

TECHNICAL  
COMMENTDecreased mass specific respiration under  
experimental warming is robust to the microbial  
biomass method employed

Mark A. Bradford,<sup>1\*</sup> Matthew D. Wallenstein,<sup>2</sup> Steven D. Allison,<sup>3</sup> Kathleen K. Treseder,<sup>3</sup> Serita D. Frey,<sup>4</sup> Brian W. Watts,<sup>5</sup> Christian A. Davies,<sup>5</sup> Thomas R. Maddox,<sup>5</sup> Jerry M. Melillo,<sup>6</sup> Jacqueline E. Mohan<sup>5</sup> and James F. Reynolds<sup>7</sup>

**Abstract**

Hartley *et al.* question whether reduction in  $R_{\text{mass}}$ , under experimental warming, arises because of the biomass method. We show the method they treat as independent yields the same result. We describe why the substrate-depletion hypothesis may not solely explain observed responses, and urge caution in interpretation of the seasonal data.

**Keywords**

Acclimation, adaptation, carbon cycling, climate change, climate warming, CO<sub>2</sub>, microbial biomass, soil respiration, temperature, thermal biology.

*Ecology Letters* (2009) 12: E15–E18

Hartley *et al.* (2009) make two comments on our work (Bradford *et al.* 2008) and re-analyse our seasonal data. We respond to each comment and then discuss the re-analysis.

The first comment is that we calculated  $R_{\text{mass}}$  as a ratio between two respiration-based measures. The positive relationship between these two variables, and importantly the negative intercept, means that as substrate-induced respiration (SIR) biomass increases  $R_{\text{mass}}$  follows a positive hyperbolic function. Specifically, across higher biomass values (in the organic horizon) there is little change in  $R_{\text{mass}}$  but at lower biomass values (in the mineral horizon)  $R_{\text{mass}}$  co-varies markedly. Had the intercept between sucrose respiration and SIR biomass been zero then  $R_{\text{mass}}$  would have been constant; if positive then  $R_{\text{mass}}$  would have decreased as biomass increased. Hartley *et al.* (2009) consider chloroform fumigation-extraction (CFE) microbial biomass an independent measure (and, indeed, use it in their seasonal re-analysis: see below). If we calculate  $R_{\text{mass}}$  using CFE then we observe that under experimental warming

$R_{\text{mass}}$  is reduced (Fig. 1). That is, our observation that prolonged experimental warming decreases  $R_{\text{mass}}$  is robust to the microbial biomass method employed.

The second comment is that if our method to calculate  $R_{\text{mass}}$  is appropriate, the lower  $R_{\text{mass}}$  is more likely due to depletion of labile carbon, rather than thermal adaptation (*sensu* Bradford *et al.* 2008). From this, Hartley *et al.* conclude that the substrate-depletion hypothesis likely explains the ephemeral augmentation of respiration in warming experiments. We agree that substrate-depletion likely contributes to this augmentation and present the first field evidence that labile carbon pools decline in response to experimental warming (see Bradford *et al.* 2008). However, the substrate-depletion hypothesis does not make explicit predictions about microbial biomass or  $R_{\text{mass}}$  (Kirschbaum 2004; Eliasson *et al.* 2005; Knorr *et al.* 2005); no change in carbon supply or adaptation of microbial metabolism is invoked to explain respiration dynamics (see Kirschbaum 2004). This makes inferences from the hypothesis about microbial biomass and activity responses speculative,

<sup>1</sup>School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA

<sup>2</sup>Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

<sup>3</sup>Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Natural Resources, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824, USA

<sup>5</sup>Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

<sup>6</sup>The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA


<sup>7</sup>Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences, and Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

\*Correspondence: E-mail: mark.bradford@yale.edu

although we recognize that the hypothesis does imply an initial increase in carbon use per microbial biomass with elevated temperature. At equilibrium, however, the depletion of labile carbon pools may not imply that microbial biomass should decline due to carbon limitation, because the substrate-depletion hypothesis assumes equal carbon supply in control and heated soils. This led us (Bradford *et al.* 2008) to speculate that decreased root-carbon supply could explain the microbial biomass decreases we observed under experimental warming. Decreases could also arise through reduced carbon-use efficiencies (Steinweg *et al.* 2008), altered growth rates (Bárceñas-Moreno *et al.* 2009),

and/or shifts in microbial community composition (Frey *et al.* 2008). Whether depletion of labile carbon pools could drive any such changes is unclear. Specifically, the substrate-depletion hypothesis may not solely explain observed responses of soil microbes and their respiration to warming; nor was it presented as a panacea (see Kirschbaum 2004). The soil and global change communities need to focus more attention on microbial and plant responses when explaining soil respiration responses to warming.


In their re-analysis of our seasonal data, Hartley *et al.* (2009) suggest there is evidence for thermal adaptation enhancing the response of soil microbial respiration to warming. We suggest



**Figure 1** Rates of soil microbial respiration of sucrose, expressed per unit CFE microbial biomass, in control and heated soils at three measurement temperatures. These plots are equivalent to Fig. S4e–h in Bradford *et al.* (2008) excepting that in the original figure rates of sucrose respiration are expressed per unit SIR microbial biomass. Field soils were sampled from control (open circles) and heated (closed circles) plots ( $n = 6$ ) and then assayed to assess sucrose mineralization rates across a temperature range from 10 to 20  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and biomass using the CFE method (for details see Bradford *et al.* 2008). Details shown are the data from assays performed for the upper mineral soil horizon across early spring (April) to late fall (November). The observed pattern is that  $R_{mass}$  is generally lower, at a specific measurement temperature and with non-limiting substrate, following long-term, experimental warming. Note that  $R_{mass}$  does generally increase with assay temperature and this is to be expected. That is, carbon use per microbial biomass is expected to increase in response to initial temperature increase and, indeed, this expectation seems an implicit prediction of the substrate-depletion hypothesis (*sensu* Kirschbaum 2004). What the hypothesis questions is whether carbon use per unit microbial biomass adapts to temperature increase (Kirschbaum 2004; Eliasson *et al.* 2005; Knorr *et al.* 2005), which is resolved here as a difference in  $R_{mass}$  at a single temperature and with non-limiting substrate. The relative roles of thermal adaptation and substrate-depletion in determining the longer-term responses of soil respiration to sustained temperature change remain unresolved. Values are mean  $\pm$  1 SEM,  $n = 6$ . Given that  $R_{mass}$  is essentially a ratio, note that standard errors were propagated from the errors in the microbial biomass and sucrose respiration data. This same pattern was observed with the SIR biomass corrected data (see Bradford *et al.* 2008). Note that  $R_{mass}$  in the organic soils, whether determined using SIR or CFE biomass, showed no consistent, significant differences between control and heated plots (data not shown).

that perhaps we and Hartley *et al.* over-stepped what could be concluded about  $R_{\text{mass}}$  responses to seasonal temperature change using the SIR and CFE methods, respectively. Although CFE and SIR share a common origin (Anderson & Domsch 1978; Vance *et al.* 1987; Jenkinson *et al.* 2004), and yield biomass estimates that are correlated (Wardle & Parkinson 1991; Anderson & Joergensen 1997), they both have limitations. First, they provide ‘estimates’ of biomass. We relied on SIR because it is more effective at resolving active biomass differences at plot-scales (Wardle & Ghani 1995); CFE is often poor for detecting fine-scale variation. After finding approximately equivalent experimental-warm-

ing responses using both methods (Fig. 1 and Bradford *et al.* 2008), we proceeded to the seasonal analysis using only SIR. Yet, Hartley *et al.*’s re-analysis highlights how this affects our interpretation of the seasonal data (Fig. 2). There is clearly a need for development of methodology to provide robust, fine-scale, independent measures of microbial biomass. In the absence of these, we emphasize the seasonal patterns that are independent of the biomass method, and even biomass correction. Particularly pronounced is the seasonal shift in the shape of the temperature response, suggesting the optimum is shifted to the right in the warm season (Fig. 2a–c). In addition, sucrose respiration rates for each season diverge markedly



**Figure 2** Respiration rates of soils sampled in the cool and warm seasons at three measurement temperatures, following the approach of Hartley *et al.* (2009). Note that this approach pools across the experimental treatments and soil horizons. Therefore, the patterns observed in Fig. 1 do not relate to what is shown in this figure. In their re-analysis of our seasonal data using CFE microbial biomass, Hartley *et al.* (2009) conclude that the large increase in  $R_{\text{mass}}$  rates at measurement temperatures of 20 °C, for soils sampled in the warm season (a), implies that thermal adaptation will enhance the response of soil microbial respiration to persistent warming. A different interpretation is obtained if one uses SIR estimates of biomass to calculate  $R_{\text{mass}}$  rates (b). There are potentially issues with both of these approaches. Indeed, mean daily temperature across the preceding 9 or 11 weeks explained 64 and 75% of the seasonal variation in  $R_{\text{mass}}$  (based on SIR) for the organic and mineral horizons, respectively (see Bradford *et al.* 2008). However, the same analysis using CFE biomass to calculate  $R_{\text{mass}}$  explained no significant variation ( $r^2$  values < 0.01; showing less than 1% of variance explained). This may be because CFE biomass values are highly variable at fine-spatial scales compared to SIR biomass estimates (see text for additional discussion). However, the apparent seasonal shift in the thermal optimum for  $R_{\text{mass}}$  appears independent of the biomass method employed (a, b), and is also observed if sucrose respiration data are not corrected for biomass (c). That is, that rates in cool season soils increase markedly between measurement temperatures of 10 and 15 °C, and little between 15 and 20 °C, whereas the opposite pattern is observed for warm season soils (a–c). That thermal optima for  $R_{\text{mass}}$  rates track seasonal temperature corresponds with similar tracking of other microbial activities involving carbon degradation (Fenner *et al.* 2005) and is a consistent pattern in our seasonal dataset. Notably, the pattern is not observed for soil respiration, expressed where substrate-limitation has not been alleviated, and without correction for biomass (d and see text).

across the temperature range (Fig. 2c), highlighting the importance of considering biomass changes. These patterns are obscured for soil respiration (Fig. 2). This may mean that soil respiration responses to warming can mask marked shifts in microbial biomass and temperature response of microbial respiration. We conclude that the relative roles and interactions of substrate-depletion and microbial responses need to be resolved in warming soils.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the Office of Science (BER), U.S. Department of Energy, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and U.S. National Science Foundation grants to the Coweeta LTER program. The authors thank four anonymous referees, the editors and Iain Hartley and Phil Wookey for constructive comments.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.P.E. & Domsch, K.H. (1978). A physiological method for the quantitative measurement of microbial biomass in soils. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 10, 215–221.
- Anderson, T.-H. & Joergensen, R.G. (1997). Relationship between SIR and FE estimates of microbial biomass C in deciduous forest soils at different pH. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 29, 1033–1042.
- Bárceñas-Moreno, G., Gómez-Brandón, M., Rousk, J. & Bååth, E. (2009). Adaptation of soil microbial communities to temperature: comparison of fungi and bacteria in a laboratory experiment. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, published online (doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01882.x).
- Bradford, M.A., Davies, C.A., Frey, S.D., Maddox, T.R., Mohan, J.M., Reynolds, J.F. *et al.* (2008). Thermal adaptation of soil microbial respiration to elevated temperature. *Ecol. Lett.*, 11, 1316–1327.
- Eliasson, P.E., McMurtrie, R.E., Pepper, D.A., Strömberg, M., Linder, S. & Ågren, G.I. (2005). The response of heterotrophic CO<sub>2</sub> flux to soil warming. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 11, 167–181.
- Fenner, N., Freeman, C. & Reynolds, B. (2005). Observations of a seasonally shifting thermal optimum in peatland carbon-cycling processes: implications for the global carbon cycle and soil enzyme methodologies. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 37, 1814–1821.
- Frey, S.D., Drijber, R., Smith, H. & Melillo, J. (2008). Microbial biomass, functional capacity, and community structure after 12 years of soil warming. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 40, 2904–2907.
- Hartley, I.P., Hopkins, D.W., Garnett, M.H., Sommerkorn, M. & Wookey, P.A. (2009). No evidence for compensatory thermal adaptation of soil microbial respiration in the study of Bradford *et al.* (2008). *Ecol. Lett.*, 12, E1–E3.
- Jenkinson, D.S., Brookes, P.C. & Powlson, D.S. (2004). Measuring soil microbial biomass. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 36, 5–7.
- Kirschbaum, M.U.F. (2004). Soil respiration under prolonged soil warming: are rate reductions caused by acclimation or substrate loss? *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 10, 1870–1877.
- Knorr, W., Prentice, I.C., House, J.I. & Holland, E.A. (2005). Long-term sensitivity of soil carbon turnover to warming. *Nature*, 433, 298–301.
- Steinweg, J.M., Plante, A.F., Conant, R.T., Paul, E.A. & Tanaka, D.L. (2008). Patterns of substrate utilization during long-term incubations at different temperatures. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 40, 2722–2728.
- Vance, E.D., Brookes, P.C. & Jenkinson, D.S. (1987). An extraction method for measuring soil microbial biomass C. *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 19, 703–707.
- Wardle, D.A. & Ghani, A. (1995). Why is the strength of relationships between pairs of methods for estimating soil microbial biomass often so variable? *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 27, 821–828.
- Wardle, D.A. & Parkinson, D. (1991). A statistical evaluation of equations for predicting total microbial biomass carbon using physiological and biochemical methods. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 34, 75–86.

Editor, Richard Bardgett

Manuscript received 8 April 2009

First decision made 24 April 2009

Manuscript accepted 5 May 2009