Re-submitted to Geoscientific Model Development

PEATBOG: A biogeochemical model for analyzing coupled carbon and nitrogen dynamics in northern peatlands

Yuanqiao Wu & Christian Blodau*

Hydrology Group, Institute of Landscape Ecology, FB 14 Geosciences, University of Münster, Germany, Heisenbergstrasse 2, 48149 Münster, Germany.

*Corresponding author, christian.blodau@uni-muenster.de; +1 251-88-30209, Fax: +1 251-83-38338

Abstract

Elevated nitrogen deposition and climate change alter the vegetation communities and carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) cycling in peatlands. To address this issue we developed a new process-oriented biogeochemical model (PEATBOG) for analyzing coupled carbon and nitrogen dynamics in northern peatlands. The model consists of four submodels, which simulate: (1) daily water table depth and depth profiles of soil moisture, temperature and oxygen levels; (2) competition among three plants functional types (PFTs), production and litter production of plants; (3) decomposition of peat; and (4) production, consumption, diffusion and export of dissolved C and N species in soil water. The model is novel in the integration of the C and N cycles, the explicit spatial resolution belowground, the consistent conceptualization of movement of water and solutes, the incorporation of stoichiometric controls on elemental fluxes and a consistent conceptualization of C and N reactivity in vegetation and soil organic matter. The model was evaluated for the Mer Bleue Bog, near Ottawa, Ontario, with regards to simulation of soil moisture and temperature and the most important processes in the C and N cycles. Model sensitivity was tested for nitrogen input, precipitation, and temperature, and the choices of the most uncertain parameters were justified. A simulation of nitrogen deposition over 40 years demonstrates the advantages of the PEATBOG model in tracking biogeochemical effects and vegetation change in the ecosystem.

1. Introduction

Peatlands represent the largest terrestrial soil C pool and a significant N pool. Globally, peat stores 547 PgC (Yu et al., 2010) and 8 to 15 PgN, accounting for one third of the terrestrial C and 9% to 16% of the soil organic N storage (Wieder and Vitt, 2006). Northern peatlands have accumulated 16 to 23 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} throughout the Holocene and 0.42 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} in the past 1000 years on average (Vitt et al., 2000; Turunen et al., 2002; Limpens et al., 2006; van Bellen et al., 2011a; van Bellen et al., 2011b). Carbon accumulation in peats has been primarily attributed to low decomposition rates, which compensate for the low production in comparison to other ecosystems (Coulson and Butterfield, 1978; Clymo, 1984). The two characteristic environmental conditions in northern peatlands- high water table (WT) and low

temperature, play an essential role in preserving the large C pool by impeding material translocation and transformation in the permanently saturated zone (Clymo, 1984). Although the total N storage in peat is substantial, the scarcity of biologically available N induces a conservative manner of N cycling in peatlands (Rosswall and Granhall, 1980; Urban et al., 1988). *Sphagnum* mosses are highly adapted to the nutrient poor environment and successfully compete with vascular plants through a series of competition strategies, such as inception of N that is deposited from the atmosphere, internal recycling of N, and a minimized N release from litter with low decomposability (Damman, 1988; Aldous, 2002).

Climate change and elevated N deposition are likely to alter the structure and functioning of peatlands through interactive ways that are incompletely understood. In general, drought and a warmer environment were found to affect vegetation composition by suppressing *Sphagnum* mosses and promoting vascular plants (Weltzin et al., 2003), which in turn alters litter quality, C and N mineralization rates (Keller et al., 2004; Bayley et al., 2005; Breeuwer et al., 2008), and the C and N balance (Moore et al., 1998; Malmer et al., 2005). In northern peatlands, nitrogen is often a limiting nutrient and regulates the rates of C and N cycling and individual processes, and thus also controls elemental effluxes to the atmosphere and discharging streams. Excessive N entering peatlands could induce changes in various processes that may lead to non-linear and even contrasting consequences with respect to C and N budgets, especially on longer time scales. For example, experimentally added N was found to increase photosynthetic capacity and growth of several *Sphagnum* species up to ca. 1.5 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} before causing their decline at low N background sites (Williams and Silcock, 1997; Granath et al., 2009). However, at high N background sites such effects occurred up to 4 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Limpens and Berendse, 2003), which raises the question of how peatland ecosystems adjust their structure and functioning to long-term N deposition. Survey studies across N deposition gradients ranging from 0.2 to 2 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} demonstrated a relation between N deposition and litter decomposition rates (Bragazza et al., 2006), in addition the effects seemed to depend on litter quality (Bragazza et al., 2009; Currey et al., 2009) and deposited N forms (Currey et al., 2010). In both long-term N fertilization experiments and survey studies an increase in N content in the surface peat and in the soil water was observed at the high N sites (Xing et al., 2010) but enhanced N effluxes in form of N_2O remained elusive (Bubier et al., 2007). In contrast, N_2O emission was found in short-term N and P fertilization experiments (Lund et al., 2009). Laboratory and field experiments aiming to quantify the combined effects of temperature, WT and N elevation have thus often arrived at contradictory conclusions, due to the interplay of effects in time and space (Norby et al., 2001; Breeuwer et al., 2008; Robroek et al., 2009). Furthermore, elevated N deposition was recently suggested to affect soil temperature and moisture through changes in the vegetation community with potential feedbacks on elemental cycles (Wendel et al., 2011).

Ecosystem modeling has become an important approach in analyzing the interacting effects of climate and N deposition on peatlands and in making long-term predictions; examples are provided by PCARS (Frolking et al., 2002), *ecosys* (Dimitrov et al., 2011), Wetland-DNDC (Zhang, 2002), and MWM (St-Hilaire et al., 2010). While models have been thoroughly developed to investigate peatland C cycling (e.g. PCARS, MWM), there have been few attempts to integrate N cycling in peatland models, although N is mostly considered to be the limiting factor on primary production (Heijmans et al., 2008). In the mentioned models, N is generally passively bound to C pools by C/N ratios, while active nitrogen transformation and translocation among N pools is omitted.

To make progress towards closing this gap, we present a novel model for the analysis of the coupled C and N cycles in northern peatlands. The model is designed to fulfill the following objectives: 1) to clarify the interaction between C and N cycling in vegetation, soil organic matter and soil water; 2) to determine key processes that control the C and N balance of northern peatlands in the short and long-term; 3) to quantify C and N pools and cycling rates in peatlands; 4) to characterize their sensitivity to N availability and climate change; and 5) to predict the combined impact of elevated N deposition and climate change on peatland C and N cycling.

In this paper, we focus on the integration of C and N cycling through vegetation, soil organic matter and soil water, the coupling of C and N throughout the ecosystem, and the consistency of mass movements between pools. We first highlight the structural design and principles that governed the modeling process, and then explain the components of the model by focusing on the individual submodels. To improve readability of the text the equations are listed in the appendix. We subsequently present an evaluation of the simulated WT dynamics, C fluxes, depth profiles of CO_2 and CH_4 in soil water, and C and N budgets. The model output is compared against observations for the well characterized Mer Bleue Bog (MB), Ontario, Canada. We also present sensitivity analyses for environmental controls, such as temperature, precipitation, and N deposition, and for some calibrated key parameters. Finally we demonstrate the potential of the model for analyzing the effects of experimental long-term N deposition and climate change.

2. Model description

The PEATBOG (Pollution, Precipitation and Temperature impacts on peatland Biodiversity and Biogeochemistry; see acknowledgements) model version 1.0 was implemented in Stella® and integrates four submodels*: environment, vegetation, soil organic matter (SOM), dissolved C and N* (Fig.1). The *environment* submodel generates daily WT depth from a modified mixed mire water and heat (MMWH) model (Granberg et al., 1999) and depth profiles of soil moisture, peat temperature and oxygen concentration. The *vegetation* submodel simulates the C and N flows and the competition for light and nutrients among three plant functional types (PFTs): mosses, graminoids and shrubs. Most of the algorithms of plant physiology were adopted from the Hurley pasture (HPM) model (Thornley and Verberne, 1989; Thornley et al., 1995; Thornley, 1998a). Modifications were made for mosses and for the competition among PFTs in the nutrient poor environment. Litter and exudates from the *vegetation* submodel flow into the *SOM* submodel and are decomposed into dissolved C and N. The *dissolved C and N* submodel tracks the fate of dissolved C and N as DOC, CH_4, CO_2 and DON, NH_4^+, and NO_3^-. The model does not consider hummock-hollow microtopography of peatlands, which in other studies had no statistically significant effect when simulating ecosystem level CO_2 exchange (Wu et al., 2011).

2.1 Model structure and principles

The following three principles were imbedded in the model in terms of scale, resolution and structure:

2.1.1. High spatial and moderate temporal resolution

In comparison to other biogeochemical process models of peatland C cycling (Frolking et al., 2002; St-Hilaire et al., 2010) that primarily focus on the ecosystem-atmosphere interactions, we increased the vertical spatial representation and kept the temporal resolution fairly low. We divided the belowground peat into 20 layers (*i*) with a vertical resolution of 5 cm except for an unconfined bottom layer. This structure applies to all belowground pools and processes. The rationale for the comparatively fine spatial resolution lies in the critical role of soil hydrology for the C and N cycles and the necessity to represent physical and microbial processes (Trumbore and Harden, 1997). Spatial distributions of water and dissolved chemical species are generated and mass movement and balances are examined throughout layers and pools, which allows for tracing the fate of C and N belowground. The high resolution allows to explicitly include the activity of plant roots and their local impact on C and N pools. Plant roots showed morphological changes upon WT fluctuation and nutrient input in bogs (Murphy et al., 2009; Murphy and Moore, 2010). Root litter also provides highly decomposable organic matter to deeper peat and serves as a substrate for microbial respiration. Moreover, roots can act as sensitive conductors of N deposition to deep peat via root chemistry and litter quality (Bubier et al., 2011; Bragazza et al., 2012). The layered structure assists in mapping the belowground micro-environment for simulating the sensitive interactions of soil moisture, roots and microbial activity. The model computes and simulates processes on a daily time step, as does for example the HPM model (Thornley et al., 1995) and the wetland-DNDC model (Zhang, 2002). The moderate temporal resolution is adequate for the model soil C in the short and long-term (Trettin et al., 2001).

2.1.2. Stoichiometry controls C and N cycles

We did not stipulate critical mass fluxes as constraints on C and N cycling. Instead these constraints are generated in the model from changes in biological stoichiometry. This structure has the advantage that the interactions between C and N fluxes and temporal and spatial changes in pools sizes control the mobility of the elements. As in some terrestrial C and N models (Zhang et al., 2005), N flows are driven by C/N ratio gradients from low C/N ratio to high C/N ratio compartments. The C/N ratios of all pools are in turn modified by their associated flows, reflecting the organisms' requirement to maintain their chemical composition in certain ranges. Results from field manipulation experiments suggested thresholds of the N deposition level, above which the *Sphagnum* moss filter fails and mineral N enters soil water (Lamers et al., 2001; Bragazza et al., 2004). Flux-based critical loads of N for *Sphagnum* moss were suggested as the high end of the *Sphagnum* tolerance range, where the values are between 0.6 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Nordin et al., 2005) and 1.5 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Vitt et al.,2003). Threshold values in stoichiometry terms appear to be less variable, ranging from 15mgN g^{-1} (Van Der Heijden et al., 2001; Xing et al., 2010) to 20 mgN g^{-1} dry mass (Berendse et al., 2001; Granath et al., 2009). The critical load of ca. 1 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} was linked to a stoichiometry thresholds of 30 (N/P ratio) and 3 (N/K ratio) in *Sphagnum mosses* (Bragazza et al., 2004). The model internally generates C/N ratios, or C/N/P ratios, for all compartments to control the N flows in plants and microorganisms.

2.1.3. Consistent conceptualization of carbon and nitrogen reactivity

Differences in the mobility of C and N compartments were implemented using a two-pool concept throughout the model. Similar to decomposition models that distinguish the quality of soil organic matter (Grant et al., 1993; Parton et al., 1993), C and N are presented in labile (*L*) and recalcitrant (*R*) pools in SOM**.** In addition, the model differentiated C and N pools based on quality in vegetation, into structural

(*struc*) pools (Fig. 2). The pasture vegetation model HPM (Thornley et al., 1995; Thornley, 1998b) was adopted, where C and N in grass and legumes were separated in structural and substrate pools in shoots (*sh*) and roots (*rt*) for 4 age categories. Considering our focus on competition between plant functional types, vegetation was not conceptualized in term of age categories but instead classified into 3 plant functional types (PFTs) (*j*: 1=mosses, 2= graminoids and 3= shrubs) that are characterized by distinctive ecological functions (Fig. 3) in our model. The plant functional types differ in the decomposability of the litter, which was represented by the different mass fractions of the labile carbon pool in the litter. The fraction of labile litter was assumed to be 0.1, 0.3 and 0.2 in mosses, graminoids and shrubs, respectively (Inglett et al., 2012). Once the litter is deposited the litter merges into one labile and one recalcitrant soil organic matter pool. The remaining fraction of the plant litter is assigned to be recalcitrant and represents the input into the recalcitrant soil organic matter pools. Thus, the composition of plants, as a result of net primary production and litter fall, is adjusted to physical conditions and N input and alters SOM quality via changes in litter quality (*Q*).

2.2 Structural adaptations for modeling peatland biogeochemistry

Modifications were made to the adopted algorithms of the MMWH and HPM models for compatibility with our modeling purpose and model structure. The main modifications and novel features of the PEATBOG model are:

2.2.1. Competition among Plant Functional Types (PFTs)

Plant functional types compete for light and nutrients through their morphology and nutrient utilization. We modified the algorithms of competition among plant functional types for these controls to better represent the shading effects among PFTs and the nutrient poor environment. Competition among plants was modeled using PFTs previously, where the depth and biomass of roots mainly determined superiority in competition (Van Oene et al., 1999; Pastor et al., 2002; Heijmans et al., 2008). We focused instead on the effect of light for PFT competition that is controlled by shading effects through canopy layers (Fig. 3). This differs from the utilization of the leaf area index, which determines the share of total photosynthesis in the HPM model (Thornley et al., 1995). In the PEATBOG model, the uptake of N is also modified to be specific for each soil layer and PFT. It includes the uptake of three forms of N in the PFTs so that N availability varies for roots of each PFT in the same location. In addition to inorganic N sources (NH_4^+ and NO_3^-), as modeled in some C and N cycling models (Aber et al., 1997; Van der Peijl and Verhoeven, 1999), DON is included as a third N source, acknowledging its abundance (Moore et al., 2005a) and potential importance in nutrient poor environments, such as bogs (Jones et al., 2005; Nasholm et al., 2009) (Fig. 3).

2.2.2. Decoupling of O_2 boundary and WT boundary

The interface between oxic and anoxic conditions and unsaturated and saturated peat (i.e. the water table position, WT) are separately modeled and control biogeochemical and physical processes, respectively. Recent findings questioned that the long-term WT is the sole control on biogeochemical processes in peat as well as the *acrotelm* and *catotelm* concept in modeling of peatlands (Morris et al., 2011). Meanwhile O_2 was found well above and below the WT in peats, for instance during drying and rewetting experiments in a degraded fen site with dense soil (Estop-Aragonés et al., 2012). The decoupling of redox conditions from the WT spatially and temporally in dense soils is potentially important for the

partitioning of respired C into CO_2 and CH_4 during the decomposition of peat. We calculated O_2 concentration in each layer to regulate energy limited processes such as CH_4 oxidation and peat decomposition. Water table, on the other hand, serves as a control on moisture limited biological or physical processes, such as root metabolism and diffusion. The belowground controls on CH_4 production and emissions and the advantages and disadvantages of our representation of oxygen and soil moisture dynamics will be further discussed in a future manuscript.

2.3 Submodel 1- Environmental controls

Physical boundary conditions, such as day length, degree days, water table depth, soil moisture, temperature and depth profiles of O_2, are generated by the model to control physiochemical and biological processes.

Day length (*DL*), which in the model controls photosynthesis, varies for geographic position of the site and day of year. The daily day length value is obtained from the angel between the setting sun and the south point, which in turn is calculated from the declination of the earth and the geographical position of the site (Brock, 1981) (Appendix, Eq. A1.14, A1.15). Declination of the earth is the angular distance at solar noon between the sun and the equator and positive for the northern hemisphere. The value of declination is approximately calculated by Cooper (1969) using the day of the year.
Temperature is modeled by sinusoidal equations (Carslaw and Jaeger, 1959) and modified by converting a dampening depth into thermal conductivity (Appendix, Eq. A1.13). Thermal conductivity ($K_{thermal}$) is adjusted for each layer for peat compaction and snow coverage that delays the thermal exchange in winter and early spring (Fig. S1a (Supplemental Information)).

Degree-days (*DD*) represent the accumulation of cold days and trigger defoliation (Frolking et al., 2002; Zhang, 2002). Similar to other models, defoliation occurs on the day when DD reaches minus 25 degrees, with accumulated temperature of lower than 0 degrees after day 181 of the year (1 July in non-leap years).

Water table (WT) depth is simulated by calculating the water table depth from the water storage of peat using a modified version of the Mixed Water and Heat model (MMWH) (Granberg et al., 1999). Precipitation and snow melt represent water inputs, and are obtained from local meteorological records, instead of modeling the snow cover. Evapotranspiration (EPT) is the water output from the peat and vegetation surface via evaporation and transpiration, which are regulated by temperature and vegetation characteristics. Different from the authors' original approach the EPT rate per unit of the peatland surface is calculated from a base EPT rate and multipliers of plant leaf area (Reimer, 2001) (Appendix, Eq. A1.3), daily air temperature (Fig. S1b), daily average photosynthetic active radiation (PAR), and a factor of WTD and rooting depth (Lafleur et al., 2005a) (Fig. S2c). A maximum water storage was added to allow overflow once the WT rises above the peat surface. WTD is then obtained from linear functions of water storage as in the MMWH model but with depth-dependent slopes (Appendix, Eq. A1.8). The WT layer is defined as the layer in which the WT is located.

Depth profiles of soil moisture (m^3 water·m^{-3} pore space) are generated by the Van Genuchten's soil water retention equation, parameterized by Letts et al. (2000) for peatlands (Appendix, Eq. A1.9)**.** Porosity is a function of depth derived from field measurements for the Mer Bleue Bog (Blodau and Moore, 2002).

In order to simulate exports of dissolved C and N without modeling water movement explicitly, runoff was distributed over 20 layers and divided into horizontal and vertical flows (Fig. 4, Appendix, Eq. A1.4-A1.7). The vertical advection rate depends on slope and is determined as a fraction of the total runoff. It is consistently applied to all layers. The remaining runoff is horizontally distributed among layers according to the vertical hydraulic conductivity distribution. In the Mer Bleue Bog, saturated hydraulic conductivity rapidly declines with depth in the acrotelm, ranging from 10^{-7} to 10^{-3} $m \cdot s^{-1}$ and reaches 10^{-8} to 10^{-6} $m \cdot s^{-1}$ in the catotelm (Fraser et al., 2001). In layers above the WT, the actual hydraulic conductivity is lower when pores are unsaturated (Hemond and Fechner-Levy, 2000) (Fig. S1d).

The depth profiles of O_2 concentrations are simulated to locate the oxic-anoxic interface. Oxygen diffuses from the surface to deeper soil layers and is consumed directly or indirectly by the oxidization of peat C to CO_2 (Appendix, Eq. A1.12). For the simulation of oxygen-dependent biogeochemical processes we chose a dichotomous distribution of O_2, where the boundary of oxic/anoxic conditions is set at 5µmol L^{-1} (Liou et al., 2008).

2.4 Submodel 2 - Vegetation

Carbon in vascular plants is represented by four pools: shoot substrate C (*sh_subsC*), root substrate C (*rt_subsC*), shoot structural C (*sh_strucC*), and root substrate C (*rt_subs C*) (Fig. 2). Substrate C and structural C refer to metabolic activated C and recalcitrant C, respectively. Substrate pools conduct metabolic activities (i.e. photosynthesis, respiration) and structural pools perform phenological activities (i.e. growth, litter production). The flow from substrate C to structural C leads to plant growth (Appendix, Eq. A2.9). Each C pool or flow is bound to a N pool or flow by the C/N ratio of the specific pool. Furthermore, shoots are divided into stems and leaves and roots into coarse and fine roots by ratios specific to the PFT. Mosses are represented by 4 aboveground pools and two compartments: *capitulum* and stem. The C and N contained in exudates are transferred from the vegetation into the uppermost labile C and N pools in the soil. Unlike N uptake by vascular plants from soil water, N uptake by mosses is restricted to atmospheric supply.

Most C and N material flows are driven by C concentration gradients except for a few processes controlled by N (i.e. N uptake, N recycling from litter production). The phenology and competing strategies of PFTs are modeled as follows: 1) considering the seasonal C and N loss in leaves of deciduous shrubs; 2) PFT-specific N flows during growth, recycling and litter production; 3) competition among PFT is implemented through shading effects, tolerance to moisture and temperature, distribution of C and N among shoots and roots, as well as turnover rates. In general, the photosynthetic nutrient-use efficiency (the ratio of photosynthesis rate and nitrogen content per leaf area) is higher in herbaceous than in evergreen woody species (Hikosaka, 2004). The growth rates in deciduous species (graminoids and deciduous shrubs) are higher than in evergreen shrubs, which in turn is higher than in mosses (Chapin III and Shaver, 1989). Graminoids are more competitive in the deep soil attributed to the longer roots (Murphy et al., 2009). Mosses have the advantage of aboveground N uptake and filtration. Below we discuss the modeling of these competition strategies.

2.4.1 Photosynthesis (PSN) and competition for light

Competition for PAR is implemented through shading effects. The light level that reaches a specific PFT after interception by a taller PFT determines the C assimilation of this PFT (Fig. 3). For each PFT, canopy

PSN is integrated from daily leaf PSN by a light attenuation coefficient (k_{ext}), leaf area index (*LAI*) and day length *(DL)* (Appendix, Eq. A2.14)**.** The coefficient k_{ext} is unitless, the values are 0.5 for graminoids (Heijmans et al., 2008), 0.97 for shrubs (Aubin et al., 2000), and assumed to be 0.9 for mosses. LAI is determined by leaf structural C mass and specific leaf area (*SLA)* of the PFT. The PSN rate for the top canopy layer of each PFT ($LeafPSN_j$) is calculated by a non-rectangular hyperbola (Fig. S2f, Appendix, Eq. A2.16)**.** The two parameters α_j and ξ control the shape of the hyperbola curves. Parameter α_j represents the photosynthetic efficiency, which is controlled by WT depth, the air temperature (T_{air}) and atmospheric CO_2 level ($CO_{2,air}$) (Appendix, Eq. A2.18). The spring PSN of mosses starts when the snow depth falls below 0.2 cm. The variable LI_j is the PAR incepted by the canopy of PFT_j ($umol \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$). The assumptions here were that radiation diminishes along with canopy depth and each canopy depth contains one PFT solely.

The asymptote of leaf photosynthesis rate (P_{max} in $gCO_2\, m^{-2}\, s^{-1}$) is regulated by T_{air}, $CO_{2,air}$, WT depth, N content in plant shoots and the season. The maximum PSN rate ($P_{max,20}$, g $CO_2\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$) occurs in an optimal environment, is also referred to as PSN capacity, and is often derived from measurements. The values of $P_{max,20}$ vary among and within growth forms and follow the general sequence of deciduous > evergreens > mosses (Chapin III and Shaver, 1989; Ellsworth et al., 2004). The maximum PSN rate $P_{max,20}$ is 0.002 g $CO_2\, m^{-2}\, s^{-1}$ for graminoids and mosses following HPM (Thornley, 1998a), and 0.005 g $CO_2\, m^{-2}\, s^{-1}$ for shrubs based on the ranges in Small (1972). The temperature dependences $(f_{T,Pmax,j})$ of P_{max} is conceptualized as sigmoidal curve with PFT-specific optimal, maximum and minimum temperature for photosynthesis and curvature q (Fig. S2e, Appendix, Eq. A2.19). The WT depth dependency of P_{max} ($f_{m,Pmax,j}$) for mosses follows Frolking et al. (2002) and is an exponential function with PFT-specific base ($a_{w,j}$) for vascular plants (Fig. S2a, S2b). The model considers season and nutrient availability effects on P_{max}. Seasonal change ($f_{season,Pmax}$) affects mosses alone between 0 to 1 and was derived from the maximum rates of carboxylation (V_{max}) in spring summer and autumn (Williams and Flanagan, 1998) (Fig. S2c).

Potential N stress on photosynthesis is modeled by using PFT-specific photosynthetic N use efficiencies. Although there are interacting controls on the N economy of plant photosynthesis, such as N effects on Rubisco activity, Rubisco regeneration and the distribution of N in leaves, there seems to be a generalized linear relation of foliar N content and PSN capacity across growth forms and seasons (Sage and Pearcy, 1987; Reich et al., 1995; Yasumura et al., 2006). The ratio of PSN capacity and foliar N concentration is defined as photosynthetic nitrogen use efficiency (PNUE) (Field and Mooney, 1986). In general, evergreens have lower PNUE and larger interception than the deciduous shrubs (Fig. S2d, Appendix, Eq. A2.23) (Hikosaka, 2004). To reflect N use strategies of growth forms, we implemented PNUE values for PFTs following the sequence: graminoids > shrubs > mosses, and interception values reversely. In addition, a toxic effect ($f_{N,toxic}$) is applied with regard to mosses when the substrate N concentration exceeds the maximum N concentration at $20mg \cdot g^{-1}$ (Granath et al., 2009).

2.4.2 Competition for nutrients

PFTs compete for N through two processes: filtration of deposited N by mosses and the uptake of N among vascular plants roots. Nitrogen deposited from the atmosphere is first absorbed by moss and then enters soil water to become available to vascular plants. The N/P ratio of mosses is used as a regulator of N pathways and an indicator of N saturation in mosses. A fraction of 95% of the deposited N is absorbed by moss until the N/P ratio reaches 15 (Aerts et al., 1992), above which N absorption decreases owing to

the co-limitation of N and P on PSN rates. We assume mosses become N saturated when the N/P ratio exceeds 30 (Bragazza et al., 2004), above which the uptake fraction declines to zero. Due to the lack of P pools in the current model version, the initial moss N/P ratio is assumed to be 10 in mosses (Jauhiainen et al., 1998).

The competition for uptake of N among PFTs is conducted through the competitive advantages in the architecture of the roots and capabilities for uptake of three N sources (NH_4^-, NO_3^- and DON) (Fig.3).The root distribution in soil is modeled using a asymptotic equation (Gale and Grigal, 1987; Jackson et al., 1996) with a PFT-specific distribution coefficient *(rt_k)* (Murphy et al., 2009) (Appendix, Eq. A2.3). Graminoids have a larger *rt_k* than shrubs, indicating more roots in deeper layers that allow utilization of N in deeper peat. The N uptake rate is affected by the surface area rather than the biomass of the fine roots. Specific root lengths LV_j that vary with root diameters are used to convert the dry biomass to the surface area of roots (Kirk and Kronzucker, 2005). The diameters of the fine roots were set to be between 0.005 to 0.1 cm for the "true fine roots" that are responsible for N uptake (Valenzuela-Estrada et al., 2008).

Nitrogen uptake is modeled using Michaelis-Menten equations (Appendix, Eq. A2.47-A2.49), controlled by the soil temperature, the root biomass of the layer and the substrate C and N concentrations in plants. Parameters V_{max} and K_m for the DIN uptake were derived from the model of Kirk and Kronzucker (2005) while those for DON uptake were calibrated based on one of the few quantitative studies for an Arctic Tundra (Kielland, 1994), where V_{max} for DON uptake was 0.0288 to 0.048 mmol g^{-1} day^{-1} for shrubs (*Ledum*) and 0.012 to 0.096 mmol g^{-1} day^{-1} for graminoids (*Carex/Eriophorum*). The effects of substrate C and N concentration in plants on N uptake rates were derived from the HPM model (Thornley and Cannell, 1992). The half saturation constant of substrate N was adjusted to be smaller for shrubs and mosses than for graminoids. The temperature influence on N uptake is modeled using Q_{10} functions for active NO_3^- uptake and linear functions for passive NH_4^+ uptake (Glass et al., 2001; Williams and Miller, 2001; Miller and Cramer, 2004). Despite the abundance of DON in soil water, which is one order of magnitude larger than the concentration of DIN in the field (Kranabetter et al., 2007; Nasholm et al., 2009), the capability of DON uptake by plants is limited to low molecular weight DON (e.g. glycine, aspartate and glutamate) (Jones et al., 2005). We assumed a fraction of 0.2 of total DON concentration to be bio-available to plants, according to reports on arctic tundra and two permafrost taiga forests (Jones and Kielland, 2002; Atkin, 2006). Pools of NH_4^+, NO_3^-, and DON are simulated in the *dissolved C and N* submodel.

2.5 Submodel 3 - Soil organic matter dynamics

The *soil organic matter (SOM)* submodel simulates peat decomposition and accumulation using a multi-layer approach. The litter produced from the *vegetation* submodel is added to the topsoil layer and into the rooted layers of the peat. In each layer, C and N are present in labile (*L*) and recalcitrant (*R*) pools. The decomposition of each *SOM* pool was modeled following the single pool model of Manzoni et al. (2010). Pool *L* and *R* are decomposed simultaneously at rates that are determined by their C/N ratios, an environmentally controlled decomposition rate constant *k*, and the availability of mineral N. Three fates of the decomposition products are possible: 1) leaching as dissolved organic matter (DOM), 2) re-immobilization into microbial biomass, and 3) conversion into dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN). DOM was extracted from SOM pools by a constant fraction, which is

empirically related to the local precipitation level of the site (Appendix, Eq. A3.13, A3.19). The value used here (0.05) is slightly smaller than the lower end (0.06) of the suggested range for ecosystems in general (Manzoni et al., 2010), owing to the small hydraulic conductivity in northern peatlands. The remaining SOM is either mineralized into dissolved inorganic matter or immobilized into microbial biomass with a microbial efficiency (*e*), indicating the immobilized fraction of the decomposed SOM (Appendix, Eq. A3.7). Parameter *e* is empirically calculated from the initial C/N ratios of the SOM pools, which in turn is controlled by the composition of litter produced from each PFT. For simplicity, microbial biomass is considered as a constant part of SOM. The actual N decomposition rate, excluding for the N immobilization to microbial biomass, can be either positive or negative. Positive rates reveal net mineralization from SOM N pools to dissolved NH_4^+ pools and negative rates indicate net immobilization. The *"critical N level*" is used as an indicator of the N concentration at which immobilization balances mineralization (Berg and Staaf, 1981). The "*critical N level*" varies according to the C/N ratio of microorganisms, the DOM leaching fraction, *e* and another factor representing the N preferences of microorganisms during decomposition ($\alpha_E N_{prefer}$) (Appendix, Eq. A3.9). The nitrogen preference of microorganisms ($\alpha_E N_{prefer}$) is a multiplier larger than 1 and is limited by the asymptotic C/N ratio of SOM at decomposition equilibrium (Appendix, Eq. A3.18).

In addition to the control of N concentration in SOM, the availability of soil mineral N also affects the decomposition rates. Nitrogen addition experiments showed neutral or negative effects on the decomposition rates of SOM due to contrary effects on the decomposition of labile and recalcitrant OM: a decrease in the decomposition rates of more recalcitrant OM and an increase in that of more labile OM (Neff et al., 2002; Janssens et al., 2010; Currey et al., 2011). We adopted the quantitative relation from the Integrated Biosphere Simulator model (IBIS) (Liu et al., 2005), by converting mineral N contents to DIN concentrations in each layer (Fig. S3d). Nitrogen mineralization is inhibited while N immobilization is promoted by increasing DIN concentration up to 200 μmol L^{-1}**.**The decomposition rate constants *k* are regulated by substrate quality (*q*), soil moisture (fm_{dec}), soil temperature (fT_{dec}) and inhibition factors accounting for the decrease in Gibbs free energy due to the accumulation of end products (i.e. CO_2, CH_4) in the saturated soils (Appendix, Eq. A3.10). The decrease in *k* with depth is modeled based on the "*peat inactivation concept*" (Blodau et al., 2011) rather than only linked to anoxia (Frolking et al., 2002) or redox potential (Zhang, 2002), as in other models. The essential idea of this concept is that the transport rate of decomposition products controls the decomposition rate in the saturated anoxic soils (S. 3) The inhibitions factors are values between 0 and 1 based on CO_2 and CH_4 concentrations according to the inverse modeling results in Blodau et al. (2011) (Fig. S3a, S3b).

The intrinsic decomposability of the substrate (*L* or *R*) determines the base decomposition rate constant (k_{Cpot}). Due to the conceptual inconsistency of k_{Cpot} in experiments (Updegraff et al., 1995; Bridgham et al., 1998), we calibrated the values of k_{Cpot} from the long-term simulations in the spin-up runs. The moisture and temperature effect on the decomposition is each pool is modeled similar to the PCARS model (Frolking et al., 2002), with the Q_{10} value of the decomposition of L pools (2.3) smaller than of that of R pools (3.3) (Conant et al., 2008; Conant et al., 2010).

2.6 Submodel 4 - Dissolved C and N

The model contains 3 dissolved C pools: CH_4, CO_2 and DOC and 4 dissolved N pools: NH_4^+, NO_3^-, NO_2^- and DON in each belowground layer (Fig. 2). Because decomposition proceeds and is controlled through

the SOM pools, DOC and DON are considered to be an end product, and are only removed by runoff. The production of DOC, DIC, DON and NH_4^+ are inputs from the *SOM* and the *vegetation* submodels. The production of DIC is further partitioned into the production of CH_4 and CO_2 in the anoxic layers.

The partitioning of respired C into CO_2 and CH_4 in the saturated layers depends on the presence of alternative electron acceptors (i.e. SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^- and likely humic substances) for the terminal electron accepting processes (TEAP) (Conrad, 1999; Lovley and Coates, 2000). In previous studies, the ratio of CO_2/CH_4 production and the production rates of CH_4 was modeled as a function of WT depth (Potter, 1997; Zhuang, 2004), or by microbial activities using Michaelis-Menten kinetics (Segers and Kengen, 1998; Lopes et al., 2011). Following the concept put forward by Blodau (2011), we modeled the CH_4 production rate by an energy limited Michaelis-Menten kinetics.

We built an equation group based on the valance balance of the overall oxidation-reduction process and the mass balance of C (Appendix, Eq. A4.22). The first equation (Appendix, Eq. A4.22) denotes that CO_2 and CH_4 are the only inorganic C products (DIC) from the decomposition of SOM. The second equation was deduced from the valance balance of CO_2 (+4) production and CH_4 (-4) production from organic C, assuming an initial oxidation state of zero as found in carbohydrates. The production of CO_2 (CO_2pro_i) is the result of the stoichiometric release of CH_4 (CH_4pro_i) from fermentation and subsequent methanogenesis, and the consumption of electron acceptors ($CO_2pro_{EA,i}$) in units of electron equivalents. The acronym EA represents electron acceptors other than CO_2, including NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}, and humic substances (HS).

In anaerobic systems, electron acceptors are consumed by terminal electron accepting processes that competitively consume H_2 or acetate. Individual processes predominate according to their respective Gibbs free energy gain, usually in the sequence NO_3^-, Fe (III), humic substances (HS), SO_4^{2-} and CO_2 (Conrad, 1999; Blodau, 2011). Owing to the extremely fast turnover of H_2 pools in peat, the Michaelis-Menten approach is not suitable for modeling CH_4 production in models running on a daily time step when H_2 is considered the substrate. To avoid modeling the pools of H_2 and acetate explicitly, the current model with daily time step focuses on the electron flow from complex organic matter to all TEAPs, instead of modeling each microbial process explicitly. In ombrotrophic systems like bogs, only SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^- and HS are considered relevant electron acceptors. The CO_2 production from SO_4^{2-} and NO_3^- reduction are calculated from the valance relations (Appendix, Eq. A4.23), One mole of SO_4^{2-} being reduced to HS^- provides 8 mole of electrons (S(+6)→ S(-2)) and 1 mole of NO_3^- release 5, 4 and 3 moles of electrons when being reduced to NO, N_2O or N_2 (N(+5)→N(+3)→N(+1)→N(0)).

Humic substances have recently also been identified as electron acceptors (Lovley et al., 1996; Heitmann et al., 2007; Keller et al., 2009) and require some consideration. Reduction of humic substances may be a significant CO_2 source in anoxic peat, where a large fraction of the total CO_2 production typically cannot be explained by consumption of known electron acceptors (Vile et al., 2003b). Although peat stores a large amount of organic carbon as humics, likely only a small fraction of it is redox active (Roden et al., 2010). The redox-active moieties in humics have been identified as quinones, here called DOM-Q (Scott et al., 1998). Electron accepting rate constants of HS in sediments were reported to be 0.34 h^{-1} and 0.68 h^{-1} based on two oxidized humic pools (Roden et al., 2010). Field measurements reported minimum

electron transfer of 0.8 mmol charge (eq.) m^{-2} day^{-1} generating CO_2 at 0.2 mmol m^{-2} day^{-1} (Heitmann et al., 2007). This rate was similar to the small production rate of CH_4 at the investigated bog site.

Based on this limited information, we conceptually modeled the reduction and oxidation of humic substances using first order kinetics (Appendix, Eq. A4.34-4.37). The initial values of the EA (electron acceptors) and ED (electron donors) pools in the humic substances are calculated from the SOM C pool by a ratio of 1.2 eq. $(mol\ C)^{-1}$ (Roden et al., 2010). The initial electron accepting capacity used in the model was ca. 2000 - 4000 mmol charge m^{-2} for the upper 60 cm of peat per m^2, which is close to the capacity of 2725 mmol charge m^{-2} derived from a drying and rewetting experiments in a minerotrophic fen (Knorr and Blodau, 2009).

In the model electron acceptors are renewed via two mechanisms: direct oxidation by O_2 due to WT fluctuation in the only temporarily saturated layers and microbially mediated electric currents through the peat column via an extracellular electron transfer ($I_{nanowire}$). While the first mechanism is well documented (Knorr and Blodau, 2009), the second is speculative. It relates to the observation that even in deeper peats, that are not affected by influx of oxygen or other inorganic electron acceptors, CO_2 seems to be net released in excess of methane (Beer and Blodau 2007). This finding has remained enigmatic because excess CO_2 release would be impossible from a stoichiometric point of view when organic matter with oxidation state close to zero is respired and other, more reduced decomposition products, in particular molecular hydrogen, are not concurrently released. A relevant accumulation of molecular hydrogen has, to our knowledge, not been observed in affected peats. Anaerobic methane oxidation may appear as a way out of the dilemma; however, also this process would depend on the elusive electron acceptor (Smemo and Yavitt, 2011).

Recently an extracellular electron transfer was described that has the potential to solve this enigma. Microorganisms in soils and sediments were first detected extracellularly utilizing electrons from redox active species, such as HS, Fe (III) (Lovley and Coates, 2000). The term "*microbial nanowire*" has been proposed later for this extracellular electron transfer (Reguera et al., 2005). Recently the process was demonstrated to occur in marine sediments over macroscopic distances (Nielsen et al., 2010). The authors suggested that electrons can extracellularly flow in interconnected networks of *"nanowires"* so that oxidation and reduction process are spatially separated from each other. In our case the oxidation process releasing CO_2 would proceed deeper into the peat, whereas the reduction reaction would take place near the peatland surface where oxygen is present. We suppose that this mechanism may be the reason for some of the frequently observed CO_2 production that is unrelated to physical supply of an electron acceptor deeper into the peat. Not knowing about mechanistic detail in peats, we conceptualized this process by simply calculating an extracellular electron current in the peat and using Ohm's law for the anoxic layers (Appendix, Eq. A4.38). Peat electron flow resistance (R) is determined by inverse modeling based on the resistance constant definition and corrected for soil moisture under the assumption that air filled pore space cannot conduct electrons (Appendix, Eq. A4.43). The parameter $\tilde{n}_{\underline{peat}}$ (Ù·m) is the specific resistance of the material and l is the layer depth (m). Electron current in mA was then converted to mmol by the Avogadro constant (NA) and the Faraday constant (F) (96490 Coulombs/mol) (Appendix, Eq. A4.38). To make this process work, electrochemical potential gradients (dEh) that drive the flow between adjacent layers are needed. In absence of meaningful measurements of redox potential of peat we calculated such a gradient from a measured redox potential gradient in the Mer Bleue Bog that was given

by concentration depth profiles of dissolved H_2, CO_2, and CH_4. We assumed that the redox potential gradient of this redox couple represents the minimum depth gradient in electrochemical potentials being present. Using the Nernst equation for the reaction $4H_2$ (aq) + CO_2 (aq) $\rightarrow 2H_2O$ (l) + CH_4 (aq) (Appendix, Eq. A4.39-4.42), concentration profiles were converted into electrochemical potential gradients with depth. H_2 concentration was measured by Beer and Blodau for the Mer Bleue bog (2007) (Table S4).
In the model the electron flow through the peat towards the peatland surface is used to reoxidise H_2S to sulfate and DOM-QH_2 to DOM-Q at larger depths. These species are the reduced again, producing the needed "excess" CO_2 in the process and lowering rates of methanogenesis, respectively ((Appendix, Eq. A4.37). The rate constant of sulfate reduction was adjusted to the suggested range of the SO_4^{2-} reduction rates based on the S deposition on the site at 0.89 mmol S m^{-3} day^{-1} (Vile, 2003a). The same thermodynamic inhibition concept as used to model methanogenesis was applied also to bacterial sulfate reduction (Appendix, Eq. A4.30).

Both CO_2 and CH_4 are in equilibrium between gaseous phase and dissolved phase obeying Henry's Law (Appendix, Eq. A4.1-A4.4). The efflux of C and N are through runoff and advection in dissolved phase and in gaseous phase from the soil surface. Diffusion follows Fick's law with moisture corrected coefficients in the saturated layers and was modeled as step functions in the unsaturated layers where diffusion accelerates by orders of magnitude for gases (Appendix, Eq. A4.5-A4.8). CH_4 also escape from the soil via ebullition and plant mediated transportation (Appendix, Eq. A4.16-A4.21). Ebullition occurs in saturated layers once CH_4 level exceeds the maximum concentration $CH_{4,max}$. The parameter $CH_{4,max}$ is sensitive to temperature and pressure (Davie et al., 2004),with a base maximum CH_4 concentration at 500uM, which is the value for a vegetated site at 10ºC in Walter et al. (2001). The ebullition of CH_4 releases the gas to the atmosphere without it passing through the unsaturated zone. In the rooted layers, graminoids transport CH_4 at rates that are determined by the biomass of the graminoid roots. A percentage of 50% of the CH_4 are oxidized to CO_2 during the plant mediated transportation by the O_2 in plant tissues (Walter et al., 2001). The CH_4 oxidation in the oxic layers was modeled using temperature sensitive double Michaelis-Menten functions (Segers and Leffelaar, 2001) (Appendix, Eq. A4.19).

The gases N_2O and NO are byproducts of nitrification and denitrification ($NH_4^+ \rightarrow NO_2^- \rightarrow NO_3^- \rightarrow NO_2^- \rightarrow$ NO$\rightarrow$ $N_2O\rightarrow$ N_2) in the oxic and anoxic layers, respectively. During nitrification, the fraction of N loss as NO (rNO_{nitri}) is 0.1% - 4% day^{-1} with a mean value of 2% (Baumgärtner and Conrad, 1992; Parsons et al., 1996). For N_2O (rN_2O_{nitri}) this value is smaller at 0.1% - 0.2% day^{-1} (Ingwersen et al., 1999; Breuer et al., 2002; Khalil et al., 2004a). We used similar values as in the model DNDC for acid ecosystems, where rN_2O_{nitri} was 0.06% and rNO_{nitri} was 0.25% (Li and Aber, 2000). Both nitrification and denitrification are regulated by temperature, moisture, and pH. Moisture is the dominant control for nitrification and an effective control for denitrification (Linn and Doran, 1984; Riedo et al., 1998). In an acidic environment, nitrification was detected to cease below pH of 4 and reached a maximum at a pH of 6 (Lång et al., 1993). The optimal range of pH for denitrification was suggested to be from 6 to 8 (Heinen, 2006). Temperature factors were empirically modeled, using the equation in DNDC (Li and Aber, 2000) for nitrification and the common formalism equation in NEMIS (Johnsson et al., 1987; Hénault and Germon, 2008) for denitrification.

3. Model Application

3.1 Site description

The model was applied on the Mer Bleue (MB) Bog for a period of 6 years from 1999 to 2004 to evaluate the simulation performances WT dynamics, carbon fluxes, soil water DIC and CH_4 concentrations and C and N budgets against observations.

The Mer Bleue Bog (45.51N; 75.48W) is a raised acidic ombrotrophic bog of 28 km^2 located 10km east of Ottawa, Ontario. The bog was formed 8400 years ago as a fen and developed into a bog between 7100 and 6800 year BP. The peat depth varies from 5 to 6 m at the center to <0.3 m at the margin (Roulet et al., 2007). The vegetation coverage is dominated by mosses (e.g. *Sphagnum capillifolium, S. angustifolium, S. magellanicum and Polytrichum strictum*) and evergreen shrubs (e.g. *Ledum groenlandicum, Chamaedaphne calyculata).* Some deciduous shrubs *(Vaccinium myrtilloides*), sedges (*Eriphorum Vaginatum),* black spruce *(Picea marinana)* and larch also appear in some areas (Moore et al., 2002). The annual mean air temperature record from the local meteorology station is 5.8 degrees and the mean precipitation is 910 mm (1961-1990 average; Environmental Canada). The coldest month is January (-10.8 ºC) and the warmest month is July (20.8 ºC) (Lafleur, 2003).

3.2 Application data and initialization

Inputs required are geographic location and local slope of the site, daily precipitation and PAR, daily snow depth record, annual average and range of air temperature, atmospheric CO_2, CH_4 and O_2 levels, annual N load and vegetation type of the site (Table 2).

Observed C fluxes, water table depth, and the depth profiles of temperature and moisture with 5 second to 30 minute intervals were obtained from *fluxnet Canada (http://fluxnet.ccrp.ec.gc.ca) and* averaged to daily values. Fluxes were determined using micrometeorological techniques and gaps shorter than 2 hours were filled by linear interpolation between the nearest measured data points. Longer gaps were filled by repeating the corresponding period of time from the closest available dates. Other data sets for model evaluation were obtained from a range of the published literature. The spin-up (initiation) of the model was conducted with initial values obtained from literature (Table S4) and the meteorological and geophysical boundary conditions (Table 2) from 1999 to 2004 obtained from *fluxnet* Canada. The time series was repeated every 6 years until the model approached its steady state after a period of longer than 100 years. The obtained values of state variables were used for the actual model application and evaluation. Most parameters were obtained from literature for bogs or peatlands in general, or calibrated for the ranges from measurements, or in line with the values used in previously published models. In total, 29 out of 140 parameters were calibrated and ranked from 3 to 1 based on their origin and descending confidence in their accuracy and correctness (Table 3, 4). Parameters in category 3 were calibrated with comparison to similar parameters in references; parameters in category 2 were calibrated in comparison to conceptually related parameters in references; parameters in category 1 were unavailable in literature and thus were calibrated without references (Table 4).

4. Results

We ran the parameterized, initiated model for 6 years from 1999 to 2004 and evaluated the simulation results of WT depth, and depth profiles of soil temperature, moisture and O_2 to assess the ability of the model to generate environmental controls on C and N cycling. The simulated C and N pool sizes, transfer rates and fluxes were compared with six years of continuous measurements to evaluate the capability of the model in quantifying C and N pools and cycling rates. We also conducted sensitivity analysis for the key factors (e.g. temperature, precipitation, N deposition) and a range of uncertain calibrated parameters (e.g. potential decomposition rate of the soil organic matter). This demonstrated the sensitivity of the model to N availability and climate controls, which shows the potential for applying the model to long-term N fertilization and N deposition and climate change studies. As statistics for evaluation we chose the root mean square error (RMSE), linear regression coefficient (r^2), and the index of agreement (d) (Willmott, 1982).

4.1 WT depth, soil temperature and moisture

Simulated daily average soil temperature was plotted against measured temperatures in hummocks at 0.05 m and 0.8 m depth (Fig. 5a). The simulations agreed well with the observations and showed degrees of agreement (d) of 0.97 and 0.95, and RMSE of 3.23 and 1.70 degrees, respectively. However, the model failed to simulate the observed deviation from the sinusoidal temperature curve when snow was not present in the winter of 2003, implying other controls on soil temperature that are currently missing in the model.

In general, the simulated WT depth showed good agreement with the observed data, with a degree of agreement (d) of 0.98 and RMSE of 0.06 m (Fig. 5b). The largest deviation was from mid-July to early August of 1999, when the simulated WT depth for some days reached the maximum depth and was more than 20 cm below the observed WT depth. From 1999 to 2002, WT depth elevation was underestimated during seasonal changes from summer to fall when the deviations of more than 10 cm occurred for 10 to 30 days. These disparities were likely owed to the simple bucket model structure that lacks processes of water transfer that buffer variations in water content.

Considering the large variation of soil moisture between hummocks and hollows, we compared the simulation at 0.2 m and 0.4 m depth with the observations in hummock and hollows, respectively (Fig. 5c). The seasonal dynamics were well captured and the 0.4 m simulation agrees with the observation strongly. However, the simulated volumetric water content at 0.2 m was systematically overestimated by 0.1 to 0.2 in summers and up to 0.5 for the wettest year in winter. Large spatial *in situ* variability of observed volumetric water content might be one of the reasons for this large discrepancy, as the simulated values are similar to other measurements in hummocks in the Mer Bleue Bog during even drier years (Wendel et al., 2011).

4.2 Daily Carbon fluxes

Gross ecosystem production (GEP) was calculated as the sum of simulated gross primary production (GPP) of all PFTs (Fig. 6a). The simulated ecosystem respiration (ER) was the release of CO_2 gas from the peat surface, which included autotrophic respiration (AR) in shoots and roots of plants and the heterotrophic respiration (HR) of microorganisms in the soil (Fig. 6b). Net ecosystem exchange (NEE) was calculated as the difference between ER and GPP (Fig. 6c).

Overall, the simulated GPP, ER and NEE captured the seasonal dynamics and the magnitudes of the C fluxes. The maximum simulated daily GPP was 5.96 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} and occurred in the driest year 1999, which is similar to the maximum observed 6.80 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}. The simulated starting dates of spring PSN ranged from day 79 (2000) to day 99 (2001), with an average date of day 90. These values fell in the reported range from day 86 to day 101 (Moore et al., 2006). The simulated starting dates of PSN in 2001 and 2003 were at day 99 and 84, which was two days earlier than in field observations. The average difference between simulated and observed GPP was 0.43 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, which was slightly larger than the calculated mean error of GPP (±0.11 gCO_2 m^{-2} day^{-1}) in measurements (Moore et al., 2006). Statistical analysis revealed a root mean square error (RMSE) of 0.73 gC m^{-2} $day^{-1}$and a degree of agreement (d) of 0.95 (Fig. 7a). However, there were a few days when the simulation errors were large, among which the maximum underestimation was 3.68 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} on 31 July in 2000 and the maximum overestimation was 3.21 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} on 23 May 2002.

ER simulation followed a seasonal trend with winter values being smaller than 1 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} and summer peaks of 5 to 7 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}. The summer peaks were higher than the field estimates from 2.07 to 4.67 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, the latter was however likely to be underestimated by 20% on average considering the measuring and calculation methods (Lafleur, 2003). The average difference between simulation and observation was 0.43 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, which was small compared to the calculated error of GPP (±0.42 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}) and to the potential correction factor of NEE (1.21±0.12 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}) (Lafleur, 2003; Moore et al., 2006). Overall, ER was overestimated in dry summers, i.e. in 1999, 2001, 2002 and 2003, with a maximum discrepancy of 4.18 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} in the driest and hottest summer in 2003 (Fig. 6b). The maximum underestimates of ER was 2.81 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} in 22 July 2004, during the period when the WT was underestimated most. The daily simulation has a degree of agreement of 0.92 and RMSE 0.64 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} (Fig.7a).

NEE was calculated from the simulated ER and GPP fluxes, therefore the absolute errors were enlarged in the simulation of NEE (Fig. 6c). The simulated peak uptake of NEE appeared annually during summer; during spring the bog took up carbon and in fall and winter lost it, as documented by measurements (Lafleur, 2003). The maximum simulated uptake occurred during the same period as in the observations, from June to early July, with values < -2.5 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} while the maximum loss appears mostly from September and October and was >1 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}(Roulet et al., 2007). Winter NEE was typically smaller than 1.5 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, which falls in the lower range of the observations between 1.2-2.4 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} (Lafleur, 2003). The dates when the bog turned from C source to C sink in spring was 15 April (±8 days), and from C sink to C source on 30 September (± 12 days). The turning point was less variable in spring than in fall, which agrees with observations, where the range was identified as 16 April ±5 days and 3 October ±17days. The average error of daily NEE was 0.55 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} during the 6 years, with the maximum overestimation of 3.54 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} occurring on 4 August 2002, and the maximum underestimation of 3.41 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}on 1 June 2002, corresponding to the period when GPP was the most overestimated. The RMSE of the simulated NEE was 0.81 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, and the degree of agreement was 0.78 (Fig. 7b).

Daily CH_4 flux was simulated from 1999 to 2009 in order to compare with the observations from 2004 to 2008. Simulated daily CH_4 flux covered a wide range from 0 to ca. 170 mg m^{-2} day^{-1}. Seasonal patterns

were stronger in wet years, such as 2004 and 2006, when the fluxes reached a maximum in mid-summer. In the dry years (e.g. 2005, 2008), summer peaks were lacking and the maximum fluxes occurred during one day in late spring and early summer due to degassing when the water table quickly declined (Fig. 8a. 8b). The instantaneous degassing in the model was caused by the release of CH_4 stored in each 5-cm layer that entered the unsaturated zone. Subsequently the CH_4 fluxes fell to very small values due to limited production and increased methane oxidation during summer. The simulated CH_4 flux agreed with the observed range from April to mid-May and was underestimated in summer (Fig. 8b).

4.3 Dissolved CH_4, CO_2 and O_2 concentration

The simulated daily concentration of dissolved CH_4 and CO_2 was plotted against depth for 2002 to evaluate the model output of belowground respiration (Fig. 9a, 9b). Both dissolved CH_4 and CO_2 accumulated with depth and showed clear seasonal dynamics with the seasonal WT fluctuation. Concentration of dissolved CH_4 increased from <0.1 mmol L^{-1} around the WT at 0.35 cm to ca. 0.6 mmol L^{-1} at 80 cm depth in January and to c.a. 0.5 mmol L^{-1} at 90 cm in October. Concentration of dissolved CO_2 increased from <0.1mmol L^{-1} around the WT to c.a. 3.5 mmol L^{-1} at 70 cm depth in January and to over 6 mmol L^{-1} in October. The maximum concentration in deep layers was ca. 7 mmol L^{-1} dissolved CO_2 and 0.6 mmol L^{-1} dissolved CH_4, respectively, close to the observed ranges (Beer and Blodau, 2007; Beer et al., 2008).

Figure 9c illustrates the profile of dissolved O_2 concentration for the year 2002. The dissolved O_2 was depleted rapidly below the WT, where concentration decreased from ca. 0.3 mmol L^{-1} at around the WT in January to ca. 0.1 mmol L^{-1} in October. Summer O_2 concentration around the WT was lower than the rest of the year, due to the alteration of Henry's law constant of O_2 by the increased summer temperature. Oxygen in soil was consumed by two processes in the model: organic C oxidation and methane oxidation. The annual consumption of O_2 in methane oxidation was between 5% and 7% of the annual input of O_2 from the atmosphere that diffused into the soil during the simulation period. Therefore methane oxidation was not an insignificant sink of oxygen, yet it was not highly important either.

4.4 Annual C budget

We calculated an annual C budget (Fig. 10a) based on the 6-year mean of annual simulated pool and flow rates (Table S1). Annual GPP ranged from 513 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} in the second wettest year 2000 to 609 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} in one of the dry years 2001. Similar to the 550 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} of GPP in the conceptual C budget model for the Mer Bleue Bog (Moore et al., 2002), the average annual GPP was 555 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, of which 70% was contributed by shrubs and 26% by mosses. Average annual ER was 526 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, 73% of which was emitted from the soil surface produced in HR of microorganisms and AR in roots. The difference of GPP and ER resulted in 286 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} of NPP of plants on average, whereas the average loss of C from the plants due to litter production and exudation was 296 C m^{-2} yr^{-1}. The difference of 10 gC between NPP and the sum of litter production and exudation corresponded to the changes of biomass in the plants. Annual net ecosystem production (NEP) was 29 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, close to the low end of the estimated 40.2 (±40.5) gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Roulet et al., 2007), which was based on 8 years of observations from 1999 onwards. The model simulated an annual CH_4 emission of 4 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} of which 83% stemmed from graminoid mediated emission. Emission of CH_4 during the wet years of 2002 and 2004 were higher than in the dry years, as is the general trend observed in the Mer Bleue Bog and in other peatlands (Roulet et al., 2007). The simulated DOC export was 15 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, which was in agreement with the estimated 14.9 (±3.1) gC

m^{-2} yr^{-1} from 5 years of runoff and 3 years of DOC concentration measurements at the site. The model suggested dissolved CO_2 and CH_4 loss in runoff was 0.29 and 0.01 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}. These values were smaller than the estimated and variable 1.77 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (CO_2) and 0.05 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (CH_4) from the annual runoff in the Mer Bleue Bog drainage system (Billett and Moore, 2007). Finally, the net ecosystem carbon balance (*NECB=GPP-ER-CH_4-DOC-DIC*) was obtained as 10 (±60) gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}. This value was smaller and more variable than field estimates of 21.5 (±39) gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, although it fell within the possible range of -105 to 50 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Roulet et al., 2007).

4.5 Annual N budget

An annual N budget for the Mer Bleue Bog is illustrated based on the 6-year average of simulated values (Fig. 10b, Table S2). The wet annual N deposited from the atmosphere was 0.81 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} onto the peatland. About 95% of the deposited N was absorbed by mosses right away. Nitrogen in the plants was associated with the plant biomass and composition, which both changed little over the 6 years. Annually, mosses exported 0.82 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} in litter and 0.02 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} in exudates to the soil N pools. For vascular plants these fluxes were 2.97 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} and 0.02 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, respectively. N uptake was 1.68 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, mostly by shrubs as NH_4^+, and only 0.3% of N uptake occurred in form of DON. N_2 fixation was 0.96 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}. Considering N uptake, N litterfall and N exudation, vegetation thus lost 0.38 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, which represents 2.5% per year over the simulation period. The NH_4^+ pool was smaller than the annual production and uptake, implying a fast turnover of NH_4^+in the soil. Other dissolved N pools (NO_3^-, N_2O and NO) were 3 to 8 magnitudes smaller than the NH_4^+ pool in the model, and N_2O emission was negligible. Export of DON and DIN through water runoff was also very small and occurred at rates of 0.04 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} and 0.01 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, respectively. Overall, the OM pools received ca. 3.83 gN from plant litter production and exudation and lost 1.91 gN and 0.05 gN by mineralization and runoff annually, which lead to an overall accumulation of 1.43 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1} in the peat.

4.6 Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis is useful in quantifying the model responses to changes in environmental drivers and other parameters. We ran a series of simulations by adjusting key environmental variables, such as precipitation, air temperature and N deposition. Variations of these parameters were chosen to be within the possible range of variability in temperate-boreal peatland ecosystems. We also adjusted parameters that are most uncertain and potentially influence C and N cycling in peatlands, such as Q_{10} values and the rate constants of the decomposition of SOM. The sensitivity of key C and N fluxes, pools, and cycling rates, including GPP, AR, ER, HR, NEE, NECB, and C and N sequestration rates in the soil organic matter, were examined. The sensitivity was tested by imposing changes in air temperature between -1 and +5 with increments of 2 °C, and changes in precipitation between -30% and +30% with increments of 15%, which were in line with the scenario predictions of future climate (IPCC, 2007). The sensitivity to N deposition that covered the N deposition range in Europe was tested by imposing N input at 0.2, 1.4, 2, 2.5 and 3.2 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}. The sensitivity to Q_{10} of labile ($Q_{10,L}$) and recalcitrant ($Q_{10,R}$) soil organic matter were tested for -40% and +40% of the ambient value, respectively. The potential decomposition constant k was tested with -25% and +25% of the ambient k for labile ($kpot_L$) and recalcitrant ($kpot_R$) in the sensitivity tests. The simulations were conducted for six years and averaged to compare with the baseline simulations (Table 5).

The sensitivity analysis showed that heterotrophic respiration was the most sensitive process in C cycling with regard to air temperature. Temperature increase had a negative effect on the production of moss and a positive effect on the production of vascular plants, suggesting a favoring of vascular species in a warmer environment. The increase in AR in vascular plants with increasing T was greater than the increase in production of vascular plants, which led to a negative effect on NPP. In the model, the Q_{10} of respiration in plants was smaller than the Q_{10} of photosynthesis, suggesting that other controls constrain primary production apart from temperature, such as N availability and soil moisture. The sensitivity of HR to temperature was greater than that of AR, resulting in preferential C loss from peat rather than from plant respiration with increasing temperature. The impact of temperature on ER was larger than on GPP and entailed a higher sensitivity of NEE to temperature as well. Although less CH_4, DOC and DIC was exported when temperature was increased, NECB declined due to the greater change in NEE. Carbon sequestration was very sensitive to temperature in the model, and an increase of 1 degree in air temperature would turn the modeled peatland from a C sink into a C source. Nitrogen sequestration was also negatively affected by temperature, but to a lesser extent.

The processes GPP, AR, HR were less sensitive to precipitation than to temperature. This was not the case for the export of dissolved C and CH_4 fluxes. Decreasing precipitation promoted primary production and autotrophic respiration in vascular plants, while inhibiting the production of mosses. Increasing precipitation more strongly raised NPP in shrubs than in mosses and had a negative effect on graminoids, suggesting vice versa that graminoids were more tolerant to dryness than shrubs and mosses. The increased NPP in shrubs resulted mostly from changing respiration rather than from gross primary production. Respiration in the model has a stronger dependency on soil moisture than GPP. In the analyses, HR was more sensitive to temperature and precipitation than AR and NPP, and it was more sensitive to temperature than to precipitation (Table 5). A decrease in precipitation by 30%, corresponding to a decline of annual mean WT depth by 7cm, led to an HR increase of 11%. In contrast DIC and DOC export declined by 36% and 66%, respectively. The decrease of dissolved C exports was owed to the diminished runoff at lower WT position, despite more production of dissolved C with raised HR. As expected, CH_4 flux was strongly positively related to precipitation. In contrast, elevated temperature decreased CH_4 emission in the model through the lowered WT depth (Table 5).
Interestingly, the sequestration rate of C was similarly sensitive to precipitation and to temperature, while the N sequestration rate was much more sensitive to precipitation than to temperature. A decrease in precipitation by 30% caused a decrease in C sequestration rate by 19%, which is comparable to the effect of an increase in temperature by 3 degrees. Meanwhile, the N sequestration rate decreased by 46% with the change in precipitation and by 10% with the change in temperature. This outcome resulted from the different mechanisms by which precipitation and temperature control the decomposition of soil organic matter. In the model, lowering the WT position via precipitation stimulated the decomposition rate of labile and recalcitrant soil equally. On the other hand, the temperature increases primarily the decomposition of recalcitrant OM due to a larger decomposition Q_{10} of this pool. As recalcitrant soil is present mostly in the deeper layers and contains less N, the temperature effect on N sequestration was weakened. Therefore, if recalcitrant SOM is more sensitive to temperature than labile SOM, as suggested by many (Davidson and Janssens, 2006; Conant et al., 2008; Craine et al., 2010; Karhu et al., 2010), the function of peatlands as N sinks will be more impaired than in predictions on models with equal Q_{10} values for labile and recalcitrant SOM.

Nitrogen deposition levels affect mostly plant related C fluxes rather than soil derived fluxes. The sensitivity of GPP to N deposition was greater than to precipitation and temperature. Overall, the model suggests a strong promotion of graminoids over shrubs and mosses when the N deposition increases. The effect of N on both GPP and NPP was stronger in graminoids than in shrubs and mosses, due to the different N use strategy of the PFTs in the model (Table 5). Graminoids have advantages because faster turnover rates allow for instantaneous response to changes in N availability in the plant-soil system. In comparison, shrubs and mosses cycle N in a more conservative manner and need lower levels of N to keep photosynthesizing, hence these PFTs react more slowly to increases in N availability. The NPP of graminoids increased non-linearly with the N deposition level, by 70% with a 150% increase and 560% by a 300% increase in annual N deposition (Table S3). This finding implies other constraints on the NPP of graminoids at low N deposition levels. The main constraint was very likely N filtration by mosses, which was alleviated when mosses became N saturated at higher N deposition levels.

The NPP of shrubs was highest at moderate N deposition level of 2.6 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, probably due to increased shading effects from the faster expansion of graminoids with more N deposition (Table S3). The NPP of mosses was negatively affected by N deposition, and only a slight promotion of GPP occurred when N deposition was slightly raised. Very different from the effects of the climatic drivers, N deposition levels had hardly an effect on HR. Other C effluxes, including dissolved C export, CH_4 flux and AR were also less sensitive to N deposition than to temperature and precipitation. As GPP and ER were both positively affected by increasing N, the NEE, NECB and C sequestration rate of peat were not very sensitive to N deposition. In contrast, N sequestration in soil organic matter showed a strong positive relation to N deposition level.

Processes in the model were generally more sensitive to changes in parameters related to the recalcitrant OM fractions (Table 5). Plant derived C fluxes were little sensitive to $Q_{10,L}$, $Q_{10,R}$ and $kpot_L$, but moderately sensitive to $kpot_R$. The effects of $kpot_R$ on GPP occur through changes in N availability in the peat, which varies according to the decomposition rate of the recalcitrant soil. The processes HR, NEE, NECB and the sequestration rates of C and N in soil showed greater and significant sensitivity to $kpot_R$ and $Q_{10,R,}$ than to $kpot_L$ and $Q_{10,L}$, showing the importance of the recalcitrant SOM pool for HR. In the short term, the process most sensitive to all varied factors other than $kpot_L$ was the net ecosystem carbon balance (NECB).

4.7 Nitrogen saturation

Increased N deposition has been observed to change vegetation composition and the C and N retention in mosses, vascular species, and peat (Lamers et al., 2001; Xing et al., 2010; Bragazza et al., 2012). The model was in part designed for quantifying changes in PFTs and for identifying the threshold of N deposition level where N saturation occurs in mosses. To study the plausibility of the model behavior we carried out a 40-year simulation with raised atmospheric N input (Fig. 11). We adjusted the N deposition to 1.5 gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}, which is the intermediate N deposition in the sensitivity analysis and has been suggested to be the *critical load* of N for mosses (Vitt et al., 2003). The C and N pools in PFTs showed a delay in responses to elevated N deposition (Fig. 11a, 11b). The fraction of deposited N absorbed by mosses remained steady for the first 12 years until the N content reached 0.02 gN g^{-1}biomass (Fig. 11d). Above this content level, the fraction of N retained by mosses declined rapidly and excess N entered the

pore water. As a result, only then did the fraction of deposited N retained in vascular plants and peat increase and peaked after ca. 20 years (Fig. 11c).

Nitrogen mineralization rates increased immediately after raising N deposition, because of the elevated litter production in plants and exudation of mosses (Fig. 11f). Output of N from the model ecosystem was about 5% of the total N input from deposition and N_2 fixation, and was continuously increasing after moss filtration of N became less effective (Fig. 11f).

One of the important findings of this exercise was that total biomass and total NPP remained comparatively stable, while the plant composition of biomass and NPP changed greatly (Fig. 11a, 11e).The moss cover was completely diminished while graminoids started to expand with higher N availability in the soil water and eventually became the dominant PFT. An increase in the labile fraction of SOM was a further consequence because invading vascular plants produce more labile litter in the model. Owing to both the increased litter inputs from the vegetation and raised litter decomposability, the sequestration rate of C in soil first accelerated but then slowed after the NPP had peaked (Fig. 11e).

5. Discussion

5.1 Carbon fluxes and environmental controls

The fluxes GPP, ER and NEE are the essential components in C cycling that express the ability of peatland ecosystems in assimilating and dissimilating C and exchange the element with the atmosphere. Overall, the model simulations showed good agreement in daily C fluxes, belowground C concentration and annual C and N budgets with empirical data. However, a bias occurred towards underestimating simulated GPP (i.e. slope = 0.936), underestimating simulated ER (i.e. slope= 0.806) and overestimating simulated NEE (i.e. slope = 1.166). These biases are within the bias range of the other models that primarily focus on C cycling (e.g. MWM, PCARS). The model performance differed in that in MWM and PCARS the simulated ER was overestimated, while it was underestimated in the PEATBOG model.

The 6-year averaged annual GPP demonstrates the ability of the model in simulating overall productivity, as only a small deviation of 5 gC m^{-2} was recorded against an empirically determined large average GPP of 550 gC m^{-2} at the site (Moore et al. 2002). Also the trends in interannual variation of GPP with precipitation and temperature were largely met. Noteworthy is for example the decline in GPP in the extremely dry year 1999, when dryness had a large impact on the GPP of mosses, and the high GPP in the warm and wet year of 2001 (Fig. 5b, Fig. 6a). While overall model performance was good some deviation from empirical measurements were illustrated by the analysis as well. Annual GPP was overestimated by 32 to 85 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} from year 2000 to 2003 and underestimated by 70 to 123 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} for the remaining years by the model simulations (Table 6). The discrepancy of annual GPP simulations ranged from 7% to 18% and was not significant (P=0.737, n=2192). The simulated GPP fraction of shrubs was 70%, ranging from 66% in the simulated wettest year of 2004 and 78% in the driest year 1999. This range was similar to the model output of MWM that ranged from 61% to 67% (St-Hilaire et al., 2010) and smaller than the shrub related fraction of GPP of 80% to 85% reported from the PCARS model (Frolking et al., 2002). Inter-annual variation of GPP for PFTs was corroborated by observation (Bubier et al., 2003): GPP of mosses increased from dry to wet years from 4% to 48%, whereas GPP of shrubs was at its lowest levels in the wet years. In comparison to other models (St-Hilaire et al., 2010; Dimitrov et al., 2011), the inhibition of GPP of shrubs due to dryness is less effective in our model..

On the daily time scale some weakness of the model in responding to weather conditions became visible. In general, the simulated GPP was deficient in capturing short-term extreme fluxes. All large underestimates (>2 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}) in the GPP simulation occurred during mid-summer in the two wet years 2000 and 2005, when GPP in the peatland was larger than 5 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, except for two days in late summer. The likely reason for the lack of adequate model performance during this time are the maximum photosynthesis rates that are set for each PFT and the impossibility to cover the daily observed extreme values that were averaged from half hour records in the measurements. This disadvantage also occurred in other models with maximum rate settings that are based on the Farquhar photosynthesis model (e.g. MWM). We also noticed that most of the underestimates that occurred in 2004 were associated with frequent heavy precipitation that raised production instantly. In the model, the production of mosses is the only PFT that reacts to precipitation directly through the water content in the *capitulum* of mosses. The indirect controls of precipitation on the production of vascular plants via WT depth is likely the reason of the underestimated promotion of photosynthesis by frequent precipitation, especially when other controlling factors (i.e. temperature, light) are within the optimal range. For example, a peak of measured daily GPP was observed during late July 2004, during one of the periods that underestimated GPP. At this time precipitation was continuous at >10 mm·$day^{-1}$and temperature was within an optimal range (20±3 °C).

The overestimation of GPP mainly occurred during late May to early June in the dry years (2001 to 2003) when PAR was comparably strong (> 600 umol·m^{-2}·s^{-1}). During those days, the model predicted GPP of mosses and shrubs to reach a level above 1.2 gC m^{-2} day^{-1} and 2 gC m^{-2} day^{-1}, respectively. Daily measured GPP in the Mer Bleue Bog was found to be significantly albeit weakly related to PAR ($P<0.001$; $r^2=0.19$) (Moore et al., 2006). In the model, this relationship is significantly stronger ($r^2 = 0.75$), due to neglecting the non-linearity of leaf response to light in the integration of canopy photosynthesis using just Beer's law. The non-linearity of leaf response to light is related to the diurnal effects on the canopy. It includes for example optimized nitrogen distribution in plant canopies, different responses to light in sun and shade leaves, and variation of stomatal conductance with light levels (Thornley, 2002; Hikosaka, 2003). Late May to early June was also the period when new biomass is built up, which affects the distribution of N within the plants. For example, both total N content and chlorophyll-a concentration in evergreen shrub foliage were low in spring and increased steadily to early June, as shown in measurements (Moore et al., 2006). The model lacks separated N pools in foliage and stems, where N content could show great variations due to phenology, which might be the reason of the overestimation of GPP in late spring.

The fluxes ER and NEE represent the gross and net release of CO_2 from peatlands, and largely determine the C balance of the ecosystem. The model reproduced the composition of ER, where HR contributed half of the total ER, while the other half was almost equally shared by AR in shoots and AR in roots, as approximately suggested by field measurements (Moore et al., 2002). However, the standard deviation of the simulated annual ER and NEE was larger than that in field estimates (50% and 40%), suggesting a larger inter-annual variation than measured in the field. The modeled annual ER ranged from 430 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} to 573 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}, with an average of 526 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Table S1), which is close to the flux quantified as 461 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} (Lafleur et al., 2001). The annual discrepancy ranged from 3% to 17%, with an exception of 25% in 2004, when the highest summer WT occurred (Table 6). The underestimation of ER

was probably caused by the simulated WT depth (Fig. 5b) that was 5 to 10 cm higher than measured in summer when both autotrophic respiration (AR) and heterotrophic respiration (HR) were potentially high. The modeled NEE showed similar inter-annual patterns to ER with the annual error being between 35 gC m^{-2} $yr^{-1}$to 18 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}. The largest deviation of simulated NEE from measurements was 106 gC m^{-2} yr^{-1} in1999, when GPP was under- and ER overestimated.

The ER was also overestimated from 1999 and 2003 (Fig. 6b). To identify the reasons, we calculated the deviation between measured and model daily ER, and regressed it against the deviation of measured and modeled daily temperature. According to this approach the overestimate of ER from 1999 to 2003 could be explained by an overestimate of soil temperature ($r^2 = 0.26$), especially during summer ($r^2 = 0.68$). Both ER and HR were strongly correlated to soil temperature at 0.2 cm depth with r^2 of 0.88 and 0.83, respectively (n=2193). The strong temperature dependence of ER and HR was associated with the Q_{10} values used in the model for the temperature effects on HR rates. Different from other models, where Q_{10} values were set to 2 for microbial respiration in soil, Q_{10} value for the decomposition of recalcitrant OM (3.3) was set to be larger than for labile OM (2.3). These Q_{10} values were in line with some of the most recent results (Davidson and Janssens, 2006; Conant et al., 2008; Conant et al., 2010; Karhu et al., 2010), their application implies an stronger increase in C loss from peatlands in a warmer climate. It has to be noted that some have assumed the value of Q_{10} for labile OM to be larger (Liski et al., 1999; Giardina and Ryan, 2000; Thornley and Cannell, 2001) than or similar to (Fang et al., 2005) that of recalcitrant OM; in this case climate change effect on NEE may not be as extraordinary as has been anticipated otherwise. The sensitivity analysis on Q_{10} and potential decomposition rates for our model highlighted the importance of the recalcitrant OM over the labile OM for the C cycling in peatlands (Table 5).

The Q_{10} values derived from the first order exponential equations of the simulated ER and HR were only 2.56 and 1.97, respectively. The Q_{10} for HR was thus smaller than either of the Q_{10} for labile or recalcitrant OM, revealing the importance of other factors that confound the temperature response of HR. The WT depth was the most important factor affecting the calculated Q_{10} values with r^2 of 0.75 between the average summer WT depth and the calculated Q_{10} values. In summer, the low soil moisture in the most upper peat layers counteracted the potential enhancement of respiration by temperature. Nevertheless, the sensitivity analysis suggested a lesser effect of WT depth than of soil temperature on CO_2 fluxes (Table 5). The daily simulated WT depth moderately correlated with ER ($r^2 = 0.51$, n = 2192), with r^2 ranging from 0.19 in the wet year 2000 to 0.79 in the dry years. Although stronger than reported from empirical studies, this relationship was in a broad agreement with field results as far as the trend of tighter correlation in dry years goes (Bubier, 2003; Lafleur et al., 2005b; Blodau et al., 2007).

The CH_4 fluxes modeled with our novel thermodynamic-kinetic approach were in a reasonable range but smaller and their seasonal pattern less pronounced than obtained with chamber measurements at the Mer Bleue Bog (Moore et al., 2011). We attribute this difference to the variability of in situ plant cover and a higher mean water table position of the 12 gas flux collars of the field study. The collars were not only located in hummocks and lawns but also in hollows. The observed average WT depth was -35 (± 8.4 cm) for the 12 collars from 2004 to 2008, whereas the simulated average WT depth was -41 cm for the same time period. Due to the generally observed exponential increase in emissions with raising water table (Moore et al., 1998), even a small number of sampled wet locations may lead to much larger emissions than simulated in the model, which represents a hummock situation. The large discrepancy after summer

was very likely due to the effects of vegetation transport on CH_4 flux, which was the most important control on the CH_4 flux from September to November over 5 years (Moore et al., 2011). In the model, graminoid cover was less than 1% during the simulation period, whereas the graminoid cover ranged from 0 to 100% in the 12 collars. Comparing model output to one of the gas flux collars similar in water table and graminoid cover (collar 8, Table 2, Moore et al., 2011) with daily CH_4 flux between 10 to 100 mg m^{-2} day^{-1}, a closer model fit was obtained. In this collar, as in our model, CH_4 emission increased less in summer than in the more grass-rich collars (Moore et al., 2011).

The growing season log_{10} values of both daily and annual CH_4 fluxes showed moderately strong relations with WT depth ($r^2 = 0.56$, n = 2119 and $r^2 = 0.45$, n = 11) (Fig. 8c, 8d). The outliners were the degassing events, which occurred when water table was crossing the boundaries of peat layers in the model. The WT depth during the growing season showed differing effects on CH_4 fluxes in dry years and wet years, as was also found in the field (Moore et al., 2011). According to the model results, the lowest dependence of CH_4 flux on the WT depth occurred in the dry years and the highest dependence in the wetter years. This finding is in conflict with relations obtained from field data, where CH_4 emissions were less related to summer WT depth in wetter years. The annual variation in CH_4 production is less pronounced than in CH_4 fluxes (Table S1); this implies that changes in the transport mode of CH_4 might offset the well-known WT control on methanogenesis. For example, the root biomass of graminoids, that provide conduits for CH_4 transport**,** was negatively correlated with WT depth and CH_4 fluxes. In the dry years, graminoid root biomass increased with declining WT in the model, due to more reallocation of newly produced biomass to roots for accessing soil water. This adaptation also increased the transport of CH_4 from the deeper peat. Overall, the model was able to simulate the variation of CH_4 fluxes with the change of environmental controls, and revealed some interesting dynamic interactions with ecosystem structure that warrant further analysis in the future.

5.2 N budget and N saturation

The simulated N budget identified the Mer Bleue Bog as a currently N limited ecosystem and sink for the element. The immobilization of deposited N by mosses was at a maximum level of 95%, including both the retention of N in the *capitulum* of *Sphagnum* mosses and indirect retention via their stems. In the simulation of N saturation, the model was able to track the effect of N deposition in different compartments of the ecosystem. The N content in mosses peaked at 0.02 gN g^{-1} biomass, similar to the field observations of 0.015 to 0.024 gN g^{-1} biomass (Heijmans et al., 2001; Granath et al., 2009; Xing et al., 2010). The simulated increase in soil organic matter mineralization was in agreement with most fertilization experiments (Bragazza et al., 2006; Breeuwer et al., 2008). It was closely related to a change in peat chemistry, such as reflected in the size of the labile OM fraction in peat and its C/N ratio, as observed in a 7-year fertilization experiment (Bragazza et al., 2012). The model also successfully simulated the maintenance of total PFT biomass and production with dramatic changes in the PFT composition, as observed in many N fertilization experiments (Bubier et al., 2007; Juutinen et al., 2010).

Uptake of DON, which has not been considered in peatland models previously, represented a negligible fraction (ca. 0.2%) of the total N uptake by the roots of vascular plants. However, the turnover rate of DON was extremely high, revealing the strong demand and potential uptake of DON by the roots of vascular plants. The fast turnover rate (Kielland et al., 2007) and the large potential uptake of DON

(Kahmen et al., 2009) were previously reported from field experiments on boreal forest and three intermediate N available systems, respectively. The model showed that the primary limitation on the uptake of DON was the DON concentration in the soil water, which was also suggested for boreal forest (Kielland et al., 2006) and for *Anthoxanthum odoratum* in a fertilized experimental site (Sauheitl et al., 2009). Consequently, DON uptake will be more important when there is more bio-available DON in the soil. Although not shown here, the DON uptake accounted for 16% of the total N uptake of shrubs after 40 years of N deposition of 1.5 $gN\ m^{-2}\ yr^{-1}$ in the N saturation simulation.

The nitrogen saturation simulation further showed that the impact of N deposition developed only after a considerable time lag (Fig. 11). Except for mineralization and N output, the C and N pools and fluxes remained stable in the first 12 simulation years until N became saturated in mosses. Only after that point, the N retention in vascular plants and peat increased dramatically and changed the peatland into grass dominated within 8 years. A delay of 12 years in the occurrence of effects of N fertilization reveals the importance of accumulated N deposition rather than annual N deposition.

6. Conclusions

The PEATBOG model has been developed for the purpose of analyzing coupled C and N cycling on a process-level and a daily to multi-year time scale. Our objective was to conceptually consistently integrate vegetation, soil biogeochemistry and soil water dynamics. The model was further designed to be sensitive to changes in N deposition, temperature and precipitation. PEATBOG thus integrates a vegetation submodel comprising three PFTs with a soil and water biogeochemical model providing high spatial and process resolution. It consistently emphasizes mass balance principles and the dynamic interplay of production, consumption and translocation of materials throughout the ecosystem. PEATBOG is able to generate soil physical conditions and plant composition internally and thus requires only a few site specific parameters on geological location, local climate and initial vegetation composition for simulations. The PEATBOG model was effective in reproducing current C and N cycles in a northern peatland with some weaknesses in displaying correct short-term dynamics of C cycling during extreme meteorological periods. It was adequately sensitive to broader changes in climate and N deposition and reproduced a considerable range of empirical findings related to effects of inter annual meteorological variability and N deposition (e.g. the temperature control on soil respiration, change in PFT composition while total C pool and NPP in plants remained robust).

In this paper we presented the components and structure of the model and evaluated the general model performance and sensitivity. The sensitivity analyses and the simulation of increased N deposition demonstrated the model's utility in analyzing the effects of climate change and N deposition on the C and N cycles of peatlands. The analyses further illustrated its usefulness in hypothesis building that could assist in designing empirical studies examining ecosystem changes over the long-term.

In terms of application, the model is suitable for investigating the mechanisms of observed changes in peatland C and N fluxes due to changes in meteorological drivers and N input. Alternatively, the model could be a tool for assessing long-term scenarios of global change. The multi-layer structure of the soil submodel also allows for the integration of other belowground processes in the future, such as SO_4^{2-} reduction, to explicitly model CH_4 production on account of the competition among electron acceptors. Although the CH_4 production was modeled conceptually from an electron competition perspective, which

we did not detail in this paper, it also produced reasonable annual fluxes and depth profiles of CH_4 concentration, which hold promise for future analyses of CH_4 dynamics.

Appendix A: Equations

A1 Environment submodel

d_i = distance between the adjacent layers (m), i = layer number, f = factors, *frac* = fraction, *PAI* = plant leaf area index (m^2), V_i = volume of layer i (m^3), *VWC* = volumetric water content (m^3m^{-3}), z_i= depth of layer i(m).

$$WS(t) = Pre + Snow - EPT - Discharge \tag{1.1}$$

$$EPT = f_{WT,EPT} \cdot f_{PAI,EPT} \cdot f_{T,EPT} \cdot PAR \cdot r\_EPT_0 \tag{1.2}$$

$$f_{PAI\_EPT} = 1 - e^{-PAI} \tag{1.3}$$

$$Runoff = \begin{cases} Transmissivity \cdot local\_slope \cdot (WT - 0.75) & if \quad pre + snowmelt + WS < WS_{\max} \\ Pre + snow\_melt & else \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

$$Advection = Advection\_frac \cdot Dischange \tag{1.5}$$

$$runoff_{L,i} = (Runoff - Advection) \cdot Kh_i / \sum_i Kh_i \tag{1.6}$$

$$Kh_i = 10^{fsaturated\_Kh_i + fVWC\_Kh_i} \tag{1.7}$$

$$WT = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot WS - 0.8 & if \quad WS < 0.2 \\ WS - 0.6 & if \quad 0.2 < WS < 0.6 \\ 0 & if \quad WS \geq 0.6 \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

$$VWC_i = VWC_{\min,i} + (porosity_i - VWC_{\min,i}) / \left(1 + \alpha |suction|^n\right)^{(1-1/n)} \tag{1.9}$$

$$Suction_i = \begin{cases} (z_i - WT) + Suction\_saturated_i & if \quad z_i > WT \\ Suction\_saturated & else \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

$$Porosity_i = (1 - 0.0107 \cdot (-z_i \cdot 100)^{0.507}) / 1.5 \tag{1.11}$$

$$O_{2,i}(t) = O_2 diff_{top,i} - O_2 diff_{bot,i} - PCO_{2,i} - 2 \cdot CH_4 oxi\_O_2 \tag{1.12}$$

$$T(z,t) = \mu_T + \sigma_T f_{snow} \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi z_i^2}{\Omega K_{thermal,i}}}\right) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi(t - t_i)}{\Omega} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi z_i^2}{\Omega K_{thermal,i}}}\right) \tag{1.13}$$

$$DL = 360 \cdot arccos(-\tan(Latitude \cdot \pi / 180) \cdot \tan(declination \cdot \pi / 180)) / 15\pi \tag{1.14}$$

$$Declination = 23.45 \cdot sin(2\pi \cdot (284 + doy) / 365) \tag{1.15}$$

$$WC_{cap}(t) = rain\_incepted_{moss} - EPT_{moss} \tag{1.16}$$

$$rain\_incepted_{moss} = \min((WC_{cap,\max} - WC_{capitulum}), Pre \cdot LAI_{moss} \cdot d_{rain} / sh\_strucB_{moss}) \tag{1.17}$$

$$EPT_{moss} = \begin{cases} WC_{cap} \cdot EPT\_r_{moss} & if \quad Pre = 0 \\ 0 & else \end{cases} \tag{1.18}$$

$$WC_{moss} = WC_{cap} + capillary\_rise \tag{1.19}$$

$$capillary\_rise = \max(WCcap_{\min}, \min(WCcap_{\max}, 22 \cdot \exp(6.5 \cdot WT))) \tag{1.20}$$

$$BD_i = 0.0107 \cdot (-100 \cdot d_i)^{0.567} \tag{1.21}$$

$$PeatC_i = BD_i \cdot V_i \cdot 100^3 \tag{1.22}$$

$$DMinitial_i = DMconc\_initial_i \cdot VWC_i \cdot V_i \tag{1.23}$$

$$Nabsorbed\_moss = Nload \cdot r\_N_{absorb} / 365 \tag{1.24}$$

A2 Vegetation

B = biomass, *conc* = concentration, *DIC* = CO_2, CH_4, *DIN* = NO_3^-, NH_4^+, j = plant functional type j (1 = mosses, 2 = graminoids, 3 = shrubs), *li* = litter, M = carbon or nitrogen, *Na* = area based nitrogen content (gN m^{-2}), Q = substrate or structural, *reallo*= reallocation of carbon or nitrogen, *rec* = recycle, *Rm* = maintenance respiration, *Rg* = growth respiration, *upt* = uptake, X = sh, rt, stem, leaf, fineroot, coarse root.

$$B_{X,j} = XstrucC_j / Cconc_j \tag{2.1}$$

$$Mconc_{X,Q,j} = M_{X,Q,j} / B_{X,j} \tag{2.2}$$

$$rt\_distrib_{i,j} = \begin{cases} rt\_k_j^{-100 \cdot z_{i-1}} - rt\_k_j^{-100 \cdot z_i} & if \quad i < i_{rooting,j} \\ rt\_k_j^{-100 \cdot z_i} - rt\_k_j^{-100 \cdot z_{20}} & if \quad i = i_{rooting,j} \\ 0 & else \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

$$B_{rt,i,j} = B_{rt,j} \cdot rt\_distrib_{i,j} \tag{2.4}$$

$$fB_{rt,i,j} = B_{rt,j} \cdot rt\_distrib_{i,j} / \sum_j B_{rt,j} \tag{2.5}$$

$$li\_M_{rt,q,i} = Li\_frac_q \cdot \sum_j (li\_M_{rt,j} \cdot rt\_distrib_{i,j}) \tag{2.6}$$

$$finertS_{i,j} = 0.01 \cdot finertB_{i,j} \cdot PI \cdot LV_j / density_{finert_j} \tag{2.7}$$

$$LV_j = 1/\pi r^2_{cylinder,j} \tag{2.8}$$

$$M_{X,Q,j}(t) = growthM_{X,j} - li\_M_{X,j} \tag{2.9}$$

$$li\_C_{sh,struc,j} = C_{sh,struc,j} \cdot mortality\_rate_{sh,j} \cdot f_{T,sh,j} + deciduous\_rate_j \cdot leaf\_strucC_j \tag{2.10}$$

$$li\_C_{rt,struc,j} = C_{rt,struc,j} \cdot mortality\_rate_{rt,j} \cdot f_{T,rt,j} \tag{2.11}$$

$$li\_N_{X,struc,j} = li\_strucC_{M,j} / CNratio_{X,struc,j} \tag{2.12}$$

$$C_{sh,subs,j}(t) = CanopyPSN\_C_j + li\_recC_{sh,j} - growthC_{sh,j} - li\_C_{sh,subs,j} - Rm_{sh,j} - Rg_{sh,j} - realloC_j - exuC_{sh,j} \tag{2.13}$$

$$CanopyPSN\_C_j = leafPSN_j \cdot DayLength \cdot \left(1 - e^{-k_{ext,j} LAI_j}\right) / k_{ext,j} \tag{2.14}$$

$$LAI_j = SLA_j \cdot C_{leaf,struc,j} \tag{2.15}$$

$$leafPSN_j = \left\{ \alpha_j k_{ext,j} LI_j + P_{\max} - \sqrt{\left[\left(\alpha_j k_{ext,j} LI_j P_{\max}\right)^2 - 4\xi\alpha_j k_{ext,j} LI_j P_{\max} \right]} \right\} / 2\xi \tag{2.16}$$

$$LI_j = \begin{cases} PAR \cdot k_{ext,shrub} \cdot \exp^{-k_{ext,shrub} \cdot LAI_{shrub}} \cdot k_{ext,gram} \cdot \exp^{-k_{ext,gram} \cdot LAI_{gram}} & if \quad i = 1 \\ PAR & if \quad i = 2 \\ PAR \cdot k_{ext,gram} \cdot \exp^{-k_{ext,gram} \cdot LAI_{gram}} & if \quad j = 3 \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_0 f_{CO_2,\alpha,j} f_{T,\alpha,j} f_{m,\alpha,j} \tag{2.18}$$

$$f_{T,\alpha,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad Snow > 0.2 \\ \min(1 - 0.001125 \cdot (T_{air} - 14), 1) & else \end{cases} \tag{2.19}$$

$$f_{CO_2,\alpha} = 1 - 0.3 \times 10^{-6} / 0.0015 \cdot CO_{2,air} \tag{2.20}$$

$$f_{m,\alpha,j} = f_{M,P_{\max},j} = \begin{cases} a_{m,sh,j}{}^2 & if \quad j > 1 \\ f_{moss,PSN} & else \end{cases} \tag{2.21}$$

$$P_{\max,j} = P_{\max,20} f_{CO_2,P_{\max}} f_{T,P_{\max},j} f_{M,P_{\max},j} f_{gs,P_{\max}} f_{season,P_{\max}} f_{PNUE,j} \tag{2.22}$$

$$f_{N,P_{\max},j} = \begin{cases} \max(0, \min(1, a_{PNUE,j} \cdot fNa_j + b_{PNUE,j})) & if \quad j > 1 \\ \max(0, \min(1, a_{PNUE,j} \cdot fNa_j + b_{PNUE,j})) & if \quad j = 1 \cap leafsubsNa_{moss} < mossNa_{\max} \\ f_{N,toxic} & else \end{cases} \tag{2.23}$$

$$fNa_j = sh\_subsN_j / sla_j / Na_{\max,j} \tag{2.24}$$

$$Rm_{X,j} = rRm_{X,j} \cdot C_{X,struc,j} \cdot f_{m,X,j} \cdot f_{T,X,r,j} \tag{2.25}$$

$$f_{T,X,r,j} = Q_{10,X,r,j}^{(T_{air}-25)/10} \tag{2.26}$$

$$growthC_{X,j} = C_{X,struc,j} \cdot r\_growth_{X,j} \cdot fT_{X,j} \cdot fm_{X,j} \cdot k\_growth_{X,j} \cdot \frac{Cconc_{X,subs,j}}{k_m growthC_j + Cconc_{X,subs,j}} \cdot \frac{Nconc_{X,subs,j}}{k_m growthN_j + Nconc_{X,subs,j}} \tag{2.27}$$

$$f_{m,X,j} = \begin{cases} a^{20}_{m,X,j} & if \quad j = 2 \\ a^{10}_{m,X,j} & if \quad j = 3 \end{cases} \tag{2.28}$$

$$f_{T,j} = \begin{cases} T_j^q (45 - T_j) / T_{ref} (45 - 20) & if \quad 0 < T_j < 45 \\ 0 & else \end{cases} \tag{2.29}$$

$$Rg_{X,j} = growthC_{X,j} \cdot (1 - k\_growth_{X,j}) / k\_growth_{X,j} \tag{2.30}$$

$$li\_M_{X,subs,j} = li\_B_{X,j} \cdot Mconc_{X,subs,j} \cdot li\_M\_frac_{X,subs,j} \tag{2.31}$$

$$li\_C\_frac_{X,subs,j} = \left(li\_C\_frac_{X,subs,j,\min} k_{li,subsC} + Cconc_{X,subs,j}\right) / \left(k_{li,subsC} + Cconc_{X,subs,j}\right) \tag{2.32}$$

$$li\_rec\_C_{X,subs,j} = li\_recN_{X,subs,j} \cdot CNratio_{rec} \tag{2.33}$$

$$realloM_j = \left| Mconc_{sh,subs,j} - Mconc_{rt,subs,j} \right| / \left(\rho_{M,j} / B_{sh,j} + \rho_{M,j} / B_{rt,j}\right) \tag{2.34}$$

$$C_{rt,subs,j}(t) = realloC_{sh \to rt,j} + lirec\_C_{rt,subs,j} + Cupt_j - li\_C_{rt,subs,j} - growthC_{rt,j} - Rm_{rt,j} - Rg_{rt,j} - exuC_{rt,j} \tag{2.35}$$

$$exuC_{X,j} = r\_exu_{X,j} \cdot fm_{X,j} \cdot fT_{X,j} \cdot C_{X,subs,j} \tag{2.36}$$

$$Cupt_j = Nupt_j \cdot CNratio_{uptake} \tag{2.37}$$

$$N_{sh,subs,j}(t) = \begin{cases} Nabsorbed\_moss + lirec\_N_{sh,subs,j} + N_2 fix_{moss} - growthN_{sh,j} - li\_N_{sh,subs,j} - exuN_{X,j} & if \quad j = 1 \\ realloN_j + lirec\_N_{sh,subs,j} - growthN_{sh,j} - li\_N_{sh,subs,j} & else \end{cases} \tag{2.38}$$

$$li\_rec\_N_{X,subs,j} = li\_N_{X,subs,j} \cdot li\_rec\_Nfrac_{X,subs,j} \tag{2.39}$$

$$li\_rec\_Nfrac_{X,subs,j} = li\_rec\_Nfrac_{X,subs,j,\max} k_{rec\_subsN} / \left(Nconc_{X,subs,j} + k_{rec\_subsN}\right) \tag{2.40}$$

$$li\_N_{X,subs,j} = frac\_li\_N_{X,subs,j} \cdot N_{X,subs,j} \cdot li\_B_{X,j} \quad (2.41)$$

$$frac\_li\_N_{X,subs,j} = frac\_li\_N_{X,subs,j,\min} \cdot k_{li\_subsN} / \left(k_{li\_subsN} + Nconc_{X,subs,j}\right) \quad (2.42)$$

$$growthN_{X,j} = growthC_{X,j} \cdot Nconc_{X,j} / Cconc_j \quad (2.43)$$

$$N_2 fix_{moss} = fracN_2 fix_{moss} \cdot TotalN_2 fix \quad (2.44)$$

$$exuN_{X,j} = exuC_{X,j} / CNratio_{X,subs,j} \quad (2.45)$$

$$N_{rt,subs,j}(t) = lirec\_N_{rt,j} + Nupt_j - reallocationN_{rt\to sh,j} - rt\_growthN_j - rt\_li\_subsN_j - rt\_exuN_j \quad (2.46)$$

$$Nupt_j = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad j = 1 \\ (\sum_i DONupt_{i,j} + \sum_i NH_4^+ upt_{i,j} + \sum_i NO_3^- upt_{i,j}) \cdot 14 / 1000 & else \end{cases} \quad (2.47)$$

$$DINupt_{i,j} = DINupt\_pot_{i,j} \cdot fT_{DINupt,i} / fCN_{subs,j} \quad (2.48)$$

$$DINupt\_pot_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad i > i_{rooting,j} \\ Vm_{DIN} \cdot DINconc_i \cdot finertS_{i,j} / \left(km_{DIN} + DIN_i\right) & else \end{cases} \quad (2.49)$$

$$fT_{NH_4^+ upt,i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad T_{soil,i} < -5 \\ 0.2T_{soil,i} + 1 & if \quad -5 < T_{soil,i} < 0 \\ 1 & if \quad T_{soil,i} > 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.50)$$

$$fT_{NO_3^- upt,i,j} = Q_{10,NO_3^- upt}^{(Tsoil,i-10)/10} \quad (2.51)$$

$$fCN_{subs,j} = 1 + km_{C,Nupt} \cdot (1 + Nconc_{rt,subs,j} / km_{N,Nupt}) / Cconc_{rt,subs,j} \quad (2.52)$$

$$DONupt_j = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad i > i_{rooting,j} \\ Vm_{DON,j} \cdot finertB_{i,j} \cdot DONavail\_conc_i / \left(Km_{DON,j} + DONavail\_conc_i\right) & else \end{cases} \quad (2.53)$$

A3 Soil Organic Matter

act = actual, *avail* = available, *dec* = decomposition, *min_immo* = mineralization or immobilization, *pot* = potential, *trans* = transfer, *q* = labile or recalcitrant.

$$SOMX_{q,i}(t) = liX_{rt,q,i} + Xtrans_{top,q,i} - Xtrans_{bot,q,i} - decXact_{q,i} \quad (3.1)$$

$$Ctrans_{top,q,i} = \begin{cases} li\_C_{sh,q} & if \quad i = 1 \\ Ctrans_{bot,q,i-1} & else \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

$$Ntrans_{top,q,i} = \begin{cases} li\_N_{sh,q} & if \quad i = 1 \\ Ctrans_{top,q,i} / CNratio_{q,i} & if \quad Ctrans_{top,q,i} > 0 \\ Ctrans_{top,q,i} / CNratio_{q,i+1} & if \quad Ctrans_{top,q,i} \le 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

$$Ctrans_{bot,q,i} = \begin{cases} Ctrans_i \cdot SOM\_frac_{q,i} & if \quad Ctransfer_i > 0 \\ Ctrans_i \cdot SOM\_frac_{q,i+1} & else \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

$$Ntrans_{bot,q,i} = \begin{cases} Ctrans_{bot,q,i} / CNratio_{q,i} & if \quad Ctrans_{bot,q,i} > 0 \\ Ctrans_{bot,q,i} / CNratio_{q,i+1} & else \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

$$Ctransfer_i = SOMCL_i + SOMCR_i - PeatC_i \quad (3.6)$$

$$decC_{q,i} = \begin{cases} SOMC_{q,i} \cdot KC_{q,i} \cdot fN\_I_i & if \quad N\_status_{q,i} < 0 \\ SOMC_{q,i} \cdot KC_{q,i} \cdot fN\_M_i & else \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

$$N\_status_{q,i} = 1 / CNratio_{q,i} - 1 / CNcritical_{q,i} \quad (3.8)$$

$$CNcritical_{q,i} = CN_{mo} \cdot \alpha_E Nprefer_{q,i} / e_q / (1 - leachingfracDOC_i) \quad (3.9)$$

$$kC_{q,i} = kCpot_q \cdot fTdecC_{q,i} \cdot fMdecC_{q,i} \cdot finhibi\_CO_{2,i} \cdot finhibi\_CH_{4,i} \quad (3.10)$$

$$DICinhibition_i = \begin{cases} DICinhibi\_pot_i & if \quad i > i_{WT} \\ 1 & else \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

$$Navail_i = (NH_{4,i}^+ + NO_{3,i}^-) \cdot 14 / 1000 \quad (3.12)$$

$$decDOC_{q,i} = decC_{q,i} * leach\_fracDOC_i \quad (3.13)$$

$$decCmicro\_growth_{q,i} = decC_{q,i} \cdot (1 - leach\_fracDOC_i) \cdot e_q \quad (3.14)$$

$$e_q = 6.25 \cdot Li\_CNratio_q^{-0.77} \quad (3.15)$$

$$decCact_{q,i} = decC_{q,i} - decCmicro\_growth_{q,i} \quad (3.16)$$

$$decN_{q,i} = decC_{q,i} \cdot \alpha_E Nprefer_{q,i} / CNratio_{q,i} \quad (3.17)$$

$$\alpha_E Nprefer_{q,i} = leach\_fracDOC_i + (1 - leach\_fracDOC_i) \cdot (1 + e_q \cdot (CN_{Limit} / CN_{mo} - 1)) \quad (3.18)$$

$$decDON_{q,i} = decC_{q,i} \cdot \alpha_E Nprefer_{q,i} \cdot leach\_fracDON_i / CNratio_{q,i} \quad (3.19)$$

$$decNmicro\_growth_{q,i} = decCmicro\_growth_{q,i} / CN_{mo} \quad (3.20)$$

$$Nmin\_immo_{q,i} = decN_{q,i} - decDON_{q,i} - decNmicro\_growth_{q,i} \quad (3.21)$$

$$decNact_{q,i} = decN_{q,i} - decNmicro\_growth_{q,i} \quad (3.22)$$

A4 Dissolved C and N

adv = advection, *afp* = air filled porosity ($m^3\ m^{-3}$), *aq* = aquatic phase, *g* = gaseous phase, *dep* = deposition, *diff* = diffusion, DM_g = dissolved gases (CO_2, CH_4, O_2), DM_s = dissolved solutes (dissolved organic matter, NO_3^-, NH_4^+), SO_4^{2-} (mmol m^{-2}) = SO_4^{2-} in 1 m^2 of peat, H_2S (mmol m^{-2}) = H_2S in 1 m^2 of peat, $EA_{HS,i}$ eq. (mmol $m)^{-2}$ = the oxidized dissolved humic substances serving as electron accepter (DOM-Q) in layer *i*, $ED_{HS,i}$ (mmol $m)^{-2}$ = the reduced dissolved humic substance that serves as electron donor (DOM-QH2) in layer *i*, *doy* = day of year.

$$DM_g conc_{aq} = DM_g conc_i \cdot ratio_{aq,g} DM_{g,i} / \left(1 + ratio_{aq,g} DM_{g,i}\right) \quad (4.1)$$

$$DM_g conc_{g,i} = DM_g conc_i / 1 + ratio_{aq,g} DM_{g,i} \quad (4.2)$$

$$ratio_{aq,g} DM_{g,i} = K_{H,DM_g,i} RT \cdot VWC_i / afp_i \quad (4.3)$$

$$K_{H,DM_g,i} = K^0_{H,DM_g,i} \cdot \exp\left(-C_{H,inv,DM_g}\left(1/T - 1/T_{25}\right)\right) / 101.325 \quad (4.4)$$

$$DM_s diff_{bot,i} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad i = 20 \\ DM_{s,i-1} \cdot (DM_s conc_{i-1} - DM_s conc_i) / d_i & if \quad i < 20 \cap DM_s conc_{i-1} < DM_s conc_i \\ DM_{s,i-1} \cdot (DM_s conc_{i-1} - DM_s conc_i) / d_{i-1} & if \quad i < 20 \cap DM_s conc_{i-1} \geq DM_s conc_i \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

$$D_{DM_{s,i}} = D_{DM_0} * VWC_i^2 \quad (4.6)$$

$$DM_g diff\_satu_i = \begin{cases} \max(0, (DM_g conc_i - DM_g conc_{atm}) \cdot D_{DM_{g,i}} / d_i & if \quad i = 1 \\ (DM_g conc_i - DM_g conc_{i-1}) \cdot D_{DM_{g,i}} / d_i & if \quad i > 1 \cap DM_g conc_i \geq DM_g conc_{i-1} \\ (DM_g conc_i - DM_g conc_{i-1}) \cdot D_{DM_{g,i}} / d_{i-1} & if \quad i > 1 \cap DM_g conc_i < DM_g conc_{i-1} \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

$$D_{DM_{g,i}} = D_{DM_{g,aq0}} \cdot porosity^2 \quad (4.8)$$

$$DOC_i(t) = DOCpro_i + DOCadv_{top,i} + DOCdiff_{top,i} - DOCadv_{bot,i} - DOCdiff_{bot,i} - DOCrunoff_{h,i} - DOCupt_i \quad (4.9)$$

$$DOCupt_i = \sum_j DONupt_{j,i} \cdot CN_{DOM} \quad (4.10)$$

$$CO_{2,i}(t) = CO_2 pro_i + CO_2\_oxiCH_{4,i} + CO_2 diff_{top,i} + CO_2 adv_{top,i} - CO_2 diff_{bot,i} - CO_2 diff_{bot,i} - CO_2 runoff_{h,i} \quad (4.11)$$

$$CO_2 pro_i = \begin{cases} R_{rt,i} + \sum_q decDIC_{q,i} & if \quad O_2 status = 1 \\ R_{rt,i} + (\sum_q decDIC_{q,i} + EACO_2 pro_i) / 2 & else \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

$$R_{rt,i} = \sum_j ((Rg_{rt,j} + Rm_{rt,j}) \cdot rt\_distri_{i,j}) \cdot 1000 / 12 \quad (4.13)$$

$$CH_{4,i}(t) = CH_4 pro_i - CH_4 PlantTrans_i - CH_4 Oxi_i + CH_4 diff_{top,i} + CH_4 adv_{top,i} - CH_4 diff_{bot,i} - CH_4 adv_{bot,i} - CH_4 runoff_i - CH_4 ebu_i \quad (4.14)$$

$$CH_4 pro_i = (DecDIC_i - EACO_2 pro_i) \cdot (1 - O_2 status_i) / 2 \quad (4.15)$$

$$CH_4 PlantTrans_i = CH_{4,i} \cdot k_{PlantTrans} \cdot ffinertB_{i,gram} \cdot (1 - Oxi\_frac\_trans_i) \quad (4.16)$$

$$k_{PlantTrans,i} = \max(1, 1.2 \cdot ffinertB_{i,gram}) \quad (4.17)$$

$$CO_2 oxiCH_{4,i} = oxi\_frac\_trans_i \cdot CH_4 PlantTrans_i + CH_4 oxiO_{2,i} \quad (4.18)$$

$$CH_4 oxiO_{2,i} = V \max_{CH_4 oxi} \cdot CH_4 conc_i \cdot O_2 conc_i \cdot Q_{10,CH_4 oxi}^{(T_i - 4)/10} * O_2 status_i / (CH_4 conc_i + Km_{CH_4 oxi}) / (O_2 conc_i + Km_{O_2 oxi}) \quad (4.19)$$

$$CH_4 ebu_i = k_{ebu} \cdot \max(0, (CH_4 conc_i - CH_4 conc_{\max})) \cdot V_i \quad (4.20)$$

$$CH_{4,\max,i} = CH_{4,\max,i}(T) \cdot P_i \quad (4.21)$$

$$\begin{cases} CO_2 pro_i + CH_4 pro_i = \sum_q decDIC_{q,i} & (C \quad balance) \\ CH_4 pro_i + CO_2 pro_{EA,i} = CO_2 pro_i & (electron \quad balance) \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

$$OtherEA_i = 5 \cdot N_2 denitri_i + 4 \cdot N_2 Odenitri_i + 3 \cdot NO_{denitri} + 8 \cdot SO_4^{2-} reduction \quad (4.23)$$

$$SO_4^{2-}(t) = Sdepo - S_{runoff} - S_{peat} - S_{plants} - Sreduction + H_2S\_oxidation \quad (4.24)$$

$$S_{runoff} = runoff \cdot Sconc \quad (4.25)$$

$$Sconc = S_{active} / \sum_i WC_i \quad (4.26)$$

$$S_{peat} = \Delta PeatC \cdot 1000 / CSratio_{peat} / 32 \quad (4.27)$$

$$S_{plants} = \Delta PlantC \cdot SCratio_{plant} \cdot 1000 / 32 \quad (4.28)$$

$$H_2S\_oxidation = SO_4^{2-} \cdot e^- \; faction_S \cdot \sum_i I_{nanowire,i} / 8 + H_2S \cdot r\_oxi\_SO_4^{2-} \tag{4.29}$$

$$SO_4^{2-}reduction = r\_red\_SO_4^{2-} \cdot SO_4^{2-} \cdot CO_2inhibition_i \tag{4.30}$$

$$H_2S(t) = SO_4^{2-}reduction - H_2Srelease \tag{4.31}$$

$$H_2Sconc = H_2S / \sum_i WC_i \tag{4.32}$$

$$H_2Srelease = H_2S \cdot rH_2S\_release \tag{4.33}$$

$$EA_{HS,i}(t) = reduction_i \tag{4.34}$$

$$ED_{HS,i}(t) = oxidation_i \tag{4.35}$$

$$reduction_i = r\_red\_HS_i \cdot EA_{HS,i} \cdot CO_2inhibition_i \cdot (1 - O_2status_i) \tag{4.36}$$

$$oxidatoin_i = \begin{cases} r\_oxi\_HS \cdot ED_{HS,i} & if \quad O_2status_i = 1 \\ I_{microwire_i} \cdot (1 - e\_fracS) & else \end{cases} \tag{4.37}$$

$$I_{nanowire,i} = \frac{3600 \cdot 24 \cdot C}{N_A} \cdot \frac{dEh_i}{R_i} \cdot (1 - O_2Status_i) \tag{4.38}$$

$$dEh_i = Eh_i - Eh_{i-1} \tag{4.39}$$

$$Eh_i = \frac{-\Delta G_{r,i} \cdot 1000}{n \cdot F} \tag{4.40}$$

$$\Delta G_{r,i} = \Delta G^0_{r,i} + RT_i \ln K_{HM,i} \tag{4.41}$$

$$K_{HM,i} = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad H_2conc_i = 0 \\ \dfrac{CH_4conc_i}{CO_2conc_i \cdot H_2conc_i^4} & else \end{cases} \tag{4.42}$$

$$R_i = |z_i| \cdot VWC_i \cdot specific\_resistance \tag{4.43}$$

$$EA_{HS,i}initial = ED_{HS,i}initial = 1.2 \cdot \sum_q SOMC_i / 12 \tag{4.44}$$

$$DON_i(t) = DON\_pro_i + DON\_depo_i + DONadv_{top,i} + DONdiff_{top,i} - DONadv_{bot,i} - DONdiff_{bot,i} - DONrunoff_{h,i} - DONupt_i \tag{4.45}$$

$$DONpro_i = \sum_q decDON_{q,i} * 1000 / 14 \tag{4.46}$$

$$NH_{4\,i}^+(t) = NH_4^+depo_i + \sum_q Nmin\_immo_{q,i} + DIN\_fix_i + NH_4^+diff_{top,i} \_ NH_4^+adv_{top,i} - NH_4^+diff_{bot,i} - NH_4^+adv_{bot,i} - NH_4^+upt_i - NO_3^-Nitri_i - N_2O\_nitri_i - NO\_nitri_i \tag{4.47}$$

$$DIN\_fix_i = 1.2 \cdot N_2fix_{moss} * (1 - frac\_N_2fix_{moss}) * f_{i,N_2fix} \tag{4.48}$$

$$N_2fix_{moss,i} = k_{fix} * fT_{fix,i} * fseason_{N_2fix} * fN_{N_2fix} \tag{4.49}$$

$$fTfix_i = \begin{cases} 0 & if \quad T_{moss} < T_{\min,fix} \\ Q_{10,fix}^{(T_{moss}-21)/10} & else \end{cases} \tag{4.50}$$

$$fseason_{N_2fix} = 15 - 0.1377 * doy + 0.0003264 * doy^2 \tag{4.51}$$

$$NO_3^-nitri_i = NH_4^-conc_i * V\max_{nitri} * NH_{4\,i}^- * fM_{nitri,i} * fT_{nitri,i} * fpH_{nitri,i} * O_2status_i / (NH_4^-conc_i + Km_{nitri}) \tag{4.52}$$

$$fT_{nitri,i} = \left(\frac{60 - T_i}{25.78}\right)^{3.503} \cdot \exp\left(3.503 * \frac{T_i - 34.22}{25.78}\right) \tag{4.53}$$

$$fpH_{nitri,i} = 0.5pH_i - 2 \tag{4.54}$$

$$NOnitri_i = NO_3^-nitri_i \cdot rNO_{nitri} * fT_{nitri,i} * fM_{nitri,i} \tag{4.55}$$

$$N_2Onitri_i = NO_3^-nitri_i \cdot rN_2O_{nitri} * fT_{nitri,i} * fM_{nitri,i} \tag{4.56}$$

$$NO_{3,i}^-(t) = NO_3^-depo_i + NO_3^-nitri_i + NO_3^-adv_{top,i} + NO_3^-diff_{top,i} - NO_3^-adv_{bot,i} - NO_3^-diff_{bot,i} - NO_{3,i}^-upt_i - N_2Odenitri_i \tag{4.57}$$

$$N_2Onitri_i = NO_3^-nitri_i \cdot rN_2O_{nitri} \cdot fT_{nitri,i} \cdot fM_{nitri,i} \tag{4.58}$$

$$NO_{3,i}^-(t) = NO_3^-depo_i + NO_3^-nitri_i + NO_3^-adv_{top,i} + NO_3^-diff_{top,i} - NO_3^-adv_{bot,i} - NO_3^-diff_{bot,i} - NO_{3,i}^-upt_i - N_2Odenitri_i \tag{4.59}$$

$$NO_3^-denitri_i = V\max_{denitri} \cdot NO_3^-conc_i \cdot fpH_{denitri,i} \cdot fT_{denitri,i} \cdot fM_{denitri,i} \cdot (1 - O_2status_i) / \left(NO_3^-conc_i + k_{m,denitri}\right) \tag{4.60}$$

$$fT_{denitri,i} = \begin{cases} 2^{(T_i-20)/10} & if \quad T_i > 10 \\ 0.5 \cdot 50^{(T_i-10)/10} & else \end{cases} \tag{4.61}$$

$$NO_{2\,i}^-(t) = NO_2^-denitri_i - NOdenitri_i - N_2Odenitri_i - N_2denitri_i \tag{4.62}$$

$$N_2denitri_i = 0.5 \cdot fT_{denitri,i} \cdot (1 - O_2status_i) \cdot NO_2^-conc_i / (NO_2^-conc_i + K_{m,denitri}) \tag{4.63}$$

$$NOdenitri_i = N_2denitri_i \cdot fT_{denitri,i} \cdot rNO_{denitri} \tag{4.64}$$

$$N_2Odenitri_i = 0.5 \cdot N_2denitri \cdot fT_{denitri,i} \cdot rN_2O_{denitri} \quad (4.65)$$

$$DMrunoff_{h,i} = DMconc_{aq,i} * runoff_i \quad (4.66)$$

Acknowledgements

We greatly acknowledge useful discussions with J. Verhoeven, N. Dise, B. Svensson, B.Robroek, L. Bragazza and P.E. Lindgren that helped clarifying concepts in the model development. We further thank T.R. Moore, P. Lafleur, N.T. Roulet and J. Bubier, S. Juutinen, E. R. Humphreys for facilitating access to data related to the Mer Bleue peatland. This study is part of the BiodivERsA-PEATBOG project whose German subproject was funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) grant 01LC0819A to C. Blodau through ERA-net (European Union's 6th Framework).

For the model codes and the boundary condition files, please contact the corresponding author.

References

Aber, J. D., and Federer, C. A.: A generalized, lumped-parameter model of photosynthesis, evapotranspiration and net primary production in temperate and boreal forest ecosystems. Oecologia, 92(4), 463-474, 1992.

Aber, J. D., Ollinger, S. V., and Driscoll, C. T.: Modeling nitrogen saturation in forest ecosystems in response to land use and atmospheric deposition, Ecological Modelling, 101, 61-78, 1997.

Aerts, R., Wallen, B., and Malmer, N.: Growth-limiting nutrients in *Sphagnum*-dominated bogs subject to low and high atmospheric nitrogen supply, Journal of Ecology, 131-140, 1992.

Aldous, A. R.: Nitrogen retention by *Sphagnum* mosses: Responses to atmospheric nitrogen deposition and drought, Canadian Journal of Botany, 80, 721-731, doi:10.1139/b02-054, 2002.

Atkin, O.: Reassessing the nitrogen relations of arctic plants: A mini-review, Plant, Cell and Environment, 19, 695-704, 2006.

Aubin, I., Beaudet, M., and Messier, C.: Light extinction coefficients specific to the understory vegetation of the southern boreal forest, quebec, Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 30, 168-177, 2000.

Bartsch, I., and Moore, T. R.: A preliminary investigation of primary production and decomposition in four peatlands near Schefferville, Quebec, Canadian Journal of Botany, 63(7), 1241-1248, 1985.

Baumgärtner, M., and Conrad, R.: Role of nitrate and nitrite for production and consumption of nitric oxide during denitrification in soil, FEMS Microbiology Letters, 101, 59-65, 1992.

Bayley, S. E., Thormann, M. N., and Szumigalski, A. R.: Nitrogen mineralization and decomposition in western boreal bog and fen peat, Ecoscience, 12, 455-465, doi:10.2980/i1195-6860-12-4-455.1, 2005.

Beer, J., and Blodau, C.: Transport and thermodynamics constrain belowground carbon turnover in a northern peatland, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 71, 2989-3002, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2007.03.010, 2007.

Beer, J., Lee, K., Whiticar, M., and Blodau, C.: Geochemical controls on anaerobic organic matter decomposition in a northern peatland, Limnology and Oceanography, 53, 1393-1407, 2008.

Berendse, F., Van Breemen, N., Rydin, H. Å., Buttler, A., Heijmans, M., Hoosbeek, M. R., Lee, J. A., Mitchell, E., Saarinen, T., and Vasander, H.: Raised atmospheric CO_2 levels and increased N deposition cause shifts in plant species composition and production in *Sphagnum* bogs, Global Change Biology, 7, 591-598, 2001.

Berg, B., and Staaf, H.: Leaching, accumulation and release of nitrogen in decomposing forest litter, Ecological Bulletins, 1981.

Billett, M., and Moore, T. R.: Supersaturation and evasion of CO_2 and CH_4 in surface waters at Mer Bleue peatland, Canada, Hydrological Processes, 22, 2044-2054, 2007.

Blodau C.: Thermodynamic control on terminal electron transfer and methanogenesis. ACS Symposium Series, Vol. 1071, 10.1021/bk-2011-1071.ch004, 2011.

Blodau, C., and Moore, T. R.: Macroporosity affects water movement and pore water sampling in peat soils, Soil Science, 167, 98-109, 2002.

Blodau, C., Basiliko, N., Mayer, B., and Moore, T. R.: The fate of experimentally deposited nitrogen in mesocosms from two Canadian peatlands, The Science of the total environment, 364, 215-228, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.06.002, 2006.

Blodau, C., Roulet, N. T., Heitmann, T., Stewart, H., Beer, J., Lafleur, P., and Moore, T. R.: Belowground carbon turnover in a temperate ombrotrophic bog, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 21, doi:10.1029/2005gb002659, 2007.

Blodau, C., Siems, M., and Beer, J.: Experimental burial inhibits methanogenesis and anaerobic decomposition in water-saturated peats, Environmental Science and Technology, 45, 9984-9989, doi:10.1021/es201777u, 2011.
Bond-Lamberty, B., and Gower, S. T.: Estimation of stand-level leaf area for boreal bryophytes, Oecologia, 151(4), 584-592, 2007.
Bragazza, L., Tahvanainen, T., Kutnar, L., Rydin, H., Limpens, J., Hajek, M., Grosvernier, P., Hajek, T., Hajkova, P., Hansen, I., Iacumin, P., and Gerdol, R.: Nutritional constraints in ombrotrophic *Sphagnum* plants under increasing atmospheric nitrogen deposition in Europe, New Phytologist, 163, 609-616, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01154.x, 2004.
Bragazza, L., Limpens J., Gerdol, R., Grosvernier, P., Hajek, M., Hájek, T., Hajkova, P. et al.: Nitrogen concentration and $\delta^{15}N$ signature of ombrotrophic *Sphagnum* mosses at different N deposition levels in Europe, Global Change Biology, 11(1), 106-114, 2005.
Bragazza, L., Freeman, C., Jones, T., Rydin, H., Limpens, J., Fenner, N., Ellis, T., Gerdol, R., Hajek, M., Hajek, T., Iacumin, P., Kutnar, L., Tahvanainen, T., and Toberman, H.: Atmospheric nitrogen deposition promotes carbon loss from peat bogs, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 103, 19386-19389, doi:10.1073/pnas.0606629104, 2006.
Bragazza, L., Buttler, A., Siegenthaler, A., and Mitchell, E. A. D.: Plant litter decomposition and nutrient release in peatlands, Geophysical Monograph Series, 184, 99-110, 2009.
Bragazza, L., Buttler, A., Habermacher, J., Brancaleoni, L., Gerdol, R., Fritze, H., Hanajík, P., Laiho, R., and Johnson, D.: High nitrogen deposition alters the decomposition of bog plant litter and reduces carbon accumulation, Global Change Biology, 18, 1163-1172, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02585.x, 2012.
Breeuwer, A., Heijmans, M., Robroek, B. J. M., Limpens, J., and Berendse, F.: The effect of increased temperature and nitrogen deposition on decomposition in bogs, Oikos, 117, 1258-1268, 2008.
Breuer, L., Kiese, R., and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: Temperature and moisture effects on nitrification rates in tropical rain-forest soils, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 66, 834-844, 2002.
Bridgham, S. D., Updegraff, K., and Pastor, J.: Carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus mineralization in northern wetlands, Ecology, 79, 1545-1561, 1998.
Brock, T. D.: Calculating solar radiation for ecological studies, Ecological Modelling, 14, 1-19, 1981.
Broecker, W., and Peng, T. H.: Gas exchange rates between air and sea, Tellus A, 26, 1974.
Bubier, J., Crill, P., Mosedale, A., Frolking, S. and Linder, E.: Peatland responses to varying interannual moisture conditions as measured by automatic CO_2 chambers. Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 17, 1066, doi: 10.1029/2002GB001946, 2003.
Bubier, J. L., Moore, T. R., and Bledzki, L. A.: Effects of nutrient addition on vegetation and carbon cycling in an ombrotrophic bog, Global Change Biology, 13, 1168-1186, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01346.x, 2007.
Bubier, J. L., Smith, R., Juutinen, S., Moore, T. R., Minocha, R., Long, S., and Minocha, S.: Effects of nutrient addition on leaf chemistry, morphology, and photosynthetic capacity of three bog shrubs, Oecologia, 167, 355-368, doi:10.1007/s00442-011-1998-9, 2011.
Carslaw, H. S., and Jaeger, J. C.: Conduction of heat in solids, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, 2nd ed., 1, 1959.
Cannell, M. G. R., and Thornley, J. H. M.: N-poor ecosystems may respond more to elevated [CO_2] than N-rich ones in the long term. A model analysis of grassland, Global Change Biology 4 (4), 431-442, 1998.
Chapin III, F., and Shaver, G.: Differences in growth and nutrient use among arctic plant growth forms, Functional Ecology, 73-80, 1989.
Clein, J. S., and Schimel, J. P.: Microbial activity of tundra and taiga soils at sub-zero temperatures, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 27 (9), 1231-1234, 1995.
Clymo, R.: The limits to peat bog growth, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences, 303, 605-654, 1984.
Conrad, R.: Contribution of hydrogen to methane production and control of hydrogen concentrations in methanogenic soils and sediments, FEMS microbiology ecology, 28, 193-202, doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.1999.tb00575.x, 1999.
Conant, R. T., Drijber, R. A., Haddix, M. L., Parton, W. J., Paul, E. A., Plante, A. F., Six, J., and Steinweg, J. M.: Sensitivity of organic matter decomposition to warming varies with its quality, Global Change Biology, 14, 868-877, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01541.x, 2008.
Conant, R. T., Haddix, M., and Paustian, K.: Partitioning soil carbon responses to warming: Model-derived guidance for data interpretation, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 42, 2034-2036, 2010.
Cooper, P.: The absorption of radiation in solar stills, Solar Energy, 12, 333-346, 1969.
Cornel, P. K., Summers, R. S., and Roberts, P. V.: Diffusion of humic acid in dilute aqueous solution, Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 110, 149-164, 1986.

Coulson, J., and Butterfield, J.: An investigation of the biotic factors determining the rates of plant decomposition on blanket bog, The Journal of Ecology, 631-650, 1978.
Craine, J. M., Fierer, N., and McLauchlan, K. K.: Widespread coupling between the rate and temperature sensitivity of organic matter decay, Nature Geoscience, 3, 854-857, 2010.
Crow, S. E., and Wieder, R. K.: Sources of CO_2 emission from a northern peatland: root respiration, exudation, and decomposition, Ecology, 86, 1825-1834, 2005.
Currey, P. M., Johnson, D., Sheppard, L. J., Leith, I. D., Toberman, H., Van Der WAL, R., Dawson, L. A., and Artz, R. R. E.: Turnover of labile and recalcitrant soil carbon differ in response to nitrate and ammonium deposition in an ombrotrophic peatland, Global Change Biology, 16, 2307-2321, 2010.
Currey, P. M., Johnson, D., Dawson, L. A., van der Wal, R., Thornton, B., Sheppard, L. J., Leith, I. D., and Artz, R. R. E.: Five years of simulated atmospheric nitrogen deposition have only subtle effects on the fate of newly synthesized carbon in *Calluna vulgaris* and *Eriophorum vaginatum*, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 43, 495-502, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2010.11.003, 2011.
Damman, A. W. H.: Regulation of nitrogen removal and retention in *Sphagnum* bogs and other peatlands, Oikos, 291-305, 1988.
Davidson, E. A., and Janssens, I. A.: Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon decomposition and feedbacks to climate change, Nature, 440, 165-173, doi:10.1038/nature04514, 2006.
Davie, M. K., Zatsepina, O. Y., and Buffett, B. A.: Methane solubility in marine hydrate environments, Marine Geology, 203, 177-184, doi:10.1016/s0025-3227(03)00331-1, 2004.
Dimitrov, D. D., Grant, R. F., Lafleur, P. M., and Humphreys, E. R.: Modeling the effects of hydrology on gross primary productivity and net ecosystem productivity at Mer Bleue Bog, Journal of Geophysical Research, 116, doi:10.1029/2010jg001586, 2011.
Ellsworth, D. S., Reich, P. B., Naumburg, E. S., Koch, G. W., Kubiske, M. E., and Smith, S. D.: Photosynthesis, carboxylation and leaf nitrogen responses of 16 species to elevated pCO_2 across four free-air CO_2 enrichment experiments in forest, grassland and desert, Global Change Biology, 10, 2121-2138, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2004.00867.x, 2004.
Estop-Aragonés, C., Knorr, K.-H., and Blodau, C.: Controls on in situ oxygen and dissolved inorganic carbon dynamics in peats of a temperate fen, Journal of Geophysical Research, 117, doi:10.1029/2011jg001888, 2012.
Fang, C., Smith, P., Moncrieff, J. B., and Smith, J. U.: Similar response of labile and resistant soil organic matter pools to changes in temperature, Nature, 433, 57-59, 2005.
Field, C., and Mooney, H. A.: The photosynthesis-nitrogen relationship in wild plants, Givnish, t. J., 25-56 pp., 1986.
Fraser, C. J. D., Roulet, N. T., and Lafleur, P. M.: Groundwater flow patterns in a large peatland, Journal of Hydrology, 246, 142-154, 2001.
Fraser, C. J. D., Roulet, N. T., and Moore, T. R.: Hydrology and dissolved organic carbon biogeochemistry in an ombrotrophic bog, Hydrological Processes, 15, 3151-3166, doi:10.1002/hyp.322, 2001.
Fredlund, D. G., Rahardjo, H., and Fredlund, D. G.: Soil mechanics for unsaturated soils, Wiley New York, 1993.
Frolking, S., Goulden, M. L., Wofsy, S. C., FAN, S. M., Sutton, D. J., Munger, A. M., Bazzaz et al.: Modelling temporal variability in the carbon balance of a spruce/moss boreal forest, Global Change Biology, 2 (4), 343-366, 1996.
Frolking, S., Roulet, N. T., Moore, T. R., Richard, P. J., Lavoie, M., and Muller, S. D.: Modeling northern peatland decomposition and peat accumulation, Ecosystems, 4(5), 479-498, 2001.
Frolking, S., Roulet, N. T., Moore, T. R., Lafleur, P. M., Bubier, J. L., and Crill, P. M.: Modeling seasonal to annual carbon balance of Mer Bleue Bog, Ontario, Canada, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 16, 1030, 2002.
Gale, M., and Grigal, D.: Vertical root distributions of northern tree species in relation to successional status, Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 17, 829-834, 1987.
Gambhir, R. S., and Banerjee, D.: Foundations of physics: electromagnetics optics and modern physics, Vol. 2, New Age International, 1993.
Giardina, C. P., and Ryan, M. G.: Evidence that decomposition rates of organic carbon in mineral soil do not vary with temperature, Nature, 404, 858-861, 2000.
Glass, A. D. M., Brito, D. T., Kaiser, B. N., Kronzucker, H. J., Kumar, A., Okamoto, M., Rawat, S., Siddiqi, M. Y., Silim, S. M., and Vidmar, J. J.: Nitrogen transport in plants, with an emphasis on the regulations of fluxes to match plant demand, Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science, 164, 199-207, 2001.
Granath, G., Strengbom, J., Breeuwer, A., Heijmans, M. M., Berendse, F., and Rydin, H.: Photosynthetic performance in *Sphagnum* transplanted along a latitudinal nitrogen deposition gradient, Oecologia, 159, 705-715, doi:10.1007/s00442-008-1261-1, 2009.

Granberg, G., Grip, H., Löfvenius, M. O., Sundh, I., Svensson, B., and Nilsson, M.: A simple model for simulation of water content, soil frost, and soil temperatures in boreal mixed mires, Water Resources Research, 35, 3771-3782, 1999.
Grant, R., Juma, N., and McGill, W.: Simulation of carbon and nitrogen transformations in soil: Mineralization, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 25, 1317-1329, 1993.
Güsewell, S.: Responses of wetland graminoids to the relative supply of nitrogen and phosphorus, Plant Ecology, 176(1), 35-55, 2005.
Heijmans, M. M. P. D., Berendse, F., Arp, W. J., Masselink, A. K., Klees, H., De Visser, W., and Van Breemen, N.: Effects of elevated carbon dioxide and increased nitrogen deposition on bog vegetation in the Netherlands, Journal of Ecology, 89, 268-279, 2001.
Heijmans, M. M. P. D., Mauquoy, D., Geel, B., and Berendse, F.: Long-term effects of climate change on vegetation and carbon dynamics in peat bogs, Journal of Vegetation Science, 19, 307-320, doi:10.3170/2008-8-18368, 2008.
Heimann, A., Jakobsen, R., and Blodau, C.: Energetic constraints on H_2-dependent terminal electron accepting processes in anoxic environments: A review of observations and model approaches, Environmental Science and Technology, 44, 24-33, 2009.
Heitmann, T., Goldhammer, T., Beer, J., and Blodau, C.: Electron transfer of dissolved organic matter and its potential significance for anaerobic respiration in a northern bog, Global Change Biology, 13, 1771-1785, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01382.x, 2007.
Heinen, M.: Simplified denitrification models: Overview and properties, Geoderma, 133, 444-463, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2005.06.010, 2006.
Hemond, H. F., and Fechner-Levy, E. J.: Chemical fate and transport in the environment, Academic Press, 2000.
Hénault, C., and Germon, J.: NEMIS, a predictive model of denitrification on the field scale, European Journal of Soil Science, 51, 257-270, 2008.
Hikosaka, K.: A model of dynamics of leaves and nitrogen in a plant canopy: An integration of canopy photosynthesis, leaf life span, and nitrogen use efficiency, The American Naturalist, 162, 149-164, 2003.
Hikosaka, K.: Interspecific difference in the photosynthesis-nitrogen relationship: Patterns, physiological causes, and ecological importance, Journal of Plant Research, 117, 481-494, doi:10.1007/s10265-004-0174-2, 2004.
Gambhir, R. S. and Banerjee D.: Foundations of physics: electromagnetics optics and modern physics (Vol 2) , New Age International, page 51, 1993.
Granhall, U., and Selander, H.: Nitrogen fixation in a subarctic mire, Oikos, 24, 8-15, 1973.
Inglett, K.S., Inglett, P.W., Reddy, K.R., Osborne, T.Z.,: Temperature sensitivity of greenhouse gas production in wetland soils of different vegetation, Biogeochemistry, 108, 77-90, 2012.
Ingwersen, J., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Gasche, R., Papen, H., and Richter, O.: Barometric process separation: New method for quantifying nitrification, denitrification, and nitrous oxide sources in soils, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 63, 117-128, 1999.
IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. In Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M. and Miller, H.L. (Eds), Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Ivanov, K. E.: Water movement in mirelands, Academic Press Inc.(London) Ltd., 1981.
Jackson, R., Canadell, J., Ehleringer, J., Mooney, H., Sala, O., and Schulze, E.: A global analysis of root distributions for terrestrial biomes, Oecologia, 108, 389-411, 1996.
Janssens, I., Dieleman, W., Luyssaert, S., Subke, J. A., Reichstein, M., Ceulemans, R., Ciais, P., Dolman, A., Grace, J., and Matteucci, G.: Reduction of forest soil respiration in response to nitrogen deposition, Nature Geoscience, 3, 315-322, 2010.
Jauhiainen, J., Vasander, H., and Silvola, J.: Nutrient concentration in shape *sphagna* at increased N-deposition rates and raised atmospheric CO_2 concentrations, Plant Ecology, 138, 149-160, 1998.
Jin, Q., and Bethke, C. M.: The thermodynamics and kinetics of microbial metabolism, American Journal of Science, 307, 643-677, 2007.
Johnsson, H., Bergstrom, L., Jansson, P. E., and Paustian, K.: Simulated nitrogen dynamics and losses in a layered agricultural soil, Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 18, 333-356, 1987.
Jones, D. L., and Kielland, K.: Soil amino acid turnover dominates the nitrogen flux in permafrost-dominated taiga forest soils, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 34, 209-219, 2002.
Jones, D. L., Healey, J. R., Willett, V. B., Farrar, J. F., and Hodge, A.: Dissolved organic nitrogen uptake by plants—an important n uptake pathway?, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 37, 413-423, 2005.

Juutinen, S., Bubier, J. L., and Moore, T. R.: Responses of vegetation and ecosystem CO_2 exchange to 9 years of nutrient addition at Mer Bleue Bog, Ecosystems, 13, 874-887, doi:10.1007/s10021-010-9361-2, 2010.
Kahmen, A., Livesley, S. J., and Arndt, S. K.: High potential, but low actual, glycine uptake of dominant plant species in three Australian land-use types with intermediate n availability, Plant and Soil, 325, 109-121, 2009.
Karhu, K., Fritze, H., Tuomi, M., Vanhala, P., Spetz, P., Kitunen, V., and Liski, J.: Temperature sensitivity of organic matter decomposition in two boreal forest soil profiles, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 42, 72-82, 2010.
Keller, J. K., Weisenhorn, P. B., and Megonigal, J. P.: Humic acids as electron acceptors in wetland decomposition, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 41, 1518-1522, 2009.
Keller, J. K., White, J. R., Bridgham, S. D., and Pastor, J.: Climate change effects on carbon and nitrogen mineralization in peatlands through changes in soil quality, Global Change Biology, 10, 1053-1064, 2004.
Khalil, K., Mary, B., and Renault, P.: Nitrous oxide production by nitrification and denitrification in soil aggregates as affected by O_2 concentration, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 36, 687-699, 2004.
Kielland, K.: Amino acid absorption by arctic plants: Implications for plant nutrition and nitrogen cycling, Ecology, 75, 2373-2383, 1994.
Kielland, K., McFarland, J., and Olson, K.: Amino acid uptake in deciduous and coniferous taiga ecosystems, Plant and Soil, 288, 297-307, 2006.
Kielland, K., McFarland, J., Ruess, R., and Olson, K.: Rapid cycling of organic nitrogen in taiga forest ecosystems, Ecosystems, 10, 360-368, 2007.
Kimball, J. S., Thornton, P. E., White, M. A., and Running, S. W.: Simulating forest productivity and surface–atmosphere carbon exchange in the BOREAS study region, Tree Physiology, 17(8-9), 589-599, 1997.
Kirk, G. J., and Kronzucker, H. J.: The potential for nitrification and nitrate uptake in the rhizosphere of wetland plants: A modelling study, Annals of Botany, 96, 639-646, 10.1093/aob/mci216, 2005.
Knorr, K.-H., and Blodau, C.: Impact of experimental drought and rewetting on redox transformations and methanogenesis in mesocosms of a northern fen soil, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 41, 1187-1198, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.02.030, 2009.
Kranabetter, J. M., Dawson, C. R., and Dunn, D. E.: Indices of dissolved organic nitrogen, ammonium and nitrate across productivity gradients of boreal forests, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 39, 3147-3158, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2007.06.026, 2007.
Krom, M. D., and Berner, R. A.: The diffusion coefficients of sulfate, ammonium, and phosphate ions in anoxic marine sediments, Limnology and Oceanography, 25, 327-337, 1980.
Kronzucker, H. J., Siddiqi, M. Y., Glass, A. D., and Kirk, G. J.: Nitrate-ammonium synergism in rice. A subcellular flux analysis, Plant Physiology, 119(3), 1041-1046, 1999.
Kuzyakov, Y.: Separating microbial respiration of exudates from root respiration in non-sterile soils: a comparison of four methods, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 34, 1621-1631, 2002.
Lafleur, P. M., Roulet, N. T., and Admiral, S. W.: Annual cycle of CO_2 exchange at a bog peatland, Journal of Geophysical Research, 106, 3071, doi:10.1029/2000jd900588, 2001.
Lafleur, P. M.: Interannual variability in the peatland-atmosphere carbon dioxide exchange at an ombrotrophic bog, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 17, doi:10.1029/2002gb001983, 2003.
Lafleur, P. M., Hember, R. A., Admiral, S. W., and Roulet, N. T.: Annual and seasonal variability in evapotranspiration and water table at a shrub-covered bog in southern Ontario, Canada, Hydrological Processes, 19, 3533-3550, doi:10.1002/hyp.5842, 2005a.
Lafleur, P. M., Moore, T. R., Roulet, N. T., and Frolking, S.: Ecosystem respiration in a cool temperate bog depends on peat temperature but not water table, Ecosystems, 8, 619-629, doi:10.1007/s10021-003-0131-2, 2005b.
Lamers, L. P. M., Bobbink, R., and Roelofs, J. G. M.: Natural nitrogen filter fails in polluted raised bogs, Global Change Biology, 6, 583-586, 2001.
Lång, K., Lehtonen, M., and Martikainen, P. J.: Nitrification potentials at different pH values in peat samples from various layers of a drained mire, Geomicrobiology Journal, 11, 141-147, doi:10.1080/01490459309377946, 1993.
Letts, M. G., Roulet, N. T., Comer, N. T., Skarupa, M. R., and Verseghy, D. L.: Parametrization of peatland hydraulic properties for the canadian land surface scheme, Atmosphere-Ocean, 38, 141-160, 2000.
Li, C., and Aber, J.: A process-oriented model of N_2O and NO, Journal of Geophysical Research, 105, 4369-4384, 2000.
Limpens, J., and Berendse, F.: Growth reduction of *Sphagnum* magellanicum subjected to high nitrogen deposition: The role of amino acid nitrogen concentration, Oecologia, 135, 339-345, doi:10.1007/s00442-003-1224-5, 2003.
Limpens, J., Heijmans, M. M. P. D., and Berendse, F.: The nitrogen cycle in boreal peatlands, Boreal Peatland Ecosystems, 195-230, 2006.

Linn, D., and Doran, J.: Effect of water-filled pore space on carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide production in tilled and nontilled soils, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 48, 1267-1272, 1984.
Liou, J. S., Derito, C. M., and Madsen, E. L.: Field-based and laboratory stable isotope probing surveys of the identities of both aerobic and anaerobic benzene-metabolizing microorganisms in freshwater sediment, Environmental Microbiology, 10, 1964-1977, doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2008.01612.x, 2008.
Liski, J., Ilvesniemi, H., Mäkelä, A., and Westman, C. J.: CO_2 emissions from soil in response to climatic warming are overestimated: The decomposition of old soil organic matter is tolerant of temperature, Ambio, 171-174, 1999.
Liu, J., Price, D. T., and Chen, J. M.: Nitrogen controls on ecosystem carbon sequestration: A model implementation and application to Saskatchewan, Canada, Ecological Modelling, 186, 178-195, doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.01.036, 2005.
Lopes, F., Viollier, E., Thiam, A., Michard, G., Abril, G., Groleau, A., Prévot, F., Carrias, J. F., Albéric, P., and Jézéquel, D.: Biogeochemical modelling of anaerobic vs. aerobic methane oxidation in a meromictic crater lake (Lake Pavin, France), Applied Geochemistry, 26, 1919-1932, doi:10.1016/j.apgeochem.2011.06.021, 2011.
Lovley, D. R., Coates, J. D., Blunt-Harris, E. L., Phillips, E. J. P., and Woodward, J. C.: Humic substances as electron acceptors for microbial respiration, Nature, 382, 445-448, 1996.
Lovley, D. R., and Coates, J. D.: Novel forms of anaerobic respiration of environmental relevance, Current Opinion in Microbiology, 3, 252-256, 2000.
Lund, M., Lafleur, P. M., Roulet, N. T., Lindroth, A., Christensen, T. R., Aurela, M., Chojnicki, B. H., Flanagan, L. B., Humphreys, E. R., Laurila, T., Oechel, W. C., Olejnik, J., Rinne, J., Schubert, P. E. R., and Nilsson, M. B.: Variability in exchange of CO_2 across 12 northern peatland and tundra sites, Global Change Biology, 16, 2436-2448, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.02104.x, 2009.
Malmer, N., Johansson, T., Olsrud, M., and Christensen, T. R.: Vegetation, climatic changes and net carbon sequestration in a north-scandinavian subarctic mire over 30 years, Global Change Biology, 11, 1895-1909, 2005.
Manzoni, S., Trofymow, J. A., Jackson, R. B., and Porporato, A.: Stoichiometric controls on carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus dynamics in decomposing litter, Ecological Monographs, 80, 89-106, 2010.
Miller, A.J., Cramer, M.D.,: Root nitrogen acquisition and assimilation. Plant and Soil 274, 1-36, doi:10.1007/s11104-004-0965-1, 2004.
Moore, T., Roulet, N., and Waddington, J.: Uncertainty in predicting the effect of climatic change on the carbon cycling of Canadian peatlands, Climatic Change, 40, 229-245, 1998.
Moore, T., Blodau, C., Turunen, J., Roulet, N., and Richard, P. J. H.: Patterns of nitrogen and sulfur accumulation and retention in ombrotrophic bogs, eastern Canada, Global Change Biology, 11, 356-367, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2004.00882.x, 2005.
Moore, T. R., Bubier, J. L., Frolking, S. E., Lafleur, P. M., and Roulet, N. T.: Plant biomass and production and CO_2 exchange in an ombrotrophic bog, Journal of Ecology, 90, 25-36, 2002.
Moore, T. R., Lafleur, P. M., Poon, D. M. I., Heumann, B. W., Seaquist, J. W., and Roulet, N. T.: Spring photosynthesis in a cool temperate bog, Global Change Biology, 12, 2323-2335, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01247.x, 2006.
Moore, T. R., Young, A., Bubier, J. L., Humphreys, E. R., Lafleur, P. M., and Roulet, N. T.: A multi-year record of methane flux at the Mer Bleue Bog, southern Canada, Ecosystems, 14, 646-657, doi:10.1007/s10021-011-9435-9, 2011.
Morris, P. J., Waddington, J. M., Benscoter, B. W., and Turetsky, M. R.: Conceptual frameworks in peatland ecohydrology: Looking beyond the two-layered (acrotelm-catotelm) model, Ecohydrology, 4, 1-11, 10.1002/eco.191, 2011.
Murphy, M. T., McKinley, A., and Moore, T. R.: Variations in above- and below-ground vascular plant biomass and water table on a temperate ombrotrophic peatland, Botany, 87, 845-853, doi:10.1139/b09-052, 2009.
Murphy, M. T., and Moore, T. R.: Linking root production to aboveground plant characteristics and water table in a temperate bog, Plant and Soil, 336, 219-231, doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0468-1, 2010.
Murray, R. E., and Knowles. R.: Production of NO and N_2O in the presence and absence of C_2H_2 by soil slurries and batch cultures of denitrifying bacteria, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 35(8), 1115-1122, 2003.
Nasholm, T., Kielland, K., and Ganeteg, U.: Uptake of organic nitrogen by plants, The New Phytologist, 182, 31-48, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02751.x, 2009.
Nedwell, D. B., and Watson, A,: CH_4 production, oxidation and emission in a UK ombrotrophic peat bog: Influence of SO_4^{2-} from acid rain, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 27(7), 893-903, 1995.

Neff, J. C., Townsend, A. R., Gleixner, G., Lehman, S. J., Turnbull, J., and Bowman, W. D.: Variable effects of nitrogen additions on the stability and turnover of soil carbon, Nature, 419, 915-917, doi:10.1038/nature01136, 2002.
Nielsen, L. P., Risgaard-Petersen, N., Fossing, H., Christensen, P. B., and Sayama, M.: Electric currents couple spatially separated biogeochemical processes in marine sediment, Nature, 463, 1071-1074, doi:10.1038/nature08790, 2010.
Norby, R. J., Cortufo, M. F., Ineson, P., Neill, E. G. O., and Canadell, J. G.: Elevated CO_2 , litter chemistry, and decomposition: A synthesis, Oecologia, 127, 153-165, doi:10.1007/s004420000615, 2001.
Nordin, A., Strengbom, J., Witzell, J., Näsholm, T., and Ericson, L.: Nitrogen deposition and the biodiversity of boreal forests: Implications for the nitrogen critical load, AMBIO, 34, 20-24, 2005.
Nordstrom D. K. and Munoz J. L.: Geochemical thermodynamics, Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1994.
Novák, M., & Wieder, R. K.: Inorganic and organic sulfur profiles in nine *Sphagnum* peat bogs in the United States and Czechoslovakia. Water, Air, & Soil Pollution, 65(3), 353-369, 1992.
Parsons, D. A. B., Scholes, M. C., Scholes, R. J., and Levine, J. S.: Biogenic NO emissions from savanna soils as a function of fire regime, soil type, soil nitrogen, and water status, Journal of Geophysical Research, 101, 23683-23688, doi:10.1029/95JD02140, 1996.
Parton, W., Scurlock, J., Ojima, D., Gilmanov, T., Scholes, R., Schimel, D., Kirchner, T., Menaut, J., Seastedt, T., and Moya, E. G.: Observations and modeling of biomass and soil organic matter dynamics for the grassland biome worldwide, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 7, 785-809, 1993.
Pastor, J., Peckham, B., Bridgham, S., Weltzin, J., and Chen, J.: Plant community dynamics, nutrient cycling, and alternative stable equilibria in peatlands, The American Naturalist, 160, 553-568, 2002.
Potter, C. S.: An ecosystem simulation model for methane production and emission from wetlands, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 11, 495-506, 1997.
Reddy, K. R., Patrick, W. H., and Broadbent, F. E.: Nitrogen transformations and loss in flooded soils and sediments, Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology, 13(4), 273-309, 1984.
Reguera, G., McCarthy, K. D., Mehta, T., Nicoll, J. S., Tuominen, M. T., and Lovley, D. R.: Extracellular electron transfer via microbial nanowires, Nature, 435, doi:1098-1101, 10.1038/nature03661, 2005.
Reich, P., Walters, M., Kloeppel, B., and Ellsworth, D.: Different photosynthesis-nitrogen relations in deciduous hardwood and evergreen coniferous tree species, Oecologia, 104, 24-30, 1995.
Reimer, A.: The role of bog plants in the exchange of carbon and water between the atmosphere and the Mer Bleue peatland. , MSc thesis, McGill University, Montreal., McGill University, Montreal., 2001.
Reynolds, J. F., and Thornley, J. H. M.: A shoot: root partitioning model, Annals of Botany, 49(5), 585-597, 1982.
Riedo, M., Grub, A., Rosset, M., and Fuhrer, J.: A pasture simulation model for dry matter production, and fluxes of carbon, nitrogen, water and energy, Ecological Modelling, 105, 141-183, 1998.
Robroek, B. J. M., Schouten, M. G. C., Limpens, J., Berendse, F., and Poorter, H.: Interactive effects of water table and precipitation on net CO_2 assimilation of three co-occurring *Sphagnum* mosses differing in distribution above the water table, Global Change Biology, 15, 680-691, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01724.x, 2009.
Roden, E. E., Kappler, A., Bauer, I., Jiang, J., Paul, A., Stoesser, R., Konishi, H., and Xu, H.: Extracellular electron transfer through microbial reduction of solid-phase humic substances, Nature Geoscience, 3, 417-421, 2010.
Rosswall, T., and Granhall, U.: Nitrogen cycling in a subarctic ombrotrophic mire, Ecological Bulletins, 209-234, 1980.
Roulet, N. T., Lafleur, P. M., Richard, P. J. H., Moore, T. R., Humphreys, E. R., and Bubier, J.: Contemporary carbon balance and late Holocene carbon accumulation in a northern peatland, Global Change Biology, 13, 397-411, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01292.x, 2007.
Ryan, M. G.: Effects of climate change on plant respiration, Ecological Applications 1(2), 157-167, 1991.
Ryan, M. G.: Foliar maintenance respiration of subalpine and boreal trees and shrubs in relation to nitrogen content, Plant, Cell and Environment, 18(7), 765-772, 1995.
Sage, R. F., and Pearcy, R. W.: The nitrogen use efficiency of C3 and C4 plants ii. Leaf nitrogen effects on the gas exchange characteristics of *Chenopodium Album* (L.) and *Amaranthus Retroflexus* (L.), Plant physiology, 84, 959-963, 1987.
Sander, R.: Compilation of Henry's law constants for inorganic and organic species of potential importance in environmental chemistry (version 3), http://www.mpch-mainz.mpg.de/~sander/res/henry.html, 1999.
Sauheitl, L., Glaser, B., and Weigelt, A.: Uptake of intact amino acids by plants depends on soil amino acid concentrations, Environmental and Experimental Botany, 66, 145-152, 2009.

Scott, D. T., McKnight, D. M., Blunt-Harris, E. L., Kolesar, S. E., and Lovley, D. R.: Quinone moieties act as electron acceptors in the reduction of humic substances by humics-reducing microorganisms, Environmental Science and Technology, 32, 2984-2989, 1998.

Segers, R., and Kengen, S.: Methane production as a function of anaerobic carbon mineralization: A process model, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 30, 1107-1117, 1998.

Segers, R., and Leffelaar, P. A.: Modeling methane fluxes in wetlands with gas-transporting plants: 1. Single-root scale, Journal of Geophysical Research, 106, 3511, doi:10.1029/2000jd900484, 2001.

Small, E.: Photosynthetic rates in relation to nitrogen recycling as an adaptation to nutrient deficiency in peat bog plants, Canadian Journal of Botany, 50, 2227-2233, 1972.

Smart, D. R., and Bloom, A. J.,: Influence of root and content on the temperature response of net and uptake in chilling sensitive and chilling resistant *Lycopersicon* taxa, Journal of Experimental Botany, 42(3), 331-338, 1991.

Smemo, K. A., and Yavitt, J. B.: Anaerobic oxidation of methane: an underappreciated aspect of methane cycling in peatland ecosystems?, Biogeosciences, 8, 779-793, 2011.

Stumm W., and Morgan J. J.: Aquatic chemistry. Wiley-Interscience, 1981

St-Hilaire, F., Wu, J., Roulet, N., Frolking, S., Lafleur, P., Humphreys, E., and Arora, V.: McGill wetland model: Evaluation of a peatland carbon simulator developed for global assessments, Biogeosciences, 7, 3517-3530, 2010.

Thornley, J., and Verberne, E.: A model of nitrogen flows in grassland, Plant, Cell and Environment, 12, 863-886, 1989.

Thornley, J., and Cannell, M.: Nitrogen relations in a forest plantation—soil organic matter ecosystem model, Annals of Botany, 70, 137-151, 1992.

Thornley, J., Bergelson, J., and Parsons, A.: Complex dynamics in a carbon-nitrogen model of a grass-legume pasture, Annals of Botany, 75, 79-84, 1995.

Thornley, J.: Dynamic model of leaf photosynthesis with acclimation to light and nitrogen, Annals of Botany, 81, 421-430, 1998a.

Thornley, J., and Cannell, M.: Soil carbon storage response to temperature: An hypothesis, Annals of Botany, 87, 591-598, 2001.

Thornley, J.: Instantaneous canopy photosynthesis: Analytical expressions for sun and shade leaves based on exponential light decay down the canopy and an acclimated non‐rectangular hyperbola for leaf photosynthesis, Annals of Botany, 89, 451-458, 2002.

Thornley, J. H. M.: Grassland dynamics: An ecosystem simulation model, CAB International Wallingford UK 241 pp ISBN 0–85199–227–7, 1998b.

Trettin, C. C., Song, B., Jurgensen, M., and Li, C.: Existing soil carbon models do not apply to forested wetlands, USDA Forest Service, Savannah River, New Ellenton, SC, 2001.

Trumbore, S. E., and Harden, J.: Accumulation and turnover of carbon in organic and mineral soils of the boreas northern study area, Journal of Geophysical Research, 102 (D24), 28817-28, 1997.

Turunen, J., Tomppo, E., Tolonen, K., and Reinikainen, A.: Estimating carbon accumulation rates of undrained mires in finland–application to boreal and subarctic regions, The Holocene, 12, 69-80, 2002.

Updegraff, K., Pastor, J., Bridgham, S. D., and Johnston, C. A.: Environmental and substrate controls over carbon and nitrogen mineralization in northern wetlands, Ecological Applications, 5, 151-163, 1995.

Urban, N., Eisenreich, S., and Bayley, S.: The relative importance of denitrification and nitrate assimilation in midcontinental bogs, Limnology and Oceanography, 1611-1617, 1988.

Valenzuela-Estrada, L. R., Vera-Caraballo, V., Ruth, L. E., and Eissenstat, D. M.: Root anatomy, morphology, and longevity among root orders in *Vaccinium Corymbosum* (Ericaceae), American Journal of Botany, 95, 1506-1514, doi:10.3732/ajb.0800092, 2008.

van Bellen, S., Dallaire, P. L., Garneau, M., and Bergeron, Y.: Quantifying spatial and temporal Holocene carbon accumulation in ombrotrophic peatlands of the eastmain region, Quebec, Canada, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 25, doi:10.1029/2010gb003877, 2011a.

van Bellen, S., Garneau, M., and Booth, R. K.: Holocene carbon accumulation rates from three ombrotrophic peatlands in boreal Quebec, Canada: Impact of climate-driven ecohydrological change, The Holocene, 21, 1217-1231, 2011b.

Van Der Heijden, E., Verbeek, S. K., and Kuiper, P. J. C.: Elevated atmospheric CO_2 and increased nitrogen deposition: Effects on C and N metabolism and growth of the peat moss *Sphagnum recurvum* P. Beauv. Var. *mucronatum* (Russ.) Warnst, Global Change Biology, 6, 201-212, 2001.

Van der Peijl, M., and Verhoeven, J.: A model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus dynamics and their interactions in river marginal wetlands, Ecological Modelling, 118, 95-130, 1999.
Van Oene, H., Van Deursen, E. J. M., and Berendse, F.: Plant-herbivore interaction and its consequences for succession in wetland ecosystems: A modeling approach, Ecosystems, 2, 122-138, 1999.
Van Rees, K. C. J., Sudicky, E. A., Rao, P. S. C., and Reddy, K. R.: Evaluation of laboratory techniques for measuring diffusion coefficients in sediments, Environmental science and Technology, 25, 1605-1611, 1991.
Vile, M. A.: Atmospheric sulfur deposition alters pathways of gaseous carbon production in peatlands, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 17, doi:10.1029/2002gb001966, 2003a.
Vile M.A., Bridgham S.D., Wieder R.K.: Response of anaerobic carbon mineralization rates to sulfate amendments in a boreal peatland, Ecological Applications, 13, 720–734, 2003b.
Vitt, D. H., Halsey, L. A., Bauer, I. E., and Campbell, C.: Spatial and temporal trends in carbon storage of peatlands of continental western canada through the Holocene, Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences, 37, 683-693, 2000.
Vitt, D. H., Wieder, K., Halsey, L. A., and Turetsky, M.: Response of *Sphagnum fuscum* to nitrogen deposition: A case study of ombrogenous peatlands in Alberta, Canada, The Bryologist, 106, 235-245, 2003.
Walter, B., Heimann, M., and Matthews, E.: Modeling modern methane emissions from natural wetlands. I- model description and results, Journal of Geophysical Research. D. Atmospheres, 106, 34, 2001.
Weltzin, J. F., Bridgham, S. D., Pastor, J., Chen, J., and Harth, C.: Potential effects of warming and drying on peatland plant community composition, Global Change Biology, 9, 141-151, 2003.
Well, R., Augustin, J., Meyer, K., and Myrold, D. D.: Comparison of field and laboratory measurement of denitrification and N_2O production in the saturated zone of hydromorphic soils, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 35(6), 783-799, 2003.
Wendel, S., Moore, T., Bubier, J., and Blodau, C.: Experimental nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium deposition decreases summer soil temperatures, water contents, and soil CO_2 concentrations in a northern bog, Biogeosciences, 8, 585-595, doi:10.5194/bg-8-585-2011, 2011.
Wieder, R. K., and Vitt, D. H.: Boreal peatland ecosystems, Springer, 2006.
Williams, B., and Silcock, D.: Nutrient and microbial changes in the peat profile beneath *Sphagnum magellanicum* in response to additions of ammonium nitrate, Journal of Applied Ecology, 961-970, 1997.
Williams, L., and Miller, A.: Transporters responsible for the uptake and partitioning of nitrogenous solutes, Annual review of plant biology, 52, 659-688, 2001.
Williams, T. G., and Flanagan, L. B.: Measuring and modelling environmental influences on photosynthetic gas exchange in *Sphagnum* and *Pleurozium*, Plant Cell Environment, 21, 555-564, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1998.00292.x, 1998.
Willmott, C. J.: Some comments on the evaluation of model performance, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 63, 1309-1369, 1982.
Wu, J., Roulet, N. T., Moore, T. R., Lafleur, P., and Humphreys, E.: Dealing with microtopography of an ombrotrophic bog for simulating ecosystem-level CO_2 exchanges, Ecological Modelling, 222, 1038-1047, 2011.
Xing, Y., Bubier, J., Moore, T., Murphy, M., Basiliko, N., Wendel, S., and Blodau, C.: The fate of ^{15}N-nitrate in a northern peatland impacted by long term experimental nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium fertilization, Biogeochemistry, 103, 281-296, doi:10.1007/s10533-010-9463-0, 2010.
Xu-Ri and Prentice, I. C.: Terrestrial nitrogen cycle simulation with a dynamic global vegetation model, Global Change Biology, 14, 1745–1764, 2008.
Yasumura, Y., Hikosaka, K., and Hirose, T.: Seasonal changes in photosynthesis, nitrogen content and nitrogen partitioning in *Lindera umbellata* leaves grown in high or low irradiance, Tree Physiology, 26, 1315-1323, 2006.
Yu, Z., Loisel, J., Brosseau, D. P., Beilman, D. W., and Hunt, S. J.: Global peatland dynamics since the last glacial maximum, Geophysical Research Letters, 37, doi:10.1029/2010gl043584, 2010.
Zhang, Y.: An integrated model of soil, hydrology, and vegetation for carbon dynamics in wetland ecosystems, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 16, doi:10.1029/2001gb001838, 2002.
Zhang, Y., Grant, R. F., Flanagan, L. B., Wang, S., and Verseghy, D. L.: Modelling CO_2 and energy exchanges in a northern semiarid grassland using the carbon- and nitrogen-coupled canadian land surface scheme (C-CLASS), Ecological Modelling, 181, 591-614, doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2004.07.007, 2005.
Zhuang, Q.: Methane fluxes between terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere at northern high latitudes during the past century: A retrospective analysis with a process-based biogeochemistry model, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 18, doi:10.1029/2004gb002239, 2004.

Table 1 State variables in the model

State Variable	Description	*Units	Eqn. No.	Initial Values		
Environment						
WS	Water content in the upper 1m^3 of peat	m^3	Eq. 1.1	0.4		
$O_{2,i}$	O_2 content layer i	mmol	Eq. 1.12	0		
Wccap	Moss capitulum water content	g H_2O g dry $mass^{-1}$	Eq. 1.16	5		
Vegetation				**Moss**	**Gram.**	**Shrub**
$C_{sh,struc,j}$	Shoot structural C of PFT j	gC	Eq. 2.9	70.45	8.05	121.20
$C_{rt,struc,j}$	Root structural C of PFT j	gC	Eq. 2.9	0	18.67	542.84
$N_{sh,struc,j}$	Shoot structural N in PFT j	gN	Eq. 2.9	1.44	0.18	2.45
$N_{rt,struc,j}$	Root structural N in PFT j	gN	Eq. 2.9	0	0.41	11.04
$C_{sh,subs,j}$	Shoot substrate C of PFT j	gC	Eq. 2.13	31.34	0.16	57.67
$C_{rt\ subs,j}$	Root substrate C of PFT j	gC	Eq. 2. 35	0	0.02	15.69
$N_{sh,subs,j}$	Shoot substrate N in PFT j	gN	Eq. 2.38	0.1	0.07	0.07
$N_{rt,subs,j}$	Root substrate N in PFT j	gN	Eq. 2.46	0	0.2	0.63
Soil organic matter						
SOM $C_{L,i}$	SOM Labile C in Layer i	gC	Eq. 3.1	Table S4		
SOM $C_{R,i}$	SOM recalcitrant C in layer i	gC	Eq. 3.1	Table S4		
SOM $N_{L,i}$	SOM labile N in layer i	gN	Eq. 3.1	Table S4		
SOM $N_{R,i}$	SOM recalcitrant N in layer i	gN	Eq. 3.1	Table S4		
Dissolved C and N						
DOC_i	DOC Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.9	0		
$CO_{2,i}$	CO_2 Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.11	Table S4, Appendix, Eq. 1.23		
$CH_{4,i}$	CH_4 Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.14	Table S4, Appendix, Eq. 1.23		
DON_i	DON Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.22	0		
$NH_4^+{}_i$	NH_4^+ Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.23	0		
$NO_3^-{}_i$	NO_3^- Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.33	0		
$NO_2^-{}_i$	NO_2 Content of layer i	mmol	Eq. 4.36	0		
SO_4^{2-}	SO_4^{2-} Content in peat	mmol	Eqn 4.24	63.15		
H_2S	H_2S Content in peat	mmol	Eqn 4.31	1.58		
$EA_{HS,i}$	oxidized dissolved humic substances as electron accepter (DOM-Q) of layer i	mmol (eq.)	Eqn 4.34	Eqn 4.44		
$ED_{HS,i}$	reduced dissolved humic substances as electron donor (DOM-QH_2) of layer i	mmol (eq.)	Eqn 4.35	Eqn 4.44		

Units were standardized to 1 m^2 area of peatlands for model output.

Table 2 Site specific parameters

Name	Description	Value	Units	Sources
local slope	Local slope of the site	0.0008	m m^{-1}	(Fraser et al., 2001)
t_l	Day of year when the annual mean T is reached	115	days	calculated
σ_T	Amplitude of the air T sinusoidal curve	17	°C	calculated
Latitude	Latitude of the site	42.24N	°	–
N load	Annual wet N deposition level	0.8	gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}	(Turunen, 2004)
rtk_j	Root distribution fraction k	Gram. 0.938 Shrub 0.935	–	(Murphy et al., 2009)
finert _$frac_j$	Fine root fraction of roots	Gram. 0.5 Shrub 0.2	–	(Murphy et al., 2009)

Table 3 Referenced Parameters

Name	Description	Value			Unit	Source
Environment						
$k_{transm,\ a}$	Parameter a for transmissivity		1.98		–	1
$K_{transm,b}$	Parameter b for transmissivity		24.38		–	1
EPT_r_{moss}	Rate constant of capitulum water Loss to evapotranspiration		0.24		day^{-1}	2
Plant		**Moss**	**Gram.**	**shrub**		
$P_{max,20}$	Light saturated PSN rate at 20 °C	2	2	5	$mgCO_2\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$	3, 4, 5
$K_{CO2,Pmax}$	Parameter of CO_2 effect on P_{max} at 700vpm CO_2, 20 °C, 1 atm		0.00128		$kgCO_2\ m^{-3}$	6
$Na_{max,j}$	Maximum N content in leaf	1.5	3	3	$gN\ m^{-2}$	10, 11
$T_{max,j}$	Maximum temperature for PSN	30	35	35	°C	2, 6
$T_{min,j}$	Minimum temperature for PSN	-1	-3	-5	°C	2, 6
mfT	Multiplier of temperature effect		2		°C	6
$T_{ref,j}$	Temperature when $f_{T,PSN}$ is 1	22	25	25	°C	6, 12
q_{fT}	Q_{10} of temperature effect		2			6
α_0	PSN efficiency at 15°C, 1 atm		2.2		$\mu gCO_2\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$	6
$Pconc_{moss}$	Moss P concentration		0.001		$gP\ g^{-1}$	*13
CNDOM	C/N ratio of DOM		40		$gC\ gN^{-1}$	14
$Cconc_j$	Structural C concentration	0.44	0.46	0.51	$gC\ g^{-1}$	15
$K_{ext,j}$	Light extinction coefficient	0.95	0.5	0.96	–	7, 16, 17
SLA_j	Specific leaf area	0.02	0.012	0.01	$m^2\ g^{-1}$	18, 19, 20
ξ_j	Curve of PSN and PAR parameter	0.99	0.9	0.7	–	7
$rRm_{leaf,j}$	Leaf maintenance respiration rate constant	12	5	5	$gC\ kgC^{-1}\ day^{-1}$	*21
$rRm_{stem,j}$	Stem maintenance respiration rate constant	10	2.5	2.5	$gC\ kgC^{-1}\ day^{-1}$	*21
$rRm_{coarsert,j}$	Coarse root maintenance respiration rate constant		0.001		day^{-1}	21
$rRm_{finert,j}$	Fine root maintenance respiration rate constant		0.0048		day^{-1}	22
$Q_{10,X,r,j}$	Q_{10} of temperature effect on respiration	2	1.7	1.8	–	23, 24, 25
li_C_$frac_{X,subs,j,min}$	Minimum substrate C fraction of litter		0.3		–	26
$k_{li\ subsC}$	Constant for substrate C in litter		0.05		$gC\ g^{-1}$	26
$CNratio_{rec}$	CN ratio of recycled litter		2.7		$gC\ gN^{-1}$	8
$CNratio_{upt}$	CN ratio of DOM uptake		2.7		$gC\ gN^{-1}$	**8
k_{rec_subsN}	Constant of recycled substrate N from litter		0.01		$gN\ g^{-1}$	8
$K\_grow_{sh,j}$	Shoot growth rate constant	0.5	0.5	0.4	day^{-1}	*8, 16
$K\_grow_{rt,j}$	Root growth rate constant		0.2		day^{-1}	*26
K_mgrowC_j	Half saturation constant for substrate C in biomass growth	0.1	0.1	0.05	$gC\ g^{-1}$	*26
K_mgrowN_j	Half saturation constant for substrate N in biomass growth	1	10	1	$gN\ kg^{-1}$	*26
$\rho_{C,j}$	resistance parameter for shoot root transport of substrate C	–	10	60	$m^2\ day\ g^{-1}$	*9
$\rho_{N,j}$	resistance parameter for shoot root transport of substrate N	–	5	5	$m^2\ day\ g^{-1}$	*9
li_rec_$Nfrac_{X,subs,j,max}$	Maximum recycled fraction of substrate N from litter	0.5	0.4	0.8	–	*8
frac_li_$N_{X,subs,j,min}$	Minimum substrate N fraction of litter	0.2	0.3	0.1	–	*8
k_{li_subsN}	Constant of substrate N in litter		0.005		$gN\ g^{-1}$	*8

$k_{m,NO3}$	Half saturation constant of NO_3^- uptake		10		mmol m^3	27
$k_{m,NH4}$	Half saturation constant of NH_4^+ uptake		50		mmol m^3	27
$V_{m,NO3}$	Maximum rate of NO_3^- uptake		0.00221		mmol cm^{-2} day^{-1}	27, 28
$V_{m,NH4}$	Maximum rate of NH_4^+ uptake		0.000432		mmol cm^{-2} day^{-1}	27, 28
$Q_{10,NO3upt}$	Q_{10} for NO_3^- uptake		1.86		–	29
$k_{m,c,Nupt}$	Constant of substrate C concentration on N uptake in plants		0.1		gC g^{-1}	*30
$K_{m,N,Nupt}$	Constant of substrate N concentration on N uptake in plants		0.005		gN g^{-1}	8
$V_{m,DON,j}$	Maximum rate of DON uptake	–	10^{-8}	0.01	mmol g^{-1} day^{-1}	*30
$K_{m,DON,j}$	Half saturation constant of DON for uptake	–	141	111	mmol m^{-3}	30
SOM						
CN_{mo}	Microbial C/N ratio		7		gC gN^{-1}	31
$T_{min,dec}$	Minimum temperature for SOM decomposition		-4		°C	31
$Q_{10,dec,q}$	Q_{10} of temperature effects on the decomposition of labile or recalcitrant SOM	$Q_{10,L}$ = 2.3, $Q_{10,R}$ = 3.3				33
$LeaDOC\%_i$	Fraction of SOM leach as DOC		0.05		–	*31
$LeaDON\%_i$	Fraction of SOM leach as DON		0.05		–	*31
CN_{limit}	The asymptotic CN ratio value of SOM decomposition		20		gC gN^{-1}	31
Dissolved						
Oxi_frac_i	Fraction of CH_4 oxidized during plant transportation		0.5		–	34
$V_{m,CH4oxi}$	Maximum oxidation rate of CH_4		63.93		mmol m^{-3} day^{-1}	34
$K_{mCH4oxi}$	Half saturation constant of CH_4 oxidation		29		mmol m^{-3}	35
$Q_{10,CH4oxi}$	Q_{10} for CH_4 oxidation		2			34
k_{ebu}	Ebullition rate constant of CH_4		0.01		day^{-1}	*34
DON%dep	Fraction of DON in deposited N		0.4		–	*13
$Q_{10,Nfix}$	Q_{10} for N_2 fixation		3		–	36
$Tmin_{Nfix}$	Minimum temperature for N_2 fixation		-4		°C	*32
$V_{m,nitri}$	Maximum nitrification rate		0.05		day^{-1}	37
$K_{m,nitri}$	Half saturation constant for nitrification		200		mmol m^{-3}	28
rNO_{nitri}	Fraction of NO production in nitrification		0.002		–	38, 39, 40
$rN2O_{nitri}$	Fraction or N_2O production in nitrification products		0.0005		–	40, 41, 42, 43
$V_{m,denitri}$	Maximum denitrification rate		86.4		mmol m^{-3} day^{-1}	29
$k_{m,denitri}$	Half saturation constant for denitrification		1		mmol m^{-3}	29
$rNO_{denitri}$	NO production rate constant in denitrification		0.002		day^{-1}	40, 42, 44
$rN2O_{denitri}$	N_2O production rate constant in denitrification		0.002		day^{-1}	45
$CSratio_{peat}$	C/S ratio in peat SOM		318		gC gS^{-1}	14
$CSratio_{plant}$	S/C ratio in plants		0.0022		gS gC^{-1}	46

1

2

Table 4 Assumed and calibrated parameters

Name	Description	Value			Unit	Source	Conf.
Environment							
r_melting	Snow melt rate constant		0.27		m m^{-1}	Calibrated	2
$snowmelt_{max}$	Maximum snow melt rate		0.007		m m^{-2} day^{-1}	Assumed	2
r_EPT_0	Base evapotranspiration rate		3.888		–	Calibrated	2
Plants		**Moss**	**Gram**	**Shrub**			
$f_{N,toxic}$	N effect on PSN when toxic		0.01		–	Assumed	1
$density_{finert,j}$	Fine roots density	–	0.05	0.06	g cm^{-3}	[28]Calibrated	2
$r_{cylinder,j}$	The radius of roots	–	0.05	0.05	cm	[28]Calibrated	3
Li_frac_L	Fraction of labile litter quality	0.1	0.3	0.2	g g^{-1}	[48]Assumed	2
$r_{mort,sh,j}$	Shoot mortality rate constant	0.004	0.006	0.0015	day^{-1}	[49]Calibrated	3
$r_{mort,rt,j}$	Root mortality rate constant	–	0.0019	0.0021	day^{-1}	[49]Calibrated	3
$r_{deciduous}$	Deciduous rate constant		0.1		day^{-1}	[49]Assumed	2
$r\_exu_{X,j}$	Exudation rate constants	0.01	0.003	0.005	day^{-1}	Assumed	2
$fracN_2fix_{moss}$	N_2 fixation fraction of mosses	0.1			–	Calibrated	1
SOM							
$kCpot_q$	Inherent potential rate constant of decomposition	$kCpot_R = 8 \cdot 10^{-6}$ $kCpot_L = 25$			day^{-1}	Calibrated	2
k_{fix}	Base N_2 fixation rate		0.04		gN m^{-2} day^{-1}	[50]Calibrated	2
Dissolved							
$r\_red\_SO_4^{2-}$	SO_4^{2-} reduction rate constant		0.1		day^{-1}	[51]Calibrated$	2
$e^-fraction_s$	fraction of *nanowire* pathway contribute to SO_4^{2-} reduction		0.4		–	[52]Calibrated$	2
$r\_red\_HS_i$	Humic substances reduction rate constant of layer I		0.0001		day^{-1}	[53]Calibrated$	2
$r\_oxi\_HS_i$	humic substances oxidation rate constant		0.05		day^{-1}	Assumed	1
specific_resistance	specific electron resistance of peat		1		Ω m	Assumed	1

M = C, N; q = labile, recalcitrant; Q = substrate, structural, X = shoots, roots, leaves, stems, fine roots, coarse roots, DM_g = CO_2, CH_4, O_2, DM_s = NH_4^+, NO_3^-, DOM; i = layer i, j = Plant functional type j.
*values were calculated for the reference or modified according to PFTs, **assumed to be the same as the C/N ratio of the recycled litter, which is similar to the C/N ratio of the smallest DON Glycine.
$values were calibrated in a compounded way.
Conf.: confidence of the calibrated or assumed parameter values. 1 = low confidence, 2= intermediate confidence, 3 = high confidence.
[1](Ivanov, 1981), [2](Frolking et al., 1996), [3](Small, 1972), [4](Chapin III and Shaver, 1989),[5](Ellsworth et al., 2004), [6](Cannell and Thornley, 1998) , [7](Thornley, 1998b), [8](Thornley and Cannell, 1992), [9](Reynolds and Thornley, 1982), [10](Bragazza et al., 2005), [11](Bragazza et al., 2012), [12](Frolking et al., 2001), [13](Bartsch and Moore, 1985), [14](Moore et al., 2004), [15](Aerts et al., 1992), [16](Heijmans et al., 2008), [17](Aubin et al., 2000), [18](Bond-Lamberty and Gower, 2007), [19](Gusewell, 2005), [20](Bubier et al., 2011), [21](Kimball et al., 1997), [22](Frolking et al., 2002), [23](Aber and Federer, 1992), [24](Ryan, 1995), [25](Ryan, 1991), [26](Thornley et al., 1995), [27](Kronzucker et al., 1999), [28](Kirk and Kronzucker, 2005), [29](Smart and Bloom, 1991), [30](Kielland, 1994), [31](Manzoni et al., 2010), [32](Clein and Schimel, 1995), [33](Conant et al., 2010), [34](Walter et al., 2001), [35](Nedwell and Watson, 1995), [36](Granhall and Selander, 1973), [37](Reddy et al., 1984), [38](Baumgärtner and Conrad, 1992), [39](Parsons et al., 1996), [40](Xu and Prentice, 2008), [41](Breuer et al., 2002), [42](Khalil et al., 2004), [43](Ingwersen et al., 1999), [44](Well et al., 2003), [45](Murray and Knowles, 2003), [46](Novák and Wieder, 1992).

Table 5 Results of sensitivity analyses. The values shown are the average relative changes in model output per change of parameter (Jørgensen and Bendoricchio, 2001). Annual C fluxes (unit: gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}) averaged over 6 years from 1999 to 2004 were compared per change of air temperature (unit: °C), precipitation (unit: m day^{-1}), N deposition level (gN m^{-2} yr^{-1}), Q_{10} (no unit) and kpot (potential decomposition constant, unit: day^{-1}) of the labile and recalcitrant peat. (+) indicates a positive relation between the change in the parameter and the change C and N pools or fluxes. (-) indicates an inverse relation between the change in parameter and the change in C and N pools or fluxes.

Parameters	Air Temperature	Precipitation	N deposition	$Q_{10,R}$	$Q_{10,L}$	K_{potR}	K_{potL}
GPP	+0.08	-0.04	+0.12	+0.02	0.00	+0.06	+0.01
PSN moss	-0.05	+0.01	+0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.09	-0.02
PSN gram	+0.03	-0.16	+0.69	+0.08	+0.01	+0.26	+0.05
PSN shrub	+0.13	-0.05	+0.13	+0.04	+0.01	+0.11	+0.02
AR	+0.25	-0.17	+0.19	+0.03	0.00	+0.08	+0.02
AR moss	+0.08	0.00	+0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AR gram	+0.09	-0.12	+0.53	+0.06	+0.01	+0.20	+0.04
AR shrub	+0.34	-0.25	+0.19	+0.04	+0.01	+0.11	+0.02
NPP moss	-0.22	+0.03	-0.18	-0.06	-0.19	-0.20	-0.04
NPP gram	-0.02	-0.19	+0.85	+0.10	+0.31	+0.32	+0.06
NPP shrub	-0.01	+0.85	+0.08	+0.03	+0.10	+0.11	+0.02
HR	+0.39	-0.30	+0.01	+0.35	+0.13	+0.83	+0.26
ER	+0.33	-0.25	+0.10	+0.20	+0.07	+0.47	+0.14
CH_4 flux	-0.30	+0.75	+0.07	+0.32	0.00	+1.03	+0.05
DOC export	-0.08	+0.80	-0.04	+0.21	+0.10	+0.55	+0.20
NEE	-4.43	+3.72	+0.39	-3.24	-1.16	-7.22	-2.24
DIC export	-0.73	+2.95	-0.19	+0.10	-0.02	+0.49	0.00
NECB	-15.47	+11.28	+1.05	-12.18	-4.35	-27.47	-0.98
C sequestration rate	-5.09	+6.13	+0.02	-7.02	-2.54	-16.57	-4.93
N sequestration rate	-0.15	+1.17	+0.77	-0.80	-0.26	-1.78	-0.44

Table 6 Observed (Obs.), simulated (Sim.), and the difference (D) between observed and simulated annual GPP, ER and NEE (units: gC m^{-2} yr^{-1}) and summer average water table depth (unit: m) from May 1st to October 30th for 6 years for the Mer Bleue peatland.

	GPP			ER			NEE			WTD		
Year	Obs.	Sim.	D	Obs.	Sim.	D	Obs.	Sim.	D	Obs.	Sim.	D
1999	593	523	-70	537	573	36	-56	42	99	-0.49	-0.61	-0.12
2000	481	513	32	456	470	14	-25	-47	-22	-0.34	-0.33	0.01
2001	524	609	85	532	581	49	8	-33	-41	-0.48	-0.52	-0.04
2002	495	560	65	487	570	83	-9	4	13	-0.51	-0.50	0.01
2003	513	562	49	498	533	35	-15	-32	-17	-0.46	-0.49	-0.03
2004	686	563	-123	574	431	-143	-112	-134	-22	-0.40	-0.37	0.03