	2000	Canada NS	21	45.7020	-63 5000
20	Meijide et al	2000	Spain	22	40 5381	-3 2823
20	Parpaudaau et al	2003	Erance	20	40.3301	-5.2025
21	Chantiany et al.	2003	Canada	24	46 7702	-71 2040
22	Dalal et al	2010		20	-27 5703	152 3250
20	Sanchez-Martin et al	2010	Spain	20	40 5381	-3 2823
24	Sanchez-Martin et al.	2010	Spain Conodo MP	21	40.5361	-3.2023
20		2010	Carlaua, IVID	20	49.0213	-90.0101
20	Viel et al.	2010	Chillid The Netherlands	29	53.0055	107.0204 E 6669
21		2011	The Nethenands	30	51.9000	5.0000
28	Ding et al.	2013	China	31	35.0000	114.4000
29	Cal et al.	2013	<u> </u>		10 7000	74 5407
30	Pelster et al.	2012	Canada, QC	32	46.7333	-/1.516/
31	Abalos et al.	2012	Spain	33	40.5333	-3.2833
32	Collins et al.	2011	USA, WA	34	46.2561	-119.7393
33	Hu et al.	2013	China	35	36.8667	115.1667
34	Carmo et al	2013	Brazil	36	-22.2500	-48.5667
0-1		2010		37	-22.6833	-47.5500
35	Li et al.	2013a	China	38	47.4333	126.6333
36	Plaza-Bonilla et al.	2014	Spain	39	41.9033	-0.5042
27	Aito at al	2014	Brozil	40	-29.7203	-53.7053
37	Alla El al.	2014	DIAZII	41	-29.7269	-53.7247
20	Sanhayram	2014	Cormony	42	53.9000	9.9000
30	Senbayran	2014	Germany	43	54.3000	10.0000
<sup>*</sup> IDstudy, L	Jnique Study Identifier; **II	Dsite, Un	ique Site Identifier			

F	ertilizat	tion	Acronyms	Des	cripti	ve parar	neters	N <sub>2</sub> O EF, % N applied										
			Representativeness N rate			N rate	Raw Data REMB <sup>1</sup>			REML <sup>2</sup>								
					total	#	kg N/ha						un	weighte	ed	weighted		
				Obs.	Site	Study	median	mean	median	mean	95% CI	df	mean	sem	$Pr >  t ^{\Upsilon}$	mean	sem	$Pr >  t ^{\mathcal{X}}$
Se	Organi	c sources	0	251	41	35	154	0.82	0.42	0.54 b	0.48 to 0.60	183	0.84 a	0.22	<0.001	0.57 b	0.30	<0.001
iType	Organi	c and synthetic sources	OS	72	13	13	150	1.50	0.87	0.77 a	0.63 to 0.91	34	1.30 a	0.30	<0.001	1.15 ab	0.31	ns
Fert	ਦ ⊒ Synthetic sources S		S	99	32	26	130	1.34	0.57	0.72 a	0.61 to 0.82	65	1.30 a	0.29	<0.001	1.76 a	0.42	<0.001
		All high-risk						1.18	0.62	0.70 A	0.63 to 0.76	152	1.09 A	0.17	<0.001	0.91 A	0.16	<0.001
		Liquid manure + S	LM-S	31	5	6	130	2.44	1.72	nc	ot available <sup>‡</sup>		1.81 a	0.48	<0.001	2.14 a	0.53	<0.001
	jh risk	Biosolid, CR + S	BSD-CR-S	6	1	1	131	1.64	1.54									
		Biosolid + S	BSD-S	6	4	4	145	1.16	0.88	1.16 a	0.75 to 1.59	5	0.39 bcd	0.55	ns	0.89 abcd	0.45	<0.05
		Waste water	WW	8	2	2	161	1.15	0.45									
	ΞĨ	Liquid manure	LM	149	24	20	148	0.96	0.56	0.67 a	0.60 to 0.75	105	1.11 ab	0.23	<0.001	1.12 ab	0.18	<0.001
	_	Biogas residues	BR	10	2	1	360	0.92	0.49									
ŝ		Solid manure + S	SM-S	3	2	2	240	0.78	0.85	0.50 -1	0.00 ( 0.00	40	4.04 .1 .	0.00		0.05	0.40	
ŝŝ		Solid manure	SM	29	13	11	170	0.97	0.24	0.56 ab	0.33 to 0.80	13	1.01 abc	0.28	<0.001	0.35 C	0.18	<0.05
Class	Ē	All medium-risk						0.50	0.44	0.58 B	0.42 to 0.73	19	0.46 B	0.22	<0.05	0.43 AB	0.43	ns
, ric	ediu risk	Compost + S	CMPT-S	14	4	5	150	0.54	0.45	0.55 ab	0.34 to 0.76	12	0.52 cd	0.26	<0.05	0.37 cd	0.24	ns
Ĕ	Š	Crop residues + S	CR-S	12	3	3	210	0.46	0.33	0.64 ab	0.31 to 0.97	6	0.66 cd	0.30	<0.05	0.59 bc	0.27	<0.05
		All low-risk						0.23	0.14	0.22 C	0.12 to 0.32	45	0.25 B	0.20	ns	0.20 B	0.17	ns
	×	Paper mill sludge + CR	PMS-CR	6	1	1	231	0.28	0.13									
	ris	Compost	CMPT	29	8	8	200	0.27	0.17	0.26 b	0.12 to 0.40	25	0.43 d	0.24	ns	0.00 d	0.17	ns
	Š	Pellets	PLTS	5	1	1	508	0.25	0.24									
	Ľ	Crop residues	CR	8	3	3	83	0.19	0.08									
		Liquid manure + CR	LM-CR	1	1	1	178	0.07	0.07									
		Paper mill sludge	PMS	6	1	1	519	0.03	0.01									

# Table 3. Global estimates of $N_2O$ emission factors ( $N_2O$ EF) according to fertilization type.

<sup>1</sup> Random effect model of Borenstein (Borenstein, 2009), weighting procedure by the inverse of N<sub>2</sub>0 EF variance

<sup>\*</sup> not available, number of observations reporting variance of N<sub>2</sub>O EF means  $\leq 2$ 

<sup>2</sup> **Residual Maximum likelihood analysis**, weighting procedure with spatial and temporal N<sub>2</sub>O coverage (Table 1)

Means sharing a small bold letter are not significantly different within FertiTypes by a LSD test (P<.05).

Means sharing a small letter are not significantly different within FertiClasses by a LSD test (P<.05).

Means sharing a capital letter are not significantly different within low-, medium-, and high-risk Ferticlasses by a LSD test (P<.05).

<sup>x</sup> Pr > |t| refers to a *t* test to test the null hypothesis that the associated population quantity equals zero.

Table 4. Significance of fertilization sources on global N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors with two statistical models.

#### $N_2 O EF$ , % N applied REMB model<sup>1</sup> REML model<sup>2</sup> unweighted weighted $|^2$ $P_{\rm chi}^2$ df Q F Pr > F df F Pr > Fdf n n n **Fertilization** FertiType 285 1042 73 <.0001 284 422 3.57 <0.05 376 314 14.89 <.0001 24 172 557 69 <.0001 171 422 2.25 <0.01 362 422 4.04 <.0001 362 **FertiClass** FertiRiskClass 219 715 69 <.0001 218 323 8.89 <0.01 277 323 48.49 <.0001 277

<sup>1</sup> Random effect model of Borenstein (Borenstein, 2009), weight equal to the inverse of  $N_2O$  EF variance

<sup>2</sup> Residual Maximum likelihood analysis, weight equal to  $N_2O$  coverage factor (Table 1)

FertiType, type of fertilization: organic, synthetic fertilizers, organic and synthetic fertilizers

 $\label{eq:FertiClass} \textit{FertiClass}, \textit{nature of organic sources } \pm \textit{synthetic sources (Table 3)}$ 

**FertiRiskClass (high, medium or low)**, N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of organic sources ± synthetic sources (Table 3) **n**, total # of observations used in the analysis

df, degree of freedom

**Q** is the weighted sum of squares on a standardized scale

 $I^2$  is the proportion (%) of the observed variance that reflects real differences in emission factor of N<sub>2</sub>O  $I^2 = (Q-df)/Q$ 

 $P_{chi}^{2}$ , refers to testing the assumption of homogeneity in fertilization effects on N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor; the null hypothesis is that all studies share a common emission factor.

Fertilization Acronyms					Global estimates of $N_2O$ emission factors , % N applied									
			Ra	w Data	REML <sup>1</sup>									
						N <sub>2</sub> O cove	rage weight	revised N we	l₂O coverage eight	weighted without superior weight studies				
				mean	median	mean	sem $\frac{Pr >  t }{x}$	mean	sem $Pr >  t ^{x}$	mean	sem	$Pr >  t ^{\mathfrak{X}}$		
S	Organ	ic sources	0	0.82	0.42	0.57 b	<b>0.30</b> <0.001	0.64 a	<b>0.15</b> <0.001	0.71 A	0.17	<0.001		
tiTyp€	Organ source	ic and synthetic es	os	1.50	0.87	1.15 ab	0.31 <i>ns</i>	0.88 a	<b>0.19</b> <0.001	1.16 A	0.26	<0.001		
Fer	Synth	etic sources	S	1.34	0.57	1.76 a	0.42 <0.001	1.62 a	0.32 <0.001	1.01 A	0.22	<0.001		
		All high-risk				0.91 A	0.16 < 0.001	1.88 A	<b>0.47</b> < 0.001	1.76 A	0.36	<0.001		
	High risk	Liquid manure + S	LM-S	2.44	1.72	2.14 a	0.53 <0.001	1.79 a	0.31 <0.001	1.84 a	0.50	<0.001		
		Biosolid, CR + S	BSD-CR-S	1.64	1.54									
		Biosolid + S	BSD-S	1.16	0.88	0.89 abcd	0.45 <0.05	1.00 abcd	0.56 <i>ns</i>	0.73 ab	0.44	ns		
		Waste water	WW	1.15	0.45									
		Liquid manure	LM	0.96	0.56	1.12 ab	0.18 <0.001	0.95 b	0.16 <.0001	0.93 ab	0.18	<.0001		
		Biogas residues	BR	0.92	0.49									
		Solid manure + S	SM-S	0.78	0.85									
es		Solid manure	SM	0.97	0.24	0.35 c	0.18 < 0.05	0.69 bc	0.29 <0.05	0.86 ab	0.30	<0.01		
ass	Ē	All medium-risk				0.43 AB	0.43 ns	0.70 AB	2.64 ns	1.04 A	0.76	ns		
rici	ediu risk	Compost + S	CMPT-S	0.54	0.45	0.37 cd	0.24 <i>ns</i>	0.25 cd	0.33 ns	0.39 b	0.39	ns		
Бе	Σ	Crop residues + S	CR-S	0.46	0.33	0.59 bc	0.27 <0.05	0.49 bcd	0.43 <i>ns</i>	0.53 b	0.39	ns		
		All low-risk Paper mill sludge +				0.20 B	0.17 <i>ns</i>	0.60 B	0.48 ns	0.97 A	0.65	ns		
	×	CR	PMS-CR	0.28	0.13									
	ris	Compost	CMPT	0.27	0.17	0.00 d	0.17 <i>ns</i>	-0.03 d	0.22 ns	0.31 b	0.41	ns		
	3	Pellets	PLTS	0.25	0.24						-			
	Ľ	Crop residues	CR	0.19	0.08									
		Liquid manure + CR	LM-CR	0.07	0.07									
		Paper mill sludge	PMS	0.03	0.01									
1 .					241 - 25-1			(T 1 1 A)						

Table 5. Sensitivity analyses of the REML approach using spatial and temporal N<sub>2</sub>O coverage information in weighing procedures<sup>2</sup>.

Residual Maximum likelihood analysis, weighting procedure with spatial and temporal N<sub>2</sub>O coverage (Table 1)

Means sharing a small bold letter are not significantly different within FertiTypes by a LSD test (P<.05).

Means sharing a small letter are not significantly different within FertiClasses by a LSD test (P<.05).

Means sharing a capital letter are not significantly different within low-, medium-, and high-risk Ferticlasses by a LSD test (P<.05).

<sup>x</sup> Pr > |t| refers to a *t* test to test the null hypothesis that the associated population quantity equals zero.

\* Superior weight studies are defined as studies whose weight of N<sub>2</sub>O observations was twice greater than the average weight of all N<sub>2</sub>O observations (0.24%).

**FertiClass**, nature of organic sources ± synthetic sources (Table 3)

FertiRiskClass (high, medium or low), N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of organic sources ± synthetic sources (Table 3)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> **FertiType**, type of fertilization: organic, synthetic fertilizers, organic and synthetic fertilizers

	FERTITYPE O						FERTITYPE O AND OS					FERTITYPE S							
		Raw	Pr > F	df			Raw	Pr > F	df		5	Raw	<b>Pr &gt; F</b>	df					
	n	mean	mean	(sem)		n	mean	mean	(sem)		n	mean	mean	(sem)					
CLIMATE																			
Climate type	251	0.81	ns	197		323	0.96	ns	249		99	1.34	ns	68					
TAP <sup>1</sup> , mm	229	0.80	***	173		296	0.97	***	221		91	1.37	ns	58					
0-250	42	0.20	0.21	(0.33)	b	51	0.21	0.29	(0.31)	b	12	0.48	-	-					
250-500	26	0.94	0.59	(0.47)	ab	45	0.78	0.61	(0.36)	ab	14	1.34	-	-					
500-1000	96	0.92	1.05	(0.18)	а	105	0.90	1.16	(0.21)	а	42	1.38	-	-					
> 1000	65	0.96	0.50	(0.19)	b	95	1.54	0.63	(0.21)	b	23	1.83	-	-					
MAT <sup>2</sup> , °C	167	0.82	ns	132		70	1.40	ns	170		70	1.40	ns	48					
	STEM	S																	
Land-use type	251	0.81	ns	196		323	0.96	ns	248		99	1.34	ns	67					
Crop type <sup>3</sup>	109	0.64	ns	87		116	0.65	ns	100		34	1.56	ns	67					
SOIL MANAGE	MENT	-																	
Soil tillage	127	1.02	ns	100		184	1.20	ns	142		57	1.22	ns	35					
Incorporation <sup>4</sup>	207	0.72	ns	63		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
SOIL PROPER	TIES																		
Drainage	115	0.81	***	102		117	0.81	***	104		34	1.93	**	24					
Poor	49	1.10	1.02	(0.16)	а	49	1.11	1.02	(0.16)	а	15	3.70	5.34	(1.46)	а				
Well	66	0.59	0.34	(0.03)	b	68	0.59	0.34	(0.03)	b	19	0.52	0.72	(0.13)	b				
Texture	221	0.89	***	129		281	1.06	*	214		90	1.41	ns	61					
Fine	49	1.33	1.52	(0.38)	а	81	1.77	1.42	(0.26)	а	24	3.01	2.85	(1.43)	а				
Medium	44	0.96	0.82	(0.18)	а	56	0.91	0.71	(0.26)	b	21	0.93	0.70	(1.86)	а				
Coarse	128	0.67	0.49	(0.18)	b	144	0.73	0.59	(0.21)	b	45	0.79	0.66	(3.00)	а				
Organic C, %	193	0.80	**	151		252	0.96	**	194		86	1.03	***	59					
< 1	31	0.64	0.47	(0.22)	b	56	0.61	0.44	(0.21)	b	20	0.71	1.09	(0.73)	b				
1-3	105	0.83	0.48	(0.18)	b	116	0.80	0.46	(0.18)	b	35	0.78	-0.71	(0.66)	b				
3-6	35	0.77	1.47	(0.29)	а	53	1.74	1.46	(0.26)	а	23	1.68	3.83	(0.72)	а				
> 6	22	0.84	0.72	(0.84)	ab	27	0.85	0.72	(0.84)	ab	8	1.07	1.21	(2.27)	ab				
Nitrogen, %	165	0.88	**	140		225	1.04	***	177		81	1.04	ns	58					
< 0.1	18	0.84	0.57	(0.35)	b	45	0.63	0.48	(0.22)	b	-	-	-	-					
0.1-0.2	117	0.72	0.50	(0.17)	b	124	0.72	1.69	(0.36)	а	-	-	-	-					
> 0.2	30	1.54	1.66	(0.31)	а	56	2.08	0.59	(0.16)	b	-	-	-	-					
Soil C/N ratio	165	0.88	ns	140		229	1.04	***	178		85	1.12	**	61					
< 10	18	0.85	0.66	(0.27)	а	41	0.54	0.81	(0.31)	а	19	1.11	1.40	(0.57)	ab				
10-14	117	0.72	0.80	(0.19)	а	90	1.51	1.16	(0.23)	а	26	1.79	2.55	(0.71)	а				
> 14	30	1.54	0.55	(0.24)	а	98	0.83	-0.17	(0.27)	b	40	0.69	0.04	(0.49)	b				
pH	184	0.87	1.76	ns	143	254	1.04	ns	194		90	1.13	ns	60					

Table 6. Significance of environmental and management-related factors on global  $N_2O$  emission factors with the weighted REML approach.

FertiType, type of fertilization: organic (O), synthetic fertilizers (S), organic and synthetic fertilizers (OS)

**n**, total # of observations used in the analysis

*Pr* > F refers to a F-test used for comparing the soil factors of the total deviation, df = degree of freedom

<sup>1</sup> TAP, Total annual precipitation

<sup>2</sup> AMAT, Annual mean air temperature

<sup>3</sup> Crop type, type of crops (legume, grass, legume + grass) in grassland only

<sup>4</sup> Incorporation, incorporation depth (cm) of organic amendments only

Significance of the effect :  $Pr < 0.001^{***}$ ,  $Pr < 0.01^{**}$  and  $Pr < 0.05^{*}$ , ns = non-significant

Means sharing a letter are not significantly different within soil factor by a LSD test (P<.05).



#### Figure 1. Global estimates of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors according to the type of fertilization

Vertical point plots were used for the graphical presentation of data when ten observations or less were reported in a category of fertilization. Box plots were represented when the number of observations per category of fertilization exceeded ten. The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented.



Mineral nitrogen content of soil amendments combined or not with fertilizers, % dry weight



The organic sources within each mineral N class are described in Table A2-2.



Figure 3. Nitrous oxide emission factors of crop residues as a function of C/N ratio

a) Observed  $N_2O$  emission factors as a function of crop residues C/N ratios

b) Linear regression analysis of log-transformed crop residue variables

c) Predicting N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors of crop residues from their C/N ratio



Figure 4. Global N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors according to the C/N ratio of inputs.



Mineral N content of soil amendments combined or not with synthetics fertilizers, % dry weight

# Figure 5. Modulation of global N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors by mineral nitrogen content of inputs from organic sources, alone and combined with synthetic inputs, and soil texture.

\* Emission factor reported by Dalal et al. (2010) after green waste compost application on a sorghum crop cultivated on a Vertisol (Udic Haplustert, USDA, 1975) under a subtropical climate (Australia).

# FORWARD TO CHAPTER 3

The meta-analysis of on-field N<sub>2</sub>O emissions induced by the application of OAs confirmed that variations in N<sub>2</sub>O EFs in OA-amended soils are influenced mainly by the mineral N content and the C/N ratio of OAs, rainfall, soil texture and drainage on a global scale. Given that an EF for OAs cannot be determined readily from field studies with diverse OA sources, climate conditions, the mechanistic basis for OA contribution to N<sub>2</sub>O production should be determined in controlled laboratory studies. However, contrasting results have been also reported in controlled conditions because the potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (POA-N<sub>2</sub>O) is affected by many other factors including soil type, the duration of the experiment and O<sub>2</sub> availability during the incubation. Thus, there is a need to determine how experimental conditions affect soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following application of OAs and provide recommendations for a standard methodology to assess POA-N<sub>2</sub>O.

## **CHAPTER 3**

Assessing the potential of organic amendments to induce soil nitrous oxide emissions in controlled conditions: a comparative study.

#### 3.1 Abstract

Three laboratory incubation methods were evaluated to determine the potential of organic amendments (OAs) to induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from a clay loam soil fertilized with either OAs or an inorganic fertilizer, or left unamended as a control. Each incubation method was done in a 1-L jar, included oxic and anoxic phases, and lasted for 92 d in the dark at 22°C. The opened/sealed-jar method with acetylene (O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>) consisted of a 43-d incubation at constant soil water content and ambient O<sub>2</sub>, followed by an anaerobic event in an O<sub>2</sub>-free atmosphere containing 10%  $^{v}/_{v}$  of acetylene (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>). The sealed-jar methods with C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> (S/S<sup>+</sup>) and without  $C_2H_2$  (S/S<sup>-</sup>) involved flushing the headspace of a closed jar with nitrogen or nitrogen containing 10%  $^{v}/_{v}$  of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> when the headspace O<sub>2</sub> concentration reached 5%. During the oxic phase, both S methods reflected the short-term potential of OAs to promote soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions 72 h after their incorporation with the  $N_2O_{0.72h}$  index. The S and O methods showed different patterns of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, and the magnitude of N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes was 1.1 to 2.3 times greater with the S than the O method. However, the S methods had an oxic phase limited to 72 h when testing OAs with high respiratory demand and the rapid depletion of O<sub>2</sub>, necessitating continuous monitoring of headspace gas concentrations, is a constraint to testing numerous OAs with contrasted chemical properties. An alternative technique would involve aerating the sealed-jar system after 72 h and relying on repeated 72-h measurement periods using the  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  index to assess the short-term (72-h) and long-term (multiple 72-h periods) potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. To capture the entire scope of this potential, the occurrence of an anoxic event after an oxic phase provided additional information. The duration of the oxic phase altered the magnitude of the OA effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions under anoxia, as reflected in the two indices  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  (magnitude of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions) and  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  (speed of N<sub>2</sub>O response). The  $O^W/S^+$  method provided the highest degree of discrimination between OAs according to  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  because the extended oxic period allowed for accumulation of mineral N prior to the anoxic event, as evidenced by the correlation between soil nitrate and  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}^{OW/S^+}$ (r=0.957, P<0.05).  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}^{S/S^+}$  was correlated with soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux at the end of the S/S<sup>+</sup> oxic phase and, thus indicates C availability to microorganisms.

**Keywords :** soil incubation methodology, organic amendment, nitrous oxide, oxic/anoxic phase, acetylene, nitrification, denitrification.

**Abbreviations** : DM, dry matter; C, carbon; DOC, dissolved organic carbon; EF, emission factor; L, lignin; N, nitrogen;  $NH_4^+$ , ammonium;  $NO_3^-$ , nitrate; N<sub>2</sub>O, nitrous oxide; N<sub>2</sub>, dinitrogen; N<sub>min</sub>, mineral nitrogen; N<sub>org</sub>, organic nitrogen; RSD, relative standard deviation; WFPS, water-filled pore space.

#### **3.2 Introduction**

Large quantities of organic materials are added to agricultural soils in various forms including crop residues, livestock manures, sludge and composts (Chaves et al., 2005). While OAs act as physical soil conditioners and a valuable source of plant-available nutrients, they also enhance nitrification and denitrification reactions that lead to increased soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, a potent greenhouse gas (Foster et al., 2007) and the dominant stratospheric ozone-depleting substance (Ravinshankara et al., 2009). In Canada, organic-N sources were estimated to contribute one third of total N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils (Rochette et al., 2008b). This estimate was obtained using an emission factor derived from synthetic N fertilizers because of insufficient information about organic materials. Improved emission inventories and development of better management practices to minimize environmental impacts associated with OA application to agricultural soils will require a deeper understanding of how OA properties influence N<sub>2</sub>O emission processes. Extreme variability in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils that received organic amendments (crop residues combined with or without inorganic fertilizers, farmyard slurries and farmyard manure) has been frequently reported in field studies with maximal relative standard deviations of N<sub>2</sub>O cumulative fluxes ranging from 128 to 500% (Paul and Zebarth, 1997; Chantigny et al. 2001; Ellert and Janzen, 2008; Shang et al., 2011; Velthof and Mosquera, 2011; Pelster et al., 2012). Therefore, potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is often assessed in the laboratory.

Controlled studies show that  $N_2O$  emissions are related to the chemical properties of the OA, such that emissions increased with increasing mineral N content of OA and with decreasing

64

C/N ratio and lignin content (Lou et al., 2007; Huang et al., 2004). High N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were associated with OA containing high levels of inorganic N and easily mineralizable N and C, such as liquid pig (Velthof et al., 2003) and sheep manure (Cardenas et al., 2007) and N-rich crop residues (Chaves et al., 2005). On the other hand, mixing manure, slurries or N-rich crop residues with materials with high C/N ratios, such as wheat straw residues (Triticum L.), saw dust, or composts also reduced soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Huang et al., 2004). However, it is difficult to generalize among studies due to variation in incubation conditions, which present soil temperatures ranging from -5.5 to 26° C, durations from 4 to 240 d and soil moisture either kept constant from 36 to above 90% of water-filled pore space (Cabrera et al., 1994a; De Wever et al., 2002; Chaves et al., 2005; Jezierska-Tys and Frac, 2007; Dalal et al., 2009; Singurindy et al., 2009). Futher complexity is added when soil moisture varies to simulate dry-wet soil cycles (Cabrera et al., 1994a; Velthof et al., 2003; Bertora et al., 2008). The use of consistent experimental approaches and methodologies would help to estimate the potential of OAs to induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Flessa and Beese, 2000; Helgason et al., 2005; Lou et al., 2007). Given the diversity of incubation conditions used in the literature and the fact that there is no unique definition of potential of OAs to induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, comparing several incubation approaches may help to determine how the methodology impacts the results. In this study, we opted for incubations that included the impact of two factors: the time since OA addition and the O<sub>2</sub> availability. Incubation duration appeared important because the mineral N (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> or  $NO_3$ ) in OAs is immediately available for nitrification and denitrification and can impact soil  $N_2O$ emissions in the short-term while the mineralization of organic-N substrates would be important in the long-term (Velthof et al., 2003). All incubation methods selected for this study

include an oxic-anoxic cycle, which allowed build-up of  $NO_3^-$  (from nitrification) and labile C substrates (from decomposition) in the oxic phase, followed by depletion of theses substrates in the anoxic phase.

The objectives of this study were (1) to compare three incubation methods to determine how experimental conditions affect soil  $N_2O$  emissions following application of OAs and (2) provide recommendations towards a standard methodology.

#### 3.3 Material and Methods

#### 3.3.1 Soil properties and preparation

A Kamouraska clay (mixed, frigid, Typic Humaquept) was collected from the 0-20 cm depth (plough layer) in November 2009, about 2 wk after the field was tilled with a mouldboard plough. This poorly drained soil was collected at the Harlaka Research Farm of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (46°48′N, 71°23′W). This soil was selected because it showed fertilizer-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions greater than the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change default factor (0.01 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> N), with values ranging from 0.027 to 0.038 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> N applied (Gagnon et al., 2011). The site was cropped with soybean (*Glycine max* L.) in 2009, so received no N fertilizer in the study year. Prior to the incubation, soil was sieved to pass a 6-mm sieve, air-dried and mixed. Selected physico-chemical properties of the Kamouraska clay are presented in Table 1. Selected physico-chemical properties of a Kamouraska clay soil (0-20 cm) used for the development of a standard method for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emission

#### 3.3.2 Amendment properties and preparation

Soil amendments consisted of five organic amendments: pig slurry (PS), Medicago sativa L. (alfalfa residues or AR), poultry manure (PM), sheep manure compost (SMC) and wheat straw residues (WSR). The inorganic fertilizer (IF) was ammonium nitrate ( $NH_4NO_3$ ) (ACS reagent grade, Sigma-Aldrich, Saint Louis, MO, USA), and an unamended soil was used as control. Before application, PM and SMC were fresh and manually ground, mixed and passed through a 2 mm mesh sieve, PS was freshly mixed with a lab homogenizer (Polytron<sup>®</sup> System PT-MR 3100 D, Kinematika AG, Littau-Luzern, Switzerland) and crop residues (WSR and AR) were dried (45°C for 2 d) and manually ground, mixed and passed through a 2 mm mesh sieve. Selected characteristics of the amendments are given in Table 2. According to Palm et al. (2001) and Chivenge et al. (2011), the classification in Table 2 for amendments tested in this comparative incubation falls between that of low- and high-decomposability materials including plant residues, manures and composts. Plant residues with high decomposability (AR) refers to fresh green materials harvested before plants have senesced, whereas plant residues with low decomposability (WSR) are materials where some senescence has occurred and refers to the dead upright plant left in the field after harvest. Decomposability of manures and composts (PM, PS, SMC) are characterized by the animal that produced them (poultry, pig, sheep), the management (with or without litter) and storage of the manures (aerobic state) and whether they were composted prior to collection.

#### 3.3.3 Soil preincubation, addition of amendments and experimental design

Pre-tests were performed on the Kamouraska clay soil to assess the impact of soil water content on structure disruption of the amendment-soil mixtures. Soil water content equal to

67

0.28/0.30/0.33 g H<sub>2</sub>O g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil was the minimal/optimal/maximal compromise between sample homogeneity and soil structure disruption. For the preincubation, air-dried soil (220 g oven dry basis) was moistened homogenously with distilled water to 0.28 g H<sub>2</sub>O g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil (65% of the field capacity). Wet soil was then placed in 1-L jars (one jar = one experimental unit) with gas-tight lids fitted with two 1-way male luer stopcocks. A 7-d anaerobic preincubation at 22°C was done to remove soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N through denitrification by sealing each jar with a lid and flushing the headspace with N<sub>2</sub> gas for 20 sec at 48 kPa.

After preincubation, jars were assigned randomly to four incubation methods (described below) and were either unamended (control) or received amendments (PM, PS, SMC, WSR, AR or IF) at the rates mentioned in Table 2. The amendments were applied to the soil surface, mixed homogenously by hand, and the jars were shaken horizontally to level the soil surface, leaving a headspace volume of roughly 0.87 L. Then, distilled water was added to the surface to adjust moisture of the amendment-soil mixture to 0.30 g  $H_2O$  g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil (70% of the field capacity). Four replicate jars were prepared for gas analysis of each method x amendment combination (4 methods x 7 amendments x 4 replicates = 112 jars) and an additional four replicates were prepared for soil analysis at the end of the oxic phase of 3 methods x amendment combination (84 jars). The closed-jar methods were identical during the oxic phase so that the same additional replicates were attributed to both methods. Jars were placed in a constant temperature incubator (22° C ± 0.03) in the dark for 92 d in a completely randomized design.

68

#### 3.3.4 Incubation methods with oxic/anoxic phases

As summarized in Table 3, three incubation methods were evaluated:  $O^w/S^+$ ,  $S/S^+$  and  $S/S^-$ . Each method included an oxic phase with opened (O) or sealed (S) jars followed by an anoxic event with opened (/O) or sealed (/S) jars in presence (<sup>+</sup>) or absence (<sup>-</sup>) of acetylene: the opened/sealed-jar method with acetylene ( $O^w/S^+$ ), the sealed-jar method with acetylene ( $S/S^+$ ) and the sealed-jar method without acetylene ( $S/S^-$ ). Duration of the oxic phase varied from 3 to 43 d, depending on the method. The anoxic event was initiated by either flushing the headspace with N<sub>2</sub> ( $S/S^-$  method) or flushing the headspace with N<sub>2</sub> enriched with 10% (v/v) of acetylene ( $O^w/S^+$  and  $S/S^+$  methods).

### 3.3.4.1 The opened/sealed-jar method ( $O^{w}/S^{+}$ )

The opened/sealed-jar method ( $O^w/S^+$ ) utilized incubation in opened jars during the oxic cycle. After applying treatments, jars were capped with a lid having a central 6-mm diameter hole to provide atmospheric air exchange between successive N<sub>2</sub>O flux measurements. Distilled water (<sup>w</sup>) was added (once per wk) to maintain the initial SM moisture content at 0.3 g H<sub>2</sub>O g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil during the oxic period. After 43 days, jars were sealed with air-tight lids and the headspace air was replaced by a N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere enriched with 10 % (v/v) of acetylene from calcium carbide.

### 3.3.4.2 The sealed-jar methods $(S/S^+ \text{ and } S/S^-)$

The sealed-jar methods refer to the  $S/S^+$  and  $S/S^-$  methods were incubation occurred in jars continuously left closed. The  $S/S^+$  method involved sealing jars with an air-tight lid immediately after adding amendments so  $O_2$  in the headspace was gradually consumed by microorganisms. When the  $O_2$  concentration in jar headspace reached 5%, the headspace was flushed with a  $N_2$  atmosphere enriched with 10 % (v/v) of acetylene produced from calcium carbide. The  $O_2$  threshold value of 5% was based on pre-tests and previous literature (Morley et al., 2008), which aimed at preventing high denitrification rates in localized soil microsites with reduced  $O_2$  during the oxic phase and to synchronize replicates entering in the anoxic phase. Because soil amendments impacted  $O_2$  consumption, the duration of the oxic phase varied from 3 to 15 d (Table 3). In contrast to the  $O^w/S^+$  method, the transition from the oxic phase to the anoxic phase occurred steadily in the S/S<sup>+</sup> method. The S/S<sup>-</sup> method followed the same method as the S/S<sup>+</sup> method except that the anoxic event was accomplished by flushing the headspace with N<sub>2</sub> that did not contain acetylene (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>).

#### 3.3.5 Measurement of headspace gases (N<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub>)

#### 3.3.5.1 Frequency of gaseous measurements

During the first oxic phase under the  $O^w/S^+$ ,  $N_2O$  and  $CO_2$  concentrations in headspace gas were measured as follows: 0h, 3h and 6h after adding amendments, then 4 times during the first wk (25h, 48h, 71h and 168h), twice in the second wk (220h and 340h) and once every two wk (528h and 700h). From the moment that the anoxic event occurred,  $N_2O$  concentration was measured as follows: 5 times in the wk following the anoxic event (1032h, 1034h, 1037h, 1055h and 1080h after amendment addition), then 2 times in the next 2 wks (1103h, 1176h, 1273h and 1396h) and 4 times during the last 5 wks (1607h, 1727h, 1944h and 2207h).

During the oxic phase under the sealed-jar methods (S/S<sup>+</sup> and S/S<sup>-</sup>), N<sub>2</sub>O, O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were measured at preset frequencies until the O<sub>2</sub> concentration in jar headspace reached 5%, and those were: Oh, 3h and 6h after amendment addition, 6 times

during the first wk (23h, 46h, 71h, 118h, 142h and 166h) and 3 times the following week (215h, 335h and 359h). After a  $N_2$  flush with  $C_2H_2$ , headspace gas was sampled from 1 to 3 times during the first 3 d, then at least once a wk until the end of the incubation. After a  $N_2$  flush without  $C_2H_2$ , headspace gas was sampled at least 2 times per d while  $N_2O$  emission increased, then once per d until the measured  $N_2O$  concentration was below 0.1 ppm.

#### 3.3.5.2 Techniques for N<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> measurements

For each method, soil gaseous emissions were measured using closed flux chambers and calculated by integrating of soil-surface gaseous fluxes with time. Soil-surface gaseous fluxes were expressed in  $\mu$ g gas kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil h<sup>-1</sup> and calculated following the <u>equation (6)</u>:

$$F_{gas} = \frac{dC_{gas}}{dt} \times \frac{V}{M} \times \frac{Mm}{Mv}$$
(6)

where  $\frac{dC_{gas}}{dt}$  (mol gas mol<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) is the rate of change of headspace gas concentration in one h, V (m<sup>3</sup>) is the jar headspace volume, M (kg) is the mass of dry soil contained in a jar, Mm (mg mol<sup>-1</sup>) is the molecular weight of gas, Mv (m<sup>3</sup>mol<sup>-1</sup>) is the air molecular volume, accounting for temperature in the room before sealing the jar (0.022 to 0.024 m<sup>3</sup>mol<sup>-1</sup>). The gaseous emissions were calculated by assuming a linear change in gas concentrations within the jar with time. Hourly gaseous fluxes were then integrated over time under incubation with the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup> method, whereas hourly gaseous concentrations were then integrated over time with incubations in sealed jars (O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>, S/S<sup>+</sup>, S/S<sup>-</sup>).

#### 3.3.5.2.1 Techniques for gaseous measurements with the opened-jar method

Before closing the jar, a fan was placed vertically above the jar opening for 5 sec to mix headspace gases. Jars were closed with a gas-tight lid fitted with a two 1-way male luer stopcock. Samples of headspace gas were taken by inserting a needle fitted to a polypropylene syringe (20 mL; Becton Dickinson, Rutherford, NJ) through one stopcock equipped with a rubber septum. Before removing the 20 mL headspace gas sample, the other stopcock was opened so an equivalent volume of ambient air would enter the headspace and ensure constant pressure. Headspace gas was sampled at 0 and 60 min after closing the jar and injected into preevacuated vials (12-mL Exetainer, Labco, High Wycombe, UK). After gas sampling, lids were removed, jars were aerated (room atmosphere) and gas-filled vials were stored for analysis.

#### 3.3-5.2.2 Techniques for gaseous measurements with the sealed-jar method

The closed chamber flux measured directly from sealed jars through the gas-tight lid fitted with two 1-way male luer stopcocks. One stopcock was equipped with a rubber septum for gas sampling. The other stopcock was tightly connected through a Bev-A-Line IV tube (1/8"ID x 1/4"OD) to a gas sampling bag (Kynar polyvinylidene fluoride bag, Cole-Parmer, Montreal, Canada) filled with He. Samples of headspace gas were taken by inserting a needle fitted to a polypropylene syringe (20 mL; Becton Dickinson) through one stopcock equipped with a rubber septum. Before removing the 20 mL headspace gas sample, the other stopcock was opened to replenish the headspace with He and ensure constant pressure. The dilution effect (from the gas) was accounted for in calculations. The gaseous sample was injected into pre-evacuated vials (12-mL Exetainer, Labco). After gas sampling, jars were left sealed and gas-filled vials were stored for analysis. 3.3-5.3 Gaseous measurements – Analytical procedures

Vials containing headspace gas sampled during oxic phases were analyzed for N<sub>2</sub>O, O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations within 1 wk by means of a gas chromatograph equipped with electron capture, thermal conductivity and flame ionization detectors (Model 3800, Varian Inc., Walnut Creek, CA) through a headspace autoinjector (Combi Pal, CTC Analytics, Zurich, Switzerland). Vials with gas sampled during anoxic phases were analyzed for N<sub>2</sub>O and O<sub>2</sub> concentrations within 1 wk with the same gas chromatograph, except that vials containing C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> were analyzed separately within 4 to 6 wk. Because of gaseous (N<sub>2</sub>O and C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>) adsorption on rubber septa of vials derived from C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>-treated jars, these septa were withdrawn from laboratory circulation to prevent cross contamination.

#### 3.3-6 Indices of the potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions

The N<sub>2</sub>O producing potentials of various OAs added to the Kamouraska clay soil can be compared using the N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor,  $EF_{N_2O}$ . The  $EF_{N_2O}$  expressed as the % of total N applied from a particular OA, was calculated following the equation (1):

$$EF_{N_2O} = \frac{\left[(N_2O - N_{treatment}) - (N_2O - N_{control})\right]}{N_{applied}} \times 100$$
(1)

where  $N_2O-N_{treatment}$  is the total  $N_2O$  emissions from the soil-amendment mixture (mg N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil) at the end of the oxic/anoxic phase and  $N_2O-N_{control}$  is the total oxic/anoxic  $N_2O$  emissions from the unamended soil (mg N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil).  $EF_{N_2O}$  was calculated for each method on the entire oxic period ( $N_2O_{OXIC}$ ). Because there were short periods of time between  $N_2O$  pulses during the oxic phase,  $EF_{N_2O}$  was also calculated on a shorter period (0-72 h) in the oxic

incubation ( $N_2O_{0-72h}$ ).  $EF_{N_2O}$  was calculated for each method on the entire anoxic period ( $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ ). The anoxic emission rate of N<sub>2</sub>O ( $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ ) was also calculated by linear regression and expressed in % of N applied h<sup>-1</sup>, after correction for the emission rate in the unamended soil.

#### 3.3-7 Soil analysis

Soil mineral N (NH<sub>4</sub>-N and NO<sub>3</sub>-N) concentration and moisture content were determined at the end of the preincubation (n=2) and at the end of the first oxic phase by destructive sampling of replicates destined for soil analysis (n=84 jars). At the end of the 92 d incubation, all jars were opened; the soil-amendment mixture was homogenized and sub-sampled for mineral N and moisture content determination. Soil mineral N was extracted by shaking 25 g of fresh soil with 125 mL of 1 M KCl for 1h, and the soil extract was analyzed with an automated continuous flow colorimeter (Model Quick-Chem 8000 FIA+, Lachat Instruments, Loveland, CO).

#### 3.3-8 Statistical analysis

To test the fixed effect of methods on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions ( $N_2O_{OXIC}$ ,  $N_2O_{0-72h}$ ,  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ ,  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ ) for each amendment, analysis of variance with heterogeneous variances was performed using the MIXED procedure of SAS (Version 9.2, SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Differences between methods or between amendments were evaluated with a Tukey-Kramer multiple comparisons test (P < 0.05). Precision of measurements was investigated using the relative standard deviation (RSD) (Russow et al, 1996). Relationships between  $N_2O_{OXIC}$ ,  $N_2O_{0-72h}$ ,  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  and  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ , soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and chemical properties of amendments were evaluated with the CORR procedure and expressed as Spearman correlation coefficients

because of a non-normal distribution of data. For all methods, least squares regressions were used to describe the functional relationship between soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentration at the end of the oxic phase and soil N<sub>2</sub>O emitted during the anoxic phase (Sigma Plot version 12.0: Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA).

#### 3.4 Results

#### 3.4-1 Oxic phase

#### 3.4-1.1 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and cumulative losses

The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions showed immediate response to amendment addition with  $\geq$  50% of the total oxic emissions occurring during the first 72 h of incubation (Fig. 1). However, temporal patterns of emissions differed among OAs and between incubation methods. Cumulative emissions at the end of the incubation period of the S methods (3 to 15 d) were similar to those observed at the same incubation time in the O method for the CTL, SMC, WSR and IF treatments but 1.1, 2.3 and 1.4 times greater for AR, PM and PS, respectively. With the O/S<sup>+</sup>, N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates declined after 72 h, and OA-enhanced emissions were back to the CTL level within 7 d.

#### 3.4-1.2 Variation in the N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor

Compared to the O method, the  $N_2O_{72h}$  and  $N_2O_{0XIC}$  indices in the S methods were greater for the AR, PM and PS treatments but similar for the IF, WSR and SMC treatments (Table 4). The incubation method did not affect IF whereas it affected  $N_2O_{72h}$  and  $N_2O_{0XIC}$  of OAs (Table 4). Both O and S methods provide similar  $N_2O_{72h}$  and  $N_2O_{0XIC}$  for low- and very lowdecomposability OAs (WSR, SMC), whereas the S method yielded significant higher  $N_2O_{72h}$  and  $N_2O_{0XIC}$  for OAs with higher decomposability (AR, PM, PS). The  $N_2 O_{72h}^{\theta}$  and  $N_2 O_{0XIC}^{\theta}$  indices provided equivalent information: only PM addition led to a significantly higher  $N_2 O_{72h}$  and  $N_2 O_{0XIC}$  (Table 5). In contrast, all class I OAs led to significantly higher  $N_2 O$  oxic indices using the S method but their relative classification slightly differed between 72 h and the whole oxic period due to 2.3 to 2.6 greater  $N_2 O_{0XIC}^S$  for the WSR and the IF treatments (Table 5). Because the first 72 hours offered the common time frame between methods that allowed comparing all OAs in oxic conditions with 50% of the total oxic cumulative  $N_2 O$  emissions occurring during this time,  $N_2 O_{0.72h}$  was used for further comparison between and within methods. Precision of  $N_2 O_{72h}$  varied between methods with relative standard deviation (RSD) from the AR- and PS-amended soils 2.4 and 1.7 greater with the O than with the S methods (Table 4). In contrast, RSD of  $N_2 O_{72h}$  in the PM-amended soils decreased by a factor of 2.5 with the O compared to the S method. For all incubation methods, RSD of  $N_2 O_{72h}$  in the WSR- and SMC-amended soils exceeded 67% (Table 4).

#### 3.4-1.3 N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor, OA properties and soil measurements

No OA properties were correlated to  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  with the O method (Table 6). In contrast, the S methods yielded correlations between  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  and the  $N_{min}/N_{org}$  (r = + 0.62 and r = +0.72 respectively, n = 20, *P* <0.01 and *P* <0.001), and between  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  and the DOC:(C-DOC) ratios (r = + 0.63 and r = +0.74 respectively, n = 20, *P* <0.01). The  $N_2O_{72h}$  index was significantly correlated with C/N and Lignin/N ratios in one of the two S methods (r = - 0.50, n = 20, *P* <0.05). Similarly, cumulative soil N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were correlated in the S methods (r = + 0.669 and r = +0.613 respectively, n = 20, *P* <0.01), but not with the O method. At the end of the oxic phase, soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations were greater for all treatments except WSR (Table A3-2-1).

Within methods, greater soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations were present at the end of the oxic phase in control jars compared to all amended soils, except WSR (Table A3-2-1).

#### 3.4-2 Anoxic phase

#### 3.4-2.1 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and cumulative losses

The total amount of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emitted (in oxic and anoxic phases) in the CTL jars after 92 d reached 16799±1436, 16207 ± 1018 and 1682 ± 410 mg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil in the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>, S/S<sup>+</sup> and S/S<sup>-</sup> methods, respectively. The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from amended soils showed immediate response to free-O<sub>2</sub> flush (using N<sub>2</sub>) with their maximum occurring within 92, 58, and 21 d of incubation in the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>, S/S<sup>+</sup> and S/S<sup>-</sup> methods, respectively (Fig. 1). In absence of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> (S/S<sup>-</sup>), the period required for headspace N<sub>2</sub>O to be consumed varied between 24 h (WSR) to 23 d (IF). In presence of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> (S/S<sup>+</sup>), N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations were greater than those measured with S/S<sup>-</sup> and reached a plateau followed by a slow gradual decline for all treatments (Fig. 1).

Compared to the CTL, the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>, S/S<sup>+</sup> and S/S<sup>-</sup> methods increased N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in the IF treatment by a factor of 5.5, 7.8 and 15.8, respectively, and decreased N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in the WSR treatment by a factor of 14.9, 2.9 and 7.6, respectively (P < 0.05). In the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup> method, cumulative emissions after 92 d increased significantly with the addition of AR, PM and PS by factors of 2.5, 4.5 and 2.9, respectively, relative to the CTL (P < 0.05). In contrast, the S/S<sup>+</sup> method did not increase N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in jars amended with highly-decomposable OAs (AR, PM, PS) above those observed in the CTL jars. The O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup> method allows for a 3 to 14 longer oxic period than the S/S<sup>+</sup> method, and jars amended with highly-decomposable OAs (AR, PM, PS) emitted about 5 times more soil N<sub>2</sub>O during the anoxic phase.

3.4-2.2 Variation in the N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXMAX</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXRATE</sub> indices

Compared to the S/S<sup>+</sup> method, estimates of  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  in jars that were kept opened for 40 d during the oxic phase (O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup>) were lower for WSR and IF, similar for SMC, and greater for AR, PM and PS (Table 4). However, the maximum N<sub>2</sub>O emission was reached earlier in the S/S<sup>+</sup> methods. For jars that were sealed during the oxic period, the addition of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> to the headspace (S/S<sup>+</sup>) resulted in approximately 2-fold greater  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  than with C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>-free air (S/S<sup>-</sup>) and 32 to 369% greater  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  or similar  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  for the IF treatment (Table 4). Anoxic phases of all three methods highlighted the potential of WSR, but not the other OAs, in reducing N<sub>2</sub>O emissions compared to CTL jars.

The O/S<sup>+</sup> method was better at controlling  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  precision in amended jars with up to 10-fold lower RSD value than the S/S<sup>+</sup> method for the PS treatment. The S/S<sup>+</sup> method was the best at controlling  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  precision with up to a 42-fold lower RSD value than the O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup> method for the AR treatment. Regardless of the method, the  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  of the SMC treatment and the  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  of the WSR treatment were highly variable, with RSD averaging 168±148 and 96 ± 54% respectively (Table 4).

#### 3.4-2.3 N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXMAX</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>ANOXRATE</sub>, OA properties and soil measurements

Estimates of anoxic indices correlated to several OA characteristics. Values of  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  from all methods correlated to the C/N, Lignin/N,  $N_{min}/N_{org}$  and DOC/(C-DOC) ratios (Table 6). Among the three methods, the S/S<sup>-</sup> method yielded highest correlations between both anoxic indices and the Lignin/N,  $N_{min}/N_{org}$  and DOC/(C-DOC) ratios whereas in the S/S<sup>+</sup>

method,  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  was only correlated to the  $N_{min}/N_{org}$  and DOC/(C-DOC) ratios. No correlation was established with the O/S<sup>+</sup> method between  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  and OA properties.

Values of  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  were related to the soil NO<sub>3</sub> concentration generated from OA decomposition during the oxic phase with the best linear fit obtained with from the O/S+ method (Fig. 2). In the S/S<sup>+</sup> method,  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  values were positively correlated to the soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux at the onset of the anoxic event (Spearman correlation, r = 0.79478, *P* < 0.001) with the best linear fit obtained with from the S/S<sup>+</sup> method (Fig. 3). The most striking difference in  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  values were observed with the S methods for the WSR treatment that reached 5454 ± 2269 or -2028±3043 mg N kg<sup>-1</sup> N applied h<sup>-1</sup> in presence or absence of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>, respectively (Table 4).

#### 3.5 Discussion

The three methods tested in this study included an oxic and an anoxic phase, in line with the strong impact of redox potential on N<sub>2</sub>O-producing reactions in soils. The impact of protocol differences on creating oxic and anoxic conditions are discussed and involved whether jars were sealed or kept open during the oxic phase, the duration of each phase, and the use of  $C_2H_2$  during the anoxic phase.

#### 3.5-1 Sealed vs. opened jars during the oxic phase

Compared to the open-jar system, sealing jars provided greater  $N_2O_{72h}$  estimates for most OAs, a better discrimination between OAs and higher correlations between  $N_2O_{72h}$  with OA properties. Possible explanations for the greater expression of this potential in S methods include: a better temporal integration of emissions with the S method; a decreased redox

79

potential at the active microsites. Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O are notoriously episodic and short peaks of emissions may have been missed with the intermittent monitoring of the open-jar system (See Fig. A3-2). Occurrence of these peaks may have been greater when highly decomposable organic materials were added, resulting in greater underestimation using the periodic sampling of the O method. Greater CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (72 h) observed in the sealed than open chambers for the soils amended with class I OAs (P<0.05), (data not shown) provide additional support for an incomplete temporal integration of gas emissions by the open method. The redox potential at the active microsites is mostly determined by the rate at which O<sub>2</sub> is consumed and that at which it is replenished. The replacement of consumed  $O_2$  at the active microsites depends on the concentration gradient and the resistance to  $O_2$  diffusion. Soil properties that determine gas diffusivity (bulk density and water content) were identical in both methods and differences in gas resistance are unlikely. In contrast, sealing jars resulted in a gradual decrease in O2 concentration that likely resulted in lower O<sub>2</sub> concentration at the outer boundary of the soil aggregates in sealed compared to open-jars, and associated slower O<sub>2</sub> diffusion towards the active microsites. The combination of slower O<sub>2</sub> diffusion and greater or equal respiration rates (see above) in sealed than in open jars suggest that lower redox potential occurred at the soil active microsites in the sealed than in the open jars. Our results therefore support that higher  $N_2O_{72h}$  in sealed than in open jars resulted from a decreased redox potential at the active microsites that promoted greater N<sub>2</sub>O yield of nitrification and greater denitrification rates, especially where OAs with greater decomposability (class I) were added. The progressive decline of O<sub>2</sub> below ambient level in the headspace of the sealed-jar system permits greater

measurements of the potential of class I OAs in enhancing soil N<sub>2</sub>O on a short period of time using the  $N_2O_{72h}^S$  index, which is not possible with the O method.

Concentration in O2 and redox potential decreased with time following the sealing of jars and it is legitimate to ask how these changes affected net N<sub>2</sub>O production. Accumulation of N<sub>2</sub>O in sealed-jar headspace increased linearly with decreasing O<sub>2</sub> concentration for all treatments, except PM for which  $N_2O$  concentrations increased non-linearly (Fig. A3-1). This indicates that for most situations, the net  $N_2O$  production did not differ drastically along the range of redox potential resulting of O<sub>2</sub> depletion from 21 to 5%. The rate of O<sub>2</sub> consumption in PM-amended soils wasn't the fastest among class 1 OAs, thus, such nonlinear N<sub>2</sub>O response could not be entirely explained by lower redox potentials in PM-amended soils compared to other class 1 OAs with the S methods, as  $O_2$  uptake was faster in AR and PS (72 h) than in PM (120 h) treatments (Fig. 1). We hypothesize that the non-linear response of N<sub>2</sub>O emission to O<sub>2</sub> levels in PM is the result of a release of NH<sub>4</sub>-N from the mineralization of uric acid and urea that occurred following incorporation into soil. Therefore, the different response of PM would be related to variations in mineral N supply to N<sub>2</sub>O producing processes rather than by factors related to C dynamics or redox potential. High N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the PM-amended soil, observed in the S methods but not in the O method, are in agreement with especially increased emissions in field situations where PM applications were often found to increase soil N<sub>2</sub>O production rates more than mineral fertilizers (Thornton et al., 1998; Akiyama et al., 2003; Dong et al., 2005; Jones et al., 2007; Pelster et al., 2012).

In controlled conditions, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were positively correlated to inorganic N and easily mineralizable N and C contents in linquid pig (Velthof et al., 2003) and sheep manure (Cardenas et al., 2007), and in N-rich crop residues (Chaves et al., 2005). By contrast, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were positively correlated to C/N ratios (wheat straw residues, saw dust, composts) of manure, slurries or N-rich crop residues (Huang et al., 2004). Thus, that the  $N_2O_{72h}$  estimated using the S method (but not those obtained with the O method) correlated with several OAs characteristics suggests that the S method provides conditions that better favor the expression of OAs potential for N<sub>2</sub>O emission. Finally, sealing the jar with the S method presented the following advantages (Table 7a):

- the method was sensitive to short-lived pulses of class I OA-induced  $N_2O$  emissions with a good integration of soil  $N_2O$  emissions;

- the method did not require soil water monitoring, minimizing possible perturbations (Mikha et al., 2005);

- the method provided a better discrimination between  $N_2O_{72h}$  indices of OAs, probably due to transient conditions from oxic to anoxic (Liang et al., 1996);

- the method is fast and economical for N<sub>2</sub>O monitoring.

3.5-2 Duration of the oxic phase

For each method, we investigated whether the first 72 h of incubation provided enough information for ranking OAs related to their potential to enhance soil  $N_2O$  emissions, or if measurements during the whole oxic period were necessary. The oxic phase for the S method

82

did not exceed 14 d and the OA rankings based on  $N_2O_{oxic}$  and  $N_2O_{72h}$  were similar, except for the IF and SMC treatments whose variability of  $N_2O_{oxic}$  was greater than that of  $N_2O_{72h}$  with a mean 2.2 and 1.3 fold increase in RSD values, respectively. For the O method, the OA-induced  $N_2O$  emissions were not sustained beyond 7 d following OA addition (Fig. A3-2) and  $N_2O_{72h}$ captured most of the OA  $N_2O$  potential with similar OA rankings based on  $N_2O_{oxic}$  and  $N_2O_{72h}$ . Moreover, the variability of  $N_2O_{oxic}$  was greater than that of  $N_2O_{72h}$  with a mean 2.2 fold increase in RDS values of all treatments. Therefore, extending the oxic period beyond 72 h did not bring additional information about the oxic potential of tested OAs to enhance soil  $N_2O$ emissions for both methods.

The  $O^{W}/S^+$  method maintained oxic conditions during 29 d that favored OA decomposition, mineralization, nitrification and build-up of soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> for an extended period of time, before an anoxic event occurred that could trigger soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Whereas a short oxic phase (72-h) was efficient for capturing the oxic N<sub>2</sub>O potential, extending the duration of the oxic phase had major impacts on the anoxic N<sub>2</sub>O potential. We investigated whether the impact of oxic phase duration reflected in  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  and  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  indices could be explained by changes induced by OA addition on soil mineral N and C availability. The  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  index was related to soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N concentrations at the end of the oxic phase and expressed in % of N applied (Fig. 2), and the  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}^{OW}$  was generally greater than the  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}^{S/S^+}$  as the longer oxic phase in the O method allowed for greater mineralization and accumulation of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> than in the S method. A better discrimination of OA using  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  was also obtained in the O than in the S method, in part because of the greater mineralization but also because of a larger NO<sub>3</sub> immobilization in WSR-amended jars than the S method prior to
the anoxic cycle (Table A3-2-1). When C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> efficiently inhibits the N<sub>2</sub>O reductase, the amount of N<sub>2</sub>O-N emitted in anoxic conditions should correspond to the amount of soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>N present at the onset of the anoxic phase (Yoshinari et al., 1977). The slope (0.95 N<sub>2</sub>O-N/soil NO<sub>3</sub>N) of the linear relationship for the O/S<sup>+</sup> method (Fig. 2a) is in agreement with these expected results. In contrast, the S/S<sup>+</sup> method yielded  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  values 1.9±0.6 times greater than the soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N accumulated at the onset of the anoxic phase. Similar observations have also been reported occasionally in sealed-bottle incubations of silty loam soil mixed with wheat straw or alfalfa residues and fertilized with KNO<sub>3</sub> (deCatanzaro et al., 1987). Total gaseous products of denitrification were also shown to exceed the amounts of initial NO<sub>3</sub>-N substrates in a soil amended with Ca(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sup>2</sup> (Yeomans and Beauchamp, 1981). It is unclear why this unbalance between soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and soil N<sub>2</sub>O emitted in the anoxic phase was observed following IF addition in the  $S/S^+$  but not in the  $O/S^+$  method. The soil  $NH_4^+$  concentration increased in both  $S/S^+$  and  $O^{\text{w}}/S^{\text{+}}$  methods during the anoxic phase, indicating that N transformations other than denitrification occurred. Possible explanations for a N<sub>2</sub>O-N/NO<sub>3</sub>-N ratio >1 include: (1) Shortlived ammonification/nitrification occurred if residual O2 was present in soil early after flush of jars with N<sub>2</sub>, and greater amounts of easily decomposable C could have been available following the shorter oxic phase in the  $S/S^+$  method, (2) greater co-denitrification in IF-amended soils with the  $S/S^+$  than with the  $O/S^+$  method, possibly fueled by N substrates originating from the soil organic matter resulting in 2 mol of N<sub>2</sub>O produced per 2 mol NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (Spott et al., 2011).

Whereas  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  is determined by the size of the soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> pool,  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  is expected to reflect the impact of the amount of easily decomposable organic C on the denitrification rate. Accordingly,  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  was greater for the S/S<sup>+</sup> than for the O/S<sup>+</sup> method because the 3 to 14 times longer oxic phase of the  $O/S^+$  method allowed for the oxidation of a greater part of the OAs' degradable organic substrates. This is in line with the close correlation between  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  and the  $CO_2$  flux at the onset of the anoxic phase with the  $S/S^+$  but not with the  $O^w/S^+$  method (Fig. 3). Therefore, we expect  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  would increase with increasing amounts of decomposable C in OAs and would decrease as the duration of the oxic phase increases (with time since OA application).

## 3.5-3 The use of $C_2H_2$

Without the use of acetylene (S/S<sup>-</sup>),  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  was approximately 3.8 times smaller than the soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> present prior to the anoxic phase (Fig. 2c). This finding is in line with the reduction of some of the N<sub>2</sub>O produced as the NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> became more scarce (Senbayram et al., 2012). The relationship between  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  and the soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N was not linear mostly because of increased  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  values for the IF treatment (Fig. 2c). Relationship between  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  and OA-induced NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> was similar between the S/S<sup>-</sup> and the S/S<sup>+</sup> method but presented a lower slope without C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> (Fig. 2b et 2c).

#### **3.6 Conclusion**

Three methods of assessing the potential N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils with OAs were evaluated and comparative evaluations of oxic and anoxic phases were summarized in Tables 7a and 7b, respectively. In oxic conditions that do not exceed 14 d, the two S methods reflected the shortterm potential of OAs to promote soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions 72 h after their incorporation, presumably due to the rapid depletion of O<sub>2</sub> in sealed jars. In contrast, the O method maintained oxic conditions during 29 d that favored OA decomposition, mineralization, nitrification and build-up

of soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> for an extended period of time, before an anoxic event occurred that could trigger soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. In the oxic phase, the S and O methods showed different patterns of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, and the magnitude of N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes was 1.1 to 2.3 times greater with the S methods than the O method. From O to 72h of incubation, the sealed-jar system was judged more sensitive than the open-jar system to short-lived pulses of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions caused by the addition of OAs with high decomposability. The progressive decline of O2 below ambient level in the headspace of the sealed-jar system permits evaluation of OAs role in enhancing soil  $N_2O$ in a  $O_2$ -limited environment (oxic phase ceased at 5%  $O_2$  concentration), which is not possible with the O method. However, the S methods had a limited oxic phase (about 72 h) when testing OAs with high respiratory demand and the rapid depletion of headspace O2 necessitated continuous monitoring of headspace gas concentrations. This is a constraint to testing OAs with a broad range of chemical properties using the S method. An alternative technique would involve aerating the sealed-jar system after 72 h and relying on repeated 72-h measurement periods with the S method to assess the short-term (72-h) and medium-term (multiple 72-h periods) potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with the  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  index.

We considered that both oxic and anoxic conditions were necessary to adequately assess the potential of OAs to enhance soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions because oxic conditions favor the accumulation of substrates for N<sub>2</sub>O production in soil, while anoxic conditions (e.g., after a rainfall event) trigger substrate consumption through denitrifier activity (Sextone et al., 1985; Baggs et al., 2000). The duration of the oxic phase altered the magnitude of the OA effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions under anoxia, as reflected in the two indices  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  (magnitude of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions) and  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  (speed of N<sub>2</sub>O response). The O<sup>w</sup>/S<sup>+</sup> method provided the highest degree of discrimination between OAs according to  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  because the extended oxic period (up to 43 days) allowed for accumulation of mineral N prior to the anoxic cycle, as evidenced by the correlation between mineral N and  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}^{OW/S^+}$  (r=0.957, P<0.05). With the S methods, anoxic conditions were induced by heterotrophic respiration in the sealed-jar system and were related to the amount of C from OAs that was oxidized during a short oxic phase (72 to 336 h). The  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}^{S/S^+}$  index was correlated with the soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux at the end of the oxic phase and thus, was an indicator of C availability to microorganisms.

Table 1. Selected physico-chemical properties of a Kamouraska clay soil (0-20 cm) used for the development of a standard met	thod
for soil N <sub>2</sub> O emission	

Paramete	er	Mean	(SD)							
Texture										
Clay	g kg⁻¹ DM	559.6								
Silt	g kg⁻¹ DM	373.3								
Sand	g kg⁻¹ DM	67.1								
Before pr	e-incubation									
С	g kg⁻¹ DM	36.3	(0.0)							
Ν	g kg⁻¹ DM	2.7	(0.0)							
DOC	mg kg <sup>-1</sup> DM	29.6	(2.1)							
NO <sub>3</sub> -N	mg kg⁻¹ DM	19.2	(0.6)							
NH <sub>4</sub> -N	mg kg⁻¹ DM	0.7	(0.4)							
After the 1-wk pre-incubation										
NO <sub>3</sub> -N	mg kg⁻¹ DM	3.8	(2.8)							
NH <sub>4</sub> -N	mg kg⁻¹ DM	2.7	(0.2)							

C, total C content measured by dry combustion (Model TruSpec CN, Leco Corp., St-Joseph, MI)

**N**, total N content measured by dry combustion except for the N in pig slurry determined by acid digestion (Isaac and Johnson, 1976)

**DOC**, dissolved organic carbon (distilled water) measured with a Formacs TOC/TN analyzer (Skalar, Breda, The Netherlands)

NO<sub>3</sub>-N and NH<sub>4</sub>-N, nitrate and ammonium concentrations (KCl 1M) measured with an automated continuous flow colorimeter (Model Quick-Chem 8000 FIA+, Lachat Instruments, Loveland, CO).

#### Table 2. Chemical composition and application rate of soil amendments used for the development of a standard method for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emission

(in parenthesis are standard deviation values, n=3)

Amendment	Abbr		Chemical properties							Application rates <sup>b</sup>		Quality class <sup>c</sup>	
					g kg <sup>-1</sup> DM g gk <sup>-1</sup>				g gk <sup>-1</sup>	mg-N kg <sup>-1</sup> dry soil	kg-N ha⁻¹	Category د	Decomposition rate <sup>c</sup>
		C:N	с	Ν	DOC	NO₃-N	NH₄-N	L	DM				
NH <sub>4</sub> NO <sub>3</sub>	IF		nd	343	nd	77.10 <sup>ª</sup>	266.80 <sup>a</sup>	nd	996 (0.0)	73	120		
Pig slurry	PS	6	439 (1)	75.64 (0)	106.2 (18.7)	0.03 (0.01)	46.79 (4.48)	2 (0)	53 (0.2)	101	165	I	High
Alfalfa residues	AR	9	437 (0)	49 (0)	nd	35.84 (0.69)	4.17 (0.06)	8 (0)	144 (0.1)	73	120	I	High
Poultry manure	РМ	10	414 (8)	41 (2)	89.2 (4.3)	0.00 (0.00)	11.74 (0.08)	44 (2)	565 (0.2)	73	120	I	High
Sheep manure compost	SMC	30	278 (5)	9 (0)	1.0 (0.0)	0.02 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	188 (1)	394 (0.4)	73	120	IV	Very Low
Wheat straw residues	WSR	140	491 (1)	4 (0)	15.5 (0.5)	0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.02)	120 (12)	961 (0.2)	11	18	Ш	Low

DM, dry matter

**C**, total C content measured by dry combustion (Model TruSpec CN, Leco Corp., St-Joseph, MI)

N, total N content measured by dry combustion except for the N in pig slurry determined by acid digestion (Isaac and Johnson, 1976)

DOC, dissolved organic carbon (distilled water) measured with a Formacs TOC/TN analyzer (Skalar, Breda, The Netherlands)

NO3-N and NH4-N, nitrate and ammonium concentrations (1M KCI) measured with an automated continuous flow colorimeter

(Model Quick-Chem 8000 FIA+, Lachat Instruments, Loveland, CO).

L, lignin fraction calculated as L= ADF-C

nd, not determined

<sup>a</sup> Estimation based on the chemical properties given by the manufacturer (Sigma-Aldrich).

<sup>b</sup> Application rates were N-based and representative of agronomic rates (CRAAQ, 2003).

<sup>c</sup> Organic resource quality classification according to Palm et al. (2001) and Chivenge et al. (2011).

Table 3. Incubation parameters of four laboratory methods proposed to evaluate the  $N_2O$  producing potential from soils receiving organic amendments.

	The opened-jar methods (O)	The sealed-jar methods (S)									
Method	opened/sealed jar	sealed jar without $C_2H_2$	sealed jar with $C_2H_2$								
(Abbreviation)	(O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺)	(S/S <sup>-</sup> )	(S/S ⁺)								
	43 days	3 to 15 d	days								
	Opened jar	Sealed	jar								
Oxic phase	Constant soil moisture	Constant soil	moisture								
	70% of field capacity <sup>‡</sup>	70 % of field capacity $^{\dagger}$									
	70% of held capacity	headspace $O_2$ concentration: 21 $\rightarrow$ 5 vol% $O_2$									
	49 days	77 to 89 days									
Anoxic event	Sealed jar Constant soil moisture 70% of field capacity <sup>†</sup> Sealed jar Constant soil moisture 70 % of field capacity <sup>†</sup>										
	$N_2$ Flush at 10 vol% $C_2H_2$	$N_2$ Flush at 10 vol% $C_2H_2$	N <sub>2</sub> Flush								
<sup>†</sup> The field capac	tity of the incubated soil co	prrespond to a gravimetric	soil moisture content								
of 0.43 g $H_2O$ g <sup>-1</sup> dry soil.											
<sup>1</sup> The O <sup>d</sup> /O <sup>w-</sup> method has been adapted from the dry-wet soil cycle method of Velthof et											
al. (2003).	al. (2003).										

		Oxic phase			Anoxic phase					
Amendment*	Method+	<b>N</b> 2 <b>O</b> 0-72h		N <sub>2</sub> O	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>OXIC</sub>		N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>ANOXRATE</sub>		OXMAX	
			mg	N kg⁻¹ N		mg N kg⁻¹	N applied	% of N	annlied	
			ар	oplied		h	-1	70 OT N	applied	
IF	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	459 a	(76)	1149 a	(885)	267 b	(282)	72.9 b	(7.6)	
	$S/S^+$	529 a	(96)	1059 a	(510)	1241 a	(395)	102.5 a	(18.4)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	602 a	(265)	1924 a	(1497)	1398 ab	(725)	37.2 c	(5.9)	
AR	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	340 b	(125)	922 a	(519)	284 c	(302)	34.7 a	(6.1)	
	$S/S^+$	1199 a	(245)	1435 a	(316)	6268 a	(159)	8.0 b	(1.2)	
	S/S⁻	1242 a	(137)	1499 a	(167)	4740 b	(838)	6.5 b	(1.9)	
PM	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	927 b	(92)	1328 b	(273)	607 c	(231)	63.8 a	(6.2)	
	$S/S^+$	1555 a	(301)	4042 a	(713)	5268 a	(472)	7.6 b	(3.5)	
	s/s⁻	1551								
	5/5	ab	(518)	3783 a	(1098)	3260 b	(326)	2.2 c	(1.2)	
PS	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	272 b	(83)	337 b	(216)	374 c	(124)	20.7 a	(1.6)	
	S/S⁺	907 a	(140)	1018 a	(162)	4862 a	(279)	2.7 b	(2.1)	
	S/S⁻	791 a	(152)	777 a	(154)	3654 b	(749)	5.5 b	(0.5)	
SMC	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	172 a	(125)	242 a	(300)	359 b	(234)	-3.4 b	(1.5)	
	$S/S^+$	30 a	(36)	39 a	(89)	977 a	(230)	-1.7 ab	(2.3)	
	S/S⁻	134 a	(213)	578 a	(748)	521 b	(125)	0.4 a	(1.3)	
WSR	$O^{w}/S^{+}$	452 a	(453)	1219 a	(1502)	-3414 b	(3313)	-151.8 c	(19.5)	
	$S/S^+$	536 a	(504)	937 a	(515)	5454 a	(2269)	-93.9 b	(13.5)	
	S/S⁻	512 a	(174)	1256 a	(227)	-2028 b	(3043)	-14.0 a	(2.5)	

Table 4. Emissions factors of  $N_2O$  during the first 72h, the whole oxic phase and the whole anoxic period, for the Harlaka soil incubation methods.

Means sharing a letter are not significantly different within amendment type by a Tukey-Kramer test ( $\alpha$ =0.05).

In parenthesis are standard deviation values (n=4).

\* See table 2 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table.

+ See table 3 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table.

			0	kic phase	
Method <sup>+</sup>	Amendment*	N <sub>2</sub> C	<b>D</b> <sub>72h</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>0</sub>	Эхіс
			g <sup>-1</sup> N applied		
	PM	927 a	(92)	1328 a	(273)
	IF	459 b	(76)	1149 ab	(885)
	WSR	452 b	(453)	1219 ab	(1502)
0	AR	340 b	(125)	922 ab	(519)
	PS	272 b	(83)	337 b	(216)
	SMC	172 b	(125)	242 b	(300)
	PM	1553 a	(139)	3913 a	(307)
	AR	1221 a	(66)	1467 b	(84)
c	PS	849 b	(53)	897 cd	(69)
5	IF	565 c	(67)	1492 bcd	(401)
	WSR	523 bc	(124)	1200 bc	(115)
	SMC	81 d	(54)	308 d	(202)

Table 5. Comparative classification of organic amendments within methods using  $N_2O_{72h}$  or  $N_2O_{0XIC}$ 

Means sharing a letter are not significantly different within amendment type by a Tukey-Kramer test ( $\alpha$ =0.05).

In parenthesis are standard errors (n=4).

\* See table 2 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table.

+ See table 3 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table.

		Chemical indices of organic amendments								
			Lignin/N			N <sub>min</sub> /N <sub>org</sub>	:	DOC/(C-DOC)		
	Methods	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	S/S⁺	S/S⁻	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	S/S⁺	S/S⁻	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	S/S⁺	S/S⁻
ces	<b>N</b> 2 <b>O</b> 0-72h	ns	ns	-0.50*	ns	0.62**	0.72***	ns	0.63**	0.74**
indi	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>ANOXMAX</sub>	-0.63**	-0.67**	-0.91***	0.63**	0.71***	0.85***	0.58*	0.71***	0.78***
N <sup>2</sup> C	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>ANOXRATE</sub>	ns	ns	-0.80***	ns	0.54*	0.85***	ns	0.54*	0.77***

Table 6. Correlations between emission factors of N<sub>2</sub>O and organic amendments properties (n = 20, Spearman correlation)

 $N_2O_{0-72h}$  and  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  were expressed in % of N applied and were corrected for the emissions of the CTL treatment.

 $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  was expressed in % of N applied h<sup>-1</sup> and was corrected for the emissions of the CTL treatment.

 $N_{\text{min}}$  referred to mineral nitrogen content of OAs.

N<sub>org</sub> referred to organic nitrogen content of OAs.

\* Significant at probability level P < 0.05

\*\* Significant at probability level P < 0.01

\*\*\* Significant at probability level P < 0.001

ns = non-significant

		(1)	Optimum incubation conditions	(2)	Precision <sup>§</sup> and absence of bias	(3)	Easy to run
	(O) poi	-	Less sensitive to short-lived pulses of class I OA-induced $N_2O$ emissions	-	Increased risk of missing N <sub>2</sub> O peaks	-	Soil water content monitoring
	ened-jar meth	-	Poor discrimination between OAs related to the $N_2O_{0-72h}$ index: PM* > other OAs ( $P < 0.05$ )	-	Precision decreased by a factor of 2 after addition of OAs with high $NH_4^+$ content	-	Labor intensive for N <sub>2</sub> O measurements: twice as many vials and gas analyses required for measurements of 1-h N <sub>2</sub> O fluxes.
	The op	-	No correlation between the $N_2O_{0-72h}$ index and OA properties		Precision increased by a factor of 2.5 after addition of $PM^*$		Duration of the oxic phase ≈ 7 d (Time required for enhanced N <sub>2</sub> O emissions back to control level)
OXIC PHASE	The sealed-jar methods (S)	+	Sensitive to short-lived pulses of class I OA-induced $N_2O$ emissions		No risk of missing N <sub>2</sub> O peaks Good integration of soil N <sub>2</sub> O emissions	+	No soil water monitoring
		+	Good discrimination between OAs within method using the $N_2O_{0-72h}$ index: PM, AR > PS $\geq$ WSR > SMC* ( <i>P</i> < 0.05)	_		+	Fast and economical for $N_2O$ monitoring
		+	$N_2O_{0.72h}$ index of poultry manure relevant to field situations: PM* > IF ( $P < 0.05$ )	+		-	Require daily $O_2$ monitoring to decide upon the anoxic event
		+	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>0-72h</sub></i> index correlated with OA properties			-	Duration of oxic phase limited to 72 h for OAs with high respiratory demand: enhanced N <sub>2</sub> O emissions won't back to control level.

# Table 7a. Comparative evaluation of the oxic phases conducted in the tested incubation methods.

Criterion 1: creating conditions that favor OA-induced emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O while establishing relationships with OAs' properties

Criterion 2: precision and absence of bias in measurements of N<sub>2</sub>O indices while maximizing discrimination of OAs within methods

Criterion 3: minimizing labor requirements

<sup>5</sup> Precision reflects how close a number of replicated measurements are to each other. It was investigated with the relative standard deviation (Russow et al, 1996)
 \* See table 2 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table for organic amendments.

See the Material and Methods sections for <u>definition</u> and <u>conceptual framework</u> of the  $N_2O_{0-72h}$  index.

Method		(1)	<b>Optimum incubation conditions</b>	(2)	Precision <sup>§</sup> and absence of bias	(3)	Easy to run
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	÷	Highest degree of discrimination between OAs using to the $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ index: ( <i>P</i> < 0.05) IF, PM > AR > PS > SMC > WSR*	+	Good integration of soil N <sub>2</sub> O emissions	+	Do NOT require daily N <sub>2</sub> O monitoring to capture the entire scope of anoxic N <sub>2</sub> O indices
			The $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ index allowed	+	Best precision in $N_2 O_{ANOXMAX}$ measures		
		+	predicting the N mineralization potential of OAs.	-	Few impact in case of an interference with $C_2H_2$	-	Required the longest oxic (43 d) and anoxic (49 d) duration
ANOXIC PHASE	s/s⁺	÷	The $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ index as an indicator of soil C availability at the end of the oxic cycle.	+ + 	Best precision in $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ measures Good integration of soil N <sub>2</sub> O emissions How much impact in case of an interference with C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub> ?	+	Do NOT required daily $N_2O$ monitoring to capture the entire scope of anoxic $N_2O$ indices Absence of synchronization between treatments (oxic phase ending at 5% $O_2$ concentration in
							the jar headspace)
	s/s <sup>-</sup>	+	The $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$ index was best correlated to L:N, $N_{min}/N_{org}$ and DOC:(C-DOC) ratios of OAs (P<0.001)	+	No interference with $C_2H_2$	-	Required daily $N_2O$ monitoring to capture the entire scope of anoxic $N_2O$ indices
	0,0	+	The $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$ index was best correlated to L:N, $N_{min}/N_{org}$ and DOC:(C-DOC) ratios of OAs (P<0.001)	-	Risk of missing N <sub>2</sub> O peaks	-	Absence of synchronization between treatments (oxic phase ending at 5% $O_2$ concentration in the jar headspace)

# Table 7b. Comparative evaluation of the anoxic phases conducted in the tested incubation method.

Criterion 1: creating conditions that favor OA-induced emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O while establishing relationships with OAs' properties

Criterion 2: precision and absence of bias in measurements of N<sub>2</sub>O indices while maximizing discrimination of OAs within methods

Criterion 3: minimizing labor requirements

<sup>§</sup> Precision reflects how close a number of replicated measurements are to each other and was investigated with the relative standard deviation (Russow et al, 1996)

\* See table 2 for an explanation of the abbreviations used in this table for organic amendments.

See the Material and Methods sections for <u>definition</u> and <u>conceptual framework</u> of the  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  and  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  indices.





Figure 1. Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from fertilized soils as influenced by incubation methods (n=4).

In the S/S<sup>+</sup> method, the end of the oxic cycle occurred at a different time for each amendment with a N<sub>2</sub> flush at 10% ( $^{V}/_{V}$ ) of C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> when [O<sub>2</sub>]<sub>headspace</sub> reached 5% (f<sup>\*</sup>). In the S/S<sup>-</sup> method, the end of the oxic cycle occurred at a different time for each amendment with a N<sub>2</sub> flush when [O<sub>2</sub>]<sub>headspace</sub> reached 5% (f<sup>\*\*</sup>).



Figure 2. Relationships between the  $N_2O_{ANOXMAX}$  index and soil nitrate build-up during the oxic phase.



Figure 3. Relationships between the  $N_2O_{ANOXRATE}$  index and soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes at the end of the oxic phase.

# **FORWARD TO CHAPTER 4**

The comparative incubation study of Chapter 3 helped identifying optimal laboratory conditions for the expression and the measurements of the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O. The selected method involved intermittent aerations of a sealed-jar system relying on repeated 72-h measurement periods in headspace O<sub>2</sub>-limited conditions to assess the short-term (72-h) and medium-term (multiple 72-h periods) potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. In Chapter 4, this incubation method was used to relate short-term (72-h) and medium-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O to the physical state (liquid, solid, powered, pelletized) and the chemical characteristics (e.g., mineral N concentration, C/N ratio, lignin content) of more than 131 OAs with a wide range of physico-chemical properties.

# CHAPTER 4

Associating the potential of organic amendments for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with their physicochemical characteristics.

## 4.1 Abstract

Predicting nitrous oxide  $(N_2O)$  emissions after applying organic amendments (OAs) to soil is difficult because the physico-chemical composition of OAs leads to complex interactions between OAs, soil properties and environmental conditions. In this laboratory study, we determined the immediate (P1), the short- (P2) and the medium-term (P3) potentials of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions of 149 products, including 131 OAs, 12 inorganic fertilizers, and 16 organic-based products (meals (ML), pellets (PLT), and others). The OAs included 65 liquid or solid farm manures (FM), 31 crop residues (CR), 30 composts (CMPT), and five sludges. A threewk incubation involved intermittent aeration of a sealed-jar system to assess P1 48 h after OA addition, and P2 and P3 during the second and the third wk, respectively. The objective of this study was to relate P1, P2, and P3 to the physical state (liquid, solid, powdered, pelletized) and the chemical characteristics of OAs. In a C-limited environment, CR promoted the highest P1 (P < 0.05) of all OA categories tested, with up to 0.25% of the total N applied being lost as  $N_2O$ . CR C/N ratio explained 60% of the variability in P1<sup>CR</sup>. Farm manure addition resulted in 0.055% of the total N applied being lost as N<sub>2</sub>O. Liquid manure P1 was five-fold greater than solid manure P1. Compost (CMPT) addition resulted in 0.006% of the total N applied being lost as  $N_2O$  but only immature composts (piles under construction, age < 3 months) significantly increased soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions compared to control soils. P1 was correlated to available forms of C (waterextractable organic C and volatile fatty acids) in interaction with nitrate, to ammonium and sometimes to sulphur (S) contents, equivalent alkalinity and pH of OAs (P < 0.05). Multiple robust regressions suggest P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup> was mainly due to denitrification, P1<sup>LM</sup> and P1<sup>SM</sup> was due to both nitrification and denitrification, and P1<sup>CMPT</sup> was mainly due to nitrification. Properties of OAs explained 18% to 56% of variability in P1 response with better performance for poultry manure. None of the chemical characteristics were correlated to P2 and P3, indicating the enhanced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions supported by the OA-C and N substrates were short-lived. However, significantly higher P2 and P3 were observed with OAs of lower particle size (powdered MLS) and higher pH (horse manure).

### 4.2 Introduction

Large quantities of organic amendments (OAs) are added to agricultural soils in various forms including livestock manures, crop residues, sludge and composts (Chaves et al., 2005). While OAs act as physical soil conditioners and a valuable source of plant-available nutrients, they also promote nitrification, nitrifier denitrification and denitrification reactions that lead to increased soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, a potent greenhouse gas (Foster et al., 2007; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013) and the dominant stratospheric ozone-depleting substance (Ravinshankara et al., 2009). For greenhouse gas inventory purposes, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recommends using the fertilizer-induced emission factor (EF<sub>1</sub>) as the worldwide default value, regardless of the fertilizer source. The EF<sub>1</sub> is estimated to be a loss of 1% of fertilizer N and was derived from published data regarding gaseous losses from soils amended with synthetic N fertilizers (Bouwman et al., 2002). It is unlikely that adding N in organic forms results in increases in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that are similar to those following addition of synthetic N fertilizers.

101

However, at the time that  $EF_1$  was adopted, there was insufficient information about gaseous N losses from organic materials to specify an emission factor for OAs.

OAs have multiple roles in the microbially-mediated reactions leading to N2O production. Mineralization of organic N contained in OAs releases ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>), with subsequent ammonia oxidation and nitrification producing gaseous N losses and yielding NO3<sup>-</sup> that is susceptible to reactions that lead to N<sub>2</sub>O production. As an organic C substrate for microbial growth, OAs may also stimulate microbial N assimilation, which can increase competition for  $NH_4^+$  between heterotrophic microorganisms and autotrophic nitrifiers (Chen et al., 2013), resulting in temporary reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O production. In soils with high N availability but low organic C, OAs may stimulate nitrifier denitrification, the oxidation of ammonia to nitrite  $(NO_2)$  and its subsequent reduction to NO and N<sub>2</sub>O by autotrophic ammonia oxidizing microorganisms under low O<sub>2</sub> availability (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). In anaerobic conditions, organic C provided by OAs enhances denitrification. The ratio of  $N_2O$  to  $N_2$  produced during denitrification increases with increasing soil NO<sub>3</sub> availability, which is influenced by the microbial consumption and production of NO3<sup>-</sup> due to C and N substrate availability in OAamended soils (Terry et al., 1980; Weier et al., 1993; Miller et al., 2008). Finally, OAs modulate O<sub>2</sub> availability in soil microsites because the labile C input enhances soil respiration and some; such as animal slurries, reduce gas diffusivity by saturating soil micropores in the short-term. Given the multiple ways that OAs impact the activity of microorganisms involved in  $N_2O$ production, their influence on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions cannot be predicted from simple factors such as the total N application rate, which is a reasonably good estimator of the EF<sub>1</sub> from synthetic fertilizers (Kim et al., 2008). Improved emission inventories require information about the

102

potential of OAs to induce soil  $N_2O$  emissions (POA- $N_2O$ ) and about the relationship between POA- $N_2O$  and the chemical characteristics of OAs.

Composition of OAs is highly variable compared to that of synthetic N fertilizers. Carbon and N components of solid manures (SM) are influenced by animal type (Chadwick, 1999), feed (Cardenas et al., 2007; Velthof et al., 2005), and by the manure management system (Chadwick, 2005). For example, poultry manures have a lower C/N ratio than other manure types (Aulakh et al., 2000) and alteration of the legume vs. non legume proportion in the animal diet modulated sheep manure C/N ratio accordingly (Cardenas et al., 2007). Liquid and solid management systems produce manures with contrasting chemical characteristics. Liquid manures (LM) generally contain less bedding materials than solid manure (SM), resulting in lower C/N ratios (Rochette et al., 2008c). Solid-liquid separation concentrates the dry matter, C content, and fibre fractions in the solid fraction, leaving a large proportion of the simple organic compounds that are readily degraded by soil microorganisms in the liquid fraction (Bertora et al., 2008). Conversely, anaerobic digestion of LM reduces dry matter, C content, and fibre fraction but results in an incomplete decomposition and produces volatile fatty acids (VFA), a C source for soil denitrifiers (Paul and Beauchamp, 1989a; Kirchmann and Lunwall, 1993). The storage of farm manure (FM), i.e., the decomposed mixture of dung and urine of farm animals along with litter, may partially or completely compost the material, depending on how long the FM is stockpiled, to what depth the manure pile is built, and whether the pile is aerated or not (Chadwick, 2005; Guo et al., 2012). Composting is a thermophilic decomposition process that degrades raw organic materials to CO<sub>2</sub>, resulting in an immobilization of inorganic N and in production of stable organic matter (Yang et al., 2002; Nada, 2015). Chemical and physical

properties of composts applied to soil vary according to the organic matter source and composting conditions (Yang et al., 2002; Guo et al., 2012; Nada, 2015).

In low-C soils, for example, N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates were found to be correlated with soluble organic C, whereas emission rates in C-rich soils were correlated with NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> availability. In soils mixed with OA under controlled conditions, the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions generally increased with increasing mineral N content, water-soluble organic C, VFA and with decreasing C/N ratio and lignin content (Paul and Beauchamp, 1989a; Lou et al., 2007; Huang et al., 2004; Chaves et al., 2005; Velthof et al., 2003; Velthof, G.L., Mosquera, 2011). Accordingly, high N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were associated with OA containing high levels of inorganic N and easily decomposable N and C, such as pig (Velthof et al., 2003) and sheep slurries (Cardenas et al., 2007) and N-rich crop residues (Chaves et al., 2005). Generally, addition of OAs with C/N ratio > 20 result in temporary net nutrient immobilization (Enwezor, 1976), although this is modulated by the chemical nature of the organic C compounds within the OA. Water-soluble organic C is quickly decomposed (Hadas et al., 2004), whereas complex polymers such as lignin and ligno-cellulose undergo slow decomposition (Vanlauwe et al., 1996). Mixing materials having a high C/N ratio (wheat straw residues, saw dust, composts) with manure, slurries or N-rich crop residues also reduced soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Huang et al., 2004; Chantigny et al. 2001). However, Li et al. (2013b) reported that the C/N ratio of plant residues was not a good predictor of OA-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions even if net N mineralization was correlated to the C/N ratio of plant residues. Moreover, plant material addition affected soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions differently under aerobic and oxygen(O<sub>2</sub>)-limited conditions, which confirmed POA-N<sub>2</sub>O is not directly related to the net N mineralization potential of OAs (Li et al., 2013b). This is likely due to (1) inorganic N content of

104

OAs directly available to soil nitrifiers and denitrifiers, and to (2) the fact that the net N mineralization from an OA declines with time as readily-mineralizable organic N substrates are depleted, and denitrifiers would compete with other heterotrophic microorganisms for a limited amount of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and soluble C (Marschner et al., 2015). Consequently, it is difficult to make generalizations; even under controlled conditions, the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O is affected by many other factors including soil type, OA characteristics, the incubation duration and O<sub>2</sub> availability during the incubation (Bertora et al., 2008; Cabrera et al., 1994b; Flessa and Beese, 2000; Helgason et al., 2005; Lou et al., 2007; Velthof et al., 2003).

Incubation in O<sub>2</sub>-limited conditions favoured expression of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O when O<sub>2</sub> headspace concentration did not fall below 6% (Chantigny et al., 2002), with large N<sub>2</sub>O production due to the addition of OAs that increased soil microbial activity and O<sub>2</sub> consumption. In the 29 d following OA addition in O<sub>2</sub>-limited environment, denitrification rate increased as O<sub>2</sub> concentration decreased in soils, nitrification stopped whereas N mineralization allowing NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> accumulation and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> depletion (Chantigny et al., 2002). Potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions evaluated immediately after OA addition differed from POA-N<sub>2</sub>O evaluated 40 d after OAs (Velthof et al., 2003).

In this study, we conducted a three-wk incubation involving intermittent aeration of a sealed-jar system to assess immediate (P1), short- (P2) and medium-term (P3) POA-N<sub>2</sub>O. The objective of this study was to relate P1, P2, and P3 to the physical state (liquid, solid, powered, pelletized) and the chemical characteristics (e.g., mineral N concentration, C/N ratio, lignin content) of more than 131 OA with a wide range of physico-chemical properties.

#### 4.3 Material and Methods

#### 4.3-1 Soil sampling and preparation

A poorly drained Kamouraska clay (mixed, frigid, Typic Humaquept) soil was collected at the Harlaka Research Farm of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (46°48′N, 71°23′W) from the 0-20cm depth (plough layer) in November 2009, about 2 wk after the field was tilled with a mouldboard plough. This soil was selected because it showed fertilizer-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions greater than the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change default factor (0.01 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> N), with values ranging from 0.027 to 0.038 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> N applied (Gagnon et al., 2011). The site did not receive N fertilizer in the study year because it was under soybean production. The soil was sieved to pass through a 6-mm sieve, air-dried and mixed to thoroughly homogenize it. Selected physico-chemical properties of the Kamouraska clay are presented in Table 1.

#### 4.3-2 Experimental design

A total number of 588 experimental units consisting of 1-L glass jars were set out in a randomized complete block design with four replicates. Starting of each block was delayed by one week for logistical reasons. Within each block, the experimental design included 4 unamended controls, and 149 treatments of 131 OAs, 12 inorganic fertilizers, and 16 organic-based products. The OAs included 65 animal manures (liquid and solid), 31 crop residues, 30 composts of varying ages and origins, and five sludges (Fig. 1). The organic-based products included three organic-based meals (bone ash crabmeal, fishmeal), eight pellets, and five other organic by-products (liquid seaweed, shrimp waste, shrimp shells, cow refuse, mouldy silage). Application rates and nature of amendments and fertilizers are mentioned in Table 2.

#### 4.3-3 Amendment sampling, storage, preparation and analyses

Amendments and fertilizers were collected from farms, compost facilities, sewage treatment plants, research units and commercial suppliers located within 30 km of Quebec City (Quebec, Canada) in summer 2011. Organic by-products such as peat, woodchip, sunflower straw residues and phragmites are not routinely used as amendment sources, but were included in the experiment to provide a wide range of chemical properties (Fig. 1).

Crop residues were dried at 30° C, ground and sieved through 2 mm and stored at ambient temperature. Liquid manures were stored at -12° C and solid manures at +4° C until preparation. Each 4-L sample of manure was blended with dry ice using a vertical cutter-mixer (R10-U, Robot Coupe Inc., MS, U.S.A.) and sieved (< 2 mm). Liquid manures were filtered through a plastic colander to collect solid particles that were first blended with dry ice before mixing the entire sample during 2 min using a Polytron (Model PT 3100, Kinematica AG, Littau-Lucerne, Switzerland). After preparation, solid manures samples were distributed in freezer bags, stored at -12° C and, then weighed 3 d before starting each block. Liquid manures were transferred into Nalgene bottles and stored at -12° C until 24 h before starting each block.

All OAs were analyzed for total C and total N. Farm manures, composts, sludges, plant residues, meals, pellets, other products and selected crop residues (32%) were analyzed for dry matter (DM), ash, organic matter (OM), water-extractable organic C (WEOC), N-NH<sub>4</sub>, N-NO<sub>3</sub>, and fiber contents, pH, equivalent alkalinity, and metals and major elements. DM was obtained by oven-drying fresh OAs at 105° C for 24 h or to a constant weight. Ash and OM were determined by loss on ignition of dry residue at 500°C during 2 h for vegetal residues and 4 h or more for

other amendments. Total C of liquid manures (DM < 15%) was determined by directly injecting the homogenized material into a TOC analyzer (Model Shimadzu ,5000A, Kyoto, Japan), whereas total C of solid manures and other amendments was measured by dry combustion (Leco Corp., St. Joseph, MI) on subsamples that had been dried at 55°C. Water-extractable organic C (WEOC) was determined on amendments by shaking fresh OAs with deionized water (1:10 fresh amendment: water ratio) for 30 min at 160 rpm. Extracts were centrifuged for 15 min (15,000 × g) and analyzed for total (TC) and inorganic dissolved C (TIC) using the Combustion / NDIR method of the Shimadzu TOC analyzer. WEOC was the difference between total and inorganic dissolved C.

The total N content of farm manures, composts and sludges was determined by the Kjeldahl method (TKN). The total N content of crop residues was determined by dry combustion (Leco CNS-1000, Leco Inc.). Mineral N content in farm manures, composts, or sludges, was determined by shaking 2.5-5 g of amendment with 50 mL of 2 M KCl solution for 60 min. Mineral N content in vegetal residues was determined by shaking 0.25 g of vegetal residues with 25 mL of distilled water for 30 min. The  $NH_4^+$ ,  $NO_3^-$ , and  $NO_2^-$  concentrations were measured in the extracts with an automated colorimeter (Technicon Industrial Systems, Tarrytown, NY).

Soluble (SOL), hemicellulose- (HEM), cellulose- (CEL), and lignin-like (LIG) were determined using a fiber analyzer (Ankom A2000, Ankom Technology, Macedon, NY). Biochemical fractions were expressed as g kg<sup>-1</sup> total OM. The fractions were defined according to their solubility in detergents as initially used to determine forage digestibility (Van Soest et

108

al., 1991). Biological stability index (BSI) was calculated according to Robin (1997), following the equation (7):

Amendment pH was either directly measured in liquid slurries or measured in slurries suspended in water (water, 1:1). For solid manures, composts and sludges, pH was measured in a pulp suspension brought to saturation. Equivalent alkalinity of OAs, defined as the neutralizing capacity of hydrogen ion, was determined by titrating samples against diluted acid (HCl 0.02N) until pH reached 4.5 and the equivalent alkalinity expressed in mg/L of CaCO<sub>3</sub>.

Metals and major elements were determined by Inductively Coupled Plasma – Optical Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-OES) following digestion with acid and hydrogen peroxide. Liquid manure was also analyzed for volatile fatty acids (VFAs) according to APHA (1992).

# 4.3-4 Incubation protocol

The protocol included a 14-d pre-incubation and a 21-d incubation involving 3 captures of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (P1, P2, and P3) with intermittent aerations of a sealed-jar system, in a constant temperature incubator ( $22^{\circ}$  C ± 0.03) in the dark. Soil preincubation began by moistening airdried soil (220 g oven dry basis) homogenously with distilled water to 0.28 g H<sub>2</sub>O g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil (65% of the field capacity). Wet soil was then placed in 1-L Mason jars (one jar = one experimental unit) with gas-tight lids fitted with two 1-way male luer stopcocks. After sealing each jar with a lid, the headspace was flushed with N<sub>2</sub> gas for 20 sec at 48 kPa and the preincubation continued for 14 d, to remove the soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N through denitrification. After preincubation, jars were aerated (room atmosphere) for 24 h. Then, distilled water was added to the surface to adjust soil moisture according to water content of assigned treatment. The targeted soil + amendment/fertilizer mixture was 0.30 g  $H_2O$  g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil (70% of the field capacity).

The incubation started 24h after soil rewetting. Each treatment (amendment or fertilizer) was applied to the soil surface, mixed homogenously by hand, and jars were shaken horizontally to level the soil surface, leaving a headspace volume of roughly 0.87 L. Then, jars were weighed and water added to reach the target soil moisture content. The first sealed-jar period started immediately after applying treatments and lasted for 72h, whereas the second (222 to 270h) and third (388h to 436h) sealed-jar periods lasted 48h. Sealed-jar periods involved sealing jars with air-tight lids immediately followed by air sampled at 0, 3, 6, 24, 48 and 72h for the first period and at the beginning and at the end of the second and third periods. Between sealed-jar periods, lids were removed, jars were aerated (room atmosphere) for 24 h and then, capped with a lid having a central 6-mm diameter hole to provide atmospheric air exchange. Distilled water was added at regular intervals (e.g., every 2 days) to maintain the initial SM moisture content at 0.3 g H<sub>2</sub>O g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil.

# 4.3-5 Headspace gas sampling technique

During the first sealed-jar period, the headspace air was sampled through the gas-tight lid fitted with two 1-way male luer stopcocks. Stopcock 1 was equipped with a rubber septum for gas sampling. Stopcock 2 was tightly connected through a Bev-A-Line IV tube (1/8"ID x 1/4"OD) to a gas sampling bag (Kynar polyvinylidene fluoride bag, Cole-Parmer, Montreal, Canada) filled with He. Samples of headspace gas were taken by inserting a needle fitted to a

110

polypropylene syringe (20 mL; Becton Dickinson, Rutherford, NJ) through one stopcock equipped with a rubber septum. Before removing the 20 mL headspace gas sample, the other stopcock was opened to replenish the headspace with He and ensure constant pressure. Dilution effect (from the gas sampling) was accounted for in calculations. The gas sample was injected immediately into a pre-evacuated vial (12-mL Exetainer, Labco, High Wycombe, UK) that were stored at ambient temperature until analysis (< 14 d). Following the first week of the incubation, all subsequent headspace gas samples were done similarly except that stopcock 2 was not connected to a He bag. Once the stopcock opened, an equivalent volume of ambient air would enter the headspace and ensure constant pressure.

Vials containing headspace gas sampled were analyzed for N<sub>2</sub>O, O<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations within 1 wk by means of a gas chromatograph equipped with electron capture, thermal conductivity and flame ionization detectors (Model 3800, Varian Inc., Walnut Creek, CA) through a headspace autoinjector (Combi Pal, CTC Analytics, Zurich, Switzerland).

# 4.3-6 Gaseous flux calculations

Fluxes of soil N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> were expressed in  $\mu g$  gas kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil h<sup>-1</sup> and calculated following equation 6:

$$F_{gas} = \frac{dC_{gas}}{dt} \times \frac{V}{M} \times \frac{Mm}{Mv}, \text{ where}$$
(6)

 $\frac{dC_{gas}}{dt}$  (mol gas mol<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) is the rate of change of headspace gas concentration in one h, V (m<sup>3</sup>)

is the jar headspace volume, M (kg) is the mass of dry soil contained in a jar, Mm (mg mol<sup>-1</sup>) is

the molecular weight of gas, Mv (m<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>) is the air molecular volume, accounting for temperature in the room before sealing the jar (0.022 to 0.024 m<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>).

## 4.3-7 Immediate, short- and medium-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O

The immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (P1) was defined as the cumulative OA-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions 48 h after the treatments were added and also expressed as the % of total N applied from a particular treatment, calculated following equation 7:

$$Pt = \frac{\left[F_{N_2O-N_{\text{preasurent}}}(t) - F_{N_2O-N_{\text{control}}}(t)\right]}{N_{applied}} \times 100, \text{ where}$$
(7)

 $F_{N_2O-N_{preasent}}(t)$  and  $F_{N_2O-N_{control}}(t)$  are the cumulative emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O (µg N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil) from the soil-amendment or soil-fertilizer mixture and the unamended (control) soil, respectively, at the time t = 48 h of the incubation period to ensure O<sub>2</sub> concentration in the jar-headspace was above 5%, to minimize total denitrification (Morley et al., 2008). Indeed, high P1 variability within amendment category was observed 72 h after OA addition (Fig. A4-2) probably due to total denitrification for some OA-soil mixtures (Fig. A4-3). The short-(P2) and medium-term (P3) POA-N<sub>2</sub>O respectively refer to OA-induced emission rates of N<sub>2</sub>O in the 2nd (t = 222-270 h) and 3rd (t = 388-436 h) sealed-jar periods of 48 h.

## 4.3-8 Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted with SAS (Version 9.2, SAS Institute, Cary, NC). To test the fixed effect of OA type on POA-N<sub>2</sub>O components (P1, P2, and P3), analysis of variance with heterogeneous variances was performed using the MIXED procedure. Differences between OA types were evaluated with a LSD test (P < 0.05). Relationships between P1, P2, P3 and soil CO<sub>2</sub>

emissions were evaluated with the CORR procedure and expressed as Spearman correlation coefficients because of a non-normal distribution of data. For crop residues, least squares regressions were used to describe the functional relationship between C/N ratio and POA-N<sub>2</sub>O components using log-transformed values. Robust multiple linear regression analyses were performed for farm manures (liquid and solid) and composts to model the relationship between selected chemical properties of OAs and the immediate, short-term and medium-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O. Robust regression techniques allowed the detection of outliers and helped providing resistant (stable) results in the presence of outliers using the MM estimation, introduced by Yohai (1987). Outliers were defined as observations with large residual or difference (above 50%) between the predicted value (based on the regression equation) and the observed value, as illustrated in red in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. To avoid multicollinearity in the regression analysis, selection of chemical properties of OAs was checked against three key criteria, as follows:

1) When computing the matrix of Pearson's Bivariate Correlation among all independent variables, the correlation coefficients need to be smaller than .08;

2) The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of the linear regression needs to be smaller than 10. The VIF is defined as VIF = 1/T, where T is the tolerance, a measure of the influence of one independent variable on all other independent variables calculated with an initial linear regression analysis;

3) The condition index calculated using a factor analysis on the independent variables needs to be smaller than 30.

In cases where the check of the OA chemical parameters against the three criteria failed, a factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis, PCA) was conducted before the regression analysis with the PROC FACTOR to develop artificial variables (PCs) that accounted for much of the variance contained in the N<sub>2</sub>O variables.

### 4.4 Results and discussion

#### 4.4-1 Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from control and synthetic N treatments

The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from control jars (no amendment, no fertilizer) reached 20.7 ± 7.3 (n = 16)  $\mu$ g N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil after the first 72 h of the incubation. Cumulative emissions were 1.5-fold greater in soils fertilized with N synthetic sources than in control soils with  $30.62 \pm 7.36$ (n = 48)  $\mu$ g N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil emitted during the first 72 h. However, fertilizer-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions did not respond to increasing rates of ammonium nitrate equivalent to 30, 60, 90, and 120 kg of N ha<sup>-1</sup> (data not shown), indicating that N<sub>2</sub>O production is limited by factors other than N availability (Breitenbeck et al., 1980; Koops et al, 1997; Rochette et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2013). Soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in control and synthetic N treatments were not significantly different and respectively reached 3.02 ( $\pm$  0.46) and 2.96 ( $\pm$  0.46) g C kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil after the first 72 h of the incubation (P < 0.05). It is possible that C availability was low in the incubated soil (Rochette et al., 2000). Jarecki et al. (2008) reported high cation exchange capacity of clay soils may also reduce N availability for soil microorganisms through NH4<sup>+</sup> adsorption in the clay, although the sorbed organo-NH4<sup>+</sup> complexes remained more susceptible to microbial decomposition, resulting in significant increase in soil  $N_2O$  emissions following the addition of 220 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> of manure to an incubated clay soil but not following the addition of the equivalent amount of

urea-ammonium nitrate. In the present study, the soil environment was suitable for detecting the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O from both C and N substrates that were provided in mixtures of soil and by OAs (Table 2).

## 4.4-2 The immediate potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, P1

Soil receiving crop residues (CR), farm manure (FM), and sludges (SDG) induced soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that were significantly (t test, Pr > 0.05) greater than the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions of soil mixed with pellets (PLTS), composts (CMPT) and synthetic fertilizers (Fig.4). Large differences in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were observed between organic-based meals (MLS), PLTS, and CMPT categories due to the wide range of physico-chemical characteristics of OAs in these classes (Table 2).

# 4.4-2.1 Crop residues

Crop residues had the highest P1 (P < 0.05) of all OA categories tested, with up to 0.25% of the total N applied being lost as N<sub>2</sub>O after 48 h of incubation, hereafter referred to as P1<sup>CR</sup> (Table 2). The CR class included legume, non legume and legume mixed with non legume crops, and more than 70% of these had C/N <30 (Fig. 1). The magnitude of P1<sup>CR</sup> was significantly affected by the C/N ratio of CR, and those with C/N< 15 had a P1<sup>CR</sup> that was 2.1-fold greater than mean P1<sup>CR</sup> of all CR (Fig. 2). It is also notable that CR with C/N > 30 had a P1<sup>CR</sup> which was not significantly different from zero by a *t* test (Pr > |t|), meaning that those CR did not induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Table 2). The trend was a linear decline in the P1<sup>CR</sup> with increasing C/N ratio and the minimum (i.e., zero N<sub>2</sub>O emissions) was reached around C/N= 76 for the CR category (Fig. 2a) and around C/N = 120 when other vegetal residues (such as peat, woodchip, sunflower straw residues, pruning residues and phragmites) were taken into account (Fig. 2b). Toma and

Hatano (2007) reported cumulative  $N_2O$  increased as the C/N ratio decreased, but not significantly. Proportion of the total N applied being lost as  $N_2O$  has been negatively correlated to plant C/N ratio by Huang et al. (2004). Crop residues with C/N ratio < 7.5 seemed to promote  $N_2O$  compared to crop residues with C/N ratio > 16 (Baggs et al., 2000; Jarecki et al. 2009)

Simple linear regression models relating P1<sup>CR</sup> to C/N ratio explained 60% of the variability in P1<sup>CR</sup> based on the C/N ratio of CRs (Fig. 2c-d). However, the regression equations underestimated the P1<sup>CR</sup> of specific CR, e.g., N-rich grassland mixtures of non legume and legume crops, and N-rich legume crops (*Lotus corniculatus, Trifolium repens*) (Fig. 2e-f). Those CR also contained the highest WEOC content of their category, e. g., above 10% dry weight (Fig. A4-3). In accordance with Miller et al., (2008), CR addition may also trigger denitrification in localized soil microsites with reduced O<sub>2</sub>, as illustrated in Fig. A4-3e with net N<sub>2</sub>O consumption measured 48 h after *Lotus corniculatus* addition. The outliers in the dataset indicate that prediction of P1<sup>CR</sup> from the C/N ratio alone would miss the peak N<sub>2</sub>O production from plant residues high-emitting plant residues. A robust multiple regression model examining the C/N ratio along with other residue chemical properties (i.e., NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, BSI, WEOC and S concentrations) was performed but did not improve P1<sup>CR</sup> prediction (Fig. 3a).

Accordingly, C/N ratio appeared as an interesting predictor to be considered in  $N_2O$  inventory report, separating CRs into three major classes: high risk (C/N< 15), medium risky (C/N between 15 and 30) and low risk (C/N> 70). In field experiments, P1<sup>CR</sup> was highly modulated by tillage practices and fertilization regime. Particular attention should be accorded to mulching of legume species (Nadeem et al., 2012), to incorporation of non legume species as

green manure when amended with farm manure simultaneously with conventional tillage (Koga N., 2013), and managed grasslands, particularly when fertilized simultaneously with ploughing (Mori and Hojito, 2007; Velthof et al., 2010). Tillage has also been proven to decrease emissions with a 2-to-3-fold reduction of  $P1^{CR}$  using full inversion tillage rather than chemical fallow for equivalent soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N in a poorly drained soil (MacDonald et al., 2011).

### 4.4-2.2 Farm manures and sludges

Farm manure P1 (P1<sup>FM</sup>) was 0.55%, a value similar to sludge P1 (P1<sup>SDG</sup>) (Table 2). Liquid manure (LM) from all sources was grouped together based on the report of similar impact of pig and cattle LMs on N<sub>2</sub>O production under laboratory (Velthoft et al., 2013) and field (Chadwick et al., 2000b) conditions. Liquid manure (P1<sup>LM</sup>) was five-fold greater than solid manure (P1<sup>SM</sup>), which is consistent with the 6 times greater  $N_2O$  emissions from liquid dairycattle than solid beef-cattle manure reported under controlled conditions (Paul et al., 1993). Similar N<sub>2</sub>O emissions between LM and SM have been also reported by Rochette et al. (2008c). The solid manures could themselves be differentiated according to the animal source. Compared to the average P1<sup>SM</sup>, the P1 estimates of sheep and alpaca manure was 2 to 3 times lower, and those of poultry and pig manures were 3.3 and 1.75 times greater (Table 2). This is consistent with previous reports of greater N<sub>2</sub>O emission with poultry than pig solid manure (Pelster et al., 2012), and from pig than cattle solid manure Chantigny et al. (2002). Thus, relationships between P1 and manure chemical properties were assessed separately with multiple linear regression models for liquid (P1<sup>LM</sup>) and solid (P1<sup>SM</sup>) manure (Table 3).

### 4.4-2.2.1 Liquid manure

For liquid manure, the predictive model (P < 0.001) indicated that P1<sup>LM</sup> was related to the manure  $NH_4^+$ , WEOC and S concentrations, which were significant at P < 0.01, P < 0.001, and P < 0.01, respectively (Table 3). The positive slope associated with NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> X VFA and WEOC concentration may indicate nitrification- and denitrification-derived N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Liquid manure (excepted cow feces and urine) contained 48% of its total N as  $NH_4^+$  (Fig. A4-5), which can be rapidly nitrified (Morvan et al., 1997; Rochette et al., 2000b; Chantigny et al., 2001). Goodroad and Keeney (1984) and Mørkved et al. (2007) noted that the  $N_2O$  product ratios of nitrification  $(N_2O/(NO_2^- + NO_3^-))$  is lower in alkaline than in acid soils. This is consistent with the negative slope associated with  $NH_4^+$  X pH. Denitrification was stimulated by the converted  $NH_4^+$  into  $NO_3^-$  in presence of available C forms from liquid manure as noted by Paul and Beauchamp (1989a), Loro et al. (1997), and Cardenas et al. (2007). Although S-containing compounds are not metabolites for heterotrophic denitrifiers, Tam and Knowles (1979) noted that sulphide inhibited N<sub>2</sub>O reduction in the denitrification process, which can favour N<sub>2</sub>O production rather than complete reduction to N<sub>2</sub>. This is consistent with the positive slope associated with S concentration and P1<sup>LM</sup> (Table 3). Significant interaction between S and WEOC indicated that the effect of S depends on the amount of WEOC added. The negative slope associated with S X WEOC may indicate that the possible inhibiting effect of S on N<sub>2</sub>O reduction decreased with increased WEOC concentrations (Table 3).

Only 25% of the variability of the P1<sup>LM</sup> was explained by the model (Table 3) because it did not predict the N<sub>2</sub>O production from dairy cow slurries freshly collected from stocking prepit with varying levels of aeration. Those slurries contained very low equivalent alkalinity (EA) (49 g/kg CaCO<sub>3</sub> d.w.), the highest level of WEOC (*i.e.* above 6000 mg/kg dry weight), and the

lowest pH of their category (*i.e.* 5.75) (Fig. A4-5). Soil pH has a marked effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions with lower denitrification rate at low soil pH but larger N<sub>2</sub>O/N<sub>2</sub> product ratio (Focht, 1974) due to severe inhibition of N<sub>2</sub>O reduction when soil pH < 6.0 (Bergaust et al., 2010). Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O decrease with increasing pH in acidic soils (Nägele and Conrad, 1990). Increases in soil pH following liquid manure application have been reported (Sommer and Sherlock, 1996; Chantigny et al., 2004) and was partly attributed to the alkaline slurry and the dissociation of slurry carbonates (Sommer and Sherlock, 1996), which occurs rapidly in acidic soils (Chantigny et al., 2001). Moreover, Paul and Beauchamp (1989b) reported the pH increase following aeration of dairy cattle slurry was promoted by the oxidation of VFA that shifted the NH<sub>4</sub> \*/NH<sub>3</sub> equilibrium towards NH<sub>3</sub> and may contribute to increased volatilization losses. In the present study, we hypothesize that addition of acidic dairy cow slurries with very low EA to the slightly acidic Kamouraska clay soil restrained the soil pH increase compared to other liquid manures, resulting in a larger N<sub>2</sub>O yield during denitrification, lower NH<sub>3</sub> volatilization, and indirectly more available N for coupled nitrification-denitrification and nitrifier denitrification.

Our results suggest greater  $P1^{LM}$  are expected with fresh LM compare to stored LM, as noted by Thormann et al. (2007). Moreover, slurry pH appeared as an important factor to consider in LM management for reducing N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

### 4.4-2.2.2 Solid manure

Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following poultry manure were then analyzed separately from other solid manure because S was not a significant predictor of  $P1^{PM}$  contrary to other solid manures. For solid manure (poultry manure excluded), WEOC,  $NO_3^-$ ,  $NH_4^+$ , EA and S were included in a

119
robust multiple regression (Table 3). The positive slope associated with  $NH_4^+$  and  $NO_3^-$  X WEOC may indicate that  $N_2O$  emission following manure application was the result of both denitrification and nitrification, which occurred simultaneously in soil (Paul and Beauchamp, 1993). The negative EA coefficient suggests lower EAs favour  $N_2O$  emissions. As discussed for liquid manure, lower EAs may have decreased  $NH_3$  volatilization, and indirectly more Navailable for coupled nitrification-denitrification and nitrifier denitrification. The positive slope associated with S may indicated that S addition from manure decreased reduction to  $N_2O$ , as noted by Tam and Knowles (1979). Negative interaction between S and  $NO_3^-$  indicated that the possible inhibiting effect of S on denitrification decreased as  $NO_3^-$  from manure increased, probably because the mole fraction  $N_2O/N_2$  of the denitrification products increases with increasing  $NO_3^-$  contents (Firestone et al. 1980). Finally, two outliers among replicated samples of P1<sup>SM</sup> were identified after emu and alpaca manure addition (Fig. 3d) and were discussed later in the present paper.

Poultry manure differentiated from other SMs with their two-fold and three-fold higher concentrations of WEOC and  $NH_4^+$ , respectively.  $P1^{PM}$  was better correlated to soil  $CO_2$ emissions (+ 0.63, P < 0.001) compare to  $P1^{FM}$  (+ 0.28, P < 0.001), as noted by Pelster et al. (2012). Greater P1 after PM than other FM addition was probably caused by a change in the soil environment that was most likely related to increased C availability (Pelster et al., 2012). Predictors (e. g.,  $NO_3^-$ , WEOC,  $NH_4^+$ , and EA) were highly significant in simple and interaction effects. As previously discussed for other solid manure, slope associated with predictors may indicate  $P1^{PM}$  was due to both nitrification and denitrification. Generally, soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions induced by PM addition are similar to emissions following LM application and are associated with denitrification after rainfall or freeze/thaw events (Thornton et al., 1998; Tatti et al., 2014). Rogeri et al. (2015) also noted nitrification increased in soils within the first two days after PM addition and was faster when poultry litter was incorporated to the soil in comparison to surface applied. Our results confirm that application of poultry manure appears to promote higher P1 than other solid manure and should be considered as risky as LM in N<sub>2</sub>O inventory reports.

### 4.4-2.3 Composts

Compost (CMPT) addition resulted in 0.006% of the total N applied being lost as N<sub>2</sub>O after 48 h (Table 2). When classified by maturity stage, only immature composts significantly increased soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, as noted by Takakai et al. (2010). Immature composts promoted P1 estimate around P1<sup>SM</sup> and above P1 of sheep and alpaca manure. Under controlled conditions, Zhu et al. (2014) also observed that immature compost induced higher soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions than the fresh solid fraction of pig manure. After three months of composting, P1<sup>CMPT</sup> is not significantly different from zero (Table 2). Such results contrast with Takakai et al. (2010) who reported soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following mature compost application were lower than in unamended soil.

Larger P1 observed after immature compost addition were mostly due to vegetal compost (Table 2). In C-limited environment,  $P1^{CMPT}$  is expected to be related to the WEOC that contains a portion of labile C which can stimulate soil microbial activity (Liang et al., 1996; Zhu et al., 2014). Immature composts contained more WEOC and also more NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Fig. A4-9a) compared to composts older than three months. In this study, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and pH were significant

predictors of P1<sup>CMPT</sup> (Table 3 and S3) but not WEOC and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. The positive slope associated with NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> may indicate N<sub>2</sub>O emission following vegetal compost application was the result of nitrification. Several studies suggest that the N<sub>2</sub>O product ratios of nitrification (N<sub>2</sub>O/(NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> + NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) are lower in alkaline soils than in acid soils (Goodroad and Keeney, 1984; Mørkved et al., 2007). This is consistent with the negative slope associated with NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> X pH and P1<sup>CMPT</sup> (Table 3). Comparing different soil types, Zhu-Barker et al. (2015) concluded that addition of green waste compost (pH = 8.1) did not induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in clay loam soils, likely due to the high capacity of these soils to buffer changes in biochemical properties such as nitrifier activity or pH. In our incubation, we compared 7 vegetal composts with contrasting pH varying from 6.39 to 8.26, suggesting that acidic compost may alter the buffering capacity of clay soils and provide conditions more favorable to nitrifier activity.

## 4.4-2.4 Organic-based meals and pellets

Exceptfor bone ash and pelletized poultry manure, estimates of P1 for organic-based meals and pellets (P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup>) was not higher than synthetic fertiliser P1 despite the amount of WEOC added with the organic-based meals, as noted by Cayuela et al. (2010) (Table 2). The interaction of NO3<sup>-</sup> X WEOC concentrations was a significant predictor of P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup>(Table A4-3). The positive slope associated with NO3<sup>-</sup> X WEOC concentrations and P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup> may indicate that N<sub>2</sub>O emission following the application of organic-based meals was the result of denitrification (Table 3 and S3).

Bone ash P1 and pelletized poultry manure P1 were three and five times higher than synthetic fertiliser P1, respectively (Table 2). Pelletized poultry manure contained large amounts of S, e.g. 20000 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> d.w., compare to other pellets and OAs (Fig. A4-1). Tam and Knowles (1979) noted that sulphide inhibited N<sub>2</sub>O reduction in the denitrification. A possible explanation of higher P1 for bone ash and pelletized poultry manure is inhibition of N<sub>2</sub>O reduction in the denitrification process, which can favour N<sub>2</sub>O production rather than complete reduction to N<sub>2</sub>. Apatite, the principal mineral constituent of bone (Sneddon et al., 2008), was found to be effective in reducing the bioavailability and leachability of Cu in soil (Ma et al., 2012). Since Cu is involved in the reduction process of denitrification (Richardson et al., 2009), accumulation of N<sub>2</sub>O due to low Cu has been observed in pure cultures and a lake ecosystem (Glass and Orphan, 2012).

#### 4.4-2.5 Variability of P1

Only one product, liquid seaweed, was removed from statistical analyses of P1 because of atypical behaviour, i.e., total anaerobic conditions occurring 48 h after addition (Fig A4-3g-h). Liquid seaweed contained large amount of WEOC (78246 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> d.w), and S (14835 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> d.w). Addition of liquid seaweed resulted in 1% of remaining O<sub>2</sub> in jar headspace after 48h (Fig. A4-3h), followed by N<sub>2</sub>O net reduction (Fig. A4-3e), which contradicts the findings of Tam and Knowles (1979) about the inhibiting effect of S on soil N<sub>2</sub>O reduction in a denitrification incubation. Magalhães et al. (2012) reported addition of dimethylsulfoniopropionate (DMSP), i.e., an abundant organic sulfur compound in marine algae, to sediments and bacterial culture resulted in accumulation of N<sub>2</sub>O. The authors suggested possible interactions between DMSP and the denitrification pathway, although no direct inhibition on N<sub>2</sub>O reductase activity by DMSP was observed. Sulphur-containing trace metal-binding protein has been correlated to elevated levels of trace metals in marin organisms (Engel and Brouwer, 1984). Bone ash that also produced the highest P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup> (Table 2) was found to stabilize metals in a field trial with mechanisms involving microbially mediated metal sulphide formation (Sneddon et al., 2008).

Variability in P1 response was also observed for vegetal compost, and solid emu/beef cattle manure with the presence of outliers included in multiple regression analyses. Those outliers reflect the intrinsically variable nature of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013), probably caused by the way we incorporated the OAs into the soil. Mixing OA has been proven to increase soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions compared to layered addition of OAs (Zhu et al., 2014), triggering denitrification in soil microsites with reduced O<sub>2</sub> (Firestone and Davidson, 1989; Sey et al., 2008).

## 4.4-3 Short- (P2) and medium-term (P3) potentials of OAs to emit soil N<sub>2</sub>O

The short- and medium-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O were nine and 25 times lower than P1, respectively, indicating that the OA-derived C and N substrates were short-lived (Rochette et al., 2008c). After 16d, P3<sup>CR</sup> was 82 times lower than P1<sup>CR</sup> (Table 2), as noted by Baggs et al. (2000) in field conditions which most of the emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O (65% of total emissions) following CR incorporation occurring in the first two weeks. Liquid manure application promoted short-lived N<sub>2</sub>O emissions because after 10 and 16d, P2<sup>LM</sup> and P3<sup>LM</sup> were 64 and 99 times lower than P1<sup>LM</sup> (Table 2). Our results are in accordance with the maximum POA-N<sub>2</sub>O reached the first day after dairy cattle manure application under maize, with emissions returned to near preapplication levels 7 d later (Lessard et al., 1996).

Even if short- and medium-term potentials were lower than P1 in magnitude, significant differences were detected among OAs which differ from classification of OAs provided by P1

(Table 2). MLS had the highest P2 (P < 0.05) of all OA categories tested, with up to 0.02% of total N applied being as N<sub>2</sub>O after 10 d of incubation. The smaller particle size of powdered MLS compared to other OAs may have increased the contact surface of the powdered MLS, facilitating accessibility to microorganisms, enhancing soil biological activity, and the mineralization of the organic matter compared to other OAs (Tejada et al., 2014). CR also exhibited higher P2 and P3 with up to 0.007 and 0.003% of total N applied being lost as N<sub>2</sub>O after 10 and 16 d, respectively, but no significant difference was observed among C/N ratios ranges (Table 2). Contrary to Velthof et al. (2003), SM but not LM presented a higher risk for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in the short- or medium-term (Table 2). The WEOC content of OAs, VFA, and mineral forms of N did not correlate well with P2 and P3 beyond the first three days, as noted by De Catanzaro and Beauchamp (1985). Other chemical characteristics such as the C/N ratio or Lignin/N were not correlated with P2 and P3. Indeed, the short duration of the experiment may not have allowed sufficient release of organic-N and available C from mineralization which impact  $N_2O$  emissions in the longer term (Liang et al., 1996; Velthof et al., 2003). Liquid manures, especially pig slurry, showed slower release of nitrogen nutrients compared to solid manure (Whalen et al., 2000). SLG and CMPT did not induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in the short- and medium-term (Table 2), probably because of their higher biological stability index, as illustrated in Fig. A4-1j (Tremblay et al., 2010).

Two OAs stood out, bone ash and horse manure, with P2 values respectively equal to 0.05% and 0.03% of the total N applied being released as as  $N_2O$  (Table 2). Moreover, horse manure P3 reached 0.04% of the total N applied, which is 10-fold greater than the average P3<sup>SM</sup> of 0.004% and higher than horse manure P2. Bone ash is a liming OA characterized by high EA

(Fig. A4-7), while horse manure pH was around nine, suggesting that the liming effect caused by OAs could impact short- and medium-term soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Liming may cause a transient enhancement of microbial respiration and nitrogen mineralization (Curtin et al., 1998), which in turn enhances denitrification through  $O_2$  consumption and nitrification through increased substrate concentrations (Mørkved et al., 2007).

## 4.5 Conclusions

In the Kamouraska clay soil, the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O of OAs appeared to be immediate and short-lived, with maximum P1 reached for CR with C/N ratio < 15 and substantial N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following LM, especially liquid dairy cattle manure. Solid manure POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was significantly lower than P1<sup>LM</sup>, although poultry manure differed from the group with the P1<sup>PM</sup> estimate being close to the P1 averages of poultry and pig slurries. In an O<sub>2</sub>-limited environment, physico-chemical properties of OAs explained 18%, 23%, 27%, 27%, 56%, and 60% of the variability in the P1 response for lower particle-sized OA (PLT-ML), SM, LM, vegetal CMPT, PM and CR, respectively. P1 was correlated to available forms of C such as water-extractable organic C and volatile fatty acids, mineral N (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and sometimes to S, equivalent alkalinity and pH of OAs (P <0.05). In contrast, none of those chemical characteristics were correlated to P2 and P3, mostly because the enhanced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions supported by the OA-C and N substrates were short-lived. Liquid manure P1 was five-fold greater than solid manure P1, whereas short- and medium-term N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were higher in SM- than in LM-amended soils. Multiple robust regressions suggest P1<sup>PLT-ML</sup>was mainly due to denitrification, P1<sup>LM</sup> and P1<sup>SM</sup> was due to both nitrification and denitrification, and P1<sup>CMPT</sup> was mainly due to nitrification. The mechanisms whereby S influences short-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O in C-limited environment may involve binding of S compounds

to trace metals, resulting in an incomplete inhibition of nitrous oxide reductase in denitrification pathways, but it remains to be determined whether this mechanism can induce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from OA-amended soils. The assessment of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was conducted in a clay soil probably C-limiting for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Further investigations are necessary to test the influence of other specific conditions, e.g., soil texture, water content, and OA application techniques, on POA-N<sub>2</sub>O and their interactions with OA properties.

Paramet	er	Mean	(SD)	
Texture				
Clay	g kg⁻¹ DM	559.6		
Silt	g kg <sup>-1</sup> DM	373.3		
Sand	g kg⁻¹ DM	67.1		
Before p	re-incubation			
рН		6.3	(0.03)	
С	g kg⁻¹ DM	36.3	(0.0)	
N	g kg⁻¹ DM	2.7	(0.0)	

Table 1. Selected physico-chemical properties of a Kamouraska clay soil (0-20 cm) used for the development of a standard method for soil  $N_2O$  emission

**C**, total C content measured by dry combustion (Model TruSpec CN, Leco Corp., St-Joseph, MI)

N, total N content measured by dry combustion (Model TruSpec CN, Leco Corp., St-Joseph, MI)

pH, soil water pH

Table 2. The immediate, medium-term and long-term potentials of organic amendments to emit N<sub>2</sub>O from the incubated Kamouraska clay soil.

					Р	otentials of orga	anic amer	dments to	emit soil N <sub>2</sub> O		
		Annelisation anto	P1, imme	1	P2, sl	hort-term	2	P3, medium-term <sup>3</sup>			
TYPES OF INPUTS	N	Application rate	ppm of N applied			ppm of N applied			ppm of N applied		
			Estimate (se)	Lsd	Pr >  t *	Estimate (se)	Lsd	Pr >  t *	Estimate (se)	Lsd	Pr >  t *
CROP RESIDUES	124	14 - 214	2471 (557)	Α	<.0001	71 (7)	в	<.0001	30 (7)	AB	<.0001
C:N ratio < 15	36	138 - 214	5306 (1853)	а	<.05	52 (11)	а	<.001	20 (7)	а	<.05
C:N ratio 15-30	52	65 - 116	1659 (277)	ab	<.0001	80 (13)	а	<.0001	34 (12)	а	<.05
C:N ratio 30-70	20	30 - 50	863 (411)	b	ns	74 (15)	а	<.001	11 (11)	а	ns
C:N ratio > 70	16	14 - 24	742 (472)	b	ns	84 (18)	а	<.001	67 (32)	а	ns
FARM MANURE	260	60 - 153	546 (78)	в	<.0001	31 (5)	D	<.0001	2 (4)	в	<.0001
LIQUID	116	60 - 124	857 (156)	Α	<.0001	13 (3)	В	<.01	9 (3)	В	<.05
Cattle slurry	44	60 - 123	1272 (221)	а	<.0001	13 (5)	а	<.0001	7 (1)	а	<.0001
Mixed slurry	12	121	799 (138)	а	<.0001	7 (9)	а	ns	5 (1)	а	ns
Pig slurry	36	121	702 (80)	а	<.0001	18 (6)	а	<.01	12 (1)	а	<.0001
Poultry slurry	4	124	621 (53)	а	<.0001	9 (16)	а	ns	12 (4)	а	<.05
Cow teces	12	121	592 (75)	а	<.0001	3 (9)	а	ns	5 (1)	а	ns
Cow urine	8	120	593 (122)	a	<.0001	20 (12)	a	ns	5 (1)	a	ns
SOLID	144	119 - 153	163 (29)	в	<.0001	46 (8)	A	<.001	37 (6)	A	<.01
Poultry manure	36	120	533 (70)	a	<.0001	70 (8)	b	<.0001	39 (6)	b	<.0001
Pig manure	8	120	286 (35)	D	<.0001	46 (11)	bca	<.01	21 (6)	D	<.001
Horse manure	4	120	202 (33)	DC	<.0001	269 (85)	a	<.0001	401 (152)	a	<.0001
Emu manure	4	128	154 (28)	DC	<.0001	22 (7)		ns	8 (3)	D	ns
Beer cattle manure	28	119 - 153	152 (28)	c	<.0001	21 (2)	ca	ns	12 (2)	D	ns
Cast manure	12	119	96 (10)	C	<.0001	10 (3)	u had	115	15 (3)	b	10001
Mixed manure	12	120	80 (0)	0	< 0001	43 (3)	d	<.001	30 (3)	b	<.0001
Shoop manuro	0	121	74 (10)	0	< 0001	10 (2)	d	115	14 (3)	b	115
Alpaga manure	0	120	74 (10) 53 (7)	C C	< 0001	10 (4)	d	ne	13 (4)	b	ne
SLUDGES	20	1120	538 (118)	BC	< 05	13 (11)	DE	ne	24 (13)	ABC	ne
Seware sludge	4	121	958 (170)	2	< 0001	9 (5)	2	ns	28 (19)	a 0	ns
Paper mill sludge	16	80 - 120	433 (88)	h	< 001	14 (13)	a	ns	23 (15)	a	ns
ORGANIC-BASED MEALS	12	130	229 (111)	CD	ns	234 (60)	A	<.001	27 (8)	AB	<.05
Bone ash	4	130	396 (50)	a	<.001	508 (30)	a	<.0001	48 (29)	a	<.05
Crabmeal	4	128	152 (50)	b	<.05	110 (24)	b	<.01	19 (23)	a	<.0001
Fishmeal	4	131	138 (50)	b	<.05	83 (24)	b	<.001	15 (23)	a	<.01
PELLETS	32	128	192 (71)	D	ns	32 (6)	CDE	<.0001	18 (4)	BC	<.001
Acti-Sol Mother Hen	4	129	678 (50)	а	<.0001	34 (16)	a	ns	5 (12)	а	ns
Pelletized pig slurry	4	120	161 (50)	b	<.05	17 (16)	а	ns	6 (12)	а	ns
Organo-mineral pellets	20	128	131 (38)	b	<.05	37 (9)	а	<.001	26 (6)	а	<.001
Vegetative Bat Guano (10-3-1)	4	137	44 (50)	с	ns	21 (16)	а	ns	6 (12)	а	ns
COMPOSTS	120	121	61 (23)	D	ns	13 (7)	Е	ns	8 (2)	С	<.001
AGE	0										
Incomplete windrow	28	121	112 (28)	а	<.001	8 (13)	а	ns	13 (3)	а	<.01
3 - 18 months	28	119	47 (28)	b	ns	4 (13)	а	ns	7 (3)	а	ns
18 - 34 months	28	120	40 (28)	b	ns	35 (13)	а	ns	7 (3)	а	ns
mature	36	121	48 (27)	b	ns	7 (11)	а	ns	7 (3)	а	ns
TYPE	0										
Vegetal compost	28	121	103 (28)	а	<.05	4 (4)	а	ns	9 (4)	а	<.05
Shrimp compost	8	127	61 (41)	ab	ns	1 (4)	а	ns	2 (2)	а	ns
Worm compost	8	120	41 (41)	ab	ns	2 (4)	а	ns	3 (5)	а	ns
Agrifood compost	12	120	37 (36)	ab	ns	6 (5)	а	ns	12 (5)	а	<.05
Manure compost	48	120	55 (25)	b	<.05	21 (14)	а	ns	9 (3)	а	<.01
Biosolid compost	16	119	34 (33)	b	ns	22 (18)	a	ns	8 (5)	a	ns
OTHER PRODUCTS	20	108	148 (96)	D	<.05	33 (7)	CDE	<.001	18 (6)	BC	<.05
Liquid seaweed *	4	119	44486 *			-6 (12)	b	ns	-4 (11)	а	ns
Shrimp waste (liquid)	4	122	331 (63)	a	<.001	35 (12)	a	< 0.01	17 (11)	a	ns
Shrimp shells	4	119	87 (63)	D	ns	32 (12)	a	<.0001	29 (11)	a	< 0.05
Cow reruse	4	120	108 (63)	D	115	32 (12)	a	< 0.05	12 (11)	a	ns
	4	120	08 (63)	D	ns	31 (12)	a	ns	15 (11)	a	ns
	48	105	135 (49)	D O	115	52 (8) 20 (14)	BC	<.0001	42 (0)	A	<.0001
Annonium nitrate	20	110	100 (33)	a	<.0001	39 (14)	u ah	<.US	27 (5)	a	<.0001
Monoammonium phosphate	4	119	157 (54)	abr	< 05	102 (24)	ລ	< 001	67 (20)	a	< 01
Diammonium phosphate	4	110	132 (54)	abc	< 05	62 (24)	ah	< 05	61 (20)	a	< 01
Ammonium sulfate	4	116	130 (04)	abc	< 05	55 (24)	ab	< 05	25 (6)	a	< 001
Urea	4	115	117 (54)	abc	< 05	99 (24)	a	< 001	38 (10)	a	< 001
Environmentally Smart Nitrogen	4	123	53 (54)	bc	ns	6 (24)	b	ns	69 (31)	a	<.05
Sulfur-coated urea	4	128	32 (54)	c	ns	39 (24)	ab	ns	40 (12)	a	< 01

N, total number of observations

<sup>1</sup> P1 is the immediate N<sub>2</sub>O potential estimated over the first 48 h after addition of organic amendments into soil incubated in jars sealed during the first 72 h.

 $^{2}$  P2 is the medium-term N<sub>2</sub>O potential estimated over a 48-h period, the second week after addition of organic amendments

<sup>3</sup> P3 is the long-term N<sub>2</sub>O potential estimated over a 48-h period, the third week after addition of organic amendments

Liquid seaweed \* has been removed from the statistical analysis of P1 because of extreme observations that were discussed in the present paper.

Means sharing a capital letter are not significantly different within category of fertilization by a Lsd test (P<.05).

Means sharing a small letter are not significantly different within subcategory of fertilization by a Lsd test (P<.05).

In parenthesis are standard error of the mean (n=4). *Pr* > |t| refers to a *t* test to test the null hypothesis that the associated population quantity equals zero (i.d., no N<sub>2</sub>O emissions induced by OA addition)

Table	3.	Linear	robust	regressions	relating	P1 <sup>a</sup>	to	organic	amendment	properties	in	а
Kamo	uras	ska clay	soil.									

-

		R <sup>2</sup>	<i>P</i> > F	N
Crop resi	dues (CR)			
	ln(P1 <sup>CR</sup> +10 ) = -1.6683 x ln(C/N + 10) + 9.9071	0.62	<0.001	124
Eq. 1	<b>P1</b> <sup>CR</sup> = exp [-1.6683 x ln( <b>C/N</b> +10) + 9.9071+ (0.4807/2)]-10			
Eq. 2	P1 <sup>CR</sup> = 12.4270 + 18.8996 x PC <sub>1</sub> (see Table A4-2 for additional details on PCA)	0.37	<0.001	60
Farm ma	nure (FM)			
Li	quid manure (LM)			
	$\mathbf{P1}^{\text{LM}} = 4.40E^{-03} \times \mathbf{NH_{a}}^{+} + 1.91E^{-01} \times \mathbf{NO_{3}}^{-} + 5.65E^{-03} \times \mathbf{WEOC} + 5.88E^{-03} \times \mathbf{VEOC}$	0.27	<.001	104
Ea. 3	<b>S</b> -5.81E <sup>-05</sup> x VFA + 1.01E <sup>-09</sup> x pH -5.28E <sup>+06</sup> x (NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+*</sup> pH) + 3.30E <sup>+04</sup> x	0.27		
-	(NO <sub>3</sub> *VFA) -5.28E <sup>+05</sup> x (NO <sub>3</sub> *S) -7.38E <sup>+03</sup> x (WEOC*S) -106.263			
S	olid manure <sup>b</sup> (SM)			
	$P1^{SM} = -3.53E^{-05} \times EA + 1.14E^{-03} \times S - 3.77E^{-05} \times WEOC + 1.15E^{-03} \times NO_{2}^{-1}$	0.23	< 001	108
Eq. 4	+ $5.51E^{-04}$ NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> - $1.35E^{+03}$ x (S*NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> ) + $1.27E^{+03}$ x (WEOC*NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> ) - $13.589$	0.23	1.001	100
S	olid poultry manure			
	$P1 = 2.00F^{-03} \times NH_4^+ - 4.79 \times NO_2^ 3.60F^{-03} \times WFOC + 2.00F^{-04}$	0.56	< 0001	36
Eq. 5	x (WEOC*NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> ) - 4.00E <sup>-04</sup> x EA + 127.84	0.50	1.0001	50
Pellets ar	nd organic-based meals (PLT-ML)			
Ea. 6	$P1^{PLT-ML} = -2.79E^{-03} \times NO_3^{-1} + 1.86E^{-05} \times WEOC + 1.18E^{+03} \times (NO_3^{-1})^{+1}$	0.18	<0.05	40
	<b>WEOC</b> ) - 0.4905			
Compost	s (CMPT)			
· v	egetal composts			
Eq. 7	<b>P1</b> <sup>CMPT</sup> = 0.05 x <b>NH</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> + 5.08 x <b>pH</b> - 0.01 ( <b>NH</b> <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> * <b>pH</b> ) - 41.79	0.27	<0.01	28
<sup>a</sup> P1	immediate potential of organic amendments (OA) to induce soil N <sub>2</sub> O emissio	ns (POA	-N <sub>2</sub> O),	
b	micrograms N <sub>2</sub> O-N kg <sup>-1</sup> dry soil induced 48h after OA addition (control emiss	ions sub	tracted).	
- (h)	Poultry manure was excluded from the group and analysed separately.			
C/N Dronionis	C/N ratio			
Propionic	Propionic acid (volatile fatty acid)			
EA	isobulying delu (voldelle fally delu) Equivalent Alkalinity (micrograms CaCO, ka <sup>-1</sup> soil)			
	Lyuivaietti Aikainilly (Illiciograms Caco3 Kg Soli) Water-extractable organic carbon (micrograms kg-1 soil)			
BSI	Biological Stability Index			



Fig 1. Collection of amendments and organic-based tested for their potentials to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in controlled conditions (n = 147).

\* Immature composts are piles under construction (compost age < 3 months).



Fig 2. Carbon: Nitrogen ratio as predictor of immediate potential of crop residue to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions\* (P1)

a) Observed P1 as a function of crop residues C/N ratios; b) Linear regression analysis of log-transformed variables; c) Predicted values of crop residue P1<sup>\*</sup> using simple linear regression model based on C/N ratio; b-d-f) Peat, woodchip, sunflower straw residues, pruning residues and phragmites were added in the regression approach. Outliers' symbols are represented in x-hair. <sup>\*</sup>P1, micrograms N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil induced 48h after OA addition (control emissions subtracted), *Lotus corniculatus* was removed from the regression (outlier) and discussed in the present paper. (See additional details in Table 3).



# Fig. 3. P1<sup>\*</sup> prediction using robust regressions based on organic amendment properties

(See equation details in Table 3, S3, S4, and S5). Outliers' symbols are represented in x-hair.

<sup>\*</sup>P1, immediate potential of organic amendments (OA) to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (POA-N<sub>2</sub>O), micrograms N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil induced 48h after OA addition (control emissions subtracted)



# Fig. 4. Type of organic amendment (OA) influenced the immediate potential of organic amendments to emit N<sub>2</sub>O from the incubated Kamouraska clay soil.

P1 is the immediate potential of organic amendments (OA) to induce soil  $N_2O$  emissions (POA- $N_2O$ ) 2d after OA addition (control emissions subtracted). Means sharing a letter are not significantly different within category of fertilization by a Lsd test (P<.05)

## **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

Over the past decades, several attempts have been made to improve the Tier1 default IPCC methodology for soil N<sub>2</sub>O inventory considering the type of N source (Bouwman et al., 2002b; Chen et al., 2013). However, previous studies focused either on a narrow range of OAs (manure, crop residues), or a particular geographical area, and none has proven robust enough for broad acceptance.

The primary goal of this thesis was to gain a better understanding of the influence of physico-chemical properties of OAs on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions shortly after their addition, and other controlling factors (incubation parameters, soil properties, climatic and management-related factors) as a prerequisite for developing more accurate predictions of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors.

Three experiments were conducted to achieve this goal. In the meta-analysis Chapter (Chapter 2), confronting three analytical approaches allowed us to distinguish and estimate EF for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from OAs, alone and combined with synthetic fertilizers. We demonstrated that the IPCC EF1 value was too high when considering the N<sub>2</sub>O contribution from agricultural soils amended with composts, but too low to represent the EF of N<sub>2</sub>O in agricultural soils receiving liquid manure (mostly pig slurry) combined with synthetic fertilizers. We propose a global default EF for organic sources, EF<sub>org</sub>, equal to 0.57 ± 0.30% and encourage the use of FertiClasses or FertiRiskClass categories to account for the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from specific OA sources or groups of OAs with similar characteristics. We improved the accuracy of EF<sub>org</sub>, especially for agricultural soils receiving high-risk and low-risk organic amendments, with the identification of three new N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of OAs (and their related global EF): the high-

risk group including animal manures, waste waters and biosolids (1.09  $\pm$  0.17%); the mediumrisk group including composts + fertilizers and crop residues + fertilizers (0.46  $\pm$  0.22%); and the low-risk group including composts, crop residues, paper mill sludge and pellets (0.25  $\pm$  0.20%). Finally, we confirmed that variations in N<sub>2</sub>O EFs in OA-amended soils are influenced mainly by the mineral N content and the C/N ratio of OAs, rainfall (expressed as TAP), soil texture and drainage. We recommend site-specific EFs that consider organic amendment chemistry, soil characteristics, climate conditions and whether the organic amendment is applied alone or in combination with synthetic fertilizers.

In the second experiment (Chapter 3), a comparative incubation study helped to identify optimal laboratory conditions for the expression and measurement of the POA-N<sub>2</sub>O. At the mesocosm scale, varying O<sub>2</sub> availability is necessary to adequately assess the potential of OAs to enhance soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. This is because oxic conditions favor substrate accumulation in soil, and those substrates become available to denitrifiers that are activated when conditions become anoxic (e.g., after a rainfall event). The duration of the oxic phase altered the magnitude of the OA effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions under anoxia. The progressive decline of O<sub>2</sub> below ambient in the headspace of the sealed-jar system permitted the evaluation of OAs role in enhancing soil N<sub>2</sub>O in a O<sub>2</sub>-limited environment (oxic phase ceased at 5% O<sub>2</sub> concentration), which is not possible with the open-jar method. For the purpose of the last experiment, we selected a laboratory method that involved intermittent aerations of a sealed-jar system. An initial 72-h measurement period was followed by repeated 48-h periods of O<sub>2</sub>-limited conditions to assess the short-term (72-h) and medium-term (multiple 72-h periods) potential of OAs to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

In Chapter 4, the laboratory assessment of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was conducted in a clay soil, probably C-limiting for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were immediate and short-lived, with maximum POA-N<sub>2</sub>O reached for CR with C/N ratio < 15 and substantial N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following LM, especially liquid dairy cattle manure. Solid manure POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was significantly lower than liquid manure POA-N<sub>2</sub>O, although poultry manure differed from the group with an estimate close to P1 averages of poultry and pig slurries. In O2-limited environments, physicochemical properties of OAs explained 18%, 23%, 27%, 27%, 56%, and 60% of variability in the immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O response for fine particle-sized OA (PLT-ML), SM, LM, vegetal CMPT, PM and CR, respectively. The immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was correlated to available forms of C such as water-extractable organic C and volatile fatty acids, mineral N (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) and sometimes to S, equivalent alkalinity and pH of OAs (P < 0.05). Our results suggested that the immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O of fine particle-sized OAs (meals and pellets) was mainly due to denitrification, was due to both nitrification and denitrification for farm manure, and for composts was mainly due to nitrification. The mechanisms whereby S influences short-term POA-N<sub>2</sub>O environment remain to be determined for OAs.

Overall, the incubation study led to contrasting results compared to the meta-analysis. While the meta-analysis concluded OAs were generally at lower N<sub>2</sub>O risk compare to synthetic N sources, the incubation study concluded OAs were generally at higher N<sub>2</sub>O risk compare to synthetic N sources. The assessment of POA-N<sub>2</sub>O in controlled conditions was conducted in a clay soil probably C-limiting for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. By contrast, agricultural soils generally received high fertilizer inputs to get maximum crop yield which eventually increases SOC, and N availability (Thangarajan et al., 2013). Soil moisture and temperature can constitute the main drivers of denitrification regardless of the scale, while proximal factors are oxygen supply influenced by substrate concentration, available energy, and distal factors refer to plant N uptake influenced by soil texture (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013). Further investigations are necessary to test the influence of other specific conditions, e.g., soil texture, water content, OA application techniques on POA-N<sub>2</sub>O and their interactions with OA properties. In conclusion, a more accurate soil N<sub>2</sub>O inventory requires deeper investigation of the interactions between the physico-chemical properties of OAs and soil properties with the systematic consideration of additional chemical properties of C and N substrates, such as OA pH, equivalent alkalinity and S.

Finally, the IPCC methodology should be revised to consider the nature of N sources. The database assembled and the approach followed in the meta-analysis could therefore be used to update the IPCC EFs for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions resulting from the application of OAs to agricultural soils. The results from this thesis showed that the chemical properties of OAs highly impact soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions immediately after their addition in agricultural soils, confirming that N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation strategies should focus on OA application techniques adapted to the OA and specific soil types. Properties of OAs have lesser impact in the short- and medium-term because N<sub>2</sub>O potentials depends on complex interactions between OA C- and N-derived substrates and soil properties. Therefore, models describing soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions should handle complex interactions between the chemical properties of OAs and soil properties for a significant step towards soil N<sub>2</sub>O mitigation in agroecosystems.

# **CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE**

The research conducted in this thesis provides the following important contributions to knowledge:

- I conducted the first meta-analysis that specifically focused on global emission factors (EF) of OAs from field experiments following the addition of OAs alone or combined with synthetic fertilizers.
  - a. My research demonstrated that the IPCC EF<sub>1</sub> for N<sub>2</sub>O inventory value was too high when considering the N<sub>2</sub>O contribution from agricultural soils amended with composts, but too low to represent the EF of N<sub>2</sub>O in agricultural soils receiving liquid manure (mostly pig slurry) combined with synthetic fertilizers.
  - b. My research led to the proposition of a new global default EF for organic sources,  $EF_{org}$ , equal to 0.57 ± 0.30%, and which is lower than the IPCC default EF of 1% for synthetic fertilizer. I also improved the accuracy of  $EF_{org}$  with the identification of three new N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of OAs (and their related global EF): the high-risk group including animal manures, waste waters and biosolids (1.09 ± 0.17%); the medium-risk group including composts + fertilizers and crop residues + fertilizers (0.46 ± 0.22%); and the low-risk group including composts, crop residues, paper mill sludge and pellets (0.25 ±0.20%).
  - c. I demonstrated that EF<sub>org</sub> was modulated by the amendment's C/N ratio, soil properties (texture, drainage, organic C and N) and climatic (precipitation) factors.

- A comparative laboratory study showed a better discrimination of OAs related to their POA-N<sub>2</sub>O using the sealed-jar method that created transient conditions from oxic to anoxic (compared to the open-jar method).
- In a second laboratory experiment, more than 130 OAs were concomitantly assessed in the same incubation study for their POA-N<sub>2</sub>O and were compared to synthetic fertilizer emissions.
  - a. According to multiple regression analyses, the physico-chemical properties of OAs explained 18% to 60% of variability in immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O (< 48 h).
  - b. My research confirmed that the immediate POA-N<sub>2</sub>O was positively correlated to available forms of C such as water-extractable organic C and volatile fatty acids, mineral N (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>). Moreover, my research demonstrated that other chemical properties were significant. I showed that OA pH and equivalent alkalinity had a significant effect on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in controlled conditions regardless of the category of OAs, and that the significant effect of OA sulphur content on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is not confined to specific crop residues such as alfalfa residues but may applied for all OAs, especially in slightly alkaline clay soil type and O<sub>2</sub>-limited environment.

# REFERENCES

**Abalos**, D., Sanz-Cobena, A., Garcia-Torres, L., Groenigen, J., Vallejo, A., 2012. Role of maize stover incorporation on nitrogen oxide emissions in a non-irrigated Mediterranean barley field. Plant and Soil 364, 1-15.

**Aguilera**, E., Lassaletta, L., Sanz-Cobena, A., Garnier, J., Vallejo, A., 2013. The potential of organic fertilizers and water management to reduce N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in Mediterranean climate cropping systems. A review. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 164, 32-52.

**Aita**, C., Gonzatto, R., Miola, E.C.C., dos Santos, D.B., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Chantigny, M.H., Pujol, S.B., Giacomini, D.A., Giacomini, S.J., 2014. Injection of dicyandiamide-treated pig slurry reduced ammonia volatilization without enhancing soil nitrous oxide emissions from no-till corn in Southern Brazil. Journal of Environmental Quality 43, 789-800.

**Akiyama**, H., McTaggart, I.P., Ball, B.C., Scott, A., 2004. N<sub>2</sub>O, NO, and NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from soil after the application of organic fertilizers, urea and water. Water Air and Soil Pollution 156, 113-129.

**Akiyama**, H., Tsuruta, H., 2003. Nitrous oxide, nitric oxide, and nitrogen dioxide fluxes from soils after manure and urea application. Journal of Environmental Quality 32, 423-431.

**Ambus**, P., E. S. Jensen, et al., 2001. Nitrous oxide and N-leaching losses from agricultural soil: Influence of crop residue particle size, quality and placement. Phyton-Annales Rei Botanicae 41, 7-15.

**Angers**, D., Recous, S., 1997. Decomposition of wheat straw and rye residues as affected by particle size. Plant and Soil 189, 197-203.

**APHA**, 1992. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater. 18th ed. American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.

**Aulakh**, M.S., Khera, T.S., Doran, J.W., 2000. Mineralization and denitrification in upland, nearly saturated and flooded subtropical soil - II. Effect of organic manures varying in N content and C : N ratio. Biology and Fertility of Soils 31, 168-174.

**Baggs**, E.M., 2008. A review of stable isotope techniques for N<sub>2</sub>O source partitioning in soils: recent progress, remaining challenges and future considerations. Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry 22, 1664-1672.

**Baggs**, E.M., Rees, R.M., Castle, K., Scott, A., Smith, K.A., Vinten, A.J.A., 2002. Nitrous oxide release from soils receiving N-rich crop residues and paper mill sludge in eastern Scotland. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 90, 109-123.

**Baggs**, E.M., Rees, R.M., Smith, K.A., Vinten, A.J.A., 2000. Nitrous oxide emission from soils after incorporating crop residues. Soil Use and Management 16, 82-87.

**Ball**, B.C., McTaggart, I.P., Scott, A., 2004. Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from soil under silage production by use of organic manures or slow-release fertilizer. Soil Use and Management 20, 287-295.

**Bergaust**, L., Mao, Y., Bakken, L.R., Frostegård, A., 2010. Denitrification response patterns during the transition to anoxic respiration and posttranscriptional effects of suboptimal ph on nitrogen oxide reductase in paracoccus denitrificans. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 76, 6387-6396.

**Bergstermann**, A., Cárdenas, L., Bol, R., Gilliam, L., Goulding, K., Meijide, A., Scholefield, D., Vallejo, A., Well, R., 2011. Effect of antecedent soil moisture conditions on emissions and isotopologue distribution of N<sub>2</sub>O during denitrification. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 43, 240-250.

**Bertora**, C., Alluvione, F., Zavattaro, L., van Groenigen, J.W., Velthof, G., Grignani, C., 2008. Pig slurry treatment modifies slurry composition, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions after soil incorporation. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 40, 1999-2006.

**Bhandral**, R., Bittman, S., Kowalenko, C.G., Friesen, A., Hunt, D.E., 2008. Emissions of nitrous oxide after application of dairy slurry on bare soil and perennial grass in a maritime climate. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 517-527.

**Bingeman**, C.W., et al., The effect of the addition of organic materials on the decomposition of an organic soil. Soil Science Society America Proceedings, 1953. 29: p. 692–696.

**Bitzer**, C.C., Sims, J.T., 1988. Estimating the availability of nitrogen in poultry manure through laboratory and field studies. Journal of Environmental Quality 17, 47-54.

**Blagodatskaya**, E. and Y. Kuzyakov, Mechanisms of real and apparent priming effects and their dependence on soil microbial biomass and community structure: critical review. Biology and Fertility of Soils, 2008. 45(2): p. 115-131.

**Bolan**, N.S., Szogi, A.A., Chuasavathi, T., Seshadri, B., Rothrock, M.J., Panneerselvam, P., 2010. Uses and management of poultry litter. World's Poultry Science Journal 66, 673-698.

**Borenstein**, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009).Introduction to metaanalysis. John Wiley & Sons.

**Bouwman**, A., 1998. Environmental science: Nitrogen oxides and tropical agriculture. Nature 392, 866-867.

**Bouwman**, A.F., Boumans, L.J.M., Batjes, N.H., 2002a. Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O and NO from fertilized fields: Summary of available measurement data. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 16, 6-1.

**Bouwman**, A.F., Boumans, L.J.M., Batjes, N.H., 2002b. Modeling global annual N<sub>2</sub>O and NO emissions from fertilized fields. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 16, 28-21.

**Breitenbeck**, G.A., Blackmer, A.M., Bremner, J.M., 1980. Effects of different nitrogen fertilizers on emission of nitrous oxide from soil. Geophysical Research Letters 7, 85-88.

**Bremer**, E., van Houtum, W., van Kessel, C., 1991. Carbon dioxide evolution from wheat and lentil residues as affected by grinding, added nitrogen, and the absence of soil. Biology and Fertility of Soils 11, 221-227.

**Bremner**, J.M., 1997. Sources of nitrous oxide in soils. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 49, 7-16.

**Brumme**, R., Beese, F., 1992. Effects of liming and nitrogen fertilization on emissions of CO2 and N<sub>2</sub>O from a temperate forest. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 97, 12851-12858.

**Brunet**, R.C., Garcia-Gil, L.J., 1996. Sulfide-induced dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonia in anaerobic freshwater sediments. FEMS Microbiology Ecology 21, 131-138.

**Buckingham**, S., Anthony, S., Bellamy, P.H., Cardenas, L.M., Higgins, S., McGeough, K., Topp, C.F.E., 2014. Review and analysis of global agricultural N<sub>2</sub>O emissions relevant to the UK. Science of the Total Environment 487, 164-172.

**Butterbach-Bahl**, K., Baggs, E.M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R., Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., 2013. Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: How well do we understand the processes and their controls? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 368.

**Cabrera**, M.L., Chiang, S.C., Merka, W.C., Pancorbo, O.C., Thompson, S.A., 1994a. Nitrous-oxide and carbon-dioxide emissions from pelletized and nonpelletized poultry litter incorporated into soil. Plant and Soil 163, 189-195.

**Cabrera**, M.L., Merka, W.C., Thompson, S.A., Chiang, S.C., Pancorbo, O.C., 1994b. Pelletizing and Soil Water Effects on Gaseous Emissions from Surface-Applied Poultry Litter. Soil Sci Soc Am J 58, 807-811.

**Cai**, Y., Ding, W., Luo, J., 2013. Nitrous oxide emissions from Chinese maize-wheat rotation systems: A 3-year field measurement. Atmospheric Environment 65, 112-122.

**Canh**, T.T., Sutton, A.L., Aarnink, A.J., Verstegen, M.W., Schrama, J.W., Bakker, G.C., 1998. Dietary carbohydrates alter the fecal composition and pH and the ammonia emission from slurry of growing pigs. Journal of animal science 76, 1887-1895.

**Cardenas**, L.M., Chadwick, D., Scholefield, D., Fychan, R., Marley, C.L., Jones, R., Bol, R., Well, R., Vallejo, A., 2007. The effect of diet manipulation on nitrous oxide and methane emissions from manure application to incubated grassland soils. Atmospheric Environment 41, 7096-7107.

**Cardenas**, L.M., Chadwick, D., Scholefield, D., Fychan, R., Marley, C.L., Jones, R., Bol, R., Well, R., Vallejo, A., 2007. The effect of diet manipulation on nitrous oxide and methane emissions from manure application to incubated grassland soils. Atmospheric Environment 41, 7096-7107.

Cardenas, L.M., Gooday, R., Brown, L., Scholefield, D., Cuttle, S., Gilhespy, S., Matthews, R., Misselbrook, T., Wang, J., Li, C., Hughes, G., Lord, E., 2013. Towards an improved inventory of N<sub>2</sub>O from agriculture: Model evaluation of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors and N fraction leached from different sources in UK agriculture. Atmospheric Environment 79, 340-348.

**Carmo**, J.B.D., Filoso, S., Zotelli, L.C., De Sousa Neto, E.R., Pitombo, L.M., Duarte-Neto, P.J., Vargas, V.P., Andrade, C.A., Gava, G.J.C., Rossetto, R., Cantarella, H., Neto, A.E., Martinelli, L.A., 2013. Infield greenhouse gas emissions from sugarcane soils in brazil: Effects from synthetic and organic fertilizer application and crop trash accumulation. GCB Bioenergy 5, 267-280.

Chadwick, D., John, F., Pain, B., Chambers, B., Williams, J., 2000a. Plant uptake of nitrogen from the organic nitrogen fraction of animal manures: a laboratory experiment. The Journal of Agricultural Science 134, 159-168.

**Chadwick**, D.R., 2005. Emissions of ammonia, nitrous oxide and methane from cattle manure heaps: effect of compaction and covering. Atmospheric Environment 39, 787-799.

**Chadwick**, D.R., Pain, B.F., Brookman, S.K.E., 2000b. Nitrous oxide and methane emissions following application of animal manures to grassland. Journal of Environmental Quality 29, 277-287.

**Chadwick**, D.R., Sneath, R.W., Phillips, V.R., Pain, B.F., 1999. A UK inventory of nitrous oxide emissions from farmed livestock. Atmospheric Environment 33, 3345-3354.

**Chang**, C., Cho, C.M., Janzen, H.H., 1998. Nitrous oxide emission from long-term manured soils. Soil Science Society of America Journal 62, 677-682.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Angers, D.A., Rochette, P., 2002. Fate of carbon and nitrogen from animal manure and crop residues in wet and cold soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 34, 509-517.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Angers, D.A., Rochette, P., Belanger, G., Masse, D., Cote, D., 2007. Gaseous nitrogen emissions and forage nitrogen uptake on soils fertilized with raw and treated swine manure. Journal of Environmental Quality 36, 1864-1872.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Pelster, D.E., Perron, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Parent, L.É., Massé, D., Ziadi, N., 2013. Nitrous oxide emissions from clayey soils amended with paper sludges and biosolids of separated pig slurry. Journal of Environmental Quality 42, 30-39.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., 2001. Short-term C and N dynamics in a soil amended with pig slurry and barley straw: a field experiment. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 81, 131-137.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Bittman, S., Buckley, K., Massé, D., Bélanger, G., Eriksen-Hamel, N., Gasser, M.-O., 2010. Soil Nitrous Oxide Emissions Following Band-Incorporation of Fertilizer Nitrogen and Swine Manure. J. Environ. Qual. 39, 1545-1553.

**Chantigny**, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Massé, D., Côté, D., 2004. Ammonia Volatilization and Selected Soil Characteristics Following Application of Anaerobically Digested Pig Slurry. Soil Science Society of America Journal 68, 306-312. **Chaves**, B., De Neve, S., Cabrera, M.D.L., Boeckx, P., Van Cleemput, O., Hofman, G., 2005. The effect of mixing organic biological waste materials and high-N crop residues on the short-time N<sub>2</sub>O emission from horticultural soil in model experiments. Biology and Fertility of Soils 41, 411-418.

**Chen**, H., Li, X., Hu, F., Shi, W., 2013. Soil nitrous oxide emissions following crop residue addition: A meta-analysis. Global Change Biology 19, 2956-2964.

**Christensen**, S., Tiedje, J.M., 1990. Brief and vigorous N<sub>2</sub>O production by soil at spring thaw. J. Soil Sci. 41, 1–4.

**Cogger**, C.G., Forge, T.A., Neilsen, G.H., 2006. Biosolids recycling: Nitrogen management and soil ecology. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 86, 613-620.

**Collins**, H.P., Alva, A.K., Streubel, J.D., Fransen, S.F., Frear, C., Chen, S., Kruger, C., Granatstein, D., 2011. Greenhouse gas emissions from an irrigated silt loam soil amended with anaerobically digested dairy manure. Soil Science Society of America Journal 75, 2206-2216.

**Coote**, D. R. and L. J. Gregorich, The health of our water: toward sustainable agriculture in Canada. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. 2000. Ottawa, ON, 188 pp.

**CRAAQ. 2010**. Reference guide for crop fertilization [In French]. 2nd ed. Centre de Référence en Agriculture et Agroalimentaire du Québec, Québec, Canada.

**Curtin**, D., Campbell, C.A., Jalil, A., 1998. Effects of acidity on mineralization: pH-dependence of organic matter mineralization in weakly acidic soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 30, 57-64.

**Dalal**, R., Gibson, I., Menzies, N., 2009. Nitrous oxide emission from feedlot manure and green waste compost applied to Vertisols. Biology and Fertility of Soils 45, 809-819.

**Dalal**, R.C., Gibson, I., Allen, D.E., Menzies, N.W., 2010. Green waste compost reduces nitrous oxide emissions from feedlot manure applied to soil. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 136, 273-281.

**Dalenberg**, J.W. and G. Jager, Priming effect of some organic additions to 14C-labelled soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 1989. 21: p. 443–448.

**Davidson**, E.A., 2009. The contribution of manure and fertilizer nitrogen to atmospheric nitrous oxide since 1860. Nature Geoscience 2, 659-662.

**De Catanzaro**, J.B., Beauchamp, E.G., Drury, C.F., 1987. Denitrification vs dissimilatory nitrate reduction in soil with alfalfa, straw, glucose and sulfide treatments. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 19, 583-587.

**De Wever**, H., Mussen, S., Merckx, R., 2002. Dynamics of trace gas production following compost and  $NO_3^-$  amendments to soil at different initial TOC/NO $_3^-$  ratios. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 34, 1583-1591.

**deCatanzaro**, J.B., Beauchamp, E.G., Drury, C.F., 1987. Denitrification vs dissimilatory nitrate reduction in soil with alfalfa, straw, glucose and sulfide treatments. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 19, 583-587.

**Dendooven**, L., Splatt, P., Anderson, J.M., 1996. Denitrification in permanent pasture soil as affected by different forms of C substrate. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 28, 141-149.

**Ding**, W., Luo, J., Li, J., Yu, H., Fan, J., Liu, D., 2013. Effect of long-term compost and inorganic fertilizer application on background N<sub>2</sub>O and fertilizer-induced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from an intensively cultivated soil. Science of the Total Environment 465, 115-124.

**Dittert**, K., Lampe, C., Gasche, R., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Wachendorf, M., Papen, H., Sattelmacher, B., Taube, F., 2005. Short-term effects of single or combined application of mineral N fertilizer and cattle slurry on the fluxes of radiatively active trace gases from grassland soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 37, 1665-1674.

**Dong** Yu, h., Ouyang, Z., Liu Shi, I., 2005. Nitrogen transformation in maize soil after application of different organic manures. Journal-of-Environmental-Sciences-(China). 17, 340-343.

**Drury**, C.F., Yang, X.M., Reynolds, W.D., Tan, C.S., 2004. Influence of crop rotation and aggregate size on carbon dioxide production and denitrification. Soil and Tillage Research 79, 87-100.

**Ellert**, B.H., Janzen, H.H., 2008. Nitrous oxide, carbon dioxide and methane emissions from irrigated cropping systems as influenced by legumes, manure and fertilizer. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 207-217.

**Engel**, D.W., Brouwer, M., 1984. Trace metal-binding proteins in marine molluscs and crustaceans. Marine Environmental Research 13, 177-194.

**Enwezor**, W.O., 1976. The mineralization of nitrogen and phosphorus in organic materials of varying C/Nand C:P ratios. Plant and Soil 44, 237-240.

**Fazzolari**, É., Nicolardot, B., Germon, J.C., 1998. Simultaneous effects of increasing levels of glucose and oxygen partial pressures on denitrification and dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium in repacked soil cores. European Journal of Soil Biology 34, 47-52.

**Fine**, P., Feigin, A., Waisel, Y., 1986. Closed, well-oxygenated system for the determination of the emission of carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, and ammonia. Soil Science Society of America Journal 50, 1489-1493.

**Firestone**, M.K., Davidson, E.A., 1989. Microbiological basis of NO and N<sub>2</sub>O production and consumption in soil. Exchange of Trace Gases between Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Atmosphere, Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons., pp. 7-21.

**Firestone**, M.K., Firestone, R.B., Tiedje, J.M., 1980. Nitrous oxide from soil denitrification: Factors controlling its biological production. Science 208, 749-751.

**Flather**, D.H., Beauchamp, E.G., 1992. Inhibition of the fermentation process in soil by acetylene. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 24, 905-911.

**Flessa**, H., Beese, F., 2000. Laboratory estimates of trace gas emissions following surface application and injection of cattle slurry. Journal of Environmental Quality 29, 262-268.

**Flessa**, H., Beese, F., 2000. Laboratory estimates of trace gas emissions following surface application and injection of cattle slurry. Journal of Environmental Quality 29, 262-268.

**Flessa**, H., Dorsch, P., Beese, F., 1995. Seasonal variation of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in differently managed arable soils in southern Germany. Journal of Geophysical Research 100.

**Focht**, D., 1974. The effect of temperature, pH, and aeration on the production of nitrous oxide and gaseous nitrogen-a zero-order kinetic model. Soil science 118, 173-179.

**Fontaine**, S., et al., The priming effect of organic matter: a question of microbial competition? Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 2003. 35(6): p. 837-843.

Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Bernsten, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D.W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D.C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schulz, M., Van Dorland, R., Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M., Miller, B.R., 2007.

Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

**Forster**, P., V. Ramaswamy, P. Artaxo, T. Berntsen, R. Betts, D.W. Fahey, J. Haywood, J. Lean, D.C. Lowe, G. Myhre, J. Nganga, R. Prinn, G. Raga, M. Schulz and R. Van Dorland, 2007: Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M.Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

**Fulda**, B., 2013. Changes in copper and cadmium solubility and speciation induced by soil redox dynamics-Competitive metal sulfide formation and interactions with natural organic matter. Diss., Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule ETH Zürich, Nr. 21200, 2013.

**Gabrielle**, B., Da-Silveira, J., Houot, S., Francou, C., 2004. Simulating urban waste compost effects on carbon and nitrogen dynamics using a biochemical index. Journal of Environmental Quality 33, 2333-2342.

**Gagnon**, B., Ziadi, N., Rochette, P., Chantigny, M.H., Angers, D.A., 2011. Fertilizer Source Influenced Nitrous Oxide Emissions from a Clay Soil under Corn. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 75, 595-604. **Giles**, M., Morley, N., Baggs, E.M., Daniell, T.J., 2012. Soil nitrate reducing processes - Drivers, mechanisms for spatial variation, and significance for nitrous oxide production. Frontiers in Microbiology 3.

**Glass**, J.B., Orphan, V.J., 2012. Trace Metal Requirements for Microbial Enzymes Involved in the Production and Consumption of Methane and Nitrous Oxide. Frontiers in Microbiology 3, 61.

Gonzalez-Rosas, A., Miranda-Gomez, J.M., Lopez-Valdez, F., Dendooven, L., Fernandez-

Luqueno, F., 2012. Greenhouse gas emissions from soil receiving wastewater, sludge or cow manure for biomass cultivation. Biotechnology Summit.

**Goodroad**, L.L., Keeney, D.R., 1984. Nitrous oxide emissions from soils during thawing. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 64, 187-194. **Griffiths**, R.I., Whiteley, A.S., O'Donnell, A.G., Bailey, M.J., 2003. Physiological and Community Responses of Established Grassland Bacterial Populations to Water Stress. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 69, 6961-6968.

**Guenzi**, W.D., Beard, W.E., 1981. Volatile Fatty Acids in a Redox-Controlled Cattle Manure Slurry. Journal of Environmental Quality 10, 479-482.

**Guo**, R., Li, G., Jiang, T., Schuchardt, F., Chen, T., Zhao, Y., Shen, Y., 2012. Effect of aeration rate, C/N ratio and moisture content on the stability and maturity of compost. Bioresource Technology 112, 171-178.

**Hansen**, S., Mæhlum, J.E., Bakken, L.R., 1993. N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in soil influenced by fertilization and tractor traffic. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 25, 621-630.

**Harrison**, R., Ellis, S., Cross, R., Hodgson, J.H., 2002. Emissions of nitrous oxide and nitric oxide associated with the decomposition of arable crop residues on a sandy loam soil in Eastern England. Agronomie 22, 731-738.

**Helgason**, B.L., Janzen, H.H., Chantigny, M.H., Drury, C.F., Ellert, B.H., Gregorich, E.G., Lemke, R.L., Pattey, E., Rochette, P., Wagner-Riddle, C., 2005. Toward improved coefficients for predicting direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soil in canadian agroecosystems. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 72, 87-99.

**Horwath**, W., Carbon cycling and formation of soil organic matter, in Soil Microbiology, Ecology, and Biochemistry, E.A. Paul, Editor. 2007, Academic Press/Elsevier: Amsterdam. p. 303-339.

**Hu**, X.K., Su, F., Ju, X.T., Gao, B., Oenema, O., Christie, P., Huang, B.X., Jiang, R.F., Zhang, F.S., 2013. Greenhouse gas emissions from a wheat-maize double cropping system with different nitrogen fertilization regimes. Environmental Pollution 176, 198-207.

**Huang**, Y., Zou, J.W., Zheng, X.H., Wang, Y.S., Xu, X.K., 2004. Nitrous oxide emissions as influenced by amendment of plant residues with different C : N ratios. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 36, 973-981.

**Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 1996**. Climate Change 1995. Impacts, adaptations, and mitigation of climate change: Scientific-technical analyses. Contribution of Working Group II to the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge Univ. Press., Cambridge.

**Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2006**. In: Eggleston, H.S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. (Eds.), 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. IGES, Hayama, Japan Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

**Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007**: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 996 pp.

**Jacinthe**, P.A., Tedesco, L.P., 2009. Impact of elevated copper on the rate and gaseous products of denitrification in freshwater sediments. Journal of Environmental Quality 38, 1183-1192.

Jarecki, M.K., Lal, R., 2006. Compost and mulch effects on gaseous flux from an alfisol in Ohio. Soil Science 171, 249-260.

Jarecki, M.K., Parkin, T.B., Chan, A.S.K., Hatfield, J.L., Jones, R., 2008. Greenhouse gas emissions from two soils receiving nitrogen fertilizer and swine manure slurry. Journal of Environmental Quality 37, 1432-1438.

**Jenkinson**, D.S., R.H. Fox and J.H. Rayner, Interactions between fertilizer nitrogen and soil nitrogen – the so-called "priming" effect. Journal of Soil Science, 1985. 36: p. 425-444.

**Jensen**, E.S., 1994. Mineralization-immobilization of nitrogen in soil amended with low C/N ratio plant residues with different particle sizes. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 26, 519-521.

Jezierska-Tys, S., Frąc, M., 2007. CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from two different types of soils as affected by applications of dairy sewage sludge. International Agrophysics 21, 323-328.

**Jones**, S.K., Rees, R.M., Skiba, U.M., Ball, B.C., 2007. Influence of organic and mineral N fertiliser on N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from a temperate grassland. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 121, 74-83.

**Kaiser**, E.A., Kohrs, K., Kücke, M., Schnug, E., Heinemeyer, O., Munch, J.C., 1998. Nitrous oxide release from arable soil: Importance of N-fertilization, crops and temporal variation. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 30, 1553-1563.

**Kebreab**, E., et al., 2006. Methane and nitrous oxide emissions from Canadian animal agriculture: A review. Canadian Journal of Animal Science 86(2), 135-158.

**Kim**, D.-G., Hernandez-Ramirez, G., Giltrap, D., 2013. Linear and nonlinear dependency of direct nitrous oxide emissions on fertilizer nitrogen input: A meta-analysis. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 168, 53-65.

**Kim**, S., Dale, B.E., 2008. Effects of nitrogen fertilizer application on greenhouse gas emissions and economics of corn production. Environmental Science and Technology 42, 6028-6033.

**Kirchmann**, H., Lundvall, A., 1993. Relationship between N immobilization and volatile fatty acids in soil after application of pig and cattle slurry. Biology and Fertility of Soils 15, 161-164.

Knowles, R., 1982. Denitrification. Microbiological Reviews 46, 43-70.

**Koops**, J.G., van Beusichem, M.L., Oenema, O., 1997. Nitrogen loss from grassland on peat soils through nitrous oxide production. Plant and Soil 188, 119-130.

**Kuzyakov**, Y., et al., Review of mechanisms and quantification of priming effects. Soil Biology & Biochemistry, 2000. 32(11-12): p. 1485-1498.

**Lampe**, C., Dittert, K., Sattelmacher, B., Wachendorf, M., Loges, R., Taube, F., 2006. Sources and rates of nitrous oxide emissions from grazed grassland after application of <sup>15</sup>N-labelled mineral fertilizer and slurry. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 38, 2602-2613.

Larney, F.J., Pan, W.L., 2006. Organic waste to resource: Recycling nutrients. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 86, 585-586.

**Laudone**, G.M., Matthews, G.P., Bird, N.R.A., Whalley, W.R., Cardenas, L.M., Gregory, A.S., 2011. A model to predict the effects of soil structure on denitrification and N<sub>2</sub>O emission. Journal of Hydrology 409, 283-290.

**Lemke**, R.L., Izaurralde, R.C., Nyborg, M., Solberg, E.D., 1999. Tillage and N source influence soilemitted nitrous oxide in the Alberta Parkland region. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 79, 15-24. **Lessard**, R., Rochette, P., Gregorich, E.G., Pattey, E., Desjardins, R.L., 1996. Nitrous oxide fluxes from manure-amended soil under maize. Journal of Environmental Quality 25, 1371-1377.

**Li**, L.J., Han, X.Z., You, M.Y., Horwath, W.R., 2013a. Nitrous oxide emissions from Mollisols as affected by long-term applications of organic amendments and chemical fertilizers. Science of the Total Environment 452-453, 302-308.

**Li**, X., Hu, F., Shi, W., 2013b. Plant material addition affects soil nitrous oxide production differently between aerobic and oxygen-limited conditions. Applied Soil Ecology 64, 91-98.

**Liang**, B.C., Gregorich, E.G., Schnitzer, M., Voroney, R.P., 1996. Carbon mineralization in soils of different textures as affected by water-soluble organic carbon extracted from composted dairy manure. Biology and Fertility of Soils 21, 10-16.

**Linn**, D.M., Doran, J.W., 1984. Effect of water-filled pore space on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide production in tilled and nontilled soils. Soil Science Society of America Journal 48, 1267-1272.

Liu, Z., Powers, W., 2012. Meta-analysis of greenhouse gas emissions from swine manure land application. American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers Annual International Meeting 2012, ASABE 2012, pp. 3829-3843.

**Lokupitiya**, E., Paustian, K., 2006. Agricultural Soil Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A Review of National Inventory Methods. J. Environ. Qual. 35, 1413-1427.

**Loro**, P.J., Bergstrom, D.W., Beauchamp, E.G., 1997. Intensity and duration of denitrification following application of manure and fertilizer to soil. Journal of Environmental Quality 26, 706-713.

**Lou**, Y.S., Ren, L.X., Li, Z.P., Zhang, T.L., Inubushi, K., 2007. Effect of rice residues on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide emissions from a paddy soil of subtropical China. Water Air and Soil Pollution 178, 157-168.

Lu, W.-W., Zhang, H.-L., Shi, W.-M., 2013. Dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium in an anaerobic agricultural soil as affected by glucose and free sulfide. European Journal of Soil Biology 58, 98-104.

**Ma**, R.H., Zong, Y.T., Lu, S.G., 2012. Reducing Bioavailability and Leachability of Copper in Soils using Coal Fly Ash, Apatite, and Bentonite. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 43, 2004-2017.

**MacDonald**, J.D., Rochette, P., Chantigny, M.H., Angers, D.A., Royer, I., Gasser, M.O., 2011. Ploughing a poorly drained grassland reduced N<sub>2</sub>O emissions compared to chemical fallow. Soil and Tillage Research 111, 123-132.

**Magalhães**, C., Kiene, R.P., Buchan, A., Machado, A., Teixeira, C., Wiebe, W.J., Bordalo, A.A., 2012. A novel inhibitory interaction between dimethylsulfoniopropionate (DMSP) and the denitrification pathway. Biogeochemistry 107, 393-408.

**Marschner**, P., Hatam, Z., Cavagnaro, T.R., 2015. Soil respiration, microbial biomass and nutrient availability after the second amendment are influenced by legacy effects of prior residue addition. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 88, 169-177.

**Meijide**, A., Diez, J.A., Sanchez-Martin, L., Lopez-Fernandez, S., Vallejo, A., 2007. Nitrogen oxide emissions from an irrigated maize crop amended with treated pig slurries and composts in a Mediterranean climate. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 121, 383-394.

**Meijide**, A., García-Torres, L., Arce, A., Vallejo, A., 2009. Nitrogen oxide emissions affected by organic fertilization in a non-irrigated Mediterranean barley field. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 132, 106-115.

**Mikha**, M.M., Rice, C.W., Milliken, G.A., 2005. Carbon and nitrogen mineralization as affected by drying and wetting cycles. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 37, 339-347.

**Miller**, M.N., Zebarth, B.J., Dandie, C.E., Burton, D.L., Goyer, C., Trevors, J.T., 2008. Crop residue influence on denitrification, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and denitrifier community abundance in soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 40, 2553-2562.

**Miller**, M.N., Zebarth, B.J., Dandie, C.E., Burton, D.L., Goyer, C., Trevors, J.T., 2009. Influence of Liquid Manure on Soil Denitrifier Abundance, Denitrification, and Nitrous Oxide Emissions. Soil Science Society of America Journal 73, 760-768.

**Mkhabela**, M.S., Gordon, R., Burton, D., Madani, A., Hart, W., 2008. Nitrous oxide emissions and soil mineral nitrogen status following application of hog slurry and inorganic fertilisers to acidic soils under forage grass. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 145-151.

**Molodovskaya**, M., Singurindy, O., Richards, B.K., Warland, J., Johnson, M.S., Steenhuis, T.S., 2012. Temporal Variability of Nitrous Oxide from Fertilized Croplands: Hot Moment Analysis. Soil Science Society of America Journal 76, 1728-1740.

**Mori**, A., Hojito, M., 2007. Grassland renovation increases N<sub>2</sub>O emission from a volcanic grassland soil in Nasu, Japan. Soil Science and Plant Nutrition 53, 812-818.

**Mørkved**, P.T., Dörsch, P., Bakken, L.R., 2007. The N<sub>2</sub>O product ratio of nitrification and its dependence on long-term changes in soil pH. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 39, 2048-2057.

**Morley**, N., Baggs, E.M., Dörsch, P., Bakken, L., 2008. Production of NO, N<sub>2</sub>O and N<sub>2</sub> by extracted soil bacteria, regulation by NO<sub>2</sub>- and O<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Fems Microbiology Ecology 65, 102-112.

**Morvan**, T., Le Houerou, B., Martinez, J., Hacala, S., 1997. La valorisation des effluents d'elevage. Collogues de l'INRA (France). no. 83.

**Morvan**, T., Leterme, P., Arsene, G.G., Mary, B., 1997. Nitrogen transformations after the spreading of pig slurry on bare soil and ryegrass using 15N-labelled ammonium. European Journal of Agronomy 7, 181-188.

**Mosier**, A.R., Duxbury, J.M., Freney, J.R., Heinemeyer, O., Minami, K., 1998. Assessing and mitigating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils. Climatic Change 40, 7-38.

**Nada**, W.M., 2015. Stability and maturity of maize stalks compost as affected by aeration rate, C/N ratio and moisture content. Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition 15, 751-764.

**Nadeem**, S., Hansen, S., Azzaroli Bleken, M., Dörsch, P., 2012. N<sub>2</sub>O emission from organic barley cultivation as affected by green manure management. Biogeosciences 9, 2747-2759.

**Nägele**, W., Conrad, R., 1990. Influence of pH on the release of NO and N<sub>2</sub>O from fertilized and unfertilized soil. Biology and Fertility of Soils 10, 139-144.

**Novoa**, R.S.A., Tejeda, H.R., 2006. Evaluation of the N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N in plant residues as affected by environmental and management factors. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 75, 29-46.

**Olander**, L.P., Wollenberg, E., Tubiello, F.N., Herold, M., 2014. Synthesis and Review: Advancing agricultural greenhouse gas quantification. Environmental Research Letters 9.

**Pansu**, M., Thuries, L., Larre-Larrouy, M.C., Bottner, P., 2003. Predicting N transformations from organic inputs in soil in relation to incubation time and biochemical composition. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 35, 353-363.

**Parkin**, T.B., 1987. Soil microsites as a source of denitrification variability. Soil Science Society of America Journal 51, 1194-1199.

**Parnaudeau**, V., Genermont, S., Henault, C., Farrugia, A., Robert, P., Nicolardot, B., 2009. Measured and Simulated Nitrogen Fluxes after Field Application of Food-Processing and Municipal Organic Wastes. Journal of Environmental Quality 38, 268-280.
**Paul**, J.W., Beauchamp, E.G., 1989a. Effect of carbon constituents in manure on denitrification in soil. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 69, 49-61.

**Paul**, J.W., Beauchamp, E.G., 1989b. Relationship between volatile fatty acids, total ammonia, and pH in manure slurries. Biol. Wastes 29, 313-318.

**Paul**, J.W., Beauchamp, E.G., Zhang, X., 1993. Nitrous and nitric oxide emissions during nitrification and denitrification from manure-amended soil in the laboratory. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 73, 539-553.

**Paul**, J.W., Etches, V., Zebarth, B.J., 1997. Increased denitrification below the root zone in the fall following a spring manure application. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 77, 249-251.

**Paul**, J.W., Zebarth, B.J., 1997. Denitrification and nitrate leaching during the fall and winter following dairy cattle slurry application. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 77, 231-240.

**Pelster**, D.E., Chantigny, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Rieux, C., Vanasse, A., 2012. Nitrous oxide emissions respond differently to mineral and organic nitrogen sources in contrasting soil types. Journal of Environmental Quality 41, 427-435.

**Plaza-Bonilla**, D., Álvaro-Fuentes, J., Arrúe, J.L., Cantero-Martínez, C., 2014. Tillage and nitrogen fertilization effects on nitrous oxide yield-scaled emissions in a rainfed Mediterranean area. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 189, 43-52.

**Ravishankara**, A.R., Daniel, J.S., Portmann, R.W., 2009. Nitrous Oxide ( $N_2O$ ): The Dominant Ozone-Depleting Substance Emitted in the 21st Century. Science 326, 123-125.

**Renault**, P., Stengel, P., 1994. Modeling Oxygen Diffusion in Aggregated Soils: I. Anaerobiosis inside the Aggregates. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 58, 1017-1023.

**Richardson**, D., Felgate, H., Watmough, N., Thomson, A., Baggs, E., 2009. Mitigating release of the potent greenhouse gas N<sub>2</sub>O from the nitrogen cycle - could enzymic regulation hold the key? Trends in Biotechnology 27, 388-397.

**Rizhiya**, E.Y., Boitsova, L.V., Buchkina, N.P., Panova, G.G., 2011. The Influence of Crop Residues with Different C/N ratios on the N(2)O Emission from a Loamy Sand Soddy-Podzolic Soil. Eurasian Soil Science 44, 1144-1151.Ravishankara, A.R., Daniel, J.S., Portmann, R.W., 2009. Nitrous Oxide ( $N_2O$ ): The Dominant Ozone-Depleting Substance Emitted in the 21st Century. Science 326, 123-125.

**Roberston**, G.P. and P.M. Groffman, 2007. Nitrogen transformations. Soil Microbiology, Ecology, and Biochemistry, E.A. Paul, Editor., Academic Press/Elsevier: Amsterdam. p. 341-364. **Robin**, D., 1997. Usefulness of organic profiles for evaluating the stable organic matter fraction produced during decomposition in soil and the classification of organic manures. Agronomie 17, 157-171.

**Rochette**, P., Angers, D.A., C ôté, D., 2000a. Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Dynamics Following Application of Pig Slurry for the 19th Consecutive Year I. Carbon Dioxide Fluxes and Microbial Biomass Carbon. Soil Science Society of America Journal 64, 1389-1395.

**Rochette**, P., Angers, D.A., Chantigny, M.H., Bertrand, N., 2008d. Nitrous Oxide Emissions Respond Differently to No-Till in a Loam and a Heavy Clay Soil. Soil Sci Soc Am J 72, 1363-1369.

**Rochette**, P., Angers, D.A., Chantigny, M.H., Gagnon, B., Bertrand, N., 2008c. N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in soils of contrasting textures fertilized with liquid and solid dairy cattle manures. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 175-187.

**Rochette**, P., Tremblay, N., Fallon, E., Angers, D.A., Chantigny, M.H., MacDonald, J.D., Bertrand, N., Parent, L.É., 2010. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from an irrigated and non-irrigated organic soil in eastern Canada as influenced by N fertilizer addition. European Journal of Soil Science 61, 186-196. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2009.01222.x

**Rochette**, P., van Bochove, E., Prevost, D., Angers, D.A., Cote, D., Bertrand, N., 2000b. Soil carbon and nitrogen dynamics following application of pig slurry for the 19th consecutive year: II. Nitrous oxide fluxes and mineral nitrogen. Soil Science Society of America Journal 64, 1396-1403.

**Rochette**, P., Worth, D.E., Huffman, E.C., Brierley, J.A., McConkey, B.G., Yang, J.Y., Hutchinson, J.J., Desjardins, R.L., Lemke, R., Gameda, S., 2008b. Estimation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from agricultural soils in Canada. II. 1990-2005 inventory. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 655-669.

**Rochette**, P., Worth, D.E., Lemke, R.L., McConkey, B.G., Pennock, D.J., Wagner-Riddle, C., Desjardins, R.L., 2008a. Estimation of  $N_2O$  emissions from agricultural soils in Canada. I. Development of a country-specific methodology. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 88, 641-654.

**Rogeri**, D.A., Ernani, P.R., Lourenco, K.S., Cassol, P.C., Gatiboni, L.C., 2015. Mineralization and nitrification of nitrogen from poultry litter applied to soil. Rev. Bras. Eng. Agric. Ambient. 19, 534-540.

**Rosenberg**, M.S., Adams, D.C., Gurevitch, J., 1999. MetaWin 2.0 (User's Manual): Statistical Software for Meta-Analysis. Sinauer Associates, Incorporated.

**Ruser**, R., Flessa, H., Russow, R., Schmidt, G., Buegger, F., Munch, J.C., 2006. Emission of  $N_2O$ ,  $N_2$  and  $CO_2$  from soil fertilized with nitrate: Effect of compaction, soil moisture and rewetting. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 38, 263-274.

**Sanchez-Martín**, L., Meijide, A., Garcia-Torres, L., Vallejo, A., 2010. Combination of drip irrigation and organic fertilizer for mitigating emissions of nitrogen oxides in semiarid climate. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 137, 99-107.

**Sauvant**, D., Schmidely, P., Daudin, J.J., St-Pierre, N.R., 2008. Meta-analyses of experimental data in animal nutrition. animal 2, 1203-1214.

**Scholefield**, D., Hawkins, J.M.B., Jackson, S.M., 1997. Development of a helium atmosphere soil incubation technique for direct measurement of nitrous oxide and dinitrogen fluxes during denitrification. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 29, 1345-1352.

**Scott**, A., Crichton, I., Ball, B.C., 1999. Long-term monitoring of soil gas fluxes with closed chambers using automated and manual systems. Journal of Environmental Quality 28, 1637-1643.

**Senbayram**, M., Chen, R., Budai, A., Bakken, L., Dittert, K., 2012.  $N_2O$  emission and the  $N_2O/(N_2O + N_2)$  product ratio of denitrification as controlled by available carbon substrates and nitrate concentrations. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 147, 8.

**Senbayram**, M., Chen, R., Wienforth, B., Herrmann, A., Kage, H., Mühling, K.H., Dittert, K., 2014. Emission of N<sub>2</sub>O from Biogas Crop Production Systems in Northern Germany. BioEnergy Research.

**Sexstone**, A.J., Revsbech, N.P., Parkin, T.B., Tiedje, J.M., 1985. Direct Measurement of Oxygen Profiles and Denitrification Rates in Soil Aggregates. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 49, 645-651.

**Sey**, B.K., Manceur, A.M., Whalen, J.K., Gregorich, E.G., Rochette, P., 2008. Small-scale heterogeneity in carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and methane production from aggregates of a cultivated sandy-loam soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 40, 2468-2473.

**Shan**, J., Yan, X., 2013. Effects of crop residue returning on nitrous oxide emissions in agricultural soils. Atmospheric Environment 71, 170-175.

**Shang**, Q., Yang, X., Gao, C., Wu, P., Liu, J., Xu, Y., Shen, Q., Zou, J., Guo, S., 2011. Net annual global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity in Chinese double rice-cropping systems: A 3-year field measurement in long-term fertilizer experiments. Global Change Biology 17, 2196-2210.

**Shcherbak**, I., Millar, N., Robertson, G.P., 2014. Global metaanalysis of the nonlinear response of soil nitrous oxide ( $N_2O$ ) emissions to fertilizer nitrogen. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

**Shelp**, M.L., Beauchamp, E.G., Thurtell, G.W., 2000. Nitrous oxide emissions from soil amended with glucose, alfalfa, or corn residues. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 31, 877-892.

**Shen**, J. K., Bartha, R., Priming effect of glucose polymers in soil based biodegradation tests. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 1997. 29, 1195–1198.

**Shirazi**, M.A., Boersma, L., 1984. A unifying quantitative analysis of soil texture. Soil Science Society of America Journal 48, 142-147.

**Simek**, M., Cooper, J.E., Picek, T., Santrůcková, H., 2000. Denitrification in arable soils in relation to their physico-chemical properties and fertilization practice. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 32, 101-110.

**Sims**, J.L., Frederick, L.R., 1970. Nitrogen Immobilization and Decomposition of Corn Residue in Soil and Sand As Affected By Residue Particle Size. Soil Science 109, 355-361.

**Singurindy**, O., Molodovskaya, M., Richards, B.K., Steenhuis, T.S., 2009. Nitrous oxide emission at low temperatures from manure-amended soils under corn (Zea mays L.). Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 132, 74-81.

**Smith**, K.A., 1980. A model of the extent of anaerobic zones in aggregated soils, and its potential application to estimates of denitrification. Journal of Soil Science 31, 263-277.

Smith, P., Martino, D., Cai, Z., Gwary, D., Janzen, H., Kumar, P., McCarl, B., Ogle, S., O'Mara, F., Rice, C., Scholes, B., and Sirotenko, O. (2007). Agriculture. In: B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, and L.A. Meyer (eds). Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

**Sneddon**, I.R., Orueetxebarria, M., Hodson, M.E., Schofield, P.F., Valsami-Jones, E., 2008. Field trial using bone meal amendments to remediate mine waste derived soil contaminated with zinc, lead and cadmium. Applied Geochemistry 23, 2414-2424.

**Snyder**, C.S., Davidson, E.A., Smith, P., Venterea, R.T., 2014. Agriculture: sustainable crop and animal production to help mitigate nitrous oxide emissions. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 9–10, 46-54.

**Sommer**, S.G., Sherlock, R.R., 1996. pH and buffer component dynamics in the surface layers of animal slurries. Journal of Agricultural Science 127, 109-116.

**Sorensen**, L. H., Stabilization of newly formed amino acid metabolites in soil by clay minerals. Soil Sci., 1972. 114: p. 5–11.

**Spott**, O., Russow, R., Stange, C.F., 2011. Formation of hybrid N<sub>2</sub>O and hybrid N<sub>2</sub> due to codenitrification: First review of a barely considered process of microbially mediated N-nitrosation. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 43, 1995-2011.

**Syakila**, A., Kroeze, C., 2011. The global nitrous oxide budget revisited. Greenhouse Gas Measurement and Management 1, 17-26.

**Takakai**, F., Takeda, M., Kon, K., Inoue, K., Nakagawa, S., Sasaki, K., Chida, A., Sekiguchi, K., Takahashi, T., Sato, T., Kaneta, Y., 2010. Effects of preceding compost application on the nitrogen budget in an upland soybean field converted from a rice paddy field on gray lowland soil in Akita, Japan. Soil Science and Plant Nutrition 56, 760-772.

**Tam**, T.-Y., Knowles, R., 1979. Effects of sulfide and acetylene on nitrous oxide reduction by soil and by Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Canadian Journal of Microbiology 25, 1133-1138.

**Tatti**, E., Goyer, C., Chantigny, M., Wertz, S., Zebarth, B.J., Burton, D.L., Filion, M., 2014. Influences of over winter conditions on denitrification and nitrous oxide-producing microorganism abundance and structure in an agricultural soil amended with different nitrogen sources. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 183, 47-59.

**Tejada**, M., Sanchez-Monedero, M.A., Gomez, I., 2014. Influence of particle size of municipal solid waste amendments and presence or absence of Eisenia fetida on soil greenhouse gases emission. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 45, 1214-1226.

**Tenuta**, M., Mkhabela, M., Tremorin, D., Coppi, L., Phipps, G., Flaten, D., Ominski, K., 2010. Nitrous oxide and methane emission from a coarse-textured grassland soil receiving hog slurry. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 138, 35-43.

**Terry**, R.E., Duxbury, J.M., 1985. Acetylene decomposition in soils. Soil Science Society of America Journal 49, 90-94.

**Terry**, R.E., Tate Iii, R.L., Duxbury, J.M., 1981. Nitrous oxide emissions from drained, cultivated organic soils of South Florida. Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association 31, 1173-1176.

**Terry**, R.E., Tate, R.L., 1980. The Effect of Nitrate on Nitrous Oxide Reduction in Organic Soils and Sediments. Soil Science Society of America Journal 44, 744-746.

**Thangarajan**, R., Bolan, N.S., Tian, G., Naidu, R., Kunhikrishnan, A., 2013. Role of organic amendment application on greenhouse gas emission from soil. Science of the Total Environment.

**Thomson**, B.C., Ostle, N.J., McNamara, N.P., Whiteley, A.S., Griffiths, R.I., 2010. Effects of sieving, drying and rewetting upon soil bacterial community structure and respiration rates. Journal of Microbiological Methods 83, 69-73.

**Thorman**, R.E., Chadwick, D.R., Harrison, R., Boyles, L.O., Matthews, R., 2007. The effect on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions of storage conditions and rapid incorporation of pig and cattle farmyard manure into tillage land. Biosystems Engineering 97, 501-511.

**Thornton**, F.C., Shurpali, N.J., Bock, B.R., Reddy, K.C., 1998. N<sub>2</sub>O and NO emissions from poultry litter and urea applications to Bermuda grass. Atmospheric Environment 32, 1623-1630.

**Tiedje** J. M. (1982) Denitrification. In Methods of Soil Analysis (A. L. Page, Ed.), Part 2. pp. 101 I-1026. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. **Tilsner**, J., Wrage, N., Lauf, J., Gebauer, G., 2003. Emission of gaseous nitrogen oxides from an extensively managed grassland in NE Bavaria, Germany. I. Annual budgets of N<sub>2</sub>O and NOx emissions. Biogeochemistry 63, 229-247.

**Toma**, Y., Hatano, R., 2007. Effect of crop residue C : N ratio on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Gray Lowland soil in Mikasa, Hokkaido, Japan. Soil Science and Plant Nutrition 53, 198-205.

**Topp**, E., Germon, J.-C., 1986. Acetylene metabolism and stimulation of denitrification in an agricultural soil. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 52, 802-806.

**Tremblay**, M.E., Nduwamungu, C., Parent, L.E., Bolinder, M.A., 2010. Biological stability of carbon and nitrogen in organic products and crop residues using Fourier-transform near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 41, 917-934.

**Tremblay**, N., Bouroubi, Y.M., Bélec, C., Mullen, R.W., Kitchen, N.R., Thomason, W.E., Ebelhar, S., Mengel, D.B., Raun, W.R., Francis, D.D., Vories, E.D., Ortiz-Monasterio, I., 2012. Corn Response to Nitrogen is Influenced by Soil Texture and Weather. Agronomy Journal 104, 1658-1671.

**Uijl**, I.E.M.d., Swart, W.A.J.M., Shaik, G.v., 2012. Dealing with missing values: a comparison of techniques. Society for Veterinary Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine. Proceedings of a meeting held in Glasgow, UK, 28th 30th March.

**Vallejo**, A., Garcia-Torres, L., Diez, J.A., Arce, A., Lopez-Fernandez, S., 2005. Comparison of N losses ( $NO_3^-$ ,  $N_2O$ , NO) from surface applied, injected or amended (DCD) pig slurry of an irrigated soil in a Mediterranean climate. Plant and Soil 272, 313-325.

**Vallejo**, A., Skiba, U.M., Garcia-Torres, L., Arce, A., Lopez-Fernandez, S., Sanchez-Martin, L., 2006. Nitrogen oxides emission from soils bearing a potato crop as influenced by fertilization with treated pig slurries and composts. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 38, 2782-2793.

**Vanlauwe**, B., Nwoke, O.C., Sanginga, N., Merckx, R., 1996. Impact of residue quality on the C and N mineralization of leaf and root residues of three agroforestry species. Plant and Soil 183, 221-231.

**Van Soest**, P.J., Robertson, J.B., Lewis, B.A., 1991. Methods for dietary fibre, neutral detergent fibre and non-starch polysaccharides in relation to animal nutrition. J Dairy Sci. 74, 3583–3597.

**Velthof**, G.L., Hoving, I.E., Dolfing, J., Smit, A., Kuikman, P.J., Oenema, O., 2010. Method and timing of grassland renovation affects herbage yield, nitrate leaching, and nitrous oxide emission in intensively managed grasslands. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 86, 401-412.

**Velthof**, G.L., Kuikman, P.J., Oenema, O., 2003. Nitrous oxide emission from animal manures applied to soil under controlled conditions. Biology and Fertility of Soils 37, 221-230.

**Velthof**, G.L., Mosquera, J., 2011. The impact of slurry application technique on nitrous oxide emission from agricultural soils. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 140, 298-308.

**Velthof**, G.L., Nelemans, J.A., Oenema, O., Kuikman, P.I., 2005. Gaseous nitrogen and carbon losses from pig manure derived from different diets. Journal of Environmental Quality 34, 698-706.

**Vinther**, P.F., Hansen, E.M., Olesen, J.E., 2004. Effects of plant residues on crop performance, N mineralisation and microbial activity including field CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in unfertilised crop rotations. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 70, 189-199.

**Wagner-Riddle**, C., Thurtell, G.W., 1998. Nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural fields during winter and spring thaw as affected by management practices. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 52, 151–163.

**Wang**, M.C., Bushman, B.J., 1998. Using the normal quantile plot to explore meta-analytic data sets. Psychological Methods 3, 46.

Wei, X.R., Hao, M.D., Xue, X.H., Shi, P., Wang, A., Zang, Y.F., Horton, R., 2010. Nitrous oxide emission from highland winter wheat field after long-term fertilization. Biogeosciences Discussions 7, 4539-4563.

**Weier**, K., Doran, J., Power, J., Walters, D., 1993. Denitrification and the dinitrogen/nitrous oxide ratio as affected by soil water, available carbon, and nitrate. Soil Science Society of America Journal 57, 66-72.

**Whalen**, S.C., Phillips, R.L., Fischer, E.N., 2000. Nitrous oxide emission from an agricultural field fertilized with liquid lagoonal swine effluent. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 14, 545-558.

**Wu**, J., et al., Formation and destruction of microbial biomass during decomposition of glucose and ryegrass in soil. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 1993. 25: p. 1435–1441.

**Wulf**, S., Maeting, M., Clemens, J., 2002. Application technique and slurry co-fermentation effects on ammonia, nitrous oxide, and methane emissions after spreading: II. Greenhouse gas emissions. Journal of Environmental Quality 31, 1795-1801.

**Xu**, Y., Yu, W., Ma, Q., Zhou, H., 2013. Accumulation of copper and zinc in soil and plant within ten-year application of different pig manure rates. Plant, Soil and Environment 59, 492-499.

**Yamulki**, S., Harrison, R.M., Goulding, K.W.T., Webster, C.P., 1997. N<sub>2</sub>O, NO and NO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from a grassland: Effect of soil pH. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 29, 1199-1208.

**Yanai**, Y., Toyota, K., Okazaki, M., 2007. Effects of charcoal addition on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soil resulting from rewetting air-dried soil in short-term laboratory experiments. Soil Science & Plant Nutrition 53, 181-188.

**Yang**, X.M., Drury, C.F., Reynolds, W.D., McKenney, D.J., Tan, C.S., Zhang, T.Q., Fleming, R.J., 2002. Influence of composts and liquid pig manure on CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from a clay loam soil. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 82, 395-401.

**Yao**, Z., Zheng, X., Xie, B., Liu, C., Mei, B., Dong, H., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Zhu, J., 2009. Comparison of manual and automated chambers for field measurements of  $N_2O$ ,  $CH_4$ ,  $CO_2$  fluxes from cultivated land. Atmospheric Environment 43, 1888-1896.

**Yeomans**, J.C., Beauchamp, E.G., 1982. Acetylene as a possible substrate in the denitrification process. Canadian Journal of Soil Science 62, 139-144.

**Yohai**, V.J., 1987. High breakdown-point and high efficiency robust estimates for regression. The Annals of Statistics, 642-656.

**Yoshinari**, T., Hynes, R., Knowles, R., 1977. Acetylene inhibition of nitrous oxide reduction and measurement of denitrification and nitrogen fixation in soil, Soil Biology and Biochemistry 9, 177-183.

**Zech**, W., et al., Factors controlling humification and mineralization of soil organic matter in the tropics. Geoderma, 1997. 79: p. 117-161.

**Zhu**, K., Christel, W., Bruun, S., Jensen, L.S., 2014. The different effects of applying fresh, composted or charred manure on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 74, 61-69.

**Zhu-Barker**, X., Doane, T.A., Horwath, W.R., 2015. Role of green waste compost in the production of N<sub>2</sub>O from agricultural soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 83, 57-65.

## **APPENDICES - CHAPTER 2.**

## Table A2-1 a Selection procedure for papers from the Scopus research database<sup>3</sup>.

Search statement	Concepts and Keywords								
	Se:				Organia amandraast				
	Soll soil*	AND	nitrous oxide	AND	organic amendment*				
		OR	N <sub>2</sub> O	OR	residue				
General				OR	Waste				
					hu producto				
					organic wasto				
					organic waste				
					organic fertilizer				
					fertilizer				
AND				UK					
	Soil	AND	N <sub>2</sub> O	AND	Organic amendment				
	soil*		nitrous oxide		vegetal residues				
		OR	$N_2O$	OR	residue				
				OR	forage				
Vegetal residues				OR	crop residue				
Vegetal residues				OR	forage crop				
				OR	crop debris				
				OR	crop refuse				
				OR	mulch				
				OR	surface trash				
AND	Soil	AND	N₂O	AND	Organic amendment				
	soil*	/	nitrous oxide	/	manure				
		OR	N <sub>2</sub> O	OR	slurry, slurries				
Livestock manures		ÖN	2 -	OR	muck slurry				
				OR	slurr*				
				OR	dung				
				OR	mud				
AND					• · ·				
	Soil	AND	N <sub>2</sub> O	AND	Organic amendment				
	soil*		nitrous oxide		sewage				
Sludges		OR	N <sub>2</sub> O	OR	sludge				
				OR	biosolid*				
				OR	00Ze				
				OR	effluent				
	Soil		N <sub>2</sub> O		organic amendment				
Composts	soil*		nitrous oxide	,	compost				
		OR	N <sub>2</sub> O	OR	decayed organic matter				
	·			-					
RESULTS	959 re	ference	s including 23	duplicat	es related to the CAB query				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The detailed review of literature was carried out until June 13 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_

Search statement	Keywords	Results
General 1	(nitrous oxide or N <sub>2</sub> O).af.	10433
AND		
General 2	soil*.af.	1288490
AND		
General 3	organic amendment*.af.	9873
AND		
RESULTS	145 references including 23 duplicat	es related to the Scopus query

Table A2-1 b Selection procedure for papers from the CAB Abstract research data base<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The detailed review of literature was carried out until June 13 2014.

# Table A2-2. Properties of organic and synthetic sources reported in the database, classified by FertiTypes and FertiClasses<sup>5</sup> (mean ± standard deviation).

				Tota	al N	input	Organic amendment properties					mineral N,		
			Ν	Min	-	Max	Dry N	latter, %	C/N	ratio	I	рН	mg/kg	dry basis
ES	Organic s	ources	251	19	-	800	15.9	± 23.9	8.3	± 11.5	7.6	± 0.7	66847	± 75520
ЕКТІТҮР	Organic and synthetic sources 72		87	-	817	24.9	± 31.3	21.4	± 27.1	7.7	±0.1	217026	± 90354	
ш	Synthetic	sources (S)	99	50	-	480	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	353040	± 94554
		All high-risk												
		Liquid manure + S	31	130	-	460	4.0	± 3.1	4.2	± 3.7	8.0	± 0.4	237042	± 78864
		Biosolid, CR + S	6	120	-	142	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	
	isk	Waste water	8	24	-	231	3.5	± 2.2	9.5	± 6.1	6.0	± 2.1	3716	± 5989
	gh r	Liquid manure	149	35	-	480	4.0	± 2.5	4.2	± 2.6	7.6	± 0.6	89896	± 79178
	ī	Biogas residues	10	160	-	480	4.9	n/a	4.6	n/a	7.6	n/a	42000	n/a
		Biosolid + S	6	87	-	300	42.5	± 3.1	26.9	± 5.4	5.1	± 1.5	83502	± 16
		Solid manure + S	3	240	-	392	19.1	n/a	15.4	n/a	n/a		n/a	
S		Solid manure	29	72	-	800	44.2	± 20.7	12.2	±4.4	7.6	± 1.6	4535	± 4584
ASSI	ε	All medium-risk												
RTICI	lediu risk	Compost + S	14	150	-	817	53.5	± 11.7	12.6	± 10.5	n/a		83745	n/a
Ħ	2	Crop residues + S	12	135	-	271	64.9	± 35.3	66.1	± 23.5	n/a		n/a	
		All low-risk												
		Paper mill sludge + CR	6	220	-	243	n/a		n/a	± 0.0	n/a		n/a	
	sk	Compost	29	125	-	672	35.7	± 21.7	10.8	± 3.3	7.6	± 0.3	4822	± 9865
	Ň	Pellets	5	508	-	510	97.4	± 0.0	9.9	± 0.7	n/a		n/a	
	2	Crop residues (CR)	8	19	-	108	95.8	± 5.9	32.1	± 40.5	n/a		n/a	
		Liquid manure + CR	1	178	-	178	6.5	n/a	35.9	n/a	n/a		2353	n/a
		Paper mill sludge	6	519	-	519	35.0	± 0.0	24.6	n/a	6.9	n/a	n/a	

N, Total # of observations; n/a, not available

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> **FertiType**, type of fertilization: organic, synthetic fertilizers, organic and synthetic fertilizers **FertiClass**, nature of organic sources ± synthetic sources (Table 3, Chapter 2) **FertiRiskClass**, N<sub>2</sub>O risk classes of organic sources ± synthetic sources (Table 3, Chapter 2)

Mineral nitrogen content % dry weight		Application rate N kg N ha <sup>-1</sup> Min - Max		te Dry	Dry Matter %		C/N ratio		рН		
	, ,		IVIIN	-	Max						
0.0 -	0.3	31	114		672	17.9	± 21.8	18.3	± 6.9	7.9	± 1.2
	Compost	13	129	-	672	25.7	± 18.3	17.2	± 2.6	7.7	± 0.1
	Liquid manure <sup>†</sup>	10	114	-	114	0.6	± 0.1	n/a	n/a	8.6	± 0.5
	Solid manure	5	170	-	480	41.3	± 27.9	15.3	± 3.7	n/a	n/a
	Waste water	2	197	-	231	4.7	± 4.2	18.4	± 4.0	5.1	± 2.0
	Liquid manure + CR	1	178	-	178	6.5	n/a	35.9	n/a	n/a	n/a
0.3 -	1.0	7	126	-	672	32.4	± 7.8	8.0	± 2.2	6.7	± 1.7
	Solid manure	7	126	-	672	32.4	± 7.8	8.0	± 2.2	6.7	± 1.7
1.0 -	10	72	35	-	480	9.6	± 13.6	6.4	± 4.6	7.4	± 0.3
	Liquid manure <sup>‡</sup>	54	35	-	480	5.6	± 1.7	5.4	± 2.0	7.3	± 0.3
	Biogas residue	10	160	-	480	4.9	± 0.0	4.6	± 0.0	7.6	± 0.0
	Compost	3	125	-	300	56.2	± 27.8	12.0	± 1.9	7.2	± 0.6
	Biosolid + S	2	300	-	300	41.3	± 3.2	26.3	± 0.0	n/a	± 0.0
	Waste water	1	117	-	117	4.8	n/a	5.3	n/a	7.8	n/a
	Solid manure	1	416	-	416	43.2	n/a	5.2	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Compost + S	1	300	-	300	36.1	n/a	12.8	n/a	n/a	n/a
10 -	25	45	130	-	300	2.9	± 1.8	3.0	± 1.4	7.9	± 0.3
	Liquid manure + S $^{\chi}$	12	130	-	130	4.4	± 2.8	3.6	± 1.9	7.9	± 0.4
	Liquid manure $^{\Sigma}$	33	130	-	300	2.3	± 0.7	2.8	± 1.1	7.9	± 0.3
> 25		11	130	-	130	1.4	± 0.3	1.5	± 0.6	8.2	± 0.2
	Liquid manure + S $^{\chi}$	8	130	-	130	1.5	± 0.4	1.6	± 0.7	8.2	± 0.2
	Liquid manure $^{\Sigma}$	3	130	-	130	1.3	± 0.3	1.3	± 0.4	8.2	± 0.3

Table A2-3. Properties of organic sources combined or not with synthetic sources (mean ± standard deviation).

**S**, synthetic sources

**CR**, crop residues

**N**, total # of observations

n/a, not available

<sup>†</sup> cattle by-products (dairy cow)

t 57% of the observations were pig slurry by-products and 43% were cattle by-products.

**x** pig slurry by-products, combined or not with synthetic fertilizers referring to raw slurry or (anaerobically) digested material, thin fraction, or decanted, filtered, flocculated fractions.

 Table A2-4. Measures of association for soil parameters reported in the database

		5011 pi	roperties			
		Silt	Total N	Organic C	C/N ratio	рН
Cilt	Rho	1.000	-0.038	-0.086	-0.320	0.258
Siit	Pr >  r		ns	ns	<.0001	<.0001
	N <sub>ob</sub>	260	237	248	237	260
	Rho		1.000	0.939	0.353	-0.461
Total N	Pr >  r			<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
	N <sub>ob</sub>		306	306	306	296
	Rho			1.000	0.587	-0.558
Organic C	Pr >  r				<.0001	<.0001
_	N <sub>ob</sub>			340	306	330
C/N ratio	Rho				1.000	-0.572
Chin ratio	Pr >  r					<.0001
	N <sub>ob</sub>				314	296
	Rho					1.000
рН	Pr >  r					
-	Nob					344

#### Soil properties

Rho, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

Rho = +1 indicates a perfect positive association of ranks,

Rho = 0 indicates no association between ranks

Rho = -1 indicates a perfect negative association of ranks

The closer Rho is to zero, the weaker the association between the ranks. Pr> |r|, H0: Rho=0

**N**<sub>ob</sub>, total # of observations



Figure A2-1. Summary of the procedure for document selection from the Scopus and CAB Abstracts research databases





a) Asymmetric distribution of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors from selected studies (n=316),

b) Emission factor (EF) of  $N_2O$ , expressed as the fraction of the N applied, plotted against the variance of emission factor (EF) from selected studies (n=316),

c) Cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions related to the standard deviation of these emissions from selected studies (n=409).



Figure A2-3. Adjustment of the random-effects model according to Borenstein (2009), comparing the model performance following different weighting procedures. Scenario 2 model provided best performance with the highly significant Chi-Square, which means it is recommended the random-effects model would use the inverse of EF variance (1/Vd) as a weighting factor.



Figure A2-4. The influence of study duration on N<sub>2</sub>O response variables.

.

The parameter EF ( $N_2O$ ) represents  $N_2O$  emission factor and the variance of EF( $N_2O$ ) represents the variance of  $N_2O$  emission factor.



Figure A2-5. The influence of total number of flux measurements on N<sub>2</sub>O response variables.

The parameter  $N_2Ocum$  represents cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions, EF ( $N_2O$ ) represents  $N_2O$  emission factor and the variance of EF( $N_2O$ ) represents the variance of  $N_2O$  emission factor.



## Figure A2-6. The influence of total surface area within closed chambers used for flux measurements on $N_2O$ variables.

The parameter  $N_2Ocum$  represents cumulative  $N_2O$  emissions, EF ( $N_2O$ ) represents  $N_2O$  emission factor and the variance of EF( $N_2O$ ) represents the variance of  $N_2O$  emission factor.



Figure A2-7.Revising the REML weighting procedure with detection of superior weight studies. Superior weight studies were defined as studies whose weight of  $N_2O$  observations was twice greater than the average weight of all  $N_2O$  observations (0.24%).

**APPENDICES - CHAPTER 3.** 

		At the	e beginning	g of the inc	of the incubation At the $\epsilon$			he end of the oxic phase			At the end of the incubation			
Amonducont	Method	soil NH4 <sup>+§</sup> soil NC		NO3 <sup>- §</sup>	$NO_3^{-\$}$ soil $NH_4^+$		soil NO <sub>3</sub>		soil $NH_4^+$		soil NO <sub>3</sub>			
Amenament							mg N k	g⁻¹ dry soil						
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺					0.44 <sup>a</sup>	(0.06)	20.74 <sup>ª</sup>	(2.15)	9.92 <sup>b</sup>	(0.30)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.00)	
CTL	S/S⁺	2.70	(0.24)	3.79	(2.76)	0.12 <sup>b</sup>	(0.06)	1.2 o.2 <sup>b</sup>	(1 16)	12.62 <sup>a</sup>	(0.25)	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	(0.02)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>					0.15	(0.08)	12.82	(1.10)	7.16 <sup>c</sup>	(1.03)	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	59.30	(0.05)	20.15	(0.01)	0.51 <sup>a</sup>	(0.13)	78.72 <sup>ª</sup>	(3.10)	10.01 <sup>b</sup>	(0.90)	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	(0.03)	
IF	S/S⁺	59.39	(0.06)	20.17	(0.02)	2 63 <sup>a</sup>	(1.48) 56.1	56 14 <sup>b</sup>	(9 98)	14.62 <sup>ª</sup>	(0.66)	0.04 <sup>b</sup>	(0.04)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	59.39	(0.06)	20.17	(0.02)	2.05		50.14	(5.56)	2.50 <sup>c</sup>	(0.10)	9.03 <sup>b</sup>	(4.00)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	8.83	(0.04)	56.47	(0.36)	0.57 <sup>b</sup>	(0.08)	49.17 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.32)	11.40 <sup>c</sup>	(0.10)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.00)	
AR	S/S⁺	8.83	(0.03)	56.51	(0.28)	3 98ª	(0.75)	(0.75) 23.69 <sup>b</sup>	(1 49)	20.59 <sup>a</sup>	(0.67)	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	(0.04)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	8.83	(0.05)	56.48	(0.47)	5.50	(0.75) 25.05	23.05	(1.43)	13.24 <sup>b</sup>	(0.57)	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	22.75	(0.03)	3.80	(0.00)	0.62 <sup>b</sup>	(0.14)	57.70 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.21)	12.32 <sup>b</sup>	(0.55)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
PM	S/S⁺	23.68	(0.03)	3.80	(0.00)	7 81 <sup>a</sup>	(1.03)	1 03) 27 50 <sup>b</sup>	(1 51)	24.98 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.91)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	23.67	(0.03)	3.80	(0.00)	7.01	(1.05)	27.50	(1.51)	14.40 <sup>b</sup>	(0.47)	0.04 <sup>b</sup>	(0.00)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	80.74	(1.52)	3.83	(0.00)	0.87b	(0.33)	45.48 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.37)	12.40 <sup>b</sup>	(0.38)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.00)	
PS	S/S⁺	71.43	(1.74)	3.83	(0.00)	7 91 <sup>a</sup>	(0.82)	20 03 <sup>b</sup>	(1 34)	28.38 <sup>a</sup>	(5.96)	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	67.50	(1.73)	3.83	(0.00)	7.51	(0.82)	20.05	(1.54)	15.50 <sup>b</sup>	(0.97)	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	(0.02)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	2.73	(0.00)	3.94	(0.00)	0.58 <sup>a</sup>	(0.21)	16.18 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.68)	9.87 <sup>b</sup>	(0.28)	0.00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.00)	
SMC	S/S⁺	2.73	(0.00)	3.94	(0.00)	0.22 <sup>b</sup>	(0.08)	12 00 <sup>b</sup>	(0.81)	12.25 <sup>ª</sup>	(0.48)	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	S/S <sup>-</sup>	2.73	(0.00)	3.94	(0.00)	0.22	(0.08)	12.90	(0.81)	7.54 <sup>c</sup>	(0.37)	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	(0.01)	
	O <sup>w</sup> /S⁺	2.77	(0.00)	3.85	(0.00)	0.54 <sup>a</sup>	(0.06)	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	(0.52)	6.83 <sup>b</sup>	(3.81)	0.13 <sup>b</sup>	(0.21)	
WSR	S/S⁺	2.77	(0.00)	3.85	(0.00)	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	(0.11)	5 62 <sup>a</sup>	(0.72)	15.15 <sup>ª</sup>	(1.12)	0.13 <sup>b</sup>	(0.24)	
	S/S⁻	2.77	(0.00)	3.85	(0.00)	0.20	(0.11)	5.63	(0.72)	11.77 <sup>a</sup>	(0.27)	0.04 <sup>b</sup>	(0.05)	

Table A3-1. Fate of mineral N in the Kamouraska soil under four different incubation methods

Means that share a letter are not significantly different within method type by a Tukey-Kramer test ( $\alpha$ =0.05). In parenthesis are standard deviation values (n=4). <sup>§</sup>Values were calculated adding the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> inputs to the soil NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> contents of the CTL jar, respectively.

Means that share a letter are not significantly different within method type by a Tukey-Kramer test ( $\alpha$ =0.05). In parenthesis are standard deviation values (n=4).



Figure A3-1. Soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions under O<sub>2</sub> –limited concentrations with the S methods



Figure A3-2. Fluxes of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions after fertilization with the opened-jar method

Abbreviations for fertilization treatment are as follows: CTL, control (unamended soil); IF, inorganic fertilizer (NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>3</sub>); AR, alfalfa residues; PM, poultry manure; PS, pig slurry; SMC, sheep manure compost and WSR, wheat straw residues.

## **APPENDICES - CHAPTER 4.**

Table A4-1. High level of collinearity between chemical properties of crop residues indicated by Pearson's correlations (n=64).

	C/N ratio	$NH_4^+$	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	BSI	WEOC	S
C/N ratio	1.00000	-0.52692	-0.32083	0.28566	-0.51611	-0.61983
		* * *	**	*	***	***
$\mathbf{NH_4}^+$		1.00000	0.48347	-0.52938	0.81314	0.95165
			***	***	***	***
NO <sub>3</sub>			1.00000	-0.30703	0.53979	0.50887
				*	***	***
BSI				1.00000	-0.58126	-0.52587
					***	***
WEOC					1.00000	0.82518
						***
S						1.00000

Chemical properties <sup>†</sup>	PC <sub>1</sub>	PC <sub>2</sub>	PC <sub>3</sub>	PC <sub>4</sub>	PC <sub>5</sub>	PC <sub>6</sub>	CE <sup>x</sup>
S	0.25						0.90
NH4 <sup>+</sup>	0.24						0.85
WEOC	0.24						0.83
NO <sub>3</sub>	0.16						0.40
BSI	-0.17						0.43
C/N ratio	-0.17						0.43
Eigenvalues	3.85	0.74	0.70	0.48	0.19	0.04	
Variance proportion	0.64	0.13	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.01	
Cumulative variance	0.64	0.77	0.89	0.96	0.99	1.00	
Multiple Linear Regression	P1 = 12.4270 + 18.8996 x PC <sub>1</sub> R <sup>2</sup> = 0.37, <i>P</i> <0.001						

Table A4-2. Robust regression model relating P1<sup>CR\*</sup> to chemical properties of crop residues based on principal component (PC) scores.

<sup>\*</sup> P1<sup>CR</sup>, immediate potential of crop residues to induce soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, micrograms N<sub>2</sub>O-N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil induced 48h after OA addition (control emissions subtracted)

<sup>+</sup> Chemical properties: S, sulphur; NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, ammonium; WEOC, water-extractable organic carbon; NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, nitrate; BSI, Biological Stability Index

<sup>x</sup>CE, Total communality estimates

Robust Parameter Estimates (method MM estimation)									
Predictors	df	Estimate	Chi- Squared	Pr > ChiSq					
Liquid manure									
NH4 <sup>+</sup>	1	4.40E <sup>-03</sup>	6.93	0.0085					
NO <sub>3</sub>	1	1.91E <sup>-01</sup>	0.58	0.4445					
WEOC	1	5.65E <sup>-03</sup>	12.39	0.0004					
S	1	5.88E <sup>-03</sup>	9.67	0.0019					
VFA	1	-5.81E <sup>-05</sup>	2.56	0.1098					
рН	1	1.01E <sup>-09</sup>	1.94	0.1632					
NH4 <sup>+</sup> *pH	1	$-5.28E^{+06}$	6.38	0.0116					
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>*</sup> VFA	1	3.30E <sup>+04</sup>	25.4	<.0001					
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> *S	1	-5.28E <sup>+05</sup>	1.96	0.1619					
WEOC * S	1	-7.38E <sup>+03</sup>	10.5	0.0012					
Solid manure (poultry manure excl	uded)								
EA	1	-3.53E <sup>-05</sup>	10.76	0.001					
S	1	$1.14E^{-03}$	28.32	<.0001					
WEOC	1	-3.77E <sup>-05</sup>	2.41	0.1203					
NO <sub>3</sub>	1	$1.15E^{-03}$	2.48	0.1152					
NH4 <sup>+</sup>	1	$5.51E^{-04}$	33.46	<.0001					
S*NO <sub>3</sub>	1	$-1.35E^{+03}$	9.88	0.0017					
WEOC*NO3	1	1.27E <sup>+03</sup>	4.79	0.0286					
Solid poultry manure									
EA	1	-4.00E <sup>-04</sup>	40.33	<.0001					
NH4 <sup>+</sup>	1	2.00E <sup>-03</sup>	46.06	<.0001					
NO <sub>3</sub>	1	-4.79	35.04	<.0001					
WEOC	1	-3.60E <sup>-03</sup>	36.44	<.0001					
NO3 <sup>*</sup> WEOC	1	2.00E <sup>-04</sup>	28.55	<.0001					
Vegetal composts									
NH4 <sup>+</sup>	1	0.0471	5.13	0.0235					
рН	1	5.0844	1.08	0.2985					
NH4 <sup>+</sup> *pH	1	-0.0060	4.32	0.0377					
Pellets									
NO <sub>3</sub>	1	-2.96E <sup>-03</sup>	2.54	0.1109					
WEOC	1	1.58E <sup>-05</sup>	0.18	0.6686					
NO3 <sup>*</sup> WEOC	1	1.11E <sup>+03</sup>	7.08	0.0078					

Table A4-3. Multiple robust regressions relating P1<sup>\*</sup> to properties of organic amendments

<sup>\*</sup> P1, immediate potential of organic amendments (OA) to induce soil  $N_2O$  emissions (POA- $N_2O$ ), micrograms  $N_2O-N$  kg<sup>-1</sup> dry soil induced 48h after OA addition (control emissions subtracted)

 $NO_3^{-}$ , nitrate; WEOC, water-extractable organic carbon; S, Sulphur; VFA, Volatile Fatty Acids; EA, Equivalent Alkalinity;  $NH_4^{+}$ , ammonium



**Fig. A4-1. Variations in chemical properties according to the organic amendment categories** The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.





(control emissions subtracted). The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.



Fig. A4-3 Dioxygen and N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations in jar headspace of unamended controls and soils mixed with reactive amendments.



**Figure A4-4. Variations in chemical properties according to manure type (liquid vs. solid)** The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.





The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.



**Figure A4-6. Variations in chemical properties according to manure nature (animal type)** The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.



**Figure A4-7. Variations in chemical properties according to the type of organic-based meal** The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.



Figure A4-8. Variations in chemical properties according to pellet type.

The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.


Figure A4-9. Variations in chemical properties according to compost age.

The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.





The boundary of the box closest to zero (Y axis) indicates the 25th percentile and the boundary of the box farthest from zero indicates the 75th percentile. Whiskers (error bars) above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles. The solid line within the box marks the median and the dashed red line marks the mean. Outlying points are represented for each organic amendment type.