

## Cover letter to the editor

The authors would like to thank the editor, Anonymous Referee #1 and Anonymous Referee #2 for their constructive and detailed comments as well as their very helpful suggestions. In our revised MS, we have performed three major corrections: (1) complete restructuring of the original MS, (2) consideration of the partitioning between NO and NO<sub>2</sub> for the top-down estimates (see Fig. 11), and (3) comparison of bottom-up estimates (see Fig. 11) on top-down estimates taking into account the emission ratio between satellite overpass (at 13:00 LT) and average diurnal emission.

To follow the suggestion of Referee #1 and Referee #2 related to the restructuring of the original MS and to present the objectives in the most coherent way to the reader, the GGTP model was replaced to the Supplement. All related results and discussions in section 2.4 of the original MS were also moved to the supplement. The text of the revised manuscript consists now of 40 pages, and 11 figures. The sections of the revised MS we have listed on the pages 3 and 17 with the responses to Referee #1 and Referee #2.

In our revised MS, we have now confined ourselves to the comparison of the bottom-up and top-down estimates, and we have also completely restructured the original MS. Therefore, in some cases on the marked-up manuscript version (pages 24-63), it is not possible to find some changes exactly same section as in the original MS.

On the next pages you will find all our responses to the Referee #1 (pages 2-16) and Referee #2 (pages 17-21). We addressed the individual comments (in bold) for each reviewer as indicated below (in italics).

With best regards,

All the authors

## Response to Anonymous Referee #1 comments

Response to the summary and general comments:

- 5    **1. In my opinion however, this article only marginally fits within the scope**  
Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. It is quite local and very technical in nature, and more  
importantly is primarily focused on the application of land surface remote sensing and the  
development of a “General Tool” for ArcGIS. Of the generous 41 pages of ACPD text (not to  
mention the 22 figures), I estimate 3 or 4 of these pages are directly relevant to implications for  
10    general atmospheric chemistry (though the actual impacts on chemistry are never explored).  
While I believe there could be an audience in ACP  
for this manuscript, I wonder why it is not better suited for Biogeosciences, Geoscientific  
Instrumentation, or Geoscientific Model Development as examples. I welcome  
discussion from the authors (and the editor’s discretion) on this issue.
- 15    *Our work is an interdisciplinary study. As is often the case with interdisciplinary work, in our study  
different methods are used. Thus, it is difficult to find the ‘perfect’ scientific journal that exactly  
matches the scope. The major outcome of our paper is that in arid regions soil emissions can  
dominate the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions during the growing season and that in general soil emissions from such  
regions are systematically underestimated. This is an important finding for atmospheric chemistry.  
20    Thus, in our opinion, the paper fits well to ACP. To balance the different parts of the paper in a  
better way and to make the main focus more clear, in the revised MS we moved several parts  
(including the description of the GGTP model to supplement).*

- 25    **2. If the paper is to be published in ACPD, I advise a significant revision and**  
**restructuring of the manuscript.....**  
I would additionally suggest restructuring the article to better streamline the  
material.....  
Given that ACP allows for deviation from the traditional “Intro / Methods / Results  
Conclusions” headings, my suggestion to improve readability and clarity would be to  
30    reorganize all the material (methods and results) into the following sections: (1) Soil sampling  
and lab measurements (with results); (2) Development and application of GGTP using Landsat  
observations and lab results (with validation and the resulting 2-D distribution of biogenic soil  
NO emissions); (3) Scaling of bottom up biogenic NO<sub>x</sub> inventory to monthly means, and the  
results; (4) Development of a bottom-up anthropogenic inventory; (5) Discussion of soil vs.  
35    anthropogenic contributions  
based on these bottom-up estimates; (6) Development of top-down estimate and  
comparison with bottom-up inventories.

40    *The authors would like to thank Anonymous Referee #1 for his/her very helpful suggestions. With  
regard to restructuring of the manuscript, the suggestions of Referee #1 and Referee #2 significantly  
overlap with following aspects:*

- *Scaling of bottom up biogenic NO<sub>x</sub> inventory*
- *bottom-up anthropogenic inventory*

- bottom-up soil vs. anthropogenic contributions
- top-down estimates
- bottom-up total soil emissions vs. top-down estimates

Given the restructuring of the revised MS, most part of the description of the GGTP model was transferred to the supplement. With consideration of the suggestions of both Referees and the guidelines of manuscript preparation of ACP (only three levels of sectioning are allowed), the revised MS has now the following sections:

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Materials and methods

2.1 Site description and soil sampling

2.2 Remote sensing and accompanying data

2.3 Bottom-up calculation of biogenic NO emission estimates

2.3.1 Laboratory determination of land use type specific net potential NO fluxes

2.3.2 Determination of land use types and corresponding soil surface temperatures from Landsat Imagery

Land use classification

Land surface temperature  $T_s$

2.3.3 Temporally high resolution data

Soil temperature,  $T_{soil}$

Gravimetric soil moisture  $\theta_g$

Fertilizer factor  $FF$

2.3.4 Monthly soil biogenic bottom-up emissions of Tohsun oasis

2.4 Bottom-up anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates

2.5. Top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates from satellite observations

2.5.1 Satellite derived tropospheric VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub>

2.5.2 Monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis (top-down)

Section 3: Results and Discussion

3.1 Bottom-up soil biogenic and anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis

3.1.1 Laboratory derived net potential NO fluxes

3.1.2 Land use type specific net NO fluxes based on soil temperature, soil moisture content, and enhancement by fertilizer application

3.1.3 Monthly soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)

3.1.4 Monthly anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)

3.1.5 Soil biogenic vs. anthropogenic emissions of Tohsun oasis

3.2 Top-down satellite derived total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis

3.2.1 Spatio-temporal variation of the tropospheric VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> measured from satellite

3.2.2 Monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis (top-down)

3.3 NO<sub>x</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis: bottom-up vs. top-down

Section 4: 4 Summary

**3. Another problem I have is that there is little-to-no mention about uncertainties in the HONO emissions that have been estimated. It is not clear to me whether HONO release was measured directly in the lab incubation experiments presented here. If not, then I think a more significant treatment of the uncertainty in the estimate is required.**

Are the HONO emissions an estimated fraction of what was measured in the lab? Or added to the amount measured in the lab based on a scaling function from the literature? Scaling up the HONO emissions to monthly means implies that they are driven by identical functions as the soil NO emissions (i.e. same dependence on soil temperature, moisture, fertilizer application). Has this been shown to be true? Or is it assumed? If the latter, what is the rationale? Given that the calculated HONO emissions can be on the order of half of the total biogenic emissions, if these were not directly measured in the lab by the present authors, the uncertainty associated with these estimates must be discussed further.

Oswald et al. (2013) found, with regard to tropospheric chemistry, that HONO emissions were one of the most relevant sources of reactive nitrogen particularly in arid areas. Two of the co-authors of our present manuscript (T. Behrendt and F.X. Meixner) have also been co-authors of the of that publication: Oswald, R., Behrendt, T., Ermel, M., Wu, D., Su, H., Cheng, Y., Breuninger, C., Moravek, A., Mougín, E., Delon, C., Loubet, B., Pommerening-Röser, A., Sörgel, M., Pöschl, U., Hoffmann, T., Andreae, M.O., Meixner, F.X., Trebs, I.: HONO emissions from soil bacteria as a major source of atmospheric reactive nitrogen, *Science*, 341, 1233-1235, 2013. T. Behrendt and F.X. Meixner have been directly involved in the laboratory experiments for the determination of HONO emissions and its relation to biogenic NO emissions. For these laboratory experiments, a total of 17 soil samples were used, which has been gathered globally from arable and arid lands. Five of these soil samples (S13–S17, s. Oswald et al. 2013) originated from the immediately neighboring region of our study area. Due to the same climate conditions, identical irrigation regimes and fertilizer applications, these soils have similar properties to those used in this study. For the laboratory experiments of Oswald et al. (2013), a state-of-the-art laboratory dynamic chamber system has been applied, which was just a next-laboratory version of that used our present study. HONO concentrations were measured by a long path absorption photometer (LOPAP) and NO concentrations by a chemiluminescence detector (identical to that used in our present study). Calculation of net potential HONO and NO fluxes by Oswald et al. (2013) was identical to that used in our present study. The result from Oswald et al. (2013) is that optimum emissions of NO and HONO have comparable magnitude and occur at similar soil moisture contents. Considering the comments of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following was added:

Page 15, lines 9-20: “Since the HONO emissions were not directly measured within the present study, the land use specific constant scale factor namely the ratios of HONO to NO releases for the optimum conditions to estimate the HONO emissions ( $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ ) were adapted from the study of Oswald et al. (2013). This is justified by: (a) the strong assumption that the soil from our study emits the same magnitude of HONO as the soil by Oswald et al. (2013) because they have the same soil properties, and they experienced the same irrigation regimes and fertilizer applications, and (b) the soil release of HONO and NO by Oswald et al. (2013) has been measured also in the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry by a next-laboratory version of that dynamic chamber system which was used to measure the soil release of NO in the present study. Consequently, corresponding ratios for optimum condition of HONO and NO emissions (i.e.,  $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}$

(NO)) have been used to calculate monthly HONO emissions from Tohsun oasis from the measured NO emissions.”.

Page 27, lines 12- 19: “Nevertheless, the optimum soil water content ( $SWC_{opt}$ ) has a strong influence on the ratio of  $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ . We used this ratio for the calculation of monthly HONO emissions by scaling corresponding NO emissions. However, particularly for cotton soil, the value of the optimum gravimetric soil water content for NO (2.1 %) is slightly lower than the corresponding value for HONO (3.6 %, s. Oswald et al., 2013). This may result in a certain error of the calculated HONO emissions, which unfortunately can not be quantified more precisely at the moment”.

Page 27, line 24 -26: “Nevertheless, the qualitative and, in particular, the quantitative agreement between bottom-up and top-down estimates indicates that our assumptions are largely justified.”

**4. The other prominent issue I have is the reference to “NO2 emissions” throughout the manuscript. It is confusing for an atmospheric chemistry audience whether or not the authors have accounted for both NO and NO2 in equilibrium, or if all NOx emissions are being reported as mass NO2 for some conventional reason (I presume the authors rarely intend to mean primary NO2 emissions?). In parts, it seems like the authors assume for simplicity that all NO is converted to NO2. Since the paper is primarily focused on biogenic emissions of NO and HONO, I don’t understand why the authors have chosen to express everything as NO2 (instead of, say, just simply mass nitrogen). If this is because satellite NO2 columns are being used in the top-down estimate, the actual NOx emissions (in order to compare with the bottom up inventory) still depend on the ambient NO:NO2 ratio. The issue of NO and NO2 in pseudo-photostationary equilibrium is mentioned, but not dealt with in the paper. Doesn’t this ratio depend on season and time of day, and won’t that impact how emission inventories are estimated?**

*Anonymous Referee #1* is right, that all NOx emissions are being reported as mass NO<sub>2</sub>. For that purpose soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO (given as mass) were multiplied by the respective ratios of the corresponding molecular weights ( $M_{NO_2}/M_{NO}$ ,  $M_{NO_2}/M_{HONO}$ ). The reason for this procedure is that the reported mass becomes independent from the partitioning ratio between NO and NO<sub>2</sub>. We added this information to the manuscript in sec. 2.3.4.

With regard of above comments of Referee #1, in our revised MS following sentences were added:  
Page 15, lines 25-31: In the present study, the total bottom-up biogenic emission estimates (NO and HONO) were expressed as NO<sub>2</sub>- partly because the reported mass of emitted nitrogen compounds becomes independent from the partitioning ratio between NO and NO<sub>2</sub>.

Additionally, the anthropogenic and top-down emissions estimates are primarily derived for NO<sub>2</sub>. In this study, the mean primary NO<sub>2</sub> emissions were not considered and all NOx emissions are being reported as mass of NO<sub>2</sub>. For that purpose soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO (given as mass) were multiplied by the respective ratios of the corresponding molecular weights ( $M_{NO_2}/M_{NO}$ ,  $M_{NO_2}/M_{HONO}$ ).

While addressing this point of the reviewer it turned out that for the interpretation of the satellite results we indeed forgot to account for the partitioning between NO and NO<sub>2</sub>. We are very thankful to the referee to pointing our attention to this point. We added the following information to section 3.2.2 (page 24, lines 28-31):

“In addition, a correction for the partitioning between NO and NO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere has to be made. For that purpose we multiply the NO<sub>2</sub> values by typical ratios between NOx and NO<sub>2</sub> of about 1.3 (see e.g. Seinfeld and Pandis, 2012).” We also updated figures 11 accordingly (see response of comment 30).

## Response to the Technical/Specific comments:

- 5 **1. p. 34534, l. 11-13: “The results show that the soil biogenic emissions of NO<sub>2</sub> during the growing period are (at least) equal until twofold of the related anthropogenic sources.” Do the authors mean “to” instead of “until”?**  
*“until” has been changed for “to” in revised MS.*
- 10 **2. p. 34534 l. 17-18: “The resulting total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions show a strong peak in winter and a secondary peak in summer, providing confidence in the method” It’s not clear from the information in the abstract why this provides confidence in the method.**  
*We changed the sentence into (Page 2, lines 22-25): “The resulting total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions show a strong peak in winter and a secondary peak in summer, providing confidence in both completely independent methods.”*
- 15 **3. p. 34535, l. 1-2: “The present evolution of anthropogenic as well as biogenic NO<sub>x</sub> sources triggers a potential increase of global tropospheric O<sub>3</sub> concentrations”. The meaning of this is not clear; please rephrase.**  
*In revised MS (page 3, line 5-8) the sentence was added: “Ozone is usually generated in polluted, industrialized regions, where ambient levels of NO<sub>x</sub> are high. Moreover, the intensification of agriculture is also associated with increased NO emissions, which also causes an increase of available nitrogen in the atmosphere (Denman et al., 2007)”.*
- 20 **4. p. 34535, l. 3: “which photo-stationary equilibrates with NO<sub>2</sub>” is not grammatically clear.**  
*The sentence was changed to “which reaches a photo-stationary equilibrium with NO<sub>2</sub> within a few minutes”.*
- 25 **5. p. 34535, l. 7-9: “Other globally important sources are soil biogenic NO emission (10–40 %), biomass burning (13–29 %) and lightning (5–16 %).” Please offer references to these estimates, or make it clear these are referring to citations from the preceding sentence.**  
*The corresponding references are given in the previous sentence. We added “and” to connect both sentences.*
- 30 **6. p. 34535, l. 20: Is there a connection between “bushy” and “dryland farming”?**  
*“bushy” has been corrected for “bushy vegetation”.*
- 35 **7. p. 34535, l. 27: “convincingly” – This subjective qualification seems awkward to me given that the authors are referring to some of their own work.**  
*- We deleted ‘convincingly’*
- 40 **8. p. 34537, l. 25: “s. Fig 2” Are the authors abbreviating “see” to “s.”? This is done in other places throughout the manuscript, while in some places they write “see Fig xx”. At first I thought they were referring to a supplement.**  
*The authors like to thank Anonymous Referee #1 for his/her comment concerning our spelling variation. All “s.” in MS have been changed to “see”.*

**9. p. 34538: “and 1 September mm” should be “and September 1 mm”?**

*- corrected, thanks.*

**10. p. 34537-34538: Here there are 3 paragraphs about the site/region, then only two sentences about the actual soil sampling: : : I had many questions: How much soil is sampled? How deep? Is the vertical structure kept, or does the soil get mixed? Is only one sample from each site taken, or duplicates? How is it removed and subsequently treated? How is it stored, and for how long, until lab experiments were performed?**

*With regard of above comments of Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentences were added: Page 6, line 14-21: “Since the primary production and consumption zones for NO are located within a very shallow layer at the soil surface (1 to 5 cm, e.g. Meixner and Yang, 2006), only soil samples of 5 cm depth of the top soil were taken. At each of the sampling sites ten soil samples (approx. 150 g) with stainless steel soil cores (5 cm length, 2.5 cm radius) were taken (randomly from a 10x10m<sup>2</sup> area); these were then combined to constitute a representative soil sample of approximately 1.5 kg in mass. These soil samples were stored at 4°C for a maximum 3 months until analysis, since the microbial alterations are not expected within storage for up to 3 months at 4° C (Stotzky et al., 1962)”.*

**11. p. 34539: l. 6: Change “begin” to “beginning” (and likewise in other instances)**  
*“begin” has been changed to “beginning”*

**12. p. 34539, l. 19: Can the authors demonstrate there is no significant trend in the NO<sub>2</sub> columns in the region during from 2006-2010, allowing them to use the mean instead of just data from 2010?**

*We have investigated the seasonal patterns of satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub> column densities (2006-2010) and monthly mean tropospheric VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> during 2006–2010 over the selected areas (Fig. 9 and Fig 10 in the revised manuscript). Thereby, the authors want to demonstrate the importance of representativeness of satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub> and the true seasonal effect on tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub>. That is because a mean value of longer periods leads to significantly reduced uncertainties and it can be better demonstrate the representativeness of satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub>. As can be seen from Fig. 10, there exist some inter-annual variability but no systematic trend of VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> (2006-2010) within the study area and its surrounding area.*

*Tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> column densities for the year of 2010 were used for top-down estimates of total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions and comparison with total bottom-up emission estimates (biogenic + anthropogenic). Following sentences have been added in the revised MS:*

*Page 18, lines 6-11: “To check the representativeness of satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub> on the .regional scale, we investigated the inter-annual variability of tropospheric VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> from 2006 to 2010. That is because a mean value of longer periods leads to significantly reduced uncertainties and it can be better demonstrate the representativeness of satellite derived NO<sub>2</sub>. Evidence of clear seasonal pattern in the long-term observations can reflect the true seasonal effect on tropospheric VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub>, which is of substantial importance with respect on the intended comparison “bottom-up” versus “top-down””.*

*Page 18, lines 26-28: “Top-down NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis (ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) were calculated from all VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> -whose pixels cover the area of Tohsun oasis and where each represents the particular monthly mean of 2010-“*

*Page 23, lines 25-27: "Comparing the mean distribution (2006-2010) of the different seasons, it is clearly visible that for all seasons enhanced values are found over the area of Tohsun oasis (compared to the surrounding desert)".*

**13. p. 34539, l. 20: "Four different areas" – Do these correspond to Figure 20? If so, can this be stated here? Or can the areas be drawn in Figure 1 as well? Otherwise can the authors more clearly state how the different areas were selected?**

*The four different areas correspond to the Figure 20 of original MS (in revised MS Fig. 3). It is not possible to indicate these areas also in Fig. 1 because this figure covers only a small part of the area shown in Fig. 20. With regard of above comments of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentences have been added:*

*Page 18, lines 15-23: "Satellite observations reflect contributions from different emission sources. In principle the retrieval of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions over a city or oases is similar. However, usually the emissions from cities are higher and the corresponding enhancements can be better identified compared to the background. In order to establish the relationship between biogenic NO<sub>2</sub> and satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub>, it is necessary to understand their spatial patterns with respect to the locations and shapes of the potential sources. Thus, four different areas (see Fig. 3) were selected to represent (1) typical agricultural areas (study area) as biogenic source, (2) mixed land use areas (agricultural & small urban) as biogenic and anthropogenic sources, (3) large urban areas as anthropogenic source, and (4) desert area as background source".*

**14. p. 34539: What are the sources of the land use map and traffic map referred to here?**  
*„2010“ changed to „Ma, 2010“*

**15. p. 34541: If this particular method has been used for the past two decades as the authors say, maybe this section can be abbreviated to simply the final paragraph? I actually found myself asking other questions more specific to this implementation that could have been covered: What is the geometry of the dynamic chambers – is there a specific reference from the above list which uses an identical chamber? Is the area that the soil takes up in the dynamic chamber the same as the area of the soil sampled? (i.e. is the thickness of the sample kept the same?) And most important, is there a specific reference that shows that these laboratory methods are equivalent/identical to an in-situ dynamic chamber method in the field?**

*"The laboratory determination of land use type specific net potential fluxes" (revised MS sec. 2.3.1) is one of the most important parts of our study. As is evident from our study, the laboratory method was successfully performed as one of the essential methods for bottom-up emission estimates. We, therefore, believe that the method has to be addressed in the paper to ensure the description of the methods section in a holistic way. However, in our revised MS the method was described as clear and simple as possible since the laboratory method has been used for the past two decades.*

*In the revised MS the following information has been added:*

*Page 8, lines 12-21: The laboratory incubation method is usually based on a dynamic chamber system which consists of gas dilution, thermostat valve, thermostat cabinet, and analysers (Behrendt et al. 2014). The dynamic chamber was made of Plexiglas with a diameter and height of 9.2 cm and 13.6 cm, respectively. Five chambers were used for soil samples while one was kept empty as a reference and the thickness of the sample in the dynamic chamber kept the same (approx. 5 cm). Laboratory measured NO fluxes have been repeatedly shown to be in good agreement with those measured in the field (Mayer et al., 2011; van Dijk et al., 2002, Ludwig et al., 2001). The wetted soil samples were placed into five chambers while one was kept empty as reference chamber. Then, the*



net potential NO release rates were measured until the soil was completely dried out. Laboratory measured NO fluxes using the incubation method have been repeatedly shown to be in good agreement with those measured in the field (Mayer et al., 2011; van Dijk et al., 2002, Ludwig et al., 2001).

5  
16. p. 34541: Here I am a bit confused about the estimated HONO release. Is HONO ever measured in these particular lab incubation experiments? Or is HONO assumed to be a certain fraction of the total NO that is measured? Or is the HONO estimate added to the NO measured based on the scale factors in the literature? If they are not directly measured, what is the uncertainty associated with these estimates?

10  
*The HONO emissions were not directly measured within the present study and the ratios of HONO to NO fluxes were adapted from the study of Oswald et al. (2013). In our revised MS, we have added a section related to the HONO estimates (sec. 2.3.4, pages 14, 15) and the uncertainty associated with these estimates were discussed in section 3.3 (page 27).*

15  
17. p. 34542, l. 24: “in particular” – This makes it sound like there are other schemes or calculations that are required (and that have been implemented), but that aren’t being described here.

20  
*these were described by the sub-schemes from S1.1 to S1.9 in the supplement. In the revised MS (in supplement page 2, line 9), “see S1-S9” was added.*

25  
18. p. 34542: Development of GGTP – Given the aim and focus of the ACP journal, I think all of sections 2.4.1 to 2.4.6 (and accompanying figures) should be in supplemental information; this is an extremely long part of the paper. Moreover this is all a description of land surface products and calculations. Since I am not a land surface remote sensor, I found these descriptions enlightening, but not exactly germane to the ACP focus. From Sections 2.4.1 to 2.4.6, the authors are implementing calculations or methods that have been published and accepted elsewhere. In my opinion, a summary of the sections (e.g. 1 sentence each?) seems like it would suffice, with all the material moved to a supplement. Likewise, Section 3.2 and Section 3.4.

30  
*The authors would like to thank Anonymous Referee #1 for his/her suggestions. In our revised MS, we have considered the above comments of Referee #1. Given the restructuring of the revised MS, the section 2.4.1, 2.4.6, 3.2 and 3.4 were replaced to supplement (S1.1, S1.6, S1.7 and S1.8).*

35  
19. p. 34543, l. 3: “causing that scanning patterns exhibited wedge-shaped” – Replace “that” with “the”?

*“that ” was replaced by “the”.*

40  
20. p. 34549, l. “the level at which plants will irreversible” – I think there are some words missing in this sentence.

*this sentence changed to “ will become irreversible”*

45  
21. p. 34551, l. 20: “images of sufficient quality” – How exactly was this determined?

*With the “images of sufficient quality”, is actually meant here the cloud free images. In revised MS (page 11, line 28 in supplement), “(cloud free observations)” was added.*

**22. p. 34553, l. 21: Insert a comma between “NO flux” and “theta(x,y)”**

*many thanks, the comma was added.*

**23. Section 2.5: I find almost all of the initial discussion (until heading 2.5.1) unnecessary, and could be removed for brevity. It could be sufficient to simply say what you did (e.g. “Mean monthly land use type specific soil NO emissions were averaged from data on the shorter time scales” and that “the NO and HONO emissions were reported in mass NO<sub>2</sub>”.**

*In our revised MS, we have considered above comments of Referee #1. Given the restructuring of the revised MS, the initial discussion until heading 2.5.1 was removed and the mean monthly soil biogenic bottom-up emission estimates (NO and HONO) were described in section 2.3.4 (page 14-16).*

**24. p. 34557, l. 10: Here the authors first mention “temporal scaling”, but what is meant by this is not exactly clear. I think this is ultimately described in a later section, but this awkward division of methods makes it hard to follow.**

*Here, additionally “with high resolution (<1h)” was added.*

*With regard to the above comments of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentence has been added (page 13, lines 9-11 in supplement):*

*“Consequently, the mean monthly land use type specific soil NO emissions have to be averaged from data calculated by temporal up-scaling with high resolution (<1h).”*

**23. p. 34557, l. 15: The authors use a constant value of soil moisture content for desert soil. Where is this number from? Is it an average of the data that was collected?**

*This information was already given in sections 2.2 and 2.4.5 of the original version of our MS. In the revised MS the related content can be found in section 2.3.3 as below:*

*Page 12 lines 15-18: “Evaluation of the MSR<sup>®</sup> 165 data logger measurements (see sect. 2.2) at the site of the Tohsun County Meteorological station (bare desert soil) has demonstrated a temporally quite constant, very low gravimetric soil moisture content of 0.0028, which has been adapted for the entire growing season (April-September 2010) for the land use type “desert” of the Tohsun oasis”.*

**24. p. 34558, l. 7-10: “result in FF = : : :” – Where did these numbers come from exactly? Lab incubation measurements in the present work? Or those from Fechner 2014 / Behrendt et al. 2014?**

*The fertilizer factor “FF” was calculated in the present work (sect. S3.3 in supplement). To calculate “FF”, we used the dependency of NO-fluxes on the fertilizer amount (FA) which was obtained by Fechner (2014) from the laboratory measurement at the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry. In our revised MS the following sentences were added:*

*Page 13 lines 17-19: “The impact of the fertilizer application on the NO-fluxes from arable soils of the Taklimakan oases was recently investigated by Fechner (2014) using the laboratory dynamic chamber system described by Behrendt et al. (2014)”.*

*Page 13, lines 29-30: “dimensionless “fertilizer factor (FF)” applied to the standard net release  $J_{NO}(\theta_{g,0}, T_{soil,0})$  in Eq. (2)”.*

*Page 14, lines 6-9: “With the assumption of an exponential decay of the fertilizer effects, corresponding functional relationships for the temporal behaviour of FF and  $Q_{10}F$  have been developed (see sect. S3.3, supplement) and temporally high resolution data (30 min) of FF and  $Q_{10}F$  were calculated”.*

**25. Section 2.5.3: I might have missed how the remotely sensed soil moisture index is ultimately used. Temporal scaling of temperature using the observations is described in detail here. How was satellite-inferred moisture used in the subsequent calculations?**

*The remotely sensed soil moisture index (SMI) which is calculated from Landsat images was used for the calculation 2-D distributions of biogenic soil NO emissions. Related information to this part is described in supplement S1.7 of the revised MS (page 6-8). The SMI are only representative for selected days. However, for any comparison of bottom-up and top-down estimates longer time scales (preferably monthly means) for the biogenic emissions have to be considered. That is because there exists a strong non-linear response of the net potential NO flux to soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture, as well as to fertilizer applications. Thus, the local chosen irrigation schedule, the two weeks regular temporal patterns, was used to determine the temporal variation of gravimetric soil moisture. For that,*

*“drying-out” shape function was defined which was scaled by multiples of the soil specific physical quantity “field capacity (FC)”. The calculation of the temporal variation of the gravimetric soil moisture for the bottom-up estimates are addressed in our revised MS in more detail (page 12, lines 15-30 and page 13, lines 1-14 in main text; S1.8 in supplement).*

**26. p. 34558, l. 10: As someone unfamiliar with the geography and development of the area, what evidence is there that Urumqi can substitute for the appropriate sectors of Tohsun County?**

*Anthropogenic emission estimates have to be calculated at the monthly level because these have to be comparable the biogenic ones. However, the data of fossil fuel consumption from the different economic sectors of Tohsun County were only available on an annual basis. The known mean monthly percentages of annual NO<sub>2</sub> emissions are only known for Urumqi. With regard to the above comment of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentences were added:*

*Page 16, lines 20-25: “Mean monthly data of Tohsun oasis have been assimilated (down-scaled) by multiplicative consideration of known mean monthly percentages of annual NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Urumqi (140 km NNW of Tohsun). This is justified by: (a) coal is the dominating fuel type of energy consumption in both areas (Mamtimin and Meixner, 2011; Pu, 2011), (b) identical arid climate conditions (resulting in identical heating periods), and (c) only from Urumqi there are known mean monthly percentages of annual NO<sub>2</sub> emissions”.*

**27. p. 34559, l. 3-5: Are the authors assuming that the normalized diel variation is constant across different seasons? Perhaps I am not clear on the exact methodology applied here.**

*It is not assumed that the normalized diel variation is constant across different seasons. In the study, we used 6 Landsat Images to derive land use type specific surface temperature data. From this point data, the land use specific surface temperature for every individual day based on 3<sup>rd</sup> order polynomials was fitted (Fig. S7 in supplement). Then, in situ-measured original data (5 min) of every particularly day (Fig. S8 in supplement) have been normalized at 10:45 LT (Landsat overflight time) for the growing season (April-September, 2010). As a result, a data set of mean diel variation (30 min) has been created by averaging all respective data from 01 July-30 September (see Fig. 6). These methods were described more clearly in our revised MS (page 11-12 in revised MS and page 13-14 in supplement).*

**28. p. 34559, l. 5: How sensitive are the results to the assumptions about seasonal temperature evolution (i.e. other interpolation estimates besides the third order polynomial fit)? There is a lot of interpolation between Day 115 and Day 225.**

We agree that the interpolation introduces uncertainties to the estimated temperatures. To estimate the corresponding uncertainties we compared results using polynomials of degree 2 and 3 for the fitted curve. We found that  $R^2$  in the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree model was 89 % while in the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree model it is 98 %. Thus, the interpolation of the data just by the third order polynomial fit yielded the most consistent results. The corresponding temperature difference is found to be between 3-6°C.

In our revised MS the following sentences were added (page 26, lines 27-31; page 27, lines 1-4):

“The soil temperature at 30-minute resolution are calculated by using of satellite-derived surface temperature and in-situ measurements. The interpolation of the satellite-derived data was done by a 3<sup>rd</sup> order polynomial. From sensitivity analyses we found that the uncertainties of the derived temperatures are up to about 6°C. Substantial deviations of soil temperatures (from the interpolated values) between Day 115 and Day 225 might be unlikely since surface temperatures in (hyper-) arid regions (even with (sparse) vegetation covering) are predominantly controlled by insolation only as long there is no impact of (convective) precipitation (indeed, Turpan’s Meteorological Station has not reported any precipitation events during the entire growing period)”.

**29. p. 34560, l. 10-21: HONO emissions: This seems to assume that HONO follows the exact same emission parameterizations as NO – where has this been shown, or why should this be assumed?**

Anonymous Referee #1 is right: to calculate the monthly HONO emissions we used the land use specific constant scale factor namely the ratio HONO and NO releases for the optimum conditions ( $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ ). The scale factor that we used is justified as follow:

- The studies by Su et al. (2011) and Oswald et al. (2013) pointed out that the HONO and NO emissions have to feature similar dependencies on soil properties, and there exist a co-emission of HONO with NO from the soil; so it could be expected that the HONO and NO emission processes follow similar parameters (Naegele and Conrad, 1990; Skopp et al., 1990, Götter and Conrad, 2000; Oswald et al., 2013).

- Furthermore, in laboratory experiments, Oswald et al. (2013) found that the reactive nitrogen is emitted as HONO from soils of this study area and that this is comparable to soil emissions of NO. Thus, this is additional loss term for fixed nitrogen in the soil beside of soil NO emission and additional source for reactive nitrogen in the atmosphere. To keep the estimation of monthly HONO emissions from cotton and grape soils simple, we applied just a scale factor, namely the ratio HONO and NO releases for the optimum conditions ( $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ ).

The calculation of the monthly HONO emission are described more clearly in our revised MS (page 14-16 in main text). The resulting uncertainties were discussed in sec. 3.3 (page 27, lines 10-20).

With regard to the above comment of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentences were added:

Page 14, lines 26-30: “the studies by Su et al. (2011) and Oswald et al. (2013) pointed out that the HONO and NO emissions have to feature similar dependencies on soil properties, and there exist a co-emission of HONO with NO from the soil; so it could be expected that the HONO and NO emission processes follow similar parameters (Naegele and Conrad, 1990; Skopp et al., 1990, Götter and Conrad, 2000; Oswald et al., 2013)”.

Page 27, lines 9-12: “since the NO and HONO emissions have the similar dependence on soil moisture for soil properties in arid climate conditions (Oswald et al. (2013)), we used the land use

specific constant scale factor namely the ratio of HONO and NO releases for the optimum conditions to estimate the HONO emissions ( $(F_{N,opt}(HONO) \text{ to } F_{N,opt}(NO))$ ”.

Page 27, lines 16-19: “this may result in a certain error of the calculated HONO emissions, which unfortunately can not be quantified more precisely at the moment. Nevertheless, these uncertainties do not question for the basic message of the study”.

**30. p. 34561: Where is the temporal/seasonal dependence of the NO to NO<sub>2</sub> ratio considered/ accounted for in the top-down inventory? And would these emissions only be representative of satellite overpass time?**

The temporal/seasonal dependence of the NO to NO<sub>2</sub> ratio was not considered in the top-down inventory. This can be explained as follow:

(a) the bottom-up emission estimates were calculated as NO<sub>2</sub> (in terms of  $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) and the reported mass of emitted nitrogen compounds becomes independent from the partitioning ratio between NO and NO<sub>2</sub>. Thus, the seasonal/temporal dependence of the NO to NO<sub>2</sub> ratio does not matter for the bottom-up emission estimates.

(b) Within the top-down emission estimates, a correction for the partitioning between NO and NO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere was performed. For that purpose, we multiplied the NO<sub>2</sub> values by typical partitioning ratios between NO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> of about 1.3. These sentences can be found in sect. 2.3.4 (page 15) and sect. 3.2.2 (page 24).

In our revised MS the following sentences were added:

Page 16, lines 1-5: For the comparison of biogenic bottom-up emissions ( $F_{\text{biogenic}}$ ) with top-down emissions ( $F_{\text{satellite}}$ ) only the data around the time of the satellite overpass around 13:00LT was considered (bottom-up results for 12:45LT (12:30-13:00) and “13:15 LT(13:00-13:30)). To estimate the effect of the diurnal cycle of the emissions we calculated the ratio of the bottom-up emission at the satellite overpass (at 13:00 LT) and the daily average emissions Fig. 11 of the revised manuscript was updated accordingly.

Fig. S12 shows the monthly mean biogenic NO emissions during the vegetation period for daily average and noontime. Also the ratio is shown (right axis). The highest ratios are found for July and August (2.4) while it is only 1.01 for April.

These informations were added to sect. 3.3 (page 25, lines 14-15) and sect. 4 (page 28, lines 27-29 and page 29, lines 18-19) as well as in Fig S12 as follow (Fig. S12 was added in supplement): .




Fig. S12: Tohsun oasis biogenic NO emissions during the growing season for 2010: Monthly mean noontime emissions and the corresponding daily averages (all data are given in terms of mass of  $\text{NO}_2$ ) and the corresponding ratio (right axis).

5

Thus, top-down emission estimates are only valid for the time of the satellite overpass (around 13:00 LT) and a few hours before. Thus we compared the top-down emissions to the results from the bottom-up emissions during the time of the satellite overlap (Fig. 11). Fortunately, the soil emissions during the satellite overpass time are strongest because of the high temperatures around noon (see

10




Fig. 11: Monthly mean top-down emissions (from satellite observations) are compared to bottom-up (soil biogenic & antropogenic) and antropogenic emissions (in terms of  $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2$ ). The biogenic bottom-up emissions around 13:00LT (at satellite overpass) are selected. They are systematically higher than the daily averages (see Fig. S12).

31. p. 34561, l. 2: I'm not familiar with a convention to capitalize Atmospheric Boundary Layer. In revised MS "Atmospheric Boundary Layer" changed to "the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL)"

32. p. 34562, l 17: I would rephrase this to "At lab incubation temperatures of 25 degrees, the peak mean net potential fluxes in the Tohsun oasis for cotton, grapes, and desert were: : : " The current wording makes it sound like the peak emission occurs at 25 degrees. This sentence is changed to "The highest mean net potential NO flux at 25°C occurred from the soil of cotton".

33. p. 34563, l. 4: What makes this remarkable? That it is such a small range? Yes, that is small range of soil water content (between 0.01-0.03). Just this makes the net potential NO fluxes from desert soil remarkable. However, in revised MS "Remarkably" changed to "Emphasizing (page 19, line 29)".

34. p. 34566, l. 27-28: "NO from soil is largely controlled by soil moisture, temperature and fertilizer" – This is obvious, since these are the three inputs (besides land cover type) in the emission functions. -In revised MS, this sentence was deleted (see S1.9 in supplement).

35. p. 34570, l. 16-21: These are details that should be moved to the methods section

**Section 3.8: Desert emissions from the GGTP calculation are predicted to be extremely minor, correct? But in Figure 12, the summer maximum in NO<sub>2</sub> column over desert is about 30-50% of the maximum over the Tohsun Oasis. Does this suggest that the desert biogenic soil NO emissions are underestimated your model?**

*In revised MS, these details have been moved to the methods section of 2.5.1.*

*Your comment about the maximum NO<sub>2</sub> VCDs over desert refers probably to Fig. 21 of the original manuscript. With regard to the above comment of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentence was added (sec 3.2.1 page 24, lines 11-18):*

*“Here, we have to mention that the desert VCD<sub>NO<sub>2</sub></sub> values are higher than in comparison to the NO emission of the GGTP model results (see supplement S1.9, Fig S6). This is indeed an interesting finding which can be attributed to the fact that in the desert region a small but still substantial diurnal variation in soil moisture is present. However, in our GGTP model we used a constant value for the soil moisture (0.0028); as a result, the diurnal cycle of soil moisture was not considered in the model calculation. It might indeed indicate that the desert soil emissions are underestimated. Alternatively, it might be partly also caused by inflow from NO<sub>x</sub>-reach air from the surrounding regions”.*

**36. p. 34571, l. 26: “insterstingly” to “interestingly”**

*many thanks, “insterstingly” was changed to “interestingly”.*

**37. p. 34572, l. 1: “Especially the good quantitative agreement was unexpected: : :” This sentence is awkward. Also, what quantitative measure/statistic was used to establish that the agreement is especially good?**

*We changed the sentence into: “Especially the quantitative agreement was better than expected taking into account the uncertainties of the bottom-up and top down emission estimates”, (page 25, lines 27-29).*

**p. 34572, l. 5-25: Herein the authors list potential uncertainties, with the caution that the good agreement could be caused by cancellation of various systematic errors; mainly: air mass factor underestimating NO<sub>2</sub> columns; NO<sub>2</sub> lifetime overestimating true emissions; and uncertainty in irrigation cycles. But the authors have not expressed the rough magnitude of any of these errors, and whether or not they actually could cancel out to give the good quantitative agreement. Please elaborate and give quantitative estimates where possible. Moreover, as I mention above, there is no mention of uncertainties in the HONO emissions, if HONO release was not measured directly in the lab incubation experiments. Since they are potentially roughly half of the total NO emitted, the uncertainty in HONO emissions is necessary to estimate.**

*In revised MS, the most important errors sources are listed in the section of 3.3 (see page 25-27). Following important aspects were discussed:*

**Top-down emission estimates:**

- (a) satellite retrieval concerning to air mass factor, NO<sub>2</sub> profile, surface albedo;*
- (b) assumption of the NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime of 4 hours;*
- (c) satellite overpass time period.*

**Bottom-up emission estimates:**

- (a) soil biogenic NO estimates;*
- (b) soil biogenic HONO estimates;*
- (c) anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub>.*



38. p. 34574, l. 8-10: While emissions estimate herein seems to be a good calculation, I personally think there is not enough certainty in the results to state unequivocally that soil emissions “are much more important contributors” to the regional budget; rather I suggest rephrasing this to something along the lines of, “We present evidence that soil emissions could be much more important: : : than thought before.”

We changed the sentence “soil emission are much more important...” to “soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO during the vegetation period could be much more important contributors to the regional NO<sub>x</sub> budget”, see page 29, line 22-24 in revised MS.

39. Finally, do the authors have any suggestions for future work that could corroborate this interesting result, or constrain any of the uncertainties further?

In future, we want to transfer this method to other semi-arid, arid, and hyper-arid regions to study consequences of ecosystem reactions forced by land use and/or climate change.

With regard to the above comment of Anonymous Referee #1, in our revised MS the following sentence was added (sec 3.3 page 27, lines 26-29, and page 20, lines 1-7):

The combination of independent methods applied in our present study was the first attempt to prove the comparison of soil NO emissions of different scales, ranging from the size of a soil sample to the size of a satellite pixel.

However, the following improvements in these methods for the future work might be necessary:

- (a) bottom-up biogenic emissions: derivation of individual NO and HONO net release rates from a series of simultaneous incubation experiments in the laboratory under well-defined conditions (full soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture scales),
- (b) temporally high resolution in-situ measurements of top soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture by suitable (and simple) sensors at representative sites of all considered land use types (at least during the growing period),
- (c) top-down emission estimates: temporally resolved consideration of the NO<sub>2</sub> lifetime.

## Response to Anonymous Referee #2 comments

Response to the comments as listed:

- 5    1) I would suggest that the contents (and subtitles) of “Sect. 2 Materials and methods”  
and “Sect. 3 Results and discussion” be reorganized (and renamed) so that the three different  
emission estimates (i.e. the bottom-up biogenic NO emission estimates, bottom-up  
anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates, and top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates) as well as  
their inter-comparisons could be seen more clearly and followed more easily. For instance, Sect.  
10    2.2 seems to have repeated contents for each of the three estimates and might be skipped with  
some contents being merged to the subsections for each corresponding estimate.

15    *The authors would like to thank Anonymous Referee #2 for his/her very helpful suggestions. With regard  
to restructuring of the manuscript, the suggestions of Referee #1 and Referee #2 significantly overlap with  
following aspects:*

- *Scaling of bottom up biogenic NO<sub>x</sub> inventory*
- *bottom-up anthropogenic inventory*
- *bottom-up soil vs. anthropogenic contributions*
- *top-down estimates*
- 20    • *bottom-up total soil emissions vs. top-down estimates*

*Given the restructuring of the revised MS, the most part of the GGTP model were transferred to the  
supplement. With consideration of the suggestions of both Referees and the guidelines of manuscript  
preparation of ACP (only three levels of sectioning are allowed), the revised MS has now the  
following sections:*

- 25    Section 1:    *Introduction*  
Section 2:    *Materials and methods*  
                2.1    *Site description and soil sampling*  
                2.2    *Remote sensing and accompanying data*  
                2.3    *Bottom-up calculation of biogenic NO emission estimates*  
30            2.3.1    *Laboratory determination of land use type specific net potential NO fluxes*  
                2.3.2    *Determination of land use types and corresponding soil surface temperatures  
from Landsat Imagery*  
                *Land use classification*  
                        *Land surface temperature  $T_s$*   
35            2.3.3    *Temporally high resolution data*  
                        *Soil temperature,  $T_{soil}$*   
                        *Gravimetric soil moisture  $\theta_g$*   
                        *Fertilizer factor  $FF$*   
                2.3.4    *Monthly soil biogenic bottom-up emissions of Tohsun oasis*  
40            2.4    *Bottom-up anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates*  
                2.5.    *Top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates from satellite observations*  
                2.5.1    *Satellite derived tropospheric VCD<sub>NO2</sub>*  
                2.5.2    *Monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis (top-down)*  
Section 3:    *Results and Discussion*

- 3.1 *Bottom-up soil biogenic and anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis*
- 3.1.1 *Laboratory derived net potential NO fluxes*
- 3.1.2 *Land use type specific net NO fluxes based on soil temperature, soil moisture content, and enhancement by fertilizer application*
- 3.1.3 *Monthly soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)*
- 3.1.4 *Monthly anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)*
- 3.1.5 *Soil biogenic vs. anthropogenic emissions of Tohsun oasis*
- 3.2 *Top-down satellite derived total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis*
- 3.2.1 *Spatio-temporal variation of the tropospheric VCD<sub>NO2</sub> measured from satellite*
- 3.2.2 *Monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis (top-down)*
- 3.3 *NO<sub>x</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis: bottom-up vs. top-down*

Section 4: 4 Summary

**2) The full name for GGTP does not fully reflect the focus of this study as “the soil biogenic NO emission” is not seen. The soil biogenic NO emission model is an important part of this study, but it appears only in the sub-sub-title (Sect. 2.4.7) of Sect. 2. I would suggest updating Sect. 2.4, first by using some phrase like soil NO emission estimate (or model) for the title. Sect. 2.3 and some contents of Sect. 2.1 might be merged to it. The updated subsection needs to be more concise, e.g. by using citations (if possible) and/or Appendix (or Supplement Information) to describe the validation of soil parameters. The same strategy may be apply for “Sect. 3 Results and discussion” (e.g. Sect. 3.2–3.5).**

*Geoscience General Tool Package (GGTP) was developed to fulfill some requirement of the spatial analysis and digital image interpretation for the study as described in section 2.4 of the original version of our MS. The package was written based on the spatial analysis model facilities in the Geoscience software namely ARC GIS; this is a set of tools that allows the derivation of various environmental parameters. That is why we called it GGTP model.*

*To determine the 2D biogenic soil NO emission source of the oasis at a fine scale matrix (30x30m<sup>2</sup>) the GGTP model was used. This means that the soil biogenic NO emission model is also part of the GGTP model, and that is why it appears in section 2.4.7 of our original MS.*

*Our response to the suggestion of Referee #2 regarding the title updating of sec. 2.4 by using soil emission estimate is as follow:*

*The GGTP model contains more than ten different geoscience spatial tools, and this model runs according to hierarchical routines, and in each step various parameters could be calculated. Within the framework of the GGTP model not only the soil NO emission is derived, but also land surface temperature, and the land use classification the results of which are used for the “bottom-up biogenic emission calculation”. Thus, we prefer to use the title as GGTP model. However, to follow the suggestion of Referee #2 (see above comment 1), the whole GGTP part of the MS (section 2.4), except land use classification and land surface temperature, was moved to the supplement.*

*In our revised MS, the sec. 2.3 (laboratory part) was not merged with the sect. 2.1 (site description part). We think, that the “bottom-up biogenic soil NO estimates” should represent a holistic way. Section 2.3 of the original MS is one of the important parts of the calculation of bottom-up biogenic soil NO estimates, and it appears now as sub-title (2.3.1) of “bottom-up calculation of biogenic NO emission estimates (sec 2.3)” in revised MS.*

*To follow the suggestion of Referee #2 related to an update of section 2.4 of the original MS and to present the objectives in the most coherent way to the reader the calibration and validation of soil*

parameters sections (2.4.5 and 2.4.6 of original MS) were moved to the Supplement. All related results and discussions in section 3 were also moved to the supplement.

**3) I would suggest moving the contents on the biogenic emissions from soil in Sect.**

**2.5. (e.g. the whole Sect. 2.5.2, which introduces the FF and Q10F) to the new section describing the soil biogenic NO emissions (as suggested above). These parts are related to human activities via soil. It would better to include them in the soil NO model to address the soil NO emission variations by ecosystem management. If possible, a sensitivity study can be carried out to investigate such anthropogenic effect by changing FF and Q10F. At the same time, just keep the contents that are related to the anthropogenic emissions from fuel composition. It seems that all the emission factors were taken from the literatures, and thus this section can be more concise by just using citations. The formula (18), Table 1 and Fig. 15 can be omitted, and instead the contributions of industrial and traffic activities to the total anthropogenic emissions may be described.**

*The authors would like to thank Anonymous Referee #2 for his/her suggestions. In our revised MS, we have considered the above comments of Referee #2 concerning the new section. Given the restructuring of the revised MS, the contents on the biogenic emissions from soil were described in a new section (see sec. 2.3 Bottom-up calculation of biogenic NO emission estimates). The impact of the fertilizer application on the NO-fluxes (FF, Q10F) was outlined in the subsection 2.3.4 (page 13 and 14 in revised MS).*

*As described in our original MS (sec. 2.4.7), the areal distributions of NO emissions can be calculated in a fine scale matrix (30x30m<sup>2</sup>) within the framework of the pixel-based soil NO model (see supplement S1.9 of the revised MS). However, these are only “snapshots” (“taken” at 5 10:45 LT of the six selected days). With regards to the suggestion of Referee #2 regarding the ecosystem management in the soil model we give the following responses:*

- the parameters of agroecosystem management such as irrigation regime and fertilizer application must be considered at temporally high resolution (diurnal cycle) since there are large diel to weekly variations of soil moisture and soil nutrient content caused by the applied irrigation and fertilization schedules,*

- 2D soil NO model control runs can not model the applied irrigation (drying-out shape function) and fertilization schedules since the diurnal cycle of the applied irrigation and fertilization schedules can not be taken into account for the corresponding pixel area,*

- however, the diurnal cycle of soil NO emissions with the consideration of the agrosystem management parameters was well represented within the framework of the “bottom-up emission estimates” and not in the scope of the 2D model. It can be emphasized that within the framework of the “bottom-up emission estimates”, the calculation must not take into account the pixel-based model runs, but it required the temporally high-resolution data.*

*The human impacts on soil emissions could be explained by changing FF and Q10F; A sensitivity analysis could investigate the change of the anthropogenic effect that results from changes in the agrosystem management. We appreciate very much the above suggestion of Referee #2 concerning to sensitivity study. However, taking into account the available data of fertilizer application, a sensitivity study by changing FF and Q10F could not be performed, since for the investigation of the anthropogenic effect on soil emissions by changing of FF and Q10F, the long-term trend of the fertilizer application must be considered.*

*Since the study area’s anthropogenic emissions predominantly originate from fossil fuel combustion of the energy and traffic sectors, it is necessary to show the emission factors for different economic*

sectors and fuel types. The anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated based on the equation of 18. (in revised MS Equation S13). Thus, we are convinced that the Equation is relevant for the study. However, to describe the anthropogenic emissions in a concise way, the calculation part was moved to the supplement (S3.4). The contribution of industrial and traffic activities to the total anthropogenic emissions was described as emission source category in economic sector “k” (see page 16, in supplement S3.4).

4) I would also suggest removing the contents on the soil biogenic emissions in Sect.2.6. Just focus on the retrieval of regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from satellite observations. Are there any advantages or disadvantages in the retrieval of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from an oasis in comparison with from a city by satellite data? In addition to OMI NO<sub>2</sub> data, were meteorological parameters, such as wind fields, used in the retrieval of this study? The retrieval of regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the oasis by satellite is an important part of this study and needs to be described/discussed more in detail.

In our revised MS, we have considered the above comments of Referee #2. Given the restructuring of the revised MS, the contents on biogenic soil emissions (in old sect. 2.6) were moved to the sec. 2.3.4 (page 15). And the retrieval of regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from satellite observation is focused on section 2.5.

In principle the retrieval of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions over a city or oases is similar. However, usually the emissions from cities are higher and the corresponding enhancements can be better identified compared to the background.

We added the following text in the revised MS, sect. 2.5.1, page 18: “Satellite observations reflect contributions from different emission sources. In principle the retrieval of NO<sub>2</sub> emissions over a city or oases is similar. However, usually the emissions from cities are higher and the corresponding enhancements can be better identified compared to the background. In order to establish the relationship between biogenic NO<sub>2</sub> and satellite-derived NO<sub>2</sub>, it is necessary to understand their spatial patterns with respect to the locations and shapes of the potential sources. Thus, four different areas (see Fig. 3) were selected to represent (1) typical agricultural areas (study area) as biogenic source, (2) mixed land use areas (agricultural & small urban) as biogenic and anthropogenic sources, (3) large urban areas as anthropogenic source, and (4) desert area as background source.”

The meteorological parameters, such as wind fields are not relevant for our top-down emission estimates because we sum up all satellite measurements for an area, which does not only cover the oasis but also the area with enhanced NO<sub>2</sub> VCDs. Thus we can assume that almost all (>90%) of the emitted NO<sub>2</sub> is destroyed before it is blown out from the considered area. We added this information to section 2.5.2, page 19.

#### Technical/Specific comments:

1. P34534, L7-9: It might not be necessary to emphasize the scaling from annual to monthly values. Instead, the anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel composition might be mentioned. Since the anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emission inventories are available only on an annual basis, we feel that it is necessary to mention the scaling approach. In our revised MS, the anthropogenic emissions from fuel composition were described in more detail in section 2.4.

2. P34534, L12: are equal to?  
“until” was changed “to”.

3. **P34534, L25:  $\text{NO}_x = \text{NO} + \text{NO}_2$**   
„  $\text{NO} + \text{NO}_2$ “ was added.
4. **P34538, L11: county?**  
5 „country“ was changed to „county“
5. **P34547, L9: replace “proposed” with “used” because so many studies are cited.**  
“proposed” replaced by “used”.
- 10 6. **P34547, L23: I do not understand the word “space” here.**  
The word “space” means here the shape between  $T_s$  and NDVI.
7. **P34549, L11-12: Wagner et al. (1989) and Mallick et al. (2009) cannot be found in the Reference.**  
15 Many thanks for Anonymous Referee #2. These references were added (in supplement).
8. **P34551-34552, Sect. 2.4.5: no validation and calibration are presented.**  
In revised MS, the validation and calibration of satellite-derived surface temperature and soil moisture data are presented in the supplement (S2, page 11-12; in Figure S4).  
20
9. **P34558, L9, the title for Sect. 2.5.3: it might not be suitable to use “assimilation” at least for the method of deriving monthly values of anthropogenic  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions.**  
The data of section 2.5.3 of the original MS were collected in various way such as modeling, temporal upscaling, personal communication and adapting. This type of data estimation which  
25 combine the model and accompanying data could be simplified by the term of “assimilation”. We added this information to supplement S3.
10. **P34561, L27-28: there could be dust aerosols over the desert region.**  
Yes, the reviewer Referee #2 is right. We added additionally “except sporadical dust”.  
30
11. **P34569, L2-4: The  $\text{NO}$  fluxes as function of theta cannot be found in Fig.9.**  
There was a simple typo, Fig.8 instead of Fig. 9.

*Reference:*

- Gödde, M., and Conrad, R.: *Influence of soil properties on the turnover of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide by nitrification and denitrification at constant temperature and moisture*, *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 32, 120-128, 2000.
- 5 Ma, X.C.: *Map of Xinjiang*, Star Map Press, Beijing, 2010.
- Mayer, J. C., Bargsten, A., Rummel, U., Meixner, F. X., and Foken, T.: *Distributed Modified Bowen Ratio method for surface layer fluxes of reactive and non-reactive trace gases*, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 151, 655–668, 2011.
- 10 Naegele, W., and Conrad, R.: *Influence of soil pH on the nitrate-reducing microbial population and their potential to reduce nitrate to nitric oxide and nitrous oxide*, *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 74, 49-58, 1990.
- Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate Change*, John Wiley & Sons., Chapter 6.5, 2012. Stotzky, G., Goos, R. D., and Timonin, M. I.: *Microbial changes occurring in soil as a result of storage*, *Plant Soil*, 16, 1–18, 1962.
- 15 Su, H., Cheng, Y., Oswald, R., Behrendt, T., Trebs, I., Meixner, F. X., Andreae, M. O., Cheng, P., Zhang, Y., and Pöschl, U.: *Soil Nitrite as a Source of Atmospheric HONO and OH Radicals*, *Science*, 333, 1616-1618, 10.1126/science.1207687, 2011.

## 5

10

15

<sup>(4)</sup> *Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena Germany.*

20



## Abstract

A study was carried out to understand the contributions of soil biogenic NO emissions from managed (fertilized and irrigated) hyper-arid ecosystems in NW-China to the regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions during the growing season. Soil biogenic net potential NO fluxes were quantified by laboratory incubation of soil samples from the three dominating ecosystems (desert, cotton and grape fields). Regional biogenic NO emissions were calculated bottom-up hourly for the entire growing season (April-September 2010) by considering corresponding land use, hourly data of soil temperature, gravimetric soil moisture, and fertilizer enhancement factors. Regional anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated bottom-up from annual statistical data provided by regional and local government bureaus which have been downscaled to monthly value. Since anthropogenic emissions are available only in the form of NO<sub>2</sub>, the total bottom-up biogenic emission estimates (NO and HONO) were expressed as NO<sub>2</sub>. Regional top-down emission estimates of NO<sub>2</sub> were derived on the monthly basis from satellite observations (OMI) of tropospheric vertical NO<sub>2</sub> column densities and prescribed values of the tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> lifetime. Consequently, monthly top-down NO<sub>2</sub> emissions (total) were compared with monthly bottom-up NO<sub>2</sub> emissions (biogenic + anthropogenic) for the time of the satellite overpass (around 13:00 LT) with the consideration of the diurnal cycle of bottom-up estimates. Annual variation of total Tohsun oasis NO<sub>2</sub> emissions is characterized by a strong peak in winter (December-February) and a secondary peak in summer (June-August). During summer, soil biogenic emissions were from equal to twofold of related anthropogenic emissions, and grape soils were the main contributor to soil biogenic emissions, followed by cotton soils while emissions from the desert were negligible. The top-down and bottom-up emission estimates were shown to be useful methods to estimate the monthly/seasonal cycle of the total regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The resulting total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions show a strong peak in winter and a secondary peak in summer, providing confidence in both completely independent methods. These findings provide strong evidence that biogenic emissions from soils of managed drylands (irrigated and fertilized) in the growing period are much more important contributors to regional NO<sub>2</sub> budgets (hence to regional photochemistry) of dryland regions than thought before.

## 1. Introduction

Atmospheric carbon monoxide, methane, and volatile organic compounds are oxidized by the hydroxyl and other radicals through various catalytic cycles (Crutzen, 1987). In these cycles, nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x = \text{NO} + \text{NO}_2$ ) are key catalysts, and their ambient concentrations determine whether ozone ( $\text{O}_3$ ) is generated or destroyed in the troposphere (Chameides et al., 1992). Ozone is usually generated in polluted, industrialized regions, where ambient levels of  $\text{NO}_x$  are high. Moreover, the intensification of agriculture is associated with increased NO emissions, which also causes an increase of available nitrogen in the atmosphere (Denman et al., 2007).  $\text{NO}_x$  in the troposphere originates mostly as NO, which reaches a photo-stationary equilibrium with  $\text{NO}_2$  within a few minutes. The current evolution of anthropogenic as well as biogenic  $\text{NO}_x$  sources triggers a potential increase of global tropospheric  $\text{O}_3$  concentrations. According to recent estimates (Kasibhatla et al., 1993; Davidson and Kingerlee 1997; Denman et al., 2007; Feig et al., 2008), anthropogenic sources amount to 45-67% of the mid 2000s total global  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions ( $42\text{--}47 \text{ Tg a}^{-1}$ , in terms of mass of N), and other globally important sources are soil biogenic NO emissions (10-40%), biomass burning (13-29%) and lightning (5-16%). The considerable uncertainty about the range of soil biogenic NO emissions stems from widely differing estimates of the NO emissions. Based on field measurements worldwide Davidson and Kingerlee (1997) estimated the global NO soil source strength to be  $21 \text{ Tg a}^{-1}$  (with an error margin of 4 to  $10 \text{ Tg a}^{-1}$ , 40% of the total), while the 4<sup>th</sup> IPCC estimate is  $8.9 \text{ Tg a}^{-1}$  (Denman et al., 2007), which is higher than the 3<sup>th</sup> IPCC estimate of  $5.6 \text{ Tg a}^{-1}$  (IPCC, 2001). Moreover, the uncertainties in the NO emission data from semi-arid, arid, and hyper-arid regions are very large (mainly due to a very small number of measurements being available). In this context, one should be aware, that approximately 40% of planet Earth's total land surface consists of semi-arid, arid and hyper-arid land and more than 30% of the world's inhabitants live in arid, semiarid and hyper-arid regions (Lai 2001).

In many parts of the world's drylands land-cover is strongly changing due to the encroachment of deserts by bushy vegetation (desert → dryland farming; bushy vegetation → dryland farming). This leads and will lead to dramatic changes in soil microbial production and consumption of NO. Consequently, it will have a strong impact on the (at least) regional budgets of those reactive trace gasses ( $\text{NO}_x$ ,  $\text{O}_3$ , volatile organic compounds (VOC), etc.) which are involved in the tropospheric oxidizing capacity. For this reason, it is necessary to quantify the NO emissions from both, natural and agricultural managed soils of the drylands.

Recently, Oswald et al. (2013) pointed out, that (a) the release of odd reactive nitrogen gases from soils due to microbial activity is not confined to NO only, (b) about equal amounts of gaseous nitrous acid (HONO) are simultaneously emitted along with NO, and (c) **HONO emissions from soils are one of the most relevant sources in arid areas with regard to tropospheric chemistry**. In addition, daytime NO production from HONO photolysis contributes to the total production of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Therefore, it is meaningful to consider HONO emissions for any estimates of biogenic total reactive nitrogen emissions from soil.

The biogenic emissions of NO (as well as HONO) depend crucially on soil temperature and soil moisture, because these factors affect the availability of organic compounds and the microbial activity in the soil (Conrad, 1996; Meixner and Yang 2006; Ludwig et al., 2001; Oswald et al., 2013). Sufficient soil moisture, high soil temperatures, and regular supply of nutrients (N-containing fertilizer) are optimum conditions for soil biogenic NO (and HONO) emissions, particularly from arid and hyper-arid land.

An oasis is an agriculturally used area in a desert region. The intensification (economically driven) oasis agriculture, however, needs enlargement of the arable land area, enhancement of necessary irrigation, and the increase of fertilizer use, which leads inevitably to increasing soil biogenic NO (and HONO) emissions. Microbial processes, which underlay NO production (and NO consumption) in soils (e.g., nitrification, denitrification) are confined to the uppermost soil layers (<0.05 m depth, Rudolph et al., 1996). The most direct method for the characterization of these processes and the quantification of the NO (and HONO) release from soils is usually realized by laboratory incubation of soil samples taken from top soil layers. In those laboratory incubation systems, the net release rate of NO is determined from the NO concentration difference between incoming and outgoing air. The application of this method in the past has proved that the release of NO can be described by specific and unique functions of soil moisture, soil temperature, and ambient NO concentration (Otto, et al., 1996; van Dijk et al., 2002; Meixner and Yang, 2006; Feig et al., 2008; Behrendt et al., 2014; Mamtimin et al., 2015).

Due to the industrialization of Chinese drylands and also to the intensification of their agriculture, not only significant anthropogenic NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from growing oasis cities are expected, but also the current and future land use will intensify the "hot spot" character of soil biogenic NO emissions from oases. The general aim of the present study is to determine the contributions of soil biogenic NO emissions of a selected oasis in the Taklimakan desert to the regional NO<sub>2</sub> emissions during the

growing season. For that, we concentrate (a) on the determination of net potential biogenic NO fluxes derived from laboratory incubation measurements of soil samples, (b) on the bottom-up calculation of regional biogenic NO (and HONO) emissions for the growing season taking into account the corresponding land use, soil temperatures, gravimetric soil moistures, and fertilizer factors, (c) on the bottom-up estimation of regional anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the oasis based on energy consumption and NO<sub>2</sub> emission factors of different energy sectors and fuel types, (d) on the top-down calculation of regional total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from satellite observations (OMI) of the vertical NO<sub>2</sub> column densities and pre-scribed values of tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> lifetime, and (e) on the quantitative comparison of regional total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions obtained by both (bottom-up (biogenic + anthropogenic) and total top-down) approaches.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Site description and soil sampling

The study area “Tohsun oasis” (Fig. 1) is a hyper-arid region located in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of P.R. China (Mamtimin et al., 2005). The Tohsun oasis belongs administratively to Turpan County with Turpan City as capital (50 km NE from Tohsun oasis). The Tohsun oasis has an extension of 1479 km<sup>2</sup>, a population of 138 thousand, and topographically constitutes the deepest point of P.R. China (154 m below sea-level; Pu, 2011). Major landform types of the Tohsun oasis are sandy-desert and Gobi-desert (stone desert), surrounded on three sides by the mountains of Bogda (north), Qoeltagh (south), and Alagou (west). Topographically, the Tohsun oasis slopes down from northwest to southeast. According to the Koeppen classification (Kottek et al., 2006), the climate of Tohsun oasis is classified as “cold desert”; i.e. hot summers (July: 33°C), cold winters (January: -6°C), and very low precipitation. Mean annual potential evaporation is about 3400 mm (see Fig. 2), while the mean annual precipitation is as low as 7 mm.

The mean monthly precipitation for Tohsun (not shown in Fig. 2) is extremely low: rainfall in June and July is about 2 mm, in January, August, and September 1 mm, respectively; and there is no rain for the rest of the year. Agriculture played and plays a significant role in Tohsun oasis; it was one of the most flourishing oases on the ancient Silk Road (Weggel, 1985). Due to the substantial lack of rainfall, regular dry-land farming is impossible without massive irrigation. Water supplies for irrigated agriculture are dependent on groundwater (pumping-wells), and on the Bai Yanggou River

which originates from the Bogda Mountains. The Bai Yanggou River is temporarily, defined by the strong seasonal pattern of snow-melt and rain in the mountains (Mamtimin, 2005).

Tohsun oasis' agriculture is dominated by intensive mono-cultivation of grapes and cotton. Grapes from the Turpan county are naturally dried to raisins which are sold on the Chinese internal market and also exported to some Asian countries (Jin, 2011; Pu, 2011). Grapes from Turpan County account for 52 % of grape production in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, and for 20 % of entire China. There, more than 100 small and medium size companies are engaged in raisin processing (Wan, 2012). In 2008, Turpan's raisin production was 130.000 tons which accounted for more than 90 % of all raisins produced in P.R. China (Wan, 2012; Li, et al., 2012; Jin, 2011; Pu, 2009). Approximately 40% of Turpan's grape production is from the Tohsun oasis (Pu, 2009). To raise the yields of grapes and cotton, the corresponding cultivation techniques have been optimized, which resulted in the extensive application of nitrogen containing fertilizers.

Soil samples from the study area were collected in 2010 from a total of three sites of Tohsun's cotton fields, and from a total of two sites of grape fields (for sample locations, see Fig. 1). Since the primary production and consumption zones for NO are located within a very shallow layer at the soil surface (1 to 5 cm, e.g. Meixner and Yang, 2006), only soil samples 5 cm top soil were taken. At each of the sampling sites ten soil samples (approx. 150 g) with stainless steel soil cores (5 cm length, 2.5 cm radius) were taken (randomly from a 10x10m<sup>2</sup> area); these were then combined to constitute a representative soil sample of approximately 1.5 kg in mass. These soil samples were stored at 4°C for a maximum 3 months until analysis, since the microbial alterations are not expected within storage for up to 3 months at 4° C (Stotzky et al., 1962). In this study, we also used soil samples from the (non-fertilized) desert ecosystem as reference, where the desert soil data was adapted from the study of Mamtimin et al. (2015).

## 2.2 Remote sensing and accompanying data

Remote sensing data from both Landsat and Aura satellites (measurements by the Ozone Monitoring Instrument, OMI) were used in combination with a Geographical Information System (GIS). Landsat images, provided by United States Geological Survey, are widely applicable for purposes like our study because of their rather high spatial resolution (30-15 m). Since the aim of our study is the quantification of biogenic NO emissions from intensively managed arid soils, the consideration of the growth state of the corresponding agro-ecosystems is important. For the representation of the

different seasons we selected four individual months: April (spring) for the beginning, July and, August (summer) for the middle, and September (autumn) for the end of the vegetation period. The winter season was not considered as most of the agro-ecosystems are frozen, hence any microbial activities are negligible. As proposed by many authors (Schott et al., 1985; Markham et al., 1986; Irish, 2003; Chander et al., 2003) we derived areal distributions of land surface temperature (LST), and land cover types from corresponding satellite data using remote sensing digital image processing. For the selection of Landsat images we confined ourselves to the year 2010 when we have taken the soil samples. Six individual Landsat images of the Tohsun oasis (25 April, 28 July, 13 and 21 August, 06 and 22 September 2010) were used.

Tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> column densities derived from the OMI satellite instrument (DOMINO version 2.0, Boersma et al., 2011) for the year of 2010 were used for top-down estimates of total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions and comparison with total bottom-up emission estimates (biogenic + anthropogenic). The long-term seasonal variability of the tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> was derived from the data of 2006-2010. For the estimation of anthropogenic sources of NO<sub>x</sub>, we used fossil fuel consumption data from different economic sectors (manufacturing, electricity, transportation and domestic) which were obtained from the Xinjiang Statistical Yearbooks (Jin et al., 2009; Jin et al., 2011) and the Turpan Statistical Yearbooks (Pu, 2011). The emission-reduction coefficient for coal-fired thermal power industry was taken from “China Electric Power Yearbook” (Zhou, 2006). The land use map of Xinjiang (1:10.000.000; Ma, 2010) and the Traffic Map of Tohsun (1: 1.050.000; Ma, 2010) were involved in this study as additional tools for land use classification.

The meteorological data set (1971-2005) of the Tohsun County Meteorological Station (42.7833°N, 88.6500°E; +1 m a.s.l.) was supplied by the Xinjiang Meteorological Bureau. It contains monthly mean (1971-2005) data of air temperature, precipitation, evaporation, wind speed and direction. Unfortunately, soil moisture content and soil temperature have not been measured routinely at Tohsun County Meteorological Station. *In-situ* measurements have been performed with a suitable sensor (MSR® 165 data logger; Rotronic, Switzerland) which has been buried at the site of Tohsun County Meteorological Station at 2.5 cm depth between July and September 2010. While soil temperature data was measured directly, data of gravimetric soil water content were obtained by gravimetric calibration of the sensor’s signal (relative humidity of soil air).

### **2.3 Bottom-up calculation of biogenic NO emission estimates**

Estimates of seasonal (monthly) bottom-up biogenic NO emissions for Tohsun oasis need (a) laboratory derived, land use type specific net potential NO fluxes (sect. 2.3.1), (b) the areal distribution of the three land use types (cotton, grapes, and desert) of Tohsun oasis (sect. 2.3.2), and (c) land use type specific and temporally high resolution data (sect. 2.3.3) of soil temperature, gravimetric soil moisture content, and fertilizer (enhancement) factors.

### 2.3.1 Laboratory determination of land use type specific net potential NO fluxes

During the last two decades, the laboratory incubation method has been used to measure the net NO release from soil (Yang and Meixner, 1997; Otter et al., 1999; Kirkman et al., 2001; Feig et al., 2008; Yu et al., 2008; Ashuri, 2009; Gelfand et al., 2009; Bargsten et al., 2010; Behrendt et al., 2014; and Mamtimin et al., 2015). However, today's knowledge of soil biogenic NO emission rates from managed arid soils is still rather limited (c.f. Behrendt et al., 2014; Mamtimin et al., 2015; Delon et al., 2015). The laboratory incubation method is usually dynamic chamber system which are consists gas dilution, thermostat valve, thermostat cabinet, and analysers (Behrendt et al., 2014). The dynamic chamber was made of Plexiglas with a diameter and height of 9.2 cm and 13.6 cm (Behrendt et al., 2014), respectively. Five chambers were used for soil samples while one was kept empty as a reference and the thickness of the sample in the dynamic chamber kept the same (approx. 5 cm). The wetted soil samples were placed into five chambers while one was kept empty as reference chamber. Then, the net potential NO release rates were measured until the soil was completely dried out. Laboratory measured NO fluxes by using the incubation method have been repeatedly shown to be in good agreement with those measured in the field (Mayer et al., 2011; van Dijk et al., 2002, Ludwig et al., 2001). The net release of NO from soil is the result of microbial production and consumption processes which occur simultaneously (Conrad, 1996). In our study, we investigated net NO releases ( $J_{NO}$ ; in terms of mass of nitric oxide per mass of dry soil and time), as well as potential NO fluxes ( $F_{NO}$ ; in terms of mass of nitric oxide per area and time) of cotton, grapes and desert soils. The methodology for the laboratory soil measurements which is used in the frame of this study, is described in detail in Behrendt et al. (2014) and Mamtimin et al. (2015). By application of the laboratory dynamic chamber method, the net potential NO flux  $F_{NO}$  ( $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , in terms of mass of NO) is defined by

$$F_{NO}(\theta_g, T_{soil}) = J_{NO}(\theta_g, T_{soil}) \frac{m_{soil}}{A} \quad (1)$$

where  $J_{NO}$  (in  $\text{ng kg}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) is derived from the laboratory measurements, as well as the dimensionless gravimetric soil moisture  $\theta_g$ . The soil temperature  $T_{\text{soil}}$  (in  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), the total mass of the dry soil sample  $m_{\text{soil}}$  (in kg), and the cross section of the dynamic chamber  $A$  (in  $\text{m}^2$ ) were directly measured.

Soil moisture and soil temperature had been identified as the most dominant influencing factors of the net NO release; therefore,  $J_{NO}$  is usually parameterized by these two quantities (Yang and Meixner, 1997; Otter et al., 1999; Kirkman et al., 2001; van Dijk et al., 2002; Meixner and Yang, 2006; Yu et al., 2008, 2010; Feig et al., 2008; Ashuri, 2009; Gelfand et al., 2009 and Bargsten et al., 2010). While the dependence of  $J_{NO}$  on  $T_{\text{soil}}$  is exponential, the dependence of  $J_{NO}$  on  $\theta_g$  has the form of an optimum curve. These dependencies are described by two explicit dimensionless functions, the so-called optimum soil moisture curve  $g(\theta_g)$  and the exponential soil temperature curve  $h(T_{\text{soil}})$  which are described in detail by Behrendt et al. (2014). Introducing  $\theta_{g,0}$ , the so-called optimum gravimetric soil moisture content (i.e., where the maximum NO release has been observed), and  $T_{\text{soil},0} = 25^{\circ}\text{C}$  as the reference soil temperature, the net potential NO flux, specific for the soils of each land use type  $i$  ( $i$ : grape fields, cotton fields, desert) is given by

$$F_{NO,i}(\theta_{g,i}, T_{\text{soil},i}) = J_{NO,i}(\theta_{g,0,i}, T_{\text{soil},0,i}) g_i(\theta_{g,i}) h_i(T_{\text{soil},i})^* (m_{\text{soil}} / A) \quad (2)$$

The land use type specific exponential soil temperature curve  $h(T_{\text{soil},i})$  and the land use type specific optimum soil moisture curve  $g(\theta_{g,i})$  are defined by eqs. (3) and (4):

$$h(T_{\text{soil},i}) = \exp \left[ \frac{\ln Q_{10,NO,i}}{10} (T_{\text{soil},i} - T_{\text{soil},0}) \right] \quad (3)$$

$$g(\theta_{g,i}) = \left( \frac{\theta_{g,i}}{\theta_{0,i}} \right)^a \exp \left[ -a \left( \frac{\theta_{g,i}}{\theta_{0,i}} - 1 \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

Land use type specific shape factors “a” of the corresponding optimum soil moisture curves were derived from laboratory drying-out incubation studies on the corresponding soil samples according to Behrendt et al. (2014). The land use type specific quantity  $Q_{10,NO}$  is the (logarithmic) slope of  $h(T_{\text{soil}})$ , which was also derived from the laboratory measurements; applying two different soil temperatures,



$T_{soil,0}$  and  $T_{soil,1}$  ( $T_{soil,1} - T_{soil,0} = 10$  K), the land use type specific  $Q_{10,NO}$  is defined by

$$Q_{10,NO} = \frac{\ln F_{NO}(\theta_{g,0}, T_{soil,1}) - \ln F_{NO}(\theta_{g,0}, T_{soil,0})}{T_{soil,1} - T_{soil,0}} \quad (5)$$

### 2.3.2 Determination of land use types and corresponding land surface temperatures from

#### Landsat Imagery

5 We used Landsat images since Landsat provides land surface information in a fine scale matrix (30x30 m<sup>2</sup>). The Landsat TM/ETM+ sensors acquire land surface information and store it as a digital number (DN) which ranges between 0 and 255. Landsat images are widely applied for the estimation of biospheric applications, such as the Normalized Differenced Vegetation Index (NDVI), Land Surface Temperature (LST), Soil Moisture Index (SMI), and fluxes of matter between different ecosystems, etc. (Goward and Williams, 1997; Liang et al., 2002; Lu et al., 2002). To perform land use classification and to derive the corresponding land use specific surface soil temperature, we have developed a tool by using ARCGIS 10.x, namely the so-called “Geoscience General Tool Package” (GGTP, see supplement, sections S1.1 – S1.7). Within GGTP model, we also calculated the 2D distributions of soil biogenic NO emissions (s. section S1.9).

#### 15 Land use classification

To classify these field-specific vegetation types, pre-processing the Landsat imagery and image interpretation has to be performed. To effectively record the image data, histogram equalization and edge detector techniques (Jensen, 2005) were applied to image pre-processing. By using suitable edge detecting functions, Landsat images were enhanced and boundaries between different classes were strongly highlighted for effective subsequent image interpretation. Due to the significant requirements for the different areas of interests (AOIs) of image classification, in-situ GPS data (160 points) from the field campaigns (2010) and also from previous field investigations (2006, 2008) were used. Spectral signatures of *in-situ* data were collected by digitizing, and were consequently used to classify all pixels. For that, image spectral analysis and the mostly used supervised classification method of maximum likelihood by Jensen (2005) was performed. This procedure ensured that (a) spectral characteristics of all AOIs were used, and (b) every pixel (both, within and outside AOIs), was assessed and associated to that land-cover of which it has the highest likelihood of being a member.

#### Land surface temperature $T_s$

Knowledge of the land surface emissivity ( $\varepsilon$ ) is highly indispensable to retrieve the land surface temperature ( $T_s$ ) from remotely sensed data. As the land cover varies greatly from place to place, land surface emissivity widely varies from one location to another. Therefore the land surface temperature  $T_s$  is defined as:

$$T_s = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{0.25}} T_B \quad (6)$$

The land surface emissivity ( $\varepsilon$ ) can be obtained from red and near-infrared (NIR) spectral reflectance, while at-sensor brightness temperature ( $T_B$ ) can be calculated from the satellite image's thermal band of high gain mode (band 6.2); more details are given in the supplement (section S1.2 – S1.6).

### 10 **2.3.3 Temporally high resolution data**

Bottom-up calculations of this study aim for regional, seasonal (monthly), and land use specific soil biogenic NO emissions via laboratory derived net potential NO fluxes which depend on soil temperature, gravimetric soil moisture (sect. 2.3.1), and fertilizer factors (i.e., amplification of NO fluxes due to the application of fertilizer). But the necessary time scale for this data must be much shorter than seasonal (monthly): (a) there is a strong non-linear response of the net potential NO flux to soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture (eqs. (3), (4)), as well as to fertilizer applications, and (b) there are large diel variations of the top soil temperature (e.g. 10–60 °C in July; Tohsun oasis desert soil), and large diel to weekly variations of soil moisture and soil nutrient content caused by the applied irrigation and fertilization schedules. Consequently, seasonal (monthly), land use type specific soil NO emissions have to be averaged from data calculated on much shorter time scales (< 1 h).

#### **Soil temperature, $T_{soil}$**

Due to the very low soil temperature before and after the growing season (s. Fig. 1b), most of the soil surface is expected to be frozen and biogenic emissions from any soils of the Tohsun oasis can be neglected. Thus, mean monthly soil NO emissions were only calculated for the period April to September. *In-situ* measurements of soil temperature (and soil moisture; 2.5 cm depth; 5 min resolution) at the Tohsun oasis have been performed only for the land use type "desert", and only for the period 01 July to 30 September, 2010 (see sect. 2.2). However, soil temperature (and soil moisture; 2.5 cm depth; 5 min resolution) have also been measured at two other Taklimakan oases during the same period, namely at Kuche (41.5360°N, 82.8546°E; "cotton soils") and Minfeng (37.0534°N; 82.0760°E; "jujube soils"). For this study, data from Kuche were adapted for the land use type "cot-

ton soils” of Tohsun oasis, while data from Minfeng were chosen to substitute “grape soils” data of Tohsun oasis. The latter is justified by the fact, that both, grapes and jujube belong to the bushy agricultural landscape type, they have similar height, distance in rows, water requirements, and percent ground cover by their canopy. For each of the three land use type data sets, each original measured data point (5 min, July-September, 2010) of a particular day has been normalized by the mean value observed at 10:45 LT (Landsat satellite overflight, supplement Fig. S7). Then, a mean diel variation data set (30 min) has been created by averaging all respective data between 1 July–30 September constituting the representative diel variation of the (normalized) soil temperature of the respective land use type valid for the entire growing period (supplement, S3.1; Fig. S8). As described in the section S3.1 of the supplement, land use type specific surface temperatures ( $T_s$ ; sect. 2.3.2), derived from Landsat observations on 25 April, 28 July, 13 and 21 August, 06 and 22 September 2010 (sect. 2.2), have been temporally up-scaled for the entire growing season (01 April – 30 September, 2010). Finally, the diel variation of soil temperatures of the land use types “desert”, “cotton soils”, and “grape soils” for every day of the growing season 2010 was obtained by multiplying the normalized soil temperatures.

### **Gravimetric soil moisture $\theta_v$**

Evaluation of the MSR<sup>®</sup> 165 data logger measurements (see sect. 2.2) at the site of Tohsun County Meteorological station (bare desert soil) has demonstrated a temporally quite constant, very low gravimetric soil moisture content of 0.0028, which has been adapted for the entire growing season (April–September 2010) land use type “desert” of Tohsun oasis. Temporal variation of gravimetric soil moisture content of the two other land use types, “cotton soils” and “grape soils” depend strongly on irrigation amounts and schedules. Unfortunately, there is no official information on Tohsun oasis’ irrigation available, neither on amounts and schedules and consequently none on the gravimetric soil moisture contents during the drying-out phases between individual irrigation events. Therefore, like for data assimilation of soil temperatures (see above), gravimetric soil moisture content data observed at Taklimakan’s oases Minfeng (“cotton soils”) and Kuche (“jujube soils”) have been adapted for Tohsun oasis’ land use types “grape soils” and “cotton soils”, respectively. That consists in temporally constant irrigation schedules, starting at 1 April 2010 and repeated every 2 weeks. From the observations at Minfeng and Kuche so-called “drying-out” shape functions could be defined, which were scaled by multiples of the soil specific physical quantity “field capacity (FC)”, the

amount of water content held in the soil after excess (irrigation) water has drained away. The quantity FC is typically used in irrigation scheduling, calculation of plant available water, as well as water depth to be applied by irrigation (Diallo and Mariko, 2013). FC-data of soil samples from Minfeng and Kuche oases have been determined by laboratory measurements (see sect. S1.8, supplement).

5 Finally, for Tohsun oasis' land use types "cotton soils" and "grape soils" the following gravimetric soil moisture contents have been chosen (for details, see sect. S3.2, supplement): (a) 0.086 ("grape soils") and 0.167 ("cotton soils") before the first irrigation event (corresponding to mean gravimetric soil moisture contents at conditions of  $0.25 \times FC$  and  $0.5 \times FC$ , respectively), and (b) 0.514 ("grape soils") and 0.586 ("cotton soils") after each irrigation (corresponding to mean gravimetric soil  
10 moisture contents at conditions of  $1.5 \times FC$  and  $1.75 \times FC$ , respectively). Since for each irrigation event (every 14 days) the starting and end conditions in terms of gravimetric soil moisture content were known, as well as the functional relationship for the temporal drying-out of "cotton soils" and "grape soils" between the irrigation events, temporally high resolution data (30 min) could be calculated. The result, the seasonal variation (01 April 2010 (DOY 90) – 30 September 2010 (DOY 273)) of the  
15 gravimetric soil moisture content (at 30 min resolution) for the land use types "cotton fields" and "grape fields" of Tohsun oasis is illustrated in Fig. S9 (supplement).

### **Fertilizer factor *FF***

To maintain the productivity of the grape and cotton fields of Tohsun oasis, the soils regularly receive considerable N-containing fertilizer amounts (see sect. 2.1). The impact of the fertilizer  
20 application on the NO-fluxes from arable soils of Taklimakan oases was recently investigated by Fechner (2014) using the laboratory dynamic chamber system described by Behrendt et al. (2014). Dependent on the applied fertilizer amount (*FA*), NO-fluxes from all soil samples increased considerably and immediately after fertilizer application, which was accomplished by dissolving the mineral fertilizer in that amount of water which was used to wet the soil samples (just to mirror the  
25 fertilization procedures of the Taklimakan oases). The impact of fertilization is twofold, (a) it strongly amplifies the net release (net potential flux) of NO over the entire range of gravimetric soil moisture, and (b) there is an moderate amplification of the net NO release (net NO potential flux) with soil temperature. Furthermore, the impact of fertilization has also a temporal dimension: it has been shown, that the fertilizer effect on the emission of N-containing gases is temporally declining  
30 after each fertilization event (Chen et al., 2011). Therefore, the fertilizer effect may be considered (a)

by the multiplicative,  $FA$ -dependent, time dependent, dimensionless “fertilizer factor ( $FF$ )” applied to the standard net release  $J_{NO}(\theta_{g,0}, T_{soil,0})$  in Eq. (2), and (b) by the  $FA$ -dependent, time dependent, dimensionless “ $Q_{10}$  factor ( $Q_{10}F$ )”, also multiplicatively applied to  $Q_{10}$  (the logarithmic slope of the exponential soil temperature curve  $h(T_{soil})$ ). According to Fechner (2014), initial fertilizer effects are  $FF = 142, 179, 205, 226$ , and  $Q_{10}F = 1.21, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26$  for fertilization amounts  $FA = 100, 200, 300$ , and  $400 \text{ kg (N) ha}^{-1}$ , respectively. From recommendations of Tohsun oasis’ local agricultural administration (personal information, 2010) and our personal communication with farmers there (2010), data for applied fertilizer amounts as well as for fertilizing schedules could be inferred. With the assumption of an exponential decay of the fertilizer effects, corresponding functional relationships for the temporal behaviour of  $FF$  and  $Q_{10}F$  have been developed (see sect. S3.3, supplement) and temporally high resolution data (30 min) of  $FF$  and  $Q_{10}F$  were calculated. The result, the seasonal variation (01 April 2010 (DOY 90) – 30 September 2010 (DOY 273)) of the (dimensionless) factors  $FF$  and  $Q_{10}F$  for the land use types “cotton fields” and “grape fields” of Tohsun oasis is illustrated in Fig. S10 (supplement).

#### 2.3.4 Monthly soil biogenic bottom-up emissions of Tohsun oasis

Estimates of soil biogenic NO fluxes can be calculated from net potential NO fluxes (see sec. 2.3.1) according to eqs. (1)-(4), since those NO fluxes which are derived from laboratory incubations have been repeatedly shown to be in good agreement with those measured in the field (Mayer et al., 2011; van Dijk et al., 2002, Ludwig et al., 2001). Consequently, soil biogenic NO fluxes for Tohsun oasis were calculated every 30 min from land use specific net potential NO fluxes (see sec. 2.3.1) using land use specific data of soil temperature (see sec. 2.3.3), gravimetric soil moisture contents (see 2.3.3), and fertilizer factors (see sec. 2.3.3). Monthly, bottom-up soil biogenic NO emissions for the entire region of Tohsun oasis were calculated by (a) averaging temporally high resolution data (30 min) of the three land use specific soil biogenic net NO fluxes for each month of the growing period (April–September 2010), (b) weighing by the areal contribution of each of the three land use types (1117, 80, and  $150 \text{ km}^2$  for desert, grape, and cotton soils; see sect. 2.3.2), and (c) summing up for each month of 2010.

The studies by Su et al. (2011) and Oswald et al. (2013) pointed out that the HONO and NO emissions have to feature similar dependencies on soil properties, and there exist a co-emission of HONO with NO from the soil; so it could be expected that the HONO and NO emission processes

follow similar parameters (Naegele and Conrad, 1990; Skopp et al., 1990, Götter and Conrad, 2000; Oswald et al., 2013).

The recent findings of Oswald et al. (2013), namely that a large amount of gaseous nitrous acid (HONO) is concurrently emitted along with NO, have been considered for the monthly estimation of biogenic emissions of the Tohsun oasis. They have investigated a total of 17 soil samples which have been taken from a variety of natural and agriculturally managed soils around the globe. Fortunately, five of these samples (no. S13–S17 in Oswald et al., 2013) were cotton, jujube, and desert soils of the Taklimakan region, they have the same arid climate condition and irrigation regime as well as fertilizer application to those used for this study. The strong dependency of HONO emissions on soil water content and soil properties were determined by laboratory experiments with dynamic chamber systems (Oswald et al., 2013). Since the HONO emissions were not directly measured within the present study, the land use specific constant scale factor namely the ratios of HONO to NO releases for the optimum conditions to estimate the HONO emissions ( $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ ) were adapted from the study of Oswald et al. (2013). This is justified by: (a) the strong assumption that the soil from our study emits the same magnitude of HONO as the soil by Oswald et al. (2013) because they have the same soil properties, and they experienced the same irrigation regimes and fertilizer applications, and (b) the soil release of HONO and NO by Oswald et al. (2013) has been measured also in the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry by a next-laboratory version of that dynamic chamber system which was used to measure the soil release of NO in the present study. Consequently, corresponding ratios for optimum condition of HONO and NO emissions (i.e.,  $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ ) have been used to calculate monthly HONO emissions from Tohsun oasis from the measured NO emissions. Monthly land use type specific contributions of HONO emission for the Tohsun oasis during the growing period 2010 were estimated by multiplying the corresponding NO emissions with the mean, land use type specific factors (0.8 for grape and desert soils, and 1.6 for cotton soils); these were calculated from individual values provided by Oswald et al. (2013) which are derived from the ratio for the optimum condition  $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ .

In the present study, the total bottom-up biogenic emission estimates (NO and HONO) were expressed as NO<sub>2</sub>- partly because the reported mass of emitted nitrogen compounds becomes independent from the partitioning ratio between NO and NO<sub>2</sub>. Additionally, the anthropogenic and top-down emissions estimates are primarily derived for NO<sub>2</sub>. In this study, the mean primary NO<sub>2</sub> emissions were not considered and all NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are being reported as mass of NO<sub>2</sub>. For that

purpose soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO (given as mass) were multiplied by the respective ratios of the corresponding molecular weights ( $M_{\text{NO}_2}/M_{\text{NO}}$ ,  $M_{\text{NO}_2}/M_{\text{HONO}}$ ).

For the comparison of biogenic bottom-up emissions ( $F_{\text{biogenic}}$ ) with top-down emissions ( $F_{\text{satellite}}$ ) only the data around the time of the satellite overpass around 13:00LT was considered (bottom-up results for 12:45LT (12:30-13:00) and “13:15 LT(13:00-13:30)). To estimate the effect of the diurnal cycle of the emissions we calculated the ratio of the bottom-up emission at the satellite overpass (at 13:00 LT) and the daily average emissions.

## 2.4 Bottom-up anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates

Tohsun oasis’s anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions predominantly originate from fossil fuel combustion of the energy and traffic sectors. To quantify the amount of an emitted substance from a source like fossil fuel consumption, specific emission factors have to be applied, which are expressed as the fraction of the substance emitted from the mass or volume of the fuel. In P.R. China, emission factors for different economic sectors and fuel types are available, but quite variable during the last decade. Based on sparsely available statistical data, the fuel types consumed in Tohsun are ranking from coal to coke, crude oil, natural gas, diesel, and gasoline. For the calculation of bottom-up anthropogenic NO<sub>x</sub> emissions we used those NO<sub>x</sub> emission factors (in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) which are widely used in P.R. China (see Table S1; supplement). According to Hao et al. (2002), Zhang et al. (2009), and Shi et al. (2014) an algorithm (see eq. (S13), supplement) has been applied to calculate the emitted mass ( $E^N$ ; in kg NO<sub>2</sub>) from emission factors  $K^N$  (in kg t<sup>-1</sup>), dimensionless removal efficiencies  $P^N$  of corresponding emission reduction technology, and the particular fuel consumption  $F$  (in t). Unfortunately, data of fossil fuel consumption from the different economic sectors of Tohsun County (see sect. 2.2) are only available on an annual basis. Mean monthly data of Tohsun oasis have been assimilated (down-scaled) by multiplicative consideration of known mean monthly percentages of annual NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Urumqi (140 km NNW of Tohsun). This is justified by: (a) coal is the dominating fuel type of energy consumption in both areas (Mamtimin and Meixner, 2011; Pu, 2011), (b) identical arid climate conditions (resulting in identical heating periods), and (c) only from Urumqi there are known mean monthly percentages of annual NO<sub>2</sub> emissions. More details are given in sect. S3.3 of the supplement.

## 2.5. Top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates from satellite observations



Satellite retrieved tropospheric vertical column densities of  $\text{NO}_2$  ( $\text{VCD}_{\text{NO}_2}$ ) over the Tohsun oasis provide a daily measure for the atmospheric  $\text{NO}_2$  concentration vertically integrated over the entire troposphere (during the time of overflight, around 13:00 LT). Only a few assumptions are necessary to derive related  $\text{NO}_2$  fluxes (representing total  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions) from this data: (1) the  $\text{NO}_2$  molecules of the tropospheric vertical column originate exclusively from  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions (anthropogenic + biogenic) from the area of the Tohsun oasis, (2) due to the surface source, the abundance of  $\text{NO}_2$  molecules of the tropospheric vertical column is within its lowermost part, the Atmospheric Boundary Layer, (3) the depletion of  $\text{NO}_2$  in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer is primarily due to the reaction of  $\text{NO}_2$  with the hydroxyl radical OH (leading to the formation of gaseous nitric acid,  $\text{HNO}_3$ ), and (4) the characteristic time (lifetime) of the depletion is approximately known.

### 2.5.1 Satellite-derived tropospheric $\text{VCD}_{\text{NO}_2}$

OMI satellite data of tropospheric  $\text{NO}_2$  were chosen because of their smaller pixel size ( $13 \times 24 \text{ km}^2$  in nadir) compared to data from SCIAMACHY ( $60 \times 30 \text{ km}^2$ ), or GOME ( $320 \times 40 \text{ km}^2$ ). OMI is operated in a sun-synchronous orbit such that measurements are taken at about 13:00 local time. OMI data also provides daily global coverage (Boersma, et al, 2007). For our study we used the OMI monthly mean tropospheric  $\text{NO}_2$  data, which is calculated on the basis of the results of daily OMI overflights (around noon), and is provided by TEMIS (Tropospheric Emission Monitoring Internet Service, European Space Agency (ESA); <http://www.temis.nl/>). The OMI monthly mean tropospheric  $\text{NO}_2$  data product was averaged on a  $0.125^\circ \times 0.125^\circ$  grid, and has been retrieved for cloud fractions  $< 20\%$ .

It should be noted that the tropospheric  $\text{VCDs}$  derived from satellite measurements can be systematically affected by the a-priori assumptions needed for the calculation of the air mass factor  $\text{AMF}$  (reflecting the satellite sensitivity for tropospheric  $\text{NO}_2$ ), such as cloud fraction, pressure at cloud level, surface albedo, and trace gas profile (Boersma et al., 2007, 2011). Fortunately, the region of Tohsun County provides relatively favorable conditions for accurate calculation of tropospheric  $\text{AMFs}$ , since the desert region is typically only little affected by clouds and aerosols; also lightning activity, due to the predominant absence of convective rains, is rather weak, if not negligible. The  $\text{AMF}$  for OMI DOMINO v2.0 has been calculated using TM4 model  $\text{NO}_2$  profiles with a longitude-latitude resolution of  $3^\circ \times 2^\circ$ , a surface reflectance climatology ( $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ ), and cloud information (Boersma et al., 2011). To test whether the assumed surface albedo is appropriate for the Tohsun oasis, we examined the OMI surface reflectance climatology for the study area, and compared it with



the high resolution MODIS surface reflectance product ( $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ , MOD43B). We used the MODIS albedo products from channel 3 (at 459- 479 nm) because this channel is close to the spectral window (405-465 nm) used for the OMI retrieval. According to Kleipool et al. (2008) the surface albedo difference between 470 nm (center of MODIS channel) and 440 nm (OMI surface reflectance climatology) is very small for land surfaces.

To account for any background  $\text{NO}_2$  from upwind (desert) areas, representative  $VCD_{\text{NO}_2}$  observed over the Taklimakan desert (400 km away from the oasis, at  $85.5129^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $40.0669^\circ\text{N}$ ) were subtracted from the  $VCD_{\text{NO}_2}$  observed over the Tohsun area.

To check the representativeness of satellite-derived  $\text{NO}_2$  on the regional scale, we investigated the inter-annual variability of tropospheric  $VCD_{\text{NO}_2}$  from 2006 to 2010. That is because a mean value of longer periods leads to significantly reduced uncertainties and it can be better demonstrate the representativeness of satellite-derived  $\text{NO}_2$ . Evidence of clear seasonal pattern in the long-term observations can reflect the true seasonal effect on tropospheric  $VCD_{\text{NO}_2}$ , which is of substantial importance with respect on the intended comparison "bottom-up" versus "top-down". Seasonal patterns (i.e. December–February, March–May, June–August, September–November) of satellite-derived  $\text{NO}_2$  column densities were evaluated using long-term cloud-free (cloud fraction  $<20\%$ ) measurements from 2006 to 2010.

Satellite observations reflect contributions from different emission sources. In principle the retrieval of  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions over a city or oases is similar. However, usually the emissions from cities are higher and the corresponding enhancements can be better identified compared to the background. In order to establish the relationship between biogenic  $\text{NO}_2$  and satellite-derived  $\text{NO}_2$ , it is necessary to understand their spatial patterns with respect to the locations and shapes of the potential sources. Thus, four different areas (see Fig. 3) were selected to represent (1) typical agricultural areas (study area) as biogenic source, (2) mixed land use areas (agricultural & small urban) as biogenic and anthropogenic sources, (3) large urban areas as anthropogenic source, and (4) desert area as background source.

### 2.5.2 Monthly total $\text{NO}_2$ emissions of Tohsun oasis (top-down)

For the top-down inventory, the given molecular weight of  $\text{NO}_2$ , Avogadro's number, a lifetime of  $\text{NO}_2$  and pixel area ( $\text{m}^2$ ) of  $\text{NO}_2$  were considered. Top-down  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions from Tohsun oasis ( $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , in terms of  $\text{NO}_2$ ) were calculated from all  $VCD_{\text{NO}_2}$  – whose pixels cover the area of Tohsun

oasis and where each represents the particular monthly mean of 2010 – as follows: (a) from each individual  $VCD_{NO_2}$  (in  $NO_2$  molecules  $cm^{-2}$ ) the representative "desert"- $VCD_{NO_2}$ -value was subtracted to account for any background  $NO_2$  from upwind (desert) areas, (b) all these  $VCD_{NO_2}$  were multiplied by their respective pixel area and summed up to obtain the mean number of (vertically integrated)  $NO_2$  molecules for each month of 2010 over Tohsun oasis (for the area indicated in Fig. 3), (c) this value was converted to mass of  $NO_2$  per unit area ( $m^2$ ) and divided by the characteristic lifetime of  $NO_2$ ,  $\tau_{NO_2}$  (with respect to its reaction with the hydroxyl radical OH). The corresponding result represents the mean monthly total  $NO_2$  emission (i.e. from anthropogenic and biogenic sources) from the area of the Tohsun oasis at the time of OMI satellite overflight (and a few hours before). Here it should be noted that meteorological information has not explicitly to be taken into account, because from the satellite observations (Fig. 9) we can conclude that most  $NO_x$  (about more than 90%) is already destroyed before it is blown by winds outside the considered area. The characteristic lifetime of  $NO_2$  can be indicated as short lifetime. It has been e.g. investigated by Beirle et al. (2011) and can be estimated to about  $\tau_{NO_2} = 4$  h for low and mid-latitudes, particularly for the dryland cities of Isfahan ( $32.6^\circ N$ ) and Riyadh ( $24.6^\circ N$ ).

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Bottom-up soil biogenic and anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis

##### 3.1.1 Laboratory derived net potential NO fluxes

Results of the laboratory derived net potential NO fluxes ( $F_{NO}$ ) from soils of the desert and the irrigated and fertilized cotton and grape fields of are shown in Fig. 4. The highest mean net potential NO flux at  $25^\circ C$  occurred from the cotton soils, with a maximum net potential NO flux of  $125 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , followed by grape soils ( $41 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), and desert soils ( $9 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), respectively. Common to all net potential NO fluxes from the major land use types of the Tohsun oasis is the exponential response to soil temperature (due to strong enzymatic activities associated with microbial processes of soil NO production). During the growing period (April – September), soil temperatures of  $> 45^\circ C$  are easily reached for the soils of the Tohsun oasis, particularly for the desert soils (see supplement, Fig. S1). At  $T_{soil} = 50^\circ C$ , maximum net potential NO fluxes of 834 (cotton soils), 249 (grape soils), and  $99 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  (desert soils) are reached at an optimum gravimetric soil moisture content ( $\theta_{g,opt}$ ) of 0.021, 0.146, and 0.0158, respectively. These  $\theta_{g,opt}$ -values, particularly those of the cotton and desert soils,

are much lower than those of natural and agriculturally used soils of temperate latitudes ( $> 0.25$ , c.f. Oswald et al., 2013; Behrendt et al., 2014).

Emphasizing, significant net potential NO fluxes from desert soil only occurs if  $\theta_g$  is higher than 0.01 and less than 0.03. Since the observed  $\theta_g$ -value of the Tohsun desert soils is 0.0028 (see sect. 2.3.3), no significant biogenic NO emissions are expected from there. As stated in sect. 2.3.3, the chosen irrigation schedules of cotton and grape fields resulted in certain, pre-defined ranges of gravimetric soil moisture contents (depending on the field capacity (FC) of the respective soils). Immediately after each irrigation event  $\theta_g$ -values of 0.514 (grape soils) and 0.586 (cotton soils) occur; according Fig. 4, there will be no significant biogenic NO emissions at this stage. However, after 14 days (just before the next irrigation event),  $\theta_g$ -values as low as 0.086 (grape soils) and 0.167 (cotton soils) are found; consequently, regarding the results in Fig. 4, maximum biogenic NO emissions from grape soils have to be expected for the end of the 14 day irrigation period ( $\theta_{g,opt} = 0.146$ ), while at that time biogenic NO emissions from cotton soils will be (even at  $T_{soil} = 50^\circ\text{C}$ ) less than  $10 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , since then the  $\theta_g$  value for cotton soils (0.167) is far above the corresponding optimum value ( $\theta_{g,opt} = 0.021$ ). This means, that despite the overwhelming potential of cotton soils to dominate the biogenic NO emissions of the Tohsun oasis (see Fig. 4), their net actual contribution is almost negligible over the full 14 days irrigation cycles (see below). It should be noted that for other oases (with other irrigation cycles) the contribution cotton soils might be much larger.

### 3.1.2 Land use type specific net NO fluxes based on soil temperature, soil moisture content, and enhancement by fertilizer application

The land-cover classification of the Tohsun oasis has been also derived from Landsat images. Based on these results, the dominant land cover types were cotton and grapes, building/residential area, other vegetation, and desert (see Fig. 5).

Biogenic net NO fluxes (in  $\text{ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , in terms of NO) from the three land use types of the Tohsun oasis have been calculated from laboratory derived, land use specific net potential NO fluxes (see above) by eqs. (2) – (5) from assimilated data sets of soil temperature, gravimetric soil moisture content, and the enhancement of biogenic net NO fluxes caused by regular fertilizer application (see sect. 2.3.3).

3D graphs of the seasonal variation (01 April 2010, DOY 90 – 30 September 2010. DOY 273) of the mean diel soil temperature (at 30 min resolution) are presented in Fig. 6 for desert, grape, and cotton

soils of Tohsun oasis. As expected, soil temperature in desert soils exhibits the largest variation on both, diel and seasonal scales, while, due to the shading by the considerably dense canopy of cotton plants, the corresponding variations of the soil temperature in cotton fields are smallest. Corresponding seasonal variations of the gravimetric soil moisture content as well as the (dimensionless) fertilizer factors  $FF$  and  $Q_{10}F$  (at 30 min resolution) for Tohsun oasis' cotton and grape soils are shown in Fig. S10 (supplement), clearly demonstrating regular temporal patterns due to the chosen irrigation and fertilization schedules.

The seasonal variation of the diel variation of the biogenic net NO flux from soils of the land use types "grape soils" and "cotton soils" are shown in Fig. 7. Results of the biogenic net NO fluxes from desert soils are not shown. Despite very high values of the soil temperature, the net NO fluxes from Tohsun oasis' desert soils are ( $\ll 1 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) due to the extremely low gravimetric soil water content assumed for the Tohsun's desert soils ( $\theta_{g,desert} = 0.0028$ ). Highest NO emissions were observed from grape soils ( $7000 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), while highest NO emissions from cotton soils are only  $1.2 \text{ ng m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Also considering the entire growing period, biogenic net NO fluxes from grape soils are dominating by far, and exceed those from cotton soils on average by a factor of  $1 - 2 \times 10^3$ . In both soils, the seasonal and diel variations of the net NO fluxes clearly mirror those of the corresponding soil temperature. On the seasonal scale, there is striking evidence for the impact of the chosen irrigation schedules particularly on the net NO fluxes from cotton soils (through the assumed regular 2 weekly variation of the corresponding gravimetric soil moisture content). Immediately after (flooding) irrigation, soils might be water-logged which prevents any diffusion of gases out of the soil; but even after evaporation of the surface waters, the chosen "drying-out" curves (see supplement Fig. S9) prescribe  $\theta_g$ -values of 0.514 ("grape soils") and 0.586 ("cotton soils") which are well above the corresponding values at field capacity conditions. There, soil diffusivity as well as soil microbial processes are severely suppressed (c.f. Skopp et al., 1990). This is clearly reflected in the results of laboratory incubations (see Fig. 4), where the corresponding net potential NO fluxes are close to zero for  $\theta_g > 0.4$ . Approaching the end of the chosen 14 day irrigation period,  $\theta_g$ -values reach 0.086 and 0.167 for grape soils and cotton soils, respectively. Then, the soil diffusivity is no longer limited in both soils, but soil microbial processes in cotton soils are still far from their maximum activity ( $\theta_{g,opt} = 0.021$ ), while soil microbial processes in grape soils have even passed their maximum activity ( $\theta_{g,opt} = 0.146$ ). That is why biogenic net NO fluxes from grape soils of the Tohsun oasis are dominating those from cotton soils. Furthermore, the impact on net NO emission by fertilizer

application on 01 April (DOY 91), 27 May (DOY 147), 10 June (DOY 161), 22 July (DOY 203), and 05 August (DOY 217; Fig. S10, supplement) amplifies the already higher net NO fluxes from grape fields. As a consequence, NO emissions from cotton soils can be neglected if compared with emissions from grape soils, even though the net potential emission of cotton soils is more than three times higher than for grape soils. It should, however, be emphasized that just small changes of cotton soils' low optimum soil moisture may cause higher NO emission than initially estimated.

### 3.1.3 Monthly soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)

Given the areal contributions of the three land use types of the Tohsun oasis (1117, 80, and 150 km<sup>2</sup> for desert, grape, and cotton soils), the corresponding monthly bottom-up biogenic NO and HONO emissions have been calculated by (a) summing up 30 min data of related biogenic net NO fluxes (presented in the preceding section) for each month of the growing period (April-September), and (b) multiplying the results by the area of appropriate land use types. Based on the results of Oswald et al. (2013), monthly biogenic emissions of nitrous acid (HONO) have been calculated by land use type specific factors applied to the monthly means of biogenic NO emissions from grape and cotton soils (see sect. 2.3.4). For comparison with anthropogenic emissions (which are given exclusively in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>, see below), respective numbers of monthly soil biogenic NO and HONO emissions have been multiplied by the respective ratios of corresponding molecular weights ( $M_{\text{NO}_2}/M_{\text{NO}}$ ,  $M_{\text{NO}_2}/M_{\text{HONO}}$ ) and are shown in terms of mass of NO<sub>2</sub> Fig. 8 (NO: green bars; NO+HONO: pink bars).

Summing up the monthly data of NO emissions for the entire oasis, corresponding totals (calculation of grapes+cotton+desert) of April, May, June, July, August and September are 42, 77, 173, 227, 219 and 10 tons, respectively (see Fig.7). Corresponding monthly bottom-up data for HONO are 33 (April), 62 (May), 139 (June), 182 (July), 176 (August) and 8 tons (September), respectively. It is noteworthy, that the bottom-up biogenic soil emissions at the monthly scale seem to be under the primary control of the soil temperature; indeed, the seasonal variation of the soil biogenic emissions mirrors greatly that of the soil temperature (see Fig.6; Fig. S8, supplement). Particularly during July, when soil temperatures are highest, both, monthly biogenic soil NO emissions (227 t) and soil HONO emissions (182 t) are too.

### 3.1.4 Monthly anthropogenic emissions from Tohsun oasis (bottom-up)

Annual anthropogenic emissions (in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) of the Tohsun oasis have been determined from published information on annual consumption of different fossil fuel types and related NO<sub>2</sub> emission factors which are widely used in P.R. China (see sect. 2.4). The results of Tohsun oasis' NO<sub>2</sub> emissions per fuel type are shown in Fig. S11 (see supplement). Like other parts of China, coal combustion is the largest contributor to NO<sub>2</sub> emissions and is accounting for approx. 58 % (5040 tons) of the NO<sub>2</sub> emission inventory. As the second largest contributor, coke combustion contributed about 10 %. Monthly anthropogenic emissions (given in terms of mass of NO<sub>2</sub>) have been calculated from Tohsun County's annual NO<sub>x</sub> emission data, which were down-scaled by appropriate mean monthly percentages (see Sect. 2.4); corresponding results are also shown in Fig. 8 (black bars). As expected, the overwhelming part of anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> (600–920 t NO<sub>2</sub> month<sup>-1</sup>) was emitted in the winter, when air temperatures (well below 0°C; see Fig. 2) necessitate substantial domestic heating (predominantly by coal), while in July (approx. +35°C) anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions shrunk to approx. one tenth of the winter value (150 t NO<sub>2</sub> month<sup>-1</sup>) which might mainly be attributed to traffic emissions.

### 3.1.5 Soil biogenic vs. anthropogenic emissions of Tohsun oasis

On annual basis (not shown), anthropogenic sources contribute by 81.4 %, biogenic sources by 18.6 % (10.3 % NO, 8.3 % HONO) to Tohsun oasis' total emissions (7246 t, in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) of reactive nitrogen in 2010. However, if only the growing period (April–September) is considered, where 40 % (2884 t) of Tohsun oasis' total annual emissions occur, the anthropogenic emissions contribute about 53.2 %, and biogenic sources about 46.8 % (26.0% NO, 20.8 % HONO). As already mentioned in section 3.1.3, soil biogenic emissions at monthly scales seemed to be primarily controlled by soil temperature. Consequently, during June, July and August, total biogenic emissions (NO and HONO) exceed anthropogenic emissions by factors of 1.8, 2.8, and 1.5, respectively (see Fig. 8). Therefore, biogenic soil emissions of NO and HONO during the growing period are certainly much more important contributors to the regional NO<sub>2</sub> budget (hence to regional photochemistry) than thought before.

## 3.2 Top-down satellite-derived total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Tohsun oasis

### 3.2.1 Spatio-temporal variation of the tropospheric VCD<sub>NO2</sub> measured from satellite

Fig. 9 shows the seasonal means for spring, summer, autumn and winter (from 2006 to 2010) of the tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> VCD around the Tohsun oasis. Comparing the mean distribution (2006-2010) of

the different seasons, it is clearly visible that for all seasons enhanced values are found over the area of Tohsun oasis (compared to the surrounding desert). Even stronger enhancements of  $VCD_{NO_2}$ -values are also found for other regions, which are always dominated by anthropogenic emissions, especially the growing mega-city of Urumqi (cf. Mamtimin and Meixner, 2011). To investigate these seasonal and spatial variations in more detail, time series of monthly means are calculated for four selected areas (see Fig. 3): an exclusively agriculturally used area (A: study area), an area of mixed land use (B: agricultural and urban), a large urban area (Urumqi; C), and a desert area (D). The seasonal variation of mean tropospheric  $VCD_{NO_2}$  of areas A – D is shown in Fig. 10. These data can distinctively be classified: highest  $VCD_{NO_2}$  values ( $3\text{--}15 \times 10^{15}$   $\text{NO}_2$  molecules  $\text{cm}^{-2}$ ) over the large urban area Urumqi (C),  $1\text{--}6.5 \times 10^{15}$   $\text{NO}_2$  molecules  $\text{cm}^{-2}$  over Tohsun oasis (A) and Tohsun & Turpan area (B), and less than  $1 \times 10^{15}$   $\text{NO}_2$  molecules  $\text{cm}^{-2}$  over the chosen desert area (D). From these seasonal cycles, clear indications of the relative contributions from fossil fuel combustion and soil emissions can be drawn: Over Urumqi (C) clear maxima are found during winter indicating the dominating contribution from fossil fuel combustion, while there are evidently clear minima during the summer months. In contrast, over the desert (D), where only low  $VCD_{NO_2}$  values prevail, small, but distinctive maxima are found during summer, which might be caused by soil emissions. Here, we have to mention that the desert  $VCD_{NO_2}$  values are higher than in comparison to the NO emission of the GGTP model results (see supplement S1.9, Fig S6). This is indeed an interesting finding which can be attributed to the fact that in the desert region a small but still substantial diurnal variation in soil moisture is present. However, in our GGTP model we used a constant value for the soil moisture (0.0028); as a result, the diurnal cycle of soil moisture was not considered in the model calculation. It might indeed indicate that the desert soil emissions are underestimated. Alternatively, it might be partly also caused by inflow from  $\text{NO}_x$ -reach air from the surrounding regions.

Over Tohsun oasis (A) and Tohsun & Turpan area (B) a clear maximum, however 2–3 fold lower than that over (C), is also found in every winter certainly related to fossil fuel combustion during the heating period. Unique for all seasonal cycles are secondary maxima found in over (A) and (B) during the summer months, which amount approx. half of the winter maxima and indicate that during summer soil emissions substantially contribute to total  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions.

### 3.2.2 Monthly total $\text{NO}_2$ emissions from Tohsun oasis (top-down)

As described in sect. 2.5.2, top-down monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions (particularly from anthropogenic and biogenic sources) of Tohsun oasis were calculated from satellite-derived, background-corrected VCD<sub>NO2</sub> over Tohsun oasis and the characteristic lifetime of NO<sub>x</sub>,  $\tau_{\text{NO}_x}$  (with respect to its reaction with the hydroxyl radical OH). In addition, a correction for the partitioning between NO and NO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere has to be made. For that purpose we multiply the NO<sub>2</sub> values by typical ratios between NO<sub>x</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> of about 1.3 (see e.g. Seinfeld and Pandis, 2012). Results are shown in Fig. 11. Since a prescribed and constant value for  $\tau_{\text{NO}_x}$  (4.h) has been applied, the seasonal course of monthly total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions is directly proportional to that of VCD<sub>NO2</sub> over the area of Tohsun oasis (A) in Fig. 10. In 2010, highest total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions were observed in January and December (343–308 ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-2</sup>, in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>), and lowest, 100–110 ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-2</sup>, in May, September, and October. Between July and August, there is the already mentioned secondary maximum of total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions (177 ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-2</sup>), approximately half of the value in January and December, and approximately twofold of the values in May, September, and October.

### 3.3 NO<sub>x</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis: bottom-up vs. top-down

Finally, we compare the satellite-derived (top-down) total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the Tohsun oasis with the bottom-up total emission estimates (anthropogenic+biogenic) for the year of 2010. As mentioned before (see sec. 2.3.4), we calculated the ratio of bottom-up emission at the satellite overpass (13:00 LT) and the daily average emissions to estimate the effect of the diurnal cycle of the emissions. The highest ratios are found for July and August (2.4) while it is only 1.01 for April (see Fig S12). Monthly means of bottom-up biogenic emissions at satellite overpass (13:00 LT) with the considering the diurnal cycle of the bottom-up estimates from the Tohsun oasis are also shown in Fig. 11. Bottom-up anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions are shown individually to emphasize the contribution of soil biogenic emissions (NO+HONO).

The seasonal course of the bottom-up total emissions (anthropogenic+biogenic; in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) qualitatively exhibits nearly the identical shape as the seasonal course of the top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Interestingly, the second maximum in summer is only found, if the soil emissions are taken into account. This finding confirms that during summer soil emissions play an important (if not the dominant) role for Tohsun oasis' total emissions. However, quantitative agreement of bottom-up and top-down total emissions is only perfect for the months April, May and October. For the months of March, June, July, and August, total bottom-up emissions are always higher than the top-down



ones between 10–62%. The finding seems to confirm that the soil biogenic emission's evidence for the tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> through the impact of the monthly variation of soil temperature, irrigation schedules, and fertilizer application. Especially the quantitative agreement was better than expected taking into account the uncertainties of the bottom-up and top down emission estimates. The most important error sources are discussed in the following:

**Top-down emission estimates:**

(a) satellite retrieval: air mass factor (*AMF*) has to be calculated for the conversion of the retrieved slant column densities into the vertical column densities. Mainly uncertainties of the *AMF* leading to uncertainties of the derived NO<sub>2</sub> VCD of about 50%. Here particular assumptions on the trace gas profile and the surface albedo have to be made. For NO<sub>2</sub> vertical profiles from a global model (TM4, s. sect. 2.5.1) with a rather coarse spatial resolution are used. Probably the derived NO<sub>2</sub> VCDs underestimate the true NO<sub>2</sub> VCDs because the true NO<sub>2</sub> profile is peaked more closely to the ground than the profile used in the satellite retrieval. Here it should be noted that the uncertainties of the spectral retrieval are much smaller because many measurements are averaged. As a consequence, the true *AMF* is probably smaller than the one used in the OMI retrieval, and thus the *VCD<sub>NO2</sub>* from the operational product probably underestimates the true tropospheric *VCD<sub>NO2</sub>*. In contrast, the surface albedo used in the operational product is very similar to those from other data sets (MODIS and MERIS). Here it is interesting to note that the spatial patterns of the surface albedo and the tropospheric *VCD<sub>NO2</sub>* show no similarities.

(b) assumption of the NO<sub>x</sub> lifetime of 4 hours: The life time of NO<sub>2</sub> in the troposphere depends on season and altitude and varies from hour to days. Due to the winterly lower OH concentration, lifetime in winter is longer than corresponding values in summer. However, to keep the estimation of the top-down inventory simple, we used a temporally constant mean lifetime of 4 hours; that leads to a certain overestimation of the emissions in winter. Nevertheless, the considered lifetime within study is a good approximation for the growing season. Thereby, the potential uncertainties might be neglected if one considers the uncertainties which may be caused by the Air Mass Factor (*AMF*).

(c) satellite overpass time period: top-down emission estimates are only valid for the time of the satellite overpass (around 13:00 LT) and a few hours before. Thus we compared the top-down emissions to the results from the bottom-up emissions during the time of the satellite overlap (Fig. 11). Fortunately, the soil emissions during the satellite overpass time are strongest because of the high temperatures around noon.

### **Bottom-up emission estimates:**

(a) soil biogenic NO: The soil temperature at 30-minute resolution are calculated by using of satellite-derived surface temperature and in-situ measurements. The interpolation of the satellite-derived data was done by a 3<sup>rd</sup> order polynomial. From sensitivity analyses we found that the uncertainties of the derived temperatures are up to about 6°C. Substantial deviations of soil temperatures (from the interpolated values) between Day 115 and Day 225 might be unlikely since surface temperatures in (hyper-) arid regions (even with (sparse) vegetation covering) are predominantly controlled by insolation only as long there is no impact of (convective) precipitation (indeed, Turpan's Meteorological Station has not reported any precipitation events during the entire growing period). The soil moisture contents were adapted from in-situ measurements of Minfeng and Kuche oases (see. S1.8). Thus, the bottom-up NO estimates might be prone of systematic uncertainties which are inevitably due to the assumptions and adaptations of the data assimilation for soil temperatures, gravimetric soil moisture contents, and fertilizer factors (s. sect. S3.1–S3.3, supplement).

(b) soil biogenic HONO: Since the NO and HONO emissions have the similar dependence on soil moisture for soil properties in arid climate conditions (Oswald et al. (2013)), we used the land use specific constant scale factor namely the ratio of HONO and NO releases for the optimum conditions to estimate the HONO emissions ( $(F_{N,opt}(HONO) \text{ to } F_{N,opt}(NO))$ ). Nevertheless, the optimum soil water content ( $SWC_{opt}$ ) has a strong influence on the ratio of  $F_{N,opt}(HONO)$  to  $F_{N,opt}(NO)$ . We used this ratio for the calculation of monthly HONO emissions by scaling corresponding NO emissions. However, particularly for cotton soil, the value of the optimum gravimetric soil water content for NO (2.1 %) is slightly lower than the corresponding value for HONO (3.6 %, s. Oswald et al., 2013). This may result in a certain error of the calculated HONO emissions, which unfortunately can not be quantified more precisely at the moment. Nevertheless, these uncertainties do not question for the basic message of the study.

(c) anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub>: Furthermore, one should keep in mind, that the percentage factors for temporal down-scaling annual anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Tohsun oasis to monthly have to be adapted from the growing mega-city of Urumqi.

Because of these uncertainties, the good agreement between top-down and bottom-up emission estimates should be treated with caution. Nevertheless, the qualitative and, in particular, the quantitative agreement between bottom-up and top-down estimates indicates that our assumptions are

largely justified. The combination of independent methods applied in our present study was the first attempt to prove the comparison of soil NO emissions of different scales, ranging from the size of a soil sample to the size of a satellite pixel. However, the following improvements in these methods for the future work might be necessary:

- 5 (d) bottom-up biogenic emissions: derivation of individual NO and HONO net release rates from a series of simultaneous incubation experiments in the laboratory under well-defined conditions (full soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture scales),
- (e) temporally high resolution in-situ measurements of top soil temperature and gravimetric soil moisture by suitable (and simple) sensors at representative sites of all considered land use types
- 10 (at least during the growing period),
- (f) top-down emission estimates: temporally resolved consideration of the NO<sub>2</sub> lifetime.

#### 4 Summary

This study is focusing on the investigation and quantification of the biogenic NO emission from agriculturally managed soils of the Tohsun oasis (i.e. from soils of grape and cotton cultivation).

15 Biogenic emissions of nitrous acid (HONO, concurrently emitted with NO) were also estimated using scaling factors applied to the calculated NO emissions. The following methodology was applied: Firstly, the Geoscience General Tool Package (GGTP) has been developed to obtain the soil temperatures and classification of land use types of the oasis from Landsat satellite data. Secondly, mean diel and land use specific variations of the normalized soil temperature, gravimetric soil

20 moisture content, and fertilizer factors were assimilated from (sparsely) available data sources (of different spatial and temporal scales as well as data quality). These have been used to calculate the mean monthly land use specific bottom-up biogenic NO emissions from so-called net potential NO fluxes which in turn have been derived from laboratory incubation of soil samples from the three considered land use types (cotton, grape, and desert soils). Thirdly, land use specific factors of

25 HONO to biogenic NO emissions from grape and cotton soils were applied to calculate the monthly biogenic bottom-up HONO emissions during the growing period. Fourthly, data of the anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions (down-scaled from annual to monthly values) were estimated and compared to the mean monthly soil biogenic emissions (NO+HONO). Fifthly, top-down total NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the Tohsun oasis have been derived from satellite observations (monthly means of Vertical Column

30 Densities of NO<sub>2</sub>,  $VCD_{NO_2}$ ) and prescribed values of the characteristic lifetime of NO<sub>2</sub>,  $\tau_{NO_2}$  (with

respect to its reaction with the hydroxyl radical OH). Finally, we compared the biogenic bottom-up emissions at around noon time (13:00 LT) to that of the top-down emissions with the consideration of the diurnal cycle of bottom-up estimates.

The importance of soil biogenic emissions to the regional NO<sub>2</sub> budget of Tohsun oasis has been demonstrated by the comparison between monthly biogenic soil emissions (NO and HONO, expressed in terms of NO<sub>2</sub>) and the corresponding anthropogenic NO<sub>2</sub> emissions. During the growing period, particularly between June and August, biogenic emissions are up to twofold of the anthropogenic emissions. From the three considered land use types of the Tohsun oasis (desert, grape, and cotton soils), the soil biogenic emissions from grape soils (fertilized and irrigated) dominated summertime soil biogenic emissions of the oasis; emissions from cotton soils (fertilized and irrigated) were orders of magnitude lower (particularly because of its soil physical nature and the chosen irrigation schedule); soil biogenic emissions from desert soils could be completely neglected. It should be noted, that the contribution from cotton soils might be considerably higher for other oases. During winter, Tohsun oasis' soils are frozen, and biogenic emissions are virtually zero; thus total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions of the Tohsun oasis during that season are exclusively due to anthropogenic emissions. As a consequence of both, anthropogenic and biogenic contributions, the seasonal (monthly) variation of total emission is characterized by two peaks (a strong peak in winter and a weaker, secondary peak in summer). The monthly variation of the top-down total emissions (derived from satellite observations) reveals the identical two-peak shape and agrees qualitatively truly satisfactory to that of bottom-up emissions. Also good quantitative agreement between the top-down and the bottom-up estimates is found. Here it should be noted that the emissions around noon (the satellite overpass time) are up to about two times higher than the daily averaged emissions during the growing season. Therefore, these results provide strong evidence that the biogenic emissions from soils of managed drylands (irrigated, fertilized) in the growing period exceed local anthropogenic emissions, hence contributing substantially to the local tropospheric NO<sub>x</sub> levels. Summarizing, it is concluded, that soil biogenic emissions of NO and HONO during the vegetation period could be much more important contributors to the regional NO<sub>x</sub> budget (hence to regional photochemistry) of dryland regions than thought before.

#### **Author contributions.**

B. Mamtimin analyzed the data and performed the bottom-up estimates; B. Mamtimin and T. Behrendt carried out the field experiments; T. Behrendt performed laboratory experiments; B.

Mamtimin and T. Wagner performed the top-down estimates; B. Mamtimin and M. Badawy developed the GGTP model; B. Mamtimin, F.X. Meixner and T. Wagner wrote the paper and all Authors contributed to the discussion of the paper.

## Acknowledgements.

- 5 This work was funded through the German Research Foundation (DFG) project “DEQNO – Desert Encroachment in Central Asia – Quantification of soil biogenic Nitric Oxide” (DFG-MA 4798/1-1), the Max Planck Society (MPG). The authors like to thank Zhaopeng Wu for his field assistance and his substantial support before, during and after the field campaign. We acknowledge the free use of tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> column data from the OMI sensor from [www.temis.nl](http://www.temis.nl). We thank the Xinjiang  
10 Meteorological Bureau, PR China and the United States Geological Survey for their providing meteorological data and Landsat images, respectively. The authors would like to thank S. Beirle, E. Falge, R. Shaiganfar, Y. Wang and J. Lampel for useful discussions.

## Reference

- 15 Ashuri, F. A.: Der Austausch von Stickstoffmonoxid zwischen Boden und Atmosphäre unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Bodenwassergehaltes, Einfluss kulturnaturlandschaftlicher Verhältnisse auf den Umsatz eines Spurengases. Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Mainz, Germany, 1–169, 2009.
- 20 Bargsten, A., Falge, E., Pritsch, K., Huwe, B., and Meixner, F. X.: Laboratory measurements of nitric oxide release from forest soil with a thick organic layer under different understory types, Biogeosciences, 7, 1425–1441, doi:10.5194/bg-7-1425-2010, 2010.
- Behrendt, T., Veres, P.R., Ashuri, F., Song, G., Flanz, M., Mamtimin, B., Bruse, M., Williams, J., and Meixner, F.X.: Characterisation of NO production and consumption: new insights by an improved laboratory dynamic chamber technique. Biogeosciences, 11, 5463–5492, doi:10.5194/bg-11-5463-2014, 2014.
- 25 Beirle, S., Boersma, K.F., Platt, U., Lawrence, M.G., and Wagner, T.: Megacity emissions and lifetimes of nitrogen oxides probed from space. Science 333, 1737, 2011.
- Boersma, K.F., Eskes, H.J., Veefkind, J.P., Brinksma, E.J., R.J. van der A, M. Sneep, G.H.J. van den Oord, P.F. Levelt, P. Stammes, J.F. Gleason and Bucsela, E.J.: Near-real time retrieval of tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> from OMI, Atm. Chem. Phys., 2013-2128, sref:1680-7324/acp/2007-7-2103,  
30 2007.
- Boersma, K. F., Eskes, H. J., Dirksen, R. J., van der A, R. J., Veefkind, J. P., Stammes, P., Huijnen, V., Kleipool, Q. L., Sneep, M., Claas, J., Leitão, J., Richter, A., Zhou, Y., and Brunner, D.: An improved tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> column retrieval algorithm for the Ozone Monitoring Instrument, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 4, 1905–1928, doi:10.5194/amt-4-1905-2011, 2011.
- 35 Chameides, W. L., Fehsenfeld, F., Rodgers, M. O., Cardelino, C., Martinez, J., Parrish, D., Lonneman, W., Lawson, D. R., Rasmussen, R. A., Zimmerman, P., Greenberg, J., Middleton, P., and Wang, T.: Ozone precursor relationships in the ambient atmosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 92, 6037–6055, 1992.

- Chander, G. and Markham, B.: Revised Landsat-5 TM radiometric Calibration procedures and postcalibration dynamic ranges. *IEEE Transaction on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, Vol. 41, No. 11, 2674-2677, 2003.
- 5 Chen, S.H., Zhang, Y., Liu, J., Cui, S.S., and Shen, J.P.: Present Situation, Problems and Countermeasure of Applying Fertilizer to Cotton Xinjiang. *Xinjiang Agricultural Sciences*, Vol. 45-1, 147-150, 2008.
- Chen, X.P., Cui, Z.L., Vitousek, P.M., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Bai, J.S., Meng, Q.F., Hou, P., Yue, S.C., Römheld, V., and Zhang, S.F.: Integrated soil-crop system management for food security. *PNAS*, Vol. 108-16, 6399-6404, 2011.
- 10 Conrad, R.: Soil Microorganisms as controllers of atmospheric trace gases ( $H_2$ , CO,  $CH_4$ ,  $N_2O$ , and NO), *Microbiol. Rev.*, 60, 609–640, 1996.
- Crutzen, P. J.: Role of the tropics in atmospheric chemistry, in: *The Geophysics of Amazonia*, edited by: Dickinson, R. E., John Wiley & Sons, New York, 107–132, 1987.
- Davidson, E. A. and Kinglerlee, W.: A global inventory of nitric oxide emissions from soils, *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys.*, 48, 37–50, 1997.
- 15 Delon, C., Mougin, E., Serça, D., Grippa, M., Hiernaux, P., Diawara, M., Galy-Lacaux, C., and Kergoat, L.: Modelling the effect of soil moisture and organic matter degradation on biogenic NO emissions from soils in Sahel rangeland (Mali). *Biogeosciences*, 12, 3253–3272, doi:10.5194/bg-12-3253-2015, 2015.
- 20 Denman, K.L., Brasseur, G.P., Chidthaisong, A., Ciais, P., Cox, P.M., Dickinson, R.E., Hauglustaine, D., Heinze, C., Holland, E.A., Jacob, D.J., Lohmann, U., Ramachandran, S., da Silva Dias, P.L., Wofsy, S.C., and Zhang, X.: Couplings between changes in the climate system and biogeochemistry. In S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor & H.L. Miller (Ed.), in *Climate Change 2007: The physical science basis. contribution of working group 1 to the fourth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 499-588). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- 25 Diallo, D., and Mariko, A.: Field capacity (FC) and permanent wilty point (PWP) of clay soils developed on Quaternary alluvium in Niger River loop (Mali). *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, 3, 1085-1089, 2013.
- 30 Fechner, A.: The release of nitric oxide from agriculturally managed soils of selected oases on the fringe of the Taklimakan desert (Xinjiang, P.R. China) - Investigation of fertilizers' impact (in German), MSc thesis, 135 pp., Institute of Geography, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany, 2014.
- Feig, G.T., Mamtimin, B., and Meixner, F.X.: Soil Biogenic emissions for nitric oxide from a semi-arid savanna in South Africa. *Biogeosciences*, 5, 1723–1738, doi:10.5194/bg-5-1723-2008, 2008.
- 35 Gelfand, I., Feig, G., Meixner, F. X., and Yakir, D.: Afforestation of semi-arid shrubland reduces biogenic NO emission from soil, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 41, 1561–1570, 2009.
- Goward, S. N. and Williams, D. L.: *Landsat and Earth Systems Science: Development of terrestrial monitoring*, *Photogr. Eng. Remote Sens.*, vol. 63, pp. 887-900, 1997.
- 40 Gödde, M. and Conrad, R.: Influence of soil properties on the turnover of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide by nitrification and denitrification at constant temperature and moisture, *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 32, 120-128, 2000.



- Hao, J.M., Tian, H.Z., and Lu, Y.Q.: Emission Inventories of NO<sub>x</sub> from Commercial Energy Consumption in China, 1995 – 1998. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 36, 552-560, 2002.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in: Chapter 4: Atmospheric Chemistry and Greenhouse Gases, edited by: Houghton, J. T., Ding, Y., Griggs, D. J., Noguera, M., van der Linden, P. J., and Xiaosa, D., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 239–287, 2001.
- Irish, R.: Landsat 7 Science Data Users Handbook, NASA Goddard Space Flight Cent., Greenbelt, Md. (Available at [http://ftpwww.gsfc.nasa.gov/IAS/handbook/handbook\\_toc.html](http://ftpwww.gsfc.nasa.gov/IAS/handbook/handbook_toc.html)), 2003.
- Jensen, J.R.: Introductory Digital Image Processing: A Remote Sensing Perspective. 3rd Edition, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, 198-210, 337- 401, 2005.
- Jin, J.X. and Ma, X.D.: Xinjiang Statistical Yearbook 2009. China Statistics Press, Beijing, 2009.
- Jin, J.X. and Ma, X.D.: Xinjiang Statistical Yearbook 2011. China Statistics Press, Beijing, 2011.
- Kasibhatla, P. S., Levy, H., and Moxim, W. J.: Global NO<sub>x</sub>, HNO<sub>3</sub>, PAN, and NO<sub>y</sub> Distributions from Fossil-Fuel Combustion Emissions– a Model Study, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 98(D4), 7165–7180, 1993.
- Kirkman, G.A., Yang, W.X., and Meixner, F.X.: Biogenic nitric oxide emissions upscaling: an approach for Zimbabwe, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 15(4), 1005-1020, 2001.
- Kottek, M., Grieser, J., Beck, C., Rudolf, B., and Rubel, F.: World Map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification Updated, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 15 (3), 259-263, 2006.
- Lai, R.: Potential of desertification control to sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect. *Climatic Change* 51, 35-72, 2001.
- Li, Z.X., Zhu, Z.J., Yang, L.L., Yang, Z.Q., Cui, K.B., Liu, K., Liu, J., Shen, X.H., and Maihemujiang.: Study on technical Countermeasure of promoting Xinjiang Raisin into International Market. *Xinjiang Agricultural Science*, 49 (6), 129-135, 2012.
- Liang, S., Fang, H., Morisette, J. T., Chen, M., Shuey, C. J., Walthall, C. L., and Daughtry, C. S. T.: Atmospheric Correction of Landsat ETM+ Land Surface Imagery: II. Validation and Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2002.
- Lu, D., Mausel, P., Brondizio, E., and Moran, E.: Assessment of atmospheric correction methods for Landsat TM data applicable to Amazon basin LBA research. *Int. j. remote sensing*, vol. 23, no. 13, 2651–2671, 2002.
- Ludwig, J., Meixner F.X., Vogel, B., and Förstner, J.: Soil-air exchange of nitric oxide: An overview of processes, environmental factors, and modeling studies. *Biogeochemistry*, 52, 225-257, 2001.
- Ma, X.C.: Map of Xinjiang, Star Map Press, Beijing, 2010.**
- Mamtimin, B.: Climate of arid and semi-arid regions and the possibilities of sustainable agriculture utilization in Xinjiang (China) as an example. Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Mainz, Germany, 1–206, 2005.
- Mamtimin, B. and Meixner, F. X.: Air pollution and meteorological processes in the growing dryland city of Urumqi (Xinjiang, China), *Science of the Total Environment*, 409, 1277-1290, 2011.
- Mamtimin, B., Behrendt, T., Badawy, M.M., Wagner, T., Qi, Y., Wu, Z., and Meixner, F.X.: Tropospheric vertical column densities of NO<sub>2</sub> over managed dryland ecosystems (Xinjiang, China): MAX-DOAS measurements vs. 3-D dispersion model simulations based on laboratory-

- derived NO emission from soil samples. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 867–882, doi: 10.5194/acp-15-867-2015, 2015.
- Mao, X.Q, Xing, Y.K., Hu, T., Zeng, A., and Liu, S.Q.: An environmental-economic analysis of carbon, sulfur and nitrogen co-reduction path for China's power industry. *China Environmental Science*, 2012, 32(4): 748~756, 2012.
- Markham, B. L. and Barker J. L.: Landsat MSS and TM postcalibration dynamic ranges, exoatmospheric reflectance and at-satellite temperatures, EOSAT Landsat Tech. Notes 1, pp. 3 – 8, Earth Obs. Satell. Co., Lanham, Md., 1986.
- Mayer, J. C., Bargsten, A., Rummel, U., Meixner, F. X., and Foken, T.: Distributed Modified Bowen Ratio method for surface layer fluxes of reactive and non-reactive trace gases, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 151, 655–668, 2011.
- Meixner, F.X. and Yang, W.X.: Biogenic emissions of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide from arid and semi-arid land. In P. D'Odorico, and A. Porporat (Ed.), *Dryland Ecohydrology*, 233-255, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- Naegele, W. and Conrad, R.: Influence of soil pH on the nitrate-reducing microbial population and their potential to reduce nitrate to nitric oxide and nitrous oxide, *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 74, 49-58, 1990.
- Oswald, R., Behrendt, T., Ermel, M., Wu, D., Su, H., Cheng, Y., Breuninger, C., Moravek, A., Mougin, E., Delon, C., Loubet, B., Pommerening-Röser, A., Sörgel, M., Pöschl, U., Hoffmann, T., Andreae, M.O., Meixner, F.X., and Trebs, I.: HONO emissions from soil bacteria as a major source of atmospheric reactive nitrogen, *Science*, 341, 1233-1235, 2013.
- Otter, L. B., Yang, W. X., Scholes, M. C., and Meixner, F. X.: Nitric Oxide emissions from a southern African Savanna, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(D15), 18 471–18 485, 1999.
- Pu, Y.P.: *Tulufan (Turpan) Statistical Yearbook 2008*. China Statistics Press, Beijing, 2009.
- Pu, Y.P.: *Tulufan (Turpan) Statistical Yearbook 2010*. China Statistics Press, Beijing, 2011.
- Schott, J. R. and Volchok, W. J.: Thematic Mapper thermal infrared calibration, *Photogramm. Eng. Remote Sens.*, 51, 1351–1357, 1985.
- Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: From Air Pollution to Climate Change*, John Wiley & Sons., Chapter 6.5, 2012.
- Shi, Y., Xia, Y.F., Lu, B.H., Liu, N., Zhang, L., Li, S.J., and Li, W.: Emission inventory and trends of NO<sub>x</sub> for China, 2000–2020, *Journal of Zhejiang Univ-Sci A (Appl Phy & Eng)*, 15, 454-464, 2014.
- Skopp, J., Jawson, M.D., and Doran, J.W.: Steady-State Aerobic Microbial Activity as a Function of Soil-Water Content. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 54 (6), 1619-1625, 1990.
- Stotzky, G., Goos, R. D., and Timonin, M. I.: Microbial changes occurring in soil as a result of storage, *Plant Soil*, 16, 1–18, 1962.
- Su, H., Cheng, Y., Oswald, R., Behrendt, T., Trebs, I., Meixner, F. X., Andreae, M. O., Cheng, P., Zhang, Y., and Pöschl, U.: Soil Nitrite as a Source of Atmospheric HONO and OH Radicals, *Science*, 333, 1616-1618, 10.1126/science.1207687, 2011.
- Van Dijk, S.M., Gut, A., Kirkman, G.A., Meixner, F.X., and Andreae, M.O.: Biogenic NO emissions from forest and pasture soils: Relating laboratory studies to field measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 107 (D20), LBA25-1 – LBA25-11, 2002.
- Wan, Y.: Strategy of foreign trade office of several companies to develop raisins international market.



Baidu Wenku/Baidu Library published by the Government of the PR China.  
www.wenku.baidu.com, 14.11.2012, 2012.

Weggel, O.: Xinjiang (Sinkiang), Hamburg. Germany p. 76, 1985.

- 5 Yang, W. X. and Meixner, F. X.: Laboratory studies on the release of nitric oxide from subtropical grassland soils: the effect of soil temperature and moisture, in: Gaseous Nitrogen Emissions from Grasslands, Wallingford, England, 67–70, 1997.

Yu, J., Meixner, F. X., Sun, W., Liang, Z., Chen, Y., Mamtimin, B., Wang, G., and Sun, Z.: The biogenic nitric oxide emission from saline sodic soils in semiarid region, Northeastern China: A laboratory study. *J. Geophys. Res.*, Vol. 113, 1-11, 2008.

- 10 Zhang, Q., Street, D.G., and Carmichael, G.R.: Asian emissions in 2006 for the NASA INTEX-B mission. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 9, 5131-5153, doi:10.5194/acp-9-5131-2009, 2009.

Zhou, X.Q.: China Electric Power Yearbook. China Power Press, Beijing, 2006.

## Figures:




Fig.1: Satellite map of the Tohsun oasis (Landsat ETM+, 13 August 2010; “gamma correction” was applied to enhance the contrast of this Landsat image). Green color identifies arable soils of the Tohsun oasis, red and yellow dots represent the locations of soil sampling from grape fields and cotton fields, respectively. The blue line represents the seasonal Bai Yanggou River. The study area of the Tohsun oasis is approx. 50 km SW of Turpan city.




Fig. 2: Climate diagram of the Tohsun oasis. Red dots represent monthly means of air temperature, blue bars monthly means of potential evaporation for the period 1971-2005 (data source: Xinjiang Meteorological Bureau, Urumqi, P.R. China).

5




Fig. 3: Selected areas for the examination of the spatial seasonal variation of the tropospheric  $\text{NO}_2$  VCDs: rectangles “A”, “B”, “C”, and “D” represent agricultural area (Tohsun), mixed land use area (Tohsun and Turpan city), large urban area (Urumqi) and desert area, respectively.

10




Fig.4: Results of laboratory incubation measurements on soil samples of the Tohsun oasis taken in 2010: The net potential NO fluxes  $F_{NO}$  (ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, in terms of mass of NO) from the three major land use types of the Tohsun oasis (desert, grape, and cotton soils) are shown as functions of soil temperature and the gravimetric soil moisture content. The soil samples have been taken in 2010. Note the different scales of net potential NO fluxes and the gravimetric soil water content.




Fig. 5: Land-cover classification map (2010) derived from a Landsat Image (13 August 2010)






Fig. 6: Seasonal variation of the diel soil temperature (30 min resolution) for "desert soils", "grape soils" and "cotton fields" of the Tohsun oasis for the entire growing period of 2010 (01 April (DOY 90) – 30 September (DOY 273)).




Fig. 7: Seasonal variation of diel net NO flux (at 30 min resolution) for "grape soils" and "cotton fields" of the Tohsun oasis for the entire growing period of 2010 (01 April (DOY 90) – 30 September (DOY 273)).




Fig. 8: Anthropogenic  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions vs. soil biogenic  $\text{NO}_2$  emissions from NO and HONO emissions of the Tohsun oasis in 2010; biogenic emissions of nitrous acid (HONO) have been estimated according to Oswald et al. (2013). All data are given in terms of mass of  $\text{NO}_2$ .

5




Fig. 9: Seasonal 5 year-mean Tropospheric Vertical Column Densities of  $\text{NO}_2$  (2006- 2010); the “circumference line” represents the agriculturally managed part of the Tohsun oasis (230 km<sup>2</sup>).

10




Fig. 10: Monthly mean tropospheric NO<sub>2</sub> VCD during 2006 - 2010 over selected areas (unit: 10<sup>15</sup> molec cm<sup>-2</sup>)




Fig. 11: Monthly mean top-down emissions (from satellite observations) are compared to bottom-up (soil biogenic & antropogenic) and antropogenic emissions (in terms of ng m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, NO<sub>2</sub>). The biogenic bottom-up emissions around 13:00LT (at satellite overpass) are selected. They are systematically higher than the daily averages (see Fig. S12).