

Interactive comment on "Nitrous oxide emissions from a commercial cornfield (*Zea mays*) measured using the eddy-covariance technique" *by* H. Huang et al.

H. Huang et al.

wangjim@illinois.edu

Received and published: 27 October 2014

Dear Dr. Guenther,

First of all, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for the valuable comments. We appreciate their time and contribution. We have made revisions to reflect all of the reviewers' comments. We have added more analysis and revised some parts of the manuscript to make it clearer and more accurate.

The responses to the reviewers' comments and the revised manuscript (Supplemental file), and the revised figures are attached .

C8522

We hope the revisions are satisfactory for final acceptance of the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Junming Wang

Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/14/C8522/2014/acpd-14-C8522-2014supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 20417, 2014.



Figure 1: Photo of the experimental site, Williamson County (Nolensville, TN).

Fig. 1.

C8524



Figure 2: Time series of measured N₂O concentrations (blue dots, pplw, 10 Hz) under field conditions and the associated Allan variance, downward sloping straight line shows the theoretical behavior of white noise (with a slope of 1, bracked by dotadsh lines showing the 95% confidence interval), provided by Dr. Mark Zahniser at Aerodyn.



Figure 3: Whole-season histogram of the frequency distribution of time lags of N_2O measurements from wind velocity measurements, found by searching the maximum of cross-covariance.

Fig. 3.

C8526





Figure 5: Daily average N₂O flux (μg N₂O-N m^{-2} hr^{-1}) with rainfall and N fertilizer applications from April 4 to August 8, 2012. Error bars were the standard deviations of all data collected on each day ($u_{\star} \geq 0.2$ m s^{-1}), the dates of fertilization were indicated by dashed lines.

Fig. 5.

C8528



Figure 6: Daily average N₂O concentration (ppbv) with rainfall and N fertilizer applications from April 4 to August 8, 2012. Error bars were the standard deviations of all data collected on each day (u_x ≥ 0.2 m s⁻¹), the dates of fertilization were indicated by dashed lines.



Figure 7: Diurnal variation of 30-min N₂O flux of five selected days when day and night were nearly complete (data points > 20 hours/day and u, \ge 0.2 m s⁻¹). The five days were April 15, April 25, April 26, June 1 and June 10. Bars are 95% confidence interval. Data were normalized by each day maximum

Fig. 7.





Figure 8: Diarnal variation of 30-min N₂O mx for the four sub-periods defined in Table 1, a. the first period, b. the second period, c. the third period, and d. the fourth period. $r_{\rm s}$ is the correlation coefficient of N₂O flux and soil moisture.



Figure 9: Cumulative N₂O emission for the experimental site, during April 4 to August 8, 2012. Rainfall and N fertilizer applications data were also shown, 24 days before the experiment (March 10) chicken litter was applied at a rate of 99 kg N ha⁻¹ (not shown on the figure).

Fig. 9.

C8532



^{44 420} era 429 5/11 526 6/18 era 7/18 Figure 10: Time series 30.min of soil temperature, soil moisture, N₂O concentration, and flux for the whole experimental period. The vertical dashed lines indicate the sub-periods defined in Table 1.



Figure 11: Regression of cumulative N₂O emission on the total applied fertilizer N in 10 different studies (where both amount of fertilizer and cumulative N₂O emission are provided) listed in Table 6, the result of this study is indicated by the red square.

Fig. 11.

C8534