Working with Data: Soil Respiration at Harvard Forest

Gareth E. Roberts

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science College of the Holy Cross Worcester, MA, USA

Seminar in Mathematics and Climate MATH 392-01 Spring 2018

April 17, 2018

▲ 同 ▶ → 三 ▶



Figure: Soil Warming Experiment at Harvard Forest. Cables are buried in different plots to heat (or not) the soil 5° C above the ambient temperature in order to determine the effect on soil CO₂ emissions. Figure Source: http://harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/photos/soil-warming-control-plot



Figure: Experiment begun in 1991 consisting of 18 total plots, each $6 \times 6 \text{ m}^2$, of three different types: H (heated via buried cables), C (control, undisturbed with no cables), DC (disturbed control, buried cables with no heat). DC plots used to distinguish effects from heating versus cable installation.



Figure: Figure 1 from "Long-term pattern and magnitude of soil carbon feedback to the climate system in a warming world," Melillo et. al., *Science* **358**, 101–105 (2017). (A) shows soil CO_2 emissions from control plots (black) compared with heated plots (gray). (B) gives the four-year rolling mean change in emissions (heated – control).

Phase 1: Over the first 10 years, soil CO₂ emissions significantly larger in heated plots than control plots.

4 A N

- Phase 1: Over the first 10 years, soil CO₂ emissions significantly larger in heated plots than control plots.
- Phase 2: For years 11–17, soil CO₂ emission rates were basically identical (occasionally less for heated) in the different plots.

- Phase 1: Over the first 10 years, soil CO₂ emissions significantly larger in heated plots than control plots.
- Phase 2: For years 11–17, soil CO₂ emission rates were basically identical (occasionally less for heated) in the different plots.
- Phase 3: In years 18–23, soil CO₂ emissions were once again larger in heated plots than control plots. The difference is not quite as large as in Phase 1.

- Phase 1: Over the first 10 years, soil CO₂ emissions significantly larger in heated plots than control plots.
- Phase 2: For years 11–17, soil CO₂ emission rates were basically identical (occasionally less for heated) in the different plots.
- Phase 3: In years 18–23, soil CO₂ emissions were once again larger in heated plots than control plots. The difference is not quite as large as in Phase 1.
- Phase 4: Over the past three years, soil CO₂ emission rates were again roughly identical.

- Phase 1: Over the first 10 years, soil CO₂ emissions significantly larger in heated plots than control plots.
- Phase 2: For years 11–17, soil CO₂ emission rates were basically identical (occasionally less for heated) in the different plots.
- Phase 3: In years 18–23, soil CO₂ emissions were once again larger in heated plots than control plots. The difference is not quite as large as in Phase 1.
- Phase 4: Over the past three years, soil CO₂ emission rates were again roughly identical.
- Over the full 26-year study, 17% of the soil carbon contained in the top 60 cm of the heated soil was lost.

< < >> < <</p>





Roberts (Holy Cross)

æ



Figure: Cosine fit to soil CO₂ flux data. $F = a\cos(b(t-c)) + d$, where a = 68.76, b = 0.41, c = 2.16, and d = 54.72. The R^2 -value is 0.7821 and the period of the fit is 15.28 years.

Matlab Code

format long;
plot(t,F,'b*'); %% Data Plot: t = years, F = CO2 flux values

per = 15.28; %% Period; estimated to minimize R^2 value b = 2*pi/per;

%% Least squares approach to fit standard cosine curve X = [cos(b*t) sin(b*t) ones(23,1)]; %% Least-squares matrix v = inv(X'*X)*X'*F; %% Least-squares solution

```
a = sqrt(v(1)^2 + v(2)^2); %% amplitude of cosine fit
c = atan(v(2)/v(1))/b; %% phase shift
d = v(3); %% vertical shift
```

```
s = [0:0.1:23];
y = a*cos(b*(s-c)) + d;
plot(t,F,'b*',s,y,'r'); %% Plot of data and fit together
```

```
FHat = X*v;
Rsqrd = (norm(FHat-mean(F))/norm(F-mean(F)))^2;
%% R^2 value is 0.7821
```