Answer to comments from the reviewer #1.

We thank reviewer for the constructive evaluation of the manuscript. Please find below our answers to questions/comments. Comments from the reviewer were left intentionally in this document and written in roman font. Our answers are written in italics.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 June 2018

Improvement of the soil modules in global carbon cycle models is a recurrent need claimed by the scientific community. The land surface model Orchidee is one of the important tools to analyse and predict future changes of the Earth's climate and biosphere. A recent study highlighted that current Earth system models predict a too young age for soil organic carbon. The present work introduces the radiocarbon isotope in the model to better constrain Orchidee. Based on the use of radiocarbon, the study furthermore improved the model itself, and model prediction, through a better representation of carbon movement within the soil profile. The article is fully relevant, clearly written and illustrated, and worth publication in GMD.

Thank you very much for the positive comments

But one point requires a significant change. Once this point fixed, the paper could be acceptable with only minor corrections.
Important point. (parameterization of the 'Model_Test_He') Line 233 authors state "... multiply by 14 the turnover rate and by 0.07 the flux...". And later Line 236 and in Table 2: "decrease the flux from 0.07 to 0.049. Consistency would either decrease the flux from 0.07 to 0.0049, or multiply it by a factor 0.7. I suppose that the initial intention of authors was to multiply by 0.07 the flux, so that the steady state stock of passive would be kept similar (multiplied by 14 x 0.07 = 0.98), but with a F14 much lower.
Here it seems from the results that the stock of the passive pool was multiplied by a factor almost 10 (less than 10 because of the duration of the spin-up), as expected by a factor x 0.7 for the flux. The over estimation of both carbon content and age is obviously expected with such a parameterization. In the present state, I further recomment not to use the name of a person in the surname of the model.
Finally, I recommend that the authors either (i) remove this model_test from the paper, which would then be accepted with minor revison, or (ii) recalculate using a flux to passive 0.0049 instead of 0.049. Option (ii) is preferred, but is not mandatory, since the other parts bring significant results; note that option (i) would not affect the summary nor the conclusion.

Actually this was only a typo mistakes in the manuscript but we carefully checked the code and it was correct. We therefore corrected the manuscript.

Minor and typographical points.

Table 1. Be clear in the legend on what was averaged. Do "over the profiles" means a calculated mean for (0- 2.0 m)"?
We did not have data up to 2m so we calculated a mean for the different available layers that we applied to the entire profile of the model (0-2.0 m). We clarified the legend: "Table 1. General description of the studied sites. The mean bulk density, pH and clay fraction values calculated from the different soil layers depths available in the data were used as input for each site. For Mons and Feucherolles sites, min and max values of pH and clay fraction are provided between brackets"

Table 3 Data are in kg C m-3, which is a unit for local concentration, not for carbon stock. Is it: (a) kg C m-2, i.e., the carbon stock per unit area; or (b) the average concentration over the 0-2.0 m profile (then the Stock would be 2 times the mean concentration value)? Option (a) would be preferred.
The table 3 was modified and all the results are now presented in kg C m-2.

Line 786 Legend fig.6: indicate the variable in object (= F14C).
This is now added in the legend

Line 134. A brief statement of the formalism and parameterization of the priming would be welcome.
We modified the text in the revised version as following: "Briefly, priming is described following equation 1.

$$\frac{\partial SOC_{i,z}}{\partial t} = DOC_{Recycled,i,j}(t) - k_{SOC,i} \times (1 - e^{-c \times LOC_z(t)}) \times SOC(t)_{i,z} \times \theta(t) \times \tau(t) \qquad (1)$$

with $DOC_{recycled}$ being the unrespired DOC that is redistributed into the pool i considered for each soil layer z in g C m^{-2} $days^{-1}$, k_{SOC} being a SOC decomposition rate constant ($days^{-1}$), and LOC being the stock of labile organic C defined as the sum of the C pools with a higher decomposition rate than the pool considered within each soil layer z. We therefore considered that for the active carbon pool LOC is the litter and DOC, but for the slow carbon pool LOC is the sum of the litter, DOC and so on. Finally, c is a parameter controlling the impact of the LOC pool on the SOC mineralization rate, i.e., the priming effect. The equation was parameterized based on soil incubations data and evaluated over litter manipulation experiments (Guenet et al. 2016)."

Line 179. In Eq (6), STRUC was excluded of total 14C. Was it? In the Century model, STRUC usually accounts for 10- 20% of C in 0-20 cm layer, and is therefore non negligible (your figure 7). It is considered as retrieved as material < 2mm (for a large part) and therefore often included in the "measured" total carbon. This exclusion may affect the comparison between observed and modelled values of F14.
In the model, structural litter may come from leaves or root litter production of the ongoing year. Soil scientists, before measurements, generally remove it. We agreed with the reviewer that a part can still be present after few years but we were not able to clearly define a time

step when structural litter is less than 2mm and therefore integrated in the measurements. To avoid overestimation of modern C we decided to not integrate the structural litter in the final calculation. If needed we can perform a sensitivity analysis adding or not the structural litter in the final calculation to estimate the impacts on our results.

Line 218. "OCC (wt/wt)" would be better than "OCC (wt %)"
Done

Line 232. "turnover rate" is an unclear term (might be the reciprocal of turnover time). Here turnover time?
Correction is done in the revised version of the manuscript.

Lines 314-326 and throughout: MSD values aren't in kg C m-3, but in kg2 C m-6 (variance not standard deviation); or use squareroot(MSC)
We corrected the MSD units in the revised version of the manuscript.

Line 325. Arenosols are not very specific and are broadly represented on the planet.
Remove "for such specific conditions". Replace by "Probably due to an overestimation of decay rates by ORCHIDEE in sandy soils?
This is now corrected in the revised version of the manuscript.

Lines 367-401. See Major comment.
As explained above, the error was in the table but not in the model.

Do is the boundary condition at depth 2.0 for constant diffusion affect the base of the profils?
It is difficult to answer this question because changing the soil depth of the model would not only affect the carbon but also the hydrology, the plant uptake and in fine the carbon inputs.

Typography

All the typo mistakes are corrected in the revised version.
Line 71. "this"
Line 158. verify in the final edition the greek symbol delta (not ok in my pdf)
Line 186. "1.5_m" (= separate the units throughout)
Line 227. "(2016) (=no square brackets)
Line 242. "et al. (2014)" (spaces)
Line 255. Point missing; also lines 326, 337 ... check.
Line 315: spaces before and after "=" (throughout the text)
Line 447 'processes

Answer to comments from the reviewer #2.

We thank reviewer for the constructive evaluation of the manuscript. Please find below our answers to questions/comments. Comments from the reviewer were left intentionally in this document and written in roman font. Our answers are written in italics.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 August 2018

This paper presents ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C, a new version of the IPSL-Land Surface Model, and tests it against data from four different sites. It makes an important contribution by implementing the isotopic tracer ^{14}C in the model. This is a valuable addition to the ORCHIDEE-SOM model, which simulates depth-resolved soil carbon dynamics from 0-2m below the surface. The authors also demonstrate how the new model can be used to constrain SOC turnover times and internal model processes. In particular, they implement two variations on the model ("Model_Test_He" and "Model_Test_Diffusion").

They follow the suggestions of He et al (2016) to slow turnover in the passive pool and reduce the flux from the slow to passive pool (pending comment by reviewer #1).

They also implement a version of the model with depth-dependent bioturbation rate following Jagercikova et al (2014). Conceptually, this paper is a nice demonstration of how F^{14}C data could be used for comparison against different model implementations.

However, there are significant issues which should be addressed both with the implementation (see Reviewer #1 comments) and interpretation of the results (see below) prior to publication.

Thanks for the positive comments please see our answer to reviewer #1.

In its current form, this paper does not convincingly demonstrate that there are meaningful differences in the modeled profiles across sites, or that any differences reflect the modeled differences in climate, vegetation or soil properties. Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate that the model can broadly fit a generic soil profile. However, it is unclear if the model can reliably capture differences between sites (for example, in Fig 3, the model reasonably fits only two of the four profiles). Comparison to a somewhat larger number of published soil F^{14}C profiles is needed to support current statements that the model can "reproduce soil organic carbon stocks and radiocarbon profiles" (for example, line 29). This additional analysis would significantly strengthen the paper. It would also be particularly interesting to see if the model is able to capture the wide differences in bulk soil ^{14}C seen across soil taxa (for example as explored in Mathieu et al (2015)). Alternatively, if the authors feel that comparison to a wider suite of soil profiles is beyond the scope of the current work, the current model-data comparison should be rephrased as a proof-of-concept contribution. In either case, the discussion should address potential controls on the soil F14C profiles (for both data and model). For example, despite the important role of minerology and clay content in controlling the age of soil C, these topics are not mentioned in the current discussion. Relatedly, more discussion and exploration of the model processes and parameters that control the ^{14}C profiles would be an important addition to this paper. Although I acknowledge that comparison to a wider suite of soil profiles may be beyond the scope of the current work, I would like to see more exploration and discussion of these issues prior to publication.

We agree that such an evaluation would be a good step forwards but one the difficulty to run the model over such a large database is that very often some boundaries conditions of the model are missing and we have to estimate them with large scale database that may not be accurate for a given site. In this study we decided to carefully choose some sites which have enough data to feed the model and which are also representative of different situations. We aimed to go for such large-scale evaluation but we thought that it would have been more useful to have first a model description papers evaluated on well-chosen site. We changed several parts of the document in the revised version of the manuscript to explore more this weakness of our study see for example:
"Nevertheless, the model evaluation performed here on only four sites should be considered as proof of concept and more in depth evaluation are needed, in particular using a large ^{14}C database available at global scale (Balesdent et al., 2018; Mathieu et al., 2015). Indeed, the $F^{14}C$ is largely controlled by pedo-climatic conditions such as clay content, climate and mineralogy (Mathieu et al., 2015) and the range of situations we covered here is relatively limited."

or "Furthermore, here we used only one averaged value over the soil profile for soil boundary conditions (texture, pH, bulk density) but those variables are known to impact the $F^{14}C$ (Mathieu et al., 2015) and change with depth (Barré et al., 2009) and depth-varying boundary conditions may also help to improve the model.""

The authors make a good case for the addition of depth-varying parameters, both conceptually (eg line 69) and in the results, by making the important contribution of implementing He el al's suggested parameters in a depth-dependent context and updating the diffusion formulation. However, although the updated diffusion formulation is a key contribution of the paper, the impact of this model improvement should not be overstated, as the difference between the two different model profiles relative to the data is not large (fig 3 &4). The modest gains suggest that adding other depth-varying processes in the future could be valuable. Although implementation of depth-varying parameters is clearly important, diffusion alone is not a singular model fix, and the discussion and conclusion should be broadened where possible to reflect this (for example, "mainly for diffusion" in line 40 and 468 is misleading/overstated).
We agree with this statement and we add a paragraph in the conclusion to detail what should be the next step in the implementation of depth-varying parameters: "Here we presented the effect of a depth-varying diffusion constant but other parameters are depth dependent and should be represented in the next version of the model. For instance, belowground litter production in the model is simply represented by an exponential law without any representation of the effect of resource distribution on root profile (e.g. water or nutrients). This is a complex task in a land surface model aiming at running at large scale with a classical resolution of 0.5° but the soil modules of land surface models are quite sensitive to the NPP (Camino-Serrano et al., 2018; Todd-Brown et al., 2013) and a better constraint on the profile of the below ground litter production would probably improve the model performance."

I agree with Reviewer #1 on the major technical issue presented. This should be corrected prior to publication. The contribution of implementing the He et al (2016) suggested parameters is a good idea, and a nice contribution to the paper, so I would suggest retaining this model fit after updating the values as suggested by reviewer #1.
In general, figures could be made more professional, and a careful reading for grammatical errors is needed prior to publication.
The error was a typo mistake in the manuscript but we carefully checked the code and it was correct.

In summary, this manuscript should be considered for publication after major revisions, including the technical fix presented by reviewer #1, model comparison to additional soil profiles, and/or an updated discussion of the results. Minor comments are listed below.

Specific comments:
Line 40 & 468: "mainly for diffusion" is misleading as discussed above
This is removed in the revised version.

Lines 71-84: In introduction, cite other work using radiocarbon profiles to constrain soil models (e.g. Braakhekke et al, 2014; Ahrens et al, 2015)
We added the citation the papers suggested by the reviewer: "Different authors have already succesfully implemented radiocarbon in soil models and were able to clearly show that the introduction of pools with turnover time of thousands of year were unnecessarry to fit radiocarbon data (Ahrens et al., 2015) whereas Braakhekke et al., (2014) showed that after a reparameterization of the models based on radiocarbon data the prediction of their model was quite different with more carbon in top soil and less in deep soil compared to the model without radiocarbon."

Line 136-137: Please clarify, as this seems contradictory: "SOC diffusion is actually a representation of bioturbation processes (animal (and plant) activity), whereas DOC diffuses through concentration gradients." This text suggests that implementation of SOC diffusion would not be based on a concentration gradient, while the Fick's law formulation provided (138-140) relies on a concentration gradient. Also, what do you mean by "the amount of carbon in the pool subject to transport"?
Both are based on a concentration gradient but the mechanisms we aimed to represent are different since it is bioturbation for the SOC whereas it is "real" diffusion for the DOC. We clarified the sentence: "SOC diffusion is actually a representation of bioturbation processes (animal (and plant) activity), whereas DOC relies more on a non-biological diffusion. Both diffuse through concentration gradients."

Line 181...: 14C data collection:

-Please clarify: was new data collected for this paper or is this published elsewhere?
More details are now given see answer below.

-Please include a table of 14C data values, including sampling depth increments
We added the table 5 to present those data in the revised version of the manuscript.

-Please provide more methods details on soil collection and processing or reference to appropriate publication.
For the French sites information can be found in Jagercikova, M., S. Cornu, D. Bourlès, O. Evrard, C. Hatté, and J. Balesdent (2017), Quantification of vertical solid matter transfers in soils during pedogenesis by a multi-tracer approach, J. Soils Sediments, 17(2), 408–422, doi:10.1007/s11368-016-1560-9. The information is now added.
For the two other sites, data are not published yet so we added more details. See for instance for the Misiones sites: "Details on measurements and sampling can be found in Tifafi et al., in prep. Briefly, the soil was sampled in May 2015 at different depth: 0-5cm, 5-10cm, 10-15cm, 15-20cm, 20-30cm, 30-40cm, 40-50cm, 50-60cm, 60-80cm, 80-100cm. All sampled were crushed and air-dried. Once in the laboratory, they were homogenized, crushed, randomly subsampled and sieved at 200µm. Then ^{14}C measurements were made using a new Compact Radiocarbon System called ECHoMICADAS (Environment, Climate, Human, Mini Carbon Dating System) following the recommendation of Tisnérat-Laborde et al., (2015)."

-How were litter and roots handed? Included/excluded? How does that correspond to model results?
Roots were removed when visible. In the model we used only the active, slow and passive pools to calculate the F14C but as mentioned by reviewer #1 structural litter might have been included in the calculation. Nevertheless, structural litter in the model can be part of the litter produced during the on-going year but can also be few years old. Fix a threshold to determine which part of the structural litter would have been included needs underlying assumptions difficult to test. We therefore considered that only the soil carbon pools must be included in the calculation.

Line 245-255: How are soil F14C values handled in the spinup? What is the potential influence on initial soil 14C values? Spinup is only ~2 half-lives of 14C and doesn't consider atmospheric variation prior to 1700.
F14C were considered as stable before 1700. We considered this is a reasonable assumption since the variations observed from 1700 are mainly anthropogenic. The initialization procedure may indeed impact the results. If needed, we can perform a sensitivity analysis to the initial F14C.

Line 301: Please mention somewhere how comparisons are made between data and model, given differences in depths

We added this information: "The intervals of soil depth of the model outputs and the measurements were homogenized by interpolating linearly the data to common depth intervals defined for each site. The simulations and data were then compared for each depth interval."

Line 309-313 & Table 3: Visually, and discussed in the text, the sites Misiones and Feucherolles appear to have quite good fits for total soil carbon, while the fit is the worst for Mons, and also poor for Kissoko. However, the correlation coefficients are highest for Mons, but lowest for Kissoko. Is this a meaningful metric?
The good correlation coefficient for Mons is due to the relative good representation of the shape of the profile even though the mean bias is quite important as it is shown in Fig. 4. To clarify this point we added few words on this aspect at: "The correlation coefficient for Mons is relatively high compared to other site (Table 3) whereas Fig. 3 shows that the model performance was not very good for this site. This is mainly due to a large SB whereas other MSD components were rather low."

Table 3&4: Is there a reason all values have been rounded to end in .05 or .00?
It was pure random and following the recommendation of reviewer #1 we change the units of the total carbon from kg C m^{-3}in kg C m^{-2} and the values from Table 3 do not all finished by .00 or .05

Line 320-326/Fig 3: Any comments on why the model does so well in one French Luvisol (Feucherolles) and so poorly on the other (Mons) for total soil carbon? From the site description the sites sound very similar.
This model like all the models following a similar structure are quite sensitive to the litter production. For Mons a net primary production (NPP) of 6.7 t ha-1 yr-1 was estimated by the technical institute for pasture in this region of France based on the annual yields, whereas the model predicts a NPP of 7.5 t ha-1 yr-1. The large over estimation might be a consequence of a bias in NPP. As far as we know no NPP estimation is available for Feucherolles. We added this information: "For Mons a net primary production (NPP) of 6.7 t ha-1 yr-1 was estimated by the technical institute for pasture in this region of France based on the annual yields, whereas the model predicts a NPP of 7.5 t ha-1 yr-1. The large overestimation of the SOC stocks may therefore be due to an overestimation of the NPP."

Line 334: "The vertical profile of the SOC stock simulated was thereby globally not very far from that of the data". This seems like an overstatement based on results in Table 3. For example, although reported model total soil carbon is 1.7 and 2.1 overestimated at two sites with better fits, it is overestimated by a factor of 8.5 and 4.6 at the other two sites.

We rephrase to avoid overstatement. See line: "The vertical profiles of the SOC stock were fairly represented by the model"

Fig 3: Relatedly, what depth ranges are used for comparison between data and model? How does this influence the results? For example, model and data look quite similar in Fig 3 for Misiones and Feucherolles, but the mean total soil carbon is reported to be overestimated by nearly a factor of 2.
This information is now added in the method section "The intervals of soil depth of the model outputs and the measurements were homogenized by interpolating linearly the data to common depth intervals defined for each site. The simulations and data were then compared for each depth interval."

Lines 364-366: Interesting, and nice to build on He et al (2016) using a depth-resolved approach
Thanks for the positive comments.

Line 392: More explanation of the results/implications of the priming effect mentioned here would be interesting, but not required
Since we did not run our model without priming we prefer to not increase the discussion section as it is to avoid over-interpretation.

Lines 407-408: "Using a fixed diffusion constant implicitly suggests that soil fauna activity is uniform over the entire soil profile". Please add more explanation of the link between fauna activity and the diffusion term formulation for the reader. This diffusion term will vary with depth and across sites, because the Fick's law formulation also relies on the concentration gradient with depth. For example, in Kissoko, for much of the profile there is almost no change in total soil carbon with depth, so the diffusion term here would be zero. Does that imply that there is no soil fauna activity? Or simply that soil fauna activity does not result in a change in the soil carbon profile?
Here we were wanted to talk about the diffusion rate and not the entire diffusion fluxes. We clarified the sentence: "Fick's law of diffusion is classically used in models to represent bioturbation assuming that soil fauna activity may be represented following the Fick's law of diffusion (Elzein and Balesdent, 1995; Guenet et al., 2013; Koven et al., 2013; O'Brien and Stout, 1978; Wynn et al., 2005). Using a fixed diffusion constant (D in eq. 2) implicitly suggests that soil fauna activity is uniform over the entire soil profile. This is generally the case of several models of diffusion especially used at the level of an ecosystem (Bruun et al., 2007; Guimberteau et al., 2017; O'Brien and Stout, 1978). However, soil faunal activity vary naturally with depth and the diffusion constant should be depth-dependent (Jagercikova et al., 2014)."

Lines 449-454: Well-stated summary of model contributions
Thanks.

Line 457: Please mention and cite any other land surface models that incorporate soil 14C either here or in introduction.
We added a paper by Koven et al., 2013 in Biogeosciences.

Lines 466-468: “This suggests that, from now on, model improvements should mainly focus on a depth dependent parameterization, mainly for diffusion.” Although diffusion did improve model results, the change was not dramatic. Please make sure the language used here reflects the results.
This was rephrased in the revised version

-Broadly, figure aesthetics should be updated to look more professional throughout prior to publication. For example:
-Fig 7. Please label x & y axis. Please write depth increments for each bar on y-axis instead of 1-11. Also, in some of the panels numbers 11 and 12 are cutoff (eg 1..)
-Fig 3-7: Use more professional titles and punctuation on figures (eg. rather than “Model_Control” , “Model_Test He”, etc.)
-Fig 7: It appears there are stray line numbers throughout the figures which will presumably be removed once the line numbers have been removed (eg fig 4,6,7)
-Update “litter structural below” and “litter metabolic below” to more clear and professional names
All the figures have redo to more professional aspects.

-Fig 7 is instructive and interesting. However, what is the reason for the “litter structural below” to decrease then increase again at the deepest depths in some of the profiles?
The question might be that the diffusion constant D in deep layers has very low values in deep soil because of the depth-varying equations we used. Therefore the diffusion fluxes are quite limited in deep layers. Furthermore, in deep soil the temperature is rather stable and those layers don’t face important temperature increase in summer leading to high decomposition rates. Then, in deep soil the decomposition is limited and diffusion is not strong enough to homogenize the profile.

Language Comments: A careful and significant reading for grammatical errors and typos is needed prior to publication. A large number of very small changes are required.
All the grammatical errors were corrected and a native English speaker read the revised manuscript.
Here are a few examples (not comprehensive):
Line 59: “simulate” should be “simulates”
Line 71: typo “thIS"
Lines 74-77: very confusingly worded sentence
Line 81: “have” should be “has”
Line 84:”because of the conceptual description by pools non measurable” – fix grammar
Line 92: “yielded for the abrupt increase of atmospheric 14C concentration that doubles in 2-3 years.” -clarify language
Line 198: “Congo Republic” should be “Republic of Congo”
Line 337: Missing period at end of sentence
Lines 659-660: “over the profile according to total soil carbon” - Meaning is unclear

Additional references:

Ahrens et al (2015). Contribution of sorption, DOC transport and microbial interactions to the 14C age of a soil organic carbon profile: Insights from a calibrated process model. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 88. pp. 390-402.

Braakhekke et al (2014). The use of radiocarbon to constrain current and future soil organic matter turnover and transport in a temperate forest. Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 119(3).

Mathieu et al (2015). Deep soil carbon dynamics are driven more by soil type than by climate: a worldwide meta-analysis of radiocarbon profiles. Global Change Biology, 21. pp. 4278-4292.

Answer to comments from the reviewer #3.

We thank reviewer for the constructive evaluation of the manuscript. Please find below our answers to questions/comments. Comments from the reviewer were left intentionally in this document and written in roman font. Our answers are written in italics.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 23 August 2018

The cycling of organic matter through soil ecosystems is highly simplified in land surface models. This is a major source of uncertainty in projections of the terrestrial carbon sink under global climate change. Measurements of the radioactive carbon isotope ^{14}C provides a powerful constraint for soil carbon models which include a radiocarbon tracer component. This manuscript documents the addition of a radiocarbon tracer component into the ORCHIDEE land model in order to enable radiocarbon constraints in it and in the IPSL Earth System Model it is coupled with. This study then demonstrated applying this constraint to the model based on several vertically-resolved soil radiocarbon profiles.

General comments:

The paper represents a substantial advance in the ORCHIDEE/IPSL model, which is an important tool in climate science, and has broader implications for other models. As such, it is well within the scope of GMD, and would represent a meaningful contribution to the field. However, there are several issues that would need to be addressed before I could recommend it for publication. I have detailed these issues below, and I hope that by addressing them, the authors will return with an improved presentation of this worthwhile research.

Thanks for the positive comments.

Major issue 1:

There are a couple of major issues with the Model_Test_He experiment. He et al (2006) suggested scaling the passive pool turnover time in IPSL/ORCHIDEE by 14, while scaling the slow-to-passive transfer coefficient by 0.07. I applaud the authors'effort to test this suggestion. However, the manuscript lacks a detailed explanation of exactly which quantities were scaled, and which of the arrows in Figure 1 corresponds with the first column of Table 2. The reduced complexity models of He et al consisted of three pools in series, whereas Figure 1 implies that ORCHIDEE has three soil pools that each independently exchange with a single pool of free DOC. Therefore, it seems that ORCHIDEE does not have a single transfer coefficient between slow and passive pools.

To avoid making the manuscript too long we did not give all the details of the model construction (we mainly refer to Camino-Serrano et al. 2018) and mainly information on the ^{14}C-related part. Nevertheless, in the model when the decomposed SOC goes to DOC, we keep track of the pool where it came from and the redistribution of the DOC once decomposed into SOC follows the same parameterization than the ORCHIDEE version incorporated to the IPSL-ESM used by He et al., (2016). We therefore considered that using those parameter values still makes sense.

Furthermore, as pointed out in RC1, there seems to be an arithmetic error in the scaling of this transfer coefficient. The first and third rows of Table 2 imply that ORCHIDEE has some parameter with a value of 0.07 (this parameter being what needs improved explanation). Multiplying this by the scaling factor suggested in He et al would yield 0.0049, but it seems that 0.049 was used instead. The result is that the passive pool turnover time is increased by an order of magnitude without an equivalent adjustment to the inputs to this pool, leading to a large accumulation of radiocarbon-depleted SOM. This explains why the Model_Test_He experiment is so far off in Figures 3 and 5, and why the standard bias is so high in Figures 4 and 6.

I would encourage the authors to re-run this experiment with the correct values and keep it in the manuscript (and, unlike RC1, I have no problem with the name). I understand that the recommended values were for a previous version of IPSL/ORCHIDEE, and that some of the changes since then (yielding ORCHIDEE-SOM, detailed in Camino-Serano et al , 2017) make the recommended changes superfluous by accounting for priming. Nevertheless, I think that testing these recommendations is a worthwhile exercise, even with this updated model version, and I would be interested in seeing it done correctly.

The error was a typo mistake in the manuscript but we carefully checked the code and we used the good value for the simulations.

Major issue 2:

There is insufficient explanation of the depths at which the observational (field) data were sampled, and how that was compared with the model output. Figure 1 explains sufficiently the depth of the soil layers in the ORCHIDEE model (though an explanation in the main text would be welcome as well). The depth of the field measurements can be seen in Figures 3 and 5, but not with enough resolution to really understand. Was each field profile sampled at the exact same depths as the layers in ORCHIDEE, or is there some interpolation going on between one or the other?

More information is now given in the method section: "The intervals of soil depth of the model outputs and the measurements were homogenized by interpolating linearly the data to common depth intervals defined for each site. The simulations and data were then compared for each depth interval."

The statistics in Section 2.6 are all over a dimension i, which I assume to represent the layers over depth, but this is not clearly stated. Given the importance of this i, we need more detail as to what it is.

We added this information: "x refers to the model outputs and y to the measurements, while i refers to soil depth."

I would prefer to see an additional table or additional information in Table 1 to indicate how many samples were taken at each site and at what depths. And, most importantly, some explanation in the methods of how layer depths were harmonized between the model and observations, including an indication of the size of I (i.e., the n in the equations of Section 2.6).

We added a table given the different layers and we add information on the interpolation method we used to compare data and model outputs (see previous answer).

Moreover, the specific depths at which the observed and modeled layers are compared should be clearly visible in Figures 3 and 5. The field observations are shown as points, with a single depth. Were measurements taken just at those single depths? Or were entire layers sampled with an upper and lower boundary depth? The model is presumably providing an average concentration of carbon (and radiocarbon) for entire layers, but the lines in Figures 3 and 5 make it seem like the data are continuous rather than discrete.

Since in the revised version of the manuscript we give both the interpolation method and the layers depth we hope that enough information is given to avoid misunderstanding.

Finally, the absence of explicit field data hinders the reproducibility of the study. The methods are described sufficiently to reproduce the study, and the model source code is available (though the web link has a problem, see below). But the study cannot be truly replicated without having access to the field data that were used. Including the field data in tabular format (perhaps as supplementary material) would go a long way toward making the methods more understandable and facilitating reproducibility.

Some of the data are already published and we refer now to the proper citation but others will be presented in an in prep. manuscript by the same authors. More details are now given. For instance: "Details on measurements and sampling can be found in Tifafi et al., In prep. Briefly, the soil was sampled in May 2015 at different depth: 0-5cm, 5-10cm, 10-15cm, 15-20cm, 20-30cm, 30-40cm, 40-50cm, 50-60cm, 60-80cm, 80-100cm. All sampled were crushed and air-dried. Once in the laboratory, they were homogenized, crushed, randomly subsampled and sieved at 200µm. Then ^{14}C measurements were made using a new Compact Radiocarbon System called ECHoMICADAS (Environment, Climate, Human, Mini Carbon Dating System) following the recommendations of Tisnérat-Laborde et al., (2015)."

Major issue 3:

The authors provide some interpretation of each of the individual results in Section 3, but the manuscript lacks an overall discussion of the big-picture implications of these results and how they serve to advance scientific knowledge. The introduction section provides a compelling motivation for the study, but the manuscript lacks a sufficient discussion of how the current study informs these issues, what can be learned about SOM processes and soil-climate interactions, and what the implications are for the use of ESMs to project future climate change. I would like to see an expanded discussion of how these results fit in with the larger body of literature. The authors neglect to acknowledge that radiocarbon has already been implemented in a well known ESM (the Community Earth System Mode, CESM), and therefore do not discuss how their results relate to the existing work. The authors do cite the paper that would be relevant for this (Koven et al, 2013) in the context of diffusion representing bioturbation (line 406), but I would like to see an expanded discussion of how the results from the two papers potentially inform each other.

The paper by Koven et al., 2013 is now properly cited to its contribution "ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C, is one of the first land surface models that incorporates the ^{14}C dynamic in the soil (Koven et al., 2013)."

And more discussion has been added. For instance: "We limited our work here to depth-varying diffusion, but other parameters are also depth dependent and should be represented as such in the next version of the model. For instance, belowground litter production in the model is simply represented by an exponential law without any representation of the effect of resource distribution on root profile (e.g. water or nutrients). This is a complex task in a land surface model running at large scale with a classical resolution of 0.5°, but the soil modules of land surface models are quite sensitive to the NPP (Camino-Serrano et al., 2018; Todd-Brown et al., 2013) and a better constraint on the profile of the below ground litter production would likely improve the model performance. Furthermore, here we used only one averaged value over the soil profile for soil boundary conditions (texture, pH, bulk density) but those variables are known to impact the F^{14}C (Mathieu et al., 2015) and change with depth (Barré et al., 2009) and depth-varying boundary conditions may also help to improve the model."

Or "Nevertheless, the model evaluation performed here on only four sites should be considered as proof of concept and more in depth evaluation are needed, in particular using a large ^{14}C database available at global scale (Balesdent et al., 2018; Mathieu et al., 2015). Indeed, the F^{14}C is largely controlled by pedo-climatic conditions such as clay content, climate and mineralogy (Mathieu et al., 2015) and the range of situations we covered here is relatively limited."

Minor issues and technical corrections:

All the minor issues and technical corrections were taken into account.

Abbreviations: there are some abbreviations that are used without an explicit definition. In some cases, they are defined later, but they should be defined in the first instance of use. I would avoid abbreviating SOC and SOM in the abstract, since neither one is used again in the abstract and just use the full text instead (but then define the abbreviation and begin using it when it first appears int he main body of the text). The abbreviation "F14C" for fraction modern is used in the abstract, but not explicitly defined. "IPSL" is used several times before it is defined on line 105, and ORCHIDEE is never defined.

Line 71: spurious capitalization in the word "this"
Line 74: The sentence that begins on this line is too long, and should be broken up into at least two sentences to be understandable.
Line 75: "implementing" should be "to implement"
Lines 91-92: The decades should not have apostrophes (e.g., 1950s, not 1950’s)
Line 93: Remove the word "since"
Line 94: Should be "As WITH any other carbon isotopes"
Lines 106–113: I am not sure how useful it is to list the names of the sub-components of ORCHIDEE without any further indication of how these components fit in to the present study. Instead, I would prefer to see a description of how ORCHIDEE fits into the larger ESM (e.g., which fluxes and state variables coupled it with the atmospheric model).
Line 158: There is some rendering issue with the δ (delta) symbol in δ13C; please double check.
Line 162: The abbreviations Asample and Aref should be explicitly defined for the sake of the reader who may be new to the concepts of radiocarbon.
Lines 167–179: There is some inconsistency between the main text and the equations regarding abbreviations. The text uses"14C" while the equations use "carbon14". I believe these are supposed to represent the same thing, and should therefore have the same abbreviations for clarity.
Lines 184–212: Some measurements include a space between the quantity and the units (e.g., "680 mm" on line 185) while others do not (e.g., "1.5m" on line 186)
Line 192: Define the abbreviation LSCE
Line 194: Define the abbreviation LMC14
Line 197: Define the abbreviation SOERE F-ORE-T
Line 232: The term "turnover rate” is ambiguous. I assume the authors mean "turnover time" since this is what He et al suggest should be scaled by 14, which would be the inverse of the decay "rate".
Line 252: What assumptions were made about the atmospheric 14C content during spinup?
Line 256: Were simulations actually run at a yearly time step? Section 2.1 indicates that some model components have a much shorter time step. Also, for comparison with the field data, was the final (2011) time step used?
Lines 339–340: Something is wrong with this sentence grammatically, which makes it difficult to interpret.
Lines 392–393: The 50
Line 408: Remove the word "fact" or add the word "in" before it.
Line 465-466: Please revise this sentence for grammatical accuracy.

Line 477: The provided website address links to a page that has issues with the SSL certificate, and will not load in any web browser without having to make a security exception. Providing the link as http rather than https would fix this issue, though the preferred solution would be maintain the https link and insure that the website has a valid SSL certificate.

The use of radiocarbon ^{14}C to constrain carbon dynamics in the soil module of the land surface model ORCHIDEE (SVN r5165)

Marwa Tifafi[1], Marta Camino-Serrano[2,3], Christine Hatté[1], Hector Morras[4], Lucas Moretti[5], Sebastián Barbaro[5], Sophie Cornu[6], Bertrand Guenet[1]

[1]Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE/IPSL, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France.
[2]CREAF, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193, Catalonia, Spain
[3]CSIC, Global Ecology Unit CREAF-CSIC-UAB, Bellaterra 08193, Catalonia, Spain
[4]INTA-CIRN, Instituto de Suelos, 1712 Castelar, Buenos Aires, Argentina
[5] INTA-EEA Cerro Azul, 3313 Cerro Azul, Misiones, Argentina
[6]Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, IRD, INRA, Coll France, CEREGE, Aix-en-Provence, France

Corresponding authors: Marwa Tifafi (marwa.tifafi@lsce.ipsl.fr)

Abstract. Despite the importance of soil as a large component of the terrestrial ecosystems, the soil compartments are not well represented in the Land Surface Models (LSMs). Indeed, soils in current LSMs are generally represented based on a very simplified schema that can induce a misrepresentation of the deep dynamics of soil carbon. Here, we present a new version of the Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL) Land Surface Model called ORCHIDEE-SOM (ORganizing Carbon and Hydrology in Dynamic EcosystEms-Soil Organic Matter), incorporating the ^{14}C dynamic in the soil. ORCHIDEE-SOM first simulates soil carbon dynamics for different layers, down to 2 m depth. Second, concentration of dissolved organic carbon and its transport are modeled. Finally, soil organic carbon decomposition is considered taking into account the priming effect.

After implementing ^{14}C in the soil module of the model, we evaluated model outputs against observations of soil organic carbon and modern ^{14}C fraction (F^{14}C) for different sites with different characteristics. The model managed to reproduce the soil organic carbon stocks and the F^{14}C along the vertical profiles for the sites examined. However, an overestimation of the total carbon stock was noted, primarily on the surface layer. Due to ^{14}C, it is possible to probe carbon age in the soil, which was found to underestimated. Thereafter, two different tests on this new version have been established. The first was to increase carbon residence time of the passive pool and decrease the flux from the slow pool to the passive pool. The second was to establish an equation of diffusion, initially constant throughout the profile, making it vary exponentially as a function of depth. The first modifications did not improve the capacity of the model to reproduce observations whereas the second test improved both estimation of surface soil carbon stock as well as soil carbon age. This demonstrates that we should focus more on vertical variation of soil parameters as a function of depth, in order to upgrade the representation of global carbon cycle in LSMs, thereby helping to improve predictions of the of soil organic carbon to environmental changes.

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé:

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:58
Supprimé: -

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 07:58
Supprimé: ,

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 07:58
Supprimé: ,

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:57
Supprimé: (DOC)

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:57
Supprimé: (SOC)

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 07:59
Supprimé: the

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:58
Supprimé: activity

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 07:59
Supprimé: chosen here

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:00
Supprimé: but was mostly marked

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:01
Supprimé: Then, thanks to the introduction of

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:01
Supprimé: has

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:02
Supprimé: been possible to highlight an underestimation of the age of carbon in the soil

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:05
Supprimé: showed a decrease of the soil carbon stock overestimation, especially at the surface and an improvement of the estimates of the carbon age

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:06
Supprimé: assumes

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:17
Supprimé: (?)

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:23
Supprimé: mainly for diffusion,

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:17
Supprimé: future response

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:17
Supprimé: global warming

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:18
Supprimé: ... [1]

1 Introduction

The complexity of the mechanisms involved in controlling soil activity (Jastrow et al., 2007) and therefore the carbon flux from the soil to the atmosphere makes predicting the response of these systems to climate change extremely complex. Thus our ability to predict future changes in carbon stocks in soils using global climate models is currently heavily criticized (Todd-Brown et al., 2013; Wieder et al., 2013). Indeed, Earth System Models (ESMs) are increasingly used today in order to predict the future evolution of the climate. For instance, results of a set of ESMs are taken into account within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Taylor et al., 2012) for assessment of the impacts of climate change and design of mitigation strategies. Hence, their predictions need to be as accurate as possible. These models represent the physical, chemical and biological processes within and between the atmosphere, ocean and terrestrial biosphere. They allow us to follow and understand both the effect of the climate on carbon storage and vice versa. However, ESMs are continuously under development and some key processes in the global carbon cycle are still missing or not represented with the necessary details. One of the components of an ESM is the land surface model (LSM). This component primarily manages the carbon cycle, energy and water on land and simulates the carbon exchange between the land surface and the atmosphere, namely the gross primary production (GPP), the autrophic and heterotrophic respiration.

Despite the importance of soils as a large component of the global carbon storage, soil compartments are not well represented in LSMs (Todd-Brown et al., 2013). Indeed, carbon dynamics in soil described in LSMs are based on the "Century" (Parton et al., 1987) or Roth-C models (Coleman et al., 1997) where soil carbon is represented as several pools with different turnover rates for each pool. Carbon is decomposed in each pool, one part of which is then transferred from one pool to another and the other part is lost through heterotrophic respiration. In addition, soils are generally represented as a single-layer box in LSMs that do not take into account the evolution and variation of soil organic processes as a function of depth (Todd-Brown et al., 2013).

One way to reconcile this simplified representation of carbon dynamics of the models with the complexity of the data collected in the field is to integrate isotopic tracers into the models themselves and thus facilitate the comparison between model outputs and data (He et al., 2016). Moreover, thanks to an additive constraints on the model structure, this may improve the model performances. For instance, radiocarbon is an important tool for studying the dynamics of soil organic matter (Trumbore, 2000). Indeed, ^{14}C data acquired from soil organic matter provide complementary information on the dynamics (temporal dimension) of soil organic matter. This tracer has the major advantage of being integrator of carbon dynamics on long time scales (a few decades to several centuries). It is therefore a very powerful tool to constrain conceptual schemes that may not be directly compared to variables measured in the field (Elliott et al., 1996). Different authors have already succesfully implemented radiocarbon in soil models and were able to clearly show that the introduction of pools with turnover time of thousands of year were unnecessarry to fit radiocarbon data (Ahrens et al., 2015) whereas Braakhekke et al., (2014) showed that after a reparameterization of the models based on radiocarbon data the prediction of their model was quite different with more carbon in top soil and less in deep soil compared to the model without radiocarbon.

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:08
Supprimé: of the processes governing storage and destocking at variable time and space scales …s currently heavily criticized (... [2]

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:21
Supprimé: …nd heterotrophic soil ... [3]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:57
Supprimé: the…soil compartments ar ... [4]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: thIS

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 08:59
Supprimé: to

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:21
Supprimé: Indeed, in order to be more pertinentrelevant to in evaluating the parameters and the equations of the newly implemented processes, it is of interest implementing carbon isotope dynamics in the model itself, this to facilitate the comparison between model outputs and available observations…Moreover,… but also… ... [5]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:01
Supprimé: on…soil organic matter, ... [6]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:36
Supprimé: ve…the major advantage o ... [7]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:03
Supprimé: succesfully…radiocarbon ... [8]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:30
Supprimé: (

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:03
Supprimé: were

Radiocarbon is produced naturally at a constant rate in the upper atmosphere through bombardment of cosmic rays. It thus provides information on the dynamics of organic matter that has been stabilized by interaction with mineral surfaces and stored long enough for significant radioactive decay (Trumbore, 2000), as the half-life of ^{14}C is about 5730 years. We must also take into account radiocarbon produced during atmospheric tests of thermonuclear weapons in the early sixties (Delibrias et al., 1964; Hua et al., 2013). Atmospheric bomb testing in the late 1950s and early 1960s lead to an abrupt doubling of atmospheric ^{14}C concentration in a span of 2-3 years. Through exchange with ocean and terrestrial reservoirs, it has decreased but still remains above the natural background. As with any other carbon isotopes, this ^{14}C was metabolized by the vegetation and transferred to soil. By measuring ^{14}C activity of a soil sample, it is possible to evaluate the amount of carbon introduced into the soil since the 1960s (Balesdent and Guillet, 1982; Scharpenseel and Schiffmann, 1977).

In this study, we present a new version of the IPSL-Land Surface Model called ORCHIDEE-SOM incorporating ^{14}C dynamics in the soil. Thanks to this tracer, we can evaluate the SOC dynamics, in particular by looking at the ^{14}C peak produced by atmospheric weapons testing and observed in the soils at four different sites having different biomes.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 ORCHIDEE-SOM overview

ORCHIDEE is the Land Surface Model of the IPSL Earth System Model (Krinner et al., 2005). It is composed of three different modules. First, SECHIBA (Ducoudré et al., 1993; Rosnay and Polcher, 1998), the surface-vegetation-atmosphere transfer scheme, describes the soil water budget and energy and water exchanges. The time step of this module is 30 min. Second, the module of the vegetation dynamics has been taken from the dynamic global vegetation model LPJ (Sitch et al., 2003). The time step of this module is one year. Finally, the STOMATE (Saclay Toulouse Orsay Model for the Analysis of Terrestrial Ecosystems) module simulates vegetation phenology and carbon dynamics with a time step of one day.

ORCHIDEE can be run coupled to a global circulation model where the boundary conditions of the model are provided by the atmospheric modules (temperature, precipitation, atmospheric CO_2 concentration, etc.). In return ORCHIDEE provides the land surface carbon, energy and water fluxes. However, since our study focuses on changes in the land surface rather than on the interaction with climate, we ran ORCHIDEE in the off-line configuration. In this case, atmospheric conditions such as temperature, humidity and wind are read from a meteorological dataset. The climate data CRUNCEP used for our study (6-hourly climate data over several years) were obtained from the combination of two existing datasets: the Climate Research Unit (CRU) (Mitchell et al., 2004) and the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) (Kalnay et al., 1996).

Our starting point is a ORCHIDEE-SOM version based on the SVN r3340 (Krinner et al., 2005), which is presented in detail in Camino-Serrano et al. (2017). Figure 1 represents how the soil is described in this new version. Indeed, the major particularity of ORCHIDEE-SOM is that it simulates the dynamics of soil carbon for eleven layers from the surface to two

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:04
Supprimé: First, there is the natural ... [9]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:02
Supprimé: '… and early 1960'… yiel ... [10]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:07
Supprimé: increase…of atmospheric ... [11]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:03
Supprimé: since …ut still remains ab ... [12]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:11
Supprimé: the

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:58
Supprimé: (Institut Pierre Simon Laplace)

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:12
Supprimé: S…rface-vegetation-atmo ... [13]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:14
Supprimé: ies…conditions of the mo ... [14]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:16
Supprimé: the… ORCHIDEE-SOM ... [15]

meters depth. First, litter is divided into four pools: metabolic or structural litter pools which can be found below or aboveground. Only the belowground litter is modeled on eleven levels, from surface to 2 m depth, as the aboveground litter layer has a fixed thickness of 10 mm. Second, SOC is divided into three pools (active, passive and slow), following Parton et al. (1988), which differ in their turnover rates and which are discretized into 11 layers up to a depth of two meters. Then, dissolved organic carbon (DOC) is represented as two pools and also discretized over 11 layers up to a depth of two meters: labile DOC has a high decomposition rate and recalcitrant DOC has a low decomposition rate (Camino-Serrano et al., 2018). Finally, another particularity of this version of ORCHIDEE-SOM is that the SOC decomposition is modified to account for the priming effect following Guenet et al. (2016). Briefly, priming is described following equation 1.

$$\frac{\partial SOC_{i,z}}{\partial t} = DOC_{Recycled,i,j}(t) - k_{SOC,i} \times (1 - e^{-c \times LOC_z(t)}) \times SOC(t)_{i,z} \times \theta(t) \times \tau(t) \qquad (1)$$

with $DOC_{recycled}$ being the unrespired DOC that is redistributed into the pool *i* considered for each soil layer *z* in g C m^{-2} days^{-1}, k_{SOC} being a SOC decomposition rate constant (days^{-1}), and *LOC* being the stock of labile organic C defined as the sum of the C pools with a higher decomposition rate than the pool considered within each soil layer *z*. We therefore considered that for the active carbon pool LOC is the litter and DOC, but for the slow carbon pool LOC is the sum of the litter, DOC and so on. Finally, *c* is a parameter controlling the impact of the *LOC* pool on the *SOC* mineralization rate, i.e., the priming effect. The equation was parameterized based on soil incubations data and evaluated over litter manipulation experiments (Guenet et al. 2016).

Since the soil profile is divided into 11 layers, SOC and DOC transport following the diffusion must also be described. SOC diffusion is actually a representation of bioturbation processes (animal and plant activity), whereas DOC relies more on non-biological diffusion. Both diffuse through concentration gradients.

This is represented using the Fick's law (Braakhekke et al., 2011; Elzein and Balesdent, 1995; O'Brien and Stout, 1978; Wynn et al., 2005):

$$F_D = -D * \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} \qquad (2)$$

Where F_D is the flux of carbon transported by diffusion in g C m^{-3} day^{-1}, *D* is the diffusion coefficient (m^2 day^{-1}) and *C* is the amount of carbon in the pool (DOC or SOC) subject to transport (g C m^{-3}). The diffusion coefficient is assumed to be constant across the soil profile in ORCHIDEE-SOM but the diffusion parameters (D) used in the equations for SOC and DOC can differ.

2.2 ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C

In ORCHIDEE-SOM, the different compartments (soil carbon input, litter, SOC, DOC and heterotrophic respiration) are presented as a matrix with a single dimension referring to the total carbon. In order to introduce the ^{14}C, a new dimension has been added to all the variables cited above. Thus, all processes that apply to the total soil carbon are now also represented for ^{14}C. We label this new version including ^{14}C as ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C.

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:19
Supprimé: 11
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:19
Supprimé: horizons
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:19
Supprimé: however
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:19
Supprimé: ,
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:19
Supprimé: ,
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:20
Supprimé: into
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:20
Supprimé: the
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:20
Supprimé: with
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:20
Supprimé: the
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:20
Supprimé: with
Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:28
Mis en forme: Default, Gauche, Espace Après : 6 pt
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:22
Supprimé: not
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:22
Supprimé: -
Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:27
Mis en forme: Non Exposant/ Indice
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:50
Supprimé: is
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:50
Supprimé: (
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:50
Supprimé:)
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:51
Supprimé: a
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:38
Supprimé: s
Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:30
Supprimé: . . .
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 1
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:51
Supprimé: are
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:51
Supprimé: different
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:52
Supprimé: T
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:52
Supprimé: the
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:52
Supprimé: will be called

Several ways of reporting ^{14}C activity levels are available. We chose to use the *fraction modern*, with the $F^{14}C$ symbol as advocated by Reimer et al. (2004) rather than absolute concentration of ^{14}C (reported as Bq).

$$F^{14}C = \left({A_S}/{0.95\, A_{OX1}}\right) * \left({0.975}/{0.981}\right)^2 * \left[\left(1 + {\delta^{13}C_{OX1}}/{1000}\right) / \left(1 + {\delta^{13}C_S}/{1000}\right)\right]^2 \qquad (3)$$

with A = $^{14}C/^{12}C$, S for sample, OX1 for Oxalic Acid 1, the ^{14}C international standard.

$F^{14}C$ is twice normalized: i) it takes into account isotopic fractionation by being normalized to a $\delta^{13}C = -25$‰, and ii) it corresponds to a deviation towards an international standard (i.e. 95% of OX1 as measured in 1950 – (Stuiver and Polach, 1977)). By propagating $F^{14}C$ from atmosphere at the origin of vegetal photosynthesis to soil respired CO_2, there is no need to focus on ^{13}C isotopic fractionation all along the organic matter mineralization with $F^{14}C$.

To make the reading of the paper easier, we will further express $F^{14}C$ as $F^{14}C = A_{sample}/A_{ref}$ with A_{sample} being the A of the measured (or modeled) data and A_{ref} an international reference. Normalizations are included in A_{ref} and $F^{14}C$ will be written as F^{14} to simplify notation involving superscripts and subscripts.

Since we focus on SOC dynamics, we did not include the ^{14}C in the plants but did include ^{14}C in the litter. The ^{14}C-litter is obtained by multiplying the atmospheric value by the total carbon in the litter:

$$Litter\ (^{14}C) = F^{14}_{atm} * Litter\ (C) \qquad (4)$$

where F^{14}_{atm} is the $F^{14}C$ of atmosphere at the time of leaf growth (figure 2).

Thus, from the litter, all processes defined in section 2.1 that apply to total soil carbon are also represented for ^{14}C.

We also take into account the radioactive decay of ^{14}C. For that, we calculate the amount of ^{14}C as follow:

$$^{14}C = {}^{14}C - K_{decrease} * {}^{14}C \qquad (5)$$

Where $k_{decrease}$ is the radioactive decay constant (= Ln2/5730) (Godwin, 1962)

The $F^{14}C$ of the soil is then calculated back for carbon, per pool:

$$F^{14}_{Pool,z} = \frac{^{14}C_{Pool,z}}{C_{Pool,z}} \qquad (6)$$

with *pool* representing the active, slow or passive pool.

Finally, we calculate a mean $F^{14}C$ value per soil layer, according to the depth:

$$F^{14}_{Mean,z} = \frac{F^{14}_{active,z} * {}^{14}C_{active,z} + F^{14}_{slow,z} * {}^{14}C_{slow,z} + F^{14}_{passive,z} * {}^{14}C_{passive,z}}{^{14}C_{active,z} + {}^{14}C_{slow,z} + {}^{14}C_{passive,z}} \qquad (7)$$

2.3 Site descriptions

2.3.1 French sites

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:53
Supprimé: that should be

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 09:59
Commentaire [1]: Delta symbol to checked in the pdf (comments from ref#1)

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:31
Supprimé: … …2 ... [16]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé:)

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:53
Supprimé: -

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 22:53
Supprimé: d…3C=- ... [17]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:53
Supprimé: -

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:53
Supprimé: easier …he reading of the ... [18]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:08
Supprimé: normalizations

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:54
Supprimé: to

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:31
Supprimé: ··· ... [19]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:55
Supprimé: the …otation with…nvol ... [20]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:55
Supprimé: directly …n the litter. The ... [21]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 3

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:31
Supprimé: = $-K_{decrease}$ * ... [22]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: (=

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 09:59
Supprimé: Then…he, ... [23]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 5

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:00
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Italique, Anglais (E.U.), Motif : Transparente (Blanc)

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:00
Supprimé: So f

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 6

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:01
Supprimé: s

Two Luvisol (WRB, 2006) profiles located in the northern France were selected: the Feucherolles and Mons sites. In Mons (49.87°N, 3.03°E), Luvisol, the soils sit under grassland, and are developed from several meters of loess and therefore well drained. The mean annual air temperature is 11°C and the annual precipitation is about 680 mm (Keyvanshokouhi et al., 2016). In Feucherolles (48.9°N, 1.97°E), the soil sits under oak forest and clay and gritstone deposits are found at approximately 1.5 m depth. The mean annual air temperature is 11.2°C and the annual precipitation is about 660 mm (Keyvanshokouhi et al., 2016). Both soils are neutral to slightly acidic and are characterized by the presence of a clay accumulation Bt horizon with clay content reaching 30 % for Feucherolles and 27 % for Mons, while the upper horizons are poorer in clay (17 % for Feucherolles and 20% for Mons).

The ^{14}C data from the soils of both sites were obtained after chemical treatment done at Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE) using a protocol adapted to achieve carbonate leaching without any loss of organic carbon; ^{14}C activity was measured by AMS at the French Laboratoire de mesure du ^{14}C (LMC14) facility (Cottereau et al., 2007). Details on measurements and sampling can be found in Jagercikova et al., (2017)

2.3.2 Congo site

The studied site is located in Kissoko (4.35°S, 11.75°E). It belongs to the SOERE F-ORE-T (Site de l'ObservatoirE de Recherche en Environnement sur le Fonctionnement des écosystèmes fOREsTiers) field observation sites of Pointe Noire, Republic of Congo. The mean annual air temperature is about 25°C with low seasonal variation (± 5°C), and average annual precipitation of 1400mm, and a dry season between June and September. The deep acidic sandy soil is a ferralic Arenosol (WRB, 2006). The soil is characterized by a sand content larger than 90% (Laclau et al., 2000). A soil profile was taken under native savanna vegetation dominated by C4 plants (Epron et al., 2009). The soil was sampled in May 2014 at different depths: 0-5cm, 5-10cm, 10-15cm, 15-20cm, 20-30cm, 30-40cm, 40-50cm, 50-60cm, 60-80cm, 80-100cm, 100-120cm. All samples were crushed and air-dried. Once in the laboratory, they were homogenized, crushed, randomly subsampled and sieved at 200µm. Then ^{14}C measurements were made the same way as the two French sites, using the LSCE chemical treatment and the French LMC14 facility following recommendations by Cottereau et al., (2007).

2.3.3 Argentina site

The Province of Misiones is located in northeastern Argentina. The climate is subtropical humid without a dry season, an annual mean temperature of 20°C and 1850mm of mean annual rainfall (Morrás et al., 2009). The profile used in this study is located in the southern part of Misiones (27°S, 55°W). Native vegetation is a forest dominated by C3 plants. The soil selected is an Acrisol (WRB, 2006). It's a red clay soil, strongly to very strongly acid with a clay content varying from 40% at the surface to 60% at 1m depth. ^{14}C measurements were made using a new Compact Radiocarbon System called *ECHo*MICADAS (Environment, Climate, Human, Mini Carbon Dating System) (Tisnérat-Laborde et al., 2015). Details on measurements and sampling can be found in Tifafi et al., *In prep*. Briefly, the soil was sampled in May 2015 at different depths: 0-5cm, 5-10cm, 10-15cm, 15-20cm, 20-30cm, 30-40cm, 40-50cm, 50-60cm, 60-80cm, 80-100cm. All samples were crushed and air-dried. Once

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:01
Supprimé: (

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:02
Supprimé: are

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:02
Supprimé: thus

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:02
Supprimé: s

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:03
Supprimé: , site (48.9°N, 1.97°E),

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 5m

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:05
Supprimé: ,

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:05
Supprimé: and [1]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:05
Supprimé: measurement performed

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 12:59
Supprimé: (

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:38
Supprimé: Republic

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:05
Supprimé: of

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:05
Supprimé: s

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:06
Supprimé: and

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:06
Supprimé: averages

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:06
Supprimé: with

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:06
Supprimé: N

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:07
Supprimé: is a savanna

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:07
Supprimé: and the selected soil profile is under this native savanna vegetation

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:07
Supprimé: d

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:21
Supprimé: ^{14}C analyses were made in

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:21
Supprimé: with the measurements for

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:21
Supprimé: (

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:48
Supprimé: of mean annual temperature

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:49
Supprimé: d

in the laboratory, they were homogenized, crushed, randomly subsampled and sieved at 200µm. Then ^{14}C measurements were made using a new Compact Radiocarbon System called *ECHo*MICADAS (Environment, Climate, Human, Mini Carbon Dating System) following the recommendations of Tisnérat-Laborde et al., (2015).

For the four sites, the SOC (kg m^{-3}), for each depth *z*, was calculated using carbon content and bulk density data using the following equation:

$$SOC_z = OCC_z * BD_z \qquad (8)$$

Where *OCC* (wt/wt) is the carbon content and BD (kg m^{-3}) is the bulk density.

2.4 Different model tests

After the implementation of radiocarbon in the model, different tests were carried out (Table 2). Here we represent the outputs provided by three simulations:

i- Simulation using the initial version ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (labelled "Control" in figures and tables) in which no changes were made. The diffusion was kept constant throughout the profile (D = 1.10^{-4} m^2 year^{-1}) and the other parameters are those of the detailed version in Camino-Serrano et al., (2017).

ii- Simulation using the initial version ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C in which we modified some parameters following He et al. (2016) ("He et al., (2016) parameterization" in figures and tables). In brief, the authors used ^{14}C data from 157 globally distributed soil profiles sampled to 1-meter depth to evaluate CMIP5 models. Their results show that ESMs underestimated the mean age of soil carbon by a factor of more than six and overestimated the carbon sequestration potential of soils by a factor of nearly two. So, the suggestion (that we apply in this simulation) for the IPSL model was to multiply the turnover time of the passive pool by 14 and the flux from slow pool to passive pool by 0.07 (Table 2). The diffusion was kept constant throughout the profile (D = 1.10^{-4} m^2 year^{-1}) but the turnover time of the passive pool increased from 462 years to 6468 years and the flux from the slow pool to the passive pool decreased from 0.07 to 0.0049.

iii- Simulation using the initial version ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C in which we assume that the diffusion varies as a function of the depth ("Depth-varying diffusion constant" in figures and tables) according to the equation below:

$$D(z) = 5.42.10^{-4} e^{(-0.04z)} \qquad (9)$$

Where *D* is the diffusion (m^2 year^{-1}) at a specific depth and *z* is the depth. This equation of diffusion varying as a function of depth following Jagercikova et al. (2014) and assumes that bioturbation is higher in the top soil than in deep soil.

2.5 Model simulations

In order to reach a steady state of the soil module, we ran the model over 12700 years (spinup). The state at the last time step of this spinup was used as the initial state for the simulations. For this, the CRUNCEP meteorological data for the period 1901-1910 were used. This has been applied for Misiones, Feucherolles and Mons. However, for Kissoko, a first spinup similar to the other sites was carried out but a second one (over approximately 4200

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:49
Supprimé: using the following equation
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 7
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:50
Supprimé: %
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:50
Supprimé: made
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:50
Supprimé: so-called
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:50
Supprimé: has…as been ... [24]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: […[…016]…] ... [25]
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:51
Supprimé: so-called
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:51
Supprimé: they…he authors used ... [26]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:52
Supprimé: rate
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:52
Supprimé: by 0.07 …he flux from ... [27]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 049
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:52
Supprimé: , initially constant throughout the profile, …aries as a function of ... [28]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:43
Supprimé: 8
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:00
Supprimé:
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:53
Supprimé: First of all, i… order to re ... [29]

years) was also done after the end of the first to take into account the change of the land cover from a tropical forest to a C4 savanna at this site (Schwartz et al., 1992). The atmospheric CO_2 concentration has been set at 296 ppm (year 1901, (Keeling and Whorf, depth-varying diffusion constant)) for the spinups and the $F^{14}C$ has been set to pre-industrial values. For each site, specific pH, clay content and bulk density values were used (Table 1). It should be noted that for these last data, only one value (the mean value on the profile) is provided as input for the model.

The simulations were outputted at a yearly time step, from 1900 to 2011. A yearly atmospheric CO_2 concentration value (Keeling and Whorf, depth-varying diffusion constant) is read for the sites. The same specific pH, clay content and bulk density values were used (Table 1).

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the $F^{14}C$ values in the atmosphere used in our model for Argentina, Congo and France (Figure 5 from Hua et al. (2013)). The values provided are classified into five zones, three in the Northern Hemisphere (NH) and two in the Southern Hemisphere (SH), corresponding to different levels of ^{14}C. For France, the values correspond to the NH zone 2, for the Congo to the SH zone 3 and finally for Argentina to the SH zone 1-2. Thus, for our simulations, a yearly value is read for each site.

An $F^{14}C$ value of 1.8 represents a doubling of the amount of ^{14}C in atmospheric CO_2. In figure 2, it can be noted that the values recorded in France (northern hemisphere) are higher than those in the Congo and Argentina (southern hemisphere). This is due to the preponderance of atmospheric tests in the northern hemisphere and the time required to mix air across the equator.

2.6 Statistical analysis

Simulating carbon processes in soil requires comparison between the model outputs and the measurements to test the model accuracy and possibly implement further improvement. Statistical analysis based on the statistics of deviation were done to evaluate the model–measurement discrepancy according to Kobayashi and Salam (2000) (where a detailed description of the method is provided). Here, we only reproduce the different equations used. x refers to the model outputs and y to the measurements, while i refers to soil depth. The intervals of soil depth of the model outputs and the measurements were homogenized by linearly interpolating the data to common depth intervals defined for each site. The simulations and data were then compared for each depth interval.

$$RMSD = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - y_i)^2} \qquad (10)$$

RMSD is the Root Mean Squared Deviation, which represents the mean distance between simulation and measurement.

$$MSD = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - y_i)^2 = (\bar{x} - \bar{y})^2 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}[(x_i - \bar{x}) - (y_i - \bar{y})]^2 \qquad (11)$$

MSD, the Mean Squared Deviation, is the square of RMSD. The lower the value of MSD, the closer the simulation results are to the measurements.

$$SB = (\bar{x} - \bar{y})^2 \qquad (12)$$

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:51
Supprimé: 2006

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:15
Supprimé: then run

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:51
Supprimé: 2006

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:55
Supprimé: Of course, t

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:55
Supprimé: In fact, t

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:55
Supprimé: 3

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:55
Supprimé: 2

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:56
Supprimé: O

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:56
Supprimé: represent

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:52
Mis en forme: Police :Italique

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:52
Mis en forme: Police :Italique

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:57
Supprimé: linearly

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 9

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 10

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:57
Supprimé: is

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 11

Where are the means of x_i (model outputs) and y_i (measurements) respectively.

SB is a part of the MSD (Eq.14) and represents the bias of the simulation from the measurement.

$$SD_s = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - \bar{x})^2} \quad (13)$$

SD_s is the Standard Deviation of the simulation.

$$SD_m = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (14)$$

SD_m is the Standard Deviation of the measurements.

$$r = \frac{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - \bar{x}) - (y_i - \bar{y})}{SD_m \, SD_s} \quad (15)$$

r is the correlation coefficient between the simulation and measurements.

$$SDSD = (SD_s - SD_m)^2 \quad (16)$$

SDSD is the difference in the magnitude of fluctuation between the simulation and measurements.

$$LCS = 2SD_s \, SD_m(1 - r) \quad (17)$$

LSC represents the lack of positive correlation weighted by the standard deviations.

The MSD can be therefore be rewritten as:

$$MSD = SB + SDSD + LCS \quad (18)$$

For the different simulations, the MSD and its components were calculated according to the total soil carbon and to the $F^{14}C$.

3 Model results and evaluation

3.1 Outputs from simulation using the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control)

3.1.1 Simulated total soil carbon

Results from the initial version of ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C show that in all the studied sites, the model succeeds in reproducing the trend of the total carbon profiles, with more carbon at the surface which then decreases according to the depth (Figure 3). Moreover, total soil carbon stock simulated down to 2m depth is in accordance with data in the case of Misiones and Feucherolles where the major difference mainly lies on the surface. This results in correlation coefficients of 0.44 and 0.2 respectively (Table 3). For the sites of Kissoko and Mons, an over-estimation of the total soil carbon is found to a depth of 50cm for Kissoko and up to a depth of 120cm for Mons. Correlation coefficients are 0.14 and 0.49 for Kissoko and Mons respectively (Table 3).

Metrics presented in Figure 4, showed that this version (ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C) represents relatively well the observation from Feucherolles (MSD = 206 kg C m^{-6}), whereas the other

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:45
Supprimé: 3

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 12

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 13

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 14

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:58
Supprimé: Where

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:58
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Italique, Anglais (E.U.)

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 15

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:58
Supprimé: here,

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 16

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 10:58
Supprimé: Finally, with all the above terms combined, the

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:44
Supprimé: 17

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: **Model_Control**

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:00
Supprimé: then

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:05
Supprimé: 55

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:05
Supprimé: 6

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:00
Supprimé: marked

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:00
Supprimé: deep

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:01
Supprimé: (then it decreases)

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:01
Supprimé: deep

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:06
Supprimé: 75

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:53
Supprimé: 3

are highly overestimated (Kissoko, MSD = 1343 kg C m^{-6}; Misiones MSD = 2180 kg C m^{-6}; Mons MSD = 3355 kg C m^{-6}). By detailing the different components of the MSD (Figure 4), we note that for Mons and Kissoko, standard bias (SB) is the major component of the MSD with contributing 70% and 60% respectively. This reflects that the average of total soil carbon over the soil profile simulated by the model is primarily the origin of the deviation of the model outputs from data. The mean total soil carbon estimated by the model (Table 3) is almost three times higher than the mean total carbon measured for Mons (2.37 kg C m^{-2} against 0.8 kg C m^{-2} respectively) and it is more than five times that measured for Kissoko (2.44 kg C m^{-2} against 0.42 kg C m^{-2} respectively). For Mons a net primary production (NPP) of 6.7 t ha^{-1} yr^{-1} was estimated by the technical institute for pasture in this region of France based on the annual yields, whereas the model predicts a NPP of 7.5 t ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. The large overestimation of the SOC stocks may therefore be due to an overestimation of the NPP. This significant gap recorded in the case of the Kissoko site, where the measured SOC is very low, is probably due to an overestimation of decay rates by ORCHIDEE in sandy soils. The correlation coefficient for Mons is relatively high compared to other site (Table 3) whereas Fig. 3 shows that the model performance was not very good for this site. This is mainly due to a large SB whereas other MSD components were rather low.

However, the main components of MSD for Feucherolles and Misiones are both SB (46% and 56% for Feucherolles and Misiones, respectively) and also LCS (53 and 31% for Feucherolles and Misiones, respectively). This means that for these two sites, the deviation between model outputs and measurements is mainly due to a variation of carbon stock estimation throughout the profile. The mean total soil carbon estimated in these both cases (Table 3) is only slightly higher than those measured (2.03 kg C m^{-2} estimated against 2.14 kg C m^{-2} measured for Misiones and 0.7 kg C m^{-2} estimated against 0.68 kg C m^{-2} measured for Feucherolles).

The vertical profiles of the SOC stock were fairly represented by the model. The overestimation, especially at the top, suggests that the distribution of the litter following the root profile and / or the vertical transport of SOC by diffusion are not correctly described in the model.

3.1.2 Simulated $F^{14}C$

Regarding the ^{14}C activity, bulk $F^{14}C$ profiles show a classical pattern with higher ^{14}C activity on the top, slightly influenced by the peak bomb enriched years. Subsequently profiles show decreasing ^{14}C activity with depth (Figure 5).

The estimated profiles (Model-Control) follow the same trend with a decrease from the surface to the depth. However, there is a significant difference between the estimated values and those measured throughout the profile. The statistical analyzes (Figure 6) provide MSD values: 0.02 for Mons and Misiones, 0.03 for Kissoko and 0.09 for Feucherolles. The major component of the MSD in the four sites is the LCS, with a proportion reaching 90% for Mons, 80% for Misiones and 70% for Congo, but only 55% for Feucherolles. The high proportions of LCS suggest that the model fails to reproduce the shape of the profile. The lower values estimated by the models reflect a more modern carbon age than in reality. This can be

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:03
Supprimé: ^{3}…; Misiones MSD=…= 2 ... [30]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:01
Supprimé: Then, b

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:32
Supprimé: more …lmost than four… ... [31]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:03
Supprimé: ORCHIDEE is a global model that is not parameterized for such specific soil conditions

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:12
Supprimé: only 1.7 to 2…nly slightly ... [32]

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:43
Supprimé: simulated was thereby globally not very far from that of the data

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:03
Supprimé: ,…on the top, slightly infl ... [33]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:04
Supprimé: always greater than 50% and which…eaching is even…90% for M ... [34]

explained, first, by the fact that the root profile puts too much fresh organic carbon in deep soil. Afterwards, in ORCHIDEE, root profile is assumed to follow an exponential function without modulation due to environmental conditions.

SB's contribution to the MSD does not exceed 7% for Misiones, Kissoko and Mons but reaches about 40% for Feucherolles. This reflects that the mean value of the $F^{14}C$ estimated by the model and that obtained after the measurements are not very different, except for Feucherolles site (Table 4). Indeed, the average value estimated for Misiones is 0.920, very close to that measured at 0.930, 0.995 for Kissoko against 0.985 measured and 0.860 for Mons against 0.815 measured. Yet, the difference is greater for the Feucherolles site, the estimated value being 0.915 while the measurement is 0.725. This difference might be caused by the low $F^{14}C$ value measured at 150cm (0.257), that the model is not able to capture. This suggests that modeled deep soil carbon is much younger than the observed total soil carbon, probably because ORCHIDEE-SOM simulates a relatively small proportion of passive pool in the lower soil horizons (Figure 7), while an increasing proportion of passive carbon with soil depth could be expected.

In brief, SOC stocks are generally overestimated and soil carbon age in deep soils (as shown by the $F^{14}C$) is underestimated, suggesting that the turnover rate of the passive pool is subject to improvements in ORCHIDEE-SOM.

3.2 Outputs from simulation using the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C including He's suggestion (He et al., (2016) parameterization)

3.2.1 Simulated total soil carbon

Figure 3 shows profiles output after He et al., (20016)'s suggestion was implemented into ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (green dotted curves). Resulting profiles follow the same trend than observations but in this case ("He et al., (2016) parameterization"), the overestimation is very high across the whole profile. This is further confirmed by the metrics analysis (Figure 4). MSD values markedly increased, resulting in an even higher variance. Obviously, the major component of MSD in all cases is the SB (varying from 80% to 87%) reflecting an even more marked overestimation of the mean total carbon estimates: 7.38 kg C m^{-2} against 2.14 kg C m^{-2} for Misiones, 2.44 kg C m^{-2} against 0.42 kg C m^{-2} for Kissoko, 2.33 kg C m^{-2} against 0.66 kg C m^{-2} for Feucherolles and 9.99 kg C m^{-2} against 0.8 kg C m^{-2} for Mons.

3.2.2 Simulated $F^{14}C$

He et al., (2016) parameterization outputs (Figure 5, green dotted curves) for $F^{14}C$ are once again even further away from observations and MSDs (Figure 6) are much higher, except for Feucherolles. The MSD components for the Feucherolles site show that the LCS increases from 0.05 to 0.06 whereas the SB decreases from 0.04 to 0.03, again reflecting a variation of the profile more than a difference from the means.

Improvement of the model-measurement fit for the $F^{14}C$ at 150 cm in Feucherolles confirms that the deep soil carbon simulated by the control version of ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C was excessively young, since the longer residence time of the passive pool reported by He et al. (2016) resulted in a higher proportion of passive pool across the soil profile (Figure 7), thus improving deep soil carbon age. Nevertheless, this test only improves the simulation of deep

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:05
Supprimé: Then,
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:05
Supprimé: es
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:09
Supprimé: from the surface to the depth
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:13
Supprimé: 128
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:13
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:13
Supprimé: 31
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:13
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 53
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 4
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 14
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 131
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 15
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:14
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:10
Supprimé: , which MSD value in this case is lower
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:10
Supprimé: it is
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:10
Supprimé: which
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:10
Supprimé: d

soil carbon in Feucherolles. On the contrary, this increase in carbon residence time increases model deviation from observations for all the other cases (Figure 5 and 6).

Indeed, taking the priming effect into account in this new version of ORCHIDEE has contributed to a 50% of decrease in carbon storage over the historical period. He et al., (2016)'s correction was also aimed at reducing this storage and is of the same order of magnitude as the priming effect. Thus, applying He's correction to this version of the model, which takes into account the priming effect, contributes to a double correction for the same target, which then generates this important difference between model outputs and measurements. Moreover, the work of He et al. (2016) is done under the standard parameterization of ORCHIDEE based on Century, while ORCHIDEE-SOM was re-parameterized after adding several different processes, the priming effect among them (Camino-Serrano et al., 2017), which makes it difficult to compare results from between the two studies.

3.3 Outputs from simulation using the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C with diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant)

3.3.1 Simulated total soil carbon

Fick's law of diffusion is classically used in models to represent bioturbation assuming that soil fauna activity may be represented following the Fick's law of diffusion (Elzein and Balesdent, 1995; Guenet et al., 2013; Koven et al., 2013; O'Brien and Stout, 1978; Wynn et al., 2005). Using a fixed diffusion constant (*D* in eq. 2) implicitly suggests that soil fauna activity is uniform over the entire soil profile. This is generally the case of several models of diffusion, in particular at the level of an ecosystem (Bruun et al., 2007; Guimberteau et al., 2017; O'Brien and Stout, 1978). However soil faunal activity vary naturally with depth and the diffusion constant should therefore be depth-dependent (Jagercikova et al., 2014).

With Depth-varying diffusion constant, the carbon profiles (orange dashed curves) was improved compared to the initial outputs (Control). The overestimation at the surface decreases at the four sites (Figure 3). In particular, the Misiones outputs fit very well the observed profiles. This is confirmed with lower MSDs for the four sites for this version compared to Control (Figure 4).

The total SOC stocks simulated according to this third simulation are closer to the measured values and describing the vertical transport of SOC through diffusion varying according to the depth improves significantly the model outputs.

3.3.2 Simulated F^{14}C

Regarding the F^{14}C outputs, the simulations using the initial version ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C in which we assume that the diffusion varies as a function of the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) results in an improvement of the F^{14}C profiles (orange dashes curves), in particular for the sites Misiones, Mons and Kissoko (Figure 5). Statistical analyzes prove it with significantly lower MSDs. In addition, the proportion of LCS is 98%, 92% and 88% for Mons, Misiones and Kissoko, respectively, highlighting an estimated average very close to the measurements with a clear disparity, less marked than with the first two simulations, throughout the profile (Figure 6). Overall, the simulated F^{14}C to 2 m of depth according to

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:11
Supprimé: has even more deviated the outputs of the model

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:39
Supprimé: 's

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:12
Supprimé: then

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:13
Supprimé: what

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:13
Supprimé: associate

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:13
Supprimé: her and this study

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:54
Supprimé: fact

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:14
Supprimé: especially used

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:55
Supprimé: , in addition, the characteristics of a soil, i.e. its structure and pore distribution, may vary depending on the depth, so,

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:55
Supprimé: coefficient

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:15
Supprimé: showing a much smaller deviation from the measurements

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:15
Supprimé: Anyway, t

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:15
Supprimé: especially

this third simulation are in a better agreement with the measured values, and thus incorporating diffusion that varies with depth significantly improves the model outputs.

Using a diffusion coefficient that varies as a function of the depth seems to correct the overestimation of the surface total soil carbon by increasing the proportion of labile soil carbon pools in the first soil layers.

When we sum the total soil carbon at each soil layer and look at the relative proportion of each of the soil carbon pools (Figure 7), we note that it is mainly the distribution of the litter according to the depth which varies. In fact, the structural litter proportion is multiplied by about 2 in all four cases, and this proportion remains relatively constant across the profile. This increase in litter proportion has also resulted in a decrease in the passive pool, more pronounced at the surface but also important at depth (except for Feucherolles where the decrease is only marked at the bottom). It suggests that the vertical carbon distribution, which is largely modified by the diffusion coefficient, greatly impacts the SOC and ^{14}C profiles, which is in line with Dwivedi et al. (2017) who found that the vertical carbon input profiles were important controls over the ^{14}C depth distribution.

In this study, the vertical transport of SOC and litter through diffusion has been improved by varying diffusion according to the depth. Further model development should explore the impact of the other processes defining the soil carbon pools vertical distribution and especially the distribution of the litter according to the root profile.

Overall, by using radiocarbon (^{14}C) measurements we have been able to diagnose internal model biases (underestimation of deep soil carbon age) and to propose further model improvements (depth-dependent diffusion). Therefore, the use of radiocarbon (^{14}C) tracers in global models emerges as a promising tool to constrain not only SOC turnover times in the long-term (He et al., 2016), but also internal SOC processes and fluxes that have no direct comparison with field measurements. Nevertheless, the model evaluation performed here on only four sites should be considered as proof of concept and more in depth evaluation are needed, in particular using a large ^{14}C database available at global scale (Balesdent et al., 2018; Mathieu et al., 2015). Indeed, the $F^{14}C$ is largely controlled by pedo-climatic conditions such as clay content, climate and mineralogy (Mathieu et al., 2015) and the range of situations we covered here is relatively limited.

4 conclusion

ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C, is one of the first land surface models that incorporates the ^{14}C dynamics in the soil (Koven et al., 2013). Its starting point is ORCHIDEE-SOM, a recently developed soil model. We evaluated the new model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C for four sites in different biomes. The model almost managed to reproduce the soil organic carbon stocks and the ^{14}C content along the vertical profiles at all four sites. However, an overestimation of the total carbon stock throughout the profile was noted, with the greatest deviation at the surface. By using radiocarbon (^{14}C) measurements, we have been able to diagnose internal model biases (underestimation of deep soil carbon age) and to propose further model improvements (depth-dependent diffusion). These results demonstrate the importance of depth-dependent

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:16
Supprimé: ,

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:16
Supprimé: varying according to the depth

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:16
Supprimé: significantly

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:17
Supprimé: ,

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:17
Supprimé: summing the total soil carbon at each soil layer

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:17
Supprimé: d

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:18
Supprimé: as large at the surface as at depth

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: process

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:19
Supprimé: t

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:19
Supprimé: are

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:19
Supprimé: has

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:20
Supprimé: the

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:20
Supprimé: but

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:20
Supprimé: was mostly marked on

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:20
Supprimé: Then, b

diffusion to improving model outputs with regards to observations. This suggests that, from now on, model improvements should mainly focus on a depth dependent parameterization. We limited our work here to depth-varying diffusion, but other parameters are also depth dependent and should be represented as such in the next version of the model. For instance, belowground litter production in the model is simply represented by an exponential law without any representation of the effect of resource distribution on root profile (e.g. water or nutrients). This is a complex task in a land surface model running at large scale with a classical resolution of 0.5°, but the soil modules of land surface models are quite sensitive to the NPP (Camino-Serrano et al., 2018; Todd-Brown et al., 2013) and a better constraint on the profile of the below ground litter production would likely improve the model performance. Furthermore, here we used only one averaged value over the soil profile for soil boundary conditions (texture, pH, bulk density) but those variables are known to impact the $F^{14}C$ (Mathieu et al., 2015) and change with depth (Barré et al., 2009) and depth-varying boundary conditions may also help to improve the model. Finally, the next step will deal with the comparison of model outputs to data at larger scales to be able to run the new version ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C at both regional and global scales.

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:21
Supprimé: The importance of diffusion has also been highlighted as by making it

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:17
Supprimé: varies according to the depth

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:21
Supprimé: depth-dependent, the model outputs have been improved

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:24
Supprimé: , mainly for the diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:23
Supprimé: Here we presented the effect of a

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:23
Supprimé: constant

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:23
Supprimé: aiming at

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:24
Supprimé: probably

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:24
Supprimé: ies

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 15:18
Supprimé: The

Code availability

The version of the code is freely available here:

http://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/orchidee/wiki/GroupActivities/CodeAvalaibilityPublication/ORCHIDEE_gmd-2018-14C

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 16:18
Supprimé: s

Acknowledgement

This study, part of the MT's PhD, financed by the University of Versailles Saint Quentin, is within the scope of the ANR-14-CE01-0004 DeDyCAS project. Marta Camino-Serrano acknowledges funding from the European Research Council Synergy grant ERC- 2013-SyG-610028 IMBALANCE-P. Part of the data were acquired in the frame of the AGRIPED project (ANR 2010 BLAN 605). We thank Matthew McGrath for his valuable comments on the manuscript.

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:24
Supprimé: g

References

Ahrens, B., Braakhekke, M. C., Guggenberger, G., Schrumpf, M. and Reichstein, M.: Contribution of sorption, DOC transport and microbial interactions to the 14C age of a soil organic carbon profile: Insights from a calibrated process model, Soil Biol. Biochem., 88, 390–402, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.06.008, 2015.

Balesdent, J. and Guillet, B.: Les datations par le 14C des matières organiques des sols.

Contribution à l'étude de l'humification et du renouvellement des substances humiqueétriques, Sci. du sol, 2, 93–111, 1982.

Balesdent, J., Basile-Doelsch, I., Chadoeuf, J., Cornu, S., Derrien, D., Fekiacova, Z. and Hatté, C.: Atmosphere–soil carbon transfer as a function of soil depth, Nature, 23, 1, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0328-3, 2018.

Barré, P., Berger, G. and Velde, B.: How element translocation by plants may stabilize illitic clays in the surface of temperate soils, Geoderma, 151(1–2), 22–30, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.03.004, 2009.

Braakhekke, M., Beer, C., Schrumpf, M., Ekici, A., Ahrens, B., Hoosbeek, M. R., Kruijt, B., Kabat, P. and Reichstein, M.: The use of radiocarbon to constrain current and future soil organic matter turnover and transport in a temperate forest, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences, 372–391, doi:10.1002/2013JG002420.Received, 2014.

Braakhekke, M. C., Beer, C., Hoosbeek, M. R., Reichstein, M., Kruijt, B., Schrumpf, M. and Kabat, P.: SOMPROF: A vertically explicit soil organic matter model, Ecol. Modell., 222(10), 1712–1730, doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.02.015, 2011.

Bruun, S., Christensen, B. T., Thomsen, I. K., Jensen, E. S. and Jensen, L. S.: Modeling vertical movement of organic matter in a soil incubated for 41 years with 14C labeled straw, Soil Biol. Biochem., 39(1), 368–371, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2006.07.003, 2007.

Camino-Serrano, M., Guenet, B., Luyssaert, S., Ciais, P., Bastrikov, V., De Vos, B., Gielen, B., Gleixner, G., Jornet-Puig, A., Kaiser, K., Kothawala, D., Lauerwald, R., Peñuelas, J., Schrumpf, M., Vicca, S., Vuichard, N., Walmsley, D. and Janssens, I. A.: ORCHIDEE-SOM: Modeling soil organic carbon (SOC) and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) dynamics along vertical soil profiles in Europe, Geosci. Model Dev., 11, 937–957, doi:10.5194/gmd-11-937-2018, 2018.

Coleman, K., Jenkinson, D. S., Crocker, G. J., Grace, P. R., Klír, J., Körschens, M., Poulton, P. R. and Richter, D. D.: Simulating trends in soil organic carbon in long-term experiments using RothC-26.3, Geoderma, 81(1–2), 29–44, doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(97)00079-7, 1997.

Cottereau, E., Arnold, M., Moreau, C., Baqué, D., Bavay, D., Caffy, I., Comby, C., Dumoulin, J.-P., Hain, S., Perron, M., Salomon, J. and Setti, V.: Artemis, the New 14C AMS at LMC14 in Saclay, France, Radiocarbon, 49(2), 291–299, doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.49.2928, 2007.

Delibrias, G., Guillier, M. T. and Labeyrie, J.: Saclay natural radiocarbon measurements i, Radiocarbon, 6, 233–250, 1964.

Ducoudré, N. I., Laval, K. and Perrier, A.: SECHIBA, a New Set of Parameterizations of the Hydrologic Exchanges at the Land-Atmosphere Interface within the LMD Atmospheric General Circulation Model, J. Clim., 6(2), 248–273, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1993)006<0248:SANSOP>2.0.CO;2, 1993.

Dwivedi, D., Riley, W., Torn, M., Spycher, N., Maggi, F. and Tang, J.: Mineral properties, microbes, transport, and plant-input profiles control vertical distribution and age of soil carbon stocks, Soil Biol. Biochem., 107(2017), 244–259, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.12.019, 2017.

Elliott, E. T., Paustian, K. and Frey, S. D.: Modeling the Measurable or Measuring the Modelable: A Hierarchical Approach to Isolating Meaningful Soil Organic Matter Fractionations, in Evaluation of Soil Organic Matter Models: Using Existing Long-Term Datasets, vol. 1994, pp. 161–179., 1996.

Elzein, A. and Balesdent, J.: Mechanistic Simulation of vertical distribution of carbon concentrations and residence times in soils, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 59, 1328–1335, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004, 1995.

Epron, D., Marsden, C., M'Bou, A. T., Saint-André, L., d'Annunzio, R. and Nouvellon, Y.: Soil carbon dynamics following afforestation of a tropical savannah with Eucalyptus in Congo, Plant Soil, 323(1), 309–322, doi:10.1007/s11104-009-9939-7, 2009.

Godwin, H.: Half-life of radiocarbon, Nature, 195(4845), 984, doi:10.1038/195984a0, 1962.

Guenet, B., Eglin, T., Vasilyeva, N., Peylin, P., Ciais, P. and Chenu, C.: The relative importance of decomposition and transport mechanisms in accounting for soil organic carbon profiles, Biogeosciences, 10(4), 2379–2392, doi:10.5194/bg-10-2379-2013, 2013.

Guenet, B., Moyano, F. E., Peylin, P., Ciais, P. and Janssens, I. A.: Towards a representation of priming on soil carbon decomposition in the global land biosphere model ORCHIDEE (version 1.9.5.2), Geosci. Model Dev., 9(2), 841–855, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-841-2016, 2016.

Guimberteau, M., Zhu, D., Maignan, F., Huang, Y., Yue, C., Dantec-Nédélec, S., Ottlé, C., Jornet-Puig, A., Bastos, A., Laurent, P., Goll, D., Bowring, S., Chang, J., Guenet, B., Tifafi, M., Peng, S., Krinner, G., Ducharne, A., Wang, F., Wang, T., Wang, X., Wang, Y., Yin, Z., Lauerwald, R., Joetzjer, E., Qiu, C., Kim, H. and Ciais, P.: ORCHIDEE-MICT (revision 4126), a land surface model for the high-latitudes: model description and validation, Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 1–65, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-122, 2017.

He, Y., Trumbore, S. E., Torn, M. S., Harden, J. W., Vaughn, L. J. S., Allison, S. D. and Randerson, J. T.: Radiocarbon constraints imply reduced carbon uptake by soils during the 21st century, Science (80-.)., 353(6306), 1419–1424, 2016.

Hua, Q., Barbetti, M. and Rakowski, A. Z.: Atmospheric Radiocarbon for the Period 1950–2010, Radiocarbon, 55(4), 2059–2072, doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.v55i2.16177, 2013.

Jagercikova, M., Evrard, O., Balesdent, J., Lefèvre, I. and Cornu, S.: Modeling the migration of fallout radionuclides to quantify the contemporary transfer of fine particles in Luvisol profiles under different land uses and farming practices, Soil Tillage Res., 140(2014), 82–97, doi:10.1016/j.still.2014.02.013, 2014.

Jagercikova, M., Cornu, S., Bourlès, D., Evrard, O., Hatté, C. and Balesdent, J.: Quantification of vertical solid matter transfers in soils during pedogenesis by a multi-tracer approach, J. Soils Sediments, 17(2), 408–422, doi:10.1007/s11368-016-1560-9, 2017.

Jastrow, J. D., Amonette, J. E. and Bailey, V. L.: Mechanisms controlling soil carbon turnover and their potential application for enhancing carbon sequestration, Clim. Change, 80, 5–23, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9178-3, 2007.

Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Leetmaa, a., Reynolds, R., Jenne, R. and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-year reanalysis project, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 77(3), 437–471, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2, 1996.

Keeling, C. D. and Whorf, T. P.: Atmospheric CO2 records from sites in the SIO air sampling network, Oak Ridge Natl. Lab. U.S. Dept. or Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., 2006.

Keyvanshokouhi, S., Cornu, S., Samouëlian, A. and Finke, P.: Evaluating SoilGen2 as a tool for projecting soil evolution induced by global change, Sci. Total Environ., 571, 110–123, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.119, 2016.

Kobayashi, K. and Salam, M. .: Comparing simulated and measured values using mean squared deviation and its components, Agron. J., 92(2), 345–352 [online] Available from: http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Comparing+Simulated+and+Measured+Values+Using+Mean+Squared+Deviation+and+its+Components#0 (Accessed 2 February 2012), 2000.

Koven, C. D., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Tang, J. Y., Torn, M. S., Collins, W. D., Bonan, G. B., Lawrence, D. M. and Swenson, S. C.: The effect of vertically resolved soil biogeochemistry and alternate soil C and N models on C dynamics of CLM4, Biogeosciences, 10(11), 7109–7131, doi:10.5194/bg-10-7109-2013, 2013.

Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Ogée, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S. and Prentice, I. C.: A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system, Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles, 19(1), doi:10.1029/2003GB002199, 2005.

Laclau, J. P., Bouillet, J. P. and Ranger, J.: Dynamics of biomass and nutrient accumulation in a clonal plantation of Eucalyptus in Congo, For. Ecol. Manage., 128(3), 181–196, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(99)00146-2, 2000.

Mathieu, J. a., Hatté, C., Balesdent, J. and Parent, É.: Deep soil carbon dynamics are driven more by soil type than by climate: a worldwide meta-analysis of radiocarbon profiles, Glob. Chang. Biol., n/a-n/a, doi:10.1111/gcb.13012, 2015.

Mitchell, T. D., Carter, T. R., Jones, P. D., Hulme, M. and New, M.: A comprehensive set of high-resolution grids of monthly climate for Europe and the globe: the observed record (1901–2000) and 16 scenarios (2001–2100), … Cent. Clim. …, (July), 1–30 [online] Available from: http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wp55.pdf, 2004.

Morrás, H., Moretti, L., Píccolo, G. and Zech, W.: Genesis of subtropical soils with stony horizons in NE Argentina: Autochthony and polygenesis, Quat. Int., 196(1), 137–159, doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2008.07.001, 2009.

O'Brien, B. J. and Stout, J. D.: Movement and turnover of soil organic matter as indicated by carbon isotope measurements, Soil Biol. Biochem., 10(4), 309–317, doi:10.1016/0038-0717(78)90028-7, 1978.

Parton, W., Schimel, D. S., Cole, C. and Ojima, D.: Analysis of factors controlling soil organic matter levels in Great Plains grasslands, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 51, 1173–1179 [online] Available from: http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search/display.do?f=1990/US/US90315.xml;US9004388 (Accessed 27 July 2011), 1987.

Parton, W. J., Stewart, J. W. B. and Cole, C. V.: Dynamics of C, N, P and S in grassland soils: a model, Biogeochemistry, 5(1), 109–131, doi:10.1007/BF02180320, 1988.

Reimer, P. J., Brown, T. A. and Reimer, R. W.: Discussion: reporting and calibration of post-bomb 14C data., Radiocarbon, 46(1), 1299–1304, doi:10.2458/azu_js_rc.46.4183, 2004.

Rosnay, P. de and Polcher, J.: MOdelling root water uptake in a complex land surface scheme coupled to a GCM, Hydrol. Earth Syst. …, 2, 239–255 [online] Available from: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1998HESS....2..239D (Accessed 26 March 2013), 1998.

Scharpenseel, H. W. and Schiffmann, H.: Radiocarbon dating of soils, a review, Zeitschrift für Pflanzenernährung und Bodenkd., 140(2), 159–174, doi:10.1002/jpln.19771400205, 1977.

Schwartz, D., Mariotti, A., Trouve, C., Van Den Borg, K. and Guillet, B.: Etude des profils isotopiques 13C et 14C d'un sol ferrallitique sableux du littoral congolais : implications sur la dynamique de la matière organique et l'histoire de la végétation, Comptes Rendus l'Académie des Sci. 2 Mécanique..., 1992, 315, p. 1411-1417. ISSN 0249-6305, 315, 1411–1417, 1992.

Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I. C., Arneth, a., Bondeau, a., Cramer, W., Kaplan, J. O., Levis, S., Lucht, W., Sykes, M. T., Thonicke, K. and Venevsky, S.: Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model, Glob. Chang. Biol., 9(2), 161–185, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.2003.00569.x, 2003.

Stuiver, M. and Polach, H. A.: Reporting of 14C data, Radiocarbon, 19(3), 355–363, doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.11.013, 1977.

Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J. and Meehl, G. a.: An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment design, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 93(4), 485–498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1, 2012.

Tisnérat-Laborde, N., Thil, F., Synal, H.-A., Hatté, C., Cersoy, S., Gauthier, C., Kaltnecker, E., Massault, M., Michelot, J.-L., Noret, A., Noury, C., Siani, G., Tombret, O., Vigne, J.-D., Wacker, L. and Zazzo, A.: A new compact AMS facility measuring 14C dedicated to Environment, Climate and Human Sciences, in 22nd International Radiocarbon Conference, Dakar, Senegal. November 2015. Oral presentation, pp. 16–20., 2015.

Todd-Brown, K. E. O., Randerson, J. T., Post, W. M., Hoffman, F. M., Tarnocai, C., Schuur, E. a. G. and Allison, S. D.: Causes of variation in soil carbon simulations from CMIP5 Earth system models and comparison with observations, Biogeosciences, 10(3), 1717–1736, doi:10.5194/bg-10-1717-2013, 2013.

Trumbore, S.: Age of Soil Organic Matter and Soil Respiration : Radiocarbon Constraints on Belowground C Dynamics, Ecol. Appl., 10(2), 399–411, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[0399:AOSOMA]2.0.CO;2, 2000.

Wieder, W. R., Bonan, G. B. and Allison, S. D.: Global soil carbon projections are improved by modelling microbial processes, Nat. Clim. Chang., 3(8), 1–4, doi:10.1038/nclimate1951, 2013.

WRB: World reference base for soil resources 2006: a framework for international classification, correlation and communication., 2006.

Wynn, J. G., Bird, M. I. and Wong, V. N. L.: Rayleigh distillation and the depth profile of 13C/12C ratios of soil organic carbon from soils of disparate texture in Iron Range National Park, Far North Queensland, Australia, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 69(8), 1961–1973, 2005.

Table 1. General description of the studied sites. The mean bulk density, pH and clay fraction values calculated from the different soil layers depths available from the data were used as input for each site. For the Mons and Feucherolles sites, min and max values of pH and clay fraction are provided between brackets.

Site name	Feucherolles	Mons	Kissoko	Misiones
Sampling Date	April 2011	March 2011	May 2014	May 2015
Location	France	France	Congo	Argentina
Coordinates	48.90°N, 1.97°E	49.87°N, 3.03°E	4.35°S, 11.75°E	27.65°S, 55.42°W
Elevation (m)	120	88	100	NA
Mean Annual Rainfall (mm)	660	680	1400	1850
Mean Annual Temperate (°C)	11.2	11	25	20
Soil Type (WRB)	Luvisol	Luvisol	Arenosol	Acrisol
Land Use	Temperate broad-leaved summergreen forest	Grassland	Native savanna	Tropical broad-leaved evergreen forest
Mean Bulk Density ($g\ cm^{-3}$)	1.34	1.4	1.48	1.15
Mean pH	5.9 (5.12-8.55)	6.9 (6.70-7.56)	5.2	5.2
Mean Clay Fraction (%)	20 % (13-30 %)	23 % (19-27 %)	5 %	58 %

Table 2. The main differences between the three simulations

	Flux from slow pool to passive pool	**Turnover time of the passive pool (year)**	**Diffusion ($m^2\ year^{-1}$)**
Control	0.07	462	$D(z) = 1.10^{-4}$
He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.0049	6468	$D(z) = 1.10^{-4}$
Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.07	462	$D(z) = 5.42.10^{-4}e^{(-0.04z)}$

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:08
Supprimé: over the profiles
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:25
Supprimé: in
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:34
Supprimé:
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 049
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Table 3. The correlation coefficient (r) between model outputs and measurements for carbon stock (kg C m^{-2}) over the soil profile, for the four sites. The results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control) as well as those from the version including the modification according to (He et al., 2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) are provided.

		r	Mean total soil carbon (kg C m^{-2}) Model	Mean total soil carbon (kg C m^{-2}) Measurements
Misiones	Control	0.44	2.03	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.69	7.38	2.14±0.30
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.46	2.23	
Kissoko	Control	0.14	0.76	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.55	2.44	0.42±0.38
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.13	0.88	
Feucherolles	Control	0.20	0.70	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.11	2.33	0.66±0.08
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.22	0.77	
Mons	Control	0.49	2.37	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	-0.14	9.99	0.8±0.10
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.48	2.42	

Table 4. The correlation coefficient (r) between model outputs and measurements and the mean values (provided by the model and the measurements) over the profile according to F^{14}C for the four sites. The results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control) as well as those from the version including the modification according to (He et al., 2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) are provided.

		r	Mean Model	Mean Measurements
Misiones	Control	0.55	0.920	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.50	0.560	0.930±0.009
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.60	0.900	
Kissoko	Control	0.40	0.995	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.30	0.620	0.985±0.004
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.55	0.995	
Feucherolles	Control	0.55	0.915	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.55	0.550	0.725±0.005
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.60	0.890	
Mons	Control	0.75	0.860	
	He et al., (2016) parameterization	0.70	0.510	0.815±0.005
	Depth-varying diffusion constant	0.80	0.835	

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 13:40
Supprimé: and the mean values (prov ... [35]
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:26
Supprimé: if the passive pool turnov ... [36]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He…e et al., ... [37]
Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:26
Supprimé: ,
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 3
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 55
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 65
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [38]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 50
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 128
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 31
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [39]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 60
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 57
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [40]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 40
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 34
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [42]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 40
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 53
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [41]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 30
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 50
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Supprimé: 31
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Mis en forme ... [43]
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:10
Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23

Table 5. $F^{14}C$ profile obtained for each site

Sites	Soil depth (cm)	$F^{14}C$
Misiones	0-5	1.08
	5-10	1.04
	10-15	1.05
	15-20	0.99
	20-30	0.99
	30-40	0.87
	40-50	0.91
	50-60	0.76
	60-80	0.79
	80-100	0.79
Kissoko	0-5	1.06
	5-10	1.07
	10-15	1.07
	15-20	1.08
	20-30	1.05
	30-40	1.04
	40-50	1.02
	50-60	0.97
	60-80	0.90
	80-100	0.81
	100-120	0.72
Feucherolles	0-2	1.08
	16-18	1.05
	40-45	0.92
	75-85	0.69
	105-115	0.54
	125-135	0.53
	147-157	0.26
Mons	0-2	1.02
	2-4	1.03
	18-20	1.03
	45-50	0.87
	60-65	0.71
	82-92	0.65
	102-112	0.64
	142-152	0.55

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:43
Mis en forme: Gauche, Interligne : multiple 1,15 li

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 11:43
Mis en forme: Exposant

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:27
Supprimé: s



Figure 1. Overview of the different fluxes and processes in soil as presented in the version of ORCHIDEE-SOM adapted from Camino-Serrano et al. (2017).

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:33
Supprimé:



Figure 2. Evolution of the $F^{14}C$ of atmospheric CO_2 in Argentina, Congo and France (data from Hua et al. 2013).

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:42

Supprimé:



Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:33

Mis en forme: Justifié, Interligne : multiple 1,15 li



Figure 3. Total soil carbon (kg C m^{-3}) according to the depth for the four sites. The results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control) as well as those from the version including the modification according to (He et al., 2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) are shown.

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:42
Supprimé: ... [50]

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:27
Supprimé: ,

Unknown
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Unknown
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:27
Supprimé: if the passive pool turnover rate and the slow-to-passive flux revised

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:27
Supprimé: ,

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:43



Supprimé:



Figure 4. Mean Squared Deviation (MSD) and its components for total soil carbon (kg C m^{-6}): lack of correlation weighted by the standard deviation (LCS), squared difference between standard deviations (SDSD) and the squared bias (SB). For the four sites, the results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control as well as those from the version including the modification according to (He et al., 2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant), are shown.

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:43
Supprimé: ... [51]

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:43
Mis en forme: Gauche, Interligne : multiple 1,15 li

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:54
Supprimé: 3

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:28
Supprimé: if the passive pool turnover rate and the slow-to-passive flux revised

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:43
Supprimé:





Figure 5. Modern fraction $F^{14}C$ according to the depth, for the four sites. The results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control) as well as those from the version including the modification according to He et al., (2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) are shown.

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:25



Supprimé: ... [52]

Unknown

Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18

Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:28

Supprimé: if the passive pool turnover rate and the slow-to-passive flux revised

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20

Supprimé: Model_Test He

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23

Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:28

Supprimé: ,



Figure 6. Mean Squared Deviation (MSD) and its components: lack of correlation weighted by the standard deviation (LCS), squared difference between standard deviations (SDSD) and the squared bias (SB) calculated for modern fraction $F^{14}C$. For the four sites, the results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control) as well as those from the version including the modification according to He et al., (2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant) are shown.

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:44
Supprimé:

Unknown
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Unknown
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:28
Supprimé: if the passive pool turnover rate and the slow-to-passive flux revised

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:28
Supprimé: ,

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 10:31
Supprimé:



Figure 7. Relative proportion of each of the soil carbon pools summing the total soil carbon at each soil layer. The results of the initial version of the model ORCHIDEE-SOM-^{14}C (Control, left pattern) as well as those from the version including the modification according to (He et al., 2016) (He et al., (2016) parameterization, pattern in the middle) and diffusion varying according to the depth (Depth-varying diffusion constant, right pattern) are shown.

Bertrand Guenet 31/10/y 19:44
Supprimé: ... [53]

Unknown
Mis en forme: Police :(Par défaut) Times New Roman

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:18
Supprimé: Model_Control

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:29
Supprimé: if the passive pool turnover rate and the slow-to-passive flux revised

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:20
Supprimé: Model_Test He

Bertrand Guenet 30/10/y 14:23
Supprimé: Model_Test Diffusion

Auteur inconnu 31/10/y 11:29
Supprimé: ,