Multiscale analysis of temporal variability of soil CO₂ production as influenced by weather and vegetation

RODRIGO VARGAS*, MATTEO DETTO*, DENNIS D. BALDOCCHI* and MICHAEL F. ALLEN†

*Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, Ecosystem Sciences Division, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA, †Center for Conservation Biology, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

Abstract

Ecosystem processes are influenced by weather and climatic perturbations at multiple temporal scales with a large range of amplitudes and phases. Technological advances of automated biometeorological measurements provide the opportunity to apply spectral methods on continuous time series to identify differences in amplitudes and phases and relationships with weather variation. Here we used wavelet coherence analysis to study the temporal covariance between soil CO₂ production and soil temperature, soil moisture, and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR). Continuous (hourly average) data were acquired over 2 years among three vegetation types in a semiarid mixed temperate forest. We showed that soil temperature and soil moisture influence soil CO₂ production differently at multiple periods (e.g. hours, days, weeks, months, years), especially after rain pulse events. Our results provide information about the periodicity of soil CO₂ production among vegetation types, and provide insights about processes controlling CO₂ production through the study of phase relationships between two time series (e.g. soil CO₂ production and PAR). We tested the performance of empirical models of soil CO₂ production using the continuous wavelet transform. These models, built around soil temperature and moisture, failed at multiple periods across the measured dates, suggesting that empirical models should include other factors that regulate soil CO₂ production at different temporal scales. Our results add a new dimension for the analysis of continuous time series of biometeorological measurements and model testing, which will prove useful for analysis of increasing sensor data obtained by environmental networks.
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Introduction

Emissions of CO₂ from soils (i.e. CO₂ efflux, Rₐ) represent a major flux of carbon into the atmosphere (Raich & Potter, 1995), and climate records indicate that the Earth is experiencing important biophysical changes (Hughes, 2000) with an overall trend of increasing temperatures for the past 100 years (IPCC, 2007). Changes in precipitation and temperature may influence the interannual variability of Rₐ (Raich et al., 2002), and changes in vegetation distribution will affect carbon dynamics at the landscape scale (Bachelet et al., 2001; Lenihan et al., 2003). Thus, it is crucial to understand how climate and weather variability influences Rₐ and which biophysical factors drive Rₐ in different vegetation types.

The general pattern of climate change models suggests that southern California and northern Mexico are persistent hotspots for changes in interannual climate variability (Diffenbaugh et al., 2008). The California mixed conifer forest is like many semiarid forest regions in that it is composed of patches of trees and small meadows. In many cases, the meadow patches are actually small burns resulting from lightning strikes burning small tree stands, or smoldering fires burning understory and small tree patches. Today, these dynamics have changed and the relative amounts of meadow and forest are being altered in an unpredictable manner. Fires and climate variation in these mixed forests have affected species composition, forest structure, and forest function (Minnich et al., 2000; Lenihan
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et al., 2003; Battles et al., 2008). Expected climate change may influence species composition and interannual variation in temperature and precipitation in semiarid forests, thus it is crucial to understand the influence of biophysical factors on $R_s$ at multiple spatial and temporal scales.

$R_s$ is the result of production of CO$_2$ in the soil ($P_s$) by autotrophic (roots and mycorrhizae) and heterotrophic (decomposers) respiration processes (Hanson et al., 2000; Ryan & Law, 2005). Variation of $P_s$ in the soil profile changes soil CO$_2$ concentration gradients, and in conjunction with changes in soil CO$_2$ diffusivity these biophysical processes regulate $R_s$ (Šimůnek & Suarez, 1993). While previous studies have focused on $R_s$ in multiple biomes and vegetation types (e.g. Ryan & Law, 2005), a mechanistic description of soil CO$_2$ dynamics is needed to understand how $P_s$ may vary in relation to weather and climate variation (Davidson & Trumbore, 1995; Hashimoto & Suzuki, 2002). The importance of $P_s$ relies on the fact that it is directly related to the biological activity in the soil, while $R_s$ provides integrated information about the interaction between soil structure, biophysical dynamics, and the atmosphere.

Automated continuous measurements of $R_s$ (see Goulden & Crill, 1997; Savage & Davidson, 2003) provide insights about processes, which were not possible to explore before. For example, one can identify phase lags between $R_s$ and soil temperature, at diel (Tang et al., 2005; Gaumont-Guay et al., 2006; Riveros-Iregui et al., 2007; Bahn et al., 2008; Vargas & Allen, 2008a) and seasonal scales (Moren & Lindroth, 2000; Drewitt et al., 2002; Vargas & Allen, 2008b), and previous studies have identified responses of $R_s$ to diel temperature independence (Liu et al., 2006; Vargas & Allen, 2008c), rain pulses (Jassal et al., 2005; Daly et al., 2008), and changes in the influence of soil temperature and soil moisture on $R_s$ (Goulden & Crill, 1997; Irvine & Law, 2002; Carbone et al., 2008). However, with increasing numbers and length of continuous measurements of biometeorological variables (e.g. soil CO$_2$ efflux) it is important to identify alternative tools to analyze the dependencies between these series and the series of the environmental factors (e.g. temperature and soil moisture).

Ecosystem processes are influenced by weather and climatic perturbations, which often contain oscillations at multiple temporal scales (Baldocchi et al., 2001; Bowling et al., 2002). We propose that complex spectral methods are needed to better understand the temperature and water dependence of soil CO$_2$ processes. Previous studies have used Fourier transform (Tang et al., 2005; Baldocchi et al., 2006) and cross-correlation (Stoy et al., 2007) analysis to investigate spectral properties of soil CO$_2$ signals. However, these analyses failed in presence of nonstationary phenomena (Katul et al., 2001a) such as a rain pulses, heat waves, or freezing events. Soil CO$_2$ signals (and most biometeorological measurements) typically violate the stationary assumption underlying the analysis of ‘global’ spectral properties. Moreover, as many meteorological variables, these signals contain strong periodicities that further complicate their interpretation. Here, we use the continue wavelet transform as a novel approach to the interpretation of soil CO$_2$ time series, where smooth, continuous variations in wavelet amplitude are expected (Torrence & Compo, 1998).

Wavelet transforms originated in geophysics in the early 1980s for the analysis of seismic signals. Since then, this technique has been applied in many other scientific fields including for analysis of meteorological data (Farge, 1992; Collineau & Brunet, 1993; Cao & Li, 1993; Kumar & Foufoula Georgiou, 1997; Torrence & Webster, 1999; Grinsted et al., 2004), but has rarely been applied to study time series of biophysical measurements such as fluxes of CO$_2$ and water vapor between ecosystem and atmosphere (Katul et al., 2001b; Stoy et al., 2005). Detailed reviews on the application and theory of wavelet analysis can be found in many studies (Farge, 1992; Torrence & Compo, 1998; Grinsted et al., 2004; Cazelles et al., 2008). The advantage of wavelet analysis over other time series analysis is that the window size is not fixed, varying as a function of frequency with an optimal trade-off between time and frequency resolution overcoming the problems of non-stationarity in time series. The intrinsic smoothing property of the wavelet produces results that are more easily interpretable, without the need of excessive manipulation of the original signal (e.g. averaging, smoothing, and tapering) or without restrictive assumptions (e.g. periodicity, stationarity). Furthermore, wavelet analysis can be performed in two time series of biophysical interest (e.g. soil CO$_2$ production and temperature) and can provide information of causality through analysis of the phase relationship between these two time series (e.g. cross-wavelet transform, wavelet coherence analysis) (Grinsted et al., 2004; Govindan et al., 2005).

The main goal of this study was to test how the temporal covariance between $P_s$ and soil temperature, and soil moisture changed among three adjacent vegetation types in a semiarid mixed temperate forest in Southern California. We compared the variation in measurements collected from January 2006 to February 2008. The studied vegetations were in a short distance ($< 150$ m) and represent a transition between mature mixed forest and an open meadow with similar soil properties and meteorological conditions (Vargas & Allen, 2008b). Thus, this experimental design allowed us to explore how different vegetation types respond to
similar weather variations. The specific objectives were (1) to apply wavelet coherence analysis as a novel approach for soil CO2 research using hourly measurements of \( P_s \), soil temperature, soil moisture, and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR). Using this technique we propose that it is possible to infer additional information about the biophysical processes that regulate soil CO2 fluxes by examining the temporal patterns and relationships (i.e. phase differences) among these variables. (2) To use wavelet analysis to test the performance of empirical models among vegetation types and identified periods (e.g. hours, days, months) and time domains (i.e. day of the year) where the models fail. Empirical models with soil temperature and soil water content have been widely used to represent variation in \( R_s \) (Davidson et al., 1998; Reichstein et al., 2003; Ryan & Law, 2005), but they may not accurately represent the variation of soil CO2 fluxes at multiple periods along the time domain (i.e. days of the year).

In this study we tested the following hypotheses:

**H1:** \( P_s \) has a spectral signature with a strong signal at the 1-day and 1-year (~360 days) periods at all vegetation types, but the spectral signature at intermediate scales (weeks–months) may vary among them.

The pattern of solar radiation at the 1-day (variation in day and night) and at 1-year period (seasonal variation) influences plant photosynthesis and microbial heterotrophic metabolism. At intermediate scales plant phenology and weather patterns (e.g. cold periods, heat waves, or rain pulses) that influence soil moisture and soil temperature could differentially influence plant and microbial activity among vegetation types. Multiple studies have investigated the influence of these transient events in soil CO2 fluxes at intermediate temporal scales (Schimel & Clein, 1996; Huxman et al., 2004; Jarvis et al., 2007) and here we explored their influence in the spectral characteristics of \( P_s \).

**H2:** The phase differences between two time series, within a specific period (e.g. 1 day), could provide insights of the timing of mechanisms that regulate soil CO2 fluxes.

The phase differences could be seen as the temporal lag between two time series within a specific period and can provide information of causality between two processes (Grinsted et al., 2004). Therefore, we explore if changes in the \( P_s \) time series occur at the same time (in phase with no lags) as changes in the soil temperature or PAR, or is there a tendency for changes in \( P_s \) to lag (out of phase) behind or ahead changes in the other time series.

**Methods**

**Study site**

The study was conducted at the University of California James San Jacinto Mountain Reserve, a UC Natural Reserve System field station. The Reserve is a mixed conifer-oak forest at 1640 m a.s.l. located in the San Jacinto Mountains, CA, USA (33°48′30″N, 116°46′40″W). Most of the precipitation occurs between the months of November and April with a mean annual precipitation of 640 mm and a mean air temperature of 10.3 °C. The Reserve serves as the Terrestrial Ecology Observing Systems field site for the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing (CENS, http://cens.ucla.edu) with the goals to research and develop new wireless environmental-sensing technologies for ecological observations (Allen et al., 2007).

In October 2005 we established a 150 m transect from an area of mature woody vegetation, passing through an area of young woody vegetation, and ending in an adjacent open meadow with scattered herbaceous vegetation (Vargas & Allen, 2008b). These transitions are becoming more abundant in these mixed forests due to recurrent fires and climate variation (e.g. long-term droughts). The vascular plants present at mature woody vegetation were large individuals (DBH > 30 cm) of Quercus chrysolepis Leibem. (Canyon live oak), and Pinus ponderosa C. Lawson (Ponderosa Pine). The vascular plants present at young woody vegetation were medium individuals (DBH < 20 cm) individuals of Quercus kelloggii Newb. (California black oak), Calocedrus decurrens (Torr.) Florin (Incense cedar), Arctostaphylos pingeii Parry (Manzanita), and Pinus lambertiana Doug. (Sugar pine). The scattered herbaceous vegetation at the meadow included individuals of Eriogonum wrightii Torr. Ex Benth (Bastard sage) of <10 cm in height and a density of nearly 2 plants m\(^{-2} \). Bastard sage was also present at the understory of young woody vegetation with a similar density as at scattered herbaceous vegetation meadow. Soils had similar physical characteristics (Table 1) and fine root biomass (<2 mm in diameter) was low in the scattered herbaceous meadow (10 g m\(^{-2} \)), medium in young woody vegetation (18 g m\(^{-2} \)), and high in mature woody vegetation (25 g m\(^{-2} \)).

**Soil CO2 measurements**

Along the 150 m transect we established one 40 m\(^2 \) plot for each vegetation type. Within these plots, we installed a suite of soil wireless sensors (i.e. nodes) to monitor gas-phase CO2 concentrations (CARBOCAP, GMM 222, Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland), temperature...
and moisture (Decagon, ECHO) simultaneously at several depths in the soil (2, 8, 16 cm) as described previously (Allen et al., 2007; Vargas & Allen, 2008b). At young woody vegetation and scattered herbaceous meadow we installed four nodes, and at mature woody vegetation two nodes for a total of 30 CO2 sensors in a replicated design. The CO2 sensors were protected with Gore-Tex® fiber to avoid possible wetting during rainfall events and calibrated every 6 months against reference gases. Measurements were recorded every 5 min and averaged every hour from January 2006 to February of 2008.

Soil CO2 fluxes were calculated using the flux gradient method described previously (Vargas & Allen, 2008b) with modifications for signal processing and calculation of $P_s$. Briefly, the CO2 concentration from the sensors was corrected for temperature and pressure accordingly to the manufacturer (Vaisala, Helsinki, Finland). We applied a Savitzky–Golay smoothing filter, which preserves peak heights and widths of the original signal to reduce noise of measured CO2 concentrations. A similar approach was used by Chen et al. (2005) for continuous measurements of CO2 concentrations using a cubic polynomial and a frame size of 8. These corrected CO2 concentrations were used to calculate the flux of CO2 between any two layers at depth $i$ in the soil profile using Fick’s law of diffusion. Diffusivity of soil CO2 in the soil profile was calculated using the Moldrup model (Moldrup et al., 1999), which is based on diffusion through porous media:

$$D_s = \varphi^2 \left( \frac{\psi}{\phi} \right)^{\beta s}$$

where $D_s$ is the gaseous CO2 diffusion coefficient in the soil, $D_i$ the CO2 molecular diffusivity of CO2 in the air, $\beta$ is a constant ($\beta = 2.9$), $S$ is silt + sand content ($S = 93$), and $\phi$ is soil porosity (see Vargas & Allen, 2008b, c).

Assuming a constant rate of CO2 production in the soil profile, $R_s$ can be calculated as

$$R_s = \frac{z_i F_i - z_{i+1} F_{i+1}}{z_{i+1} - z_i},$$

where $F_i$ and $F_{i+1}$ are CO2 effluxes ($\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) at depths $z_i$ and $z_{i+1}$ (m), respectively. The storage term was negligible at these depths for our study site, and the condition of constant CO2 production throughout the soil profile may not be entirely met in productive ecosystems where soil CO2 storage may be changing. Fluxes calculated using the flux gradient method and the Moldrup model for soil CO2 diffusivity have been extensively validated with the chamber flux method (LI-8100, LI-COR Lincoln, NE, USA) at the study site showing good agreement (Vargas & Allen, 2008b, c).

To estimate soil CO2 production ($P_s$) first we estimated $F_i$ at two depths between 0.02–0.08 and 0.08–0.16 m. Once $F_i$ was calculated for discrete layers in the soil profile, $P_s$ was calculated from the difference between the effluxes across soil layers as a flux divergence (Simůnek & Suarez, 1993):

$$P_s = F_i - F_{i+1} \frac{z_{i+1} - z_i}{z_{i+1} - z_i},$$

where $P_s$ is soil CO2 production ($\mu$mol m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$) at depth $(z_{i+1} - z_i)$ or 8.5 cm depth for this case. We report hourly averages of $P_s$ as positive values. We averaged time series of multiple nodes at the same vegetation to report a mean time series per vegetation type.

Wavelet analysis

Previous works have reviewed in detail the concepts of wavelet analysis for different applications (Daubechies, 1990; Torrence & Compo, 1998; Cazelles et al., 2008). Here, we list some important concepts with special attention to some properties used in this study.

The wavelet transform of a discrete signal $x_n$ of length $N$ recorded at $\delta t$ interval, is defined as the convolution integral

$$W_n(s) = (\frac{\delta t}{s})^{1/2} \sum_{n'=0}^{N-1} x_{n'} \psi_0^*(\frac{n-n'}{s/\delta t}),$$

where $\psi_0^*$ is the complex conjugate of the scaled and translated mother wavelet and $s$ is the wavelet scale at which the transform is applied. The continuous wavelet

Table 1 Soil characteristics and fine root biomass at three vegetation types at the James Reserve, a mixed temperate forest in Southern California, USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Soil carbon (%)</th>
<th>Nitrogen (%)</th>
<th>Fine root biomass (g m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>Soil bulk density (g cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Soil texture (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Fine roots</td>
<td>C1 (1)</td>
<td>C2 (2)</td>
<td>Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWv</td>
<td>3.3 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.29)</td>
<td>25 (2.32)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWv</td>
<td>3.1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.58 (0.23)</td>
<td>18 (1.56)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hv</td>
<td>2.4 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.24)</td>
<td>10 (2.75)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in parentheses represent ± 1 SD.

MWv, mature woody vegetation; YWv, young woody vegetation; Hv, scattered herbaceous meadow.
transform is calculated by continuously shifting the scale and time in Eqn (4). The mother wavelet with all its dilations and translations form an over-complete basis of \( N^2 \) coefficients. Thus, there is redundant information in the coefficients of the wavelet transform as they are not independent. The continuous wavelet transform can be viewed as a microscope able to reveal details of the signal at the position \( n \) with the magnification \( s \). This approach is useful for time series analysis, where the power of the signal is modulated at different scales and it varies with time. For this study we used the continuous wavelet transform because of its ability to produce a smooth picture in time-scale domain of a nonstationary process (i.e. soil CO\(_2\) production) and it is suitable for visual interpretation.

The ability to discern small intervals of scales (spectral resolution), depends on the choice of the wavelet because wavelets with good frequency resolution have poor time localization (temporal resolution) and vice versa (‘Heisenberg principle’). One of the most-used mother wavelets for geophysical applications is the Morlet wavelet (Torrence & Webster, 1999; Grinsted et al., 2004), given by

\[
\psi_0 = \pi^{-1/4} e^{i \omega_0 t} e^{-t^2/2},
\]

where \( \omega_0 \) (the base frequency) is set to 6. The Morlet is a complex nonorthogonal wavelet with a good time and scale resolution. A complex wavelet function, such as this, has the advantage to return information about both amplitude and phase.

The cross-wavelet transform of two time series, \( x = [x_n] \) and \( y = [y_n] \), at scale \( s \), first introduced by Hudgins et al. (1993) is defined as

\[
W_{xy}^{s}(s) = W_{x}^{s}(s)W_{y}^{s}(s),
\]

where \( W_{x}^{s}(s) \) is the complex conjugate of \( W_{x}^{s}(s) \). The cross-wavelet amplitude is given then by \( |W_{xy}^{s}(s)| \) while the phase difference is defined as \( \tan^{-1}[\mathcal{R}(W_{xy}^{s}(s))/\mathcal{I}(W_{xy}^{s}(s))] \). Here, \( \mathcal{R} \) represents the imaginary part and \( \mathcal{I} \) is the real part of \( W_{xy}^{s}(s) \). The cross-wavelet transform is simply the bivariate extension of the wavelet analysis and is used to explore the relationship between two time series to expose their common power in frequency domain (Grinsted et al., 2004).

The wavelet coherence analysis is defined as

\[
WCA(s) = \frac{|\langle s^{-1} W_{xy}^{s}(s) \rangle|^2}{|\langle s^{-1} W_{x}^{s}(s) \rangle|^2 |\langle s^{-1} W_{y}^{s}(s) \rangle|^2},
\]

where the angular brackets indicate a smoothing in time and scale. As in Fourier analysis, it is necessary to smooth the spectra and the cross spectrum before calculating coherency (which is otherwise identically equal to 1). The smoothing is performed in both, time and scale using the method proposed by Torrence & Webster (1999), which provides the minimal amount of smoothing necessary to include two independent points in both dimensions. Wavelet coherence analysis is similar to the cross-wavelet transform and can be thought of as the local correlation, between two time series. Importantly, wavelet coherence analysis finds regions in time–frequency space where two time series covary but do not necessarily have high common power (Grinsted et al., 2004; Cazelles et al., 2008).

In this study we focused on wavelet coherence analysis instead of the cross-wavelet transform for several reasons (1) there is some redundancy between the two measurements but they are complementary, (2) the wavelet coherence analysis reveals correlations in regions of the frequency domain where the two variables do not necessarily have high common power, and (3) there is evidence that the cross-wavelet transform may not be the best approach for significance testing of the interrelation between two time series (Maraun & Kurths, 2004), but the choice of a stationary test can be challenging (Lau & Weng, 1995). One of the reasons is that entire subsets of the record may be dropped below the significant level, due to the intrinsic nonstationarity of the process. Wavelet coherence analysis partially avoids this problem because in each region the copower is normalized by the local power of the two time series [Eqn (7)]. Although we only present the wavelet coherence analysis, our interpretations of the results and discussion are based on both wavelet coherence analysis and cross-wavelet transform.

The statistical significance (5% significance level) of common power between two time series (e.g. soil CO\(_2\) production and soil temperature) was assessed within the cone of influence of the wavelet coherence analysis using Monte Carlo simulations of wavelet coherency between 10 000 sets (two each) of white noise time series (Torrence & Webster, 1999). Grinsted et al. (2004) showed that the color of the noise has little impact on the 5% significance level analysis. The cone of influence is the region in which the wavelet transform suffers from edge effects because of incomplete time-locality across frequencies (Torrence & Compo, 1998), thus outside the cone of influence the results are unreliable and have to be interpreted carefully. To reduce errors at the beginning and at the end of the wavelet power spectrum the time series were padded with zeros which introduces discontinuities at endpoints and therefore it is important to be aware of edge effects delimited by the cone of influence in the wavelet spectrum (Torrence & Compo, 1998).

The phase relationships, which can be expressed in unit of time multiplying by the respective period, inform on synchronization between oscillations of the two time series (Govindan et al., 2005). The delay between
We tested two empirical models for $P_s$, soil temperature at depth of $P_s$, soil moisture, or PAR previously normalized. Data analyses were performed using MATLAB R2007a (The MathWorks Inc.), and wavelet analysis software written by C. Torrence (ITT Visual Info. Solutions, Boulder, CO, USA), G. P. Compo (NOAA/CIRES Climate Diagnostics Center, Boulder, CO, USA) and A. Grinsted (Arctic Centre, University of Lapland, Finland).

**Soil CO$_2$ production modeling and spectral testing**

We tested two empirical models for $P_s$ at three vegetation types using hourly means of the variables involved. The first model was a simple exponential equation with soil temperature as an independent variable:

$$ P_s = B_1 e^{(B_2 T)}. \quad (8) $$

The second model was a combination of soil temperature and volumetric water content and has been used in semiarid ecosystems where changes in soil temperature and water are important drivers for $P_s$ (Xu et al., 2004; Vargas & Allen, 2008c):

$$ P_s = B_1 e^{(B_2 T)} e^{(B_3 \theta)} e^{(B_4 (\theta^2))}. \quad (9) $$

where $P_s$ is soil CO$_2$ production ($\mu$mol CO$_2$ m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$), $T$ is soil temperature (°C) at depth of $P_s$, $\theta$ is soil water content (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$, average 2–16 cm depth), and $B_2$–$B_4$ are model parameters estimated using the Levenberg–Marquardt method. To select the best statistical model for $P_s$, we used the root mean squared error (RMSE), and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as a penalized likelihood criterion (Burnham & Anderson, 2002):

$$ AIC = -2 \ln(L) + 2p, \quad (10) $$

where $L$ is the likelihood of the fitted model, and $p$ is the total number of parameters in the model. The best statistical model minimizes the value of AIC.

Once the best statistical model for $P_s$ was selected, we used the continuous wavelet power spectrum of the residuals of that model to identify significant regions in the spectral signature where the model fails. This approach allowed testing model performance at multiple periods and time domains, as we can identify patterns where the signal of the residuals is large (i.e. large variation in residuals means poor model fit).

**Results and discussion**

Our results showed how the temporal covariance between soil temperature and soil moisture with soil CO$_2$ production ($P_s$) changed at multiple periods (e.g. hours, days, weeks, months, years) along the time domain (i.e. days of the year) among adjacent vegetation types in a semiarid mixed temperate forest. We propose that wavelet coherence analysis of continuous time series is a useful statistical tool to understand interactions among biophysical factors and provide insights about the periodicity of processes that regulate $P_s$ under weather variation. Furthermore, we tested empirical models using continuous wavelet transform and showed that these models failed to represent soil CO$_2$ fluxes at multiple periods among vegetation types.

We analyzed over 2 years of measurements where the first year was characterized as a warmer but slightly wetter year (Table 1), with high precipitation during spring that substantially increased soil moisture (Fig. 1). In contrast, the second year was slightly colder (Table 1) with lower and less variable soil moisture content during winter and spring (Fig. 1). Although all vegetation types were exposed to the same meteorological conditions, they had slightly different patterns in interannual soil temperature and soil moisture (Fig. 1). In general, the mature woody vegetation was slightly warmer and the soils were moister than the other vegetation types likely because of higher canopy cover that intercepted rainfall and reduced soil evaporation.

We were able to detect two summer rainfall events (Fig. 1; days 200 and 630 after January 1, 2008), where the effects on soil water content were different between years and among vegetation types (Fig. 1). Summer rainfalls are critical because they are drivers for soil microbial processes (Fierer et al., 2003; Collins et al., 2008), biological activity (Potts et al., 2006), and soil CO$_2$ pulses at the study site (Vargas & Allen, 2008b) and other arid and semiarid ecosystems (Huxman et al., 2004; Xu et al., 2004; Jarvis et al., 2007).

Different interannual patterns of soil temperature and soil moisture had a large effect on the timing and patterns of $P_s$. Our observations showed that, during the first year, spring rainfall was associated with higher fluxes and higher variation of $P_s$ in comparison with the drier following year (Fig. 2). We observed a reduction in mean annual $P_s$ and $R_s$ at the mature woody vegetation and scattered herbaceous meadow from the first to the second year, but an increase at the young woody vegetation (Fig. 2, Table 2). By studying the measured variables in the time domain, it is clear that rain pulses...
and rapid changes in soil temperature are transient events that influence patterns of $P_s$ among vegetation types (Figs 1 and 2). Next we explored the spectral characteristics of these irregular and nonstationary time series to extract information from their frequency domains that could provide insights of the periodicity at which different processes may regulate soil CO$_2$ fluxes.

**Fig. 1** Seasonal trends of (a) soil temperature and (b) soil moisture at the James San Jacinto Mountains Reserve from January 2006 to February 2008 at three vegetation types. The time series represents DOY after January 1, 2006. DOY, day of the year; MWv, mature woody vegetation; YWv, young woody vegetation; Hv, scattered herbaceous meadow. Arrows indicate the approximate date of summer rainfall events.

**Periodicity of soil CO$_2$ production, temperature, soil moisture**

The control of soil CO$_2$ fluxes by soil temperature and soil water content is well documented in different ecosystems (Davidson et al., 2000; Curel Yuste et al., 2003; Reichstein et al., 2003), but by studying the time series in the frequency domain one can identify the main periodic components. First, we studied the global wavelet power spectrum (Fig. 3), which is defined as the averaged variance contained in all wavelet coefficients of the same frequency and provides quantification of the main periodic components of a time series (Torrence & Compo, 1998).

The global power spectrum of soil temperature showed a strong periodicity at the 1-day and 1-year, while the global power spectrum of soil moisture had a strong periodicity at intermediate scales (weeks to months) and 1-year (Fig. 3a). Variation in soil moisture at weeks and months was a result of seasonal precipitation events (Fig. 1). Similarly, the global power spectrum of $P_s$ showed the expected pronounced peaks at 1-day and 1-year periods for all vegetation types (Fig. 3b). This pattern is common to most biological processes because they respond to diel and seasonal variations of meteorological phenomena of changes in temperature. Differences at the 1-year period among vegetation types were likely a result of stochastic fluctuations due to site differences, and these fluctuations
Table 2  Mean values divided by measurement years of soil temperature, air temperature, soil moisture, soil CO2 production ($P_s$), and soil respiration ($Rs$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>MWv</th>
<th>YWv</th>
<th>Hv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil temperature (°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td>2 cm</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td>8 cm</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td>16 cm</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air temperature (°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil moisture (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_s$ ($\mu$mol CO2 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs ($\mu$mol CO2 m$^2$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs sum (gC m$^2$ yr$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1171*</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Measurements of 50 days were missing at MWv during the beginning of the first year.

Hv, scattered herbaceous meadow; MWv, mature woody vegetation; YWv, young woody vegetation.

may influence the interannual response of the autotrophic and heterotrophic components of $P_s$ among vegetation types.

The global power spectrum showed that the spectral characteristics of $P_s$ varied among vegetation types at intermediate periods (e.g., weeks–months) supporting H1. Possible factors that regulate $P_s$ at these periods are different responses of microbes (Fierer et al., 2003) and vegetation (Xu et al., 2004) to water and temperature pulses, site variation in plant phenology (DeForest et al., 2006), differences in canopy photosynthesis (Baldocchi et al., 2006; Irvine et al., 2008), and differences in root and rhizomorph dynamics (Vargas & Allen, 2008a). Our results are consistent with previous findings that have identified strong periodicities in biometeorological measurements at similar intermediate periods (Baldocchi et al., 2001), and these results support the importance of understanding biophysical factors that may influence interannual variability of ecosystem CO2 fluxes (Mahecha et al., 2007). The fact that $P_s$ (and likely ecosystem CO2 fluxes) varied among vegetation types at intermediate periods is a critical property that process-based ecosystem models should take into consideration. Our results showed that the relationships between $P_s$ and soil moisture and soil temperature are dynamic and change along the frequency and time domains as discussed in the following two sections.

Wavelet coherence analysis: soil CO2 production and soil water content

We used wavelet coherence analysis to quantify the degree of linear relationship between the nonstationary series of soil $P_s$ and soil water content. Our results showed that the relationships between soil moisture and $P_s$ were significant at intermediate periods (between 2- and 32-day), but were associated with discrete pulses in soil moisture (Fig. 4). The darker red areas inside the contour lines in Fig. 4 represent high local correlation between these two time series (representing 5% significance level; see ‘Methods’), and the arrows indicate the phase relationship between these time series. Although we found a consistent correlation between $P_s$ and soil moisture at intermediate periods (indicated by the y-axis), we found that the localization of these correlations varied in the time domain (represented by the x-axis) among vegetation types (Fig. 4).

In general, the local correlation (denoted by darker red areas in Fig. 4) was higher at mature woody vegetation than at the other vegetation types suggesting a strong link between variations in $P_s$ and soil water content especially at the beginning of the winter rains (DOY 350 and 700 after January 1, 2006; Fig. 4a). In the young woody vegetation and herbaceous meadow, the effects of the summer rainfalls (DOY ~ 200 and ~ 600 after January 1, 2006) in soil water content appeared to be largely correlated with $P_s$ (Fig. 4b and c). The different response to water pulses between vegetation types could be associated with differences in plant phenology, root biomass (Table 1), mycorrhizal strategy (Vargas & Allen, 2008b), or the ability of larger plants to tap groundwater (Querejeta et al., 2009) during the dry summer months by mature woody vegetation. At the herbaceous meadow we observed the importance of water pulses for $P_s$ as seen in other herbaceous semiarid ecosystems (Huxman et al., 2004). With lower plant, fine roots, and rhizomorphs density, heterotrophic respiration is likely to be dependent on pulses of water input during warm conditions, where a large pool of readily digestible carbon may be rapidly consumed by the rehydrated microbial community (Fierer et al., 2003; Schimel et al., 2007).

Our results showed that $P_s$ responded differently to variation in soil water content among vegetation types, and using wavelet coherence analysis we were able to
identify significant correlations in frequency (y-axis) and time domains (x-axis; Fig. 4). These results could be applied for pulse responses analyses and models as we identified that the variation of $P_s$ to the pulse is associated to specific periods between 2- and 32-days. Further rain pulse experiments could be design to identify processes that regulate the fluxes at those periods among different vegetation types, climate conditions, soil textures, and soil nutrient gradients.

Wavelet coherence analysis: soil CO2 production and soil temperature

Wavelet coherence analysis was also applied to quantify the relationship between the time series of soil $P_s$ and soil temperature. A strong significant local correlation was observed at the 1-day period (see dark red areas along the 1-day period in y-axis; Fig. 5) at all vegetation types as biological processes depend on diel temperature cycles (Fig. 3a). Noteworthy, the local correlation was substantial at the 1-day period for mature woody vegetation (Fig. 5a), while there was a wide range of periods that showed local correlation at the young woody vegetation and the scattered herbaceous meadow (Fig. 5b and c).

The local correlation at the meadow was stronger at the 4–64-day periods. These coherencies were significant during increasing temperatures under wet conditions during spring (Fig. 5c; DOY 100–200 and 400–500 after January 1, 2006). These local correlations were also observed during the same time of the year at young woody vegetation, but we also observed significant local correlations when soil moisture increased early in the fall (Fig. 5b, DOY 350 and 700 after January 1, 2006). The influence of changes in soil temperature on $P_s$ at larger periods was more sensitive at herbaceous meadow where the vegetation cover is reduced as seen previously in grasslands (Bahn et al., 2008). Furthermore, the local correlation between soil temperature and $P_s$ was significant during conditions of high soil water content, suggesting the importance of temperature during these wet conditions. These results support the general observation that soil CO2 fluxes are related to changes in soil temperature (Lloyd & Taylor, 1994), but we showed that these relationships vary in the frequency and time domains, likely as a result of changes in moisture availability and substrate supply (Davidson et al., 2006).

Using wavelet coherence analysis one can extract phase relationships between two time series (represented as arrows in Figs 4 and 5), and this information could provide insights of biophysical controls on soil CO2 fluxes (H2). To test this hypothesis we calculated the wavelet coherence between the time series of $P_s$ and soil temperature, $P_s$, and PAR at the 1-day period to study diel responses.

Our results showed that lags between $P_s$ and both soil temperature and PAR varied each day showing that there is not a constant diel lag for each vegetation type (Fig. 6). Overall we found that PAR increased 5 and 3h before $P_s$ at woody and herbaceous vegetation types,
respectively. In contrast, soil temperature increased between 3 and 4 h after $P_s$ at woody vegetation types, but soil temperature was in phase (no lags) with $P_s$ at the herbaceous site. When comparing lags between these time series we found that variation in phase angles between $P_s$ and PAR explains nearly 70% and 80% of the variation in phase angles between $P_s$ and soil temperature ($P < 0.001$) in woody vegetation sites (Fig. 6a and b). This was not the case for the scattered herbaceous meadow (Fig. 6c).

At woody vegetation sites nearly 62% of the measurements showed lags $>1$ h between $P_s$ and both soil temperature and PAR (Fig. 6a and b). The relationship of lags between soil temperature and $P_s$ was strongest during the spring when soil moisture was decreasing but temperature was increasing. Furthermore, early spring was also the time where lags between $P_s$ and PAR explained the variation in lags between soil temperature and $P_s$ (Fig. 6a and b). Our results suggest that at the 1-day period photosynthesis of woody vegetation is likely to precede soil CO$_2$ fluxes and support previous observations (Tang et al., 2005).

At herbaceous vegetation nearly 64% of the measured days had lags $<1$ h between $P_s$ and soil temperature (at the 1-day period), but there was a more constant pattern of lags between $P_s$ and PAR among days (Fig. 6c). These...
results suggest that the biophysical mechanisms that regulate $P_s$ are tightly coupled with the frequency of the soil temperature signal, and support previous observations that photosynthesis regulates $R_s$ (at the 1-day period) by a rapid transfer of carbon for respiratory use in short stature vegetation (Carbone & Trumbore, 2007; Bahn et al., 2009).

Our results support the fact that PAR (as a surrogate for photosynthesis) regulates soil CO$_2$ fluxes at the 1-day period at different vegetation types, but showed that this influence is not consistent with time. We propose that different mechanisms prevail under different weather, plant physiological, and soil conditions at the 1-day period. These results bring attention to the need for understanding the biophysical mechanisms that regulate the diel variation of lags between CO$_2$ fluxes and soil temperature, and PAR. Possible general mechanisms that influence the lags between these time series are (a) changes in soil CO$_2$ diffusivity; (b) daily variation in carbon phloem transport that may influence the transport to labile carbon to the root and the microbes (Thompson & Holbrook, 2004); (c) changes in heat transfer in the soil due to changes in soil moisture; and (d) changes in daily transport of dissolved CO$_2$ in the xylem among vegetation types (McGuire & Teskey, 2004). We propose that isotope

---

**Fig. 5** Wavelet coherence analysis and phase difference between soil CO$_2$ production ($P_s$) and soil temperature at (a) mature woody vegetation, (b) young woody vegetation, and (c) herbaceous vegetation from January 2006 to February 2008. The phase difference is shown by arrows: in-phase pointing right (no lags between time series), out of phase pointing in other direction (representing lags between time series). The color codes for power values are from dark blue (low values) to dark red (high values). Black contour lines represent the 5% significance level and thick black line indicates the cone of influence that delimits the region not influenced by edge effects. DOY, day of the year after January 1, 2006. Arrows at the top of the panels indicate the approximate date of summer rainfall events.
analysis for tracking the fate of carbon among vegetation types are an important complement to time series analysis to better understand the mechanisms that regulate the lags between environmental variables and soil CO₂ fluxes.

Our results were based on soil temperature measured at the soil depth (8 cm) where $P_s$ was measured, but the interpretation of these results do not change using soil temperatures measured at different depths. The effect of heat transfer in the soil influenced the calculation of the phase angles among sites (Fig. 7), but because of the consistency on changes among vegetation types our conclusions are robust. However, it is critical to identify the depth of highest $P_s$ to better associate a respective temperature with soil CO₂ processes (Pavelka et al., 2007). Future studies should identify the depth of maximum $P_s$ in the soil profile, and explore which are the mechanisms that regulate the vertical distribution of production of CO₂ in the soil.

### Wavelet analysis and soil respiration modeling

Multiple empirical soil respiration models are based on variation in soil temperature and soil water content (e.g. Davidson et al., 1998; Reichstein et al., 2003), but their performance may vary depending on the frequency analyzed (e.g. using daily average or monthly average). Given the complexity of mechanisms involved in soil CO₂ processes, a first step is to reevaluate the performance of simple empirical models. Here we evaluated empirical models using inputs at 1-h intervals, and compared their performances in the frequency domain. We believe that a first step to improve model structure and model performance is first to identify were the models fail in both the frequency and time domains.

We analyzed two simple empirical models previously used in Mediterranean ecosystems (Xu et al., 2004; Vargas & Allen, 2008c) and selected the best fit based on the RMSE and the AIC (Table 3). We determined that an empirical model with soil temperature [Eqn (8),
Table 3  Nonlinear regression results relating soil CO2 production to soil water content and soil temperature at three vegetation types at the James Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation type</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$B_1$</th>
<th>$B_2$</th>
<th>$B_3$</th>
<th>$B_4$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWv</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>8.002</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWv</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.771</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>4.861</td>
<td>–18.601</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>4.817</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hv</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>–16.734</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model I has the form $P_s = B_1 e^{(B_2 T)}$ and model II the form $P_s = B_1 e^{(B_2 T)} e^{(B_3 \theta)} + (B_4 \theta^k)$. The best-fit model parameters ($B_1–B_4$) are reported for each model together with the squared coefficient of regression ($r^2$), the RMSE and the AIC. $T$ is temperature (°C) at 8 cm depth, $\theta$ is volumetric water content (m$^3$ m$^{-3}$), and $P_s$ is soil CO2 production (µmol CO m$^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$). Model parameters were estimated using the Levenberg–Marquardt method. The models are fit with the hourly data in the three vegetation types.

AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; MWv, mature woody vegetation; RMSE, root mean-squared error; YWv, young woody vegetation; Hv, scattered herbaceous meadow.

model I] was the best fit for $P_s$ in the scattered herbaceous meadow, whereas a model including soil temperature and soil moisture was the best to represent $P_s$ at mature and young woody vegetation [Eqn (9), model II]. Using hourly data the $r^2$ values of the models were low ($r^2$<0.5, Table 3), but allowed us to represent variation of $P_s$ at multiple periods (Fig. 8). We used the continuous wavelet transform on the residuals of the models to identify significant regions in the spectral signature where the error variance was significant (Fig. 8). Significant regions of error are represented by the red areas within the cone of influence in Fig. 8. The models failed to represent high-frequency (~1-day period) and low-frequency components (>36-day periods) for each vegetation type (see dark red areas inside contour lines). These results can be compared with the observations in the lack of coherence between soil temperature and moisture with $P_s$ at similar periods (blue areas outside contour lines in Figs 4 and 5).

In mature woody vegetation the model failed to explain variation at 1-day period from DOY 150 to 240 and from DOY 550 to 600 (after January 1, 2006) as represented by the red areas inside the contour lines at the 1-day period (Fig. 8a). These results support the observations that other variables rather than soil temperature and soil water content would be needed to explain soil CO2 fluxes at the study site (Vargas & Allen, 2008b). Noteworthy, the regions where the model failed were associated with periods of stress characterized by high temperatures and low soil water content (Fig. 1). The effect of the summer rainfall events can be seen at periods between 2- and 8-day. In addition, we found a significant large model failure between DOY 150 and 450 (after January 1, 2006) at periods between 8- and 128-day associated with large fluctuations of $P_s$ during the wet spring conditions of the year of 2006 (Fig. 1). In the young woody vegetation, the model failed to explain variation at periods larger than 4-day and especially over 64-day (red areas inside contour lines, Fig. 8b). In general, the model represented well the 1-day period except when soil water content increased during the summer rainfall events and during the winter rains. The effect of the summer rainfall can also be seen at periods between 2- and 8-day. The largest source of error was associated with low temperatures and high moisture content (DOY 350–450; after January 1, 2006), but the influence of seasonal precipitation on $P_s$ was difficult to represent at >32-day periods. These results bring special attention to the role of water and temperature pulses and how to better understand their influence and prediction of soil CO2 fluxes.

At the scattered herbaceous meadow, we used a simple exponential model using only soil temperature (Table 3), and this model accurately represented variation in $P_s$ at most periods along the time domain. However, this model failed to explain variation at periods >32-day (red areas inside contour lines) mainly influenced by seasonal changes in soil water content (Fig. 8c). Noteworthy, this model accurately represents variation at 1-day period supporting the results that temperature is the main control of soil CO2 fluxes in grassland sites (Bahn et al., 2009). The effect of the summer rainfall events can be seen at periods between 2- and 8-day and >32-day for the first year, but only at 16- and 32-day periods for the second year (Fig. 8).

It has been reported that terrestrial ecosystem models performed poorly in Mediterranean sites because of problems in the representation of water stress effects on CO2 dynamics (Morales et al., 2005). Our results suggest that water stress effects are likely to influence the variance in $P_s$ at intermediate periods (i.e. weeks to months), but we showed that the relationship
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between $P_s$ and soil moisture is dynamic and change along the frequency and time domains. Thus, there is a need to integrate modeling and experimental efforts in water stressed systems to better understand biophysical processes that act at intermediate periods for better representation of CO2 responses to weather variation.

**Conclusions**

Soil respiration processes are complex because the interactions between climatic forcing and biological components act at multiple temporal scales. In order to understand these interactions we used wavelet coherence analysis on continuous measurements of soil CO2 production as a novel approach for terrestrial CO2 flux research. The main advantage of wavelet coherence analysis approach is the ability to analyze transient dynamics for the association between two time series and the calculation of the phase difference. Our analysis has helped to identify repeating periods (i.e. hours, days, weeks, months, years) along the time domain (i.e. day of year) where different biophysical factors influence soil CO2 fluxes. Our results provide several key points: first, rain pulses and rapid temperature changes influence soil CO2 fluxes differently depending on the vegetation type. The influence of these water and temperature pulses can be seen at intermediate periods (e.g. weeks to months) in the frequency domain. Second, we propose that the information extracted from wavelet analysis is an alternative method for the under-
standing of biophysical frequency relations of soil CO₂ fluxes that have remained unclear so far. Here we showed that PAR (as a surrogate for photosynthesis) influenced soil CO₂ fluxes at the 1-day period but this influence is not consistent through time. Third, a first step to improve modeling of soil CO₂ fluxes is to evaluate model performances at multiple frequency and time domains. The temporal domains where the models fail provide information about biophysical processes that are not captured by these empirical models. Finally, we expect that time series analyses will become more common with increasing growth of continuous biometeorological measurements (e.g. ecosystem CO₂ fluxes, CH₄, NO₂, and O₃) by environmental networks such as the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS), and FLUXNET.

Acknowledgements
This research was undertaken with funding from the National Science Foundation no. EF-0410408, the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing no. CCR-0120778, CONACyT, and the Keck Foundation. R. V. was supported by grant DEB-0639235 while writing this manuscript.

References
Baldocchi D, Tang JW, Xu LK (2006) How switches and lags in biophysical frequency relations of soil CO₂ fluxes that have remained unclear so far. Here we showed that PAR (as a surrogate for photosynthesis) influenced soil CO₂ fluxes at the 1-day period but this influence is not consistent through time. Third, a first step to improve modeling of soil CO₂ fluxes is to evaluate model performances at multiple frequency and time domains. The temporal domains where the models fail provide information about biophysical processes that are not captured by these empirical models. Finally, we expect that time series analyses will become more common with increasing growth of continuous biometeorological measurements (e.g. ecosystem CO₂ fluxes, CH₄, NO₂, and O₃) by environmental networks such as the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS), and FLUXNET.

Acknowledgements
This research was undertaken with funding from the National Science Foundation no. EF-0410408, the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing no. CCR-0120778, CONACyT, and the Keck Foundation. R. V. was supported by grant DEB-0639235 while writing this manuscript.

References
Baldocchi D, Tang JW, Xu LK (2006) How switches and lags in biophysical frequency relations of soil CO₂ fluxes that have remained unclear so far. Here we showed that PAR (as a surrogate for photosynthesis) influenced soil CO₂ fluxes at the 1-day period but this influence is not consistent through time. Third, a first step to improve modeling of soil CO₂ fluxes is to evaluate model performances at multiple frequency and time domains. The temporal domains where the models fail provide information about biophysical processes that are not captured by these empirical models. Finally, we expect that time series analyses will become more common with increasing growth of continuous biometeorological measurements (e.g. ecosystem CO₂ fluxes, CH₄, NO₂, and O₃) by environmental networks such as the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS), and FLUXNET.

Acknowledgements
This research was undertaken with funding from the National Science Foundation no. EF-0410408, the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing no. CCR-0120778, CONACyT, and the Keck Foundation. R. V. was supported by grant DEB-0639235 while writing this manuscript.

References
Baldocchi D, Tang JW, Xu LK (2006) How switches and lags in biophysical frequency relations of soil CO₂ fluxes that have remained unclear so far. Here we showed that PAR (as a surrogate for photosynthesis) influenced soil CO₂ fluxes at the 1-day period but this influence is not consistent through time. Third, a first step to improve modeling of soil CO₂ fluxes is to evaluate model performances at multiple frequency and time domains. The temporal domains where the models fail provide information about biophysical processes that are not captured by these empirical models. Finally, we expect that time series analyses will become more common with increasing growth of continuous biometeorological measurements (e.g. ecosystem CO₂ fluxes, CH₄, NO₂, and O₃) by environmental networks such as the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS), and FLUXNET.

Acknowledgements
This research was undertaken with funding from the National Science Foundation no. EF-0410408, the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing no. CCR-0120778, CONACyT, and the Keck Foundation. R. V. was supported by grant DEB-0639235 while writing this manuscript.

References
Gao W, Li BL (1993) Wavelet analysis of coherent structures at the 1-day period but this influence is not consistent through time. Third, a first step to improve modeling of soil CO₂ fluxes is to evaluate model performances at multiple frequency and time domains. The temporal domains where the models fail provide information about biophysical processes that are not captured by these empirical models. Finally, we expect that time series analyses will become more common with increasing growth of continuous biometeorological measurements (e.g. ecosystem CO₂ fluxes, CH₄, NO₂, and O₃) by environmental networks such as the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS), and FLUXNET.

Acknowledgements
This research was undertaken with funding from the National Science Foundation no. EF-0410408, the Center for Embedded Networked Sensing no. CCR-0120778, CONACyT, and the Keck Foundation. R. V. was supported by grant DEB-0639235 while writing this manuscript.


