

Review of: "Thawing Yedoma permafrost is a neglected nitrous oxide source"

Paul Schuster¹

¹ United States Geological Survey

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Post-publication comments; Schuster 1/21/22:

Thawing Yedoma permafrost is a neglected nitrous oxide source, M. E. Marushchak, et. al.
NATURE COMMUNICATIONS | (2021) 12:7107 | <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27386-2> |
www.nature.com/naturecommunications

Summary:

Although there is no evidence of N₂O emissions increasing globally since 1990 (EPA), this study has identified drying and revegetation with grasses and structural changes of the microbial community responsible for N cycling as mechanisms for increased N₂O emissions from thawing Yedoma at two locations in Siberia. Logistics and economics often prohibit wide-scale studies of this nature. As with many Arctic studies there is always the question of scaling up. A basic assumption is usually made that the quantification and qualification of identified processes transfer to other environments with similar characteristics. Despite these unavoidable shortfalls, these results advance the state of the science and understanding of the importance of N₂O emissions as a positive feedback to global warming highlighting the importance of extra N availability from thawing Yedoma permafrost.

Additional comments:

Why did the authors single out N₂O₆ when all nitrous oxides are considered GHG's? Is it simply because N₂O₆ is 300X more powerful as a GHG than CO₂? The reader is left hanging here. How much N₂O transforms to N₂O₆? How stable is N₂O₆ and how long does it cycle in the atmosphere?

In Results and discussion, the following wording

"At the Kurunghakh exposure, the N₂O fluxes from thawed Yedoma surfaces were highly variable (63 (–19–6286) µgNm^{–2} day^{–1}; median with (range)), at the high-end exceeding the typical fluxes from permafrost-affected soils (38 (6–189) µgNm^{–2} day^{–1}; median with (25th–75th percentiles); ref. 6) by two orders of magnitude"

Makes it sound very alarming by using “two orders of magnitude” when more realistically and statistically, it is only a 2-fold increase on average. It seems to me the authors are “cherry-picking” their verbiage to sound what might be considered over-stated alarms.

N₂O vs [C] and C-flux shows a significant correlation $R^2=0.5$, $p=0.05$ and 0.4 , $p=0.002$, respectively. Suggesting plant derived organic C may stimulate N cycling processes. This is a very important observation regarding globally thawing permafrost and it should have received more discussion and explanation.

Thawing and subsequent drying of oxic permafrost (Yedema) due to a warming Earth may result in a 6-fold increase in N₂O production as a positive feedback. Now that is alarming!

This is a very insightful article.