Dear Editor,

We have now revised our manuscript bg-2015-263 by Guerin et al submitted for publication to Biogeosciences.

Overall, we significantly improved the manuscript by following all suggestions and comments provided by the reviewer.

Kind Regards
F Guérin, on behalf of all co-authors

AC: The authors thank the reviewer for its thorough, very constructive and positive review that really contributed to the improvement of the manuscript.

General comments:
1. For the most part, the English is good throughout the paper. It does require some grammatical corrections, of which a few I will suggest to look out for (but this is likely not an exhaustive list).
a. The word 'a' should be used in certain situations. For example, lines 27 and 54 where it should read 'recognized as a source' and 'known to be a source', respectively.
b. While 'fortnightly' does mean 'every two weeks', it is not the most commonly used word and I would recommend the authors avoid using it as many readers may not know its meaning. In many instances, it can be replaced with 'every two weeks' and in some instances there does not necessarily need to be a mention of the sampling resolution (see specific comments).
c. There are many places in the text where the authors could replace the phrasing 'X of Y' with simply 'Y X'. For example, on line 171 it now reads 'vertical profiles of O2 and CH4', but this could be changed to 'vertical O2 and CH4 profiles'. This is an easy fix that works in the majority of cases and sounds more eloquent.
d. Some words are pluralized incorrectly. For example, on line 69 'overturns' is incorrect.
e. In some places, words are incorrectly ordered. For example, on line 72 it should read 'of annual CH4 emissions'

AC: All suggestions listed here and in the detailed comments were taken into account.

2. I believe I did not see anywhere in the text the words 'artificial mixing' as stated in the title of the manuscript. I am torn on the use of the word 'artificial' here. It is artificial in the sense that it is not brought on naturally by way of convection or wind, for example; however, it is still mixing and I would rather say it is simply 'mixing induced by the water intakes'. While you cannot say all of that in the title then it is fair to say 'artificial mixing' but this must be defined in the abstract and again early on in the discussion.

AC: We kept artificial mixing in the title since we do not have better proposition to name what happens upstream of the water intake. As suggested, artificial mixing was defined and used in the abstract (L51), at the end of the introduction (L116), in the discussion (L768) and in the conclusion (L805)

3. I believe that the water level changes and consequent seasonal surface area changes must be important to CH4 storage and emissions. The surface area increases threefold from dry to wet seasons. That must have an impact on total emissions. In fact, this is also very important in terms of storage values if the increase in depth also increases storage volume. This is never explicitly discussed in the paper in terms of the results. I would like to see a bit more discussion of this.

AC: A new figure was added with the seasonal evolution of the water surface, volume and water level variations (Figure 2) which is described L164-173. In the result section (L421-422) it is now noted that the maximum storage was concomitant with the smallest water volume. This point is discussed L570-573.

4. The authors do not report much about the k600 values that they estimated, which are crucial for estimating diffusive emissions. I would like to see more details about the values and variability of k600 over the years and seasons and across stations.

AC: The answer to this general comment is given in our answer to the detailed comments 43-45. More details are now given L274-322

5. Section 4.2 – The first two paragraphs (lines 438-476) cover both sporadic destratification due to river inflows and seasonal overturn. It is too confusing to have them combined in this discussion. Separate them out for the reader.

AC: The first two paragraphs are now split in three paragraphs, one per season, in order to emphasis the spatial differences according to the seasonal specificities.

6. The authors should be careful with the sampling resolution recommendations that they make on lines 553-572. Their resolution was only 2 weeks and there was ample time between samplings for events to occur and to be missed. See specific comments for more details.

AC: The end of the paragraph (L830-838) and the conclusion (L872-874) were modified with special care to the specific comments 92 and 94.

Now it is stated L830: "The auto-correlation function of the concentration time series indicates that a minimum sampling frequency of 1 month is required in this monomictic reservoirs for an accurate description of the change in the surface concentrations and estimation of the emissions (Figure S4). Although a better temporal resolution than 15 days or monthly would probably improve the estimation of CH_4 emissions from this reservoir, a lower temporal resolution could significantly affect (positively or negatively) the emission factor of this reservoir that overturn gradually over several month. Therefore, the monthly frequency defined for this specific reservoir is probably not applicable to every aquatic ecosystem, especially in lakes or reservoirs that overturn within a week or less (Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2012). However, it suggests that quantification of emissions based on 2-4 campaigns in a year might significantly affect emissions factors and carbon budgets of ecosystems under study."

And in the conclusion L872: "Our results suggest that sporadic emissions cannot be integrated properly in the quantification of emissions and establishments of carbon budgets based only on seasonal sampling (2-4 campaigns)."

7. Table 1 – I would like to see depth ranges for these sites

AC: added

8. Table 3 – the left column descriptions are not easy to understand – make these much more specific. For example, 'total emissions from reservoir' includes ebullition and diffusion, correct? Then put that in parentheses

AC: Two row titles were modified to make them more explicit

9. Figure 2 – the CH4 scale should be reduced in any panel in which necessary to see the trend of the line. They all don't have to be the same scale. State in the caption that the reader should note the changing CH4 scale.

AC: Graphs for the stations RES1, 7 and 8 all have the same scale now while RES9 and RES3 are presented with specific scales. This is specified in the legend.

10. Figures 3, 6, and 7 – Instead of color coding the seasons on these figures, I think it would be easier for the reader to see labels depicting the length of the seasons, like this:

AC: The color code is kept since it can be used consistently in all figures. The representation proposed by the reviewer would imply different representations for the seasons in figures 3, 5, and 6 (with the new numbering).

Specific comments:
1. Line 30 – delete 'fortnightly' and 'parameters'. Add 'every 2 weeks for 3.5 years' after 'concentrations'

AC: Done

2. Line 35 – why parentheses around the reference?

AC: Removed

3. Line 37 – 'dependent on the thermal' – watching spelling of 'dependent' and 'on' instead of 'of'

AC: Done

4. Line 39 – avoid using 'They' to start a sentence. Here you can say 'Concentration and storage'

AC: Done

5. Line 40 – delete 'the' in 'decreases of the CH4 storage'

AC: Done

6. Line 41 – delete 'sporadic' here – it's not necessary

AC: Done

7. Line 41-42 – here you can say 'These sporadic emissions occurred…'

AC: Done

8. Line 42-43 – you do not need to say 'the overturn', you can simply say 'overturn'

AC: Done

9. Line 44 – should read 'these extreme CH4 emissions'

AC: Done

10. Line 46 – it sounds better to say '…WW seasons, an emission hotspot was identified…'

AC: Done

11. Line 46-52 – it's confusing that you are saying the water intake area is a hot spot but during CD that that location is where the lowest emissions are observed. I recommend deleting the sentence about CD season – it's not necessary. I also recommend that you explicitly state here that the reason this location is a hot spot is because of the 'artifical' mixing induced by the water intake. Otherwise, the reader is left wondering why and whether or not you actually know the answer.

AC: The following sentence was added L50: "The hotspot was attributed to the mixing induced by the water intakes (artificial mixing)."

12. Line 64 – before discussing that diffusive fluxes are usually highest when stratification weakens, the authors should mention that CH4 builds up in anoxic hypolimnions of stratified water bodies

AC: L81-83, the sentence was modified as follow: "In tropical amictic and well-stratified reservoirs with CH_4-rich hypolimnion, the highest diffusive fluxes are usually observed during dry periods and when the stratification weaken at the beginning of the rainy season (Guerin and Abril, 2007)."

13. Line 66 – doesn't 'amictic' refer to lakes that freeze?

AC: An amictic lake is a lake that never overturns.

14. Line 69 – delete 'the reservoir' and don't make 'overturn' plural

AC: Done

15. Line 72 – 'of annual CH4 emissions' instead of 'of CH4 annual emissions'

AC: Done

16. Line 77-81 – I recommend re-writing this sentence: 'The spatial variability of diffusion in reservoirs is less prominent with a few exceptions of higher emissions (1) in areas where dense forest is flooded (Abril), (2) at shallow sites (Zheng..), and (3) at river inflows (Musenze).' Also, be more specific with shallow sites. Were these simply littoral areas or just because of depth no matter the location? What would be a depth range?

AC: Done for the rewriting. According to Zheng et al. and Sturm et al., fluxes increase at sites shallower than 10 m and this was added to the text.

17. Line 83 – in what way does the spatiotemporal variability 'significantly affect carbon budgets and emission factors'? In a negative or positive way?

AC: Done

18. Line 85 – add 'reservoir' after 'subtropical'

AC: Done

19. Line 85-86 – define 'Lao PDR' here instead of line 99

AC: Done

20. Line 86 – add 'previously' before 'studied'

AC: Done

21. Line 89 – 'in previously published CH4 budgets due….' Does this refer to previously published CH4 budgets of NT2R? I guess so but be specific and cite papers.

AC: L103-118: It did not refer to previous study at NT2R and the writing was actually confusing. The objectives of the paper were rewritten as follow: "In the present study, the objective is to quantify the CH_4 diffusive fluxes at the surface of NT2R and evaluate the significance of the diffusive fluxes in total methane emissions in a subtropical monomictic reservoir with a peculiar water intake that artificially mix the water column. The CH_4 emissions were quantified every two weeks during three and a half year (June 2009 to December 2012) based on a monitoring of CH_4 concentrations in the reservoir water column."

22. Line 90 – extra period

AC: removed

23. Line 91-92 – you state that data was taken over a 'three and half year period (May 2010 to December 2012)' however this is only 2.5 years. Then you finish the sentence talking about concentrations that started in June 2009. This is confusing.

AC: There was confusion in the dates and it was corrected L117: 'three and half year period (May 2009 to December 2012)'

24. Line 101 – should read 'in April 2008 with full water level reached by October 2009 and the power plant commissioned in April 2010.'

AC: Done

25. Line 102 – I believe 'commissioned' here means that the turbines were officially turned on. If this is the case, please specify that here as it directly relates to your results regarding Res9 hot spot.

AC: This is now explicitly specified L132-135: "The filling of the reservoir began in April 2008 with full water level reached by October 2009 and the power plant commissioned in April 2010. After that date, turbines were turned on and water was continuously delivered to the turbines and downstream of the reservoir."

26. Line 104 – is 2 m3/s the real flow? That seems quite low.

AC: This is low but there is no mistake. The following sentence was added L138 in order to explain it: "This low water discharge corresponds to the minimum water discharge of the Nam Theun River before the dam was built."

27. Line 106-107 – Most people would expect a hydroelectric reservoir to have the intakes and power station be at the dam itself, but I believe that NT2R is set up slightly differently with the intake and power station at another end of the reservoir. While you have other papers describing this, you should state that explicitly here. It also lets the reader know why you state that the water used for electricity is delivered from the water intake to the powerhouse, which is a sentence that I, at first, thought was unnecessary.

AC: The reservoir description was improved with the addition/modification of text L125-132. This now reads: "A detailed description of this trans-basin hydroelectric reservoir located on the Nakai Plateau is given in Descloux et al. (2014). Basically, the Nam Theun River is dammed (Nakai Dam, ND in Figure 1) and the water from the Nam Theun River is diverted to the Xebang Fai watershed after passing through water intake (WI in Fig 1) to the powerhouse (PH in Fig 1). The WI is located in a 130 m-width and 9 to 20 m-deep channel on the southwest side on the reservoir and it is located 5 m above the bottom (Figure S1). The powerhouse is located in the valley 200 m below the plateau." A detailed view of the water was added in the supplemental (Figure S1)

28. Line 116-117 – here you have more dates about water level and the study period that don't exactly match the dates on lines 91-92. This is all confusing, especially here where you say that the reservoir water level was constant til April 2010, which was after your measurements started (June 2009?). Water level started to change in April 2010 when the turbines were put to use but online line 116 you say 'After the commissioning during the studied period (June 2009 to Dec 2012),' of which then June 2009 to April 2010 is not technically after commissioning.

AC: The paragraph was modified and all dates are now corrected (see L164-173). Also, a new figure (Figure 2) was added in order to illustrate the variations of surface and volume of the reservoir.

29. Line 118 – the authors should explicitly state (1) that the surface area triples from dry to wet seasons, (2) that the depth increases by X meters at most locations, and (3)

what the volumetric changes of the reservoir are over a season. These are important values related to your results.

AC: all this information is now given in the text (L166-173) and in the new figure 2.

30. Line 122 – this has already been stated twice before (nine stations monitored fortnightly)

AC: this was said in the abstract (but it cannot be counted since it is a summary) and at the end of the introduction when describing the objectives of the study. Since the spatio-temporal variations of emissions are at the heart of the paper, this cannot be dismissed. And this is mandatory in the sampling strategy section. Therefore, that was kept.

31. Line 124 – what characteristics are in the table?

AC: the sentence was modified as follow (L177-178): "The type of ecosystems flooded, the depth range and the hydrology of the stations are given in the Table 1."

32. Table 1 should also contain depth ranges at each site

AC: Table 1 was modified and depth range were added

33. Line 129 – here you should state the depth of the intake relative to depth of water column seasonally

AC: More detail is now given (L182-185). 'The RES1 station is located 100 m upstream of the Nakai Dam, and RES9 station is located 800 m upstream of the water intake (WI) delivering the water to the powerhouse (Figure 1 and Figure S1). The station RES9 is under the influence of the water column mixing induced by the water withdrawal at the WI, located at the bottom of the reservoir (5m above the bottom) and under 10 to 20 m of water (see discussion).'

34. Line 139 – using the words 'since January 2009' implies constantly measured. Is that the case?

AC: Yes but the spatial and vertical resolution was not as high as after June 2009. We modified the date to June in order not to generate confusion

35. Line 144 – is it a custom-built water sampler? If so, state that.

AC: stated

36. Line 146 – water samples were stored air free, correct? Please state that

AC: stated

37. Line 160 – should read 'Between sampling depths of the vertical CH4 profiles, concentrations were assumed to change linearly…' But what was the sampling resolution for the profiles? Be specific.

AC: Modified and the following sentence was added (L208-210): "Other samples from the water column were taken with an Uwitec water sampler at 3m-depth, at the oxic-anoxic interface 1m above and below the oxic-anoxic interface and every 3 to 5m down to 0.5 m above the bottom."

38. Line 171 – 'since the resolution of the vertical O2 and CH4 profiles was not high enough in 2009'… we don't know the resolution at all

AC: The vertical resolution of the O2 profiles was given in the section 2.3.1 and the vertical resolution of the CH4 profile was added (see previous comment)

39. Line 179 – you need to define Km too

AC: Done

40. Line 182 – 'limit of oxygen penetration'
AC: Done

41. Line 184 – delete 'fortnightly'
AC: Done

42. Line 190-193- since you need to define kt, you should move that to the end of this paragraph (after delta C) and then go right into the equation for kt

AC: Done

43. Line 198-210 – in general here, this paragraph is very confusing. First, you say used both k600s determined by wind and rain and the Macintyre 2010 equation, but how? Did you average them for each station?

AC: The k600 used for flux calculation is an average of the k600 calculated by the relationships of Guerin et al and McIntyre et al. as now stated L274. As we used the same wind speed and rainfall for the station RES1-RES8 (see below), we have the same k600 value for each sampling date which is applied to all station.

Next, I believe you are trying to validate the use of these two k600 equations by stating that the fluxes calculated with them agreed with chambers and eddy fluxes. If this is true then it needs to be stated clearer. Also, I don't understand how the eddy covariance system would have impacted buoyancy fluxes.

AC: (L277-279), the sentence was modified as follow to better explain that we already compared successfully flux calculation using the two above-mentioned relationships and direct measurements with floating chambers at NT2R. However, the part of the sentence related to eddy covariance was removed since it was confusing.

Then for wind speed and rainfall, did you use both met stations data? How did you split them amongst stations? I am guessing you used a k600 for each station on each sampling, but you never state that.

AC: Explanations about the met data we used was modified (L281-284) in order to answer the questions: 'The average wind speed (at 10 m height) and rainfall from two meteorological stations located at the Ban Thalang Bridge (close to RES4 station,) and close to the WI (Figure 1) was used for the calculation of fluxes all stations (RES1-8).'

Then you report an average k600, which confuses the reader more. Please be more specific as to what you used.

AC: A few sentences were added here: (L284-289) 'On average for all stations and all sampling date, the k_{600} was 5.6±5.3 cm h^{-1} ranging between 0.91 to 40.4 cm h^{-1}. The lowest k_{600} were calculated in the CD season (3.43±1.01 cm h^{-1}; 1.65-6.06 cm h^{-1}) while the highest were obtained during the WW season (6.78±6.33 cm h^{-1}; 1.57-40.42 cm h^{-1}) due to high rainfall (up to 113 mm day^{-1}). In the WD season k_{600} averaged 5.58±4.81 cm h^{-1}. This average k_{600} is significantly enhanced by some rainy events in late May-early June in 2010 and 2012 (up to 60 mm d^{-1}).'

44. Line 206-207 – delete 'for calculation purpose'

AC: Done

45. Line 218-220 – how exactly did you determine the k600 here? With chambers? These measurements that are not shown, are they in another paper?

AC: In order to state that fluxes were determined by floating chambers, we modified the text as follow (L294 297): 'In the regulating dam, the k_{600} obtained in May 2009 and March 2010 with a drifting floating chamber as described in Deshmukh et al. (2014) was 19 cm h^{-1} on average for 4 measurements ranging from 9 to 40 cm h^{-1}.' Those 4 values were not published elsewhere and the range is now given in the text.

46. Line 226 – 'it has been shown'

AC: modified

47. Line 264 – reference Figure 3a after 'temperature was defined.'

AC: Done

48. Line 267 – 'oxycline' and not 'oxicline'

AC: Done

49. Line 277-278 – 'After the commissioning of the reservoir and the turbines were

powered on in April 2010, the water column located near the intake (RES9) completely mixed as indicated by the homogeneous temperature and oxygen profiles with depth in every season'.

AC: modified

50. Line 283 – 'on average'

AC: modified

51. Line 291-294 – You are reporting two averages here and it's a bit confusing. Maybe separate this into two sentences and be explicit. Is the 215 uM the highest recorded average of a single day (including all stations)? And then the other averages are seasonal averages, which includes all stations and all days within a single season?

AC: The text was modified L410-413: 'The highest average CH_4 concentration from the surface to the bottom peaked up to 215 µmol L^{-1} in July 2010 at this station. On a seasonal basis, the CH_4 concentration at RES9 averaged 39.8 ± 48.8, 29.9 ± 55.4 and 1.9 ± 4.3 µmol L^{-1} during the WD, WW and CD seasons, respectively (Figure 3).' This was separated in two sentences. It is now clearer that the highest value was obtained on a single day at RES9 and that the seasonal averages were only for RES9.

52. Line 301 – delete 'the reservoir'

AC: Done

53. Line 301-313 – I am very curious about how much of the CH4 storage is due to CH4 accumulation and how much to any volumetric changes of the hypolimnion. The oxycline must move throughout the year, which will impact the hypolimnetic volume. Also, do the large changes in surface area and water level impact the hypolimnetic volume? I think these numbers would be interesting to see for each season too.

AC: L423 and L426, it is now clearly stated that the highest storage occurred when the reservoir volume was the smallest (transition WD-WW) and that the smallest storage was when the reservoir volume was the highest (CD)

54. Line 324 – was it the single highest aerobic oxidation rate observed in CD of 2012? If so, make sure to put the word 'single' as you just state earlier in that sentence that WW and WD have higher rates than CD.

AC: The sentence was rewritten (L463-464): "In the CD season of the year 2012, the aerobic oxidation rate were exceptionally high compare to the same season in the previous years."

55. Line 333 – why do you cite supplemental figure S3 before S1 and S2? Change the order of the figures if there is no mistake here.

AC: numbering of the figures in the supplemental was corrected

56. Line 337 – ‘in all seasons’

AC: Done

57. Line 346 – delete ‘at’ before ‘all stations’

AC: Done

58. Line 349 – delete ‘the’ in the beginning of the line

AC: Done

59. In table 2, you also report ‘% Fch4 < 1’ but you don’t say anything about it in the text

AC: The following sentence was added: ‘During the WW and the CD seasons, more than 60% of the calculated fluxes were lower than 1 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}, which corresponds to classical flux in pristine rivers.’

60. Line 363-364 – you say ‘NT2’ and then the next sentence ‘NT2R Reservoir’… be consistent throughout the paper. Check them all

AC: checked and corrected

61. Line 365 – ‘lower than those at Petit Saut’

AC: Done

62. Line 367 – ‘for reservoirs ~ 10 to 18 years older’

AC: Done

63. Line 373-374 – should read ‘Following the commissioning of the reservoir and powering of the turbines, CH4 concentrations at station RES9, which was located at the water intake, were up to 30 times higher than at the other stations (36.6….)’

AC: Done

64. Line 375-376 – delete ‘that is’ and put the rest of the sentence in parentheses

AC: Done

65. Line 377 – how are concentrations in WW higher than those in WW? Something strange here

AC: L537-538: now it is: ‘The surface concentrations at RES9 were significantly higher in the WD and WW seasons than in the CD season’

66. Line 390-393 – this is a discussion point and not for results

AC: Moved to section 4.3, L756-758.

67. Line 408-416 – I understand your point here but it is a bit convoluted. You should explicitly state that you 'did not see a significant increase in methane oxidation during overturn in the CD season except for in the year 2012 when hypolimnetic CH4 concentrations were still quite high'. I believe you need to state here too that in fact the turnover in this reservoir is gradual and doesn't just occur in a few short days as observed in other systems. You say that later but I think it's fair to put that point here now.

AC: The end of the paragraph was modified accordingly (L587-591): 'Significant increase in methane oxidation during overturn in the CD season was not observed except for the year 2012 (Figure 5) when hypolimnetic CH_4 concentrations were still quite high (Figure 4c,d). The absence of a clear enhancement of the CH_4 oxidation in the water column of NT2R can be attributed to the slow erosion of the thermal stratification before the reservoir really overturns.'

68. Line 411 – delete 'already'

AC: Done

69. Line 418 – delete ' in the reservoir'

AC: Done

70. Line 426-427 – 'storage in the dry year of 2012 was twice that of the wet year of 2011, likely due to a 25% increase in residence time' - why did the residence time increase?

AC: The sentence was reworded (L601-603). The residence time increase due to a very decrease in water inputs and rainfall as now stated in the MS.

71. Line 428 – why is the warming of surface waters less efficient? Simply because of the inflows? I agree with this point but the sentence needs to be a bit clearer

AC: L603-605: it is now sais that the warming is less efficient due to less insulation and input of cold water in the epilimnion

72. Line 430 – what I don't agree with is how a sharper decrease and larger range of temperature from top to bottom means a less stable stratification. A more pronounced thermocline actually induces a more stable water column. Something is confused in your writing here.

AC: There was a confusion here. It was not written sharper decrease and larger range of temperature but of ΔT which is our stratification index. This is now explicitly stated to avoid confusion (L629-630)

73. Line 433 – 'Therefore, our results suggest that hydrology…'

AC: Done

74. Line 435 – you state that hydrology ultimately influences emissions too but you don't make that connection here directly. Add one more sentence about this.
75. Line 438 – delete the first 'the' and start with 'Figure 7'

AC: Done

76. Line 443 – 'and were usually' …. Everything should be in past tense

AC: Done

77. Line 445 – if these CH4 bursts were during CD does that mean they were during overturn?

AC: They occurred in both the CD and WW seasons as now stated L 645: 'It shows that the large bursts of CH_4 (from 5 up to 200 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) always occurred in both the CD and WW seasons only when ΔT decreased sharply (>4°C, Figure 8a,d,g,j) and were usually followed by a sharp decrease of the CH_4 storage in the water column (Figure 8b,e,h,k).'

78. Line 447-452 – 'together with the CH4 storage in the water column but remained less than 20 mmol m-2 d-1. Sporadic high fluxes occurred in the WD season at Res3,7, and 8 and were usually associated with dT variations less than 2C. The CH4 storage decreases associated with these fluxes, however, were not as sharp as those observed during other seasons.' But what is the 20 mmol/m2/d all about? Why is this relevant?
79. Line 465 – 'in a reservoir older than'

AC: Done. This sentence was moved in a new paragraph following the modification asked in the major comment 5. This is now L698-706 and it is clearly said that the extreme fluxes in the CD (<20 mmol m-2 d-1) are up to ten times lower than extreme fluxes in the other seasons: 'In the WD season, some sporadic emissions occurred but they were always lower than 20 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} that is up to ten times lower than extreme fluxes in the WW and CD season. Those high fluxes occurred at RES3, RES7 and RES8 (Figure 8d,g,j) and were associated with ΔT variations lower than 2°C. The CH_4 storage decreases associated with these fluxes, however, were not as sharp as those observed during other seasons (Figure 8e,h,k). These high emissions were actually associated with early rains and associated high winds that occur sometimes in the last fifteen days of May. This shows that a moderate erosion of the stratification when hypolimnic CH_4 concentrations are high could enhance vertical transport of CH_4 toward the surface and emissions to the atmosphere.'

80. Line 471-475 – this sentence is a bit long and wordy. You can separate it into two or put in numbers (1) and (2) for the two different points. Delete 'mostly' both times. The second half could read as follows: 'an in areas away from inflows during overturn'. Why does 'riverbed' matter here?

AC: We put numbers in the sentence as suggested (L707-710). We removed riverbed here as it is confusing and a bit redundant with the idea of inflow.

81. Line 484 – you finally state here that NT2R destratifies progressively rather than quickly. This should have been stated earlier!

AC: this was done L366 in the results and this observation was also taken into account in the discussion of the sampling frequency L837

82. Line 485 – 'when the water body finally overturns as was observed'

AC: Done

83. Line 489-492 – 'Therefore, during overturn in the CD season, a significant amount of CH4 is oxidized, but the removal of CH4 during overturn is not as efficient as….' Why are the references in the middle of the sentence here? I don't think they are necessary here.

AC: the references were removed

84. Line 517 – I do not understand the description of this channel. Perhaps a figure would be useful, like an inset on Figure 1.

AC: Google Earth pictures were added as supplementary material (Figure S1)

85. Line 532 – the 18-27% estimate includes hot spots and moments then?

AC: Hotspots and hot moments are included as now specified in the sentence

86. Line 536-539 – you need to be explicit here that it was the powered on of the reservoirs that made the different between 2009 and 2010. Also, you don't have measurements for many months of 2009 so that could also influence the difference between these years, although it was more the hotspot of RES9 following commissioning.

AC: we modified the text as follow in order to answer all questions raised by the reviewer: 'Most of the increase of CH_4 emissions by diffusive fluxes from 4 to 9 Gg(CH_4) between 2009 and 2010 is due to very significant emissions of 2-3 Gg(CH_4) at the water intake after the commissioning of the reservoir and resulting artificial mixing (Figure 9a). This increase might be overestimated because we have no measurements between Jan. and May but this overestimation might be reasonable since those months are usually associated with the lowest emissions of the year (Figure 9b). After the commissioning, the outgassing of CH_4 was triggered by the artificial mixing generated by the withdrawal of water from the reservoir to the turbines.'

87. Line 541 – I believe you are reporting values only for 2010, 2011 and 2012 here. You should state that you are disregarding 2009 data as it was prior to commissioning of the reservoir.

AC: Added L802

88. Line 545 – shouldn't it be between 3 and 7 %?

AC: OK

89. Line 547 – delete 'very'.. avoid using this word altogether. It's informal and not necessary usually.

AC: Done

90. Line 547-549 – these locale perturbations and how much they influence mixing are also dependent on depth, however

AC: This is one of the many parameters that we do not discuss here because we cannot be exhaustive and specific.

91. Line 553 – you are talking about total daily emissions here, right? Add the word 'daily' if so

AC: it was added L819

92. Line 562-567 – can you really make any recommendations on sampling frequency when your data was only at a 2 week resolution? You do not know what happened in the two weeks between samplings. Even if you saw high emissions in two consecutive samplings that doesn't mean that it was occurring consistently between samplings. I think you need to be careful here. Clearly, your resolution is better than only seasonally or monthly, but that is likely as much as you can say. Also, if overturn happens quickly in a water body, sometimes just two or three days, then you would definitely miss those emissions if you were not there during those days. This should also be stated here. Your resolution worked only because of the gradual destratification.

AC: The end of the paragraph L819-842 was substantially modified in order to take all these comments into account. Here are the last lines were most of the changes were done: 'At a single station, there is a possibility that we did not catch the peak of emissions but extreme emission events never lasted more than 2 months (3 consecutive sampling dates) and probably lasted less than 15 days most of the time (Figure 8). The auto-correlation function of the concentration time series indicates that a minimum sampling frequency of 1 month is required in this monomictic reservoirs for an accurate description of the change in the surface concentrations and estimation of the emissions (Figure S4). Although a better temporal resolution than 15 days or monthly would probably improve the estimation of CH_4 emissions from this reservoir, a lower temporal resolution could significantly affect (positively or negatively) the emission factor of this reservoir that overturn gradually over several month. Therefore, the monthly frequency defined for this specific reservoir is probably not applicable to every aquatic ecosystem, especially in lakes or reservoirs that overturn within a week

or less (Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2012). However, it suggests that quantification of emissions based on 2-4 campaigns in a year might significantly affect emissions factors and carbon budgets of ecosystems under study.'

93. Line 580 – 'areas far from inflows'

AC: Done

94. Line 583-587 – these lines can be moved to the paragraph before describing sampling resolutions

AC: Those lines were added to the paragraph modified according to the comment 92.

Effect of sporadic destratification, seasonal overturn and artificial mixing on CH_4 emissions from a subtropical hydroelectric reservoir

F. Guérin[1,2,3,*], C. Deshmukh[1,4,5,a], D. Labat[1], S. Pighini[6,b], A Vongkhamsao[6], P. Guédant[6], W. Rode[6], A. Godon[6,c], V. Chanudet[7], S. Descloux[7], D. Serça[4]

[1]{Université de Toulouse ; UPS GET, 14 Avenue E. Belin, F-31400 Toulouse, France}

[2]{IRD ; UR 234, GET ; 14 Avenue E. Belin, F-31400, Toulouse, France}

[3]{Departamento de Geoquimica, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niteroi-RJ, Brasil}

[4]{Laboratoire d'Aérologie - Université de Toulouse - CNRS UMR 5560; 14 Av. Edouard Belin, F-31400, Toulouse, France}

[5]{Centre for Regulatory and Policy Research, TERI University, New Delhi, India}

[6]{Nam Theun 2 Power Company Limited (NTPC), Environment & Social Division – Water Quality and Biodiversity Dept.– Gnommalath Office, PO Box 5862, Vientiane, Lao PDR}

[7]{Electricité de France, Hydro Engineering Centre, Sustainable Development Dpt, Savoie Technolac, F-73373 Le Bourget du Lac, France}

[a]{now at: Nam Theun 2 Power Company Limited (NTPC), Environment & Social Division – Water Quality and Biodiversity Dept.– Gnommalath Office, PO Box 5862, Vientiane, Lao PDR}

[b]{now at: Innsbruck University, Institute of Ecology, 15 Sternwartestrasse, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria and Foundation Edmund Mach, FOXLAB-FEM, Via E. Mach 1, IT-38010 San Michele all'Adige, Italy}

[c]{now at: Arnaud Godon Company, 44 Route de Genas, Nomade Lyon, 69003 Lyon, France}

*Correspondence to: F Guérin (Frederic.guerin@ird.fr)

Abstract

Inland waters in general and specifically freshwater reservoirs are recognized as a source of CH_4 to the atmosphere. Although the diffusion at the air-water interface is the most studied pathway, its spatial and temporal variations are poorly documented.

We measured temperature and O_2 and CH_4 concentrations every two weeks for 3.5 years at nine stations in a subtropical monomictic reservoir which was flooded in 2008 (Nam Theun 2 Reservoir, Lao PDR). Based on these results, we quantified CH_4 storage in the water column and diffusive fluxes from June 2009 to December 2012. We compared diffusive emissions with ebullition from Deshmukh et al. (2014) and aerobic methane oxidation and downstream emissions from Deshmukh et al. (2016).

In this monomictic reservoir, the seasonal variations of CH_4 concentration and storage were highly dependent on the thermal stratification. Hypolimnic CH_4 concentration and CH_4 storage reached their maximum in the warm dry season (WD) when the reservoir was stratified. Concentration and storage decreased during the warm wet (WW) season and reached its minimum after the reservoir overturned in the cool dry season (CD). The sharp decreases of CH_4 storage were concomitant with extreme diffusive fluxes (up to 200 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}). These sporadic emissions occurred mostly in the inflow region in the WW season and during overturn in the CD season in the area of the reservoir that has the highest CH_4 storage. Although they corresponded to less than 10% of the observations, these extreme CH_4 emissions (>5 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) contributed up to 50% of total annual emissions by diffusion.

During the transition between the WD and WW seasons, a new emission hotspot was identified upstream of the water intake where diffusive fluxes peaked at 600 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} in 2010 down to 200 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} in 2012. The hotspot was attributed to the mixing induced by the water intakes (artificial mixing). Emissions from this area contributed 15-25% to total annual emissions although they occur on a surface area representative of less than 1% of the total reservoir surface. We highly recommend measurements of diffusive fluxes around water intakes in order to evaluate if such results can be generalized.

1. Introduction

Since the 1990s, hydroelectric reservoirs are known to be a source of methane (CH_4) to the atmosphere. Their contribution to total CH_4 emissions still needs refinement since the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:32
Supprimé: fortnightly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:04
Supprimé: parameters

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:05
Supprimé: dependant of the thermal

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:06
Supprimé: They

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:06
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:06
Supprimé: sporadic

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:07
Supprimé: hot moments of

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:07
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:07
Supprimé: CH_4

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:08
Supprimé: of emissions

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:41
Supprimé: . In the CD season, diffusive fluxes from this area were the lowest observed at the reservoir surface.

discrepancies among estimates is large, ranging from 1 to 12% of total CH_4 emissions (St Louis et al., 2000;Barros et al., 2011). These two estimates are mostly based on diffusive fluxes at the air-water interface and they overlook emissions from the rivers downstream of the dams (Abril et al., 2005;Guerin et al., 2006;Kemenes et al., 2007;Teodoru et al., 2012;Maeck et al., 2013;Deshmukh et al., 2016), CH_4 ebullition (DelSontro et al., 2010;Deshmukh et al., 2014) and emissions from the drawdown area of reservoirs (Chen et al., 2009;Chen et al., 2011) although these pathways could largely dominate diffusion at the surface of the reservoirs.

Even if CH_4 diffusion at the surface of reservoir is the best-documented emission pathway, little information is available on spatial and temporal variability of CH_4 emissions by diffusive fluxes. In tropical amictic and well-stratified reservoirs with CH_4-rich hypolimnion, the highest diffusive fluxes are usually observed during dry periods and when the stratification weaken at the beginning of the rainy season (Guerin and Abril, 2007). A study of CH_4 emissions from a dimictic reservoir suggests a potential large outgassing of CH_4 during the overturn (Utsumi et al., 1998b) as it is the case in natural monomictic and dimictic lakes (Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2010;Schubert et al., 2012;Fernández et al., 2014). Such hot moments of emissions (McClain et al., 2003) could contribute 45-80% of annual CH_4 emissions by diffusion (Schubert et al., 2012;Fernández et al., 2014). They are rarely taken into account in carbon budgets since they can only be captured by high frequency monitoring. Spatial heterogeneity of CH_4 emissions at the surface of reservoirs is also very high. It mostly depends on the spatial variations of ebullition that is controlled by sedimentation (DelSontro et al., 2011;Sobek et al., 2012;Maeck et al., 2013). The spatial variability of diffusion in reservoirs is less prominent with a few exceptions of higher emissions (1) in areas where dense forest is flooded (Abril et al., 2005), (2) at shallow sites (<10m) (Zheng et al., 2011;Sturm et al., 2014) and (3) at river inflows (Musenze et al., 2014). However, as it was shown for CO_2 emissions from a tropical hydroelectric reservoir, taking into account both spatial and temporal variability of emissions significantly affect positively or negatively carbon budgets and emission factors (Pacheco et al., 2015).

In the framework of a comprehensive project aiming at quantifying greenhouse gas emissions from the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir (NT2R), a recently flooded subtropical reservoir located in Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), we studied (1) the spatial and temporal variability of CH_4 ebullitive fluxes (Deshmukh et al., 2014) and (2) the downstream CH_4 emissions (Deshmukh et al., 2016). In the present study, the objective is to quantify the CH_4 diffusive

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:20
Supprimé: reservoir

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:39
Supprimé: s

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:39
Supprimé: annual

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:22
Supprimé: The spatial variation of diffusion appears to be low with emissions being slightly higher (1) in area where dense forest is flooded as compare to the former riverbed

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:23
Supprimé: at shallow sites than at deeper ones

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:23
Supprimé: in inflow zones of reservoirs compare to the main body

fluxes at the surface of NT2R and evaluate the significance of the diffusive fluxes in total methane emissions in a subtropical monomictic reservoir with a peculiar water intake that artificially mix the water column. The CH_4 emissions were quantified every two weeks during three and a half year (June 2009 to December 2012) based on a monitoring of CH_4 concentrations in the reservoir water column. This was performed at nine stations flooding different types of ecosystems. On the basis of these results, we discuss the spatial and temporal variations of the CH_4 emissions by diffusive fluxes and the significance of hotspots and hot moments in the total emissions from the surface of the reservoir.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Study area

The NT2 hydroelectric reservoir (17° 59' 49" N, 104° 57' 08" E) was built on the Nam Theun River located in the subtropical region of Lao PDR on the Nakai Plateau. A detailed description of this trans-basin hydroelectric reservoir located on the Nakai Plateau is given in Descloux et al. (2014). Basically, the Nam Theun River is dammed (Nakai Dam, ND in Figure 1) and the water from the Nam Theun River is diverted to the Xebang Fai watershed after passing through water intake (WI in Fig 1) to the powerhouse (PH in Fig 1). The WI is located in a 130 m-width and 9 to 20 m-deep channel on the southwest side on the reservoir and it is located 5 m above the bottom (Figure S1). The powerhouse is located in the valley 200 m below the plateau. The filling of the reservoir began in April 2008 with full water level reached by October 2009 and the power plant commissioned in April 2010. After that date, turbines were turned on and water was continuously delivered to the turbines and downstream of the reservoir. Annually, the NT2 Reservoir receives around 7527 Mm^3 of water from the Nam Theun watershed, which is more than twice the volume of the reservoir (3908 Mm^3). A continuous flow of 2 $m^3 s^{-1}$ (and occasionally spillway release) is discharged from the Nakai Dam (ND in Fig 1) to the Nam Theun River. This low water discharge corresponds to the minimum water discharge of the Nam Theun River before the dam was built.

Typical meteorological years are characterized by three seasons: warm wet (WW) (mid June-mid October), cool dry (CD) (mid October-mid February) and warm dry (WD) (mid February-mid June). Daily air temperature varies between 14°C (CD season) to 30°C (WD season). The mean annual rainfall is about 2400 mm and occurs mainly (80%) in the WW season.

Frédéric Guérin 23/5/y 14:50
Supprimé: if

Frédéric Guérin 23/5/y 14:51
Supprimé: were improperly quantified in previously published CH_4 budget due to inappropriate spatial and seasonal resolution

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:27
Supprimé: .

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:33
Supprimé: fortnightly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:30
Supprimé: May

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:30
Supprimé: 2010

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:31
Supprimé: that started in June 2009

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:26
Supprimé: Lao People's Democratic Republic (

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:26
Supprimé:)

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:39
Supprimé: e study site

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:32
Supprimé: in April 2008, the full water level was first reached in October 2009 and the power plant was commissioned in April 2010

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:44
Supprimé: The water used for electricity production is delivered from water intake (WI in Fig 1) to the powerhouse (PH in Fig 1). The powerhouse is located in the valley 200 m below the plateau.

During the filling of the reservoir, 489 km^2 of soils and different types of vegetation (Descloux et al., 2011) were flooded by the end of October 2008. The water level in the reservoir was nearly constant from October 2009 to April 2010 (Figure 2a). After the commissioning (from April 2010 to December 2012) the reservoir surface varied seasonally by a factor of three and reached its maxima (489 km^2) and minima (168 to 176 km^2 depending on the years) during the WW and WD seasons, respectively (Figure 2a). The average water volume is 2.65 km^3 with the lowest volume by the end of the WD season (0.71 in June 2011) and the highest at the end of the rainy seasons (3.97 km^3 in September 2011) (Figure 2b). The seasonal water level variations are about 10 m (Figure 2c), the average depth is 8 m for a maximum depth of 39 m close to the Nakai Dam.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:48
Supprimé: 2008

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:48
Supprimé: , during the studied period (June 2009

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:32
Supprimé: According to

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:19
Supprimé: these

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:32
Supprimé: water level variations

2.2. Sampling strategy

A total of nine stations (RES1-9, Figure 1) located in the reservoir were monitored every two weeks (fortnightly) in order to determine the vertical profiles of temperature and O_2 and CH_4 concentration in the water column. The type of ecosystems flooded, the depth range and the hydrology of the stations are given in the Table 1. Basically, three stations are located on the thalweg of the former Nam Theun River (RES2, RES4, RES6) whereas four other stations are located in a small embayment in the flooded dense forest (RES3), flooded degraded forest (RES5), flooded swamp area (RES7) and flooded agricultural land (RES8). The RES1 station is located 100 m upstream of the Nakai Dam, and RES9 station is located 800 m upstream of the water intake (WI) delivering the water to the powerhouse (Figure 1 and Figure S1). The station RES9 is under the influence of the water column mixing induced by the water withdrawal at the WI, located at the bottom of the reservoir (5m above the bottom) and under 10 to 20 m of water (see discussion). All samples and in situ measurements were taken in the morning or early afternoon from an anchored boat. Most of the time, the boat was attached to a buoy at the sampling station. When no buoy was present, an anchor was used with care in order not to re-suspend surface sediments. As the sampling started from the surface, the bottom water was sampled almost an hour later and should not be influenced by the perturbation generated by the anchor.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:33
Supprimé: fortnightly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:53
Supprimé: characteristics

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 10:46
Supprimé: ~1 km

2.3. Experimental methods

2.3.1. Vertical profiles of oxygen and temperature

Vertical profiles of O_2 and temperature were measured in situ at all sampling stations with a multi-parameter probe Quanta® (Hydrolab, Austin, Texas) since June 2009. In the reservoir, the vertical resolution was 0.5 m above the oxic–anoxic limit and 1 to 5 m in the hypolimnion.

2.3.2. Methane concentration in water

The evolution of CH_4 concentrations has been monitored every two weeks from May 2009 to December 2012. Surface samples were taken with a surface custom-built water sampler (Abril et al., 2007). Other samples from the water column were taken with an Uwitec water sampler at 3m-depth, at the oxic-anoxic interface 1m above and below the oxic-anoxic interface and every 3 to 5m down to 0.5 m above the bottom. Water samples were stored without air bubble in serum glass vials, capped with butyl stoppers, sealed with aluminium crimps and preserved with $HgCl_2$ (Guerin and Abril, 2007). Samples were analysed within 15 days. Before gas chromatography analysis for CH_4 concentration, a N_2 headspace was created and the vials were vigorously shaken to ensure an equilibration between the liquid and gas phases. The concentration in the water was calculated using the solubility coefficient of Yamamoto et al. (1976).

2.3.3. Gas chromatography

Analysis of CH_4 concentrations were performed by gas chromatography (SRI 8610C gas chromatograph, Torrance, CA, USA) equipped with a flame ionization detector. A subsample of 0.5 ml from the headspace of water sample vials was injected. Commercial gas standards (10, 100 and 1010 ppmv, Air Liquid "crystal" standards) were injected after analysis of every 10 samples for calibration. Duplicate injection of samples showed reproducibility better than 5%.

2.4. Water column CH_4 storage

Between sampling depths of the vertical CH_4 profiles, concentrations were assumed to change linearly in order to calculate the concentration in each 1-m layer of water. The volume of water in each layer was calculated using the volume-capacity curve (NTPC, 2005). The CH_4

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 11:16
Supprimé: January

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:34
Supprimé: on a fortnightly basis

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 11:19
Supprimé: and o

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 16:20
Supprimé: .

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 19:58
Supprimé: Between two sampling depth of the vertical profiles of CH_4 concentrations, the CH_4 concentrations were assumed to change linearly

storage was calculated by multiplying the average CH_4 concentrations of each layer by the volume of the layer and summing-up the amount of CH_4 for all depth intervals.

2.5. Aerobic CH_4 oxidation

The depth-integrated CH_4 oxidation rates at each station were calculated on the basis of the specific oxidation rates (d^{-1}) determined at NT2R (Deshmukh et al., 2016) and vertical CH_4 and O_2 profiles in the water column as already described in (Guerin and Abril, 2007). The depth-integrated CH_4 oxidation rates at each station were estimated only from January 2010 since the vertical resolution of the vertical profiles of O_2 and CH_4 was not high enough in 2009.

As the aerobic methane oxidation rates we obtained were potential, $CH_{4\text{-}ox}$ were corrected for two limiting factors, the oxygen availability and the light inhibition as described in Guerin and Abril (2007). The final equation to compute in situ oxidation rates ($CH_{4\text{-}ox}$, mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) is:

$$CH_{4\text{-}ox} = C_{CH4} \cdot S_{CH4\text{-}ox} \cdot C_{O2} / (C_{O2} + K_{m\,(O2)}) \cdot d \cdot I(z)$$

with C_{CH4}, the CH_4 concentration; $S_{CH4\text{-}ox}$, the specific $CH_{4\text{-}ox}$ from Deshmukh et al. (2016); C_{O2}, the oxygen concentration; $K_{m(O2)}$, the half-saturation constant (Km) of O_2 for CH_4 oxidation, d, depth of the water layer and I(z), the inhibition of methanotrophic activity by light as defined by Dumestre et al. (1999) at the Petit Saut Reservoir. Finally, the CH_4 oxidation rates were integrated in the oxic water column, from the water surface to the limit of oxygen penetration.

2.6. Diffusive fluxes from surface concentrations

The diffusive CH_4 fluxes were calculated from the monitoring of surface concentrations with the thin boundary layer (TBL) equation at all stations in the reservoir (RES1-9). The CH_4 surface concentrations in water and the average CH_4 concentration in air (1.9 ppmv) obtained during eddy covariance deployments (Deshmukh et al., 2014) were applied in equation (1) to calculate diffusive flux:

$$F = k_T \times \Delta C \qquad (1)$$

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:37
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:38
Supprimé: vertical

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:38
Supprimé: of CH_4 and O_2 concentrations

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:03
Supprimé: of oxygen

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:04
Supprimé: fortnightly

where F, the diffusive flux at water-air interface; $\Delta C = C_w - C_a$, the concentration gradient between the water (C_w) and the concentration at equilibrium with the overlying atmosphere (C_a) and k_T, the gas transfer velocity at a given temperature (T):

$$k_T = k_{600} \times (600/Sc_T)^n \quad (2)$$

with Sc_T, the Schmidt number of CH_4 at a given temperature (T) (Wanninkhof, 1992); n, a number that is either 2/3 for low wind speed (< 3.7 m s^{-1}) or 1/2 for higher wind speed and turbulent water (Jahne et al., 1987).

For the determination of k_{600} at the stations RES1-8, we averaged the formulations from Guerin et al. (2007) which includes the cumulative effect of wind (U_{10}) and rain (R) on k_{600} (k_{600} = 1:66$e^{0:26U10}$ + 0:66R), and the formulation of MacIntyre et al. (2010) ((k_{600} = 2.25 U_{10} + 0.16) whatever the buoyancy fluxes. As shown by Deshmukh et al. (2014), the average of the fluxes obtained from these two relationships compared well with fluxes measured by floating chambers at the reservoir surface during three deployments at NT2R. Since the water current velocities were lower than 1 cm s^{-1} in most of the reservoir (Chanudet et al., 2012), the effect of water current on k_{600} was not included. The average wind speed (at 10 m height) and rainfall from two meteorological stations located at the Ban Thalang Bridge (close to RES4 station) and close to the WI (Figure 1) was used for the calculation of fluxes all stations (RES1-8). On average for all stations and all sampling date, the k_{600} was 5.6±5.3 cm h^{-1} ranging between 0.91 to 40.4 cm h^{-1}. The lowest k_{600} were calculated in the CD season (3.43±1.01 cm h^{-1}; 1.65-6.06 cm h^{-1}) while the highest were obtained during the WW season (6.78±6.33 cm h^{-1}; 1.57-40.42 cm h^{-1}) due to high rainfall (up to 113 mm day^{-1}). In the WD season k_{600} averaged 5.58±4.81 cm h^{-1}. This average k_{600} is significantly enhanced by some rainy events in late May-early June in 2010 and 2012 (up to 60 mm d^{-1}).

At the water intake (RES9) where the hydrology and hydrodynamics is different from the other stations, it was impossible to quantify the k_{600} since the boat drifted quickly to the shoreline because of water currents in the narrow channel (Figure S1). According to Chanudet et al. (2012), water current velocity in this area of the reservoir is about 0.2 m s^{-1}. After Borges et al. (2004), the contribution of such water currents in a water body with depth ranging from 9 to 20 m is 2.0±0.5 cm h^{-1} which should be summed up with the contribution of wind and rainfall from Guerin et al. (2007) and MacIntyre et al. (2010). It gives an average of 9 cm h^{-1}. The k_{600} was determined in the regulating dam located downstream of the turbine where we visually observed vortexes similar to those observed at RES9. In the regulating

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:05
Supprimé: k_T, the gas transfer velocity at a given temperature (T);

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:05
Supprimé: . Afterward, the k_T was computed from k_{600} with the following equation

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:07
Supprimé: used both

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:07
Supprimé: average

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:12
Supprimé: and no enhancement of the CH_4 fluxes could have been attributed to the variations of buoyancy fluxes when the eddy covariance system was deployed

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:18
Supprimé: For calculation purpose, w

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:40
Supprimé: two adjacent

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:40
Supprimé: Nakai Village (close to RES9 station) and at

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:42
Supprimé: Figure 1

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 11:40
Supprimé: were

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:14
Supprimé: At these stations

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:14
Supprimé: average

Frédéric Guérin 30/5/y 16:32
Supprimé: 6.5

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:15
Supprimé: over the course of the year

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 12:34
Supprimé:

dam, the k_{600} obtained in May 2009 and March 2010 with a drifting floating chamber as described in Deshmukh et al. (2014) was 19 cm h^{-1} on average for 4 measurements ranging from 9 to 40 cm h^{-1}. In order to be conservative for the estimation of emissions from the water intake, we considered a constant value of k_{600} (10 cm h^{-1}) which is in the lower range of (1) the k_{600} calculated from (Guerin et al., 2007), MacIntyre et al. (2010) and Borges et al. (2004), and (2) k_{600} values determined in the regulating dam that we consider as an area with comparable hydrology/hydrodynamics.

Frédéric Guérin 24/5/y 12:27
Supprimé: (not show)

2.7. Total emissions by diffusive fluxes

Based on physical modelling (Chanudet et al., 2012), it has been shown that the station RES9 located at the water intake is representative of an area of ~3 km^2 (i.e. 0.6% of reservoir water surface), whatever the season. This 3-km² area was used to extrapolate specific diffusive fluxes from RES9. The embayment where RES3 is located represents a surface area of 5-6% of the total surface area of the reservoir whatever the season (maximum 28 km^2), to which were attributed the specific diffusive fluxes from RES3. The diffusive fluxes calculated for RES1, RES2, RES4, RES5, RES6, RES7 and RES8 stations were attributed to the water surface area representative for each station, taking into account the seasonal variation of the reservoir water surface from the surface-capacity curve (NTPC, 2005).

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:30
Supprimé: showed

2.8. Statistical and correlation analysis

Statistical tests were performed to assess the spatial and temporal variations in the surface CH_4 concentrations and diffusive fluxes at all stations in the reservoir. Normality of the concentration and diffusive datasets was tested with R software (R Development Core Team, 2008) and the Nortest package (Gross and Ligges, 2015). The data distribution was tested with the Fitdistrplus package (Delignette-Muller et al., 2015).

Since all tests indicated that the distribution of the data were neither normal nor lognormal, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests were performed with GraphPad Prism (GraphPad Software, Inc., v5.04). No significant differences were found between the seasons and/or the stations. These test results were attributed to the very large range of surface concentrations due to the sporadic occurrence of extreme values (over 4 orders of magnitude). In order to reduce this range, the log of the concentrations was used. For each station, the time series of the log of the CH_4 surface concentrations were linearly interpolated and re-sampled every 15 days in order to compare time series with the same number of observations. The log of the

concentrations was used to determine the frequency distribution, the skewness of the dataset (third order moment), the auto-correlation of each time series and the correlation between the different stations. All analyses were performed using Matlab.

3. Results

3.1. Temperature and O_2 dynamics in the reservoir

During the three and half year of monitoring at the stations RES1-8, the NT2R was thermally stratified with a thermocline at 4.5 ± 2.6 m depth in the WD (Feb-Jun) season as revealed by the vertical profiles of temperature (Figure 3). In the WW season, the temperature vertical profiles at the stations RES1-8 either showed a thermocline (RES7 and RES8 in 2010 and 2011, Figure 3) whereas in some occasions, the temperature decreased regularly from the surface to the bottom during sporadic destratification (RES1-3, Figure 3). On average during the WW season, a thermocline was located at 5.8 ± 4.8 m depth. During the CD season, the reservoir overturned as already mentioned by Chanudet et al. (2012) and the temperature was constant from the surface to the bottom (Figure 3) in the different years. In order to illustrate the destratification, a stratification index (ΔT) which corresponds to the difference between the surface and bottom water temperature was defined (Figure 4a). During the periods of stratification in the WD seasons, ΔT was up to 10°C higher than during reservoir overturn in the CD season with ΔT close to zero (Figure 4a). During the WW season, the ΔT decreased gradually which means that the overturn occurred over several months.

During the WD season at the stations RES1-8, an oxycline was most of the time located at a depth concomitant with the depth of the thermocline whereas oxygen penetrated deeper in the WW season (Figure 3). During these two seasons, the epilimnion was always well oxygenated with O_2 concentrations higher than 200 µmol L^{-1}. In the WD season, the hypolimnion was completely anoxic whereas O_2 reached occasionally the hypolimnion during the sporadic destratification events in the WW season (29±54 µmol L^{-1}, Figure 3 and 4b). During the CD season (reservoir overturn), the water column was often oxygenated from the top to the bottom of the reservoir (Figure 3). On average over the whole reservoir, the lowest hypolimnic oxygen concentration was observed in 2010 before the reservoir was commissioned (Figure 4b).

After the commissioning of the reservoir and the turbines were powered on in April 2010, the water column located near the intake (RES9) completely mixed as indicated by the

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:07
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:07
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:07
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:07
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 3a

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:32
Supprimé: i

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 3b

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 3b

homogeneous temperature and oxygen profiles with depth in every season (Figure 3). The water column at RES9 was always well oxygenated (163 ± 62 µmol L^{-1}, Figure 3).

3.2. Seasonal dynamics of the CH_4 concentration in the reservoir

At the station RES1-8, when the water column is thermically stratified with a steep oxicline in the WD and often in the WW seasons, CH_4 concentrations are on average ~150 times higher in the reservoir hypolimnion (246 ± 234 µmol L^{-1}) than in the epilimnion (1.6 ± 7.7 µmol L^{-1}) (Figure 3). The gradient of CH_4 concentration at the thermocline/oxicline was steeper during the WD season than during the WW season (Figure 3). During the CD season, the average CH_4 concentration in the reservoir bottom water lowered by a factor of three compare to the WD and the WW seasons. However, the reservoir overturn increased the average CH_4 concentrations in the epilimnion by a factor of two (3.4 ± 14.8 µmol L^{-1}) in comparison with the WD and WW seasons. After the commissioning, the CH_4 vertical profiles of concentration before turbine intake (RES9) were homogeneous from the surface to the bottom. The highest average CH_4 concentration from the surface to the bottom peaked up to 215 µmol L^{-1} in July 2010 at this station. On a seasonal basis, the CH_4 concentration at RES9 averaged 39.8 ± 48.8, 29.9 ± 55.4 and 1.9 ± 4.3 µmol L^{-1} during the WD, WW and CD seasons, respectively (Figure 3). The concentrations at RES9 were up to 10 times lower than the maximum bottom concentrations at the other stations for a given season. Since the station RES9 behaved differently from the other stations, results from this station will be treated separately.

The overall bottom CH_4 concentration (Figure 4c) and dissolved CH_4 stock in the reservoir (Figure 4d) increased at the beginning of the WD season. The higher bottom CH_4 concentration and storage in the reservoir are concomitant with the establishment of anoxia in the hypolimnion and thermal stratification (Figure 4). Hypolimnic CH_4 concentration and storage reached their maxima (up to 508 ± 254 µmol L^{-1} and 4.7 ± 0.5 Gg(CH_4), Figure 4c,d) at the end of the WD-beginning of the WW season when the residence time of water in the reservoir was the lowest (40 days, Figure 4d) and when the reservoir volume was the smallest (Figure 2b). Along the WW season, the thermal stratification weakened (Figure 4a) and the CH_4 concentration and dissolved CH_4 stock decreased (Figure 4c,d) while the residence time of water increased (Figure 4d) and the water volume increased (Figure 2b). In the CD season, the reservoir overturns as evidenced by the low ΔT and the penetration of O_2 to the hypolimnion (Figure 4a,b). During CD season, the bottom CH_4 concentration and the storage reached their minima (down to 1.3 ± 4.5 µmol L^{-1} and 0.01 ± 0.001 Gg(CH_4), Figure 4c,d)

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:33
Supprimé: After the commissioning of the reservoir (April 2010), the water column located near the water intake (RES9) got totally mixed as revealed by the homogeneous temperature and oxygen profiles from the surface to the bottom whatever the season

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:34
Supprimé: i

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:08
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:35
Supprimé: with

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:35
Supprimé: averages

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:35
Supprimé: of

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3d

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 16:51
Supprimé: both

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 20:39
Supprimé: the reservoir

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3d

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3a

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:09
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3d

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3a

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3c

when the residence time of water was the longest (Figure 4d). The sharp decrease of CH_4 storage and concentration in the transition from the WW to the CD seasons is concomitant with a sharp increase of O_2 concentration at the bottom (up to 160 ± 89 µmol L^{-1}, Figure 4).

During the three and a half years of monitoring, the same seasonal pattern as described above is observed although the annual CH_4 bottom concentration and storage was threefold higher in 2009 and 2010 than in the year 2011 (Figure 4c,d). In the dry year 2012, the reservoir bottom CH_4 concentration and storage was almost twice higher than in wet year 2011.

3.3. Aerobic CH_4 oxidation in the reservoir

Between 2010 and 2012, the depth integrated aerobic CH_4 oxidation rates ranged between 0.05 and 380 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} at the stations RES1-RES8 (Figure 5). On average, aerobic oxidation was higher in the WW season (55±63 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) than in the CD (30±46 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) and WD (36±32 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) seasons and it was not statistically different for the three years. In the WD season, aerobic CH_4 oxidation was on average twice higher in 2010 than for the two following years. In the CD season of the year 2012, the aerobic oxidation rate were exceptionally high compare to the same season in the previous years.

3.4. Spatial and seasonal variability of surface CH_4 concentration and diffusive fluxes at the reservoir surface (RES1-RES8)

The surface concentrations at the stations RES1-8 ranged from 0.02 to 150 µmol L^{-1} and were 2.0±10.5 µmol L^{-1} (median = 0.9), 1.5±5.5 µmol L^{-1} (median = 0.4) and 3.4±14.7 µmol L^{-1} (median = 0.2) on average for the CD, WD and WW season, respectively. The surface concentration followed a loglogistic distribution, which indicates the existence of extremely high values. This is confirmed by the fact that the skewness of the time series of the log of the CH_4 concentrations for all stations is positive (Figure S2), especially at the stations RES1, RES3 and RES7 for which the skewness is >1 (Figure S2). Over the course of the three and a half year of survey, the surface concentrations were not statistically different between all stations and no statistically significant seasonal variations were observed because of the occurrence of sporadic events in all season (Figure S3a). The normalized distribution of concentrations (in log) according to seasons (Figure 6) indicates that these high concentrations were observed without any clear seasonal trend at the station RES1, RES5 and RES6 (<1 up to 150 µmol L^{-1}). At the stations RES2 and RES3, the concentrations up to 128

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3d

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 4

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 12:05
Supprimé: whereas

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:00
Supprimé: in the CD season

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 12:05
Supprimé: highest

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 12:06
Supprimé: was observed in 2012

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:01
Supprimé: S3

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:02
Supprimé: at

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:02
Supprimé: S2a

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:10
Supprimé: 5

µmol L^{-1} were mostly observed in the CD season when the reservoir overturns. At the station RES4 located at the Nam Xot and Nam Theun confluence and at the stations RES7 and RES8 both located in the inflow region of the Nam Theun River, the high surface concentrations (up to 64.60 µmol L^{-1}) were mostly observed during the WW season when the reservoir undergoes sporadic destratification. The auto-correlation function of the time series of the log of the surface CH_4 concentrations and diffusive fluxes at the stations RES1-8 indicated that all stations (except RES1) have a memory effect of 30 to 40 days (Figure S4). This implies that with a sampling frequency of 15 days, we captured most of the changes in the surface CH_4 concentrations. At station RES1, the changes in CH_4 concentrations are faster than at other stations and would have deserved a monitoring with a frequency higher than 15 days.

During the monitoring at RES1-RES8 stations, the average diffusive flux was 2.8 ± 12.2 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} ranging from 0.01 to 201.86 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} without any clear interannual and seasonal trends (Figure S3b). As for the concentrations, flux data followed a loglogistic distribution. The median flux in the WD season is 40 to 80% higher than the median in the WW and CD season, respectively. During the WW and the CD seasons, more than 60% of the calculated fluxes were lower than 1 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}, which corresponds to classical flux in pristine rivers. However, the average fluxes in the WW and CD season are 30% higher than in the WD season (Table 2). This confirms the presence of extremely high values during WD and CD seasons, as expected from the surface concentrations. All seasons together, around 7% of the diffusive fluxes that we observed were higher than 5 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} which corresponds to extremely high diffusive fluxes in comparison with data from the literature for reservoirs and lakes (Bastviken et al., 2008;Barros et al., 2011). The median and average of these extreme fluxes higher than 5 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} were 2 times higher in the WW and CD seasons than in the WD season (Table 2).

At NT2R, diffusive CH_4 fluxes covered the whole range of fluxes reported for tropical reservoirs, depending on the season. Most of the fluxes at the NT2R Reservoir were around one order of magnitude lower than those at Petit Saut Reservoir (French Guiana) just after the impoundment (Galy-Lacaux et al., 1997), and in the same order of magnitude as reported for reservoirs 10 to 18 years older (Abril et al., 2005;Guerin et al., 2006;Kemenes et al., 2007;Chanudet et al., 2011). However, some diffusive fluxes at the stations RES1-8 in the WW and the CD seasons (up to 202 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) are among the highest ever reported at the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:03
Supprimé: at

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:02
Supprimé: S1

Frédéric Guérin 20/5/y 09:59
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:08
Supprimé: S2b

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:06
Supprimé: the ones

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:06
Supprimé: older by

surface of a hydroelectric reservoir or a lake (Bastviken et al., 2011;Barros et al., 2011) and rivers downstream of dams (Abril et al., 2005;Guerin et al., 2006;Deshmukh et al., 2016).

3.5. Surface methane concentrations and diffusive fluxes at the water intake (RES9)

After the commissioning of the reservoir (Julian day 450), the concentrations at the stations RES9 (Figure 7a) located at the water intake were up to 30 times higher than at any other stations Following the commissioning of the reservoir and powering of the turbines, CH_4 concentrations at station RES9, which was located at the water intake, were up to 30 times higher than at the other stations (Figure 7a). On average CH_4 concentrations were 36.6±35.8 µmol L^{-1} (median = 24.3), 37.6±67.0 µmol L^{-1} (median = 0.9) and 1.0±1.7 µmol L^{-1} (median = 0.3) in the WD, WW and CD season, respectively. The surface concentrations at RES9 were significantly higher in the WD and WW seasons than in the CD season ($p = 0.0002$ and Figure 7a). The highest concentration was observed each year at the end of the WD season-beginning of the WW season in between June and August. These maxima decreased from 215 µmol L^{-1} in August 2010 to 87 µmol L^{-1} in June 2012.

The diffusive fluxes ranged between 0.03 and 605.38 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} (Figure 7b and Table 2). On average, the CH_4 diffusive fluxes at RES9 were two to forty times higher than at the other stations in the CD, WD and WW season. Diffusive fluxes at this station are usually higher than 10 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} from April to July that corresponds to the WD season and the very beginning of the WW season. In 2010, diffusive fluxes were on average 241 ± 219 and 239 ± 228 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} respectively for the WD and WW seasons. In 2011 and 2012, the fluxes dropped down by a factor of two in the WD season (112 ± 110 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) and almost by a factor of forty in the WW season (6.8 ± 14.4 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}). Overall, emissions at RES9 decreased by a factor of two between 2010 and 2012.

4. Discussion

4.1. CH_4 dynamic in the reservoir water column

The gradual decrease of the CH_4 concentration from the anoxic bottom water column to the metalimnion and the sharp decrease around the oxicline in the metalimnion (Figure 3) is typical in reservoirs and lakes where CH_4 is produced in anoxic sediments and flooded soils (Guerin et al., 2008;Sobek et al., 2012;Maeck et al., 2013), and where most of it is oxidized at

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:11
Supprimé: 6

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:08
Supprimé: that is

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:08
Supprimé: WW and

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:09
Supprimé: s

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:11
Supprimé: 6

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:11
Supprimé: 6

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 17:07
Supprimé: At the water intake, CH_4 diffusive fluxes during the transition between the WD and WW seasons (up to 600 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) are the highest reported at the surface of an aquatic ecosystem (Abril et al., 2005;Guerin et al., 2006;Bastviken et al., 2011;Barros et al., 2011;Deshmukh et al., 2016).

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:11
Supprimé: 2

the oxic-anoxic interface (Bedard and Knowles, 1997;Bastviken et al., 2002;Guerin and Abril, 2007;Deshmukh et al., 2016).

CH_4 concentrations and storage increase concomitantly with the surface water temperature and the establishment of the thermal stratification during the WD season and peak at the end of the WD season-beginning of the WW season when the surface and the volume of the reservoir was minimum (Figure 2, 3 and 4). The fact that the storage reached its maximum when the reservoir volume is at its minimum shows that the increase of concentration at the bottom of the reservoir is highly significant. During the WW season, CH_4 concentrations and storage decrease slowly (Figure 4) while aerobic methane oxidation reaches its maximum (Figure 5). When the reservoir overturns at the beginning of the CD season, the CH_4 hypolimnic concentrations and storage reach their minima (Figure 4). The overturn favours the penetration of oxygen down to the bottom (Figure 3 and 4b). The sharp decrease of the CH_4 concentrations and CH_4 storage during this period is expected to result from sudden outgassing (Section 4.2) together with an enhancement of the aerobic CH_4 oxidation as observed in lakes that overturn (Utsumi et al., 1998b;Utsumi et al., 1998a;Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2010;Schubert et al., 2012;Fernández et al., 2014). Significant increase in methane oxidation during overturn in the CD season was not observed except for the year 2012 (Figure 5) when hypolimnetic CH_4 concentrations were still quite high (Figure 4c,d). The absence of a clear enhancement of the CH_4 oxidation in the water column of NT2R can be attributed to the slow erosion of the thermal stratification before the reservoir really overturns.

As the reservoir overturns during the period over which the water residence time is the longest, the temporal evolution of the concentrations is anti-correlated with the residence time (Figure 4c,d). The seasonal dynamics of the CH_4 in the monomictic NT2R differs from permanently stratified reservoirs like Petit Saut Reservoir where CH_4 concentration increased with retention time (Abril et al., 2005). However, at the annual scale the water residence time has a strong influence on CH_4 concentration and storage in the reservoir. Before the reservoir was commissioned (April 2010), the water residence time was up to 4 years and the CH_4 storage was up to four times higher than in 2011 and 2012 (Figure 4d). Although a decrease of concentration and storage with the age of the reservoir was expected (Abril et al., 2005), storage in the dry year of 2012 was twice that of the wet year of 2011, likely due to a 25% increase in residence time between 2011 and 2012 due to a decrease in rainfall and water inputs. In wet years like 2011, the thermal stratification is weaker than in dry years since the

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:11
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 4

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3b

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:17
Supprimé: already

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:14
Supprimé: A large increase of the aerobic methane oxidation was only observed in the CD season in the dry year 2012 (Figure 4) because the amount of hypolimnic CH_4 to be oxidized at the beginning of the CD season was still high in the water column

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:17
Supprimé: in the reservoir

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3c

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3d

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:21
Supprimé: the storage in the dry year 2012 was twice higher than in the wet year 2011 due to an increase of the water residence time by 25%

warming of the epilimnion is less efficient due to (1) lower insulation and cold water inputs from above and (2) the high riverine inputs of water alters the stability of the reservoir thermal stratification as shown by the sharper decrease of the thermal stratification illustrated by the decrease of the stratification index (ΔT) in 2011 than in 2012 (Figure 4a). As a consequence, the oxygen diffusion to the hypolimnion was higher in 2011 than in 2012 (Figure 4b) and it enhanced aerobic methane oxidation by 20% in the water column in the WW season in 2011 as compared to 2012 (Figure 5). Therefore our results suggest that the hydrology affects both the thermal stratification and therefore the diffusion of O_2 in the water column. The enhancement of O_2 penetration in rainy years favours the CH_4 oxidation and therefore contributes to the CH_4 storage reduction. With less CH_4 in the water column, the potentiality for downstream emissions (Deshmukh et al., 2016) and emissions through hotspots and hot moments (see below) is highly reduced.

4.2. Hot moments of emissions during sporadic destratification and reservoir overturn

Figure 8 illustrates the evolution of the diffusive fluxes, the stratification index (ΔT), the CH_4 storage and the aerobic CH_4 oxidation at the stations RES1, RES3, RES7 and RES8. These four stations were selected for their contrasting skewness (Figure S2) which gives an indication on the occurrence of extreme events and the facts that they are representative for all station characteristics (Table 1). It shows that the large bursts of CH_4 (from 5 up to 200 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) always occurred in both the CD and WW seasons only when ΔT decreased sharply (>4°C, Figure 8a,d,g,j) and were usually followed by a sharp decrease of the CH_4 storage in the water column (Figure 8b,e,h,k).

Hot moments of emissions occurred during overturn in the CD at the stations RES1 and RES3 as illustrated in Figure 7. We therefore confirm the occurrence of hot moments of emissions during the reservoir overturn in the CD season as already observed in lakes that overturn in temperate regions (Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2010;Schubert et al., 2012;Fernández et al., 2014). The highest emissions determined at NT2R are one order of magnitude higher than previously reported outgassing during overturn and they occur mostly in the section of the reservoir that has the longest water residence time (RES1-3, Table 1) and the largest CH_4 storage (Figure 8b,e,h,k). This suggests that the impact of reservoir overturn can be very critical for the whole-reservoir CH_4 budget in tropical hydroelectric reservoirs and especially in young ones where hypolimnic concentration could reach up to 1000 µmol L^{-1}.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:25
Supprimé: surface

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:25
Supprimé: water

Frédéric Guérin 30/5/y 17:47
Supprimé: water

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 17:21
Supprimé: and the larger range of

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:12
Supprimé: 3a

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 3b

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 4

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:32
Supprimé: It t

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:32
Supprimé: s

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 17:42
Supprimé: the hypolimnic storage of CH_4 in reservoirs, indirectly controls aerobic methane oxidation, and ultimately influences emissions.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:34
Supprimé: The f

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 7

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:08
Supprimé: 3

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 7a

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:34
Supprimé: are

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 7b

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:33
Supprimé: These hot moments of emissions occurred mostly in the CD at the stations RES1 and RES3 whereas it was in the WW season at the stations RES7 and RES8 (Figure 7). In the WD season, diffusive fluxes gradually increased together with the CH_4 storage in the water column (Figure 7a,d,g,j) and they remained always lower than 20 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}. These sporadic high fluxes occurred in the WD season at RES3, RES7 and RES8 (Figure 7d,g,j). They are usually associated with ΔT variations lower than 2°C and the CH_4 storage decrease that is associated with these fluxes is not as sharp as the one observed in the CD and WW season (Figure 7e,h,k).

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:13
Supprimé: 7b

Hot moments of emissions also occur during sporadic destratifications in the WW season in the inflow region (RES4 and RES6-8) where the inflow of cool water from the watershed might disrupt the thermal stratification in reservoirs (see stations RES7 and 8 in Figure 8). This is contrasting with the observations in reservoir older than NT2R where high emissions from the inflow region were recently attributed to an enhancement of CH_4 production fuelled by the sedimentation of organic matter from the watershed (Musenze et al., 2014).

In the WD season, some sporadic emissions occurred but they were always lower than 20 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} that is up to ten times lower than extreme fluxes in the WW and CD season. Those high fluxes occurred at RES3, RES7 and RES8 (Figure 8d,g,j) and were associated with ΔT variations lower than 2°C. The CH_4 storage decreases associated with these fluxes, however, were not as sharp as those observed during other seasons (Figure 8e,h,k). These high emissions were actually associated with early rains and associated high winds that occur sometimes in the last fifteen days of May. This shows that a moderate erosion of the stratification when hypolimnic CH_4 concentrations are high could enhance vertical transport of CH_4 toward the surface and emissions to the atmosphere.

Basically, this intense monitoring shows that spatial and temporal variations of CH_4 emissions are largely controlled by the hydrodynamics of the reservoir with extreme emissions occurring (1) in the inflow region during the wet season and (2) in area away from inflow zone during reservoir overturns in the CD season. Even if less frequent, moderate erosion of the stable and steep thermal stratification during warm seasons, could also lead to high emissions.

The evolution of depth-integrated aerobic CH_4 oxidation is not clearly related with the reservoir overturns and the CH_4 burst (Figure 8). Significant increases in the aerobic CH_4 oxidation occurred mostly during the first half of the WD season when the stratification was unstable and at the very beginning of the destratification in the WW, when ΔT started to decrease. The oxidation could reach high values (up to 380 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) during these two periods since the yield of CH_4 in the water column to sustain the activity of methanotrophs is higher than in the CD season when the reservoir overturns. It shows that in reservoirs or lakes like NT2R that destratify progressively before the overturn, there is no substantial increase of the CH_4 oxidation when the water body finally overturns as was observed in lakes that overturn within a few days (Kankaala et al., 2007). In addition, the contribution of CH_4 oxidation to the total loss of CH_4 (sum of diffusion and oxidation) in the WD and WW

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:38
Supprimé:

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:48
Supprimé: older

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:32
Supprimé: in the WD seasons

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:49
Supprimé: mostly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:49
Supprimé: mostly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:50
Supprimé: remotely located

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:50
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:38
Supprimé: and the riverbed

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:14
Supprimé: 7

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:52
Supprimé: it could be

seasons was 90-95% during the entire monitoring whereas it was 85% in the CD season. Therefore, during overturn in the CD season, a significant amount of CH_4 is oxidized, but the removal of CH_4 during overturn is not as efficient as during seasons with a well-established thermal stratification.

During the periods with major loss in the CH_4 storage with concomitant CH_4 burst, we compared the change in the yield of CH_4 with the sum of emissions and oxidation. Most of the time, the emissions alone and/or the sum of emissions and oxidation were significantly higher than the amount of CH_4 that was lost from the water column. At the Pääjärvi Lake in Finland (López Bellido et al., 2009), the fact that measured or calculated emissions exceed the loss of CH_4 in the water column was attributed to a probable underestimation of the CH_4 storage in the lake by under-sampling the shallow area of the lake. In this study, emissions, storage and oxidation were estimated at the same stations, avoiding such sampling artefacts. Therefore, it suggests that CH_4 is provided by lateral transport or by production in the flooded soil and biomass (Guerin et al., 2008) at a higher rate than the total loss of CH_4 from the water column by emissions and oxidation. This hypothesis could only be verified by a full CH_4 mass balance including production and total emissions from the reservoir, which is beyond the scope of this article.

4.3. Hot spot of emissions at the water intake (RES9)

After the commissioning of the reservoir, the temperature and the oxygen and CH_4 concentrations were constant from the surface to the bottom of the reservoir at the vicinity of the water intake. On the basis of physical modelling and measurements of water current velocities (Chanudet et al., 2012), the vertical mixing at this station was attributed to the water withdrawal at the intake generating turbulence and water currents over a surface area of 3 km^2. At this station, CH_4-rich water from the reservoir hypolimnion reached the surface and led to diffusive fluxes up to 600 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} in the WD-WW seasons (Figure 7b) whereas fluxes are 3 orders of magnitude lower in the CD season. These high fluxes are the highest reported at the surface of an aquatic ecosystem (Abril et al., 2005;Guerin et al., 2006;Bastviken et al., 2011;Barros et al., 2011;Deshmukh et al., 2016). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time it is reported that the artificial mixing induced by the water intakes upstream of a dam or a power station enhance significantly emissions. At NT2R, the intake is located at the bottom of a narrow (130 m) and shallow channel (depth =9-20 m) on the side of the reservoir (Figure S1). This design enhances horizontal water current velocities,

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:55
Supprimé: During overturns, a significant amount of CH_4 is oxidized but it also indicates that the removal of CH_4 during overturn is not as efficient as during seasons with a well established thermal stratification.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:14
Supprimé: 6b

Frédéric Guérin 20/5/y 10:02
Supprimé: a hotspot of emissions is reported

Frédéric Guérin 20/5/y 10:03
Supprimé: an intake bringing water to the turbines

the vertical mixing and therefore the emissions. The existence of such a hotspot at other reservoirs might be highly dependant on the design of the water intake (depth among other parameters) and its effect on the hydrodynamics of the reservoir water column.

4.4. Estimation of total diffusive fluxes from the reservoir

Yearly emissions by diffusive fluxes peaked at more than 9 Gg(CH_4) in 2010 when the reservoir was commissioned and they decreased down to ≈ 5 Gg(CH_4) in 2011 and 2012 (Figure 9a and Table 3). Yearly integrated at the whole reservoir surface, these emissions correspond to diffusive fluxes of 1.5 to 4 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}. These emissions are significantly lower than diffusive fluxes measured at the Petit Saut Reservoir during the first two years after flooding but similar to those determined in the following years (Abril et al., 2005) and values reported for diffusive fluxes from tropical reservoirs in Barros et al. (2011). In absence of the extreme emissions (both hotspots and hot moments), diffusive emissions from NT2R would have been one order of magnitude lower than emissions from tropical reservoirs as expected from the lower flooded biomass compare to Amazonian reservoirs (Descloux et al., 2011). Due to the specific dynamic of diffusive fluxes at NT2R with hotspots and hot moments, diffusion at the reservoir surface contribute 18 to 27% of total emissions (Table 3) that is significantly higher than at other reservoirs tropical reservoirs where it was measured (See also Deshmukh et al., 2016).

Most of the increase of CH_4 emissions by diffusive fluxes from 4 to 9 Gg(CH_4) between 2009 and 2010 is due to very significant emissions of 2-3 Gg(CH_4) at the water intake after the commissioning of the reservoir and resulting artificial mixing (Figure 9a). This increase might be overestimated because we have no measurements between Jan. and April but this overestimation might be reasonable since those months are usually associated with the lowest emissions of the year (Figure 9b). After the commissioning, the outgassing of CH_4 was triggered by the artificial mixing generated by the withdrawal of water from the reservoir to the turbines. Although the area under the influence of the water intake is less than 1% of the total area of the reservoir, emissions at the water intake contributed between 13 and 25% of total diffusive emissions and 4 to 10 % if considering both ebullition and diffusion, disregarding the year 2009 (Table 3). It is worth to note that emissions at this site are only significant within 3-5 month per year at the end of the WD season-beginning of the WW season when the storage of CH_4 reach its maximum in the reservoir (Figure 9b). This new hotspot equals 20 to 40% of downstream emissions and contributes between 3 and 7% of total

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:15
Supprimé: 8a

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:15
Supprimé: 8a

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 22:00
Supprimé: This

Frédéric Guérin 27/5/y 16:29
Supprimé: vertical

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:15
Supprimé: 8

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 22:02
Supprimé: 4

emissions from NT2R surface when including ebullition and downstream emissions (Table 3 and Deshmukh et al. (2016)). Localized perturbation of the hydrodynamics, especially in lakes or reservoirs with CH_4-rich hypolimnion, can generate hotspots of emissions contributing significantly to the total emissions from a given ecosystem. These hotspots could be found upstream of dams and water intake in reservoirs but also around aeration stations based on air injection or artificial mixing that could be used for improving water quality in water bodies (Wüest et al., 1992).

The contribution of extreme diffusive fluxes (with daily values being > 5 up to 200 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) to total emission by diffusion range from 30 to 50% on a yearly basis (Figure 9a) and from 40 up to 70% on a monthly basis (Figure 9b) although these hot moments represent less than 10% of the observations during the monitoring. In the literature, the statistical distribution of CH_4 emissions dataset always follows heavy-tailed and right skewed distribution like the log-normal, the Generalized Pareto Distribution (Windsor et al., 1992;Czepiel et al., 1993;Ramos et al., 2006;DelSontro et al., 2011) or loglogistic (this study) which indicates that CH_4 emissions are always characterized by high episodic fluxes. The quantification of emissions thus requires the highest spatial and temporal resolutions in order to capture as many hot moments as possible. At a single station, there is a possibility that we did not catch the peak of emissions but extreme emission events never lasted more than 2 months (3 consecutive sampling dates) and probably lasted less than 15 days most of the time (Figure 8). The auto-correlation function of the concentration time series indicates that a minimum sampling frequency of 1 month is required in this monomictic reservoirs for an accurate description of the change in the surface concentrations and estimation of the emissions (Figure S4). Although a better temporal resolution than 15 days or monthly would probably improve the estimation of CH_4 emissions from this reservoir, a lower temporal resolution could significantly affect (positively or negatively) the emission factor of this reservoir that overturn gradually over several month. Therefore, the monthly frequency defined for this specific reservoir is probably not applicable to every aquatic ecosystem, especially in lakes or reservoirs that overturn within a week or less (Kankaala et al., 2007;López Bellido et al., 2009;Schubert et al., 2012). However, it suggests that quantification of emissions based on 2-4 campaigns in a year might significantly affect emissions factors and carbon budgets of ecosystems under study.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:04
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 21:04
Supprimé: reservoir

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 22:02
Supprimé: Very l

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:43
Supprimé: (

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 17:43
Supprimé:)

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:16
Supprimé: 8

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:16
Supprimé: 8

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:16
Supprimé: 7

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:08
Supprimé: l

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:23
Supprimé: A

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:23
Supprimé: can

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:24
Supprimé: s

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:24
Supprimé: s

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:24
Supprimé: non-permanently stratified freshwater

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:24
Supprimé: reservoirs

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:27
Supprimé: This is particularly critical in the inflow regions when water inputs from the watershed increase in the rainy season in all reservoirs and at the beginning of the overturn in regions of the world where reservoirs are not permanently stratified like in Asia (Chanudet et al., 2011) which concentrate 60% of the worldwide hydroelectric reservoirs (Kumar et al., 2011).

5. *Conclusion*

The monitoring of CH_4 diffusive emissions every two weeks at nine stations revealed complex temporal and spatial variations that could hardly been characterized by seasonal sampling. The highest emissions occur sporadically during hot moments in the rainy season and when the reservoir overturns. In the rainy season, they mostly occur in the inflow region because the increase of the discharge of cool water from the reservoir tributaries contributes to sporadic thermal destratification. During the reservoir overturn, extreme emissions occur mostly in area far from inflows and outflows that are supposed to have the highest water residence time. It shows that diffusive emissions can be sporadically as high as ebullition and that these hot moments could contribute very significantly to the total emissions from natural aquatic ecosystems and reservoirs. Our results suggest that sporadic emissions cannot be integrated properly in the quantification of emissions and establishments of carbon budgets based only on seasonal sampling (2-4 campaigns).

We also identified a new hotspot of emissions upstream of the water intake resulting from the artificial destratification of the water column due to horizontal and vertical mixing generated by the water withdrawal. In the case of the NT2R, emissions from this site contribute up to 25% of total diffusive emissions over less than 1% of the total reservoir area. We highly recommend measurements of diffusive fluxes around water intakes (immediately upstream of dams, typically) in order to evaluate if such results can be generalized.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank everyone who contributed to the NT2 monitoring programme, especially the Nam Theun 2 Power Company (NTPC) and Electricité de France (EDF) for providing financial, technical and logistic support. We are also grateful to the Aquatic Environment Laboratory of the Nam Theun 2 Power Company whose Shareholders are EDF, Lao Holding State Enterprise and Electricity Generating Public Company Limited of Thailand. CD benefited from a PhD grant by EDF.

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 18:35
Supprimé: fortnightly

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 22:07
Supprimé: remotely located

Frédéric Guérin 19/5/y 22:07
Supprimé: the

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:29
Supprimé: showing that a monthly frequency monitoring is the minimum required to capture all emissions is probably not applicable to every aquatic ecosystem

Frédéric Guérin 25/5/y 18:36
Supprimé: . However, it suggests that quantification of emissions based on 2-4 campaigns in a year might significantly affect emissions factors and carbon budgets of ecosystems under study.

References

Abril, G., Guerin, F., Richard, S., Delmas, R., Galy-Lacaux, C., Gosse, P., Tremblay, A., Varfalvy, L., Dos Santos, M. A., and Matvienko, B.: Carbon dioxide and methane emissions and the carbon budget of a 10-year old tropical reservoir (Petit Saut, French Guiana), Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 19, 10.1029/2005gb002457, 2005.

Abril, G., Commarieu, M.-V., and Guerin, F.: Enhanced methane oxidation in an estuarine turbidity maximum, Limnol. Oceanogr., 52, 470-475, 2007.

Barros, N., Cole, J. J., Tranvik, L. J., Prairie, Y. T., Bastviken, D., Huszar, V. L. M., del Giorgio, P., and Roland, F.: Carbon emission from hydroelectric reservoirs linked to reservoir age and latitude, Nature Geosci, 4, 593-596, 2011.

Bastviken, D., Ejlertsson, J., and Tranvik, L.: Measurement of methane oxidation in lakes: A comparison of methods, Environ. Sci. Technol., 36, 3354-3361, 10.1021/es010311p, 2002.

Bastviken, D., Cole, J. J., Pace, M. L., and Van de Bogert, M. C.: Fates of methane from different lake habitats: Connecting whole-lake budgets and CH_4 emissions, J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeosci., 113, G02024
10.1029/2007jg000608, 2008.

Bastviken, D., Tranvik, L. J., Downing, J. A., Crill, P. M., and Enrich-Prast, A.: Freshwater Methane Emissions Offset the Continental Carbon Sink, Science, 331, 50, 10.1126/science.1196808, 2011.

Bedard, C., and Knowles, R.: Some properties of methane oxidation in a thermally stratified lake, Can. J. Fish. Aquat.Sci., 54, 1639-1645, 1997.

Borges, A. V., Delille, B., Schiettecatte, L. S., Gazeau, F., Abril, G., and Frankignoulle, M.: Gas transfer velocities of CO2 in three European estuaries (Randers Fjord, Scheldt, and Thames), Limnol. Oceanogr., 49, 1630-1641, 2004.

Chanudet, V., Descloux, S., Harby, A., Sundt, H., Hansen, B. H., Brakstad, O., Serca, D., and Guerin, F.: Gross CO2 and CH4 emissions from the Nam Ngum and Nam Leuk sub-tropical reservoirs in Lao PDR, Sci. Total Environ., 409, 5382-5391, 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.09.018, 2011.

Chanudet, V., Fabre, V., and van der Kaaij, T.: Application of a three-dimensional hydrodynamic model to the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir (Lao PDR), J. Great Lakes Res., 38, 260-269, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2012.01.008, 2012.

Chen, H., Wu, Y., Yuan, X., Gao, Y., Wu, N., and Zhu, D.: Methane emissions from newly created marshes in the drawdown area of the Three Gorges Reservoir, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D18301, doi:10.1029/2009JD012410, 2009.

Chen, H., Yuan, X., Chen, Z., Wu, Y., Liu, X., Zhu, D., Wu, N., Zhu, Q. a., Peng, C., and Li, W.: Methane emissions from the surface of the Three Gorges Reservoir, J. Geophys. Res., 116, D21306, 10.1029/2011jd016244, 2011.

Czepiel, P. M., Crill, P. M., and Harriss, R. C.: Methane emissions from municipal wastewater treatment processes, Environ. Sci. Technol., 27, 2472-2477, 10.1021/es00048a025, 1993.

Delignette-Muller, M. L., Dutang, C., Pouillot, R., and Denis, J.-B.: An R Package for Fitting Distributions, 1.0-4, 2015

DelSontro, T., McGinnis, D. F., Sobek, S., Ostrovsky, I., and Wehrli, B.: Extreme Methane Emissions from a Swiss Hydropower Reservoir: Contribution from Bubbling Sediments, Environ. Sci. Technol., 44, 2419-2425, 10.1021/es9031369, 2010.

DelSontro, T., Kunz, M. J., Kempter, T., Wüest, A., Wehrli, B., and Senn, D. B.: Spatial Heterogeneity of Methane Ebullition in a Large Tropical Reservoir, Environ. Sci. Technol., 45, 9866-9873, 10.1021/es2005545, 2011.

955 Descloux, S., Chanudet, V., Poilvé, H., and Grégoire, A.: Co-assessment of biomass and soil
956 organic carbon stocks in a future reservoir area located in Southeast Asia, Environ. Monit.
957 Assess., 173, 723-741, 10.1007/s10661-010-1418-3, 2011.
958 Descloux, S., Guedant, P., Phommachanh, D., and Luthi, R.: Main features of the Nam Theun
959 2 hydroelectric project (Lao PDR) and the associated environmental monitoring programmes,
960 Hydroécol. Appl., 10.1051/hydro/2014005 2014, 2014.
961 Deshmukh, C., Serca, D., Delon, C., Tardif, R., Demarty, M., Jarnot, C., Meyerfeld, Y.,
962 Chanudet, V., Guedant, P., Rode, W., Descloux, S., and Guerin, F.: Physical controls on CH4
963 emissions from a newly flooded subtropical freshwater hydroelectric reservoir: Nam Theun 2,
964 Biogeosciences, 11, 4251-4269, 10.5194/bg-11-4251-2014, 2014.
965 Deshmukh, C., Guérin, F., Labat, D., Pighini, S., Vongkhamsao, A., Guédant, P., Rode, W.,
966 Godon, A., Chanudet, V., Descloux, S., and Serça, D.: Low methane (CH4) emissions
967 downstream of a monomictic subtropical hydroelectric reservoir (Nam Theun 2, Lao PDR),
968 Biogeosciences, 13, 1919-1932, 10.5194/bg-13-1919-2016, 2016.
969 Dumestre, J. F., Guezennec, J., Galy-Lacaux, C., Delmas, R., Richard, S., and Labroue, L.:
970 Influence of Light Intensity on Methanotrophic Bacterial Activity in Petit Saut Reservoir,
971 French Guiana, Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 65, 534-539, 1999.
972 Fernández, J. E., Peeters, F., and Hofmann, H.: Importance of the Autumn Overturn and
973 Anoxic Conditions in the Hypolimnion for the Annual Methane Emissions from a Temperate
974 Lake, Environ. Sci. Technol., 48, 7297-7304, 10.1021/es4056164, 2014.
975 Galy-Lacaux, C., Delmas, R., Jambert, C., Dumestre, J. F., Labroue, L., Richard, S., and
976 Gosse, P.: Gaseous emissions and oxygen consumption in hydroelectric dams: A case study in
977 French Guyana, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 11, 471-483, 1997.
978 Gross, J., and Ligges, U.: Tests for Normality (Nortest), 1.04-4, 2015
979 Guerin, F., Abril, G., Richard, S., Burban, B., Reynouard, C., Seyler, P., and Delmas, R.:
980 Methane and carbon dioxide emissions from tropical reservoirs: Significance of downstream
981 rivers, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, 10.1029/2006gl027929, 2006.
982 Guerin, F., and Abril, G.: Significance of pelagic aerobic methane oxidation in the methane
983 and carbon budget of a tropical reservoir, J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeosci., 112,
984 10.1029/2006jg000393, 2007.
985 Guerin, F., Abril, G., Serca, D., Delon, C., Richard, S., Delmas, R., Tremblay, A., and
986 Varfalvy, L.: Gas transfer velocities of CO2 and CH4 in a tropical reservoir and its river
987 downstream, J. Mar. Syst., 66, 161-172, 10.1016/j.jmarsys.2006.03.019, 2007.
988 Guerin, F., Abril, G., de Junet, A., and Bonnet, M.-P.: Anaerobic decomposition of tropical
989 soils and plant material: Implication for the CO2 and CH4 budget of the Petit Saut Reservoir,
990 Appl. Geochem., 23, 2272-2283, 10.1016/j.apgeochem.2008.04.001, 2008.
991 Jahne, B., Munnich, K. O., Bosinger, R., Dutzi, A., Huber, W., and Libner, P.: On the
992 parameters influencing air-water gas-exchange, J. Geophys. Res. Oceans, 92, 1937-1949,
993 1987.
994 Kankaala, P., Taipale, S., Nykanen, H., and Jones, R. I.: Oxidation, efflux, and isotopic
995 fractionation of methane during autumnal turnover in a polyhumic, boreal lake, J. Geophys.
996 Res.-Biogeosci., 112, G02003
997 10.1029/2006jg000336, 2007.
998 Kemenes, A., Forsberg, B. R., and Melack, J. M.: Methane release below a tropical
999 hydroelectric dam, Geophys. Res. Lett., 34, L12809 10.1029/2007gl029479, 2007.
1000 López Bellido, J., Tulonen, T., Kankaala, P., and Ojala, A.: CO2 and CH4 fluxes during
1001 spring and autumn mixing periods in a boreal lake (Pääjärvi, southern Finland), J. Geophys.
1002 Res.-Biogeosci., 114, G04007, 10.1029/2009JG000923, 2009.

1003 MacIntyre, S., Jonsson, A., Jansson, M., Aberg, J., Turney, D. E., and Miller, S. D.: Buoyancy
1004 flux, turbulence, and the gas transfer coefficient in a stratified lake, Geophys. Res. Lett., 37,
1005 L24604, 10.1029/2010GL044164, 2010.
1006 Maeck, A., DelSontro, T., McGinnis, D. F., Fischer, H., Flury, S., Schmidt, M., Fietzek, P.,
1007 and Lorke, A.: Sediment Trapping by Dams Creates Methane Emission Hot Spots, Environ.
1008 Sci. Technol., 47, 8130-8137, 10.1021/es4003907, 2013.
1009 McClain, M. E., Boyer, E. W., Dent, C. L., Gergel, S. E., Grimm, N. B., Groffman, P. M.,
1010 Hart, S. C., Harvey, J. W., Johnston, C. A., Mayorga, E., McDowell, W. H., and Pinay, G.:
1011 Biogeochemical hot spots and hot moments at the interface of terrestrial and aquatic
1012 ecosystems, Ecosystems, 6, 301-312, 10.1007/s10021-003-0161-9, 2003.
1013 Musenze, R. S., Grinham, A., Werner, U., Gale, D., Sturm, K., Udy, J., and Yuan, Z.:
1014 Assessing the Spatial and Temporal Variability of Diffusive Methane and Nitrous Oxide
1015 Emissions from Subtropical Freshwater Reservoirs, Environ. Sci. Technol., 48, 14499-14507,
1016 10.1021/es505324h, 2014.
1017 NTPC: Environmental Assessment and Management Plan - Nam Theun 2 Hydroelectric
1018 Project. Nam Theun 2 Power Company, NTPC (Nam Theun 2 Power Company), Vientiane,
1019 212, 2005.
1020 Pacheco, F. S., Soares, M. C. S., Assireu, A. T., Curtarelli, M. P., Roland, F., Abril, G., Stech,
1021 J. L., Alvalá, P. C., and Ometto, J. P.: The effects of river inflow and retention time on the
1022 spatial heterogeneity of chlorophyll and water–air CO2 fluxes in a tropical hydropower
1023 reservoir, Biogeosciences, 12, 147-162, 10.5194/bg-12-147-2015, 2015.
1024 R Development Core Team: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R
1025 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 3-900051-07-0, 2008
1026 Ramos, F. M., Lima, I. B. T., Rosa, R. R., Mazzi, E. A., Carvalho, J. o. C., Rasera, M. F. F.
1027 L., Ometto, J. P. H. B., Assireu, A. T., and Stech, J. L.: Extreme event dynamics in methane
1028 ebullition fluxes from tropical reservoirs, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L21404,
1029 10.1029/2006gl027943, 2006.
1030 Schubert, C., Lucas, F., Durisch-Kaiser, E., Stierli, R., Diem, T., Scheidegger, O., Vazquez,
1031 F., and Müller, B.: Oxidation and emission of methane in a monomictic lake (Rotsee,
1032 Switzerland), Aquat. Sci., 72, 455-466, 10.1007/s00027-010-0148-5, 2010.
1033 Schubert, C. J., Diem, T., and Eugster, W.: Methane Emissions from a Small Wind Shielded
1034 Lake Determined by Eddy Covariance, Flux Chambers, Anchored Funnels, and Boundary
1035 Model Calculations: A Comparison, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 4515-4522,
1036 10.1021/es203465x, 2012.
1037 Sobek, S., DelSontro, T., Wongfun, N., and Wehrli, B.: Extreme organic carbon burial fuels
1038 intense methane bubbling in a temperate reservoir, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39, L01401,
1039 10.1029/2011gl050144, 2012.
1040 St Louis, V. L., Kelly, C. A., Duchemin, E., Rudd, J. W. M., and Rosenberg, D. M.: Reservoir
1041 surfaces as sources of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere: A global estimate, Bioscience, 50,
1042 766-775, 2000.
1043 Sturm, K., Yuan, Z., Gibbes, B., Werner, U., and Grinham, A.: Methane and nitrous oxide
1044 sources and emissions in a subtropical freshwater reservoir, South East Queensland, Australia,
1045 Biogeosciences, 11, 5245-5258, 10.5194/bg-11-5245-2014, 2014.
1046 Teodoru, C. R., Bastien, J., Bonneville, M.-C., del Giorgio, P. A., Demarty, M., Garneau, M.,
1047 Hélie, J.-F., Pelletier, L., Prairie, Y. T., Roulet, N. T., Strachan, I. B., and Tremblay, A.: The
1048 net carbon footprint of a newly created boreal hydroelectric reservoir, Global Biogeochem.
1049 Cycles, 26, GB2016, 10.1029/2011gb004187, 2012.
1050 Utsumi, M., Nojiri, Y., Nakamura, T., Nozawa, T., Otsuki, A., and Seki, H.: Oxidation of
1051 dissolved methane in a eutrophic, shallow lake: Lake Kasumigaura, Japan, Limnol.
1052 Oceanogr., 43, 471-480, 1998a.

1053 Utsumi, M., Nojiri, Y., Nakamura, T., Nozawa, T., Otsuki, A., Takamura, N., Watanabe, M.,
1054 and Seki, H.: Dynamics of dissolved methane and methane oxidation in dimictic Lake Nojiri
1055 during winter, Limnol. Oceanogr., 43, 10-17, 1998b.
1056 Wanninkhof, R.: Relationship between wind-speed and gas-exchange over the ocean, J.
1057 Geophys. Res. Oceans, 97, 7373-7382, 1992.
1058 Windsor, J., Moore, T. R., and Roulet, N. T.: Episodic fluxes of methane from subarctic fens,
1059 Can. J. Soil Sci., 72, 441-452, doi:10.4141/cjss92-037, 1992.
1060 Wüest, A., Brooks, N. H., and Imboden, D. M.: Bubble plume modeling for lake restoration,
1061 Water Resour. Res., 28, 3235-3250, 10.1029/92WR01681, 1992.
1062 Yamamoto, S., Alcauskas, J. B., and Crozier, T. E.: Solubility of methane in distilled water
1063 and seawater, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 21, 78-80, 10.1021/je60068a029, 1976.
1064 Zheng, H., Zhao, X. J., Zhao, T. Q., Chen, F. L., Xu, W. H., Duan, X. N., Wang, X. K., and
1065 Ouyang, Z. Y.: Spatial-temporal variations of methane emissions from the Ertan hydroelectric
1066 reservoir in southwest China, Hydrol. Processes, 25, 1391-1396, 10.1002/hyp.7903, 2011.
1067
1068

Table 1: Characteristics of the nine monitoring stations in the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir

Station	Depth (min-max) (m)	Flooded ecosystem[1]	Hydrology	Water residence time index[2]
RES1	25.4-35	Dense forest	100 m upstream of the Nakai Dam	**
RES2	18.4-28	Dense forest	Thalweg of the Nam Theun River	**
RES3	6.4-16	Dense forest	Embayment	***
RES4	17.4-27	Degraded forest	Confluence Nam Theun-Nam Xot Rivers	**
RES5	8.4-18	Degraded forest	Aside from the main stream	**
RES6	15.4-25	Degraded forest	Thalweg of the Nam Theun River	*
RES7	5.4-15	Swamp	Between inflows and water intake	*
RES8	11.4-21	Agricultural soils	Between inflows and water intake	*
RES9	9.4-19	Civil construction	Water intake	*

[1]Descloux et al. (2011)

[2]Water renewal index in arbitrary units, (***) stands for longer residence time, (**) for average residence times and (*) for shorter residence times than average for the whole reservoir

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 12:30
Tableau mis en forme

1077
1078 Table 2 : Median, average, ranges and proportion of diffusive fluxes (F_{CH4}) < 1 and > 5 mmol
1079 m^{-1} d^{-1} for three seasons
1080

Station		Warm Dry (WD)	Warm Wet (WW)	Cool Dry (CD)
RES1-RES8	n	212	252	217
	range	0.01-102.59	0.01-201.86	0.01-94.64
	median	1.08	0.64	0.20
	Average ± SD	2.23±7.37	3.12±14.58	3.04±12.89
	% F_{CH4} < 1	48%	63%	86%
	% F_{CH4} > 5	6.6%	7.5%	7.4%
	Mediane F > 5	10.67	13.80	23.75
	Average F > 5	16.69±25.04	30.23±45.99	36.45±33.19
RES9	n	39	45	36
	range	0.24-342.00	0.03-605.38	0.07-17.62
	median	40.81	1.23	0.48
	average ± SD	83.33±15.57	78.58±24.73	2.21±0.69

1081
1082

Table 3: Methane emissions from the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir between 2009 and 2012.

$Gg(CH_4)\ year^{-1}$	2009	2010	2011	2012
Emission from reservoir				
Diffusion at RES9 only	0.02±0.01	2.33±0.21	0.86±0.12	0.66±0.11
Total diffusion	4.45±1.01	9.34±2.32	3.71±0.81	4.95±1.09
Contribution of RES9 to diffusion (%)	0.4	24.9	23.2	13.3
Ebullition[1]	11.21±0.16	14.39±0.11	14.68±0.10	12.29±0.09
Total emissions from reservoir (Ebullition + diffusion at all stations)	15.66±1.02	23.73±2.32	18.39±0.82	17.25±1.09
Contribution of RES9 (%) to total emissions from reservoir	0.1	9.8	4.7	3.8
Total downstream emissions[2]	7.79±0.90	10.73±0.83	2.29±0.41	2.00±0.32
Total emissions (reservoir + downstream)	23.45±1.36	34.46±2.46	20.67±0.92	19.24±1.14
Contribution of diffusion to total emission	19%	27%	18%	26%
Contribution of RES9 to total (%)	<0.1	6.8	4.2	3.4

[1]Deshmukh et al. (2014)
[2]Deshmukh et al. (2016)

Figure captions

Figure 1: Map of the sampling stations and civil structures at the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir (Lao PDR).

Figure 2: Variations of (a) surface of the reservoir (km^2), volume of water (km^3) and water level (masl) at the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir between January 2009 and December 2012.

Figure 3: Vertical profiles of temperature (°C), oxygen (µmol L^{-1}) and methane (µmol L^{-1}) at the stations RES1, RES3, RES7, RES8 and RES9 in the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir. Representative profile of the years 2010 (circle), 2011 (square) and 2012 (triangle) are given for each seasons: cool dry in blue, warm dry in red, and warm wet in grey. Note that for the stations RES3 and RES9, the scale is different for the vertical profiles of CH_4.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:16
Supprimé: 2

Figure 4: (a) Stratification index (ΔT, see text), (b) O_2 concentration in the hypolimnion (µmol L^{-1}), (c) CH_4 concentration in the hypolimnion (µmol L^{-1}) and (d) CH_4 storage in the water column (Gg(CH_4) $month^{-1}$, bars) and water residence time (days, black line with circles) in the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir (Lao PDR) between 2009 and 2012. The red, grey and blue colours indicate the warm dry (WD), warm wet (WW) and cool dry (CD) seasons, respectively. For the panels (a), (b) and (c), the boxes show the median and the interquartile range, the whiskers denote the full range of values and the plus sign (+) denotes the mean.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 3

Figure 5: Seasonal variations between 2010 and 2012 of the depth-integrated aerobic CH_4 oxidation (mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}) at the stations RES1-RES8 calculated from the aerobic oxidation rates determined by (Deshmukh et al., 2016). WD stands for warm dry (in red), WW for warm wet (in grey) and CD for cool dry (in blue). The boxes show the median and the interquartile range, the whiskers denote the full range of values and the plus sign (+) denotes the mean.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 4

Figure 6: Frequency distribution of the log of CH_4 concentrations (µmol L^{-1}) at the nine monitoring stations of the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir. The red, grey and blue colours indicate the warm dry (WD), warm wet (WW) and cool dry (CD) seasons, respectively.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 5

Figure 7: (a) Surface concentrations and (b) diffusive fluxes between June 2009 and December 2012 at the station RES9 located at the water intake. Julian day 0 is 1st of January, 2009. The red, grey and blue colours indicate the warm dry (WD), warm wet (WW) and cool dry (CD) seasons, respectively.

Figure 8: (a, d, g, j) stratification index (ΔT, red line, see text) and diffusive fluxes, (b,e,h,k) CH_4 storage and (c,f,i,l) depth-integrated aerobic CH_4 oxidation (mmol m^{-2} d^{-1}, black line) calculated from the aerobic oxidation rates determined by (Deshmukh et al., 2016) and ΔT (red line) between June 2009 and December 2012 at the stations RES1, RES3, RES7 and RES8 at the Nam Theun 2 Reservoir. Julian day 0 is 1st of January, 2009. The red, grey and blue colour dots indicate the warm dry (WD), warm wet (WW) and cold dry (CD) seasons, respectively.

Figure 9: (a) Total emissions by diffusive fluxes in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, and (b) monthly emissions by diffusive fluxes between May 2009 and December 2012. Emissions from RES9 (water intake) are shown in black, emissions resulting from diffusive fluxes lower than 5 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} from the stations RES1 to RES8 are shown in white and emissions resulting from diffusive fluxes higher than 5 mmol m^{-2} d^{-1} from the stations RES1-RES8 are shown in grey.

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 6

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 7

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 8

1150
1151 Figure 1
1152



1153
1154
1155

Figure 2


Surface (km²)
500
400
300
200
a
Volume (km³)
4
3
2
1
0
b
Water level (masl)
540
535
530
c
Jan-09
Jul-09
Jan-10
Jul-10
Jan-11
Jul-11
Jan-12
Jul-12

1160 Figure 3

1161



1162

1163

1164

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 2

Frédéric Guérin 30/5/y 14:28
Supprimé:



Figure 4

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 3



Figure 5

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 4



Figure 6



Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 5

Figure 7



Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:17
Supprimé: 6

Figure 8

Frédéric Guérin 26/5/y 14:18
Supprimé: 7



Figure 9


a
b
Gg(CH4) y-1
Gg(CH4) month-1
RES1-RES8 (< 5 mmol.m-2.d-1)
RES1-RES8 (> 5 mmol.m-2.d-1)
Water intake (RES9)
2009
2010
2011
2012
Jan-09
Apr-09
Jul-09
Oct-09
Jan-10
Apr-10
Jul-10
Oct-10
Jan-11
Apr-11
Jul-11
Oct-11
Jan-12
Apr-12
Jul-12
Oct-12