Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Open Access Earth System Science Data Discussions

An open source database for the synthesis of soil radiocarbon data: ISRaD version 1.0

Corey R. Lawrence[1*#], Jeffrey Beem-Miller[2#], Alison M. Hoyt[2,3#], Grey Monroe[4#], Carlos A. Sierra[2#], Shane Stoner[2], Katherine Heckman[5#], Joseph C. Blankinship[6#], Susan E. Crow[7#], Gavin McNicol[8], Susan Trumbore[2#], Paul A. Levine[9], Olga Vindušková[8], Katherine Todd-Brown[10], Craig Rasmussen[6#], Caitlin E. Hicks Pries[11#], Christina Schädel[12#], Karis McFarlane[13], Sebastian Doetterl[14], Christine Hatté[15], Yujie He[9], Claire Treat[16], Jennifer W. Harden[7,17], Margaret S. Torn[3], Cristian Estop-Aragonés[18], Asmeret Asefaw Berhe[19#], Marco Keiluweit[20#], Erika Marin-Spiotta[21#], Alain F. Plante[22#], Aaron Thomson[23#], Joshua P. Schimel[24#], Lydia J. S. Vaughn[3,25], Rota Wagai[26#]

[1]US Geological Survey, Geoscience & Environmental Change Science Center, Denver, CO, USA
[2]Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany
[3]Climate and Ecosystem Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA
[4]Graudate Degree Program in Ecology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA
[5]US Forest Service Northern Research Station, Houghton, MI, USA
[6]Department of Soil, Water, and Environmental Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
[7]University of Hawaii Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA
[8]Department of Earth System Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
[9]Department of Earth System Science, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA
[10]Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
[11]Department of Biological Sciences, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA
[12]Center for Ecosystem Science and Society, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA
[13]Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, USA
[14]Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH, Zurich, Switzerland
[15]LSCE, UMR 8212 CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris Saclay, F- 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
[16]University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu, Finland
[17]US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA, USA
[18]Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
[19] Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Merced, CA, USA
[20]Stockbridge School of Agriculture, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA
[21]Department of Geography, University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA
[22]Department of Earth and Environmental Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
[23]Department of Crop and Soil Science & Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
[24]Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA
[25]Department of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA
[26]National Agriculture and Food Research Organization, Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

***Corresponding Author (clawrence@usgs.gov), [#]USGS Powell Center working group participant**

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Abstract. Radiocarbon is a critical constraint on our estimates of the timescales of soil carbon cycling that can aid in identifying mechanisms of carbon stabilization and destabilization, and improve forecast of soil carbon response to management or environmental change. Despite the wealth of soil radiocarbon data that has been reported over the past 75 years, the ability to apply these data to global scale questions is limited by our capacity to synthesis and compare measurements generated using a variety of methods. Here we describe the International Soil Radiocarbon Database (ISRaD, soilradiocarbon.org), an open-source archive of soils data that include data from bulk soils, or "whole-soils"; distinct soil carbon pools isolated in the laboratory by a variety of soil fractionation methods; samples of soil gas or water collected interstitially from within an intact soil profile; CO_2 gas isolated from laboratory soil incubations; and fluxes collected *in situ* from a soil surface. The core of ISRaD is a relational database structured around individual datasets (entries) and organized hierarchically to report soil radiocarbon data, measured at different physical and temporal scales, as well as other soil or environmental properties that may also be measured at one or more levels of the hierarchy that may assist with interpretation and context. Anyone may contribute their own data to the database by entering it into the ISRaD template and subjecting it to quality assurance protocols. ISRaD can be accessed through: (1) a web-based interface, (2) an R package (ISRaD), or (3) direct access to code and data through the GitHub repository, which hosts both code and data. The design of ISRaD allows for participants to become directly involved in the management, design, and application of ISRaD data. The synthesized dataset is available in two forms: the original data as reported by the authors of the datasets; and an enhanced dataset that includes ancillary geospatial data calculated within the ISRaD framework. ISRaD also provides data management tools in the ISRaD-R package that provide a starting point for data analysis. This community-based dataset and platform for soil radiocarbon and a wide array of additional soils data information in soils where data are easy to contribute and the community is invited to add tools and ideas for improvement. As a whole, ISRaD provides resources that can aid our evaluation of soil dynamics and improve our understanding of controls on soil carbon dynamics across a range of spatial and temporal scales. The ISRaD v1.0 dataset (Lawrence et al., 2019) is archived and freely available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2613911.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

1. Introduction

The study of soil organic matter (SOM) dynamics is essential to an improved understanding of the Earth's carbon cycle. Current evaluations suggest that SOM accounts for up to 2770 Pg of organic carbon in the top 3 m of soil (Jackson et al., 2017; Le Quéré et al., 2018), which makes it one of the largest actively cycling terrestrial carbon reservoir and an important modulator of climate change (Sulman et al., 2018). However, the lack of clarity about which fraction of that reservoir will respond to ongoing environmental changes (i.e. timescales of years to centuries) and which will respond only on millennial timescales (He et al. 2016) makes it imperative to improve our understanding of the controls on soil carbon cycling. Additionally, many studies and models focus on only the top 0.5 m of soil or less, despite deeper soils contributing a significant proportion of SOM storage (Rumpel and Kögel-Knabner, 2010). There is an urgent need to synthesize a wide variety of soils data to model the role of soil in the climate system (Bradford et al., 2016), to develop more data driven estimates of soil health (Harden et al., 2017), and to extend our detailed understanding of soil developed from observations made at the profile scale to both regional and global extents. Here we describe a new open-source database for the synthesis of soils data with a particular focus on soil radiocarbon data.

Radiocarbon (i.e., ^{14}C) content of SOM is a useful estimate of the timescales of SOM cycling including the turnover time, residence time, or mean age of carbon in soil - defined as the time it has been isolated in soil from the atmosphere (Sierra et al., 2017; Manzoni et al., 2009; Trumbore, 2006). Although it was recognized very early on that radiocarbon measurements could provide a useful measure of the stability of soil carbon (Tam and Ostlund, 1960), the need for several grams of carbon for decay-counting methods meant that there were relatively few publications before the mid-1980's. Many of these papers only published bulk soil radiocarbon for the same reason (with some exceptions, e.g., Martel and Paul, 1974; Goh et al. 1977). These early papers indicated that carbon in soils is heterogeneous and made up of a range of different aged materials that could be separated chemically (Martel and Paul, 1974). Several of these papers use models and the uptake of bomb carbon (Goh et al. 1977, Cherinski 1981, O'Brien, 1984; Balesdent, 1987). The advent of accelerator mass spectrometry in the 1980's allowed for radiocarbon analysis using milligrams of carbon instead of grams, while simultaneously increasing sample throughput. This development

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

enabled analysis of small amounts of archived soils to track the incorporation of ^{14}C derived from atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, as well as making it far easier to analyze physically and chemically isolated soil fractions (e.g., Trumbore 1993). These applications have led to an explosion in the number of publications with radiocarbon measurements from soil. This database is an attempt to provide an archive for all the previously published data but also a repository for organizing new data as it is published.

Two recent soil radiocarbon synthesis efforts demonstrate the utility of these data for improving predictions of SOM dynamics (He et al., 2016; Mathieu et al., 2015). However, bulk soil radiocarbon measurements alone do not accurately predict the true timescales of soil carbon cycling (Trumbore, 2000). Using radiocarbon to calculate SOM dynamics requires partitioning SOM into pools with different characteristic mean ages and cycling rates. The pool partitioning approach is easily implemented in SOM models, but in reality, measuring these pools is both challenging and dependent on the techniques used to fractionate the bulk soil (Moni et al., 2012). A second measure of carbon cycling rates in soils is the transit time, or the mean age of carbon leaving the soil as respired CO_2 or in dissolved forms (Sierra et al., 2017). The modeled transit time can be constrained by measurements of the radiocarbon signature of carbon in these fluxes. Critically, both approaches using radiocarbon to estimate the timescales of carbon cycling in soils require multiple measurements of carbon in distinct soil reservoirs.

Ongoing study of soils has led to shifting conceptual views of the controls on SOM dynamics (Blankinship et al., 2018; Lehmann and Kleber, 2015; Schmidt and Torn et al., 2011). Current conceptual views that emphasize the protection of SOM from microbial decomposition via physical isolation or sorption to soil mineral surfaces (Lehmann and Kleber, 2015) and within anaerobic microsites (Keiluweit et al., 2016) have largely replaced earlier paradigms of humification, selective preservation, and progressive decomposition. Two fundamental questions currently driving SOM research are: (1) which factors determine the fraction of organic inputs to soil that are quickly lost from soils or retained in soil organic matter; and (2) which mechanisms contribute to the stabilization or protection of SOM? To address these questions, researchers typically measure the concentration and/or mass content of organic carbon along with other properties, including molecular composition, isotopic ratios, and the distribution of SOM between conceptually or operationally defined pools.

Soil fractionation is the operationally defined separation of soils into distinct pools or "fractions" through a variety of physical, chemical, and biological approaches. Soil fractionation is generally intended to isolate soil fractions that reflect SOM in different physico-chemical states or mechanisms of SOM protection; these mechanisms may operate on distinct temporal scales. For example, density fractionation of SOM is a commonly applied technique (Crow et al., 2007; Sollins et al., 2009; 2006; Swanston et al. 2005). The "light" soil material that floats in a dense solution (e.g., sodium polytungstate) or gets picked up by electrostatic attraction (Kaiser et al., 2009) are sometimes used as proxies for rapidly cycling SOM, while the "heavy" or dense material is used as a proxy for mineral-associated SOM, which is assumed to cycle more slowly. In some cases, sonication of the suspension may be used to further isolate occluded SOM, i.e., organic material in soil aggregates (Kasier and Berhe, 2014). Other methods for isolating SOM with different cycling rates in the soil include, but are not limited to, physical separation of aggregates by size and water-stability (Jastrow et al., 2006; Plante et al., 2006; Six and Paustian, 2014) or of different-sized soil particles (Desjardins et al., 1994), biological incubation of soils (Torn et al., 2005; Trumbore, 2000; Paul, et al., 2001), and chemical extractions (Heckman et al., 2018; Masiello et al., 2004).

Comparing the mass and radiocarbon signature of the carbon leaving or entering the soil system (fluxes) with those of specific soil fractions provides insight into the rates of transfers between pools, as well as differentiating between the mean age and the transit time for the whole soil, a given depth increment or a given SOM pool (Sierra et al., 2012; Ohno et al., 2017; Ziegler et al., 2017; Szymanski et al., 2019). Similarly, measurements of interstitial soil carbon (i.e., in soil water or gases collected from within an intact soil profile) and its isotopic signature provide key information about the dynamics of the carbon present in the soil solution. Soluble carbon is believed to be the dominant pathway for vertical transport of organic carbon (Kaiser and Kalbitz, 2012; Angst et al., 2016), and also an intermediate stage through which carbon exchanges from being vulnerable to microbial decomposition to being stabilized on mineral surfaces (Jackson et al., 2017; Leinemann et al., 2018).

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Measurements of bulk soils as well as soil fractions are evaluated in the context of other soil properties to better understand the controls on SOM preservation. However, the diversity of soil fractionation methods makes it difficult to compare measurements across soils or to evaluate best practices. Combining radiocarbon measurements of soil carbon fractions, incubations, interstitial observations (i.e., measurements of dissolved or gaseous carbon forms), and fluxes has proven useful in resolving the contribution of different soil carbon persistence mechanisms in a site-specific modeling context (Braakhekke et al., 2015), but the application of this approach beyond the site-scale has thus far been limited due to the lack of globally synthesized data.

With a changing paradigm for SOM dynamics and ever-evolving SOM models, it is more important now than ever that we synthesize existing soil radiocarbon measurements *and* provide a central repository for new data. There have been previous efforts to develop a soil radiocarbon database (Becker-Heidmann, 1996; 2010; Trumbore et al. 2011), separately or integrated with a general-purpose soil carbon database (Harden et al., 2017). However, a challenge remains: to compile and organize soil radiocarbon data that has been collected in many different and complex ways (e.g., using various fractionation methods or including fluxes as well as organic matter pools). Addressing this challenge will provide new opportunities to leverage existing soil radiocarbon data for critical research such as developing practical and theoretical insights into the information contained in various fractionation methods and how they relate to one another, expanding our understanding of controls on soil carbon dynamics, and facilitating broader integration of radiocarbon constraints on soil carbon turnover in Earth surface models. For example, He et al. (2016) leveraged a synthesis of bulk-soil radiocarbon data to better constrain the age of carbon in five Earth system models, demonstrating that without this added constraint, these models overestimate soil carbon sequestration potential by an average of 40%.

Here we present a flexible database spanning broad spatial scales and capturing a range of data types including diverse soil fractionation methods, incubations, fluxes, interstitial measurements and spanning a range of spatial scales. Our goal is to provide an open-access data resource that will encourage the scientific community to apply the database for a variety of synthesis studies or metaanalyses and also contribute data to the repository.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

2. The Soil Radiocarbon Database (ISRaD)

ISRaD (v1.0) is designed to be an open-source platform that (1) provides a repository for soil radiocarbon and associated measurements, (2) is able to accommodate data collected from a large variety of soil fractionation techniques, and (3) is flexible and adaptable enough to accommodate new variables and data types. The ISRaD v1.0 data is archived and freely available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2613911 (Lawrence et al., 2019). Access to additional information as well as the various ISRaD resources described below is provided through the ISRaD web interface (soilradiocarbon.org).

2.1 Database and Dataset Structure

In its most general form, ISRaD is an implicitly relational database. It consists of a linked hierarchical list of tables that contain soil measurements, i.e. variables (Fig. 2). The fundamental unit of organization in ISRaD is the *entry*, which corresponds to a unique dataset i.e., a dataset with a digital object identifier (DOI), while each subordinate table corresponds to data from that entry with a particular spatial or temporal dimension (Fig. 1).

Transparency and traceability are fundamental tenants of ISRaD. Accordingly, each entry, whether ingested individually or as a compilation, must have a DOI. For data from published studies, the DOI of the publication is acceptable. Data from unpublished studies must be registered for a DOI through a DOI registration agency (e.g., zenodo.org, www.pangaea.de/, etc.) prior to ingestion into ISRaD. As it is equally important to be able to reconstruct prior data compilations e.g., synthesis studies, the specific references for individual datasets making up a synthesis are ingested as part of the synthesis entry and the entry is flagged with a reference the synthesis study itself. For example, several of the major data sources added to ISRaD were synthesis studies (e.g., He et al., 2016; Mathieu et al., 2015), and users can generate reports of data from these prior syntheses by constructing a query that utilizes this synthesis flag.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

2.2 Data Hierarchy

The ISRaD data hierarchy consists of eight levels of information. The top level of the data hierarchy is the metadata table (1), which includes information describing the source of data for a particular entry. The remainder of the hierarchical levels can be defined by the spatial extent of the information included in each table. The site (2), profile (3), layer (4), and fraction (5) tables represent information captured from decreasing spatial extents: from the scale of the study area to individual mass fractions isolated from a single soil sample. Special cases of the last three spatial extents further accommodate the temporal context of repeated measurements: (6) fluxes, (7) interstitial, and (8) incubations. In the sub-sections below, we provide overviews and examples of the types of information reported at each level, and for each of the tables that occupy these levels (Fig. 2).

The data hierarchy is maintained across tables through the use of unique keys, or linking variables (noted with a "*" in the following descriptions) that are required in each record (row) of data in each table. In addition to the table-specific key, each subordinate table in the hierarchy must also contain the key variables of the above tables. For example, in addition to a unique *layer_name*, each record in the layer table must also be associated with an *entry_name*, *site_name*, and *pro_name* (profile name) i.e., the key variables for the metadata, site, and profile tables.

ISRaD provides basic quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) protocols (described below) applied when ingesting entries. These protocols are used to ensure required variables are complete and that the key variables match across levels of the hierarchy (more detail below). Additionally, each table includes some mandatory variables that are required in order for the entry to be ingested. Variables that are not designated as mandatory need only be completed if those data are available. The ISRaD template and a detailed description containing the full list of variables along with instructions for populating the template can be downloaded or viewed from the "Contribute" page of the web-interface (soilradiocarbon.org).

For all variables across all hierarchical levels, it is important to observe the acceptable data types (character, numeric) and units. Variable names, descriptions, and reporting conventions are given in the heading columns of the ISRaD template file (ISRaD_Template.xlsx) and more detailed

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

information is provided in the data dictionary (ISRaD_Template_Info.xlsx). Allowed values include unrestricted text, controlled text, or numeric variables with or without defined ranges. Unrestricted text is generally limited to naming and note data fields, while controlled text fields are implemented for certain variables in an attempt to standardize the data and simplify data analysis. In the event that desired variables are not included in the current version of ISRaD, users may submit a request to add new variables. This process is initiated by posting an issue at the ISRaD GitHub repository and is described in more detail in section 3.4.

2.2.1 Metadata Table

The metadata table provides information for the characterization of the entry itself. Required metadata includes the entry name (i.e., *entry_name**), the DOI, the data curator (the person who oversees template entry), and their contact information. The entry name is the key variable used to match the entry with measurements reported at the other data levels.

2.2.2 Site Data Table

Site-level data are limited to the geospatial details defining the coarsest scale of the study area(s) included in each entry. We define a site as a spatially defined location that includes one or more soil profiles. By convention, we define a site as having ≥ 5km radius, i.e., samples collected within 5 km of each other should be grouped under the same "site" designation. However, the 5 km radius is a convention only, as the distinction between site and profile may be study-specific, and geospatial data at this resolution is not always available for legacy datasets. The required fields at the site level are limited to the site name (*site_name*), latitude, and longitude. In other words, spatial coordinates are required to designate a site. Every entry must specify a minimum of one site location, but can include multiple sites that do not need to be located in close proximity. For entries that do not report spatial coordinates, the data curator may estimate latitude and longitude based on the description of the study area using any of the widely acceptable mapping software (e.g., Google Earth, Google Maps, etc.). The site level does not include fields for reporting site properties. Such directly measured variables are reported at the profile level. The intended purpose of the site level data is to provide at least coarse-scale geospatial coordinates for extracting consistently sourced parameters from geospatial datasets, which can then be compared against the range of measurements reported at the profile level.

2.2.3 Profile Data Table

Profile-level data includes details pertaining to the specific sampling location of each soil. If available, profile-scale spatial coordinates should be provided in addition to site-scale coordinates.

Many variables that may initially appear to belong at the site level are instead included at the profile level to facilitate accurate representation of spatial heterogeneity at a finer scale than the site level (e.g., for multiple profiles observed at the same site). Examples include local mean annual temperature and precipitation, soil taxonomic classification, vegetation type, land cover, depth to bedrock, and parent material composition. Other than the entry name and site name, the only additional required variable at the profile-level is the profile name (*pro_name*).

2.2.4 Flux Data Table

Soil flux data present a special case of observations that correspond to the profile level of the database hierarchy. Flux-level data allows for reporting of temporally explicit measurements of mass or energy transfer occurring at the profile scale. Both gas and liquid analytes (e.g. CO_2, CH_4, dissolved OC, particulate OC, etc.) may be reported in flux data. In addition to the profile name, records with flux data must also include the observation date (*flx_obs_date*). Data measured at multiple time points in a single location will have identical profile names but unique temporal data.

2.2.5 Layer Data Table

Layer-level data corresponds to measurements made for a specific depth increment collected from a soil profile. The required variables at the layer level include layer name (*lyr_name*), depth of layer top, and depth of layer bottom. The latter two variables describe the upper and lower range of the sampling depth, respectively, in units of centimeters. We use a depth reporting system where the top of the mineral soil is denoted as zero and subsequent depths below that point are reported with incrementally increasing positive values. Organic horizons are thus reported as negative depth intervals. Special indicator fields (*lyr_all_org_neg* and *ist_all_org_neg*) are used when the depth to the mineral soil is unknown, e.g. for deep organic horizons or peats. The layer level is where most common measurements of soil physical, chemical, and/or biological properties are reported.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

As such, there is an ever-increasing list of variables that may be reported at the layer level. Users should consult the up-to-date template instruction file for the complete list of accepted variables.

2.2.6 Interstitial Data Table

The interstitial level is a special case of layer-level data. Specifically, interstitial data refers to measurements made on material occupying the interstices of the soil structure. In most cases, this material can be thought of as being mobile relative to the rest of the soil matter. Some common examples include gases, liquids, and colloids. Like flux data, the interstitial data table accommodates repeated measurements of these properties through time and as such, the observation date must be recorded for each record in the interstitial table. Because interstitial records may not correspond to the same depth increments defined for solid phase analyses, separate entries may be used in the layer table. Both sampling methodology as well as the properties of interstitial samples are reported in the interstitial table.

2.2.7 Fraction Data Table

Compared with most other soil databases, the fraction data table of the ISRaD is unique. The fraction data fields are designed to accommodate and allow for fair comparison of the wide-ranging methodologies utilized to partition soils into discrete fractions. As such, there are more required fields for the fraction level compared with the other hierarchical levels. These required fields include fraction name (*frc_name*); the input source (*frc_input*), which can be the name of another fraction or bulk (unfractionated) soil layer fraction scheme (*frc_scheme*), which is a controlled set of terms describing the general class of fractionation procedure used; the fractionation agent (*frc_agent*), which provides additional detail for methods that have multiple options; the upper and lower boundaries (*frc_lower* and *frc_upper*), which allow for description of the fractionation thresholds used in the fractionation procedure; and finally the fraction scheme units (*frc_scheme_units*), which describes the units of reference for the cut-off thresholds.

For example (see figure 3), most soil density fraction (*frc_scheme* = density) procedures starts with bulk soil from the layer in question (*frc_input* = bulk). The first distinct fraction, “free light”, is isolated by floating the soil in a heavy solution, e.g. sodium polytungstate (frc_agent = SPT). If the density of the sodium polytungstate used in density separation step was 1.6 g cm^{-3}, *frc_lower* for the "free light" fraction = 0 (indicating that anything with a density less than 1.6 was included), *frc_upper* = 1.6, and *frc_scheme_units* = g cm^3. In addition to these required fields, the fraction-level data may include most of the same data fields that are reported for the layer-level data. Ideally the fraction data also includes the mass percentage of the total sample represented by the fraction as well as the specific carbon concentration and carbon isotopic composition of the fraction, which are critical for relating bulk and fraction level observations..

2.2.8 Incubation Data Table

Flux rates and isotopic signatures of incubated samples are reported in the incubation table, at the fraction level of the ISRaD hierarchy. Sample processing data (e.g., whether or not roots have been removed from samples prior to incubation) are recorded, as well as incubation conditions (e.g. temperature, moisture, duration). Repeat measurements, such as incubation time series, can also be recorded, but not manipulations such as nutrient additions (e.g., priming). Incubation records must be linked either to a layer or both a fraction and a layer, such as roots isolated from a specific depth interval.

2.3 Data Ingestion

New data entries are added, or ingested, into ISRaD through a user-initiated process. The most common means of ingesting entries is via a template provided on the ISRaD web interface (*ISRaD_Master_Template.xlsx*). The template is intended to be used in combination with the data dictionary (*ISRaD_Template_Info.xlsx*). These files and other supporting documentation (user guide and FAQ) are also available at the web interface. Completed entries that have been formatted for ingestion must also pass the automated QA/QC test before the ingestion process can proceed. Users can initiate QA/QC using the ISRaD-R package (described below), or directly from the ISRaD web interface. If the entry fails QA/QC, the report from the test can be used as a guide to make corrections. Once an entry passes QA/QC, it can be submitted for the final two steps of the ingestion process: expert review and final ingestion.

Data templates that have passed QA/QC should be submitted via email to ISRaD at info.israd@gmail.com. These templates are then distributed to ISRaD expert reviewers who inspect template files to ensure proper completion of the more complex aspects of the template, such as classification of soil fractionation methods. If problems are identified with a submitted dataset during the expert review process, reviewers will work with the data curator to ensure these problems are corrected. Once the expert reviewer signs off on a submitted template, it will be ingested into the database.

3. Database Infrastructure

3.1 ISRaD v1.0

The current version, v1.0, of ISRaD includes a total of 195 individual data entries and 503 sites spanning the globe (Fig. 3). The current distribution of data across the various levels of the database hierarchy are shown in Table 1, and a full list of data entry references is provided in Supplemental Table 1.

Users may access ISRaD and its supporting information three ways: (1) the web interface, (2) the ISRaD-R package, and (3) the GitHub repository. Each of these access points is described in more detail below.

3.2 The ISRaD Web Interface

Most simply, users can access ISRaD data and associated resources by way of the web interface (https://soilradiocarbon.org). From the web interface users can download pre-compiled versions of the database in a simple file format (.csv), which can be easily ingested into graphical or database software. The web interface also provides access to the most recent versions of the ISRaD entry template, the template information file, an up-to-date list of the datasets included in the latest version of ISRaD, the QA/QC tool, and a variety of other resources for assisting with filling out data templates and interacting with ISRaD data.

3.3 The ISRaD-R package

All ISRaD users, but especially those already familiar with the R computing environment (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), are encouraged to download the ISRaD-R package (also called *ISRaD* and available at the CRAN repository, https://cran.r-project.org/). At present, we provide some basic tools for compiling data in the ISRaD template format into an ISRaD-structured database, and downloading both archived and current versions of the database from the ISRaD github repository as an R list object (.rda file), or .xlsx file. The ISRaD-R package includes two data objects: (1) *ISRaD_data*, which includes only data entered from the original source studies and (2) *ISRaD_extra*, which includes the original source data as well as gap-filled and additional variables that have been calculated or filled from external geospatial data sources. Value-added data included in the current implementation of *ISRaD_extra* are described in Table 2.

The ISRaD-R package also includes support for an R-Shiny application that provides a simple graphical user interface (GUI), with which users can perform several basic functions. The GUI allows for preliminary data visualization, which is intended for quick assessment and/or filtering of the database.

A few simple report functions are built into the ISRaD-R package that can be used to produce basic data summaries and visualizations for the full dataset or user-defined subsets. However, ISRaD has been designed for ease of use in the R environment in order for users to be able to take advantage of the full suite of R capabilities and functionality to manipulate and analyze ISRaD data. A number of vignettes including R scripts for some commonly used data manipulations or plotting are given on the web site and are also included in the ISRaD-R package installation.

3.4 The ISRaD GitHub Repository

The source code for the ISRaD-R package is hosted under version control on the GitHub repository ISRaD (https://github.com/International-Soil-Radiocarbon-Database/ISRaD) (GitHub Inc., San Francisco, CA). This platform is used to facilitate the open-source collaborative development of ISRaD data and additional database tools. Through the GitHub interface, users may (1) access data entries included in the compiled database; (2) evaluate and suggest modifications of the underlying code used for compilation, QA/QC, and calculation of the additional variables included in either the compiled ISRaD data object (*ISRaD_data*) or in the augmented data product (*ISRaD_extra*); and (3) report problems, questions, or other issues.

3.5 The Soil Carbon Information Hub

For students or non-experts interested in learning more about the science behind the data, we have developed the Soil Organic Carbon Information Hub (SOC-Hub). SOC-Hub (https://international-soil-radiocarbon-database.github.io/SOC-Hub/) is a set of articles in the form of blog posts providing background information on soils, radiocarbon, the terrestrial carbon cycle, and soil models. A large portion of the content for this site was created by students, and whenever possible uses non-technical language to describe topics pertinent to ISRaD. Technical editing of the SOC-Hub is facilitated through the ISRaD GitHub repository. Users are welcome and encouraged to contribute to or improve the content in SOC-Hub.

4. Database Operations

4.1 Accessing data entries

Individual data entries (i.e., completed templates, or templates output from ingested compilations) that have passed QA/QC and the expert review process are hosted in the "ISRaD_data_files" folder of the GitHub repository. Users may download these entries in order to add new data or to make corrections to existing data if problems are discovered. Corrected files can be resubmitted to ISRaD once they pass QA/QC by emailing the updated template and a text file of the QA/QC report to the ISRaD editor (info.israd@gmail.com), and will be reingested after passing the expert review process. This process of user-initiated revision of existing data entries is particularly useful when large data compilations are ingested into ISRaD from previously published syntheses (e.g., He et al., 2016; Mathieu et al., 2015) or when publications report treatment means. Depending on the scope of the synthesis efforts, entries ingested into ISRaD this way may omit data available from the original studies, and the entry modification process allows those data to be added or corrected as needed.

4.2 Accessing code

Access to the source code underlying the ISRaD database compilation and calculations allows for users to check for errors and contribute to the functionality of ISRaD. Users with a registered GitHub account are invited to write code that adds to or improves upon the existing database tools. Using standard GitHub tools, users will submit a "pull request", and following code testing and evaluation of utility to the ISRaD community, user-submitted code will be incorporated into the ISRaD-R package.

4.3 Reporting Issues, making suggestions, and asking questions.

One of the most important tools available to ISRaD users is the ability to post questions, report issues, or make suggestions, including requests to incorporate new variables. We use issue tracking tools provided by GitHub to track and categorize user input including: suggestions for improvements; problems or errors with web interface, the R-package, code, or any other aspects of ISRaD; requests for new variables or issues related to existing variables (e.g., incorrect acceptable ranges used in QA/QC); or asking questions related to template entry or any other aspect of ISRaD. While the GitHub issue-reporting functionality is the preferred means for reporting questions or issues with the database or process, it does require that users register a GitHub account. Users who do not wish to or are not able to register with GitHub, can also submit issues or questions via an email to the ISRaD editor (info.israd@gmail.com), however, the response time may be slower.

4.4 Database Versioning and Archiving

Updated versions of the database will be periodically released following substantial changes or ingestion of new datasets. Versioning of these official releases are tracked an associated version number, e.g., ISRaD v1.0, and so on. These official releases will be annually archived at the USGS Science Base repository and at Zenodo (https://zenodo.org/), with a dataset DOI issued for each release. These archived releases will be maintained into perpetuity to facilitate reproduction of any analyses conducted using a past version of the database. Additionally, each release of a new ISRaD version will correspond with the splitting of a stable branch of the GitHub repository, where the particular versions of the ISRaD-R package and the underlying code will be maintained in a stable state so that users may revert back to the earlier version if so required. In the interim between official releases, updates to the dataset (including ingestion of new data) and database infrastructure are tracked via the Git commit identifier, which is a unique alphanumeric string issued anytime the repository is modified. When accessing the dataset, users should record the most recent stable version number as well as the most recent commit identifier.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

4.5 Data Sharing Between Soil Databases

ISRaD is not the only soils database available to the international research community. The primary niche of ISRaD is the ability to synthesize soil radiocarbon data and provide a framework for comparing soil carbon fraction data. For other purposes, there may be other soil databases that are more applicable. However, as a benefit of adding data to ISRaD, we facilitate sharing of data ingested into ISRaD with other databases developed by the soil science community. At present, ISRaD has a reciprocal agreement with the International Soil Carbon Network (ISCN), which is focused on soil carbon content and related variables from bulk soils (i.e., no isotope or soil fraction information). As per this agreement, the ISCN retrieves bulk soil data from ISRaD, and is responsible for filtering duplicate entries and incorporating any new data into the ISCN database.

5. Database Governance

ISRaD is a community effort with multiple contributors operating at different levels. Governance of ISRaD is required in order to ensure continuity of services and to plan for the future evolution of this data repository. The governance structure of the ISRaD is pyramid shaped (Fig. 5).
The ISRaD *scientific steering committee* (SSC) consists of a rotating group of 7 scientists and data managers. The committee members are nominated and voted into service by a majority vote of the existing steering committee. The role of the steering committee is to determine the feasibility of major changes to ISRaD proposed by the community; to oversee data management, archiving, and establishment of cooperative agreements; and to coordinate activities and funding of affiliated institutions.

Database *maintainers* oversee the development and maintenance of the technical resources underlying ISRaD. For example, these individuals are responsible for overseeing GitHub pull requests and managing major changes in the ISRaD data template and/or data structure. The ISRaD associate editor is a special case of maintainer, whose role also includes assigning submitted templates to expert reviewers (described below) and periodically rebuilding the database with new entries that have passed the expert review process.

Data *contributors* are users who contribute data to ISRaD. Anyone can be a data contributor provided they agree to the terms of use and follow the proper steps for contributing data to ISRaD.

Within the pool of data contributors, individuals with significant experience working within the ISRaD structure may be designated, either by the steering committee or database maintainers, as *expert reviewers*. These individuals are tasked to assist maintainers and oversee peer review of contributed entries. Although the automated QA/QC tools are designed to catch many common errors in the data ingestion process, review by these expert contributors ensures the integrity of the data within ISRaD.

Finally, ISRaD *data users* are individuals who are accessing ISRaD or ISRaD-supported resources to utilize data and other resources rather than to contribute data. Anyone can be a data user provided they agree to the basic user guidelines and terms of use described in the next section.

Although the structure of the ISRaD governance pyramid is oriented around individual users, the nature of scientific research is often more group-focused. For example, teams of researchers generally work together to seek out funding and to conduct research. Thus, in some cases a group or team of individuals may seek to utilize or modify ISRaD for their purposes. Such groups can petition the scientific steering committee to be formally designated as an ISRaD organization**.** This process should be followed when groups seek to leverage the ISRaD resources beyond the scope of a basic user or contributor. The steering committee will consider the scope of the work proposed by the group and, when appropriate, provide a letter of support for funding proposals. Approved organizations should nominate a member to serve on the steering committee and, in the case of organizations making large changes or additions to ISRaD, a data maintainer to coordinate the technical aspects of that work.

6. Database Availability and User Guidelines

As detailed above, ISRaD is an open source project that provides several ways for participation. ISRaD v1.0 data (Lawrence et al., 2019) is archived and freely available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2613911 Anyone may share or adapt the ISRaD dataset provided they do so in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode), also referred to as CC-By. In addition, we strongly encourage ISRaD users to follow two simple guidelines for use:

(1) When utilizing the resources provided by ISRaD, including the complete dataset, individually curated entries, or value-added calculations included in the R-package, users should cite this publication and reference the version of ISRaD that was used for their work (see section 3.6 above). Additionally, if users leverage individual data entries from the database, they should also cite the original source dataset and/or paper.
(2) When users interpret their own data in the context of data accessed from ISRaD, they should submit those new data for inclusion in ISRaD after they have published their results and/or obtained a DOI for their dataset.

7. Conclusions and Outlook

ISRaD is an interactive open source data repository specializing in radiocarbon data associated with measurements of soils spanning a broad range of spatial scales. The ISRaD dataset is unique in that it includes not only measurements of bulk soils but also measurements of soil water, gases, and the wide diversity of soil pools isolated through different fractionation methodologies. Most of the studies summarized in ISRaD were conducted with a goal of understanding the factors controlling timescales of carbon cycling in specific sites, regions or biomes. ISRaD is an attempt to gather the data from these individual studies in one place and in the same format to facilitate comparisons and synthesis activities. There are three ways through which potential users can access ISRaD: (1) the web-interface enables users to download of the most recently compiled report formatted as a .csv file, (2) the ISRaD-R package provides access to the compiled reports as well as visualization tools and R-based querying tools, or (3) the GitHub repository provides direct access to the source code for the ISRaD-R package, as well as data from individual entries and the compiled database. Currently, the ISRaD dataset contains ~8500 radiocarbon analyses, which, at a typical cost ~$500 each, represent over US $4,250,000 dollars of research investment. By providing a useful platform for existing data, we hope to encourage the community to increase the effectiveness of that investment, and to use the ISRaD platform as a repository to increase the impact of new results. Many opportunities exist for applying ISRaD data for improving our understanding of controls on soil carbon dynamics, for comparing different methodologies of characterizing soils, or for constraining soil processes in models ranging from profile to global scales.

8. Author Contribution

The creation of ISRaD was a community effort. The initial concept to build ISRaD started with the USGS Powell Center working group on Soil Carbon Storage and Stability but benefited greatly from early efforts of the International Soil Carbon Network and other individual efforts to compile soil fraction or radiocarbon data. Scientists from the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry joined forces with the Powell Center group to greatly expand the scope and technical complexity of the ISRaD. CL, JBM, AH, GM, CS, SS, KH, JB, SC, GMc, and ST designed and built ISRaD as well as led the preparation of the manuscript. PL, OV, KTB, CR, CHP, CS, KM, and SD provided technical contributions, including coding, to the creation of the database as well as assisted with the ingestion of data. CH, YH, CT, JH, MT, and CEA provided large datasets or data compilations. AAB, MK, EMS, AP, AT, JS, LV, and RW contributed to the conceptual framing of the ISRaD and assisted with data ingestion. All authors read and commented on the manuscript.

9. Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge funding support for this work from the US Geological Survey Powell Center, the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, the European Research Council (Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme - grant agreement No. 695101), the USGS Land Change Science program, and the US Department of Agriculture. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

10. Citations

Anderson, DW., Paul, EA. Organo-mineral complexes and their study by radiocarbon dating. Soil Science Society of America Journal, 48(2), 298-301, 1984.

Angst, G., Kögel-Knabner, I., Kirfel, K., Hertel, D. and Mueller, C. W.: Spatial distribution and chemical composition of soil organic matter fractions in rhizosphere and non-rhizosphere soil under European beech (Fagus sylvatica L.), Geoderma, 264, 179–187, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.10.016, 2016.

Balesdent, J. The turnover of soil organic fractions estimated by radiocarbon dating. Science of the total environment, 62, 405-408, 1987.

Becker-Heidmann, P.: Requirements for An International Radiocarbon Soils Database, Radiocarbon, 38(02), 177–180, doi:10.1017/S0033822200017549, 1996.

Becker-Heidmann, P.: A new attempt to establish the international radiocarbon soils database (IRSDB), Radiocarbon, 52, 1405–1410, 2010.

Blankinship, J. C., Berhe, A. A., Crow, S. E., Druhan, J. L., Heckman, K. A., Keiluweit, M., Lawrence, C. R., Marin-Spiotta, E., Plante, A. F., Rasmussen, C., Schädel, C., Schimel, J. P., Sierra, C. A., Wagai, R. and Wieder, W. R.: Improving understanding of soil organic matter dynamics by triangulating theories, measurements, and models, Biogeochemistry, 140(1), 1–13, doi:10.1007/s10533-018-0478-2, 2018.

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

Bradford, M. A., Wieder, W. R., Bonan, G. B., Fierer, N., Raymond, P. A. and Crowther, T. W.: Managing uncertainty in soil carbon feedbacks to climate change, Nature Climate Change, 6(8), 751–758, doi:10.1038/nclimate3071, 2016.

Cherkinskii, AE. Contemporary hypotheses of humification and radiocarbon analyses of some types of soils. Doklady Akademii nauk SSSR, 258(4), 993-996, 1981.

Crow, S. E., Swanston, C. W., Lajtha, K., Brooks, J. R. and Keirstead, H.: Density fractionation of forest soils: methodological questions and interpretation of incubation results and turnover time in an ecosystem context, Biogeochemistry, 85(1), 69–90, doi:10.1007/s10533-007-9100-8, 2007.

Desjardins, T., Andreux, F., Volkoff, B. and Cerri, C. C.: Organic carbon and 13C contents in soils and soil size-fractions, and their changes due to deforestation and pasture installation in eastern Amazonia, Geoderma, 61(1-2), 103–118, doi:10.1016/0016-7061(94)90013-2, 1994.

Goh, KM., Stout, JD., Rafter, TA. Radiocarbon enrichment of soil organic-matter fractions in New Zealand soils. Soil Science, 123(6), 385-391, 1977.

Harden, J. W., Hugelius, G., Blankinship, J. C., Bond-Lamberty, B., Lawrence, C. R., Loisel, J., Malhotra, A., Jackson, R. B., Ogle, S., Phillips, C., Ryals, R., Todd-Brown, K., Vargas, R., Vergara, S. E., Cotrufo, M. F., Keiluweit, M., Heckman, K. A., Crow, S. E., Silver, W. L., DeLonge, M. and Nave, L. E.: Networking our science to characterize the state, vulnerabilities, and management opportunities of soil organic matter, Global Change Biol, 348(2), 895–14, doi:10.1111/gcb.13896, 2017.

He, Y., Trumbore, S. E., Torn, M. S., Harden, J. W., Vaughn, L. J. S., Allison, S. D. and Randerson, J. T.: Radiocarbon constraints imply reduced carbon uptake by soils during the 21st century, Science, 355(6306), 1419–1424, doi:10.1126/science.aag0262, 2016.

Heckman, K., Lawrence, C. R. and Harden, J. W.: A sequential selective dissolution method to quantify storage and stability of organic carbon associated with Al and Fe hydroxide phases, Geoderma, 312, 24–35, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.09.043, 2018.

Jackson, R. B., Lajtha, K., Crow, S. E., Hugelius, G., Kramer, M. G. and Piñeiro, G.: The Ecology of Soil Carbon: Pools, Vulnerabilities, and Biotic and Abiotic Controls, Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 48(1), 419–445, doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-112414-054234, 2017.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Jastrow, J. D., Amonette, J. E. and Bailey, V. L.: Mechanisms controlling soil carbon turnover and their potential application for enhancing carbon sequestration, Climatic Change, 80(1-2), 5–23, doi:10.1007/s10584-006-9178-3, 2006.

Kaiser, M., Ellerbrock, R. H., & Sommer, M. Separation of coarse organic particles from bulk surface soil samples by electrostatic attraction. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *73*(6), 2118-2130, 2009.

Kaiser, Michael, and Asmeret Asefaw Berhe. "How does sonication affect the mineral and organic constituents of soil aggregates?—A review." *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 177, no. 4: 479-495, 2014

Kaiser, K. and Kalbitz, K.: Cycling downwards - dissolved organic matter in soils, Soil Biol Biochem, 52(C), 29–32, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.04.002, 2012.

Keiluweit, M., Nico, P. S., Kleber, M. and Fendorf, S.: Are oxygen limitations under recognized regulators of organic carbon turnover in upland soils*? Biogeochemistry*, 127(2-3), 157–171, doi:10.1007/s10533-015-0180-6, 2016.

Lawrence, Corey R., Beem-Miller, Jeffery, Hoyt, Alison M., Monroe, Grey, Sierra, Carlos A., Stoner, Shane, Heckman, Katherine, Blankinship, Joseph C., Crow, Susan E., McNicol, Gavin, Trumbore, Susan, Levine, Paul A., Vindušková, Olga, Todd-Brown, Katherine, Rasmussen, Craig, Hick Pries, Caitlin E., Schädel, Christina, McFarlane, Karis, Doetterl, Sebastian, Hatté, Christine, He, Yujie, Treat, Claire, Harden, Jennifer W., Torn, Margaret S., Estop-Aragonés, Cristian, Berhe, Asmeret Asefaw, Keiluweit, Marco, Marin-Spiotta, Erika, Plante, Alain F., Thomson, Aaron, Schimel, Joshua P., Vaughn, Lydia J. S. and Wagai, Rota: International Soil Radiocarbon Database v1.0, Zendo, doi:10.5281/zenodo.2613911, 2019.

Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Friedlingstein, P., Sitch, S., Hauck, J., Pongratz, J., Pickers, P. A., Korsbakken, J. I., Peters, G. P., Canadell, J. G., Arneth, A., Arora, V. K., Barbero, L., Bastos, A., Bopp, L., Chevallier, F., Chini, L. P., Ciais, P., Doney, S. C., Gkritzalis, T., Goll, D. S., Harris, I., Haverd, V., Hoffman, F. M., Hoppema, M., Houghton, R. A., Hurtt, G., Ilyina, T., Jain, A. K., Johannessen, T., Jones, C. D., Kato, E., Keeling, R. F., Goldewijk, K. K., Landschützer, P., Lefèvre, N., Lienert, S., Liu, Z., Lombardozzi, D., Metzl, N., Munro, D. R., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Nakaoka, S.-I., Neill, C., Olsen, A., Ono, T., Patra, P., Peregon, A., Peters, W., Peylin, P., Pfeil, B., Pierrot, D., Poulter, B., Rehder, G., Resplandy, L., Robertson, E., Rocher, M., Rödenbeck, C., Schuster, U., Schwinger, J., Séférian, R., Skjelvan, I., Steinhoff, T., Sutton, A., Tans, P. P., Tian, H., Tilbrook, B., Tubiello, F. N., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Werf, G. R., Viovy, N., Walker, A. P., Wiltshire, A. J., Wright, R., Zaehle, S. and Zheng, B.: Global Carbon Budget 2018, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 10(4), 2141–2194, doi:10.5194/essd-10-2141-2018, 2018.

Lehmann, J. and Kleber, M.: The contentious nature of soil organic matter, Nature, 1–9, doi:10.1038/nature16069, 2015.

Leinemann, T., Preusser, S., Mikutta, R., Kalbitz, K., Cerli, C., Höschen, C., Mueller, C.W., Kandeler, E., and Guggenberger G.: Multiple exchange processes on mineral surfaces control the transport of dissolved organic matter through soil profiles, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry,* 118, 79-90, 2018.

Manzoni, S., Katul, G. G. & Porporato, A. Analysis of soil carbon transit times and age distributions using network theories. *J. Geophys. Res.* 114, G04025, 2009.

Martel, YA., Paul, EA. Effects of cultivation on organic-matter of grassland soils as determined by fractionation and radiocarbon dating. Canadian Journal of Soil Science, 54(4), 419-426, 1974.

Masiello, C., Chadwick, O. A., Southon, J., Torn, M. and Harden, J. W.: Weathering controls on mechanisms of carbon storage in grassland soils, *Global Biogeochem Cy*, 18(4), GB4023, doi:10.1029/2004GB002219, 2004.

Mathieu, J. A., Hatté, C., Balesdent, J. and Parent, É.: Deep soil carbon dynamics are driven more by soil type than by climate: a worldwide meta-analysis of radiocarbon profiles, Global Change Biol, 21(11), 4278–4292, doi:10.1111/gcb.13012, 2015.

Moni, Christophe, D. Derrien, P-J. Hatton, Bernd Zeller, and M. Kleber. "Density fractions versus size separates: does physical fractionation isolate functional soil compartments?." *Biogeosciences* 9, 12:5181-5197, 2012.

Obrien, BJ. Soil organic-carbon fluxes and turnover rates estimated from radiocarbon enrichments. Soil biology & biochemistry, 16(2), 115-120, 1984.

Ohno, T., Heckman, K. A., Plante, A. F., Fernandez, I. J. and Parr, T. B.: ^{14}C mean residence time and its relationship with thermal stability and molecular composition of soil organic matter: A case study of deciduous and coniferous forest types, Geoderma, 308, 1–8, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.08.023, 2017.

Paul, E.A., Morris, S.J., and Böhm, S., The determination of soil C pool sizes and turnover rates: biophysical fractionation and tracers. In: Lal, R. (Ed.), Assessment Methods for Soil Carbon. Lewis Publishers, New York, pp. 193–206, 2001.

Plante, A. F., Conant, R. T., Stewart, C. E., Paustian, K. and Six, J.: Impact of soil texture on the distribution of soil organic matter in physical and chemical fractions, Soil Sci Soc Am J, 70(1), 287–296, 2006.

Rumpel, C., and I. Kögel-Knabner, Deep soil organic matter—a key but poorly understood component of terrestrial C cycle, *Plant Soil*, *338*(1-2), 143–158, doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0391-5. 2010.

Schmidt, M. W. I., Torn, M. S., Abiven, S., Dittmar, T., Guggenberger, G., Janssens, I. A., Kleber, M., Kögel-Knabner, I., Manning, D. A. C., Nannipieri, P., Rasse, D. P., Weiner, S. and Trumbore, S. E.: Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property, Nature, 478(7367), 49–56, doi:10.1038/nature10386, 2011.

Sierra, C., Müller, M. and Trumbore, S. E.: Models of soil organic matter decomposition: the SoilR package, version 1.0,, 5(4), 1045–1060, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-1045-2012, 2012.

Sierra, C. A., Müller, M., Metzler, H., Manzoni, S. and Trumbore, S. E.: The muddle of ages, turnover, transit, and residence times in the carbon cycle, Global Change Biol, 23(5), 1763–1773, doi:10.1111/gcb.13556, 2017.

Six, J. and Paustian, K.: Soil Biology & Biochemistry, Soil Biol Biochem, 68(C), A4–A9, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.06.014, 2014.

Sollins, P., Kramer, M. G., Swanston, C., Lajtha, K., Filley, T., Aufdenkampe, A. K., Wagai, R. and Bowden, R. D.: Sequential density fractionation across soils of contrasting mineralogy:

evidence for both microbial- and mineral-controlled soil organic matter stabilization, Biogeochemistry, 96(1-3), 209–231, doi:10.1007/s10533-009-9359-z, 2009.

Sollins, P., Swanston, C., Kleber, M., Filley, T., Kramer, M., Crow, S., Caldwell, B. A., Lajtha, K. and Bowden, R.: Organic C and N stabilization in a forest soil: Evidence from sequential density fractionation, Soil Biol Biochem, 38(11), 3313–3324, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2006.04.014, 2006.

Sulman, B. N., Moore, J. A. M., Abramoff, R., Averill, C., Kivlin, S., Georgiou, K., Sridhar, B., Hartman, M. D., Wang, G., Wieder, W. R., Bradford, M. A., Mayes, M. A., Morrison, E., Riley, W. J., Salazar, A., Schimel, J. P., Tang, J. and Classen, A. T.: Multiple models and experiments underscore large uncertainty in soil carbon dynamics, Biogeochemistry, 141(2), 1–15, doi:10.1007/s10533-018-0509-z, 2018.

Swanston, C.W., M.S. Torn, P.J. Hanson, J.R. Southon, C.T. Garten, E.M. Hanlon, L. Ganio. Characterizing processes of soil carbon stabilization using forest stand-level radiocarbon enrichment. Geoderma 128:52–62, 2005.

Szymanski, L.M., G.R. Sanford, K. Heckman, R.D. Jackson and E. Marín-Spiotta. Conversion to bioenergy crops alters the amount and age of microbially-respired soil carbon. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 128: 35-44, 2019.

Tamm, CO., Ostlund, HG. Radiocarbon dating of soil humus. Nature, 185(4714), 706-707, 1960.

Torn, M. S., Vitousek, P. M. and Trumbore, S. E.: The influence of nutrient availability on soil organic matter turnover estimated by incubations and radiocarbon modeling, Ecosystems, 8(4), 352–372, doi:10.1007/s10021-004-0259-5, 2005.

Trumbore, S. E.: Age of soil organic matter and soil respiration: Radiocarbon constraints on belowground C dynamics, Ecol Appl, 10(2), 399–411, 2000.

Trumbore, S. E.: Carbon respired by terrestrial ecosystems - recent progress and challenges, Global Change Biol, 12(2), 141–153, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.01067.x, 2006.

Trumbore, S., M. Torn, and L. Smith. Constructing a database of terrestrial radiocarbon measurements, *Eos Trans. AGU*, 92(43), 376, doi:10.1029/2011EO430006. 2011.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Open Access Earth System Science Data Discussions

Ziegler, S. E., Benner, R., Billings, S. A., Edwards, K. A., Philben, M., Zhu, X. and Laganière, J.: Climate Warming Can Accelerate Carbon Fluxes without Changing Soil Carbon Stocks, Front. Earth Sci., 5, 535–12, doi:10.3389/feart.2017.00002, 2017.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Open Access Earth System Science Data Discussions

Tables

Table 1. The number of data points currently included at each hierarchical level in ISRaD v1.0.

Entries	Sites	Profiles	Layers	Fractions	Incubations	Interstitial	Fluxes
202	530	1764	7321	3717	1976	353	2119

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Table 2. Details of calculations included with ISRaD_extra to date. Further additions are expected in the future.

Operation	Purpose	Output
fill_dates	Radiocarbon calculations and unit conversions often require the year of measurement.	If no date is reported for fraction and/or incubation observation dates, this function replaces those empty cells with the mandatory layer observation date.
fill_14c	In some studies, only fraction modern (FM) units are reported	If no $\Delta^{14}C$ values are reported, they are calculated from FM and the measurement date.
fill_coords	Spatial coordinates are required to plot soil profiles and to extract geospatial data. Profile level coordinates are often not reported in publications.	If no spatial coordinates are specified for a profile, this function fills those cells with the site coordinates, which are required for template ingestion.
delta_delta	Delta-delta ($\Delta\Delta$) is the offset between the $\Delta^{14}C$ ratio of the atmosphere and that of a sample during the year of collection and is a useful way to compare radiocarbon data across a range of collection years.	This function calculates the $\Delta\Delta$ values for all radiocarbon measurements in the database, using the profile coordinates and the year of observation to extract an atmospheric radiocarbon value for the region of sample collection. The output is appended as a new variable, e.g. lyr_dd14c.
fill_FM	In some studies, only $\Delta^{14}C$ values are reported.	If no FM values reported, they are calculated from $\Delta^{14}C$ values.
CStocks	Measurements of carbon concentration are not, on their own, good estimates of the mass of carbon in soils.	If not measured directly, organic carbon concentration is filled with total carbon concentration (carbonates are accounted for only if reported). Then, with user-supplied bulk density, these values are used to calculate the mass of carbon in each soil layer (i.e., C stocks).
fill_expert	In some cases, data measured at one extent may be reasonably substituted at another extent for the purposes of conducting comparisons across incomplete datasets	Original reported data can be merged with expert suggested data to provide unreported bulk layer values. These estimates are not from original studies, and may be approximations, but they are useful for large-scale global analyses.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

geospatial.climate	Across a wide range of datasets, basic climate variables are inconsistently measured and reported. The purpose of this function is to fill separate, geospatially-estimated, climate parameters with a consistent source and scale.	This function uses the site coordinates to pull climate, meteorological, soil and other parameters from known global scale source datasets. At present, we use climate data from WorldClim v1.4 (http://www.worldclim.org/bioclim) and soil classification and characteristics from ISRIC (https://www.isric.org/explore/soilgrids)

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Conceptual diagram of an entry in the database. Each box represents a table in an entry; the horizontal bars distinguish the hierarchical levels of the database. Arrows show the hierarchical relationship between and among levels of the database. Time is considered at the profile level, as this is the coarsest spatial scale for which observational data are reported. Every time a profile is sampled a unique profile identifier must be generated, consisting of the profile name combined with the profile observation date, which is then linked to all measurements made at or below the profile level of the hierarchy.

Figure 2. An entity relationship diagram for the International Soil Radiocarbon Database (ISRaD). A short description of the required variables for each entity are shown along with the field name used in the database and the variable data type. Crow's foot connections with a straight line indicate mandatory daughter entities (one or more), whereas a crow's foot with an open circle indicates indicate optional (zero or more) daughter entities. The "*" indicates entries indicate keys, or linking variables, which are repeated at each successive level of the ISRaD hierarchy. The "^"indicates conditionally required values. A full list of non-required variables is available in the Template Information File.

Figure 3. One key feature of the ISRaD structure is the ability to classify and categorize data generated from diverse methods for fractionating soils. The ISRaD approach requires specification of the fractionation scheme applied, which may include but is not limited to: density (A), aggregate (B), and/or particle size (C) separations. In each of these examples, the fraction data is linked to a specific soil layer. Classification of the fractionation scheme along with several other fields that specify the nature of the fractionation method allow for an accurate partitioning of mass between the individual fractions, such that the total mass of the soil layer can be reconstructed. A proper accounting of mass attributable to each soil fraction, which in some cases may be derived from more complicated multistep or sequential fractionations (D), is essential in order to compare measurements across these diverse methods.

Figure 4. Geographic location of sites currently included in ISRaD v1.0. Circles that appear darker in color indicate multiple overlapping sites at the resolution of the map.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Figure 5. A simplified depiction of the ISRaD governance pyramid, where the scientific steering committee is responsible for approving major management decisions and data maintainers are responsible for implementing broad changes, but data contributors and users are the primary drivers of the evolution of the data product.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Open Access Earth System Science Data Discussions



Figure 1.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Earth System Science Data
Open Access Discussions



Figure 2.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019



Figure 3.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019

Open Access Earth System Science Data Discussions



Figure 4.

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-55
Manuscript under review for journal Earth Syst. Sci. Data
Discussion started: 9 May 2019



Figure 5.