Assessing soil CO₂ efflux using continuous measurements of CO₂ profiles in soils with small solid-state sensors
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Abstract

This paper describes a new method to monitor continuously soil CO₂ profiles using small solid-state CO₂ sensors buried at different depths of the soil. Based on the measurement of soil CO₂ profile and a gaseous diffusivity model, we estimated soil CO₂ efflux, which was mainly from heterotrophic respiration, and its temporal variation in a dry season in a Mediterranean savanna ecosystem in California. The daily mean values of CO₂ concentrations in soils had small variation, but the diurnal variation was significant and correlated well with soil temperature. The daily mean CO₂ concentration remained steady at 396 ± 92 mol mol⁻¹ at 2 cm depth during the dry summer from days 200 to 235 in 2002. Over the same period, CO₂ concentration decreased from 721 to 611 mol mol⁻¹ at 8 cm depth, and from 1044 to 871 mol mol⁻¹ at 16 cm. The vertical soil CO₂ concentrations changed almost linearly with depth up to 16 cm, but the gradient varied over time. Based on the soil CO₂ gradient and the diffusion coefficient estimated from the Millington–Quirk model, continuous soil CO₂ efflux was calculated. The daily mean values of CO₂ efflux slightly decreased from 0.43 to 0.33 mol m⁻² s⁻¹ with a mean of 0.37 mol m⁻² s⁻¹. The mean diurnal range of CO₂ efflux was greater than the range of daily mean CO₂ efflux within the study period. The diurnal variation of soil CO₂ efflux ranged from 0.32 to 0.45 mol m⁻² s⁻¹ with the peak value reached between 14:30 and 16:30 h. This pattern corresponded well with the increase in soil temperatures during this time. By plotting CO₂ efflux vs. soil temperature, we found that CO₂ efflux correlated exponentially with soil temperature at the depth of 8 cm, with R² of 0.86 and Q₁₀ of 1.27 in the summer dry season. The Q₁₀ value increased with the depth of soil temperature measurements. The high correlation between CO₂ efflux and temperature explains the diurnal pattern of CO₂ efflux, but moisture may become another factor driving the seasonal pattern when moisture changes over seasons. The estimated CO₂ efflux using this method was very close to chamber measurements, suggesting that this method can be used for long-term continuous measurements of soil CO₂ efflux.
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1. Introduction

Soil surface CO₂ efflux, or soil respiration, is a major component of the biosphere’s carbon cycle because it may constitute about three-quarters of total ecosystem respiration (Law et al., 2001). In recent years, soil CO₂ efflux has been the subject of intense studies because of its potential and controversial role in amplifying global warming (e.g. Trumbore et al., 1996; Liski et al., 1999; Cox et al., 2000; Giardina and Ryan, 2000; Kirschbaum, 2000; Luo et al., 2001). Soil carbon modelers generally view soil CO₂ efflux as a
function of soil temperature or a combination of soil
temperature and moisture (e.g. Raich and Schlesinger,
1992; Davidson et al., 1998; Epron et al., 1999;
Treonis et al., 2002). However, there is no consen-
sus in functional forms and parameterization in these
models. The uncertainty is partly due to the instru-
mentation and methods used to measure soil CO₂
production and efflux (Livingston and Hutchinson,
1995; Davidson et al., 2002).

Information on soil respiration is also needed to in-
terpret eddy covariance measurements, which are now
being acquired on a quasi-continuous basis across the
global FLUXNET network (Baldocchi et al., 2001).
The eddy covariance method measures ecosystem pro-
ductivity (NEP), a net result of photosynthesis and res-
piration, but it does not provide individual information
such as photosynthesis, autotrophic respiration, and
heterotrophic respiration (though nighttime eddy co-
variance data provide information on ecosystem respi-
ration in the dark). Since these processes have differ-
ent mechanisms and environmental drivers, partition-
ing of eddy covariance data has received much atten-
tion (Piovesan and Adams, 2000). Continuous eddy
covariance measurements of CO₂ fluxes need contin-
uous soil CO₂ measurements at a similar frequency
(per half-hour) in order to decompose NEP, understand
temporal variation, and explain some unusual episodic
events that are observed.

Methods of soil CO₂ efflux measurement are still
in development. An early method periodically ex-
tracts soil gas samples from different depths to study
CO₂ profile and diffusion (De Jong and Schapper,
1972; Wagner and Buyanovsky, 1983; Burton and
Beauchamp, 1994; Davidson and Trumbore, 1995).
The gas extraction method can provide information
on soil CO₂ production at several depths, but it can-
not provide in situ, continuous and convenient data
on CO₂ efflux. Furthermore, this method will disturb
the soil environment. An unavoidable bias may oc-
cur during the processes of gas extraction, storage,
transport, and measurement.

Chamber-based measurements allow us to directly
measure CO₂ efflux from soils on a small scale (e.g.
Meyer et al., 1987; Norman et al., 1992). Fixed cham-
bers and portable chambers have evolved into auto-
mated systems for continuous and semi-continuous
measurements (Goulden and Crill, 1997; Russell et al.,
1998; Scott et al., 1999; Drewitt et al., 2002; King and
Harrison, 2002). Shortcomings with closed-chamber
methods, however, still exist. Efflux readings may be
biased by disturbing air pressure and altering CO₂
concentration in the soil (Livingston and Hutchinson,
1995; Healy et al., 1996; Davidson et al., 2002). By
measuring accumulation of soil CO₂ productivity re-
leased from the soil surface, chambers are unable to
provide information about soil profiles and individual
contributions at certain soil depths, which is important
for understanding soil carbon mechanisms. Currently,
no reliable and robust automated chambers for field
measurements are commercially available.

Understory eddy covariance towers provide an alter-
native to continuously measure soil CO₂ efflux without
disturbing the soil (Baldocchi and Meyers, 1991; Law
et al., 1999). As with overstory eddy covariance tech-
niques, understory eddy covariance measurement may
face difficulty in measuring respiration at night when
turbulence is weak and intermittent and drainage flows
dominate the transfer of CO₂ (Goulden et al., 1996;
Moncrieff et al., 1997). Compared with overstory
eddy covariance, the low height of understory towers
corresponds with small areas of footprint, which may
induce errors when large areas of ecosystems are rep-
resented. Furthermore, understory eddy covariance
data cannot separate soil CO₂ efflux, bole respiration
below sensors, and overlying herbaceous vegetation,
when it is present.

Partitioning NEP into GPP (gross primary pro-
ductivity) and NPP (net primary productivity), and
partitioning soil respiration into autotrophic and het-
erotrophic respiration are of critical importance for
building process-based models since these compo-
ents respond differently to abiotic and biotic drivers.
Despite the development of methods such as trenching
and isotopic approaches for partitioning the source
of soil CO₂ (Hanson et al., 2000), few studies have
directly measured and modeled heterotrophic respi-
ration in situ without any disturbance. As a result,
studies on temperature sensitivity (Q₁₀) of soil CO₂
efflux often combine heterotrophic respiration with
autotrophic respiration (e.g. Raich and Schlesinger,
1992; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994; Xu and Qi, 2001),
which may vary with plant physiological and pheno-
ological factors other than temperature. Thus, correla-
tion coefficients between soil CO₂ efflux and temper-
ature often have low values. Savanna ecosystems with
dead grasses and live but sparse trees in the summer
provide a unique opportunity to measure and model heterotrophic respiration. However, publications on heterotrophic respiration in savannas are limited. Due to the limitation of instrumentation, particularly due to the large size of commonly used infrared gas analyzers, there are very few publications on continuous measurements of CO₂ profile in the soil. Recently, an innovative CO₂ sensor was developed for air quality monitoring and control. This instrument has the potential to be buried in the soil and measure CO₂ in the soil atmosphere. Hirano et al. (2000) first used a type of these small CO₂ sensors (GMD20, Vaisala Inc., Finland) buried in the soil under a deciduous broad-leaved forest in Japan to deduce soil respiration, and therefore have demonstrated the feasibility of the instrument.

In order to develop more measurement methods in soil CO₂ efflux, this paper describes in detail the use of the new small solid-state CO₂ sensors (GMT222, Vaisala Inc., Finland) to continuously monitor soil CO₂ profiles and soil CO₂ efflux by burying these CO₂ sensors at different soil depths. Based on the measurement of the CO₂ profile and a diffusivity model, we estimated rates of soil CO₂ efflux in a dry season in a Mediterranean savanna ecosystem in California. The relationship between CO₂ efflux and soil temperature was explored. Soil CO₂ efflux measurements by chambers were used to validate this method.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Site description

The field study was conducted at an oak-grass savanna (38.4311°N, 120.9660°W and 177 m), one of the Ameriflux sites, located at the lower foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains near Ione, California. The climate is Mediterranean, hot and dry with almost no rain in the summer and relatively cold and wet in the winter. Mean annual temperature and precipitation over the recent 30 years at a nearby weather station with similar altitude and vegetation are 16.3 °C and 558.7 mm, respectively.

The overstory of the oak savanna consists of scattered blue oak trees (Quercus douglasii), with occasional gray pine trees (Pinus sabiniana) (3 ha⁻¹). The understory landscape has been managed, as the local rancher has removed brush and the cattle graze the herbs. The main grass and herb species include Brachypodium distachyon, Hypochaeris glabra, Bromus madritensis, and Cynosurus echinatus.

A demographic survey on stand structure was conducted on a 100 m x 100 m plot of the savanna and along a 200 m transect in 2000 (Kiang, 2002). The mean height of the forest stand was 7.1 m, its mode was 8.6 m, and the maximum height was 13.0 m. The landscape supported 194 stems per hectare, whose mean diameter at breast height (DBH) was 0.199 m and basal area was 18 m² ha⁻¹. The oak tree leaves out normally at the end of March. In about 2 weeks, its leaf area index (LAI) reaches its maximum value at about 0.6 in 2001. The growing of the understory grass is confined in the wet season, usually from the end of October to the middle of May in the next year. The maximum LAI of the grass is around 1.0. The grass was dead while this study was conducted.

2.2. Soils

The soil of the oak-grass savanna is an Auburn very rocky silt loam (Lithic haploxerepts). The soil profile is about 0.75 m deep, and overlays fractured rock. In the open area the soil is composed of 48% of sand, 42% of silt, and 10% of clay with a bulk density of 1.64 g cm⁻³, and 0.92% of C and 0.10% of N, while under canopy the soil is composed 37.5% of sand, 45% of silt, and 17.5% of clay with a bulk density of 1.58 g cm⁻³, and 1.09% of C and 0.11% of N. Soil texture and chemical composition were analyzed at DANR Analytical Laboratory, University of California, Davis.

2.3. Environmental measurements

Air temperature and relative humidity were measured with a platinum resistance thermometer and solid-state humicap, respectively (model HMP-45A, Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland). Static pressure was measured with a capacitance analog barometer (model PTB101B, Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland). Volumetric soil moisture content was measured continuously in the field at several depths in the soil with frequency domain reflectometry sensors (Theta Probe model ML2-X, Delta-T Devices, Cambridge, UK). Sensors were placed at various depths in the soil (5, 10, 20
and 50 cm) and were calibrated using the gravimetric method. Profiles of soil moisture (0–15, 15–30, 30–45 and 45–60 cm) were made periodically and manually using an enhanced time domain reflectometer (Moisture Point, model 917, E.S.I. Environmental Sensors Inc., Victoria, Canada). Ancillary meteorological and soil physics data were acquired and logged on CR-23x and CR-10x dataloggers (Campbell Scientific Inc., Utah, USA). The sensors were sampled every second, and half-hour averages were computed and stored on a computer to coincide with the flux measurements.

2.4 Soil CO$_2$ profile measurements

We built a 42.5 m transect between two oak trees in the savanna, and installed CO$_2$ sensors in the soil at an open area near the midpoint of the transect. Since the nearest oak trees were more than 20 m away from the sensors, the impact of oak root respiration on soil CO$_2$ measurements was minimal. Because the annual grasses were dead during the study period, it was safe to assume that all of CO$_2$ emanating from the soil is due to heterotrophic respiration.

We used solid-state CO$_2$ sensors (GMT222, Vaisala, Finland) to measure CO$_2$ profiles in the soil. The CO$_2$ sensor consists of three parts, a remote probe, a transmitter body, and a cable. The probe is a new silicon-based, non-dispersive infra-red (NDIR) sensor for the measurement of CO$_2$ based on the patented CARBOCAP® technique. Using the same working principle as other high performance large NDIR analyzers, it assesses CO$_2$ concentration by detecting the attenuate of single-beam dual-wavelength infra-red light across a fixed distance. The sensor is small because the CARBOCAP® sensor possesses a tiny electrically controlled Fabry–Perot interferometer (FPI) made of silicon, replacing the traditional rotating filter wheel in larger scale NDIRs. Therefore, a true dual-wavelength measurement can be made by a simple and small sensor (http://www.vaisala.com).

The feature of the probe provides us with a new and novel means of measuring soil CO$_2$ concentration profiles and deducing estimation of CO$_2$ efflux by burying the probe (sensor) in the soil. The probe is a cylinder with 15.5 cm in length and 1.85 cm in diameter. Tiny holes on the surface of the probe allow CO$_2$ to diffuse three-dimensionally through membranes into the sensor. In order to measure CO$_2$ concentration at some specific depth of soil, we encased the probe with an aluminum pipe with the same length but 5 mm larger in diameter. The casing was sealed with the probe on the upper end using a rubber gasket. The opening on the lower end allowed CO$_2$ molecule to diffuse to the sensor at the buried depth for CO$_2$ concentration measurement. The encased probe could respond to the change of CO$_2$ concentration in soils less than 5 min. We buried three sensors at depths of 2 cm (with a range of 0–5000 µmol mol$^{-1}$), 8 cm (0–10 000 µmol mol$^{-1}$), and 16 cm (0–10 000 µmol mol$^{-1}$), respectively; they were separated horizontally by about 2 cm. A schematic of the system is shown in Fig. 1.

The cable connected the probe in the soil with the transmitter body placed on the ground. After receiving the signal from the probe, the transmitter sends the output signal both to a datalogger (CR-23x, Campbell Scientific Inc., Utah, USA) and to an optional LCD display on the transmitter for the CO$_2$ concentration reading. We used custom-built thermocouple sensors to monitor soil temperature at the same depth where the CO$_2$ sensors were buried. Outputs from the probe and thermocouples were scanned every 30 s, and 5 min means were stored in the datalogger.

The system was powered by 24 V dc provided by two 12 V batteries connected in series, which were continuously charged by a 24 V photovoltaic system. Each CO$_2$ sensor consumes less than 4 W. The system was installed and tested in March 2002 and started to collect data on June 20, 2002. To avoid the potential impact from soil disturbance on the soil CO$_2$ measurements, only data collected after July 19, 2002 were included in the analysis of this study.

The GMT222 CO$_2$ sensor is a kind of GMT220 series sensors that have measurement range options from 0–2000 µmol mol$^{-1}$ to 0–20%. The technical specifications indicate an operating temperature ranging from −20 to 60 °C, and the accuracy of GMT222 is ±20 µmol mol$^{-1}$ plus 2% of reading. We calibrated the sensors using lab standards that are traceable to the NOAA/CMDL standards, and found that the shift of spans were in the specification range.

2.5 Data analysis

In order to decrease the systematic error, the concentration readings from the CO$_2$ sensor need to be
corrected for variations in temperature and pressure. The reference temperature and pressure for the sensor are 25°C and 101.3 kPa, respectively. Based on the ideal gas law and instrument specifications, the manufacturer of the sensor (personal communication with Dick Gronholm, Vaisala Inc. in California) provided the following empirical formulas for correcting for temperature and pressure applicable to GMT222 sensors:

\[
C_c = C_m - C_T - C_P,
\]

where \(C\) is the CO₂ concentration in \(\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}\), and the subscripts \(c\), \(m\), \(T\), and \(P\) stand for corrected, measured, temperature correction, and pressure correction.

The temperature correction was computed by

\[
C_T = 14.000 \left( K_T - K^2 \right) \frac{25 - T_c}{25},
\]

where \(T_c\) is the temperature (°C), and \(K_T = A_0 + A_1 \times C_m + A_2 \times C_m^2 + A_3 \times C_m^3\). \(A_0 = 3 \times 10^{-3}\), \(A_1 = 1.2 \times 10^{-5}\), \(A_2 = -1.25 \times 10^{-7}\), \(A_3 = 6 \times 10^{-14}\).

The pressure correction was computed by

\[
C_P = K_P \left[ \frac{P - 101.3}{101.3} \right],
\]

where \(P\) is the pressure (kPa), and \(K_P = A \times C_m\). \(A = 1.38\).
The data collected from CO₂ sensors are in volume fraction (μmol mol⁻¹), which can be changed to mole concentration (μmol m⁻³). The flux of CO₂ diffused from the soil can be calculated by Fick’s first law of diffusion:

\[ F = -D_s \frac{dC}{dz} \]

where \( F \) is the CO₂ efflux (μmol m⁻² s⁻¹), \( D_s \) the CO₂ diffusion coefficient in the soil (m² s⁻¹), \( C \) the CO₂ concentration (μmol m⁻³), and \( dC/dz \) the vertical soil CO₂ gradient.

\[ D_s = D_a \xi \]

where \( D_a \) is the CO₂ diffusion coefficient in the free air, \( \xi \) the gas tortuosity factor, and \( D_s \) the CO₂ diffusion coefficient in the soil. The effect of temperature and pressure on \( D_s \) is given by

\[ D_s = D_{a0} \left( \frac{T}{293.15} \right)^{1.75} \left( \frac{P_{a(m)}}{101.3} \right) \]

where \( T \) is the temperature (K), \( P \) the air pressure (kPa), \( D_{a0} \) a reference value of \( D_a \) at 20 °C (293.15 K) and 101.3 kPa, and is given as 14.7 mm² s⁻¹ (Jones, 1992).

There are several empirical models in the literature for computing \( \xi \) (Sallam et al., 1984). We used the Millington-Quirk model (Millington and Quirk, 1961):

\[ \xi = \frac{\omega^{0.3}}{\phi^2} \]

where \( \omega \) is the volumetric air content (air-filled porosity), \( \phi \) the porosity, sum of \( \omega \) and the volumetric water content \( \theta \). Note,

\[ \phi = \omega + \theta = 1 - \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_m} \]

where \( \rho_b \) is the bulk density, and \( \rho_m \) the particle density for the mineral soil.

Eqs. (5)–(8) are used to compute the soil CO₂ diffusion coefficient \( D_s \) at the site was measured as 1.64 g cm⁻³, and typical \( \rho_m \) of 2.65 g cm⁻³ was used. Thus \( \phi = 1 - 1.64/2.65 = 0.38 \). A continuous \( \theta \) measured at the 5 cm depth was used to represent the average between 0 and 16 cm to compute \( \omega \) and thus \( \xi \) by applying the Millington-Quirk model. Free air \( D_a \) is adjusted by soil temperature at 8 cm depth and air pressure.

### 2.6. Soil CO₂ efflux measurements by closed chambers

To validate the above method, CO₂ efflux from the soil surface was also manually and periodically measured by chambers across the transect. Eleven soil Collins, each with a height of 4.4 cm and a diameter of 11 cm, were inserted into the soil along the transect and used to measure CO₂ efflux. Soil CO₂ efflux was measured using a soil chamber (LI-6400-09, LI-COR Inc., Nebraska, USA) connected to a portable photosynthesis system (LI-6400, LI-COR Inc., Nebraska, USA) for data collection and storage. Soil CO₂ efflux was measured 1 day for every 2 weeks. The averaged CO₂ efflux measurements of two locations closest to the solid-state CO₂ sensors on days 200, 214, and 235 were used to validate estimated CO₂ efflux from these CO₂ sensors.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. CO₂ profile in measurements

Fig. 2 shows seasonal patterns with daily mean values between days 200 and 235 in 2002 of (a) CO₂ concentrations at three depth, (b) soil CO₂ efflux, (c) soil temperature, (d) soil volumetric water content, and (e) diffusion coefficient. In Fig. 2a we plotted half-hour average of CO₂ concentration at depths of 2, 8 and 16 cm and their daily mean values. During the study period, the daily mean values of CO₂ did not vary significantly at the depth of 2 cm, but decreased slightly at the depth of 8 and 16 cm. At the depth of 2 cm, the daily mean CO₂ concentration varied between 386 and 403 μmol mol⁻¹ with an average over 36 days of 396 μmol mol⁻¹. The daily mean CO₂ concentration decreased from 721 to 611 μmol mol⁻¹ at the depth of 8 cm; it decreased from 1044 to 871 μmol mol⁻¹ at the depth of 16 cm. Daily mean soil temperature measured at the depth of 8 cm varied from 32.6 to 38.3 °C during these days (Fig. 2c), but the variation of the temperature curve did not indicate the synchronous pattern with the daily mean concentration curves. Soil volumetric moisture at the depth of 5 cm had no significant
Fig. 2. Seasonal patterns with daily mean values between days 200 and 235 in 2002. (a) CO₂ concentrations in the soil at depths of 2, 8, and 16 cm; (b) soil CO₂ efflux; (c) soil temperature at the depth of 8 cm; (d) soil volumetric moisture at the depth of 5 cm; (e) diffusion coefficient.
diurnal variation (Fig. 2d), and it decreased slightly from 6.5 to 5.9\% with an average of 6.3\% over the 36-day drying period.

The decrease in soil CO\(_2\) concentration at the depth of 8 and 16 cm probably attributed to the continuous decrease in soil moisture and carbon content at these two levels. At the depth of 2 cm, soil moisture did not change since moisture was already at a threshold value of about 5\%. Thus the daily mean CO\(_2\) concentration indicated no decrease at the depth of 2 cm.

Unlike the seasonal patterns of the soil CO\(_2\) profile, the diurnal variation of the soil CO\(_2\) profile was significant and correlated well with soil temperature. We computed mean diurnal patterns of soil CO\(_2\) concentration and temperature at three depths, and their standard deviations over 34 days between days 201 and 234 (Fig. 3a and c). The 8 and 16 cm CO\(_2\) concentration curves indicated a similar temporal pattern while the 2 cm curve showed differently. During the time 14:30–16:30 h when soil temperature was the highest within a day, the 8 cm curve and 16 cm curve reached the peak values, while the 2 cm CO\(_2\) curve had a minimum value during this time. Temperature curves at the various depths did not peak at the same time. The temperature at 2 cm peaked early while the temperature at 16 cm peaked late. Correspondingly, the CO\(_2\) concentration curve at 8 cm peaked earlier than that at 16 cm. The amplitudes of three temperature waves are also different with the greatest at 2 cm and the least at 16 cm.

The value of CO\(_2\) concentration is mainly determined by the rate of CO\(_2\) production in a certain layer of the soil and by vertical diffusion of CO\(_2\) in and out of the layer if we neglect the horizontal transport. The 8 and 16 cm curves correlated positively with soil temperature but not the 2 cm curve. This may be explained by the CO\(_2\) production rate and diffusivity at 2 cm. CO\(_2\) production rates are sensitive to soil temperature, but temperature sensitivity and CO\(_2\) production rates may decrease with the further increase in temperature (Singh and Gupta, 1977; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994; Kirschbaum, 1995; Xu and Qi, 2001). At the top soil layer, the soil temperature can be as high as 50 \(^\circ\)C in the early afternoon. Thus the 2 cm CO\(_2\) concentration curve did not peak in the early afternoon probably due to the extremely high temperature. Another reason for the decreased CO\(_2\) concentration under high temperature is the transport of CO\(_2\). The high transport rate of CO\(_2\) may prevent the CO\(_2\) from building-up at the top layer during early afternoon because CO\(_2\) diffusivity increases with temperature. In addition to soil biological and physical factors, the low ambient CO\(_2\) concentration in the afternoon (data not shown) due to tree’s photosynthesis and well mixing in the atmospheric boundary layer may reduce soil CO\(_2\) concentration at the top layer. The pressure fluctuation caused by the surface wind may also affect CO\(_2\) concentration and CO\(_2\) efflux through the pressure pumping effect (Massman et al., 1997).

3.2. Soil CO\(_2\) gradients

The vertical CO\(_2\) gradient (dCO\(_2\)/dt) was approximately a constant at different depths of soil in our site for the field conditions experienced during this study. By plotting CO\(_2\) concentrations vs. depth, we
found the CO₂ concentration linearly increased with depth up to 16 cm. Thus, through linear regression for CO₂ concentration over depth we computed the slope, which was used to represent CO₂ concentration gradient. The gradient changed over time. We conducted linear regressions for computing the gradient and \( R^2 \) for each 5 min period. The averaged \( R^2 \) over 10,090 regressions between days 200 and 235 was 0.997. The linearity of CO₂ gradient makes its calculation simple, with a finite difference (\( \frac{dC}{dz} = \frac{\Delta C}{\Delta z} \)); this approximation may not be valid at deeper soil depths and during other seasons. Soil CO₂ concentration will increase with depth until reaching a certain level where CO₂ concentration may either keep a constant if a barrier is present, or decrease if there is no barrier (Jury et al., 1991). The gradient will vary with soil temperature, moisture and carbon content.

### 3.3. Estimation of soil CO₂ diffusivity

The average of the soil CO₂ diffusion coefficient over the depth of 0–16 cm was computed by the
Mallington-Quirk model (Eq. (7)) after it was corrected for changes in soil temperature and air pressure. Due to a small variation of soil moisture, soil CO₂ diffusion coefficient (Fig. 2e) did not vary significantly in the summer, although diurnal patterns were affected by soil temperature. Between days 200 and 235, ΔD_s ranges from 2.29 to 2.54 mm² s⁻¹ with a mean of 2.43 mm² s⁻¹.

3.4. Soil CO₂ efflux and its correlation with soil temperature

After we measured soil CO₂ concentrations in the soil and estimated soil CO₂ diffusivity, we computed soil surface CO₂ efflux by Fick’s law. Fig. 2b illustrates the seasonal variation of soil CO₂ efflux between days 200 and 235. Fig. 3b indicates the diurnal pattern of soil CO₂ efflux.

CO₂ efflux from the soil surface in the dry season at the savanna was very small. Between days 200 and 235, the daily mean values of CO₂ efflux slightly decreased from 0.43 to 0.33 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ with a mean of 0.37 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ or 0.0318 mol m⁻² per day. It corresponded with the small variation of daily mean soil temperature and moisture curves. Compared with the day-to-day variation (Fig. 2b), the mean diurnal range of CO₂ efflux (Fig. 3b) was greater within the study period, and correlated well with the diurnal variation of soil temperature (Fig. 3c).

The mean diurnal pattern of soil CO₂ efflux and its error bars (standard deviation) indicated a stable diurnal variation during this period. The diurnal variation of soil CO₂ efflux ranged from 0.32 ± 0.02 to 0.45 ± 0.03 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹. Soil CO₂ efflux increased after 09:00 h and reached the peak values at about 14:30-16:30h. This pattern corresponded well with the increase in soil temperatures, particularly with the ones at depths of 8 and 16 cm. However, different from the diurnal temperature curves, which had one maximum value, the diurnal curve of soil CO₂ efflux had a small concave between 14:30 and 16:30 h. This may be caused by the decreased temperature sensitivity under very high temperature in the early afternoon. Microbial decomposition may be constrained by extremely high temperature and low moisture.

To investigate the temperature sensitivity (Q₁₀ value) of soil CO₂ efflux at our site, we further plotted CO₂ efflux vs. soil temperature at the depth of 8 cm (Fig. 4). An exponential curve is fitted to the plot:

\[ F = 0.162 e^{0.037T}, \quad R^2 = 0.86, \quad n = 10,090, \]

(9)

where \( F \) is the soil CO₂ efflux and \( T \) the soil temperature; \( Q_{10} = 1.27 \).

Eq. (9) indicates that CO₂ efflux has a strong correlation with soil temperature. The high correlation may be explained by the simple state of the system in which CO₂ efflux is derived mainly from heterotrophic respiration without the influence from root activities. During other times of the year soil CO₂ efflux will consist of root respiration and heterotrophic respiration. Its correlation with soil temperature may diminish then because root respiration (or total soil respiration) may also correlate with photosynthesis, as indicated by Kuzyakov and Cheng (2001) and Hogberg et al. (2001). Separately modeling heterotrophic respiration, tree root respiration, and grass root respiration in savannas are necessary because these three processes may be driven by different variables, parameters, and functional forms. It is suggested to further study root respiration from oak trees by comparing soil CO₂ efflux under trees (root and heterotrophic respirations combined) with one in the bare soil (heterotrophic respiration) in the summer.

Eq. (9) also indicates that the temperature sensitivity is relatively low in the dry season. The \( Q_{10} \) value is commonly considered ranging from 1.3 to 3.3 (Raich and Schlesinger, 1992). \( Q_{10} \) itself is also temperature-dependent (Lloyd and Taylor, 1994) and may positively correlate with moisture (Xu and Qi, 2003). The high temperature and extremely low moisture content in the summer at our site may explain the low \( Q_{10} \) value and low CO₂ efflux. This may be partially verified by the fact that the slightly decreased daily mean CO₂ efflux (Fig. 2b) responds to the slightly decreased daily mean moisture (Fig. 2d). The high correlation between CO₂ efflux and soil temperature may explain well the diurnal patterns of CO₂ efflux driven by soil temperature, but not seasonal patterns. It is expected that when moisture changes over seasons, moisture may become an important factor driving CO₂ efflux.

To study the seasonal pattern of soil CO₂ efflux and its sensitivity to soil temperature with varying soil
moisture contents, an extended measurement covering whole seasons is needed. The sensor probe and casing need to be protected from submerging in liquid water by some special coats which are still permeable for gaseous CO$_2$. The CO$_2$ gradient, which may not be a constant vertically, and diffusivity, which varies with moisture, can still be calculated using the methods we provided. Thus, by this approach continuous and long-term measurements of soil CO$_2$ efflux covering diurnal and seasonal variations become applicable.

By plotting soil CO$_2$ efflux with soil temperature at different depths, we found the correlation was the highest at the depth of 8 cm. The exponential curves of soil CO$_2$ efflux vs. soil temperature yielded $R^2$ of 0.78 and $Q_{10}$ of 1.17 at the depth of 2 cm, and $R^2$ of 0.64 and $Q_{10}$ of 1.54 at the depth of 16 cm. The highest correlation at 8 cm indicated that the soil temperature at this depth was suitable to study the relationship between CO$_2$ efflux and temperature. This may be the depth where most CO$_2$ was produced. The $Q_{10}$ value increased with the depth of soil temperature measurements. Higher $Q_{10}$ was found when temperature was measured at the deep soil than that measured at the top soil.

3.5. Validation of CO$_2$ efflux

To validate the estimated CO$_2$ efflux results, we used simultaneous and manually measured data to compare with estimated ones. A linear relationship was found between measured efflux and estimated one (using the Millington–Quirk diffusivity model) with a slope $= 0.907$, intercept $= -0.0348$, and $R^2 = 0.84$ (Fig. 5).

The estimated CO$_2$ efflux is correlated well with measured data, but it is about 9% less than the measured ones if the Millington–Quirk model is used. The way in which diffusivity was computed may explain this systematic difference. We selected the Millington–Quirk model to calculate the tortuosity factor $\xi$, or the ratio of gas diffusion coefficient ($D_s/D_a$). Sallam et al. (1984) plotted five models and compared the theoretical ratios including the Penman, Burger, Currie, Marshall, and Millington–Quirk models, in the order from the highest value of $\xi$ to the lowest value. They found when the volumetric air content is less than 30%, the results of the Millington–Quirk model is the lowest compared with other models. To test the result from the Millington–Quirk model, we used the Marshall, the nearest model to the
Millington–Quirk model, to compute diffusivity and then CO₂ efflux. As indicated in Fig. 5, the results from the Marshall model are systematically greater than measured ones by about 18%. The measured result falls between the Marshall and Millington–Quirk models. This may suggest that the difference between our estimated and measured effluxes comes from the diffusivity calculation, not from the CO₂ gradient measurement and computing. Further studies are suggested to modify the parameters of diffusivity models so that we may improve estimated CO₂ efflux results.

In addition to the validation of estimated CO₂ efflux, chamber measurements are able to complement the spatial variation of CO₂ efflux that is not captured by the miniature solid-state CO₂ sensors. The soil in the open area of the savanna is relatively homogeneous horizontally in the summer. Yet soil CO₂ efflux under oak trees is different from that in the open area. The spatial pattern will become more complex when grass is growing both under oak trees and in the open area in the rainy season. In order to understand both the spatial and temporal patterns of soil CO₂ efflux in the savanna, more deployments of CO₂ sensors in soils, horizontally and vertically, are suggested. Periodical chamber measurements also provide supplemental information on spatial variation.

Compared with chamber measurements which may disturb natural conditions such as air pressure, CO₂ gradient measurement methods do not cause this disturbance. Traditional gradient methods involve periodically extracting soil gas samples. The sensors and method introduced in this paper allow us to continuously measure CO₂ gradient without the need for gas extraction. This method is not influenced by wind velocity and flatness of terrains, which may cause biases for the eddy covariance technique. The potential errors for this gradient method may be from the unevenly distributed CO₂ sources in soils where the sensors are buried, and from the calculation of CO₂ diffusivity that varies temporally and spatially.

4. Conclusion

We described a simple technique to measure continuously soil CO₂ profile by burying small solid-state
CO₂ sensors at different soil depths. After calculating soil CO₂ diffusivity, we estimated CO₂ efflux, which was mainly from heterotrophic respiration, in a dry season in a Mediterranean savanna ecosystem in California. Between days 200 and 235 in 2002, the daily mean CO₂ concentration remained steady at 2 cm depth while slightly decreasing at 8 and 16 cm depth. The vertical CO₂ gradient at a certain time was approximately a constant when the depth was less than 16 cm, but the gradient varied over time. By running the Millington–Quirk model, we found soil CO₂ diffusion coefficient varied mainly with soil moisture. Ranging from 0.32 to 0.45 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹, the diurnal pattern of CO₂ efflux was more significant than the day-to-day pattern. CO₂ efflux had a strong exponential correlation with soil temperature at the depth of 8 cm with R² of 0.86 and Q₁₀ of 1.27 in the summer dry season. The Q₁₀ value increased with soil depth of temperature measurements. The extremely low moisture content in the summer at our site may explain the low Q₁₀ value. The high correlation between soil CO₂ efflux and temperature may be due to the minimum disturbance and continuous measurements of heterotrophic respiration from soils. The high correlation explains the diurnal patterns of CO₂ efflux driven by soil temperature, but it is expected that moisture may become an important factor driving CO₂ efflux when moisture changes over seasons.

By comparing estimated CO₂ efflux with measured CO₂ efflux data, we conclude that the described CO₂ sensors and diffusion method yielded satisfactory results. This simple and commercially available technique provides continuous soil CO₂ concentration profiles, and thus helps us estimate CO₂ production at various depths of soils and efflux from the soil surface. It may also help to decompose NEP and calibrate and correct eddy covariance data.
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