

AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society

EARLY ONLINE RELEASE

This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0212.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

If you would like to cite this EOR in a separate work, please use the following full citation:

Tian, H., J. Yang, C. Lu, R. Xu, J. Canadell, R. Jackson, A. Arneth, J. Chang, G. Chen, P. Ciais, S. Gerber, A. Ito, Y. Huang, F. Joos, S. Lienert, P. Messina, S. Olin, S. Pan, C. Peng, E. Saikawa, R. Thompson, N. Vuichard, W. Winiwarter, S. Zaehle, B. Zhang, K. Zhang, and Q. Zhu, 2018: The global N2O Model Intercomparison Project (NMIP): Objectives, Simulation Protocol and Expected Products. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0212.1, in press.

script (r	non-LaTeX) Click here to download Manuscript (non-LaTeX) Revised BAMS- D-17-0212.docx						
	STANG INDUSTRY COMPLET						
1	The global N ₂ O Model Intercomparison Project (NMIP): Objectives,						
2	Simulation Protocol and Expected Products						
3	SOCIETY 1919 Jright Jright - NOLVOINS						
4	Hanqin Tian ^{1,2} , Jia Yang ^{1,2} , Chaoqun Lu ^{1,3} , Rongting Xu ¹ , Josep G Canadell ⁴ , Robert Jackson ⁵ ,						
5	Almut Arneth ^o , Jinfeng Chang ['] , Guangsheng Chen ^{1,2} , Philippe Ciais ['] , Stefan Gerber ⁸ , Akihiko						
6	Ito ² , Yuanyuan Huang ^{7, 8} , Fortunat Joos ^{10,11} , Sebastian Lienert ^{10,11} , Palmira Messina ⁷ , Stefan						
/	Ulin ¹² , Shufen Pan ^{1,2} , Changhui Peng ¹³ , ¹⁴ , Eri Saikawa ¹³ , Rona L. Thompson ¹⁴ , Nicolas						
ð 0	Vuichard, whithed whitwarter v, Sonke Zaenie , Bowen Zhang, Kerou Zhang , Oiuan Zhu ¹⁴						
9 10	Qiuali.zhu						
11	Let met in a l Carto for Cline to a l Clabel Change Describe Caberta (Describerta) (NVIIII) C. C. in an						
11	A International Center for Climate and Global Change Research, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences,						
12	Audurn University, Audurn, AL 30849, USA						
11	of Urban and Pagional Ecology, Pajijing 100085, China						
14	³ Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, Jowa State University, JA 50011, USA						
15	⁴ Global Carbon Project CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Canberra Australia						
16	⁵ Department of Earth System Science, Woods Institute for the Environment and Precourt Institute for						
17	Energy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-2210						
18	⁶ Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research/Atmospheric						
19	Environmental Research, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany						
20	⁷ Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE, 91191 Gif sur Yvette, France						
21	⁸ University of Florida, IFAS, Soil and Water Sciences Department, Gainesville, FL, 32611-0510, USA						
22	⁹ Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba,						
23	3058506, Japan						
24	¹⁰ Climate and Environmental Physics, Physics Institute, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland						
25	¹¹ Oeschger Centre for Climate Change Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland						
26	¹² Department of Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science, Lund University, S-223 62 Lund, Sweden						
27	¹³ Department of Biology Sciences, University of Quebec at Montreal (UQAM), Montréal (Québec), H3C						
28	3P8, Canada						
29	¹⁴ Center for Ecological Forecasting and Global Change, College of Forestry, Northwest A&F University,						
30	Yangling, Shaanxi /12700, China						
21	¹⁵ Department of Environmental Sciences, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA						
31 32	¹⁷ Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (AIR). International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis						
33	Schlossplatz 1A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria						
34	¹⁸ The Institute of Environmental Engineering, University of Zielona Gora, Licealna 9, 65-417 Zielona						
35	Gora, Poland						
36	¹⁹ Max Planck Institut für Biogeochemie, P.O. Box 600164, Hans-Knöll-Str. 10, 07745 Jena, Germany						
37	Corresponding author: Hangin Tian (tianhan@auburn edu)						
30	Corresponding author. manquir man (<u>manuall@auburn.cuu</u>)						
40	7 Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society (RAMS)						
/1	Revised Manuscrint (12/26/2017)						
42	(12/20/2017)						

43 Abstract

Nitrous oxide (N_2O) is an important greenhouse gas (GHG) and also an ozone-depleting 44 substance that has both natural and anthropogenic sources. Large uncertainty remains on the 45 magnitude and spatiotemporal patterns of N_2O fluxes and the key drivers of N_2O production in 46 the terrestrial biosphere. Some terrestrial biosphere models have been evolved to account for 47 48 nitrogen processes and show the capability to simulate N₂O emissions from land ecosystems at the global scale, but large discrepancies exist among their estimates primarily due to inconsistent 49 input data sets, simulation protocol, and model structure and parameterization schemes. Based on 50 51 the consistent model input data and simulation protocol, the global N₂O Model Inter-Comparison 52 Project (NMIP) was initialized with ten state-of-the-art terrestrial biosphere models with N cycling included. Specific objectives of NMIP are to: 1) Unravel the major N cycling processes 53 controlling N2O fluxes in each model and identify the uncertainty sources from model structure, 54 input data and parameters; 2) Quantify the magnitude, spatial and temporal patterns of global and 55 regional N₂O fluxes from the pre-industrial period (1860) to present, and attribute the relative 56 contributions of multiple environmental factors to N_2O dynamics; and 3) Provide a bench-57 marking estimate of N₂O fluxes through synthesizing the multi-model simulation results and 58 59 existing estimates from ground-based observations, inventories, and statistical and empirical extrapolations. This study provides detailed descriptions for the NMIP protocol, input data, 60 model structure and key parameters, along with preliminary simulation results. The global and 61 62 regional N₂O estimation derived from the NMIP is a key component of the Global N₂O Budget activity jointly led by the Global Carbon Project (GCP) and the International Nitrogen Initiative 63 (INI). 64

-	_
C	C
n	n
0	v

67	Capsules
----	----------

The N₂O Model Inter-Comparison Project (NMIP) aims at understanding and quantifying the budgets of global and regional terrestrial N2O fluxes, environmental controls and uncertainties associated with input data, model structure and parameters.

89 **1. Introduction**

Nitrous oxide (N_2O) is an important greenhouse gas and the time-integrated radiative 90 forcing resulting from a mass unit of N_2O is 298 times larger than that from carbon dioxide (CO_2) 91 92 emissions for a 100-year time horizon (Ciais et al., 2013; Myhre et al., 2013). Multiple lines of evidence indicate that human activities (e.g., industrial N₂ fixation by the Haber-Bosch process 93 or by combustion, and manure N application) play an increasingly significant role in the 94 perturbation of the global N cycle (Galloway et al., 2008; Gruber et al., 2008; Fowler et al., 95 2015), which has led to an increase in atmospheric N₂O concentration by $\sim 21\%$, from 271 ppb at 96 pre-industrial level to 329 ppb in 2015 (MacFarling et al., 2006; Prather et al., 2012, 2015; 97 Thompson et al., 2014; https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/). The anthropogenic N₂O emissions are 98 estimated to have increased from 0.7 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 1860 to 6.9 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 2006, ~60% of which 99 100 was ascribed to agricultural activities (Ciais et al., 2013, Davidson and Kanter, 2014). The increased N₂O emissions have significantly contributed to climate warming. During the 2000s, 101 the warming effect of N₂O emissions from the terrestrial biosphere counteracted more than half 102 103 of the cooling effect of the global land CO_2 sink (Tian et al., 2016), and anthropogenic N₂O emissions are projected to lead to further global warming during the 21st century and beyond 104 105 (Stocker et al., 2013).

In terrestrial ecosystems, N₂O is mainly produced in soils via nitrification and denitrification processes (Smith and Arah, 1990; Wrage et al., 2001; Schmidt et al., 2004). All these processes are regulated by microbial activities under various soil micro-environments such as soil temperature, moisture and aeration, clay content, pH, and C and N availability (Firestone and Davidson, 1989; Goldberg and Gebauer, 2009; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013; Brotto et al., 2015; Rowlings et al., 2015). In addition, N₂O emissions from terrestrial ecosystems can be

112 regulated by both natural disturbances and human management such as synthetic N fertilizer, 113 manure N application, irrigation, tillage, and the choice of crop varieties (Rice and Smith, 1982; Cai et al., 1997; Ding et al., 2010). However, our understanding of the mechanisms responsible 114 for terrestrial N₂O emissions is still limited, which contributes to large uncertainties in estimating 115 both preindustrial and contemporary N₂O emissions. For example, estimates of global terrestrial 116 N₂O emissions from natural sources vary by up to a factor of three and range between 3.3 and 117 9.0 Tg N yr⁻¹ (Ciais et al. 2013). Human-induced biogenic N₂O emissions from the land 118 biosphere have not yet been investigated well (Tian et al. 2016). Therefore, a major international 119 120 and multidisciplinary effort is required to assess information from different research disciplines 121 and approaches in order to constrain current knowledge on the N₂O budget and drivers, and to 122 identify research gaps.

Process-based modeling is an essential tool in assessing and predicting the terrestrial N 123 cycle and N₂O fluxes in response to multi-factor global changes. Several process-based models 124 have been used to estimate N2O emissions from natural and agricultural soils at various 125 126 spatiotemporal scales. The conceptual model of "hole-in-pipe" (Firestone and Davidson, 1989) was first incorporated in the Carnegie-Ames-Stanford-Approach (CASA) Biosphere model 127 128 (Potter et al., 1993) to estimate N trace gas emissions at the global scale (Potter et al., 1996). The daily version of the CENTURY model (DAYCENT) was linked to atmospheric models to better 129 estimate trace gas fluxes from different ecosystems (Parton et al., 1998). The DeNitrification-130 131 DeComposition model (DNDC; Li et al., 1992) was developed to study the impacts of various agricultural practices on N₂O emissions. In the Dynamic Land Ecosystem Model (DLEM), Tian 132 et al. (2011, 2015) considered the biotic and abiotic processes (e.g., plant N uptake and N 133 134 leaching loss) that regulate N₂O fluxes in natural and managed soils. In recent years, multiple C-

N coupled models, such as DyN-LPJ (Xu-Ri and Prentice, 2008), O-CN (Zaehle and Friend, 135 136 2010, 2011), Land Surface Processes and exchanges model of the University of Bern (LPX-Bern 1.0; Stocker et al., 2013), CLMCN-N₂O (Saikawa et al., 2014), and LM3V-N (Huang and Gerber, 137 138 2015) were developed by integrating a prognostic N cycle into different land surface models and 139 simulate N₂O emissions from land ecosystems. Unsurprisingly, these models generated divergent 140 estimates of global terrestrial N₂O budgets and spatiotemporal patterns mainly due to differences in model input datasets, model structure, and parameterization schemes. What are the major 141 contributing factors responsible for the changing patterns of terrestrial N₂O emissions? How can 142 143 we narrow down the model-estimated bias or uncertainties? What are the knowledge gaps in fully accounting for the N_2O processes? Here, we attempt to answer these questions through the 144 establishment and designing of the global N₂O Model Inter-comparison Project (NMIP). 145

During the past two decades, carbon-related Model Intercomparison Projects (MIPs) have 146 been established to evaluate model uncertainties in simulating the terrestrial carbon dynamics. 147 148 For example, the Vegetation-Ecosystem Modeling and Analysis Project (VEMAP) was a pioneer 149 MIP activity, driven by a common model input database and was established to provide multi-150 model ensemble estimates of carbon fluxes and storage in response to changing climate and 151 atmospheric CO₂ (Melillo et al., 1995; Schimel et al., 2000). More recently, a number of CO₂oriented MIPs and synthesis activities were implemented, such as the North American Carbon 152 Program site and regional synthesis (NACP; Schwalm et al., 2010; Richardson et al., 2011; 153 154 Schaefer et al., 2012) and its extended Multi-Scale Synthesis and Terrestrial Model Intercomparison Project (MsTMIP; Huntzinger et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014), the TRENDY 155 Project (Le Quéré et al., 2016; Sitch et al., 2015), the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model 156 157 Intercomparison Project (ISI-MIP) (Warszawski et al., 2014; Ito et al., 2016), and the Multi Model-data Synthesis of Terrestrial Carbon Cycles in Asia (Asia-MIP; Ichii et al., 2013). These
MIPs enhanced our understanding of model uncertainties and provided insight into future
directions of model improvement.

Following the CO₂-related MIPs, global methane (CH₄) MIPs and synthesis activities 161 were implemented in recent years, for example, the Wetland and Wetland CH₄ Intercomparison 162 of Models Project (WETCHIMP; Melton et al., 2013; Wania et al., 2013) and GCP global CH4 163 budget synthesis (Saunois et al., 2016; Poulter et al. 2017). Although terrestrial biogenic N₂O 164 emissions significantly contribute to climate warming, the model development for simulating N 165 166 cycle and N₂O fluxes remains far behind the CO₂- and CH₄-related activities. The relatively sparse and short-term observations limited our understanding of N cycling in terrestrial 167 ecosystems. Comparing with CO₂ and CH₄, smaller N₂O concentration gradients in the 168 169 atmosphere and the varying magnitudes of soil N₂O emissions across observation sites and periods makes it more difficult to quantify the N₂O budget at a large scale. Another important 170 uncertainty comes from the differences in model representation and parameterization schemes of 171 N processes, and the influence of biophysical and environmental factors on N_2O dynamics 172 (Appendix A). Similar to the purposes of the CO₂- and CH₄-related MIPs, there is a need to 173 174 initialize a MIP for the N models to assess the global N₂O budget. Under the umbrella of the Global Carbon Project (GCP) and the International Nitrogen Initiative (INI), we initiated the 175 NMIP to investigate the uncertainty sources in N₂O estimates and provide multi-model N₂O 176 177 emissions estimates from natural and agricultural soils. This paper describes the detailed NMIP protocol, input data, model structure, and some preliminary simulation results. 178

179

180 **2.** The NMIP framework, objectives and tasks

181 Motivated by large uncertainties and increasing data availability, the NMIP is developed 182 to establish a research network for providing a multi-model ensemble estimate on the global/regional N₂O budgets and to identify major uncertainties associated with model structure, 183 parameters and input data (Figure 1). This project was first proposed at the Regional Carbon 184 Cycle Assessment and Processes (RECCAP) workshop "4th International workshop on Asian 185 Greenhouse Gases", in JAMSTEC, Yokohama, Japan, April 8-10, 2014. The NMIP was 186 launched at a side meeting during the 2015 American Geophysical Union fall meeting and began 187 to work in the fall of 2016. 188

189 Specific objectives of NMIP are: 1) Unravel the major N cycling processes controlling 190 N₂O fluxes in each model and identify the uncertainty sources from modeling structure, input data and parameters; 2) Quantify the magnitude, spatial and temporal patterns of global and 191 regional N₂O fluxes during 1860–2015, and attribute the relative contributions of multiple 192 environmental factors to N₂O dynamics; and 3) Provide a bench-mark estimate of global/regional 193 194 N₂O fluxes through synthesizing the multi-model simulation results and existing estimates from ground-based observations, inventories, and statistical/empirical extrapolations. To achieve these 195 objectives, the NMIP group members have collectively developed a model simulation protocol 196 as outlined in Figure 1. 197

There are five key tasks or progressing stages in the protocol: 1) Development and
delivery of spatiotemporal model driving forces; 2) Individual model calibration and evaluation;
3) Model simulations and delivery of results; 4) Quality control and analysis of model results; 5)
Synthesis and uncertainty analysis.

202

203 **3. Key model input datasets**

204 To minimize the uncertainty that results from input datasets, the NMIP provided consistent model driving datasets for all modeling groups. The datasets include potential 205 vegetation, climate, atmospheric CO₂ concentration, atmospheric N deposition, synthetic N 206 207 fertilizer applications in cropland and pasture, manure N production and applications in cropland and pasture, and historical distribution of cropland at a spatial resolution of 0.5° by 0.5° 208 latitude/longitude (Table 1). Half-degree resolution is appropriate for studies at a global scale, 209 210 considering that most of model input data are available and many previous MIPs at a global scale were conducted at this resolution. Here we briefly describe these input data sets and their 211 212 sources.

1) Climate: CRU-NCEP climate version 7 is a fusion of the CRU and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis climate datasets between 1901 and 2015, which was reconstructed by the Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et l'Environnement, Paris, France (https://vesg.ipsl.upmc.fr). Major climate variables include longwave and shortwave radiation, air pressure, humidity, temperature, precipitation, and wind speed at 6-hourly temporal resolution. Monthly magnitude of climate variables in CRU-NCEP dataset was forced to be consistent with the observational-based CRU datasets.

220 2) Atmospheric CO₂: Monthly atmospheric CO₂ concentration from 1860 to 2015 was
 221 obtained from NOAA GLOBALVIEW-CO₂ dataset derived from atmospheric and ice core
 222 measurements (https://www.esrl.noaa.gov).

3) Vegetation: Potential vegetation map was acquired from the Synergetic Land Cover
Product (SYNMAP, <u>ftp://ftp.bgc-jena.mpg.de/pub/outgoing/mjung/SYNMAP/</u>), which merged
multiple satellite-global land cover maps into a desired classification approach (Jung et al., 2006).
Each 0.5° grid cell includes the area fractions for a maximum of 47 land cover types. Vegetation

in SYNMAP is classified according to its life form, leaf type, and leaf longevity. Barren ground, 227 permanent snow and ice are also included in this dataset. Based on this SYNMAP dataset, 228 participating model groups could create vegetated land fraction and reorganize the vegetation 229 230 types to generate the corresponding plant functional type and fractions for their models. Annual cropland area from 1860 to 2015 was acquired from the HYDE 3.2 datasets 231 (ftp://ftp.pbl.nl/hyde/), which reconstructed time-dependent land use by historical population and 232 allocation algorithms with weighting maps (Klein Goldewijk et al., 2016). This dataset shows 233 that global cropland area increased from 5.9 million km² in the year of 1850 to 15.2 million km² 234 235 in the year of 2015.

4) Atmospheric N deposition onto land surface: The monthly atmospheric N deposition 236 (NHx-N and NOy-N) during 1860 - 2014 were from the IGAC/SPARC Chemistry-Climate 237 Model Initiative (CCMI) N deposition fields. CCMI models explicitly considered N emissions 238 from natural biogenic sources, lightning, anthropogenic and biofuel sources, and biomass 239 burning (Eyring et al., 2013). The transport of N gases has also been simulated by the chemical 240 241 transport module in CCMI models. This data was recommended by the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) and used as the official products for CMIP6 models that lack 242 243 interactive chemistry components (https://blogs.reading.ac.uk/ccmi/forcing-databases-in-supportof-cmip6/). 244

5) N fertilizer application: Spatially-explicit synthetic N fertilizer use data was specifically developed in this project. We reconstructed the annual synthetic/mineral N fertilizer dataset from 1960 to 2014 for the global cropland, matched with HYDE 3.2 cropland distribution (Lu and Tian, 2017; https://doi.pangaea.de/10.1594/PANGAEA.863323). Data on national-level crop-specific fertilizer use amount was collected from the International Fertilizer Industry

Association (IFA) and FAO. This N fertilizer dataset shows that the global total N fertilizer amount increased from 11 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 1960 to 112 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 2013, and N fertilizer use rate per unit cropland area increased by about 8 times in this period. N fertilizer application rate before 1960 was linearly reduced to the zero in the 1900s.

6) Manure N production and application: Gridded annual manure N production in the 254 period of 1860-2014 was developed by integrating the Global Livestock Impact Mapping System 255 (GLIMS), the country-level livestock population from FAO, and N excretion rates of different 256 livestock categories according to IPCC 2006-Tier I and (Zhang et al., 257 2017. https://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.871980). This annual dataset shows that manure N 258 production increased by more than 6 times from 21 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 1860 to 131 Tg N yr⁻¹ in 2014, 259 and application rate of manure N to cropland is less than 20% of the total production. In this 260 261 project, we only consider the manure N application in cropland area. Manure N production and application rates in 2015 was assumed to be same as that in 2014. 262

All the input datasets were delivered to the modeling groups in netCDF format. To fit 263 with individual modeling requirements for input datasets, the modeling groups could either use a 264 subset of these data sets or add some additional data sets. For example, the participating model 265 266 DLEM used all these environmental factors as inputs, while the model O-CN did not use manure N as an input (See Table 3 for model input requirements in each model). Figure 2 illustrates the 267 inter-annual variations of the major input datasets at the global level during different available 268 time periods. Figure 3 shows the spatial patterns of atmospheric N deposition, N fertilizer use, 269 and manure N production in 1860, 1900, 1950, and 2014. 270

271

4. Model result benchmarking and evaluation

Except for bottom-up model simulations, the NMIP also plans to synthesize multiple 273 274 sources of terrestrial soil N_2O emission data to provide a benchmark for evaluating model estimates. Four types of data will be collected or developed to serve as a potential benchmark: 1) 275 276 Site-level N cycling processes and N₂O emission measurements through chamber or eddy-flux 277 tower across biomes; 2) N₂O flux measurement data from national-based or global-based measurement network (e.g., Long Term Ecological Research Network, Long Term 278 279 Agroecosystem Research Network, Greenhouse gas Reduction through Agriculture Carbon Enhancement network, http://www.n2o.net.au, etc.); 3) Other spatialized datasets, including 280 281 statistical extrapolation (e.g., Xu et al. 2008; Kurokawa et al., 2013; Zhuang et al., 2012); 4) N₂O 282 fluxes from other than terrestrial ecosystem sources to allow for a global budget (industrial, combustion, waste water & water bodies, marine and oceanic sources) (e.g., Battaglia and Joos, 283 284 in press; Davidson and Kanter, 2014; Galloway et al., 2004; Fowler et al., 2013; Winiwarter et al., 2017); and 5) atmospheric inversions (e.g., Saikawa et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2014) in 285 conjunction with atmospheric N₂O measurements from tall towers. We also call for more 286 287 observation-derived studies to provide regional and global N₂O emission estimates through advanced computational techniques, such as machine learning, Multi-Tree Ensemble (MTE), and 288 remote sensing products. We anticipate that through multiple constraints, process-based 289 modeling approach can be more effective and reliable in estimating magnitude, spatial and 290 temporal patterns of terrestrial N₂O emissions, and quantifying relative contributions of 291 292 environmental drivers to N₂O dynamics.

293

5. Major characteristics of participating models

295 The N cycle in the earth system involves complex biogeochemical processes, in which N 296 is transformed into various chemical forms, and circulates among the atmosphere, terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. Important terrestrial processes in the N cycle include biological N fixation 297 298 (BNF), mineralization (conversion of organic N to inorganic N during the processes of organic matter decomposition), immobilization (transformation of soil inorganic N to organic N), 299 300 ammonification (conversion of organic to ammonium N), volatilization (transformation of soil ammonium N to ammonia gas), nitrification (transformation of ammonium N to nitrate and 301 nitrite N), denitrification (the process of nitrate reduction by microbial activities), plant uptake 302 303 from soil, resorption by living plant organs, adsorption and desorption by soil mineral particles, 304 and N leaching from soil to aquatic systems. The modeled N processes include N transformation between organic and inorganic forms and movements among atmosphere, vegetation, soil, and 305 306 riverine systems. Although N processes are tightly coupled with carbon processes in soil and vegetation, the greater variability in N processes compared to C processes make it more difficult 307 to simulate N cycling. At current stage, the NMIP has included ten ecosystem models with 308 309 explicit terrestrial N cycling processes (Table 2; Figure 1). Nine models (DLEM, LM3V-N, ORCHIDEE, ORCHIDEE-CNP, O-CN, LPJ-GUESS, LPX-Bern, TRIPLEX-GHG and VISIT) 310 311 are capable of simulating N_2O emissions from both natural and agriculture ecosystems, while one model (CLM-CN) only simulates N₂O emissions from natural vegetation. The biophysical 312 processes (such as, canopy structure, albedo and evapotranspiration), biogeochemical processes 313 314 (such as decomposition and denitrification), and N input for cropland are significantly different from those for natural vegetation. For example, temperature in cropland was found to be lower 315 316 than that in natural forest due to the higher albedo and evapotranspiration (Bonan, 2000). These 317 differences could lead to different magnitude and timing of N₂O emissions from cropland.

Therefore, biophysical characteristics and management practices in cropland, such as crop cultivation, fertilizer uses, irrigation and harvesting, are required to be explicitly represented by the models with crop module.

In order to assess the uncertainty from model structure, each participating model was asked to complete a detailed survey specifying the modeling mechanisms in exogenous N inputs (e.g., N deposition, synthetic N fertilizer and manure N application, and BNF) and N transformation processes. The summarized survey results are shown in Table 3. In general, N₂O emissions from soil are regulated at two levels, which are the rates of nitrification and denitrification in the soil and soil physical factors regulating the ratio of N₂O to other nitrous gases (Davidson et al., 2000).

For N input to land ecosystems, all ten models considered the atmospheric N deposition 328 and biological fixation, nine models with a crop N_2O module included N fertilizer use, but only 329 six models considered manure as N input. For vegetation processes, all models included dynamic 330 algorithms in simulating N allocation to different living tissues and vegetation N turnover, and 331 332 simulated plant N uptake using the "Demand and Supply-driven" approach. For soil N processes, all ten models simulated N leaching according to water runoff rate; however, the models differ in 333 334 representing nitrification and denitrification processes and the impacts of soil chemical and physical factors. The differences in simulating nitrification and denitrification processes are one 335 of the major uncertainties in estimating N₂O emissions. Algorithms associated with N₂O 336 337 emissions in each participating model are briefly described in Appendix A.

338

6. The NMIP model simulation methods and experimental designs

340 **6.1 Model initialization**

341 The model simulations were divided into two stages: (1) spin-up and (2) transient runs (Figure 4). During the spin-up run, models were driven by the repeated climate data from 1901 -342 1920 and by other driving forces in 1860, i.e., atmospheric CO₂ concentration, N deposition, N 343 fertilizer use, manure N application, and land cover and land use change (LCLU). The N 344 fertilizer use was assumed to be zero in 1860. Each model group could determine the spin-up 345 running years according to model's specific requirement. For example, the DLEM assumed that 346 model reaches the equilibrium status when the differences of grid-level carbon, N, and water 347 stocks were less than 0.5 g C m⁻², 0.5 g N m⁻², and 0.5 mm in two consecutive 50 years. When 348 349 these thresholds were met, the spin-up run stopped and model reached an equilibrium state.

350

351 **6.2 Model simulation experiments**

During the transient run, seven experiments were designed to simulate global terrestrial 352 N₂O emissions. All the model experiments started with the equilibrium carbon, water and N 353 status in 1860, which is obtained from the spin-up run, and transiently ran through the period 354 355 during 1860-2015 (Figure 4). For the period of 1860-1900 when CRU/NCEP climate data is not available, the 20-year average climate data between 1901 and 1920 were used. In the NMIP, we 356 357 applied the progressively reducing factor experimental scheme (i.e., first experiment includes all factors and then reduce one factor each time; the effect of this factor is equal to the difference 358 between previous and current experiment) to simulate the impacts of individual environmental 359 360 factors on N₂O fluxes. In total, seven experiments (from S0 to S6) were designed (Figure 4). The S0 reference (baseline) run was designed to track the model internal fluctuation and model drift. 361 The S1 experiment included the temporal variations of all time-varying driving forces. "Best 362 363 estimate" of N₂O emissions were acquired from either S1 experiment (for models considering

manure as input) or S2 experiment (for models without considering manure). The overall effect
of all environmental factors was calculated as: S1-S0. The effects of manure N use (MANN), N
fertilizer use (NFER), N deposition (NDEP), LCLU, atmospheric CO₂ (CO₂), and climate (CLIM)
were respectively calculated as: S1–S2, S2–S3, S3–S4, S4–S5, S5–S6, and S6–S0, respectively.

368

7. Model outputs, quality control and data availability

370 All participating model groups are requested to provide the gridded simulations of N_2O 371 fluxes from global terrestrial ecosystems and other relevant variables that can be used for 372 understanding C-N coupling and key N processes simulated by each individual model (Table 4). 373 The required model output will be submitted at the annual time-step during 1860-2015 and at the 374 monthly time-step during 1980-2015. In addition to modeling estimates of grid-level fluxes and pool sizes, modeling groups will submit biome-level results to facilitate biome-level N2O 375 emission analysis and split contributions of global N₂O dynamics to primary biome types. The 376 model output from each modeling group is sent to the core team led by Dr. Hangin Tian for data 377 378 quality checking and preliminary analysis. The quality control is conducted to check if the individual model results are reasonable and to avoid the obvious errors during model simulations. 379 380 After quality control process, model output is transferred to a data sharing website.

The model input and output datasets are made available to all model groups for further analyses. Model input data and model results will be made available to broader research community once the results of the first NMIP are published. A data use and authorship policy has been established.

385

8. Result analysis and synthesis

387 Based on model results, the NMIP team will provide multi-model ensemble estimates for terrestrial N₂O fluxes at various scales from country-, sector-, continental, to global, and also 388 assess differences and uncertainties among participating models. Through the seven simulation 389 experiments, the magnitudes and spatiotemporal variations in terrestrial N_2O emissions will be 390 391 attributed to changes in different environmental factors at both regional and global scales. The 392 global and regional N₂O flux data derived from other sources including atmospheric inversion, statistical extrapolation, and inventory approaches (e.g., the N_2O emission data collected in Tian 393 et al. 2016) will be compared and integrated with the NMIP modeled results. Through these 394 395 syntheses and evaluations of modeled versus field observed N_2O dynamics, we will further identify the gaps in our understanding to estimate N₂O fluxes and put forward potential strategies 396 to improve the models. In the following sections, we provide an initial analysis of simulated 397 terrestrial N₂O emissions from the three models (DLEM, O-CN, and VISIT), which simulate 398 both natural and agricultural emissions. 399

As indicated by the model ensemble, the global N₂O emission has significantly increased, 400 especially since the 1960s with more rapidly rising exogenous N inputs to terrestrial ecosystems 401 (Figure 5). Natural soils were the largest source across the entire period. Cropland is the single 402 403 largest contributor to the increasing trend in N_2O emissions during 1860-2015. Despite the same input datasets, the interannual variations among the three models were different due to the 404 differences in model structure and parameters. The estimated N₂O emissions from VISIT were 405 406 consistently higher than those from the other two models during 1860-2015; N_2O emissions from DLEM and O-CN were similar in magnitude. The increasing trends of N₂O emissions before the 407 408 end of 1960s were similar among the three models, while the largest increasing trend was found 409 for O-CN, followed by DLEM and the least for VISIT. The ultimate global terrestrial N₂O

410 budgets, interannual variations, and attributions of the differences among models will be further 411 analyzed in more detail after modeling results from all ten models are included.

The terrestrial N₂O emissions showed substantial spatial variations across the global land 412 surface since 1860 (Figure 6). The highest emission was from the tropical area during all four 413 periods (i.e., the 1860s, 1900s, 1950s, and 2001-2015) (Figure 6), primarily due to higher soil N 414 415 transformation rates and soil N contents in tropical ecosystems. The latitudinal distribution patterns were slightly different from the 1860s to 2001-2015, showing an increasing importance 416 and second peak of N_2O emissions in the temperate climatic zone of the Northern Hemisphere. 417 418 Temperate regions were another hotspot for N₂O emissions due to the high N fertilizer use and N deposition rates in China, India, Europe, and the contiguous United States. Of all 14 examined 419 regions as defined by Global Carbon Project (GCP) CH₄ budget synthesis (Saunois et al., 2016), 420 tropical South America had the largest N₂O emissions throughout the study period, contributing 421 to about 20% of the global total emission (Figure 7). China and the contiguous United States 422 were characterized by the most rapid N₂O increasing rates. In the recent three decades, China, 423 424 India, and western Europe were the only three regions with higher N₂O emissions from cropland than that from natural ecosystems. It is noteworthy to point out that the estimated cropland N_2O 425 426 emissions in these three regions have large uncertainty ranges due to varied model representation and parameterization methods of the impacts from agricultural management. Larger uncertainty 427 ranges for N₂O emissions from natural ecosystems were found in Russia, Northern Africa, 428 429 Boreal North America, Southeast Asia, and the contiguous United States.

430

9. Summary 431

432 Current assessments of terrestrial N₂O emission at regional and global scales are subject to large uncertainties. The NMIP is attempting to better identify, and eventually reduce those 433 uncertainties. The activity was initialized in 2015 and currently includes ten terrestrial biosphere 434 models with N cycling coupled. NMIP is an open initiative and other models are invited to join 435 the effort. It targets to provide an improved estimate of global and regional terrestrial N₂O fluxes 436 437 as a contribution to the larger GCP Global N₂O Budget activity. NMIP is being developed with the capacity to update flux estimates at regular intervals and quantify the uncertainties related to 438 model structure, algorithms, and parameters. The NMIP protocol includes seven simulation 439 440 experiments to quantify and attribute the contribution of environmental factors to the interannual variation and long-term trend of terrestrial N₂O emissions. In addition, this project 441 intends to identify our knowledge gaps and bring forward potential strategies for improving the 442 prediction capability of N₂O models in the future. The data products and ensemble estimates of 443 terrestrial N₂O emissions will be made available and package to be relevant for policy makers 444 and non-government entities participating in the climate change issues. 445

446

447 Acknowledgments

H. Tian and his team acknowledge the support by National Key Research and Development
Program of China (# 2017YFA0604702), CAS Grants (KFJ-STS-ZDTP-0; SKLURE2017-1-6),
NOAA Grants (G00010410, G00010318), National Science Foundation (1210360, 1243232) and
Auburn University IGP Program. A. Ito was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of
Science (Grant # 17H01867). C. Peng acknowledges the support by National Science and
Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) discovery grant and China's QianRen
Program. E. Saikawa was supported by NOAA Climate Program Office's AC4 program, award #

455	NA13OAR4310059. S. Zaehle was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under
456	the European Union's H2020 Programme (grant # 647304; QUINCY). P. Ciais and J. Chang are
457	supported by the European Research Council Synergy grant ERC-2013-SyG-
458	610028 IMBALANCE-P. S. Lienert and F. Joos acknowledge support by the Swiss National
459	Science Foundation (# 200020_172476). We acknowledge Dr. Andy Jacobson for extending
460	global gridded monthly CO ₂ data for us to use in the NMIP. The authors declare no conflict of
461	interest.

463	Appendix A: Brief description of algorithms associated with N ₂ O flux in each participating
464	model

465 1) CLM-CN-N₂O:

466 CLMCN-N₂O is based on the DeNitrification-DeComposition (DNDC) model (Li et al.,
467 1992) implemented in the Community Land Model v3.5 (Oleson et al., 2008; Stöckli et al., 2008)
468 with explicit carbon and nitrogen (CN) processes (Thornton et al., 2007; Randerson et al., 2009;
469 Thornton et al. 2009). CLMCN-N₂O is added to CLM-CN v3.5 in a one-way coupling
470 framework and simulates N₂O emissions during nitrification and denitrification processes at an
471 hourly time step.

472 Nitrification (R_{nit}) is temperature and moisture dependent and N₂O is computed by the 473 following equation as described in Li et al. (1992):

474
$$R_{nit} = C_{NH4} f(T1)$$
 (1)

475 where C_{NH4} is the NH₄⁺-N content in soil and f(T1) is the response function of soil temperature 476 to nitrification rate. Denitrification is also soil temperature and moisture dependent and it takes place under
the anaerobic state. CLMCN-N₂O specifies the anaerobic state when the water-filled pore space
is more than 41.5% in the soil layer. Under this condition, N₂O is created based on the growth
rate of denitrifying bacteria, as well as consumption and assimilation by plants and microbes,
following Li et al. (1992). Detailed processes in simulating N₂O emissions can be found in
Saikawa et al., 2013.

483

484 2) DLEM2.0:

The nitrogen cycle scheme in DLEM2.0 (Yang et al. 2015; Xu et al. 2017) are similar as DLEM1.0 (Tian et al., 2010, 2011, 2012; Lu and Tian., 2013; Xu et al., 2012), However, the N₂O emission schemes in DLEM2.0 (Xu et al., 2017) have been modified based on Chatskikh et al. (2005) and Heinen (2006).

$$R_{nit} = k_{nit max} f(T1) f(WFPS) C_{NH4}$$
(2)

$$490 \quad R_{den} = k_{den_max} f(T2) f(WFPS) C_{NO3} \tag{3}$$

491 where R_{nit} is the daily nitrification rate (g N/m²/d); R_{den} is the daily denitrification rate (g 492 N/m²/d); f(T1) and f(T2) are the impact function of daily soil temperature on nitrification and 493 denitrification, respectively; f(WFPS) is the impact function of water-filled pore space (WFPS) 494 on nitrification, denitrification and N₂O diffusion; k_{nit_max} is the maximum fraction of NH₄⁺-N 495 that is converted to NO₃⁻-N or gases (0-1); k_{den_max} is the maximum fraction of NO₃⁻-N that is 496 converted to gases (0-1); C_{NH4} and C_{NO3} are the soil NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N content (g N/m²). N₂O 497 from denitrification and nitrification processes are calculated as,

498
$$R_{N20} = (R_{nit} + R_{den})f(T3)(1 - f(WFPS))$$
(4)

where R_{N20} is the daily N₂O emission rate (g N/m²/d); f(T3) is the impact function of daily soil temperature on N₂O diffusion rate from soil pores. The calculation methods for these functions and parameters were described in detail in Xu et al. (2017) and Yang et al. (2015).

502

503 3) LM3V-N:

504 In LM3V-N, nitrification is proportional to substrate availability (i.e., NH₄⁺), modified by 505 functions that account for effects of temperature and WFPS adapted from Parton et al. (1996).

506 Nitrification-associated N₂O emission (R_{nit}) is evaluated by

507
$$R_{nit} = k_{nit_base} f(WFPS) f(T1) C_{NH4} / b_{NH4}$$
(5)

where $k_{nit \ base}$ is the base nitrification rate; b_{NH4} is the buffer parameter for soil NH₄⁺.

Denitrification is described by a Monod-type equation, where both carbon and nitrate substrate availability can have limiting effects on N gas production following Li et al. (2000). These functions are further modified by temperature (based on Xu-Ri and Prentice, 2008), and by WFPS indicating the availability and/or absence of oxygen (adapted from Parton et al., 1996). $R_{den} = k_{den\ base} f(T2) f(WFPS) f_q C_{NO3} / b_{NO3}$ (6)

where k_{den_base} is the base denitrification rate; f_g denotes the impact of labile carbon availability to nitrate on the growth of denitrifies; b_{NO3} is the buffer parameter for soil NO₃⁻.

Gaseous losses are partitioned between NO_x and N_2O during nitrification is parameterized based on air-filled porosity, following Parton et al. (2001). Partitioning between N_2O and N_2 during denitrification follows the empirical function of Del Grosso et al. (2000), which combines effects of substrate, electron donors (labile C), and water filled pore space.

520
$$R_{N20} = 0.004R_{nit} + R_{den}f(WFPS)f(C_{N03})$$
 (7)

521 Nitrification/denitrification are treated as fast processes (Shevliakova et al., 2009) and 522 thus updated on sub-hourly time steps along with updates on soil moisture, soil temperature and 523 C and N mineralization. Model description including model formulation are detailed in Huang 524 and Gerber (2015).

525

526 4) LPJ-GUESS:

The nitrogen cycle scheme in LPJ-GUESS is based on CENTURY (Parton et al., 1996) and Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008). Inorganic soil nitrogen pools in the model are: ammonium, nitrite and nitrate. Nitrification only occurs in the dry part of the soil (fractionated using waterfilled pore space, WFPS), the ratio between N_2O and NO_x of the gaseous losses in nitrification is based on the moisture content in the soil (f(WFPS)).

532
$$R_{nit} = k_{nit_max} f(WFPS) C_{NH4}$$
(8)

533 Denitrification occurs in the wet part (based on WFPS) of the soil, the denitrification rate 534 depends on temperature, soil moisture and labile carbon (approximated with heterotrophic 535 respiration, rh). Gaseous losses through denitrification results in N₂O, N₂ and NO_x.

536
$$R_{den} = k_{den_base} f(T2) f(WFPS) f(rh) C_{NO3}$$
(9)

The fractionation between the gaseous N species are modelled using soil moisture and temperature. All losses of gaseous N, are modelled. Emissions to the atmosphere from these pools are modelled using rate modifiers that are based on the soil moisture and temperature. No re-transformation of these gaseous N species is considered. These processes (N-cycling and gaseous N emissions) are modelled in different land use classes: natural vegetation, pastures/rangelands and croplands. On croplands, fertilizers are spread as mineral and/or organic N. Mineral fertilizers are considered as an input to the ammonium and nitrate pools at a fixed ratio (50/50), and manure as an input into the organic nitrogen pool with a fixed C:N ratio (currently set to 30).

546

547 5) LPX-Bern:

The implementation of nitrogen dynamics in LPX-Bern is based on the work of Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008). Nitrogen uptake by plants is governed by their demand and the availability of nitrogen in two soil pools representing ammonium and nitrate. Nitrogen from deposition and fertilization are added to these inorganic soil pools. Losses include ammonium volatilization, nitrate leaching as well as N₂O and NO production during nitrification and N₂O, NO and N₂ production during denitrification. Aerobic nitrification of ammonium is dependent on soil temperature (T_{soil}) and indirectly on soil water content due to the partitioning of wet and dry soil:

555
$$R_{nit} = max_{nit}f_1(T_{soil})C_{NH4,dry}$$
(10)

where $max_{nit} = 0.92 \text{ day}^{-1}$ is the daily maximum nitrification rate at 20°C.

557 Anaerobic denitrification of nitrate in wet soil depends on labile carbon availability and soil 558 temperature:

559
$$R_{den} = R_{mb} / (R_{mb} + K_{mb}) f_2(T_{soil}) C_{NO3,wet} / (C_{NO3,wet} + K_n)$$
(11)

The parameters K_{mb} and K_n are taken from Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008) and R_{mb} is the microbiotical soil respiration. The amount of Nitrogen lost as N₂O due to nitrification and denitrification is modelled as a function of soil temperature, water content and the respective process rate.

564

565 6) O-CN:

566 The treatment of inorganic soil nitrogen dynamics in O-CN follows largely Xu-Ri and

Prentice (2008). O-CN (Zaehle and Friend, 2010) considers N losses to NH₃ volatilisation, NOx, N₂O and N₂ production and emission, as well as NH₄ and NO₃ leaching. Inorganic nitrogen dynamics in the soil are tightly coupled to plant uptake and net mineralization. The anaerobic volume fraction of the soil is estimated by an empirical function of the fractional soil moisture content (Zaehle et al. 2011). The fraction of ammonium in the aerobic part of the soil is subject to nitrification, according to:

573
$$R_{nit} = vmax_{nit}f(T1)f(pH1)C_{NH4}$$
(12)

where f(pH1) is the soil pH response functions for nitrification (Li et al. 1992; Xu-Ri and Prentice, 2008), and *vmax_{nit}* is the maximum daily nitrification rate under 20°C and favourable pH conditions (Xu-Ri and Prentice, 2008).

577 Gross denitrification of the fraction of nitrate under anoxic conditions is modelled as:

578
$$R_{den} = R_{mb} / (R_{mb} + K_{mb}) f(T2) f(pH2) C_{NO3} / (C_{NO3} + K_n)$$
(13)

where f(pH2) is the soil pH response functions for denitrification (Li et al., 1992; Xu-Ri and Prentice, 2008), R_{mb} is the soil microbial respiration rate, and K_{mb} and K_n parameters taken from Li et al. (1992).

582 The N_2O production from nitrification and denitrification is then calculated as:

583
$$R_{N20} = a_{nit} f(T1) R_{nit} + b_{den} f(T2) f(pH3) R_{den}$$
(14)

where a_{nit} and b_{denit} are fraction loss constants, f(pH3) is a pH-modifier changing the degree of denitrification producing N₂O versus NO_x or N₂ (Zaehle et al. 2011). Emissions of volatile compounds are simulated using the empirical emission of Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008).

587

588 7) ORCHIDEE:

589 Modeling of the mineral N dynamics by the ORCHIDEE model originates from the 590 formulations used in the O-CN (Zaehle and Friend, 2010). It is composed of five pools for 591 ammonium/ammoniac, nitrate, NOx, nitrous oxide, and di-nitrogen forms. N₂O production in 592 both nitrification and denitrification processes are represented.

593 The potential daily rate of nitrification, R_{nit} , occurs only on the aerobic fraction of the 594 soil and is a function of temperature, pH, and ammonium concentration (C_{NH4}):

595
$$R_{nit} = (1 - f(WFPS))f(T1)f(pH1)k_{nit}C_{NH4}$$
 (15)

where k_{nit} is the reference potential NO3⁻ production per mass unit of ammonium.

597 N₂O production by nitrification ($R_{N2O,nit}$, g N-N₂O/m²/d) is expressed as a function of the 598 potential daily rate of nitrification (R_{nit} , g N-NO₃⁻/m²/d), temperature and the water content as 599 shown in Zhang et al. (2002).

600
$$R_{N20,nit} = f(WFPS)f(T1)R_{nit}p_{N20,nit}$$
 (16)

where $p_{N20,nit}$ (g N-N₂O (g N-NO₃⁻)⁻¹) is the reference N₂O production per mass unit of NO₃⁻ produced by nitrification. The denitrification occurs on the anaerobic fraction of the soil which is computed as a function of the water-filled porosity (*f*(*WFPS*)) and is controlled by temperature, pH, soil NO concentration and denitrifier microbial activity (*a_{microb}*, g m⁻²) (Li et al., 2000).

$$605 \quad R_{N20,den} = f(WFPS)f(T2)f(pH)f(N0)p_{N20,den}a_{microb}$$
(17)

where f(NO) is a Michaelis-Menten shape function and $p_{N2O,den}$ is the reference N₂O production per mass unit of denitrifier microbes.

608

610 ORCHIDEE-CNP (Goll et al., 2017) is a version with the implementation of the 611 phosphorus cycle into the nitrogen enabled version of ORCHIDEE (ORCHIDEE-CN; Vuichard 612 in prep.). The inorganic soil nitrogen dynamics of ORCHIDEE-CNP includes N₂O from both nitrification and denitrification processes following the processes of O-CN (Zaehle et al., 2011). 613 One exception is the BNF. In ORCHIDEE-CNP, BNF is a function of NPP (Cleveland et al., 614 1999) and also regulated by soil mineral N concentration. ORCHIDEE-CNP accounts for 615 influence of phosphorus state of vegetation on tissue nutrient concentrations and phosphatase-616 617 mediated biochemical mineralization. Changes in nutrient content (quality) of litter affect the carbon use efficiency of decomposition and in return the nutrient availability to vegetation. The 618 model explicitly accounts for root zone depletion of phosphorus as a function of root phosphorus 619 620 uptake and phosphorus transport from soil to the root surface.

621

622 9) TRIPLEX-GHG

TRIPLEX-GHG model (Zhu et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2017) is designed to simulate N_2O 623 emissions by coupling major theoretical foundations for processes of nitrification and 624 denitrification reported by Li et al. (2000). Briefly, the nitrification rate is calculated by the 625 Michaelis-Menten function based on the concentration of NH_{4^+} , and microbial activity of 626 nitrifying bacteria is explicitly involved based on simulating their growth and death; 627 628 denitrification is expressed in a more complex way by taking into account the chain reaction $(NO_3^- \rightarrow NO_2^- \rightarrow NO \rightarrow N_2O \rightarrow N_2)$. Each step of denitrification can be regarded as an 629 630 independent process, but these steps are linked by competition for DOC between specific 631 denitrifiers during each step. A double substrate-based (DOC and NO_x) Michaelis-Menten equation was adopted to simulate the growth rates of NO_x denitrifiers (Li et al., 2000). In 632 633 addition, the effects of different factors, such as soil temperature, soil moisture and pH, are also 634 considered. The key equations for nitrification are showed as follows,

635
$$R_{nit} = B_{nit} \frac{R_{max}C_{NH4}}{(6.18 + C_{NH4})} pH$$
(18)

$$636 \quad R_{max} = COE_{NR} \cdot N_p \tag{19}$$

$$637 \quad F_{NN20} = FMAX_{N20}R_{nit}f(T1)f(WFPS) \tag{20}$$

where R_{nit} is the nitrification rate (kg N m⁻² d⁻¹); R_{max} is the maximum nitrification rate (d⁻¹); B_{nit} is the biomass concentration of nitrifiers (kg C m⁻²); *pH* is the soil pH; *COE_{NR}* represents the nitrification coefficient; N_p represents the nitrification potential (mg N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹); *FMAX_{N20}* is the maximum N₂O fraction during nitrification (kg N m⁻² d⁻¹); and *f(T1)* and *f(WFPS)* are the functions of the effects of soil temperature and soil moisture on N₂O emissions during nitrification, respectively.

644

The key equations for denitrification are showed as follows,

$$645 \qquad R_{NOX} = MUE_{NOX} \frac{[DOC]}{[DOC] + K_c} \frac{[NO_x]}{[NO_x] + K_n}$$
(21)

646
$$F_{ANNOX} = COE_{dNOx}B_{denit}\left(\frac{R_{NOx}}{EFF_{NOx}} + \frac{MAI_{NOx}[NO_x]}{[N]}\right)f_{NOx}(pH2)f(T2)$$
(22)

where MUE_{NOx} is the maximum growth rate of NO_x denitrifiers (h⁻¹); [DOC] and [NO_x] represent 647 the concentrations of DOC (kg C m⁻³ h⁻¹) and NO_x (kg N m⁻³ h⁻¹), respectively, in the anaerobic 648 balloon; K_c (kg C m⁻³) and K_n (kg N m⁻³) are the half saturation value of C and N oxides, 649 respectively. F_{ANNOX} is the consumption rate of NO_x (kg N m⁻³ h⁻¹); COE_{dNOx} represents the 650 coefficient of NO_x consumption; B_{denit} is the biomass of denitrifiers (kg C m⁻³); R_{NOx} is the NO_x 651 reduction rate (h^{-1}) ; $[NO_x]$ and [N] are the concentrations of NO_x and total N, respectively, in the 652 anaerobic balloon (kg N m⁻³); *EFF_{NOx}* is the efficiency parameter for NO_x denitrifiers (kg C kg N 653 ⁻¹); *MAI*_{NOx} is the maintenance coefficient of NO_x (h⁻¹); and $f(t)_{denit}$ represents the effect of the 654 soil temperature on the denitrification rate during each step. 655

657 10) VISIT

The nitrogen cycle scheme of VISIT is composed of three organic soil nitrogen pools (microbe, litter, and humus), two inorganic soil nitrogen pools (ammonium and nitrate), and vegetation pools. Fertilizer is considered as an input to the ammonium and nitrate pools at a fixed ratio, and manure as an input into the litter organic nitrogen pool. N₂O emissions through nitrification and denitrification are estimated using the scheme developed by Parton et al. (1996). Nitrification-associated N₂O emission ($R_{nit,N2O}$) is evaluated as follows,

664
$$R_{nit,N20} = f(WFPS)f(pH1)f(T1)(K_{max} + F_{max}f(NH4))$$
 (23)

where K_{max} is the soil-specific turnover coefficient; F_{max} is the parameter of maximum nitrification gas flux; and $f(NH_4)$ is the effect of soil ammonium on nitrification. Denitrificationassociated N₂O emission ($R_{den,N2O}$) is evaluated by the following equation:

668
$$R_{den,N20} = R_{den}(1 + R_{N2/N20})$$
 (24)

669
$$R_{den} = \min(f(NO_3), f(CO_2)) \times f(WFPS)$$
 (25)

where $R_{N2/N2O}$ is the fractionation coefficient, which is also a function of WFPS, soil nitrate, and heterotrophic respiration, $f(NO_3)$ is the maximum denitrification rate in high soil respiration rate condition, $f(CO_2)$ is the maximum denitrification rate in high NO₃⁻ levels, and f(WFPS) is the effect of WFPS on denitrification rate.

674

676 **References**

- Battaglia, G. and Joos, F. In PRESS: Marine N₂O emissions from nitrification and denitrification
 constrained by modern observations and projected in multi-millennial global warming
- 679 simulations. Global Biogeochemical Cycles. **DOI:** 10.1002/2017GB005671 Bonan, G. B.
- 680 2001: Observational evidence for reduction of daily maximum temperature by croplands in
- the Midwest United States. Journal of Climate, 14(11), 2430-2442.
- Brotto, A. C., Kligerman, D. C., Andrade, S. A., Ribeiro, R. P., Oliveira, J. L., Chandran, K., and
- de Mello, W. Z, 2015: Factors controlling nitrous oxide emissions from a full-scale activated
 sludge system in the tropics, Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 22, 1184011849.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E. M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R., and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S.,
- 687 2013: Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their
- controls?, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 368, 20130122,
- 689 https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0122.
- Cai, Z., Xing, G., Yan, X., Xu, H., Tsuruta, H., Yagi, K., and Minami, K., 1997: Methane and
 nitrous oxide emissions from rice paddy fields as affected by nitrogen fertilisers and water
 management, Plant and soil, 196, 7-14.
- 693 Chatskikh, D., Olesen, J. E., Berntsen, J., Regina, K., and Yamulki, S., 2005: Simulation of
- effects of soils, climate and management on N₂O emission from grasslands, Biogeochemistry,
 76, 395-419.
- 696 Ciais, P., and Coauthors, 2013: Carbon and other biogeochemical cycles. In Climate Change
- 697 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment
- Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press,

699 Cambridge, UK, 465–570.

- Cleveland, C. C. and Coauthors, 1999: Global patterns of terrestrial biological nitrogen (N₂)
- fixation in natural ecosystems, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 13, 623-645.
- 702 Davidson, E. Keller, M., Erickson, H., Verchot, L., and Veldkamp, E., 2000: Testing a
- conceptual model of soil emissions of nitrous and nitric oxides: using two functions based on
- soil nitrogen availability and soil water content, the hole-in-the-pipe model characterizes a
- large fraction of the observed variation of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide emissions from soils.
- AIBS Bulletin 50, 8(2000), 667-680.

- Davidson, E. A., 2009: The contribution of manure and fertilizer nitrogen to atmospheric nitrous
 oxide since 1860, Nature Geoscience, 2, 659-662.
- Davidson, E. A. & Kanter, D., 2014: Inventories and scenarios of nitrous oxide emissions.
 Environ. Res. Lett. 9, 105012.
- 711 Del Grosso, S., Parton, W., Mosier, A., Ojima, D., Kulmala, A., and Phongpan, S., 2000:
- General model for N₂O and N₂ gas emissions from soils due to dentrification, Global
 Biogeochemical Cycles, 14, 1045-1060.
- Ding, W., Yagi, K., Cai, Z., and Han, F., 2010: Impact of long-term application of fertilizers on
 N₂O and NO production potential in an intensively cultivated sandy loam soil, Water, Air, &
 Soil Pollution, 212, 141-153.
- 717 Eyring, Veronika and Coauthors, 2013: Overview of IGAC/SPARC Chemistry-Climate Model
- 718 Initiative (CCMI) community simulations in support of upcoming ozone and climate
 719 assessments, SPARC newsletter 40(Januar): 48-66.
- Firestone, M. K. and Davidson, E. A., 1989: Microbiological basis of NO and N₂O production
 and consumption in soil, Exchange of trace gases between terrestrial ecosystems and the
 atmosphere, 47, 7-21.
- Fowler, D. and Coauthors, 2013: The global nitrogen cycle in the twenty-first century.
 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 368, 20130164–
 20130164. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0164
- Fowler, D. and Coauthors, 2015: Effects of global change during the 21st century on the nitrogen
 cycle, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15(24), 13849-13893.
- Galloway, J. N. and Coauthors, 2004: Nitrogen Cycles: Past, Present, and Future.
 Biogeochemistry 70: 153–226
- Galloway, J. N. and Coauthors, 2008: Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends,
 questions, and potential solutions, Science, 320, 889-892.
- Goldberg, S. D. and Gebauer, G., 2009: Drought turns a Central European Norway spruce forest
 soil from an N₂O source to a transient N₂O sink, Global Change Biology, 15, 850-860.
- Goll, D. S. and Coauthors, 2017: A representation of the phosphorus cycle for ORCHIDEE,
- Geoscientific Model Development Discussion, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2017-62, in
- review.

- Gruber, N. and Galloway, J. N., 2008: An Earth-system perspective of the global nitrogen cycle,
 Nature, 451, 293-296.
- Heinen, M., 2006: Simplified denitrification models: overview and properties, Geoderma, 133,
 444-463.
- Huang, Y. and Gerber, S., 2015: Global soil nitrous oxide emissions in a dynamic carbonnitrogen model, Biogeosciences, 12, 6405-6427.
- Huntzinger, D. N. and Coauthors, 2013: The North American Carbon Program Multi-scale
 Synthesis and Terrestrial Model Intercomparison Project: Part 1: Overview and experimental
 design, Geoscientific Model Development, 6, 2121–2133, http://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-62121-2013.
- Ichii, K. and Coauthors, 2013: Site-level model–data synthesis of terrestrial carbon fluxes in the
 CarboEastAsia eddy-covariance observation network: toward future modeling efforts,
 Journal of Forest Research, 18, 13-20.
- Inatomi, M., Ito, A., Ishijima, K., and Murayama, S., 2010: Greenhouse gas budget of a cooltemperate deciduous broad-leaved forest in Japan estimated using a process-based model,
 Ecosystems, 13, 472-483.
- Ito, A. and Inatomi, M., 2012: Use of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets
 of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty, Biogeosciences, 9, 759-773
- Ito, A., Nishina, K., and Noda, H. M., 2016: Evaluation of global warming impacts on the carbon
 budget of terrestrial ecosystems in monsoon Asia: a multi-model analysis, Ecological
 research, 31, 459-474.
- Jung, M., Henkel, K., Herold, M., and Churkina, G., 2006: Exploiting synergies of global land
 cover products for carbon cycle modeling, Remote Sensing of Environment, 101, 534-553.
- 760 Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., Doelman, J., and Stehfest, E., 2016: New anthropogenic land
- visue estimates for the Holocene; HYDE 3.2, Earth System Science Data Discussions,
- 762 https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2016-58, in review.
- Kurokawa, J., Ohara, T., Morikawa, T., Hanayama, S., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Fukui, T.,
- Kawashima, K., and Akimoto, H. 2013: Emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases
- over Asian regions during 2000–2008: Regional Emission inventory in ASia (REAS) version
- 2. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 21, 11019-11058.

- Le Quéré, C. and Coauthors, 2016: Global carbon budget 2016, Earth System Science Data, 8,
 605-649.
- Li, C., Aber, J., Stange, F., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Papen, H., Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S., Li, C.
 S., and Aber, J., 2000: A process-oriented model of N₂O and NO emissions from forest soils:
- 1. Model development, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 105, 4369-4384.
- Li, C., Frolking, S., and Frolking, T. A., 1992: A model of nitrous oxide evolution from soil
 driven by rainfall events: 1. Model structure and sensitivity, Journal of Geophysical Research:
 Atmospheres, 97, 9759-9776.
- Lu, C. and Tian, H., 2017: Global nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizer use for agriculture
 production in the past half century: shifted hot spots and nutrient imbalance, Earth System
 Science Data, 9, 181-192.
- Lu, C. and Tian, H., 2013: Net greenhouse gas balance in response to nitrogen enrichment:
 perspectives from a coupled biogeochemical model, Global Change Biology, 19, 571-588.
- Lü, C. and Tian, H., 2007: Spatial and temporal patterns of nitrogen deposition in China:
- synthesis of observational data, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112,
 D22S05, <u>http://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007990</u>.
- MacFarling, M. and Coauthors, 2006: Law Dome CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O ice core records extended
 to 2000 years BP. Geophysical Research Letters, 33. L14810.
- Melillo, J., Borchers, J., and Chaney, J., 1995: Vegetation/ecosystem modeling and analysis
 project: Comparing biogeography and geochemistry models in a continental-scale study of
 terrestrial ecosystem responses to climate change and CO₂ doubling, Global Biogeochemical
 Cycles, 9, 407-437.
- Melton, J. and Coauthors, 2013: Present state of global wetland extent and wetland methane
 modelling: conclusions from a model intercomparison project (WETCHIMP),
 Biogeosciences, 10, 753-788.
- Myhre, G., and Coauthors, 2013 Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing, in: Climate
- 793 Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth
- Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge
- 795 University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA

- 796 Oleson, K. and Coauthors, 2008: Improvements to the Community Land Model and their impact
- on the hydrological cycle, Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 113, G01021,
 http://doi.org/10.1029/2007JG000563.
- Olin, S. and Coauthors, 2015: Soil carbon management in large-scale Earth system modelling:
 implications for crop yields and nitrogen leaching, Earth System Dynamics, 6, 745-768.
- Pan, S. and Coauthors, 2015: Responses of global terrestrial evapotranspiration to climate
 change and increasing atmospheric CO₂ in the 21st century, Earth's Future, 3, 15-35.
- Parton, W., Holland, E., Del Grosso, S., Hartman, M., Martin, R., Mosier, A., Ojima, D., and
 Schimel, D., 2001: Generalized model for NO_x and N₂O emissions from soils, Journal of
 Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 17403-17419.
- Parton, W., Mosier, A., Ojima, D., Valentine, D., Schimel, D., Weier, K., and Kulmala, A. E.,
 1996: Generalized model for N₂ and N₂O production from nitrification and denitrification,
 Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 10, 401-412.
- Parton, W. J., Hartman, M., Ojima, D., and Schimel, D., 1998: DAYCENT and its land surface
 submodel: description and testing, Global and planetary Change, 19, 35-48.
- Potter, C. S., Matson, P. A., Vitousek, P. M., and Davidson, E. A., 1996: Process modeling of
 controls on nitrogen trace gas emissions from soils worldwide, Journal of Geophysical
 Research: Atmospheres, 101, 1361-1377.
- Potter, C. S., Randerson, J. T., Field, C. B., Matson, P. A., Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., and
 Klooster, S. A., 1993: Terrestrial ecosystem production: a process model based on global
 satellite and surface data, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 7, 811-841.
- Poulter, B. et al. 2017: Global wetland contribution to 2000–2012 atmospheric methane growth
 rate dynamics, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12 (2017) 094013. https://doi.org/10.1088/17489326/aa8391
- Prather, M. J., Holmes, C. D., and Hsu, J., 2012: Reactive greenhouse gas scenarios: Systematic
 exploration of uncertainties and the role of atmospheric chemistry, Geophysical Research
 Letter 20, L00202, https://doi.org/10.1020/2012CL051440
- 822 Letter, 39, L09803, https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL051440.
- Prather, M. J. and Coauthors, 2015: Measuring and modeling the lifetime of nitrous oxide
 including its variability, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmoshpere, 120, 5693–5705.
- Randerson, J. T. and Coauthors, 2009: Systematic assessment of terrestrial biogeochemistry in
 coupled climate–carbon models, Global Change Biology, 15, 2462-2484.

- Rice, C. W. and Smith, M. S., 1982: Denitrification in no-till and plowed soils, Soil Science
 Society of America Journal, 46, 1168-1173.
- Richardson, A. D. and Coauthors, 2012: Terrestrial biosphere models need better representation
 of vegetation phenology: results from the North American Carbon Program Site Synthesis,

Global Change Biology, 18, 566-584.

- Rowlings, D., Grace, P., Scheer, C., and Liu, S., 2015: Rainfall variability drives interannual
 variation in N₂O emissions from a humid, subtropical pasture, Science of The Total
 Environment, 512, 8-18.
- Saikawa, E. and Coauthors, 2014: Global and regional emissions estimates for N₂O,
 Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 4617-4641.
- Saikawa, E., Schlosser, C., and Prinn, R., 2013: Global modeling of soil nitrous oxide emissions
 from natural processes, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 27, 972-989.
- Saunois, M. and Coauthors, 2016: The global methane budget 2000–2012, Earth Syst. Sci. Data,
 840 8, 697-751, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-8-697-2016.
- 841 Schaefer, K. and Coauthors, 2012: A model-data comparison of gross primary productivity:

Results from the North American Carbon Program site synthesis, Journal of Geophysical
Research: Biogeosciences, 117, G03010, http://doi.org/10.1029/2012JG001960.

- Schimel, D. and Coauthors, 2000: Contribution of increasing CO₂ and climate to carbon storage
 by ecosystems in the United States, Science, 287, 2004-2006.
- 846 Schmidt, I., van Spanning, R. J., and Jetten, M. S., 2004: Denitrification and ammonia oxidation
- by Nitrosomonas europaea wild-type, and NirK-and NorB-deficient mutants, Microbiology,
 150, 4107-4114.
- 849 Schwalm, C. R. and Coauthors, 2010: A model-data intercomparison of CO₂ exchange across
- 850 North America: Results from the North American Carbon Program site synthesis, Journal of
- 651 Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 115, G00H05, http://doi.org/10.1029/2009JG001229.
- 852 Shevliakova, E. and Coauthors, 2009: Carbon cycling under 300 years of land use change:
- 853 Importance of the secondary vegetation sink, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 23, GB2022,
- http://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003176.
- 855 Sitch, S. and Coauthors, 2015: Recent trends and drivers of regional sources and sinks of carbon
- dioxide, Biogeosciences, 12, 653-679.

- Smith, K. A. and Arah, J., 1990: Losses of nitrogen by denitrification and emissions of nitrogen
 oxides from soils, Proceedings-Fertilizer Society, UK, 299.
- Stocker, B. D., Roth, R., Joos, F., Spahni, R., Steinacher, M., Zaehle, S., Bouwman, L., and
 Prentice, I. C., 2013: Multiple greenhouse-gas feedbacks from the land biosphere under
 future climate change scenarios, Nature Climate Change, 3, 666-672.
- 862 Stöckli, R., Lawrence, D., Niu, G. Y., Oleson, K., Thornton, P. E., Yang, Z. L., Bonan, G.,
- B63 Denning, A., and Running, S. W., 2008: Use of FLUXNET in the Community Land Model
- development, Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences, 113, G01025,
- 865 http://doi.org/10.1029/2007JG000562.
- 866 Thompson, R. L. and Coauthors, 2014: TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison Part 2:
- Atmospheric inversion estimates of N₂O emissions, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14,
 6177–6194, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-6177-2014.
- Thornton, P. E. and Coauthors, 2009: Carbon-nitrogen interactions regulate climate-carbon cycle
 feedbacks: results from an atmosphere-ocean general circulation model, Biogeosciences, 6,
 2099-2120.
- Thornton, P. E., Lamarque, J. F., Rosenbloom, N. A., and Mahowald, N. M., 2007: Influence of
- carbon-nitrogen cycle coupling on land model response to CO₂ fertilization and climate
- variability, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 21, GB4018,
- 875 http://doi.org/10.1029/2006GB002868.
- Tian, H. and Coauthors, 2015: Global methane and nitrous oxide emissions from terrestrial
 ecosystems due to multiple environmental changes, Ecosystem Health and Sustainability, 1,
 1-20.
- Tian, H. and Coauthors, 2012: Century-scale responses of ecosystem carbon storage and flux to
 multiple environmental changes in the southern United States, Ecosystems, 15, 674-694.
- Tian, H. and Coauthors, 2016: The terrestrial biosphere as a net source of greenhouse gases to
 the atmosphere, Nature, 531, 225-228.
- Tian, H., Xu, X., Liu, M., Ren, W., Zhang, C., Chen, G., and Lu, C., 2010: Spatial and temporal
 patterns of CH₄ and N₂O fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems of North America during 1979-2008:
- application of a global biogeochemistry model, Biogeosciences, 7, 2673-2694.
- 886 Tian, H., Xu, X., Lu, C., Liu, M., Ren, W., Chen, G., Melillo, J., and Liu, J., 2011: Net
- exchanges of CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O between China's terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere

- and their contributions to global climate warming, Journal of Geophysical Research:
- Biogeosciences, 116, G02011, http://doi.org/10.1029/2010JG001393.
- 890 Vuichard et al., Accounting for carbon and nitrogen interactions in a global terrestrial ecosystem
 891 model: Multi-site evaluation of the ORCHIDEE model, in prep.
- Wania, R. and Coauthors, 2013: Present state of global wetland extent and wetland methane
 modelling: methodology of a model inter-comparison project (WETCHIMP), Geoscientific
 Model Development, 6, 617-641.
- Warszawski, L., Frieler, K., Huber, V., Piontek, F., Serdeczny, O., and Schewe, J., 2014: The
 inter-sectoral impact model intercomparison project (ISI–MIP): project framework,
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111, 3228-3232.
- Wei, Y. and Coauthors, 2014: The North American Carbon Program Multi-scale Synthesis and
 Terrestrial Model Intercomparison Project Part 2: Environmental driver data, Geosci.
 Model Dev., 7, 2875-2893, <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-2875-2014</u>.
- Winiwarter, W., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Klimont, Z., Schöpp, W., Amann, M., 2017: Technical
 opportunities to reduce global anthropogenic emissions of nitrous oxide Environ. Res. Letters,
 DOI 10.1088/1748-9326/aa9ec9
- Wrage, N., Velthof, G., Van Beusichem, M., and Oenema, O.: Role of nitrifier denitrification in
 the production of nitrous oxide, Soil biology and Biochemistry, 33, 1723-1732, 2001.
- Xu-Ri, and Prentice I. C.: Terrestrial nitrogen cycle simulation with a dynamic global vegetation
 model. Global Change Biology, 14, 1745-1764, 2008.
- Xu, R., Tian, H., Lu, C., Pan, S., Chen, J., Yang, J., and Zhang, B., 2017: Preindustrial nitrous
 oxide emissions from the land biosphere estimated by using a global biogeochemistry model,
 Climate of the Past, 13, 977-990, https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-13-977-2017.
- 911 Xu, X., Tian, H., Chen, G., Liu, M., Ren, W., Lu, C., and Zhang, C., 2012: Multifactor controls
- on terrestrial N₂O flux over North America from 1979 through 2010, Biogeosciences, 9,
 1351-1366.
- 914 Yang, Q., Tian, H., Friedrichs, M. A., Hopkinson, C. S., Lu, C., and Najjar, R. G., 2015:
- 915 Increased nitrogen export from eastern North America to the Atlantic Ocean due to climatic
- and anthropogenic changes during 1901–2008, Journal of Geophysical Research:
- 917 Biogeosciences, 120, 1046-1068.

918	Zaehle, S., Ciais, P., Friend, A. D., and Prieur, V., 2011: Carbon benefits of anthropogenic
919	reactive nitrogen offset by nitrous oxide emissions, Nature Geoscience, 4, 601-605.
920	Zaehle, S. and Friend, A., 2010: Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface
921	model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter estimates,
922	Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 24, GB1005, http://doi.org/10.1029/2009GB003521.
923	Zhang, B., Tian, H., Lu, C., Dangal, S. R. S., Yang, J., and Pan, S., 2017: Manure nitrogen
924	production and application in cropland and rangeland during 1860-2014: A 5-minute gridded
925	global data set for Earth system modeling. Earth System Science Data Discussion,
926	https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-11.
927	Zhang, K., Peng C.H., Wang M., Zhou X.L., Li M.X., Wang K.F., Ding J.H., and Zhu Q.A.,
928	2017: Process-based TRIPLEX-GHG model for simulating N2O emissions from global forests
929	and grasslands: Model development and evaluation. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth
930	Systems, In revision.
931	Zhang, Y., Li, C., Zhou, X., and Moore, B., 2002: A simulation model linking crop growth and
932	soil biogeochemistry for sustainable agriculture, Ecological Modelling, 151, 75-108.
933	Zhu, Q. and Coauthors, 2014: Modelling methane emissions from natural wetlands by
934	development and application of the TRIPLEX-GHG model, Geoscientific Model
935	Development, 7, 981-999.
936	Zhuang, Q., Lu, Y., and Chen, M., 2012: An inventory of global N ₂ O emissions from the soils of
937	natural terrestrial ecosystems. Atmospheric environment, 47, 66-75.
938	
939	
940	
941	
942	
943	
944	
945	
946	
947	
948	

949 Figure Captions

Figure 1. The framework of the N₂O Model Intercomparison project (NMIP).

- Figure 2. Evolution of the major driving factors at the global level during 1901-2016. (a) Annual
- temperature (°C, solid line) and annual precipitation (mm, dash line), (b) atmospheric CO_2
- 954 concentration (ppm), (c) cropland area (million km^2), (d) N deposition (Tg N yr⁻¹), (e) N
- fertilizer application (Tg N yr⁻¹) during 1900-2013, and (f) manure N production (Tg N yr⁻¹).
- 956

Figure 3. Spatial distribution of N deposition (a, d, g, j; g N m⁻² yr⁻¹), N fertilizer application (b,
e, h, k; g N m⁻² cropland yr⁻¹), and manure N production (c, f, i, l; g N m⁻² yr⁻¹) in 1860 (1st row),
1900 (2nd row), 1950 (3rd row), and 2015 (4th row).

- 960
- **Figure 4.** Model simulation experimental designs (Note: S0: reference (baseline); S1:
- 962 CLIM+CO₂+LCLU+NDEP+NFER+MANN; S2: CLIM+ CO₂+LCLU+NDEP+NFER; S3:
- 963 $CLIM+CO_2+LCLU+NDEP$; S4: $CLIM+CO_2+LCLU$; S5: $CLIM+CO_2$; S6: CLIM). CLIM:
- climate, CO₂: atmospheric CO₂, LCLU: land cover and land use change, NDEP: N deposition,
- 965 NFER: N fertilizer use, and MANN: manure N use.
- 966

Figure 5. Interannual variations in N₂O emissions from global terrestrial ecosystems during 1861-2015 as estimated by the average of three process-based models (DLEM, O-CN, and VISIT). The gray shades denote ± 1 standard deviation.

970

Figure 6. Spatial patterns and the latitudinal variations of mean annual N₂O emissions as

represented by the mean estimates from DLEM, VISIT, and O-CN models in the (a) 1860s, (b)
1900s, (c) 1950s, and (d) 2001-2015. The pie charts indicate the relative contributions of natural

- 973 1900s, (c) 1950s, and (d) 2001-2015. The pie charts indicate the relative contributions of natura 974 vegetation (blue) and cropland (red) to the total N₂O emissions. The gray shades denote ± 1
- 975 standard deviation.
- 976

Figure 7. Decadal N₂O emissions (Tg N yr⁻¹) from the natural ecosystems (blue lines) and

- cropland (red lines) in 14 regions (region delineation is from the Global Carbon Project global
- 979 CH₄ budget synthesis, Saunois et al., 2016). N_2O emissions are represented by the average of
- 980 DLEM, VISIT, and O-CN model simulations. The error bars denote ± 1 standard deviation.
- 981

Table 1. Summary of the NMIP driving forces

Data name	Period	Temporal	Spatial	Sources	Variables	
		resolution	resolution			
Climate	1901-2015	6-hourly	0.5°	CRU- NCEP	Incoming longwave / shortwave radiation, air humidity, pressure, precipitation, temperature, and wind speed	
CO ₂	1860-2015	Monthly	0.5°	NCAR	CO ₂ concentration	
N deposition	1860-2015	Yearly	0.5°	Eyring et al. (2013)	NH _x -N and NO _y -N deposition	
N Fertilizer use	1860-2014	Yearly	0.5°	Lu and Tian (2017)	N fertilizer use rate in cropland	
Manure N input	1860-2014	Yearly	0.5°	Zhang et al. (2017)	Manure N production	
Potential vegetation	One time	One time	0.5°	SYNMAP	Fraction of natural vegetation types	
Cropland	1860-2015	Yearly	0.5°	HYDE 3.2	Cropland fraction	

Note: Detailed descriptions of the major NMIP model input datasets have been provided in
previous publications or online documents. Here we only provide a brief description of sources
and spatiotemporal patterns of these datasets.

Model	Full name	Contact	Affiliation	Citation
CLM-CN	Community land model - CN	Eri Saikawa	Emory University, USA	Saikawa et al. (2013)
DLEM	Dynamic Land Ecosystem Model	Hanqin Tian	Auburn University	Tian et al. (2015) Xu et al. (2017)
LM3V-N	Land Model 3V-N	Stefan Gerber	University of Florida	Huang and Gerber (2015)
LPJ-GUESS	Lund-Potsdam-Jena General Ecosystem Simulator	Stefan Olin/ Almut Arneth	Lund University, Sweden/KIM, Dept. Atmospheric Environmental Research, Germany	Olin et al. (2015); Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008)
LPX-Bern	Land Processes and eXchanges model - Bern	Sebastian Lienert/ Fortunat Joos	Institute for Climate and Environmental Physics, University of Bern, Switzerland	Stocker et. al. (2013) Xu-Ri and Prentice (2008)
O-CN	ORCHIDEE-CN	Sönke Zaehle	Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry	Zaehle et al. (2011)
ORCHIDEE	Organising Carbon and Hydrology In Dynamic Ecosystems	Nicolas Vuichard	IPSL – LSCE, France	Vuichard et al. (in prep)
ORCHIDEE- CNP	Organising Carbon and Hydrology In Dynamic Ecosystems-CNP	Jinfeng Chang/ Daniel Goll	IPSL – LSCE, France	Goll et al., 2017
TRIPLEX- GHG	TRIPLEX-GHG	Changhui Peng	University of Quebec at Montreal, Canada	Zhu et al. (2014); Zhang et al. (2017)
VISIT	Vegetation Integrated SImulator for Trace- gases	Akihiko Ito	National Institute for Environmental Studies, Japan	Inatomi et al. (2010); Ito and Inatomi (2012)

	CLM-CN	DLEM	LM3V-N	LPJ -GUESS	LPX-Bern	O-CN	ORCHIDEE	ORCHIDEE -CNP	TRIPLEX- GHG	VISIT
Open N cycle ¹	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
C-N coupling	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
N pools ²	(13, 3, 4)	(6, 6, 8)	(6, 4, 3)	(5, 6, 11)	(4,3,8)	(9, 6, 9)	(9, 6, 9)	(9, 6, 9)	(3, 9, 4)	(4, 1, 4)
Demand and supply-driven Plant N uptake	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
N allocation ³	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic
Nitrification	<i>f</i> (T, SWC)	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, C _{NH4})	$f(T, SWC, C_{NH4})$	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, C _{NH4})	f(T, SWC, pH C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, C _{NH4} , T, SWC)	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, C _{NH4})
Denitrification	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, C _{NO3})	<i>f</i> (T, clay, Rh, C _{NO3})	$f(T_{soil}, Rh, SWC, C_{NH4}, C_{NO3}$	<i>f</i> (T, Rh, SWC, C _{NO3})	f(T, SWC, R _{mb} , C _{NO3})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, R _{mb} , C _{NO3})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, denitrifier, C _{NO3})	<i>f</i> (T, SWC, pH, R _{mb} , C _{NO3})	f(DOC, C _{NO3} , pH, T _{soil})	f(SWC, Rh, C _{NO3})
Mineralization, immobilization	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	$f(C_{NO3}, C_{NH4})$	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)
N leaching	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff, clay)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)	<i>f</i> (runoff)
NH ₃ volatilization	<i>f</i> (C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, T, SWC, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, T, SWC, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, T, SWC, C _{NH4})	f(pH, T, SWC, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH,C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH,C _{NH4})	<i>f</i> (pH, C _{NH4})	f(pH, T, SWC, C _{NH4})
Plant N turnover ⁴	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic	Dynamic
N resorption	<i>f</i> (C:N)	<i>f</i> (C:N)	fixed	Crop: dynamic, the rest: fixed	f(Nleaf)	fixed	f(Nleaf)	fixed	<i>f</i> (C:N)	fixed
N fixation	f(NPP)	Fixed	<i>f</i> (C _{NH4} , C _{NO3} , light, plant demand)	<i>f</i> (ET)	Implied by mass balance	$f(C_{cost}, C_{root})$	<i>f</i> (ET)	f(NPP)	f(biomass)	<i>f</i> (ET)
N fertilizer use	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Manure N use	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes
N deposition	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

989 Note: 1 "open" denotes that excess N can be leached from the system; ²numbers of N pools (vegetation pools, litter pools, soil pools); ³ Dynamic denotes time-varied N allocation ratio to different N pools; ⁴turnover time for various vegetation nitrogen pools. T: soil temperature; Clay: soil clay fraction; ET: evapotranspiration; Biomass: vegetation carbon;

990

991 NPP: net primary production; Nleaf: leaf N concentration; Runoff: soil surface and drainage runoff; Ccost: carbon cost during N2 fixation; SWC: soil water content; denitrifier: soil

992 denitrifier biomass; Rh: soil heterogeneous respiration.

Unit	Frequency	Level
kg N m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Monthly (1980-2015) Annual (1860-2015)	Grid- and biome-levels
kg N m ⁻²	Annual (1860-2015)	Grid-levels
kg C m ⁻² s ⁻¹	Monthly (1980-2015)	Grid- and biome-levels
	Annual (1860-2015)	
kg C m ⁻²	Annual (1860-2015)	Grid-level Biome-level (vegetation C)
	Unit kg N m ⁻² s ⁻¹ kg N m ⁻² kg C m ⁻² s ⁻¹ kg C m ⁻²	Unit Frequency kg N m ⁻² s ⁻¹ Monthly (1980-2015) Annual (1860-2015) Annual (1860-2015) kg N m ⁻² Annual (1860-2015) kg C m ⁻² s ⁻¹ Monthly (1980-2015) kg C m ⁻² Annual (1860-2015) kg C m ⁻² Annual (1860-2015)

Table 4. List of nitrogen and carbon variables provided by NMIP models

← N inputs -N losses Mitrate assimilation **Objective 1** Model input data 🔶 Denitrification 🛛 🔶 Nitrification Unravel the major • Climate (Temperature, controlling processes of precipitation, radiation, Litter N_2O fluxes and the N₂ fixation Natural ecosystems etc.) uncertainties from model NO CO_2 concentration • structure and parameters Inorganic N N_2O • N deposition **Objective 2** N_2 NH_3 Agricultural systems N fertilizer use • Quantify spatial and XXXXXXX • Manure N use temporal patterns of ٠ Irrigation global/regional N₂O fluxes, N uptake Land cover and land use • and attribute the relative Soil texture ٠ contributions of multiple Organic N topography (elevation, • environmental factors NO, N₂O NH4+ NO3slope, aspect, etc.) **Objective 3** Nitrification Provide a bench-marking N_2 Model calibration & estimate of global and evaluation $NO_2^$ regional N₂O budgets Denitrification through synthesizing multi-• Field observations source data Statistical extrapolation ٠ Participating Models: CLM-CN, DLEM, LM3V-N, O-CN, LPJ-GUESS, Inversion models ٠ LPX-Bern, ORCHIDEE, ORCHIDEE-CNP, TRIPLEX-GHG, VISIT NMIP benchmarks for model performance and data evaluation 998

Figure 1. The framework of the N₂O Model Intercomparison project (NMIP)



Figure 2. Evolution of the major driving factors at the global level during 1901-2016. (a) Annual temperature (°C, solid line) and annual precipitation (mm, dash line), (b) atmospheric CO_2 concentration (ppm), (c) cropland area (million km²), (d) N deposition (Tg N yr⁻¹), (e) N fertilizer application (Tg N yr⁻¹) during 1900-2013, and (f) manure N production (Tg N yr⁻¹).







Figure 3. Spatial distribution of N deposition (a, d, g, j; $g N m^{-2} yr^{-1}$), N fertilizer application (b, e, h, k; $g N m^{-2}$ cropland yr^{-1}), and manure N production (c, f, i, l; $g N m^{-2} yr^{-1}$) in 1860 (1st row),

1012 1900 (2nd row), 1950 (3rd row), and 2015 (4th row).

				i			
Spin-up	I I	CLIM	CO2	LCLU	NDEP	NFER	MANN
CLM: 1901-1920	S0	1901-1920 mean	1860	1860	1860	1860	1860
NDEP: 1860 NFER: 1860	→ S1	1901-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015
MANN: 1860 LCLU: 1860	S2 S2	1901-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860
	S3	1901-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860	1860
V	→ S4	1901-2015	1860-2015	1860-2015	1860	1860	1860
	→ S5	1901-2015	1860-2015	1860	1860	1860	1860
	S6 S6	1901-2015	1860	1860	1860	1860	1860

Transient Run (1860-2015)

1014 1015

1016 **Figure 4.** Model simulation experimental designs (Note: S0: reference (baseline); S1:

1017 CLIM+CO₂+LCLU+NDEP+NFER+MANN; S2: CLIM+ CO₂+LCLU+NDEP+NFER; S3:

1018 CLIM+ CO₂+LCLU+NDEP; S4: CLIM+ CO₂+LCLU; S5: CLIM+ CO₂; S6: CLIM). CLIM:

1019 climate, CO₂: atmospheric CO₂, LCLU: land cover and land use change, NDEP: N deposition,

1020 NFER: N fertilizer use, and MANN: manure N use



1023Figure 5. Interannual variations in N2O emissions from global terrestrial ecosystems during10241861-2015 as estimated by the average of three process-based models (DLEM, O-CN, and1025VISIT). The gray shades denote ± 1 standard deviation.



Figure 6. Spatial patterns and the latitudinal variations of mean annual N₂O emissions as represented by the mean estimates from

1031 DLEM, VISIT, and O-CN models in the (a) 1860s, (b) 1900s, (c) 1950s, and (d) 2001-2015. The pie charts indicate the relative

1032 contributions of natural vegetation (blue) and cropland (red) to the total N_2O emissions. The gray shades denote ± 1 standard deviation.



1034

Figure 7. Decadal N₂O emissions (Tg N yr⁻¹) from the natural ecosystems (blue lines) and cropland (red lines) in 14 regions (region delineation is from the Global Carbon Project global CH₄ budget synthesis, Saunois et al., 2016). N₂O emissions are represented by the average of DLEM, VISIT, and O-CN model simulations. The error bars denote ± 1 standard deviation.