Introduction

Global warming is now recognized as a major threat to natural and socio-economic systems with rapid population growth and economic development around the world [1, 2]. Increasing anthropogenic contributions to atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations [3] and changes in soil carbon and nitrogen stocks [4] are critical sources for global warming. Afforestation and establishment of grasslands on previously cropped sites are considered to be effective and cost-efficient mitigative response strategies to climate change because of the ability of forest and grassland sites to sequester CO₂ from the atmosphere and store more C and N [5, 6].

It is well documented that land use change affects soil carbon stocks (SCS) [7-11] and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions [2, 12-14]. However, with the population growing and diets changing in developing countries, more land is required for agriculture to meet food demands [15, 16]. Changing grassland to cropland systems in temperate regions has resulted in losses of soil organic C (SOC) from 18% to 29%. By 2010, land use change was responsible for
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about 30% of the increase in atmospheric CO₂ [2], 7% of the increase in N₂O [13], and less than 1% of the increase in CH₄ emissions [17, 18]. Converting farmland to grassland or forest becomes a valid and potentially useful means for SOC restoration and GHG mitigation.

When farmland is abandoned, SOC stocks can significantly increase after conversion to pasture (19%) and tree plantations (18%) [10]. These increases depend on the amount of rainfall [8], clay content of soil, and vegetation species [19]. Following such transitions, there is an increase in organic matter inputs to the soil and reduced atmospheric CO₂ concentration because of the ability to sequester C in vegetation and soil [20]. In the soil, microclimatic conditions such as microbial community, moisture, and temperature will be modified by the transition. Small changes in the SOC pool could have dramatic impacts on atmospheric CO₂. The response of SOC to global warming is of critical importance [15].

Accounting for GHG emissions and global warming potential (GWP) of cropping systems requires evaluating their net impact on all emissions associated directly and indirectly with crop production [21]. GHG emissions are associated with agricultural inputs (machinery, seed, fertilizer, and agrochemical production) and diesel fuel used in farm operations [21]. Insect damage also removes C from the ecosystem. With global warming recognized as a major threat to natural and socio-economic systems, China recently launched the ‘Grain-for-Green’ Program, stimulating the conversion of cropland to forest and grassland [10]. The average increase in SOC stocks was 26% after cropland conversion to forest [8]. Restoration of cropland back to grassland systems may restore 7-18% of native C stocks over a 20-year period in temperate moist and dry climates [22, 23]. However, Laganiere et al. [19] in a review of 33 recent publications, showed that afforestation has had mixed results, leading to decreases, increases, and negligible effects on SOC stocks. Of these references, only Wang et al. [24] identified former arable soils as a sink for CO₂ after conversion to forest in the temperate continental monsoon climate of northeast China. In China, the largest grain producing area is located in the northeast. It is therefore imperative to understand the extent of the effect of conversion of cropland to forest and grassland on GHG emissions and GWP in northeast China.

Not only is the decrease in cropland area a major driver of changes in GHG emissions, it is often the limiting factor for crop production and therefore a dominant driver of area-scaled GWP. Although food demand can often be obtained with fertilizer management, the question is whether the decrease in cropland area is large enough to offset the corresponding decrease in GHG emissions, resulting in an overall lower area-scaled GWP. Furthermore, much research has focused on changes in SCS, with little on SNS. Therefore, we hypothesized that:

(i) the primary contributing factors to GWP are different among cropland, grassland, and forest
(ii) the lowest GWP is achieved with the largest changes in SCS and SNS

Materials and Methods

Site Description, Climate and Management

The study was conducted on a typical Mollisol belt in Hailun County, Heilongjiang Province, China (N47°26′23″, E126°38′12″). The mean annual temperature is 1.5°C and annual precipitation is 550 mm with 65% from June to August. The duration of the frost-free period is about 120 days. The local climate is a semi-humid temperate continental monsoon climate with long, cold winters (November to March). The winter is dry with snow cover beginning in November and snow-melt occurring in early April. The soil is classified as Pachic Haploborolls in the US system. The soil is a silty clay loam with 40% clay [25].

The studied soil was sampled from three land-use systems named as three treatments. The study location did not need specific permissions for these studies. We confirmed that the field studies did not involve endangered or protected species. The GPS coordinates of grassland, forest, and cropland were (N47°26′23″, E126°38′12″), (N47°26′24″, E126°38′59″), and (N47°26′14″, E126°38′12″). Before conversion, the three land-use systems had the same cropping history. They included:

i) grassland, which was converted to grassland from cropland in 1985 (total C, 33.3 g·kg⁻¹; total N, 2.3 g·kg⁻¹). Total area is 1.0 ha of meadow steppe vegetation restoration, and the dominant species of foxtail (Leymus chinesis);
ii) forest, conversion of cropland to forest in 2000 (total C, 27.3 g·kg⁻¹; total N, 1.9 g·kg⁻¹) leading to 5.6 hm² total pine area;
iii) cropland, an experiment set up in 1985 (total C, 33.3 g·kg⁻¹; total N, 2.3 g·kg⁻¹) with a maize-soybean-wheat rotation.

The area is 60 m², four replicates. The fertilizer application was N (kg·ha⁻¹) 20.25 for soybean, 112.5 for maize and wheat (62.5 kg·N·ha⁻¹ as basal fertilizer at planting, and 50 kg·N·ha⁻¹ as supplemental fertilizer in July during maize growing season); P₂O₅ (kg·ha⁻¹) 54.75 for soybean, 45 for maize and wheat; K₂O (kg·ha⁻¹) 30 for three crops, applied separately.

Soil and Gas Sampling and Analysis

The soils were sampled in October 2013 with the following procedure. Each land-use system was seen as one replicate, with four replicates. In cropland, a sampling site distributed six representative points in each replicate. In grassland and forest, the sampling site located the focus of the same horizontal line as cropland and the vertical central of grassland or forest. Six destructive soil samples for each treatment were taken using a soil auger to make a composite sample from the soil profile (0-100 cm). Before mixing the soil sample, subsamples were used to measure soil density. One composite soil sample was made up from each 20-cm soil profile. The composite sample was homogenized after being air-dried. The soil carbon and nitrogen content were analyzed using an ELEMENT III CHNSO analyzer (Germany).
A static chamber technique was used for gas collection from Jan./2006 to Dec./2008. Chambers were cylindrical with a volume of 0.042 m³, surface area of 0.14 m², and height of 0.3 m. Each chamber was equipped with a fan to mix air and a thermocouple to record temperature in the headspace. Gas was collected at regular intervals (0, 10, 20, and 30 min) from closed chambers using a syringe from 10:00 to 11:00 and was injected into 18 ml evacuated vials. Sampling was done twice each week. Samples were analyzed using a gas chromatograph with an ECD for N₂O (Shimadzu, GC2010, Japan) and with an FID for CO₂ after CH₄ conversion furnace (Shimadzu GC2010, Japan). Standard gases of CO₂ and N₂O were supplied by Haipu Corp. (Beijing, China). The rate of change in chamber concentration was calculated with linear regression.

Calculation

Gas flux

\[ SF_{CO_2} = \rho_1 \frac{dc}{dt} \frac{V}{A} \times \frac{273}{273 + T} \times \frac{12}{44} \]

\[ SF_{N_2O} = \rho_2 \frac{dc}{dt} \frac{V}{A} \times \frac{273}{273 + T} \times \frac{28}{44} \]

...where \( SF_{CO_2}, SF_{N_2O} \) stand for CO₂ flux in mg C·m⁻²·h⁻¹ and for N₂O flux in μg N·m⁻²·h⁻¹; \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \) for CO₂ and N₂O density under the standard conditions, respectively; \( \frac{dc}{dt} \) for temporal increase in CO₂ and N₂O concentration in the chamber headspace; \( V \) for effective headspace volume of the chamber (0.0168 m³); \( A \) for the soil area covered by the chamber (0.14 m²); and \( T \) for air temperature inside the chamber.

Soil C and N stock were calculated as follows:

\[ SCS = BD \times SC \times D, \ SNS = BD \times SN \times D \]

...where SCS and SNS (g·cm⁻²) are the soil C and N stock; BD (g·cm⁻³) is soil bulk density; SC and SN (g·kg⁻¹) are the concentration of SOC content and total N content; D (cm) is soil depth.

GWP Calculation

\[ GWP = GWP_{fertilizer} + GWP_{pesticides} + GWP_{agriculture \, machinery} + GWP_{seed \, production} + GWP_{∆SOC} + GWP_{N_2O} \]

There are only 3-year N₂O and CO₂ emission data. The mean 3-year data was used to estimate the long-term GWP N₂O and CO₂. GWP fertilizer, agriculture machinery and seed production were based on the C equivalents referred to by West and Marland [26].

\[ GWP_{∆SOC} = SOC_{1995} - SOC_{2013} \] for cropland and grassland,
\[ GWP_{∆SOC} = SOC_{2000} - SOC_{2013} \] for forest
\[ GWP_{N_2O} = 298 \times N_2O \times 12/44 \]

Statistical Analyses

The differences in change of SCS (soil carbon stock), SNS (soil nitrogen stock), gas fluxes, and GWP across cropland, grassland, and forest were tested with statistical procedure of Origin 8 software at a significance level of 0.05. Correlations between GWP and ∆TSC (total soil carbon change), ∆TSN (total soil nitrogen change), CO₂, and N₂O emissions were analyzed using Excel 2010 software.

Results

Soil Bulk Density, Water Content, and Cand N Content

Mean data for soil density, water content, soil C and N content, determined in the soil from different depths taken from cropland, grassland, and forest land, are given in Table 1. Bulk density and water content generally decreased upon conversion from agricultural land to grassland or forest at the same depth, when compared to cropland. The average decrease in bulk density following conversion to grassland was 3.8% (n=5) and that of forest 1.6% (n=4) without 60-80 cm. The average water content was decreased by 24.1% and 15.4% upon conversion of agricultural land to grassland and forest, respectively. The total soil C and N in grassland increased by 51.1% and 28.4% at 28 y after conversion, and decreased by 7.2% and 5.2% at 14 y following conversion to forest. The depth to which soil samples are taken can significantly influence estimates of soil bulk density, water content, and total C and N contents. All these data decreased with soil depth.

CO₂ and N₂O Emissions

Soil CO₂ fluxes integrated over time was similar in all three land-use systems (Fig. 1). The CO₂ flux rates were low in January/February, but increased throughout May to September in conjunction with plant growth and a higher growing season temperature. The average CO₂ flux from 2006 to 2008 was 39.8, 46.7, and 40.9 mg CO₂-C·m⁻²·h⁻¹ in cropland, grassland, and forest. The cumulative soil CO₂ emission per year was highest in grassland (4033 mg CO₂-C·ha⁻¹), followed by forest (3537 mg CO₂-C·ha⁻¹), and cropland (3443 mg CO₂-C·ha⁻¹).

The average N₂O fluxes in cropland, grassland, and forest were 5.5, 7.9, and 1.3 μg N₂O-N·m⁻²·h⁻¹. There were some extreme peaks in cropland (July/August, 2006, May, 2007), but N₂O flux on other dates was even lower in cropland than grassland. Forest land in general had the lowest N₂O flux during the three years measured (Fig. 1).

Changes in Total Soil C and N

For each of the three categories of land use considered (cropland, grassland, and forest), land use significantly affected the change in total soil C stock (TSC) and N stock.
On average, the changes in TSC of the entire 100 cm profile were -523, 1722, and -239 kg·ha⁻¹·y⁻¹ in cropland, grassland, and forest, TSN being -83, 170, and -46 kg·ha⁻¹·y⁻¹, respectively.

There was a significant increase in change of soil C stock (SCS) and soil N stock (SNS) in the upper 20 cm of the soil profile after 28 y cultivation in cropland (Fig. 3). However, changes in SCS and SNS tended to decrease marginally in the 20-100 cm layer. The deeper the sampling depth, the smaller the change in SCS and SNS. After the conversion from agricultural land to grassland, the changes in SCS and SNS were larger than those in cropland and forest (with the exception of the 40-60 cm layer), and showed a significant positive increase (Fig. 3). However, the changes in SCS and SNS were nevertheless larger in forest compared to unchanged cropland.

Global Warming Potential (GWP)

The GWP of the cropland (717 kg CO₂-C equivalents ha⁻¹·y⁻¹) was significantly the highest, followed by the forest and grassland at -324 and -1667 kg CO₂-C equivalents ha⁻¹·y⁻¹, respectively (Table 2). The main difference in GWP across land use was attributable to differences in changes in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Bulk density (g·cm⁻³)</th>
<th>Water content (%)</th>
<th>C (g·kg⁻¹)</th>
<th>N (g·kg⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>1.09±0.00</td>
<td>28.40±0.30</td>
<td>34.15±0.76</td>
<td>2.45±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>1.23±0.04</td>
<td>31.54±1.01</td>
<td>23.84±1.62</td>
<td>1.52±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>1.30±0.01</td>
<td>29.48±0.30</td>
<td>15.73±0.34</td>
<td>0.82±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>1.30±0.03</td>
<td>28.04±0.21</td>
<td>11.97±0.23</td>
<td>0.67±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>1.35±0.01</td>
<td>27.94±0.27</td>
<td>10.52±0.24</td>
<td>0.55±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>0.98±0.04</td>
<td>17.91±0.27</td>
<td>43.46±0.67</td>
<td>3.48±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>1.22±0.02</td>
<td>25.41±0.27</td>
<td>33.46±0.58</td>
<td>2.55±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>1.26±0.03</td>
<td>25.85±0.36</td>
<td>21.87±0.07</td>
<td>1.53±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>1.24±0.03</td>
<td>27.37±0.26</td>
<td>14.65±0.71</td>
<td>0.91±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>1.36±0.01</td>
<td>26.40±0.01</td>
<td>10.09±0.75</td>
<td>0.61±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>1.11±0.02</td>
<td>17.08±0.51</td>
<td>29.50±1.13</td>
<td>2.10±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>1.22±0.06</td>
<td>22.69±0.45</td>
<td>23.67±0.44</td>
<td>1.51±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>1.27±0.02</td>
<td>23.68±0.36</td>
<td>16.95±0.75</td>
<td>0.91±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>1.35±0.01</td>
<td>22.95±0.53</td>
<td>11.52±0.62</td>
<td>0.56±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>1.33±0.02</td>
<td>24.01±0.29</td>
<td>9.54±0.47</td>
<td>0.50±0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Soil CO₂ and N₂O emissions from cropland, converted to grassland for 29 years and forest for 14 years. Bars are ±standard deviation.
SOC (ΔSOC), agricultural production, N₂O emission, and pine fixed-C. The ΔSOC contributed 69%, -100%, and 74% of GWP in cropland, grassland, and forest system, respectively. N₂O emissions accounted for 5%, -3%, and -4%, correspondingly.

The correlation analysis between gas emission, changes in TSC, TSN, and GWP is shown in Fig. 4. There was a significant positive relationship between change in CO₂ and GWP (R²=0.7835; significant at 1% significance level), and between change in N₂O and GWP (R²=0.5496; significant at 5% significance level). No significant relationship was found between soil total C and N stock (TSC and TSN) and GWP.

Discussion

C and N Changes Following Conversion from Agricultural Land to Grassland

Following conversion of cropland to grassland for 28 y, soil C and N content increased significantly (Table 1). This is because that grassland contains a large above-ground biomass of 1-3 t·C·ha⁻¹ and a higher root and shoot ratio compared to cropland [27]. Thus, a greater proportion of the root organic C was retained in soil and large amounts of above-ground litter returned to soil without annual removal through harvest. Moreover, the new material input is easy to decompose and therefore stimulates the C cycle in grassland system [28]. In our study, the highest emission of CO₂ and N₂O occurred in grassland and represented an increase of 17% and 40% compared to cropland (Fig. 1). Grass develops extensive root systems [10] and a C input of 3.15 t·C·ha⁻¹ (about 12 times to cropland) contributed to SOC accumulation. The present results show that the average rates of soil C stock ranged from 87 to 711 kg·C·ha⁻¹·y⁻¹ throughout the soil profile (0-80 cm). Our results were in accordance with a maximum SOC accumulation rate of 1100 kg·C·ha⁻¹·y⁻¹, previously observed in the surface 300 cm [29]. Soil sampling depth influenced the magnitude of change in soil C stocks after conversion from cropland to grassland. The deeper the sampling depth, the less effect of the grass on soil C stocks [8]. These data showed that grass could cause substantial C accumulation up to 80 cm depth, but this contribution decreased by 100 cm layer. Moreover, the change in soil N stock showed the same trend as C stock after conversion from agricultural land to grassland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GWP components</th>
<th>NPK</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural production</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N fertilizer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P fertilizer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K fertilizer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine fix C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil C²</td>
<td>523±197</td>
<td>-1722±176</td>
<td>239±98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil N₂Od</td>
<td>38±6</td>
<td>55±3</td>
<td>12±1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP¹</td>
<td>755±192a</td>
<td>-1667±175c</td>
<td>-324±99b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Carbon cost associated with crop production
²C fixed by pine biomass
³Δ SoiC = SOC_car - SOC_photosyn for cropland and grassland;
⁴Δ Soil C = SOC_forest - SOC_car for forest
⁵GWP (kg CO₂-C equivalents ha⁻¹·yr⁻¹) = 298 × N₂O × 12/28
⁶GWP = agricultural production + Pine fix C + Δ Soil C + N₂O

a, b, and c mean statistically significant at p<0.05.

Table 2. Estimated net global warming potential (GWP) (kg CO₂-C equivalents ha⁻¹·yr⁻¹).
C and N Changes Following Conversion from Agricultural Land to Forest

The results of the present study showed that afforestation of cropland did not lead to increased C and N content in the soil over 14 y in the full 100 cm profile (Table 1). This is in agreement with several studies in boreal zones after conversion from agricultural land to forest, as discussed in the review by Laganiere et al. [19]. Conversion from cropland to forest implies that the annual cycle of cultivating and harvesting crops is replaced by the much longer forest cycle. In the forest system, the balance of C and N input and output of the cropland system is broken [19]. The lower soil C and N input occurs due to a smaller forest biomass and low rate of litterfall [19, 30]. In addition, the slower decomposition rate in the boreal zone is a major factor inhibiting C and N input [31]. Hence, the present result is supported by previous observations in which soil carbon initially decreased during the first 12 y before gradual recovery and accumulation of soil carbon occurred [24].

In the present study, CO$_2$ emission per year in forest (3.5 g CO$_2$-C ha$^{-1}$·y$^{-1}$) was comparable to cropland (3.4 g CO$_2$-C ha$^{-1}$·y$^{-1}$, Fig. 1). The CO$_2$ emission measurement included root respiration and soil respiration. The relative large pine root biomass contributes more CO$_2$ respired [32]. The return of C was larger from pine (1.36 t·ha$^{-1}$) than cropland (0.27 t·ha$^{-1}$) (data not shown). All of the above favor the emission of CO$_2$ in the forest. Furthermore, the conversion of cropland to forest modifies the quality and quantity of litter inputs and soil microbial and faunal communities [19, 33]. In contrast, N$_2$O emissions per year were lower in forest (0.1 kg N$_2$O-N·ha$^{-1}$) than cropland (0.5 kg N$_2$O-N·ha$^{-1}$) in our study. As we know, N$_2$O emissions are mainly associated with nitrogen turnover in natural soil. Human activities intensify the process through N fertilizer application.

![Fig. 3. Influence of conversion from cropland to grassland (28 y) and forest (14 y) on changes in SCS and SNS at different depth layer. The error bars are the standard errors of the mean.](image-url)
and soil management [2, 34]. After conversion of cropland to forest, there was little human activity to provoke N\textsubscript{2}O emissions. At the same time, our results were within the value reported by Ullah et al. [35], who researched N\textsubscript{2}O emissions in three forest types in eastern Canada.

Over a 14-year conversion from cropland to forest, there was no significant difference in soil C and N contents compared to cropland. However, the change in SCS and SNS of the entire 100 cm layer was less in forest (54%) compared to cropland (Fig. 2). This is due, first of all, to the high NPP of pine, which increases C inputs to soil [36]. Second, the lack of tillage operations reduce disturbance and provide better protection of soil organic carbon against decomposition [37]. Third, the recalcitrance of C inputs is greater in forest than cropland [38]. All these reasons contributed to the observed change. Furthermore, the deeper root system in pine induced a change in SCS in the 80-100 cm layer, not seen in cropland.

**GWP after Conversion from Cropland to Grassland and Forest**

Agricultural production, ∆SOC, N\textsubscript{2}O emission, and pine C fixed as biomass were used to estimate the GWP in each of the three land use systems (Table 2). In northeast China rain-fed agricultural systems, the CH\textsubscript{4} emissions are very low at < 2 g·ha\textsuperscript{-1} [39]; CH\textsubscript{4} emission was therefore not considered in this study. However, the energy used for farming operations such as fertilizer production, seed, pesticides, and machinery was included as indicated in reports of Qiao et al. [34] and Thelen et al. [40]. ∆SOC was calculated as the change in C between 1985 and 2013 for cropland and grassland, and between 2000 and 2013 for forest.

The results in this study show that ∆SOC was the dominant contributor to the GWP across three systems. In the 100 cm soil profile, C generally increased following conversion from agricultural land to grassland and forest, which is consistent with changes observed for surface soils following afforestation in northeast China [24] and permanent grassland conversion [41]. However, the present results showed that GWP was positively related to CO\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2}O emissions, but not to ∆TSC and ∆TSN (Fig. 4). These data affirm that changing CO\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2}O emissions through conversion of cropland to grassland and forest is a major consideration toward mitigating GWP in these soils.

![Graphs showing relationship between GWP and CO\textsubscript{2}, N\textsubscript{2}O, changes in TSC and TSN after conversion from cropland to grassland (28 y) and forest (14 y).](image-url)

Fig. 4. The relationship between GWP and CO\textsubscript{2}, N\textsubscript{2}O, changes in TSC and TSN after conversion from cropland to grassland (28 y) and forest (14 y).
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