

Supplement of

Position-specific kinetic isotope effects for nitrous oxide: a new expansion of the Rayleigh model

Elise D. Rivett et al.

Correspondence to: Elise D. Rivett (rivettel@msu.edu), Nathaniel E. Ostrom (ostromn@msu.edu), and Eric L. Hegg (erichegg@msu.edu)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model

 h_2, H_2

To apply the Expanded Rayleigh model, additional values ($15N^{bulk}$ and τ) must be calculated from experimental values. If necessary, δ values $(\delta^{15}N^{bulk}, \delta^{15}N^{\alpha}, \text{ and } \delta^{15}N^{\beta})$ must be converted to the corresponding R values (Eq. (6)). ¹⁴N^{bulk} and ¹⁵N^{bulk} can then be calculated using N^{bulk} and R_{bulk} (N^{bulk} = 2*[mol N₂O]).

$$
\mathcal{L}^{14}_{\text{in}} N^{bulk} = \frac{N^{bulk}}{1 + R_{bulk}} \tag{S1}
$$

$$
\mathbf{E}^{15}N^{bulk} = R_{bulk} * \mathbf{E}^{14}N^{bulk} \tag{S2}
$$

Equations S1 and S2 are derived from the definition of R (R = $^{15}N/^{14}N$, Eq. (5)) and the fact that $^{15}N^{bulk} + ^{14}N^{bulk} =$ N^{bulk} . Similar equations can be used to calculate $¹⁴N^{\alpha}$ and $¹⁵N^{\alpha}$.</sup></sup>

$$
\frac{14}{\ln 4}N^{\alpha} = \frac{N^{\alpha}}{1+R_{\alpha}} = \frac{0.5*N^{bulk}}{1+R_{\alpha}}
$$
\n(S3)

$$
\mathcal{L}^{15}_{\square} N^{\alpha} = R_{\alpha} * \mathcal{L}^{14}_{\square} N^{\alpha} \tag{S4}
$$

The values of ${}^{14}N^{\alpha}$ and ${}^{14}N^{bulk}$ can then be used to calculate τ for every step of the reaction ($\tau = {}^{14}N^{\alpha/14}N^{bulk}$, Eq. (24)).

Standard error calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model

To calculate the standard error for KIE ${}^{15}N^{\alpha}$ or KIE ${}^{15}N^{\beta}$, the standard errors for ρ , τ , and $\alpha_{N\text{-bulk}}$ need to be determined (see Table S15). The standard error for ρ (se_p) was extracted from nonlinear model 1 or nonlinear model 2 (Baty et al., 2015). For τ , the standard error of the mean (se_t) was calculated in R using the std.error function (Lemon, 2006). The standard error for α_{N-bulk} (se_{aN-bulk}) can be determined by propagating the standard error for ε_{N-bulk} (se_{eN-} $_{\text{bulk}}$):

$$
\alpha_{N-bulk} = \frac{\varepsilon_{N-bulk}}{1000} + 1 \tag{S5}
$$

$$
se_{\alpha N-bulk} = \frac{da_{N-bulk}}{ds_{N-bulk}} * se_{\varepsilon N-bulk}
$$
(S6)

Equation (S6) simplifies to Eq. (S7),

$$
se_{\alpha N-bulk} = \frac{se_{\alpha N-bulk}}{1000} \tag{S7}
$$

where se_{εN-bulk} is the standard error of the slope of a linear regression plot of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)].

The standard error for α_{N-a} is calculated by combining the standard errors for ρ , τ , and α_{N-bulk} (e.g., error propagation for Eq. (21)):

$$
se_{\alpha N-\alpha} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\alpha}}{\partial \rho} * se_{\rho}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\alpha}}{\partial \tau} * se_{\tau}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\alpha}}{\partial \alpha_{N-bulk}} * se_{\alpha_{N-bulk}}\right)^2}
$$
(S8)

Replacing the partial derivatives in Eq. (S8) yields Eq. (S9)

$$
se_{\alpha N-\alpha} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha_{N-bulk}}{\tau} * se_{\rho}\right)^2 + \left(-\frac{\rho * \alpha_{N-bulk}}{\tau^2} * se_{\tau}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\rho}{\tau} * se_{\alpha_{N-bulk}}\right)^2}
$$
(S9)

Similarly, the standard error for $\alpha_{N-\beta}$ is calculated by performing error propagation for Eq. (22):

$$
se_{\alpha N-\beta} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\beta}}{\partial \rho} * se_{\rho}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\beta}}{\partial \tau} * se_{\tau}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial \alpha_{N-\beta}}{\partial \alpha_{N-bulk}} * se_{\alpha_{N-bulk}}\right)^2}
$$
(S10)

Replacing the partial derivatives in Eq. (S10) produces Eq. (S11):

$$
se_{\alpha N-\beta} = \sqrt{(-\frac{\alpha_{N-bulk}}{1-\tau} * se_{\rho})^2 + (\frac{(1-\rho)*\alpha_{N-bulk}}{(1-\tau)^2} * se_{\tau})^2 + (\frac{1-\rho}{1-\tau} * se_{\alpha_{N-bulk}})^2}
$$
(S11)

The standard error values for $\alpha_{N-\alpha}$ and $\alpha_{N-\beta}$ can then be converted to the corresponding errors for ϵ (Eq. (S12)) or KIE (Eq. (S13)):

$$
se_{\varepsilon} = \frac{d\varepsilon}{d\alpha} * se_{\alpha} = 1000 * se_{\alpha}
$$
 (S12)

$$
se_{KIE} = \left| \frac{dKIE}{d\alpha} * se_{\alpha} \right| = \left| -\frac{1}{\alpha^2} * se_{\alpha} \right| \tag{S13}
$$

Calculation of δ¹⁵**N**^α, δ¹⁵N^β, and ρ when ε_{N-α} or ε_{N-β} is equal to 0 (e.g., Simulated Datasets 1 and 5)

For simulated Dataset 1, ε_{N-a} was set to 0 (no isotope effect at N^a); for simulated Dataset 5, $\varepsilon_{N-\beta}$ was set to 0 (no isotope effect at N^{β}). Here we show the additional calculations required to determine $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and ρ for Datasets 1 and 5.

At or near natural abundance of ¹⁵N, ${}^{14}N^{\alpha} \approx {}^{14}N^{\beta}$ and ${}^{1}\!/(\epsilon_{N-\alpha} + \epsilon_{N-\beta})$ is equal to ϵ_{N-bulk} . Therefore, when $\epsilon_{N-\alpha}$ = 0 and $\varepsilon_{\text{N-bulk}}$ is set at -20‰, $\varepsilon_{\text{N-f}}$ must equal -40‰ (and vice versa). Conversion of these ε values to the corresponding values of α (Eq. (1)) yields values of 1.0000, 0.9600, and 0.9800 for α_{N-a} , α_{N-b} , and α_{N-bulk} , respectively, for Dataset 1. Because the values of $\alpha_{N-\alpha}$ and $\alpha_{N-\beta}$ are known in this scenario, the values of ρ/τ and $(1-\rho)/(1-\tau)$ can be calculated using Eq. (S14) and Eq. (S15) (derived from Eqs. (21-22)). For simplicity, ρ/τ is designated as A, and (1- ρ)/(1- τ) is designated as *B*:

$$
A = \frac{\rho}{\tau} = \frac{\alpha_{N-\alpha}}{\alpha_{N-bulk}} \tag{S14}
$$

$$
B = \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - \tau} = \frac{\alpha_{N - \beta}}{\alpha_{N - bulk}}\tag{S15}
$$

Additionally, as long as the average of $\alpha_{N-\alpha}$ and $\alpha_{N-\beta}$ is approximately equal to $\alpha_{N-\text{bulk}}$, the sum of *A* and *B* must be equal to 2:

$$
A + B = 2 \tag{S16}
$$

For Dataset 1, *B* was calculated using Eq. (S15), and *A* was calculated using Eq. (S16). For Dataset 5, *A* was calculated using Eq. (S14), and *B* was calculated using Eq. (S16). R_α and R_β were then calculated using Eq. (S17) and Eq. (S18),

$$
R_{\alpha} = A * R_{bulk} = \frac{\rho}{\tau} * R_{bulk} \tag{S17}
$$

$$
R_{\beta} = B * R_{bulk} = \frac{1-\rho}{1-\tau} * R_{bulk} \tag{S18}
$$

and the R values were converted to the corresponding δ values (Eq. (6)).

To determine ρ for Datasets 1 and 5, ρ was calculated for $f = 0.7$ -0.3 using Eq. (23) ($\rho = {}^{15}N^{\alpha/15}N^{\text{bulk}}$). Values of ¹⁵N^{α} and ¹⁵N^{bulk} were calculated using Eq. (S4) and Eq. (S2), respectively. For Dataset 1, the average value of ρ ± standard deviation was $0.5102 \pm 9 \text{ X } 10^{-8}$. For Dataset 5, the average value of $\rho \pm$ standard deviation was $0.4898 \pm 8 \text{ X } 10^{-8}$. Thus, the variation in calculated ρ values was minimal.

Estimation of experimental error for N^s

To simulate experimental error in simulated Datasets 1-5, randomly generated numbers were added to N^s, $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, and $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$. These simulated error values were randomly generated from a skew-normal distribution where the mean was set to 0 and the standard deviation was set to the estimated value of measurement error. For N_2O synthesis reactions, we assumed that values of N^s (*i.e.*, moles of substrate) are back-calculated from $N₂O$ concentrations, where the main source of error is volume measurements. Measurement error estimates were calculated for a hypothetical experiment where 1 ± 0.01 mL of headspace from a reaction bottle with N₂O was transferred to a sample bottle, followed by removal of 1 ± 0.01 mL of headspace from the sample bottle for quantification. The experimental error for N^s (se_{Ns}) can be approximated by propagating the error for two gas volume measurements (Eq. (S19)):

$$
se_{N^S} = N_s * \sqrt{\left(\frac{error_{v_1}}{v_1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{error_{v_2}}{v_2}\right)^2} = 0.014 * N_s
$$
\n(S19)

where v_1 and v_2 represent volume measurements 1 and 2, respectively. Thus, the error for N^s is estimated to be 1.4% of N^s . To err on the side of caution, we set the standard deviation of the distribution for our simulated error values to 1.5% of N^{s0} .

Calculation of f, δ¹⁵N^α , and δ¹⁵N^β values for previously published experimental data on NH2OH oxidation by *M. trichosporium*

To apply the Expanded Rayleigh model (and the standard Rayleigh model) to the isotopic data published by Sutka and colleagues (Sutka et al., 2006), values of f, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ had to be calculated (Table S14). In this experiment, 0.3 mL of 0.01 M NH2OH (*i.e.*, 3 μmol of NH2OH) was added to a 25 mL culture tube containing 2 mL of suspended cells (Sutka et al., 2006). Values of f were calculated by dividing μmol of NH₂OH remaining (N^s) by the initial amount of $NH₂OH (N^{s0})$ (Eq. (S20)).

$$
f = \frac{N^s}{N^{s0}}\tag{S20}
$$

As noted above, $N^{s0} = 3$ µmol. N^s was calculated by subtracting µmol of NH₂OH consumed (*i.e.*, twice the number of μmol of N₂O produced) from N^{s0} (Eq. S21).

$$
N^s = N^{s0} - 2 * (c_{N_2O} * v_{headspace})
$$
\n(S21)

As shown in Eq. (21), to convert from N₂O concentration in μ M (c_{N2O}) to μ mol N₂O, N₂O concentration was multiplied by headspace volume (vheadspace = 0.0227 L). The f values for *Methylosinus trichosporium* replicate B ranged from 0.8-0.4 (see Table S14).

By combining Eq. (15) and Eq. (32) to make Eq. (S22), values of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ can be calculated using the reported values of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ and site preference (SP):

$$
\delta \mathbf{I}_{\square}^{15} N_{\square}^{\alpha} = \delta \mathbf{I}_{\square}^{5} N_{\square}^{bulk} + \frac{SP}{2} \tag{S22}
$$

Values of $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ can then be calculated using Eq. (S23) (a rearrangement of Eq. (32)):

$$
\delta \mathbf{I}_{\square}^{15} N_{\square}^{\beta} = \delta \mathbf{I}_{\square}^{15} N_{\square}^{\alpha} - SP \tag{S23}
$$

Calculation of ε values for individual observations from previously published experimental P450 NOR data

The data for N₂O production by purified P450 NOR is unusual because plots of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ against $[-\text{flnf}/(1-f)]$ form divergent lines instead of being roughly parallel (Yang et al., 2014). Thus, ρ is not constant, and using nonlinear least squares regression to predict a "constant" value of ρ that fits the entire dataset (*i.e.*, the normal application of the Expanded Rayleigh model), is not appropriate. Therefore, as outlined in the Section 2.9 of the main paper, we calculated ρ for each observation to determine KIE $^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and KIE $^{15}N^{\beta}$ values for each timepoint. Applying the Expanded Rayleigh model to individual observations yielded KIE $15N^{\alpha}$ and KIE $15N^{\beta}$ values that are more accurate than values calculated by applying the standard Rayleigh model to the entire dataset, indicating that the Expanded Rayleigh model outperforms the standard Rayleigh model even when ρ is not constant. To verify that this improved performance was due to the difference between the two models and not due to application of the Expanded Rayleigh model to individual observations instead of the entire dataset, we also applied the standard Rayleigh model to individual observations.

To apply the standard Rayleigh model to individual observations, ε_{N-bulk} , ε_{N-a} , and ε_{N-b} were calculated for each timepoint without linear regression by solving Eq. (2) for ε

$$
\varepsilon_{p/s} = \frac{\delta_{\square}^{15} N_{\square}^p - (y \text{ intercept})}{\frac{-f \ln(f)}{1 - f}}
$$
\n(S24)

where $\delta^{15}N^{\rho}$ represents $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, or $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ and (y-intercept) is the intercept of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, or $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ plotted against [-flnf/(1-f)]. For $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, the y-intercept is the initial δ value of the substrate, $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$. While $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$ could theoretically be measured, this value was not measured for this dataset. For $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, the y-intercept doesn't have an analogous physical interpretation and thus cannot be measured directly. Therefore, the value of each yintercept was determined via linear regression of the appropriate δ value against [-flnf/(1-f)]. Linear regression was performed separately for each replicate (13 observations/replicate). The appropriate y-intercept value was then used to calculate ε for each timepoint using the specific δ value and f value from one observation. As shown in Table S17, the KIEs calculated by applying the standard Rayleigh model to each individual observation are very similar to the KIEs calculated by applying the standard Rayleigh model to all the observations from one replicate.

SI Tables

^a Simulated $\delta^{15}N^s$, $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, $\delta^{15}N^a$, and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated without Mariotti's approximation (Mariotti et al., 1981) that ln[$(\delta^{15}N^{s/1000} + 1)/(\delta^{15}N^{s0/1000})$ +1)] $\approx (\delta^{15}N^s - \delta^{15}N^{s0})/1000$. (This approximation is only valid when $\delta^{15}N^{s/1000}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{s0}/1000$ are small relative to 1.) ε_{N-bulk} was set at -20% and ρ was set at 0.5050 (normal KIE $^{15}N^{\alpha}$, normal KIE $^{15}N^{\beta}$). The average value of τ for each simulation was 0.49998.

 $\rm b$ Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value ((estimate – actual)/actual|).

^c Actual KIE values were calculated with Expanded Rayleigh model 1 using f values between 0.7-0.2. $\alpha_{N\text{-bulk}}$ was determined without the ln(1+u) = u approximation by linear regression of ln($\delta^{15}N^{s}/1000 + 1$) against ln(f); ε_{N-bulk} is the slope in this model (Hayes, 2004). (The variable u represents $\delta^{15}N^{s}$ or $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$.) The value of ρ was determined via nonlinear regression (model 1) (Eq. (29)), and τ was determined by averaging ¹⁴N^a/¹⁴N^{bulk} for every step of the reaction (Eq. (24)). The results for Expanded Rayleigh model 2 (standard Rayleigh model combined with nonlinear model 2, data not shown) are essentially identical to the results from Expanded Rayleigh model 1.

^d Estimated ε_{N-bulk} values were determined using Eq. (2), Mariotti's approximation of the Rayleigh equation (*i.e.*, via linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1f)]) using f values between 0.7-0.2. $\varepsilon_{N\text{-bulk}}$ is the slope in this model.

^e Estimated KIE values for Expanded Rayleigh model 1 were calculated using Mariotti's approximation of the standard Rayleigh equation to determine α_{N-bulk} (calculated from estimated $\epsilon_{\text{N-bulk}}$, see note d and Eq. (2)). Values for p and τ were calculated as described in note c above; these values were used to determine KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE¹⁵N^β.

Table S2. Absolute relative error of εN-bulk and KIE values introduced by varying εN-bulk values^a

^a Simulated $\delta^{15}N^s$, $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, $\delta^{15}N^a$, and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated without Mariotti's approximation (Mariotti et al., 1981) that ln[$(\delta^{15}N^{s/1000} + 1)/(\delta^{15}N^{s0/1000})$ +1)] $\approx (\delta^{15}N^s - \delta^{15}N^{s0})/1000$. (This approximation is only valid when $\delta^{15}N^{s}/1000$ and $\delta^{15}N^{s0}/1000$ are small relative to 1.) $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$ was set at 0‰ and ρ was set at 0.5050 (normal KIE $^{15}N^{\alpha}$, normal KIE $^{15}N^{\beta}$). The average value of τ for each simulation was 0.49998.

 $\rm b$ Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value (((estimate – actual)/actual|).

^c Actual KIE values were calculated with Expanded Rayleigh model 1 using f values between 0.7-0.2. $\alpha_{N\text{-bulk}}$ was determined without the ln(1+u) = u approximation by linear regression of ln($\delta^{15}N^{s}/1000 + 1$) against ln(f); ε_{N-bulk} is the slope in this model (Hayes, 2004). (The variable u represents $\delta^{15}N^{s}$ or $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$.) The value of ρ was determined via nonlinear regression (model 1) (Eq. (29)), and τ was determined by averaging ¹⁴N^a/¹⁴N^{bulk} for every step of the reaction (Eq. (24)). The results for Expanded Rayleigh model 2 (standard Rayleigh model combined with nonlinear model 2, data not shown) are essentially identical to the results from Expanded Rayleigh model 1.

^dEstimated ε_{N-bulk} values were determined using Eq. (2), Mariotti's approximation of the Rayleigh equation (*i.e.*, via linear regression of δ¹⁵N^{bulk} against [-flnf/(1-f)]) using f values between 0.7-0.2. $\varepsilon_{N\text{-bulk}}$ is the slope in this model.

 e Estimated KIE values for Expanded Rayleigh model 1 were calculated using Mariotti's approximation of the standard Rayleigh equation to determine α_{N-bulk} (calculated from estimated $\epsilon_{\text{N-bulk}}$, see note d and Eq. (2)). Values for p and τ were calculated as described in note c above; these values were used to determine KIE ${}^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and KIE ${}^{15}N^{\beta}$.

Table S3. Testing the impact of ρ and τ values on the Expanded Rayleigh model

^a Average τ \pm standard deviation. τ was calculated for each value of f (f = 0.3-0.7) using Eq. (24).

 b KIE values were calculated using the input values of $ε_N$ -bulk and ρ and average τ.</sup>

^c Average difference \pm standard deviation of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ and the average of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$. Equation 2 was used to calculate $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values where $\varepsilon_{N\text{-bulk}}$ is set at -20‰ (KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk} = 1.0204) and $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$ is set at 0‰. Equations 27-28 were used to calculate $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values using the specified value of ρ .

^d All of the average differences shown here are less than the analytical error values typical for δ values (0.5-0.7‰) (Yang et al., 2014). Only very extreme ρ values (e.g., ρ < 0.32 or ρ > 0.68) violate the assumption that $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ is equal to the average of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$.

Table S4. Dataset 1: Simulated no-error values for N ₂ O synthesis in a closed system (no isotope effect for N ^a , normal isotope effect for N ^β).												
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 δ^{15} N values for three replicates with evenly spaced f values between 0.7 and 0.3 were simulated for a hypothetical reaction where $\epsilon_{\rm N-bulk}$ = -20‰ (KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk} = 1.0204), $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0$ ‰, and $\epsilon_{N-a} = 0$ ‰ (KIE $^{15}N^a = 1$). $\delta^{15}N^s$ values were calculated using Eq. (18), and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values were calculated using Eq. (2). $\delta^{15}N^a$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated using Eq. (S17) or Eq. (S18) and Eq. (6). Accumulated N^{bulk} and N^{α} values (in nmol) were calculated for a hypothetical reaction where $N^{\text{sb}} = 10,000$ nmol. (See **SI section "Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model" for details.)**

Table S5. Dataset 2: Simulated no-error values for N2O synthesis in a closed system (normal isotope effect for N^α , normal isotope effect for N^β).

 δ^{15} N values for three replicates with evenly spaced f values between 0.7 and 0.3 were simulated for a hypothetical reaction where $\epsilon_{\rm N-bulk}$ = -20‰ (KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk} = 1.0204), $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0$ %, and $\rho = 0.5050$. $\delta^{15}N^s$ values were calculated using Eq. (18), and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values were calculated using Eq. (2). $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated using **Eq. (27) or Eq. (28). Accumulated Nbulk and N^α values (in nmol) were calculated for a hypothetical reaction where Ns0 = 10,000 nmol. (See SI section "Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model" for details.)**

Replicate	f	$\delta^{15}N^s$	$\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$	N _{bulk}	14 Nbulk	15 Nbulk	$^{14}N^{\alpha}$	$15N^{\alpha}$
	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-6.8	-26.5	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.5	5.5
	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-5.4	-25.2	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.7	7.3
	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-4.0	-23.8	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.9	9.1
	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-2.3	-22.1	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.0	11.0
	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-0.4	-20.3	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.2	12.8
$\overline{2}$	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-6.8	-26.5	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.5	5.5
2	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-5.4	-25.2	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.7	7.3
2	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-4.0	-23.8	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.9	9.1
2	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-2.3	-22.1	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.0	11.0
2	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-0.4	-20.3	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.2	12.8
3	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-6.8	-26.5	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.5	5.5
3	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-5.4	-25.2	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.7	7.3
3	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-4.0	-23.8	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.9	9.1
3	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-2.3	-22.1	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.0	11.0
3	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-0.4	-20.3	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.2	12.8

Table S6. Dataset 3: Simulated no-error values for N2O synthesis in a closed system (inverse isotope effect for N^α , normal isotope effect for N^β).

 δ^{15} N values for three replicates with evenly spaced f values between 0.7 and 0.3 were simulated for a hypothetical reaction where $\epsilon_{\rm N-bulk}$ = -20‰ (KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk} = 1.0204), $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0$ %, and $\rho = 0.5200$. $\delta^{15}N^s$ values were calculated using Eq. (18), and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values were calculated using Eq. (2). $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated using **Eq. (27) or Eq. (28). Accumulated Nbulk and N^α values (in nmol) were calculated for a hypothetical reaction where Ns0 = 10,000 nmol. (See SI section "Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model" for details.)**

Replicate	$\mathbf f$	$\delta^{15}N^s$	$\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$	N^{bulk}	14 Nbulk	15 Nbulk	$^{14}N^{\alpha}$	$15N^{\alpha}$
	0.7	7.1	-16.6	22.8	-56.1	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.4	5.6
	0.6	10.2	-15.3	24.2	-54.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.5	7.5
	0.5	13.9	-13.9	25.7	-53.4	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.6	9.4
	0.4	18.3	-12.2	27.4	-51.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2988.7	11.3
	0.3	24.1	-10.3	29.4	-50.0	7000	6974.6	25.4	3486.8	13.2
2	0.7	7.1	-16.6	22.8	-56.1	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.4	5.6
$\overline{2}$	0.6	10.2	-15.3	24.2	-54.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.5	7.5
2	0.5	13.9	-13.9	25.7	-53.4	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.6	9.4
2	0.4	18.3	-12.2	27.4	-51.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2988.7	11.3
2	0.3	24.1	-10.3	29.4	-50.0	7000	6974.6	25.4	3486.8	13.2
3	0.7	7.1	-16.6	22.8	-56.1	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.4	5.6
3	0.6	10.2	-15.3	24.2	-54.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.5	7.5
3	0.5	13.9	-13.9	25.7	-53.4	5000	4981.9	18.1	2490.6	9.4
3	0.4	18.3	-12.2	27.4	-51.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2988.7	11.3
3	0.3	24.1	-10.3	29.4	-50.0	7000	6974.6	25.4	3486.8	13.2

Table S7. Dataset 4: Simulated no-error values for N2O synthesis in a closed system (inverse isotope effect for N^α , inverse isotope effect for N^β).

 δ^{15} N values for three replicates with evenly spaced f values between 0.7 and 0.3 were simulated for a hypothetical reaction where $\varepsilon_{\text{N-bulk}} = +20\%$ (KIE 15 N^{bulk} = 0.9804), $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0$ %, and $\rho = 0.5050$. $\delta^{15}N^s$ values were calculated using Eq. (18), and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values were calculated using Eq. (2). $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated using **Eq. (27) or Eq. (28). Accumulated Nbulk and N^α values (in nmol) were calculated for a hypothetical reaction where Ns0 = 10,000 nmol. (See SI section "Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model" for details.)**

Replicate	$\mathbf f$	$\delta^{15}N^s$	$\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$	N _{bulk}	14 ybulk	15 Nbulk	$^{14}N^{\alpha}$	$15N^{\alpha}$
	0.7	-7.1	16.6	26.8	6.4	3000	2988.8	11.2	1494.4	5.6
	0.6	-10.2	15.3	25.5	5.1	4000	3985.1	14.9	1992.5	7.5
	0.5	-13.9	13.9	24.0	3.7	5000	4981.4	18.6	2490.6	9.4
	0.4	-18.3	12.2	22.4	2.1	6000	5977.8	22.2	2988.8	11.2
	0.3	-24.1	10.3	20.5	0.2	7000	6974.1	25.9	3486.9	13.1
2	0.7	-7.1	16.6	26.8	6.4	3000	2988.8	11.2	1494.4	5.6
$\overline{2}$	0.6	-10.2	15.3	25.5	5.1	4000	3985.1	14.9	1992.5	7.5
2	0.5	-13.9	13.9	24.0	3.7	5000	4981.4	18.6	2490.6	9.4
2	0.4	-18.3	12.2	22.4	2.1	6000	5977.8	22.2	2988.8	11.2
$\overline{2}$	0.3	-24.1	10.3	20.5	0.2	7000	6974.1	25.9	3486.9	13.1
3	0.7	-7.1	16.6	26.8	6.4	3000	2988.8	11.2	1494.4	5.6
3	0.6	-10.2	15.3	25.5	5.1	4000	3985.1	14.9	1992.5	7.5
3	0.5	-13.9	13.9	24.0	3.7	5000	4981.4	18.6	2490.6	9.4
3	0.4	-18.3	12.2	22.4	2.1	6000	5977.8	22.2	2988.8	11.2
3	0.3	-24.1	10.3	20.5	0.2	7000	6974.1	25.9	3486.9	13.1

Table S8. Dataset 5: Simulated no-error values for N2O synthesis in a closed system (normal isotope effect for N^α , no isotope effect for N^β).

 δ^{15} N values for three replicates with evenly spaced f values between 0.7 and 0.3 were simulated for a hypothetical reaction where $\epsilon_{\rm N-bulk}$ = -20‰ (KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk} = 1.0204), $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0$ %, and $\epsilon_{N\cdot\beta} = 0$ % (KIE $^{15}N^{\beta} = 1$). $\delta^{15}N^s$ values were calculated using Eq. (18), and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values were calculated using Eq. (2). $\delta^{15}N^a$ and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ values were calculated using Eq. (S17) or Eq. (S18) and Eq. (6). Accumulated N^{bulk} and N^{α} values (in nmol) were calculated for a hypothetical reaction where $N^{\text{sb}} = 10,000$ nmol. (See **SI section "Calculations for the Expanded Rayleigh model" for details.)**

Replicate	f	$\delta^{15}N^s$	$\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$	N _{bulk}	14 Nbulk	15 Nbulk	$^{14}N^{\alpha}$	$15N^{\alpha}$
	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-36.7	3.4	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.7	5.3
	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-35.4	4.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.9	7.1
	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-34.0	6.3	5000	4981.9	18.1	2491.2	8.8
	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-32.4	7.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.4	10.6
	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-30.5	9.9	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.6	12.4
$\overline{2}$	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-36.7	3.4	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.7	5.3
2	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-35.4	4.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.9	7.1
2	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-34.0	6.3	5000	4981.9	18.1	2491.2	8.8
2	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-32.4	7.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.4	10.6
$\overline{2}$	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-30.5	9.9	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.6	12.4
3	0.7	7.1	-16.6	-36.7	3.4	3000	2989.2	10.8	1494.7	5.3
$\overline{3}$	0.6	10.2	-15.3	-35.4	4.8	4000	3985.6	14.4	1992.9	7.1
3	0.5	13.9	-13.9	-34.0	6.3	5000	4981.9	18.1	2491.2	8.8
3	0.4	18.3	-12.2	-32.4	7.9	6000	5978.3	21.7	2989.4	10.6
3	0.3	24.1	-10.3	-30.5	9.9	7000	6974.6	25.4	3487.6	12.4

Table S9. Precision and accuracy of values calculated with the Expanded Rayleigh model using simulated datasets derived from Dataset 1 (no isotope effect for N^α , normal isotope effect for N^β).

^a See Table 2 for details.

 b Average value \pm standard deviation calculated from 1000 simulated datasets.</sup>

^c Average R² value for linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation) calculated from 1000 R² values generated from 1000 simulated datasets.

^d Average value ± standard deviation for the ρ or τ values from the no-error dataset. τ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (24). ρ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (23); see SI section "Calculation of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and ρ when $\varepsilon_{N-\alpha}$ or $\varepsilon_{N-\beta}$ is equal to 0 *(e.g.*, Simulated Datasets 1 and 5)" for details.

Table S10. Precision and accuracy of values calculated with the Expanded Rayleigh model using simulated datasets derived from Dataset 2 (normal isotope effects for \mathbf{N}^{α} **and** \mathbf{N}^{β} **).**

^a See Table 2 for details.

 b Average value \pm standard deviation calculated from 1000 simulated datasets.</sup>

^c Average R² value for linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation) calculated from 1000 R² values generated from 1000 simulated datasets.

^d Standard deviation for the τ values from the no-error dataset. τ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (24).

Table S11. Precision and accuracy of values calculated with the Expanded Rayleigh model using simulated datasets derived from Dataset 3 (inverse \mathbf{i} sotope effect for $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}},$ normal isotope effect for $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{b}}$).

^a See Table 2 for details.

 b Average value \pm standard deviation calculated from 1000 simulated datasets.</sup>

^c Average R² value for linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation) calculated from 1000 R² values generated from 1000 simulated datasets.

^d Standard deviation for the τ values from the no-error dataset. τ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (24).

Table S12. Precision and accuracy of values calculated with the Expanded Rayleigh model using simulated datasets derived from Dataset 4 (inverse isotope effects for \mathbf{N}^{α} **and** \mathbf{N}^{β} **).**

^a See Table 2 for details.

 b Average value \pm standard deviation calculated from 1000 simulated datasets.</sup>

^c Average R² value for linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation) calculated from 1000 R² values generated from 1000 simulated datasets.

^d Standard deviation for the τ values from the no-error dataset. τ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (24).

Table S13. Precision and accuracy of values calculated with the Expanded Rayleigh model using simulated datasets derived from Dataset 5 (normal isotope effect for N^{α} **, no isotope effect for** N^{β} **).**

^a See Table 2 for details.

 b Average value \pm standard deviation calculated from 1000 simulated datasets.</sup>

^c Average R² value for linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation) calculated from 1000 R² values generated from 1000 simulated datasets.

^d Average value ± standard deviation for the ρ or τ values from the no-error dataset. τ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (24). ρ was calculated for each value of f using Eq. (23); see SI section "Calculation of $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and ρ when $\varepsilon_{N-\alpha}$ or $\varepsilon_{N-\beta}$ is equal to 0 *(e.g.*, Simulated Datasets 1 and 5)" for details.

	Previously reported by Sutka et al., 2006	Back-calculated				
Time	$\left[\mathrm{N}_2\mathrm{O}\right]$	$\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$			$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$
(min.)	(μM)	$(\%0)$	$SP($ %0)	f	$\%o)$	$(\%0)$
95	12.7	5.2	34.9	0.81	22.7	-12.3
155	19.5	5.0	33.3	0.70	21.7	-11.7
195	23.3	4.7	35.1	0.65	22.3	-12.9
290	30.8	4.2	35.0	0.53	21.7	-13.3
330	30.9	4.2	35.0	0.53	21.7	-13.3
450	38	3.9	34.4	0.42	21.1	-13.3

Table S14. N₂O concentrations and $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ values (reported) and values of $\delta^{15}N^a$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ (back-calculated) for N₂O production from NH₂OH by M. *trichosporium* **replicate B [isotopic data previously published, modified from (Sutka et al., 2006)].**

Table S15. Comparison of values calculated for the standard and Expanded Rayleigh models for N2O production from NH2OH by an axenic culture of *M. trichosporium* **(***Methylocystis* **sp.). Values were calculated using isotopic data previously published for** *M. trichosporium* **replicate B (Sutka et al., 2006).**

^a Value from linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using standard Rayleigh equation, Eq. (2)). (The calculated value of $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$ is the intercept of Eq. (2)).

^b Experimentally measured $\delta^{15}N$ value for NH₂OH (Sutka et al., 2006)

 \textdegree Calculated value \pm standard error.

^d KIE values were calculated from ε_{N-bulk}, ε_{N-α}, or ε_{N-β} values obtained via linear regression of δ¹⁵N^{bulk}, δ¹⁵N^α, or δ¹⁵Nβ against [-flnf/(1-f)]).

^e For the Expanded Rayleigh model, $\alpha_{N\text{-bulk}}$ was determined with the standard Rayleigh approach, ρ was determined via nonlinear regression (nonlinear model 1 or 2, Eq. (29) or Eq. (30)), and τ was determined by averaging ¹⁴N^{α /14}N^{bulk} for every step of the reaction. Then $\alpha_{N-\alpha}$ and $\alpha_{N-\beta}$ were calculated with Eq. (21) or Eq. (22) and converted to KIE values using Eq. (10).

	Time	$[N_2O]$					
Replicate	(min.)	(mmol/mL)	$\mathbf f$	$\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$	$\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$	SP
\mathbf{A}	5	12.24	0.87	-37.68	-30.08	-45.26	15.18
\mathbf{A}	8	17.07	0.81	-37.89	-29.18	-46.57	17.39
\boldsymbol{A}	11	19.16	0.79	-37.51	-29.5	-45.49	16
A	14	22.82	0.75	-37.23	-29.5	-44.93	15.44
A	17	24.71	0.73	-37.92	-28.08	-47.69	19.61
\boldsymbol{A}	20	28.74	0.68	-38.43	-28.52	-48.25	19.73
A	23	27.32	0.70	-38.55	-28.4	-48.72	20.32
\boldsymbol{A}	26	27.87	0.69	-38.98	-28.05	-49.92	21.87
\boldsymbol{A}	32	35.02	0.62	-37.92	-27.09	-48.76	21.68
\boldsymbol{A}	38	37.23	0.59	-39.04	-27.23	-50.85	23.62
A	51	43.73	0.52	-39.05	-27.08	-51.02	23.95
A	61	43.9	0.52	-39.43	-26.81	-52.07	25.26
A	71	46.38	0.49	-39.37	-27	-51.75	24.75
\overline{B}	11	18.13	0.80	-38.68	-31.03	-46.32	15.29
$\mathbf B$	14	17.4	0.81	-38.85	-29.37	-48.25	18.88
\overline{B}	17	21.99	0.76	-38.76	-29.04	-48.41	19.37
\overline{B}	20	26.36	0.71	-39.45	-30.01	-48.82	18.81
$\mathbf B$	26	30.16	0.67	-40.14	-30.24	-49.74	19.5
\overline{B}	29	32.78	0.64	-39.75	-29.51	-49.76	20.25
\overline{B}	31	35.95	0.60	-40.22	-28.88	-51.46	22.57
$\mathbf B$	34	36.22	0.60	-40.22	-29.4	-50.93	21.53
\overline{B}	38	36.38	0.60	-40.33	-29	-51.56	22.56
\boldsymbol{B}	41	39.27	0.57	-40.42	-28.64	-52.22	23.58
$\mathbf B$	51	43.62	0.52	-40.82	-28.42	-53.38	24.96
\overline{B}	61	45.26	0.50	-40.75	-28.11	-53.62	25.51
\overline{B}	71	47.92	0.47	-41.05	-28.02	-54.39	26.36
\overline{C}	11	20.33	0.78	-37.7	-30.22	-45.16	14.93

Table S16. N2O concentrations and product δ values ($\delta^{15}N^{bulk}, \delta^{15}N^a$, and $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$) reported for N2O production from NO by purified *Histoplasma capsulatum* **(fungal) P450 NOR [isotopic data previously published (Yang et al., 2014)].**

Table S17. Comparison of values calculated for the standard and Expanded Rayleigh models for N2O production from NO by purified *Histoplasma capsulatum* **(fungal) P450 NOR [calculated using previously published isotopic data (Yang et al., 2014)].**

^a Values were calculated by analyzing each replicate separately (13 observations/replicate) via linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)] (using the standard Rayleigh equation, Eq. (2)). (The calculated value of $\delta^{15}N^{s0}$ is the intercept of Eq. (2) when $y = \delta^{15}N^{bulk}$.) For each individual observation listed for the standard or Expanded Rayleigh model, the corresponding standard Rayleigh value from the appropriate replicate is listed.

^b KIE values were calculated from ε_{N-bulk}, ε_{N-α}, or ε_{N-β} values obtained via linear regression of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, or $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ against [-flnf/(1-f)]). The standard Rayleigh model values presented here differ slightly from the previously published values (Yang et al., 2014) due to our exclusion of the earliest observation(s) from each replicate *(i.e.*, observations with the highest values of f were excluded).

 c Average value \pm standard deviation calculated for values from three separate replicates (13 observations/replicate) using the standard Rayleigh model.

^d For the standard Rayleigh model applied to individual observations, ε_{N-bulk}, ε_{N-α}, or ε_{N-β} values were determined using Eq. (S24); the y-intercept listed in that equation corresponds to the y-intercept of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, or $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$ plotted against [-flnf/(1-f)] (determined by linear regression of the data from each replicate).

 $^{\circ}$ Average value \pm standard deviation calculated for values from for six (early) or seven (late) individual observations using the standard or Expanded Rayleigh model. Individual early-reaction or late-reaction values from all three replicates were pooled and averaged.

^f For the Expanded Rayleigh model, bulk values ($\alpha_{\text{N-bulk}}$, $\epsilon_{\text{N-bulk}}$, and KIE ¹⁵N^{bulk}) were determined by analyzing each replicate separately (13 observations/replicate) with the standard Rayleigh approach. Values of ρ and τ were calculated for each observation using Eq. (23) ($\rho = {}^{15}N^{\alpha/15}N^{\text{bulk}}$) and Eq. (24) ($\tau = {}^{14}N^{\alpha/14}N^{\text{bulk}}$). Then α_{N-a} and α_{N-b} were calculated for each individual observation with Eq. (21) or Eq. (22) and converted to KIE values using Eq. (10).

SI Figures

Dataset 2: Normal KIE¹⁵N^a, Normal KIE¹⁵N^B

Each panel shows a single dataset (representative of 1000 simulated datasets) consisting of three replicates with five timepoints each. All graphs were derived from Dataset 2 ($\delta^{15}N^{50} = 0%$ **,** $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20%$ **(KIE** $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$ **), KIE** ${}^{15}N^{\alpha} = 1.0103$, and KIE ${}^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0308$). Each level of error and type of skewness is described in Table 2.

Figure S2. Example datasets derived from Dataset 3 with varying levels of error and types of skewness.

Each panel shows a single dataset (representative of 1000 simulated datasets) consisting of three replicates with five timepoints each. All graphs were derived from Dataset 3 ($\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0\%$ **,** $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20\%$ **(KIE** $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$ **), KIE** $^{15}N^{\alpha} = 0.9810$, and \overline{KIE} $^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0631$). Each level of error and type of skewness is described in Table 2.

Dataset 4: Inverse $\mathsf{KIE}^{15} \mathsf{N}^{\alpha}$, Inverse $\mathsf{KIE}^{15} \mathsf{N}^{\beta}$

Figure S3. Example datasets derived from Dataset 4 with varying levels of error and types of skewness.

Each panel shows a single dataset (representative of 1000 simulated datasets) consisting of three replicates with five timepoints each. All graphs were derived from Dataset 4 (δ¹⁵Ns0 = 0‰, εN-bulk = 20‰ (KIE ¹⁵Nbulk = 0.9804), \mathbf{KIE} ¹⁵ $\mathbf{N}^a = 0.9706$, and \mathbf{KIE} ¹⁵ $\mathbf{N}^{\beta} = 0.9903$). Each level of error and type of skewness is described in Table 2.

Figure S4. Example datasets derived from Dataset 5 with varying levels of error and types of skewness.

Each panel shows a single dataset (representative of 1000 simulated datasets) consisting of three replicates with five timepoints each. All graphs were derived from Dataset 5 ($\delta^{15}N^{50} = 0%$ **,** $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20%$ **(KIE** $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$ **), KIE** ${}^{15}N^{\alpha} = 1.0417$, and KIE ${}^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0000$. Each level of error and type of skewness is described in Table 2.

Figure S5. Dataset 2: Comparison of the accuracy and goodness of fit of the standard Rayleigh model and Expanded Rayleigh models 1 and 2.

A. Comparison of the accuracy of KIE ${}^{15}N^a$ **and KIE** ${}^{15}N^{\beta}$ **values. For each model, the absolute relative difference for KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values (average for 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 2) are shown.** Actual values for Dataset 2: $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0\%$, $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20\%$ (KIE $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$), KIE $^{15}N^{a} = 1.0103$, and **KIE** $^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0308$. Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the **estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value (|(estimate – actual)/actual|). B. Comparison of the average RMSE values for each set of 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 2. Both the standard Rayleigh model and the Expanded Rayleigh model (1 and 2) use δ¹⁵Nbulk as the dependent variable, so average RMSE values can be compared directly. Lower RMSE values indicate a better goodness of fit. At each error level (low, medium, and high), the absolute relative difference value (A) or average RMSE (B) is depicted with a symbol that represents skewness type as shown in the legend. Note that in most cases these symbols overlap.**

Figure S6. Dataset 3: Comparison of the accuracy and goodness of fit of the standard Rayleigh model and Expanded Rayleigh models 1 and 2.

A. Comparison of the accuracy of KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values. For each model, the absolute relative difference for KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values (average for 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 3) are shown. Actual values for Dataset 3: $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0\%$, $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20\%$ (KIE $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$), KIE $^{15}N^{a} = 0.9810$, and **KIE** $^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0631$. Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the **estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value (|(estimate – actual)/actual|). B. Comparison of the average RMSE values for each set of 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 3. Both the standard Rayleigh model and the Expanded Rayleigh model (1 and 2) use δ¹⁵Nbulk as the dependent variable, so average RMSE values can be compared directly. Lower RMSE values indicate a better goodness of fit. At each error level (low, medium, and high), the absolute relative difference value (A) or average RMSE (B) is depicted with a symbol that represents skewness type as shown in the legend. Note that in most cases these symbols overlap.**

Figure S7. Dataset 4: Comparison of the accuracy and goodness of fit of the standard Rayleigh model and Expanded Rayleigh models 1 and 2.

A. Comparison of the accuracy of KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values. For each model, the absolute relative difference for KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values (average for 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 4) are shown. Actual values for Dataset 4: $\delta^{15}N^{50} = 0\%$, $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = 20\%$ (KIE $^{15}N^{bulk} = 0.9804$), KIE $^{15}N^{a} = 0.9706$, and **KIE** $^{15}N^{\beta} = 0.9903$. Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the **estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value (|(estimate – actual)/actual|). B. Comparison of the average RMSE values for each set of 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 4. Both the standard Rayleigh model and the Expanded Rayleigh model (1 and 2) use δ¹⁵Nbulk as the dependent variable, so average RMSE values can be compared directly. Lower RMSE values indicate a better goodness of fit. At each error level (low, medium, and high), the absolute relative difference value (A) or average RMSE (B) is depicted with a symbol that represents skewness type as shown in the legend. Note that in most cases these symbols overlap.**

(a) Dataset 5: Normal KIE¹⁵N^a, No KIE¹⁵N^{β}

Figure S8. Dataset 5: Comparison of the accuracy and goodness of fit of the standard Rayleigh model and Expanded Rayleigh models 1 and 2.

A. Comparison of the accuracy of KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values. For each model, the absolute relative difference for KIE ¹⁵N^α and KIE ¹⁵N^β values (average for 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 5) are shown. Actual values for Dataset 5: $\delta^{15}N^{s0} = 0\%$, $\varepsilon_{N-bulk} = -20\%$ (KIE $^{15}N^{bulk} = 1.0204$), KIE $^{15}N^{a} = 1.0417$, and **KIE** $^{15}N^{\beta} = 1.0000$. Absolute relative difference (Eq. (31)) is the absolute value of the difference between the **estimated value and actual value divided by the actual value (|(estimate – actual)/actual|). B. Comparison of the average RMSE values for each set of 1000 simulated datasets derived from Dataset 5. Both the standard Rayleigh model and the Expanded Rayleigh model (1 and 2) use δ¹⁵Nbulk as the dependent variable, so average RMSE values can be compared directly. Lower RMSE values indicate a better goodness of fit. At each error level (low, medium, and high), the absolute relative difference value (A) or average RMSE (B) is depicted with a symbol that represents skewness type as shown in the legend. Note that in most cases these symbols overlap.**

References

- Baty, F., Ritz, C., Charles, S., Brutsche, M., Flandrois, J.-P., and Delignette-Muller, M.-L.: A toolbox for nonlinear regression in R: The package nlstools, J Stat Softw, 66, 1 - 21, 10.18637/jss.v066.i05, 2015.
- Hayes, J. M.: An introduction to isotopic calculations, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA, 2004.
- Lemon, J.: Plotrix: a package in the red light district of R. R-News, 6(4): 8-12., 2006.
- Mariotti, A., Germon, J. C., Hubert, P., Kaiser, P., Letolle, R., Tardieux, A., and Tardieux, P.: Experimental determination of nitrogen kinetic isotope fractionation: Some principles; illustration for the denitrification and nitrification processes, Plant Soil, 62, 413-430, 10.1007/BF02374138, 1981.
- Sutka, R. L., Ostrom, N. E., Ostrom, P. H., Breznak, J. A., Gandhi, H., Pitt, A. J., and Li, F.: Distinguishing nitrous oxide production from nitrification and denitrification on the basis of isotopomer abundances, Appl Environ Microb, 72, 638-644, 10.1128/aem.72.1.638-644.2006, 2006.
- Yang, H., Gandhi, H., Ostrom, N. E., and Hegg, E. L.: Isotopic fractionation by a fungal P450 nitric oxide reductase during the production of N₂O, Environ Sci Technol, 48, 10707-10715, 10.1021/es501912d, 2014.