

*The page numbers of the reviewer's responses link to the original document. The page numbers of manuscript changes refer the line numbers in the "track changed" document not the corrected final version.

Anonymous Referee #1

General Comments-

1. I understand the authors' reluctance to over-interpret the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ data given the fact that O isotope exchange between intermediates (notably NO_2^-) and water are known to occur. However, I do feel that more attention could be given to the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ data. Certainly, no new experiments are needed (though parallel experiments in ^{18}O labeled water would be insightful), but I am left wondering whether the authors too quickly neglect the consideration of these data by suggesting water O exchange plays such a large role in the data? More to the point, I wonder how the co-evolving $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ might be used to provide more insight, for example relating to carbon substrate concentrations and types? Is there any more information to be gained about water O isotope exchange and thereby possibly the turnover of intermediate pools by closer consideration of these data in a more 'linked' fashion? Where there coherent trends in the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ vs $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ that could be revealing? Also, were concentrations of NO_2^- measured during the sampling – in an effort to better constrain pool sizes of reaction intermediates? Even if the isotopic composition of NO_2^- was unknown – it might be useful for shedding light on variations of $\eta^{18}\text{O}$.

Response:

To address the consideration that water O exchange plays a role in the data we graphically examined the covariation between $\delta^{18}\text{O}/\delta^{15}\text{N}$ vs. $-\ln f/(1-f)$ as well as the covariation between $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. Both covariation plots indicated that the relationship between $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ were similar among treatments and replicates. Therefore, no additional information can be gleaned by discussing the relationship between O and N isotope values. Additionally, the fact that we observed a kinetic isotope effect for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ suggests that there is little exchange with H_2O in the reaction vessels.

We were unable to measure the concentration of NO_2^- in reaction vessels for two important reasons. First, sampling for NO_2^- and N_2O would have added an incredible degree of complexity to the experiment, which could have led to

inaccuracies and artefacts in the data. Second, additional punctures of the septa could contribute to N₂O leakage into and out of the reaction vessels. Sampling this way would have doubled the number of punctures and thus increased the probability for N₂O loss.

Manuscript Changes:

P9 L6 – L8 – “Additionally visual inspection of the co-variation between $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ indicated similar trends among treatments and species, and the observed kinetic isotope effect for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ suggests that there is little exchange with H₂O in the reaction vessels (Figure 1).”

2. Overall, I would appreciate a bit more insight on why the different carbon substrates might contribute to differential expression of net isotope effects. For example, how are citrate and succinate utilized by these two closely related organisms? Can the authors explain (even speculatively) about how these different carbon substrates might act to regulate expression of net isotope effects? This is an exciting and burgeoning avenue of research for microbial-isotope systematics across many elemental systems – and this study provides a unique perspective for denitrification, in particular. In general not enough attention was given to this result. Different carbon substrates were chosen – in part to explore such metabolic differences. What is the reader to learn from the experimental results using different carbon?

Response:

We agree that understanding the influence of carbon-source on η is important and timely. In fact, that was an initial objective of our research; however this objective became difficult to address when we observed that η for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of N₂O was not constant across the extent of the reaction. The fact that η changes as the reaction progresses makes it difficult to statistically quantify (i.e. the sample size at a given point in the reaction) if the difference in η between treatments occurred as a function of substrate. Moreover, we do not know which of the diffusive or enzymatic steps are controlling η at a given extent of the reaction. To address the question regarding the influence of carbon-substrate on bulk isotope values, we will need to perform a detailed study that quantifies the isotope effects of the many nitrogen intermediates of denitrification simultaneously, a significant amount of work and therefore a study of its own.

Manuscript Changes:

For the reasons outlined above, we do not feel that manuscript changes are necessary to respond to the comment.

3. The authors note that the N₂O site preference is constant among treatments yet distinct between the two bacterial strains investigated. Towards offering some explanation for this distinction, they correctly suggest that the NOR step is the most critical (combination of two NO molecules to form N₂O). However, it is unclear to me in this context how the fraction of NO remaining behind in the cell relates to the site preference (L 14). Site preference is conceptually thought to be the result of the combination of two NO molecules and to reflect the chemical (enzymatic) mechanisms by which this reaction occurs and is therefore agnostic to the composition of the precursor pool. As such – it is unclear to me how the NO precursor pool size (which may relate to its N isotopic composition) can play any role in the determination of site preference. Furthermore, it is stated that the N isotopic composition of the alpha and beta positions in the N₂O molecule are ‘factors related to site preference’ – which makes little sense since these are exactly how site preference is calculated in the first place. Perhaps the authors are referring to the alpha and beta positions represented in the NO precursor molecules – which makes sense but should be clarified. Indeed if there is an argument to be made that the NO pool size somehow influences the partitioning among NO molecules destined for the alpha position from those destined for the beta position, this would be interesting and valuable to develop. At present, however, I am missing the point of this part of the discussion.

Response:

We addressed the issues above by altering the text that contributed to the lack of clarity. Please see the manuscript changes below.

Manuscript Changes:

P10 L8 -P11 L11 - “In contrast to the results we observed for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, isotopic discrimination was not evident for SP regardless of treatment (Figure 2). Instead, SP was constant during the course of the reaction. This finding is consistent with pure culture studies of nitrification and denitrification across multiple species (Frame and Casciotti, 2010; Sutka et al., 2003, 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005). The differences we observed in SP between species, however, is likely to relate to the factors that control SP. Unlike the case for bulk isotopes, SP is determined during a single reaction, the reduction of NO to N₂O (Toyoda et al., 2005). Thus, as N₂O reduction does not occur in *P*.

aureofaciens or *P. chlororaphis*, SP is only influenced by nitric oxide reductase (NOR) activity and diffusion of NO or N₂O into or out of the cell. As SP is the difference between the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ value of two N atoms that rely on the same NO substrate, SP is not dependent upon the isotopic composition of the initial substrate (Toyoda et al., 2005; Sutka et al., 2006). The observation that SP remained constant during bacterial denitrification, even though the extent of the reaction varied, (e.g. Sutka et al., 2006) suggests that the expressed fractionation for the α and β N atoms during NO reduction were the same. If so, then one hypothesis is that f can vary markedly and SP will be constant. However, during production of N₂O by pure fungal cytochrome P450 NOR enzyme, distinct fractionation factors for the α and β N atoms were observed and it was proposed that observations of constant SP values during production by fungi were the result of f , or the internal pool size of NO, being held relatively constant during cellular metabolism (Yang et al., 2014). We observed a minor but significant difference in SP between two species of *Pseudomonas* sp. during N₂O production that is consistent with a difference in the internal pool size of NO within the cell. The abundance of NO within the cell will depend on its production, reduction, and losses due to diffusion into or out of the cell, all of which could vary between species. We do not know, for example, the degree to which the rate of NO production intrinsically differs between the *cd1*-type NIR of *P. chlororaphis* and copper containing NIR of *P. aureofaciens* or how gene expression may alter these rates. We posit that small differences in SP between and even within species in our study and others may relate to the size of the NO pool available to NOR.”

4. Figure 1. It would be helpful to know the composition of starting NO₃⁻. Or alternatively are the Y-axes meant to reflect the difference between the starting NO₃⁻ and the product N₂O? Figure 1 and 2 – while ‘no positive values were calculated’ – the distribution spills over into positive values in the upper panels of Figure 1 and all panels of Figure 2. It seems like the distribution was ‘trimmed’ for lower panels in Figure 1. I think some attention could be paid to addressing these differences – both in the text and in the figure caption. In particular – is there any reason to disregard positive values? Is the generation of a positive value in this context mathematically impossible? Figures 1 and 2 – are the tally marks meant to illustrate the distribution for each set of treatments (e.g., are there different color tally marks?). If so, I’m not sure I can distinguish among the different colors. It might be helpful to break out the different treatments and ‘stack’ the tally marks on top of one another?

Response:

We added the isotopic composition of the nitrate source to the text. See below for the manuscript changes. We felt that it would be helpful to review the basis of the generation of the density distributions from our estimates of η in order to address the reviewer's concerns regarding the density distributions. As stated in the text, we applied Gaussian kernel density estimation to determine the density distribution of η predicted to occur across the full extent of the reactions. Kernel density estimation is a non-parametric method of determining the probability density function of a random continuous variable. The kernel applies a density function to each point of data. A probability density function is then created by adding up the sum of functions for each of the supplied points and dividing by the number of data. The output is an estimate of the relative densities of values across the range of η . For example, the density distribution predicts that for *P. aureofaciens* provided 10 mM citrate, a η value of -100 ‰ would occur relatively infrequently. The horizontal arrow on the x-axis of the graphs indicates that a value of large magnitude, such as the $\eta = -100$ ‰ previously described would be observed at the beginning of the reaction. The tick marks are the η values estimated from the derivative of the non-linear model. These η values were used to construct the density distribution. These tick marks allow one to compare the estimated η values to the estimated density distribution. This discussion is reflected by changes in the text outlined below.

The reviewer's argument regarding positive values is important. If we examine the curves in figure 1, we see that each curve has a negative slope over the course of the reaction, indicative of a normal isotope effect when the x-axis variable is $-\ln f/(1-f)$. If we draw our attention to the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotope values for *P. chlororaphis* supplied with 10 mM citrate, we note that the left-hand side of the curve is approaching an asymptote with a slope approaching 0. Transition to a positive slope would require that $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotope values became more negative. This would indicate that an inverse isotope effect is contributing fractionation, something that is not supported by our data. Moreover, because *P. aureofaciens* and *P. chlororaphis* do not produce nitrous oxide reductase it is unlikely that an inverse isotope effect would be observed. Therefore, we have deliberately decided to cut off the density distributions at $\eta = 0$ ‰ and have revised figure 2 and 3 accordingly.

Manuscript Changes:

P4 L11 – “The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of the NO_3^- source was 5.4 ‰ and 24.4 ‰, respectively.”

P6 L2-4 – “Values of “a” affect the y-intercept with larger values contributing to increased prediction of the final isotope value of the reaction. Values of “b” affect the rate of change of the isotope values particularly at the

beginning of the reaction. Larger values of “b” result in a more gradual rate of change, whereas as lower values of “b” increase the initial slope.

P6 L12-16 – “We used kernel density estimation to illustrate the density distribution (DD) of η across the extent of the reaction observed. Kernel density estimation is a non-parametric method of determining the probability density function of a random continuous variable. Probability density functions were determined with a Gaussian smoothing kernel from 50 equally spaced estimates of η spanning the complete extent of the reaction (i.e. $f = 0$ to 1). The bandwidth was set to 1 for each density estimate.”

P7 L3 - L6 – “Values of $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ greater than 0 were not observed. Such values would indicate that an inverse isotope effect is contributing fractionation, something that is not indicated by our data. Moreover, because *P. aureofaciens* and *P. chlororaphis* do not produce nitrous oxide reductase it is unlikely that an inverse isotope effect would be observed. Therefore, we have deliberately decided to cut off the density distributions at $\eta = 0$ ‰.”

P16-21 - The lines as well as tick marks for figures 2 and 3 have been changed to make comparisons of the treatments easier. The x-axes have been changed to reflect that η values greater than zero were not observed in our reactions. The term PDDs in text and in figure legends has been changed to density distributions (DD) in text to reflect the previous in text changes.”

Specific Comments-

P1 L19: Somewhat awkward to use this expression for the Rayleigh accumulated product without having definitions for the terms. Consider using ‘accumulated product expression’ instead perhaps?

Response:

We will change this to “the extent of the reaction.” for the abstract. We believe that there is some virtue in stating the fraction of the accumulated product for the rest of the manuscript.

Manuscript Change:

P1 L20-21 – Changed the expression to “the extent of the reaction”.

P2 L10: “include”

Response:

Changed “includes” to “include” as recommended.

Manuscript Change:

P2 L15 – “includes” changed to “include”

P5 L28: please define “HSD”

Response:

We remove HSD and include the full term in text.

Manuscript Change:

P6 L22 – Changed “HSD” to “honest significant difference test”

P5 L14: I realize that the coefficient ‘b’ is a simple fitting parameter, but I am wondering if any sort of ‘meaning’ is discernible behind the absolute value of this coefficient? Can it be conceptualized as relating to some tangible aspect of the system?

Response:

The coefficient “b” affects the rate of change of the isotope value for a given non-linear function closer to the onset of the reaction. Increased values of “b” produce a more gradual rate of change, whereas lower “b” values increase the rate of change of isotope values producing a very steep initial slope. We have included text to explain this effect.

Manuscript Change:

P6 L3-4 - “Values of “a” affect the y-intercept with larger values contributing to increased prediction of the final isotope value of the reaction. Values of “b” affect the rate of change of the isotope values particularly at the beginning of the reaction. Larger values of “b” result in a more gradual rate of change, whereas as lower values of “b” increase the initial slope.”

Anonymous Referee #2

General Comments-

1. The novel approach to calculate the “net isotope effect” (η) is not very intuitive; therefore it should be rationalized how and why $y = b \times e^{bx}$ (formula 5, Page 5 L14) is equivalent to $\delta^{15}\text{N-N}_2\text{O} - \delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_3^-$ the standard approach to calculate the net isotope effect. In addition, results of the standard approach and the novel approach should be compared and discussed in the manuscript.

Response:

The reviewer refers to the Δ as the common approach to calculate a NIE (η). Capital delta is an approximation of the η , the slope of the Rayleigh plot, and therefore additional error is associated with this particular calculation of η (please see O’Neil 1986). Rayleigh models have been traditionally applied to describe isotope effects including η . The curvilinear behaviour of our data demonstrates that we violate the linearity, a critical assumption of the application of Rayleigh models to the estimation of isotopic fractionation. Moreover, a single value for η cannot describe our data. Thus, we provide an equation for η that allows one to obtain an estimate of the isotope effect at any point in the reaction, rather than producing a single value that would fall short of describing our curvilinear system.

O’Neil, J.R. (1986) Theoretical and experimental aspects of isotopic fractionation. In *Stable Isotopes in High Temperature Geological Processes* (eds. J.W. Valley, H.P. Taylor, Jr., and J.R. O’Neil) *Rev. Mineral.*, 16, 1-40

Manuscript Changes:

We feel that the response above addresses the concerns of the reviewer.

Specific Comments-

P1 L17: It should be mentioned here and elsewhere in the text that both bacterial strains lack the enzyme for N_2O reduction as this might not be known by every reader of the manuscript.

Response:

We made changes in the text on page 1 to address the reviewer’s concerns.

Manuscript Change:

P1 L17-18 – The sentence “*Pseudomonas aureofaciens* and *P. chlororaphis* lack the gene nitrous oxide reductase, NosZ, and therefore N₂O is the terminal product of the reduction of NO₃⁻.” has been included. Additionally, the sentence at the end of the introduction, P3 L6, addresses the lack of N₂O reductase in the two species utilized in this study.

P4 L5: The isotopic composition of the NaNO₃ should be given.

Response:

We included the requested values in text.

Manuscript Change:

P4 L11 - “The δ¹⁵N and δ¹⁸O of the NO₃⁻ source was 5.4‰ and 24.4‰, respectively.”

P4 L15: Which gas volume or range of volumes was sampled into the serum bottles?

Response:

We addressed this issue in text. Please see the changes below.

Manuscript Change:

P4 L20-22 - “Headspace samples between 200 μL and 500 μL of each of the 3 cultures were injected into 60 ml serum bottles (one per culture) that had been sparged with UHP N₂ for 15 min, and stored for isotope analysis. Each bottle contained between 5 nmols and 15 nmols of N₂O for isotopic analysis.”

P4 L26: The isotopic composition of the standards used for IRMS analysis of δ¹⁵N^α, δ¹⁵N^β, δ¹⁵N and δ¹⁸O-N₂O should be given.

Response:

We have included a paragraph in the methods section that provides the values of standards used for analysis.

Manuscript Changes:

P4 L28- P5 L2 - “Our internal laboratory pure N₂O tank standard (MSU Tank B) was isotopically characterized by analysis relative to the USGS51 and USGS52 reference materials

(<https://isotopes.usgs.gov/lab/referencematerials.html>). Following the guidelines proposed by Coplen (2011), we report here the isotope values of the reference materials as well as our internal laboratory standard. The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\beta}$, and SP values of USGS51 and USGS52 are 1.32 ‰, 41.23 ‰, 0.48 ‰, 2.15 ‰, and -1.67 ‰ and 0.44 ‰, 40.64, 13.52, -12.64 ‰, and 26.15 ‰, respectively. The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\beta}$, and SP values of reference MSU Tank C are -0.9 ‰, 0.7 ‰, -2.6 ‰, 39.6 ‰, and 3.4 ‰, respectively. The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}^{\beta}$, and SP values of the isotope standard MSU Tank B are -0.5 ‰, 11.13 ‰, -12.2 ‰, 40.8 ‰, and 23.3 ‰, respectively. All nitrogen isotope values are reported with respect to the international Air-N₂ standard, and all oxygen isotope values with respect to VSMOW.”

P4 L31: How was f determined? From the amount of substrate provided minus the cumulative amount of N₂O produced? Please add the respective information here.

Response:

We have included our mathematical approach to determining f.

Manuscript Change:

P5 L23-24 - “The fraction of substrate remaining was determined by dividing twice the amount of N₂O produced by the total amount of nitrate added, and then subtracting this quantity from 1.”

P6 section 3.1 and 3.2: Please provide results for $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ using the standard approach to calculate net isotope effects (e.g. $\delta^{15}\text{N-N}_2\text{O} - \delta^{15}\text{N-NO}_3^-$).

Response:

Please see the response to Reviewer #1’s general comments 1 and 4 for an explanation of the changes made to the manuscript.

Manuscript Change:

Please see the previous manuscript changes made as recommended in the response above.

P7 L5: One experiment with *P. aureofaciens* and succinate at 1 mM yields N₂O with low SP similar to *P. chlororaphis*. How can this be explained or is it just an outlier?

Response:

We have changed the text to make the interpretation of our results reflect the reviewer's concerns.

Manuscript Change:

P7 L30-32 – The text has been changed to read “In four of the treatments, the average SP of *P. chlororaphis* denitrification was lower than that of *P. aureofaciens*. This resulted in a difference of 4.1‰ between the average SP of *P. chlororaphis* and *P. aureofaciens*.”

P7 L12 – 21: This section, the application of the Rayleigh model, should be preferably placed in the introductory or method section.

Response:

As recommended by Reviewer #2, we have moved the application of the Rayleigh model to the method section.

Please see the text and below for the precise changes.

Manuscript Changes:

P5 L12-22 - “According to convention (Mariotti et al., 1981), the magnitude of the isotopic fractionation factor (α) for a single unidirectional reaction is defined by the rate constants of the light (k_1) and heavy (k_2) isotopically substituted compounds:

$$\alpha = k_2/k_1. \tag{3}$$

Further, the isotopic enrichment factor, ϵ , is defined as

$$\epsilon = (\alpha - 1) \times 1000, \tag{4}$$

and can be estimated from the slope of the linear relationship described by the Rayleigh model:

$$\delta^{15}\text{N}_p = \delta^{15}\text{N}_{s_0} - \varepsilon_p \left[\frac{\ln f}{1 - f} \right]; \quad (5)$$

where $\delta^{15}\text{N}_p$ is the isotope value of the accumulated product, $\delta^{15}\text{N}_{s_0}$ is the isotope value of the initial substrate, ε is the fractionation factor, and f is the fraction of substrate remaining (Mariotti et al., 1981).”

P9 L14: The statement that SP depends on $\delta^{15}\text{N}^\alpha$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}^\beta$ is trivial and could be omitted. The differences in SP between *Ps. aureofaciens* and *Ps. chlororaphis* are attributed to differences in the NO pool; which experiment could be used to check this hypothesis?

Response:

We have changed the text to reflect that these values are used to calculate SP rather than SP being related to them. As far as designing an experiment to determine if SP is affected by the NO pool, this is an inherently difficult problem, which arises from the difficulty in determining the concentration of NO available to the bacterium within the periplasmic space. We are currently beginning to examine NO reduction during enzymatic reduction both in vitro and in vivo.

Manuscript Changes:

See the response for Reviewer #1 comment 3; P10 L8 – P11 L11.

Page 8 (discussion): Temporal resolved data of N₂O isotopic composition as used in this study could be preferably be collected using an online technique, e.g. laser spectroscopy – Please comment.

Response:

While online techniques such as off-axis integrated cavity output spectroscopy (OA-ICOS) and cavity ring down spectroscopy (CRDS) offer the capability to temporally resolve changes in N₂O isotopomer values, the techniques have unique and challenges inherent to the technology to overcome. For instance, many obstacles remain that constrain the field, mesocosm, and *in vitro* application of OA-ICOS and CRDS including production and standardization of reference gases spanning a range of SP values and N₂O concentrations, as well as the

standardization of methods for data analysis. Among other labs, our group is currently working to address challenges such as these as on-line measurements promise rapid continuous field-based and mesocosm data necessary for managing and monitoring N₂O flux at local, ecosystem, and global scales. However, these topics have been reviewed and discussed in other peer-reviewed journals (Ostrom and Ostrom 2017). Therefore we feel that including such information detracts from the overall message we present in this manuscript.

Ostrom, N.E., Ostrom, P.H., 2017. Mining the isotopic complexity of nitrous oxide: a review of challenges and opportunities. *Biogeochemistry*, 132:3, 359-372.

Manuscript Changes:

Based upon the response above we do not feel that an in text response to the comment is necessary.

Estimation of isotopologue variation of N₂O during denitrification by *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis*: Implications for N₂O source apportionment

5 Joshua A Haslun^{1,3}, Nathaniel E. Ostrom^{2,3}, Eric L. Hegg^{1,3}, Peggy H. Ostrom^{2,3}

¹Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 48824, USA

²Integrative Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 48824, USA

³Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 48824, USA

Correspondence to: Peggy H. Ostrom, Nathaniel E. Ostrom

10 **Abstract.** Soil microbial processes, stimulated by agricultural fertilization, account for 90 % of anthropogenic nitrous oxide (N₂O), the leading source of ozone depletion and a potent greenhouse gas. Efforts to reduce N₂O flux commonly focus on reducing fertilization rates. Management of microbial processes responsible for N₂O production may also be used to reduce N₂O emissions, but this requires knowledge of the prevailing process. To this end, stable isotopes of N₂O have been applied to differentiate N₂O produced by nitrification and denitrification. To better understand the factors contributing to isotopic
15 variation during denitrification, we characterized the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and site preference (SP; the intramolecular distribution of ^{15}N in N₂O) of N₂O produced during NO₃⁻ reduction by *Pseudomonas chlororaphis subsp. aureofaciens* and *P. c. subsp. chlororaphis*. The terminal product of denitrification for these two species is N₂O because they lack the gene nitrous oxide reductase, which is responsible for the reduction of N₂O to N₂. In addition to species, treatments included electron donor (citrate and succinate) and electron donor concentration (0.01 mM, 0.1 mM, 1 mM, and 10 mM) as factors. In contrast to the
20 expectation of a Rayleigh model, all treatments exhibited curvilinear behaviour between $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ or $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and the extent of the reaction [$- \ln f / (1 - f)$]. The curvilinear behaviour indicates that the fractionation factor changed over the course of the reaction, something that is not unexpected for a multi-step process such as denitrification. Using the derivative of the equation, we estimated that the net isotope effects (η) vary by as much as 100 ‰ over the course of a single reaction, placing challenges for using $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ as apportionment tools. In contrast, SP for denitrification was not affected by the extent of the reaction,
25 the electron donor source, or concentration, although the mean SP of N₂O produced by each species differed. Therefore, SP remains a robust indicator of the origin of N₂O. To improve apportionment estimates with SP, future studies could evaluate other factors that contribute to the variation in SP.

Formatted: Subscript

Commented [JH1]: Reviewer #2: Specific comment P1L17

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Commented [JH2]: Reviewer #1: Specific comment P1L19

Formatted: Normal

1 Introduction

Agricultural production of food and energy has required a 10-fold increase (i.e. from 10 to 100 TGN yr⁻¹) in the application of synthetic fertilizer since 1950 (Robertson and Vitousek, 2009). Moreover, to maximize crop yields, nitrogen (N) is often applied at rates in excess of a crop's yield response, the average maximum crop yield as a function of fertilizer application rate. This results in a residual N pool (Sebilo et al., 2013). While some of the excess N may be incorporated into the soil, much of it is either transported out of the system via runoff as NO₂⁻ or NO₃⁻ (Zhou and Butterbach-Bahl, 2014), volatilized as NH₃ (Pan et al., 2016), or converted to N₂ and/or nitrous oxide (N₂O) via oxidative and reductive microbial processes (Schreiber et al., 2012; Venterea et al., 2012) such as nitrification, and denitrification, respectively. Stimulated by agricultural practices, these microbial processes account for 90 % of anthropogenic N₂O (Denman, 2007; Reay et al., 2012). Losses of N from soils in the form of N₂O are of particular concern because this greenhouse gas contributes to stratospheric ozone depletion (Portmann et al., 2012; Ramanathan et al., 1985; Ravishankara et al., 2009) and has a 100-year global warming potential that is approximately 300 times that of CO₂ (IPCC, 2014). Moreover, the relationship between N application rate and N₂O emissions from agricultural soils is non-linear (McSwiney and Robertson, 2005; Shcherbak et al., 2014), with N₂O emissions dramatically increasing with moderate increases in fertilization. To mitigate N₂O flux without compromising crop yield, several systems have been developed that include the maximum return to nitrogen system (Nafziger et al., 2004) and the variable rate nitrogen application system (Scharf et al., 2011). These strategies provide recommendations of fertilization rates that minimize reductions in crop yield while simultaneously decreasing the amount of residual N available for N₂O production, thereby lowering soil N₂O flux. Identifying how to manage the microbial processes contributing to N₂O flux from agricultural systems would be an additional mechanism to mitigate atmospheric N₂O additions (Paustian et al., 2016; Reay et al., 2012; Venterea et al., 2012). Because nitrification and denitrification require aerobic and anaerobic conditions, respectively, strategies directed at controlling soil oxygen saturation could become part of a management strategy (Kravchenko et al., 2017). This, however, requires identifying the relative importance of nitrification and denitrification to N₂O flux spatially and temporally across different agricultural landscapes.

The stable isotope ratios of δ¹⁵N and δ¹⁸O have been used to apportion N₂O flux between nitrification and denitrification (Davidson and Keller, 2000; Park et al., 2011; Yamagishi et al., 2007). Apportionment approaches require that the isotope values of N₂O differ between the two production processes and remain constant throughout the course of a reaction (Jinuntuya-Nortman et al., 2008; Ostrom and Ostrom, 2017). However, shifts or fractionation in the isotope values of N₂O produced during either nitrification or denitrification can compromise source apportionment (Barford et al., 1999; Perez et al., 2000; Sutka et al., 2008; Yoshida, 1988), and reduction of N₂O by denitrification may further alter isotope values (Jinuntuya-Nortman et al., 2008). Nevertheless, δ¹⁵N and δ¹⁸O can still be a useful tool if environmental conditions constrain processes, such as anoxic conditions prohibiting nitrification.

Site preference (SP), the difference in ¹⁵N abundance between the central N (δ¹⁵N^α) and terminal N (δ¹⁵N^β) of N₂O, offers an alternative tool for apportionment of N₂O production (Yoshida and Toyoda, 2000). The large difference in SP of N₂O produced

Commented [JH3]: Reviewer #1: Specific comment P2L10

from nitrification and denitrification (ca. 30 ‰) paired with the observations that SP is constant during N₂O production, and is independent of the isotopic composition of the nitrogen substrates of nitrification and denitrification, has prompted the use of SP for N₂O source apportionment (Sutka et al., 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005). However, SP is not without variation (Toyoda et al., 2017). In addition to production pathway, numerous factors could theoretically control the degree of variation in SP including differences in bacterial species, the specific enzyme involved in its production (Yang et al., 2014), and, for denitrification, carbon source. The accuracy of apportionment estimates using isotope values, including SP, will be improved by understanding sources of variation.

This study investigated the effect of carbon source (electron donor), and carbon source concentration on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of N₂O produced by two denitrifier species in vitro, as well the effect of these factors on SP values of N₂O. We conducted our study with *Pseudomonas chlororaphis subsp. chlororaphis* and *P. chlororaphis subsp. aureofaciens* because they are highly related denitrifiers that lack N₂O reductase, but encode different nitrite reductases (NIR).

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Organisms and Culture Conditions

Cultures of *Pseudomonas chlororaphis subsp. chlororaphis* (ATCC 43928; *P. chlororaphis*) and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis subsp. aureofaciens* (ATCC 13985; *P. aureofaciens*) were cryogenically stored (-80 °C) in tryptic soy broth (TSB; Caisson Labs, Smithfield, UT) and sterile glycerol 1:1 (v/v). Stock cultures were re-established in 5 mL TSB amended with sodium nitrate (NaNO₃, 10 mM; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) under aerobic conditions at a constant temperature with continuous agitation (18 h, 25 °C). Individual colonies were obtained from re-established stock cultures by the streak-plate technique on tryptic soy agar (TSA; Caisson Labs, Smithfield, UT) amended with NaNO₃ (10 mM). Tryptic soy agar plates of stock cultures were sealed with parafilm and incubated (aerobic, 25 °C). The plates were stored at 4 °C for up to two weeks prior to establishment in liquid media for denitrification experiments.

2.2 Preparation of Cultures for Denitrification Experiments

Starter cultures of each species were established in 5 mL TSB amended with NaNO₃ (10 mM) with 1 colony from stored stock culture plates (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA). Cultures were then grown aerobically with agitation (25 °C, 18 h) to late exponential phase (optical density at 600 nm (OD₆₀₀) = 0.3). Optical density was determined with a Spectronic 20 spectrophotometer (Bausch and Lomb, Rochester, NY). Two 160 mL sterile serum bottles containing 50 mL of carbon minimal media (CMM) (Anderson et al., 1993) amended with 10 mM NaNO₃ and 10 mM sodium succinate (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) were each inoculated with 200 μL of the aerobic culture. The bottles were stoppered (Geomicrobial Technologies, Inc.), crimp sealed, and the headspace sparged with ultra-high purity (UHP) N₂ for 15 min. Cultures were incubated (25 °C, 18 h) with agitation. Following 18 h, the cells were transferred to 50 mL conical Falcon™ tubes (Corning, Corning, NY) and centrifuged (3,000 x g, 30 min, 25 °C) to pellet the cells. The supernatant was decanted and the cells dispersed in CMM lacking

a carbon or nitrogen source ($OD_{600} = 0.2$). The cells were aliquoted (2 mL) into sterile 35 mL serum bottles, which were then stoppered (Geomicrobial Technologies, Inc.) and crimp sealed. An anaerobic environment was created by sparging the cells with UHP N_2 for 20 min. Sparging was accomplished by inserting one sterile stainless-steel needle (#20 Thomas Scientific, Swedesboro, NJ) carrying N_2 through the stopper into the media while a second sterile stainless-steel needle was inserted through the stopper and into the headspace to allow gas to exit. Following sparging, the bottles were allowed to reach atmospheric pressure, and reactions were then initiated by injecting 20 μ L of the carbon source (anaerobic) to reach a final concentration of 0.01 mM, 0.1 mM, 1 mM, or 10 mM. Treatments with citrate and succinate concentrations of 1 mM and 10 mM were conducted for both bacterial taxa. Treatments of citrate and succinate at 0.1 mM were only conducted for *P. chlororaphis*. Treatments with a carbon source concentration of 0.01 mM were only conducted with succinate but were done so for both taxa. The addition of the carbon source was followed by adding 26 μ L of 0.1 M $NaNO_3$ (anaerobic) to reach a final NO_3^- concentration of 1.3 mM. The $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{18}O$ of the NO_3^- source was 5.4 ‰ and 24.5 ‰, respectively.

2.3 Isotope Analysis and Modelling Isotope Behaviour

Each treatment consisted of four denitrification cultures. Headspace samples were obtained from each culture with a gas tight syringe (Hamilton; Reno, NV). For one of the four cultures, a 100 μ L headspace sample was obtained every 15 minutes for analysis of N_2O concentration. Headspace N_2O concentration of this culture was determined with a Shimadzu Greenhouse Gas Analyzer gas chromatograph equipped with an electron capture detector (ECD) (model GC-2014, Shimadzu Scientific Instruments; Columbia, MD). For details regarding this method see Yang et al. (2014). These data were used to determine when the N_2O concentration was sufficient for isotope analysis and to estimate the volume of headspace required for isotope analysis over the course of the reaction. Headspace sampling of the remaining three cultures was initiated when the N_2O concentration determined by ECD was above ca. 0.4 ppm. Headspace samples between 200 μ L and 500 μ L of each of the 3 cultures were injected into 60 ml serum bottles (one per culture) that had been sparged with UHP N_2 for 15 min, and stored for isotope analysis. Each bottle contained between 5 nmols and 15 nmols of N_2O for isotopic analysis. Samples were analyzed on an IsoPrime100 stable isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS) interfaced to a TraceGas inlet system (Elementar; Mt. Laurel, NJ) (Sutka et al., 2003). The inlet system used He as the carrier gas and removed both water and CO_2 with separate magnesium perchlorate (Costech; Valencia, CA) and CO_2 absorbent traps (Carbosorb, 8-14 mesh, Costech; Valencia, CA), respectively, prior to concentrating N_2O within a cryofocusing trap. Chromatographic separation of N_2O was achieved with a Porplot Q column prior to isotopic analysis. Mass overlap and related corrections followed the protocol outlined in Toyoda and Yoshida (2000). Our internal laboratory pure N_2O tank standard (MSU Tank B) was isotopically characterized by analysis relative to the USGS51 and USGS52 reference materials (<https://isotopes.usgs.gov/lab/referencematerials.html>). Following the guidelines proposed by Coplen (2011), we report here the isotope values of the reference materials as well as our internal laboratory standard. The $\delta^{15}N$, $\delta^{18}O$, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and SP values of USGS51 and USGS52 are 1.3 ‰, 41.2 ‰, 0.5 ‰, 2.2 ‰, and -1.7 ‰, and 0.4 ‰, 40.6 ‰, 13.5 ‰, -12.6 ‰, and 26.2 ‰, respectively. The $\delta^{15}N$, $\delta^{18}O$, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and SP values of reference MSU Tank C are -0.9 ‰, 0.7 ‰, -2.6 ‰, 39.6 ‰, and 3.4 ‰, respectively. The $\delta^{15}N$, $\delta^{18}O$, $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\beta}$, and SP

Commented [JH4]: Reviewer #2: Specific comment P4L5

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Superscript

Commented [JH5]: Reviewer #2: Specific comment P4L15

Formatted: Subscript

values of the isotope standard MSU Tank B are -0.5 ‰, 11.13 ‰, -12.2 ‰, 40.8 ‰, and 23.3 ‰, respectively. All nitrogen isotope values are reported with respect to the international Air-N₂ standard, and all oxygen isotope values with respect to VSMOW. The mean precision of replicate N₂O standards were 0.1 ± 0.1 ‰, 0.3 ± 0.248 ‰, 0.3 ± 0.247 ‰, 0.2 ± 0.1 ‰, and 0.6 ± 0.3 ‰ composition for δ¹⁵N, δ¹⁵N^α, δ¹⁵N^β, δ¹⁸O, and SP, respectively.

5 The δ¹⁵N and δ¹⁸O values are reported as:

$$\delta = \left[\left(\frac{R_{\text{sample}}}{R_{\text{standard}}} \right) - 1 \right] \times 1,000, \quad (1)$$

where R is the ratio of the trace to the abundant isotope of N or O, and air and VSMOW are the standards for N and O, respectively. Site preference is defined as

$$SP = \delta^{15}N^{\alpha} - \delta^{15}N^{\beta}, \quad (2)$$

10 where δ¹⁵N^α and δ¹⁵N^β are the isotope values at the central and peripheral N atom of the linear N₂O molecule, respectively. The changes in δ¹⁵N, δ¹⁸O, and SP of N₂O during the course of the reaction were investigated using the Rayleigh equation by plotting each isotope value vs. [-lnf/(1-f)] where f is the fraction of substrate remaining (Mariotti et al., 1981). ~~We modelled isotope discrimination within each of our experiments. According to convention (Mariotti et al., 1981), the magnitude of the isotopic fractionation factor (α) for a single unidirectional reaction is defined by the rate constants of the light (k₁) and heavy~~

15 ~~(k₂) isotopically substituted compounds:~~

$$\alpha = k_2/k_1, \quad (36)$$

~~Further, the isotopic enrichment factor, ε, is defined as~~

$$\varepsilon = (\alpha - 1) \times 1000, \quad (47)$$

~~and can be estimated from the slope of the linear relationship described by the Rayleigh model:~~

$$20 \delta^{15}N_p = \delta^{15}N_{s0} - \varepsilon_p \left[\frac{\ln f}{1-f} \right], \quad (58)$$

~~where δ¹⁵N_p is the isotope value of the accumulated product, δ¹⁵N_{s0} is the isotope value of the initial substrate, ε is the fractionation factor, and f is the fraction of substrate remaining (Mariotti et al., 1981). The fraction of substrate remaining was determined by dividing twice the amount of N₂O produced by the total amount of nitrate added, and then subtracting this quantity from 1.~~ Generalized additive modelling of the relationship between the isotope value of N₂O and [-lnf/(1-f)] indicated

25 asymptotic curvilinear behaviour. Therefore, we performed non-linear least squares regression starting with a three-parameter exponential function of the form

$$y = a + ce^{b|x|}, \quad (63)$$

Model reduction and selection were performed following the methods of Baty et al., (2015). Non-linear model fit was also compared to a linear model fit. Models with the lowest residual standard error, fewest iterations to convergence (< 10), lowest parameter confidence intervals, and lowest collinearity of variables were deemed to have the best fit. The goodness of fit for each model was also assessed visually from residual plots. Model residuals that displayed patterns were also deemed poor.

30 This process produced an exponential function with the generalized form

$$y = a + e^{b|x|}, \quad (74)$$

Commented [JH6]: Reviewer #2: Specific comment P4L31

Formatted: Subscript

where y is the isotope value of the accumulated product, x is $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$, and a and b are coefficients estimated by the model.

Values of “ a ” affect the y -intercept with larger values contributing to increased prediction of the final isotope value of the reaction. Values of “ b ” affect the rate of change of the isotope values particularly at the beginning of the reaction. Larger values of “ b ” result in a more gradual rate of change, whereas as lower values of “ b ” increase the initial slope. The starting values supplied to the function were $a = 7$ and $b = 5$ for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $a = 75$ and $b = 10$ for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$. These starting values were selected because they are greater than the expected coefficients, which aids in model convergence (Baty et al., 2015). The derivative of Eq. 74,

$$y' = be^{b[x]} \quad (85)$$

can be used to predict the slope at any extent of the reaction. The term net isotope effect (η) has been used to describe isotopic discrimination, the change in isotope value, observed during a multi-step reaction (Jinuntuya-Nortman et al., 2008). Therefore, η is equivalent to y' in Eq. 85.

We used ~~probability density functions kernel density estimation~~ to illustrate the ~~probability density density~~ distribution (DD) (~~PDD~~) of η across the extent of the reaction observed. Kernel density estimation is a non-parametric method of determining the probability density function of a random continuous variable. Probability density functions were determined with a Gaussian smoothing kernel from 50 equally spaced estimates of η spanning the complete extent of the reaction (i.e. $f = 0$ to 1). The bandwidth was set to 1 for each density estimate.

Modelling was performed with R statistical software (Team, 2013), and all figures were produced with ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009, 2011).

2.4 Statistical Analysis of SP Data

We used a linear model to determine if SP changed as a function of $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$. Significant relationships were not observed and therefore the effect of taxa, carbon source, and carbon source concentration on mean SP was examined with Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Tukey's honest significant difference test (HSD) was used to identify significant differences between and among groups. Normality of the data was assessed with Q-Q plots and the Shapiro-Wilk test.

Statistical analyses were performed with R statistical software (Team, 2013), and all figures were produced with ggplot2 within that software platform (Wickham, 2009, 2011).

3 Results

3.1 Effect of Carbon Source and Concentration on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ - N_2O

The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of N_2O produced by the two denitrifier taxon in our study produced a non-linear relationship with the fraction of substrate remaining expressed in the Rayleigh model as $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ (Figure 1). The derivative, Eq. (5), of the exponential equation for the curvilinear relationship between isotope value and $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ Eq. (4), indicated that $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ changed over the course of the reaction (Figure 1, Supplementary Table 1). Estimates of $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ during denitrification of NO_3^- to N_2O by $P.$

Commented [JH7]: Reviewer #1: P5L14 Please see the comment I have written in the RefereeResponses document

Commented [JH8]: Reviewer #1: Specific comment P5L28

aureofaciens ranged from -77.5 ‰ to -18.4 ‰ and -106.2 ‰ to -11.4 ‰ for citrate and succinate, respectively, while values ranged from -119 ‰ to -9.2 ‰ and -82.1 ‰ to -5.1 ‰ for citrate and succinate, respectively, during denitrification by *P. chlororaphis* (Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1). ~~Values of $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ greater than 0 were not observed. Such values would indicate that an inverse isotope effect is contributing fractionation, something that is not indicated by our data. Moreover, because *P. aureofaciens* and *P. chlororaphis* do not produce nitrous oxide reductase it is unlikely that an inverse isotope effect would be observed. Therefore, we have deliberately decided to cut off the density distributions at $\eta = 0$ ‰.~~ ~~Probability-Density~~ Density distributions of $\eta^{15}\text{N}$ for all treatments show that the majority of values are of lower magnitude, and values between -50 ‰ and -10 ‰ were most probable. High magnitude values for η occurred at the beginning of reactions, where values of $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ are high (i.e. closer to 1).

10 3.2 Effect of Carbon Source and Concentration on $\delta^{18}\text{O}\text{-N}_2\text{O}$

The $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of N_2O produced by the two taxa displayed a non-linear relationship with $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ (Figure 1), and much like $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, an exponential model Eq. (4) was the most parsimonious fit. The exponential equations determined for each treatment along with the derivatives are presented in Supplementary Documents (Table 2). Similar to the variation in $\eta^{15}\text{N}$, the most rapid changes in $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ occurred early in the extent of the reactions (i.e. larger values of $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$). Estimates of $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ determined following denitrification of NO_3^- by *P. aureofaciens* ranged from -22.2 ‰ to -9.8 ‰ and -77.0 ‰ to -3.1 ‰ for citrate and succinate, respectively, while the reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O by *P. chlororaphis* produced $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ values that ranged from -75.4 ‰ to -7.5 ‰ and -67.8 ‰ to -4.0 ‰ for citrate and succinate, respectively. ~~Probability-Density~~ density distributions of $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ indicated that treatments with narrow observed f ranges were not strictly associated with narrow PDDs (Figures 1 and 3). For instance, the observed f range for *P. aureofaciens* reduction with 0.01 mM succinate was nearly 0.6 while the range in $\eta^{18}\text{O}$ was less than -10 ‰. The rate of change of the function's slope is controlled by parameter b in Eq. (4). Therefore, lower estimates of parameter b produce narrow ranges of $\eta^{18}\text{O}$, such as that observed for *P. aureofaciens* reactions with a succinate concentration of 0.01 mM.

25 3.3 Site Preference as a Function of Carbon-Source and Concentration

Site preference did not change as a function of the extent of the reaction, and across all treatments SP ranged from -7.0 ‰ to 6.0 ‰ (Figure 1). Denitrification by *P. aureofaciens* produced a mean SP of 0 ‰ (st. dev. = 3.3 ‰); however negative SPs observed at 1 mM succinate (mean = -4.2 ‰, st. dev. = 1.8 ‰) contributed greatly to this value (Figure 4). Denitrification of NO_3^- by *P. chlororaphis* produced mean SP values that were similar among all carbon source treatments; -3.7 ‰ (st. dev. = 2.2 ‰) and -4.2 ‰ (st. dev. = 1.2 ‰) for citrate and succinate, respectively.

Analysis of variance identified a significant difference in SP values among the treatments examined for each species (ANOVA, $p < 0.001$). ~~In four of the treatments-Across all treatments,~~ the average SP of *P. chlororaphis* denitrification was ~~4.1 ‰~~ lower than that of *P. aureofaciens*. ~~This resulted in a difference of 4.1 ‰ between the average SP of *P. chlororaphis* and *P. aureofaciens*.~~ In addition to taxon, the carbon source (i.e. succinate or citrate) also contributed somewhat to differences in SP

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

between treatments (ANOVA; $p < 0.01$) with growth on succinate producing SP values 0.9 ‰ lower than those produced with citrate as the carbon source. Interestingly, the concentration of the carbon source had no discernible effect on SP under our reaction conditions. Therefore, the variation in SP was largely dependent on taxa (Figure 4).

4 Discussion

5 This study investigated the effect of denitrifier species, carbon source (electron donor), and electron donor concentration on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, and SP isotope values of N_2O produced during denitrification in pure culture. We observed isotopic discrimination against ^{15}N and ^{18}O but no change in SP during the reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O by *P. aureofaciens* or *P. chlororaphis*, and these observations held regardless of carbon source and electron donor concentration.

10 ~~We modelled isotope discrimination within each of our experiments. According to convention (Mariotti et al., 1981), the magnitude of the isotopic fractionation factor (α) for a single unidirectional reaction is defined by the rate constants of the light (k_1) and heavy (k_2) isotopically substituted compounds:~~

$$\alpha = k_2/k_1 \tag{6}$$

~~Further, the isotopic enrichment factor, ϵ , is defined as~~

$$\epsilon = (\alpha - 1) \times 1000 \tag{7}$$

15 ~~and can be estimated from the slope of the linear relationship described by the Rayleigh model:~~

$$\delta^{15}\text{N}_p = \delta^{15}\text{N}_{so} - \epsilon_p [(\text{flnf})/(1 - f)] \tag{8}$$

20 ~~where $\delta^{15}\text{N}_p$ is the isotope value of the accumulated product, $\delta^{15}\text{N}_{so}$ is the isotope value of the initial substrate, ϵ is the fractionation factor, and f is the fraction of substrate remaining (Mariotti et al., 1981).~~ **However, In contrast to the expectation of the Rayleigh model,** the reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O by *P. aureofaciens* and *P. chlororaphis*, displayed a non-linear exponential relationship between $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ vs. $[-\text{flnf}/(1-f)]$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ vs. $[-\text{flnf}/(1-f)]$. This curvilinear isotopic behaviour was evident for denitrification metabolizing both carbon substrates (citrate or succinate) and at all substrate concentrations (Figure 2, Supplementary Table 1). The non-linear behaviour indicates that the fractionation factor, ϵ , is not constant, a phenomenon not unexpected for multi-step reactions in which more than one enzymatic step and diffusion of products and/or substrates into and out of the cell can result in variation in isotopic discrimination (Granger et al., 2008; Sutka et al., 2008). Because the fractionation factor varies during multi-step reactions, it is best considered a net isotope effect (η) (Jinuntuya-Nortman et al., 2008). The reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O during denitrification involves three enzymes and multiple opportunities for diffusion, all cases where isotope discrimination can occur (Figure 5). Similar to other studies, our previous work on denitrification estimated η from a Rayleigh model (Barford et al., 1999; Lewicka-Szczebak et al., 2014; Sutka et al., 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005; Yano et al., 2014). However, the Rayleigh model assumes a unidirectional single-step reaction with linear behaviour, 25 assumptions that are clearly not valid for N_2O production from nitrate during denitrification. Thus, here we developed estimates 30

of η from the derivative of the exponential relationship between the isotope value of the accumulated product, N_2O , and the extent of the reaction $[-f \ln f / (1-f)]$. This allowed us to quantify changes in η over the course of the denitrification reaction.

For our entire data set, $\eta^{15}N$ and $\eta^{18}O$ varied by as much as ca. 100 ‰ within a single experiment (Figures 2, 3). Note, however, that during N_2O production, both $\delta^{18}O$ and $\eta^{18}O$ can be influenced by oxygen exchange between water and nitrogen oxides

(Kool et al., 2009, 2011). These oxygen exchange effects are difficult to quantify making interpretation of $\eta^{18}O$ data difficult. Additionally visual inspection of the co-variation between $\delta^{18}O$ and $\delta^{15}N$ indicated similar trends among treatments and species, and the observed kinetic isotope effect for $\delta^{18}O$ suggests that there is little exchange with H_2O in the reaction vessels (Figure 1). Thus, we limit our discussion of fractionation to $\eta^{15}N$. Values of $\eta^{15}N$ previously reported for reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O in pure cultures (-43 ‰ to -9 ‰) fall within the range we observed (Sutka et al., 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005; Rohe et al.

2014; Sutka et al 2008). However, some of our values are much greater in magnitude than those previously reported (e.g. -119 ‰). Values of such magnitude occurred near the onset of the reaction (i.e. high values of $[-f \ln f / (1-f)]$), most notably when no more than 10 % of the NO_3^- had been reduced. The occurrence of high magnitude η values near the beginning of the reaction is likely related to the relative importance of diffusion and enzymatic fractionation in controlling η . Fractionation associated with enzymes is often much larger than that associated with diffusion, and enzymatic fractionation is fully expressed when diffusion does not limit substrate supply to the enzyme (Jinuntuya-Nortman et al., 2008; Ostrom and Ostrom, 2012). Thus, the largest η is expected at the beginning of the reaction, consistent with what we observed. Large magnitude values for η can be easily missed if the isotope value of the accumulated product is used to estimate η . Without knowledge of production rate, it can be difficult to know when there is sufficient product for isotopic measurement. By characterizing production rates before initiating experiments to estimate η , we were able to capture isotope values for N_2O close to the onset of the reaction.

20 There are important reasons why published discrimination factors might be less negative and therefore of lower magnitude than ours. Prior estimates were derived from a single slope from a Rayleigh model and, therefore, do not produce estimates of η over the course of the reaction. Importantly, they may not characterize the large fractionation occurring at the onset of a reaction. Even so, our highly negative values for η might, initially, seem remarkable. Considering variation in η in the context of a multi-step model provides insight into how these values might arise, particularly in the early stages of a culture when the substrate concentration is high. The reduction of NO_3^- to N_2O includes three enzymatic steps in which substantive fractionation may occur (Figure 5). As a consequence, we would expect the products of each successive reaction to become progressively depleted in the heavy isotope, assuming normal ϵ . If, for example, the ϵ for each of the three steps was -40 ‰ then reduction of nitrate with a $\delta^{15}N$ of 0 ‰ could yield N_2O of -120 ‰. Thus, denitrification has the potential to produce N_2O that is greatly depleted in ^{15}N resulting in highly negative values for η . As the reaction proceeds, each enzyme is likely to be limited by the

30 supply of substrate from diffusion. This has a tendency to reduce expression of fractionation, and η is therefore reduced to less negative values. Probability density distributions indicate that markedly low η values associated with one endpoint of the range in η are not common (Figure 3). They also illustrate the range in η that would be expected for the reaction, and their shape emphasizes

important changes in η during the course of a reaction. For example, several of the distributions show a marked change in slope on the left side of the distribution (e.g. 10 mM citrate $\eta^{15}\text{N}$, both species) that is a consequence of a significant change in slope along the curve of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ vs. $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ (Figures 1, 3). While we cannot ascribe a specific event to this change, future studies aimed at investigating specific enzymes may provide a better understanding of the behaviour of η during denitrification.

5 Perhaps most importantly, these distributions emphasize that assessments of net isotope effects for multi-step reactions will not be complete without consideration of isotopic behaviour over a wide extent of the reaction and the development of models that describe isotope behaviour that does not fit a linear Rayleigh model.

In contrast to the results we observed for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, isotopic discrimination was not evident for SP regardless of treatment (Figure 2). Instead, SP was constant during the course of the reaction. This finding is consistent with pure culture studies of nitrification and denitrification across multiple species (Frame and Casciotti, 2010; Sutka et al., 2003, 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005). The differences we observed in SP between species, however, relates to the factors that control SP. Unlike the case for bulk isotopes, SP is determined during a single reaction, the reduction of NO to N_2O (Toyoda et al., 2005). Thus, SP is only influenced by nitric oxide reductase (NOR) activity and diffusion of NO or N_2O into or out of the cell. If we solely consider enzymatic fractionation by NOR, SP is related to three factors; the fraction of substrate remaining f , $\delta^{15}\text{N}^a$, and $\delta^{15}\text{N}^b$. In this case, however, f differs from the quantity we refer to in Fig. 1, which is the fraction of N_2O produced in a multi-step reaction. For the purposes of discussing solely NO reduction, we are unable to use the concentration of the end product of a multi-step reaction. Instead, we could define f as either the concentration of substrate (i.e. NO) available to NOR or the concentration of product (i.e. N_2O) produced from the reaction mediated by NOR. While we did not measure the concentration of the substrates or products of NO reduction in bacterial cells directly, to understand isotope systematics we can consider their behaviour in the environment. Our considerations will focus on NO. The NO concentration will depend on its production, reduction, and losses due to diffusion into or out of the cell, all of which could vary between species. We do not know, for example, the degree to which the rate of NO production intrinsically differs between the *cd₁* type NIR of *P. chlororaphis* and copper containing NIR of *P. aureofaciens* or how gene expression may alter these rates. We posit that small differences in SP between and even within species in our study and others may relate to the size of the NO pool available to NOR. In contrast to the results we observed for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, isotopic discrimination was not evident for SP regardless of treatment (Figure 2). Instead, SP was constant during the course of the reaction. This finding is consistent with pure culture studies of nitrification and denitrification across multiple species (Frame and Casciotti, 2010; Sutka et al., 2003, 2006; Toyoda et al., 2005). The differences we observed in SP between species, however, is likely to relate to the factors that control SP. Unlike the case for bulk isotopes, SP is determined during a single reaction, the reduction of NO to N_2O (Toyoda et al., 2005). Thus, as N_2O reduction does not occur in *P. aureofaciens* or *P. chlororaphis*, SP is only influenced by nitric oxide reductase (NOR) activity and diffusion of NO or N_2O into or out of the cell. As SP is the difference between the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ value of two N atoms that rely on the same NO substrate, SP is not dependent upon the isotopic composition of the initial substrate (Toyoda et al., 2005; Sutka et al., 2006). The observation that SP remained constant during bacterial denitrification, even though the extent of the reaction

varied, (e.g. Sutka et al., 2006) suggests that the expressed fractionation for the α and β N atoms during NO reduction were the same. If so, then one hypothesis is that f can vary markedly and SP will be constant. However, during production of N₂O by pure fungal cytochrome P450 NOR enzyme, distinct fractionation factors for the α and β N atoms were observed and it was proposed that observations of constant SP values during production by fungi were the result of f , or the internal pool size of NO, being held relatively constant during cellular metabolism (Yang et al., 2014). We observed a minor but significant different in SP between two species of *Pseudomonas* sp. during N₂O production that is consistent with a difference in the internal pool size of NO within the cell. The abundance of NO within the cell will depend on its production, reduction, and losses due to diffusion into or out of the cell, all of which could vary between species. We do not know, for example, the degree to which the rate of NO production intrinsically differs between the *cd₁*-type NIR of *P. chlororaphis* and copper containing NIR of *P. aureofaciens* or how gene expression may alter these rates. We posit that small differences in SP between and even within species in our study and others may relate to the size of the NO pool available to NOR.

Nitrous oxide is the third most abundant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere and is the greatest source of stratospheric ozone depletion (Ravishankara et al., 2009). Moreover, efforts to balance the N₂O budget have been challenged by the episodic nature of N₂O flux (Nishimura et al., 2005) and, historically, identifying the pathway of N₂O production has been enigmatic (Schreiber et al., 2012). Here we emphasize that within our toolbox, SP remains a robust indicator of N₂O derived from denitrification regardless of carbon source or concentration, and we identify that a component of the variation in SP can be ascribed to species differences. Our ability to understand factors that control variation in SP is important to refining estimates of the relative importance of N₂O production pathways, something that is necessary for mitigation of fluxes of this important GHG from aquatic and terrestrial environments.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the DOE Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center (DOE BER Office of Science DE-FC02-07ER64494). We would like to thank Dr. Hasand Gandhi from Michigan State University for his insight and direction during isotope analyses.

References

- Anderson, I. C., Poth, M., Homstead, J. and Burdige, D.: A comparison of NO and N₂O production by the autotrophic nitrifier *Nitrosomonas europaea* and the heterotrophic nitrifier *Alcaligenes faecalis*, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 59(11), 3525–3533, 1993.
- Barford, C. C., Montoya, J. P. and Altabet, M. A.: Steady-State Nitrogen Isotope Effects of N₂ and N₂O Production in *Paracoccus denitrificans*, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 65(3), 989–994, 1999.
- Baty, F., Ritz, C., Charles, S., Brutsche, M., Flandrois, J.-P. and Delignette-Muller, M.-L.: A Toolbox for Nonlinear Regression

Formatted: Subscript

- in R: The Package nlstools, *J. Stat. Softw.*, 66(5), 1–21, doi:10.18637/jss.v066.i05, 2015.
- Davidson, E. A. and Keller, M.: Isotopic variability of N₂O emissions from tropical forest soils, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 14(2), 525–535, 2000.
- Denman, K. L.: Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, Cambridge Univ. Press, 499–587 [online] Available from: <http://www.amazon.com/Climate-Change-2007-Contribution-Assessment/dp/0521880092>, 2007.
- 5 Frame, C. H. and Casciotti, K. L.: Biogeochemical controls and isotopic signatures of nitrous oxide production by a marine ammonia-oxidizing bacterium, *Biogeosciences*, 7(9), 2695–2705, doi:10.5194/bg-7-2695-2010, 2010.
- Granger, J., Sigman, D. M., Lehmann, M. F. and Tortell, P. D.: Nitrogen and oxygen isotope fractionation during dissimilatory nitrate reduction by denitrifying bacteria, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 53(6), 2533–2545, doi:10.4319/lo.2008.53.6.2533, 2008.
- 10 IPCC: Summary for Policymakers., 2014.
- Jinuntuya-Nortman, M., Sutka, R. L., Ostrom, P. H., Gandhi, H. and Ostrom, N. E.: Isotopologue fractionation during microbial reduction of N₂O within soil mesocosms as a function of water-filled pore space, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 40, 2273–2280, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.05.016, 2008.
- 15 Kool, D. M., Müller, C., Wrage, N., Oenema, O. and Van Groenigen, J. W.: Oxygen exchange between nitrogen oxides and H₂O can occur during nitrifier pathways, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 41(8), 1632–1641, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.05.002, 2009.
- Kool, D. M., Wrage, N., Oenema, O., Van Kessel, C. and Van Groenigen, J. W.: Oxygen exchange with water alters the oxygen isotopic signature of nitrate in soil ecosystems, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 43(6), 1180–1185, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.02.006, 2011.
- 20 Kravchenko, A. N., Toosi, E. R., Guber, A. K., Ostrom, N. E., Yu, J., Azeem, K., Rivers, M. L. and Robertson, G. P.: Hotspots of soil N₂O emission enhanced through water absorption by plant residue, *Nat. Geosci.*, 10(7), 496–500, doi:10.1038/ngeo2963, 2017.
- Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Well, R., Köster, J. R., Fuß, R., Senbayram, M., Dittert, K. and Flessa, H.: Experimental determinations of isotopic fractionation factors associated with N₂O production and reduction during denitrification in soils, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 134, 55–73, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2014.03.010, 2014.
- 25 Mariotti, A., Germon, J. C., Hubert, P., Kaiser, P., Letolle, R., Tardieux, A. and Tardieux, P.: Experimental determination of nitrogen kinetic isotope fractionation: Some principles; illustration for the denitrification and nitrification processes, *Plant Soil*, 62(3), 413–430, doi:10.1007/BF02374138, 1981.
- McSwiney, C. P. and Robertson, G. P.: Nonlinear response of N₂O flux to incremental fertilizer addition in a continuous maize (Zea mays L.) cropping system, *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, 11(10), 1712–1719, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.01040.x, 2005.
- 30 Nafziger, E. D., Sawyer, J. E. and Hoeft, R. G.: Formulating N Recommendations for Corn in the Corn Belt Using Recent Data, *Proc. North Cent. Extension-Industry Soil Fertil. Conf.*, 20, 5–11 [online] Available from: <http://www.agronext.iastate.edu/soilfertility/info/nrecNCEISFC-04.pdf>, 2004.
- Ostrom, N. E. and Ostrom, P. H.: Handbook of Environmental Isotope Geochemistry, edited by M. Baskaran, pp. 453–476,

- Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg., 2012.
- Ostrom, N. E. and Ostrom, P. H.: Mining the isotopic complexity of nitrous oxide: a review of challenges and opportunities, *Biogeochemistry*, 132(3), 359–372, doi:10.1007/s10533-017-0301-5, 2017.
- Pan, B., Lam, S. K., Mosier, A., Luo, Y. and Chen, D.: Ammonia volatilization from synthetic fertilizers and its mitigation strategies: A global synthesis, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 232, 283–289, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2016.08.019, 2016.
- 5 Park, S., Pérez, T., Boering, K. A., Trumbore, S. E., Gil, J., Marquina, S. and Tyler, S. C.: Can N₂O stable isotopes and isotopomers be useful tools to characterize sources and microbial pathways of N₂O production and consumption in tropical soils?, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 25(1), doi:10.1029/2009GB003615, 2011.
- Paustian, K., Lehmann, J., Ogle, S., Reay, D., Robertson, G. P. and Smith, P.: Climate-smart soils, *Nature*, 532(7597), 49–57, doi:10.1038/nature17174, 2016.
- 10 Perez, T., Trumbore, S. E., Tyler, S. C., Davidson, E. A., Keller, M. and de Camargo, P. B.: Isotopic variability of N₂O emissions from tropical forest soils, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 14(2), 525–535, 2000.
- Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S. and Ravishankara, A. R.: Stratospheric ozone depletion due to nitrous oxide: influences of other gases, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 367(1593), 1256–1264, doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0377, 2012.
- 15 Ramanathan, V., Cicerone, R. J., Singh, H. B. and Kiehl, J. T.: Trace gas trends and their potential role in climate change, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 90(D3), 5547–5566, doi:10.1029/JD090iD03p05547., 1985.
- Ravishankara, A. R., Daniel, J. S. and Portmann, R. W.: Nitrous oxide (N₂O): the dominant ozone-depleting substance emitted in the 21st century., *Science* (80-.), 326(5949), 123–125, doi:10.1126/science.1176985, 2009.
- Reay, D. S., Davidson, E. A., Smith, K. A., Smith, P., Melillo, J. M., Dentener, F. and Crutzen, P. J.: Global agriculture and nitrous oxide emissions, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 2(6), 410–416, doi:10.1038/nclimate1458, 2012.
- 20 Robertson, G. P. and Vitousek, P. M.: Nitrogen in Agriculture: Balancing the Cost of an Essential Resource, *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 34(1), 97–125, doi:10.1146/annurev.enviro.032108.105046, 2009.
- Scharf, P. C., Shannon, D. K., Palm, H. L., Sudduth, K. A., Drummond, S. T., Kitchen, N. R., Mueller, L. J., Hubbard, V. C. and Oliveira, L. F.: Sensor-based nitrogen applications out-performed producer-chosen rates for corn in on-farm demonstrations, *Agron. J.*, 103(6), 1683–1691, doi:10.2134/agronj2011.0164, 2011.
- 25 Schreiber, F., Wunderlin, P., Udert, K. M. and Wells, G. F.: Nitric oxide and nitrous oxide turnover in natural and engineered microbial communities: Biological pathways, chemical reactions, and novel technologies, *Front. Microbiol.*, 3(OCT), 1–24, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2012.00372, 2012.
- Sebilo, M., Mayer, B., Nicolardot, B., Pinay, G. and Mariotti, A.: Long-term fate of nitrate fertilizer in agricultural soils, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 110(45), 18185–18189, doi:10.1073/pnas.1305372110, 2013.
- Shcherbak, I., Millar, N. and Robertson, G. P.: Global metaanalysis of the nonlinear response of soil nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions to fertilizer nitrogen, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 111(25), 9199–9204, doi:10.1073/pnas.1322434111, 2014.
- Sutka, R. L., Ostrom, N. E., Ostrom, P. H., Gandhi, H. and Breznak, J. A.: Nitrogen isotopomer site preference of N₂O produced by *Nitrosomonas europaea* and *Methylococcus capsulatus* bath, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 17(7), 738–745,

- doi:10.1002/rcm.968, 2003.
- Sutka, R. L., Ostrom, N. E., Ostrom, P. H., Breznak, J. A., Pitt, A. J., Li, F. and Gandhi, H.: Distinguishing Nitrous Oxide Production from Nitrification and Denitrification on the Basis of Isotopomer Abundances, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 72(1), 638–644, doi:10.1128/AEM.72.1.638, 2006.
- 5 Sutka, R. L., Adams, G. C., Ostrom, N. E. and Ostrom, P. H.: Isotopologue fractionation during N₂O production by fungal denitrification, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 22(24), 3989–3996, doi:10.1002/rcm.3820, 2008.
- Team, R.: R Development Core Team, R A Lang. *Environ. Stat. Comput.*, 55, 275–286 [online] Available from: <http://www.mendeley.com/research/r-language-environment-statistical-computing-96/%5Cnpapers2://publication/uuid/A1207DAB-22D3-4A04-82FB-D4DD5AD57C28>, 2013.
- 10 Toyoda, S., Mutoke, H., Yamagishi, H., Yoshida, N. and Tanji, Y.: Fractionation of N₂O isotopomers during production by denitrifier, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 37(8), 1535–1545, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.01.009, 2005.
- Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N. and Koba, K.: Isotopocule analysis of biologically produced nitrous oxide in various environments, *Mass Spectrom. Rev.*, 36, 135–160, doi:10.1002/mas, 2017.
- Venterea, R. T., Halvorson, A. D., Kitchen, N., Liebig, M. A., Cavigelli, M. A., Del Grosso, S. J., Motavalli, P. P., Nelson, K. A., Spokas, K. A., Singh, B. P., Stewart, C. E., Ranaivoson, A., Strock, J. and Collins, H.: Challenges and opportunities for mitigating nitrous oxide emissions from fertilized cropping systems, *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, 10(10), 562–570, doi:10.1890/120062, 2012.
- 15 Wickham, H.: *ggplot2*. [online] Available from: http://books.google.com/books?id=rhRqtQAACAAJ&dq=intitle:ggplot2+inauthor:wickham&ie=ISO-8859-1&source=gbs_gdata, 2009.
- 20 Wickham, H.: *ggplot2*, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Comput. Stat., 3(2), 180–185, doi:10.1002/wics.147, 2011.
- Yamagishi, H., Westley, M. B., Popp, B. N., Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N., Watanabe, S., Koba, K. and Yamanaka, Y.: Role of nitrification and denitrification on the nitrous oxide cycle in the eastern tropical North Pacific and Gulf of California, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences*, 112(2), 1–15, doi:10.1029/2006JG000227, 2007.
- 25 Yang, H., Gandhi, H., Ostrom, N. E. and Hegg, E. L.: Isotopic Fractionation by a Fungal P450 Nitric Oxide Reductase during the Production of N₂O, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 48(18), 10707–10715, doi:10.1021/es501912d, 2014.
- Yano, M., Toyoda, S., Tokida, T. and Hayashi, K.: Soil Biology & Biochemistry Isotopomer analysis of production, consumption and soil-to-atmosphere emission processes of N₂O at the beginning of paddy field irrigation, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 70, 66–78, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.11.026, 2014.
- 30 Yoshida, N.: 15N-depleted N₂O as a product of nitrification, *Nature*, 335, 528–529, doi:10.1038/335528a0, 1988.
- Yoshida, N. and Toyoda, S.: Constraining the atmospheric N₂O budget from intramolecular site preference in N₂O isotopomers, *Nature*, 405(6784), 330–4, doi:10.1038/35012558, 2000.
- Zhou, M. and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: Assessment of nitrate leaching loss on a yield-scaled basis from maize and wheat cropping systems, *Plant Soil*, 374(1–2), 977–991, doi:10.1007/s11104-013-1876-9, 2014.





Figure 1: $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, and site preference (SP) of N_2O produced during denitrification of NO_3^- by *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* subsp. *aureofaciens* and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* subsp. *chlororaphis* with different electron donor sources and concentrations. A larger value of $[-\text{flnf}/(1-f)]$, where f is the fraction of substrate remaining, represents earlier points in the reaction. The curved relationships are of the form $y = a + e^{b|x|}$, where y is the isotope value, x is $[-\text{flnf}/(1-f)]$ and a and b are the estimated coefficients that affect the y-intercept and curvilinear shape, respectively.







Figure 2. **Probability-Density distributions (PDD)** of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ net isotope effects (η) derived from the derivative of the exponential function (Eq. 4) describing the relationship between $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $[-\ln f/(1-f)]$ for *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* (orange) and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* (blue). Estimates of η were produced over the entire extent of the reaction (i.e. $f=0$ to 1). The left panel displays the

PDDs for citrate treatments and the right for succinate treatments. Positive values of η were not observed during reactions. Tally marks at the base of each panel indicate the actual distribution of calculated values.







Figure 3. **Probability Density distributions (PDD)** of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ net isotope effects (η) estimated from the derivative of an exponential function describing the relationship between $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $[-\text{flm}/(1-f)]$ for *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* (orange) and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* (blue). The estimates of η are extrapolated to include the complete extent of the reaction. The left panel displays the

EDDs for citrate treatments and the right for succinate treatments. Positive values of η were not observed during reactions. Tally marks at the base of each panel indicate the actual distribution of calculated values.



5 Figure 4. The mean site preference (SP) of N₂O produced during the reduction of NO₃⁻ by *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* (orange) and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* (blue) with different concentrations of electron donors: citrate and succinate. Error bars indicate 1 standard deviation.

10

15




Figure 5. A schematic representation of the multi-step reduction of nitrate to nitrous oxide during denitrification specific to *Pseudomonas aureofaciens* and *Pseudomonas chlororaphis*, which lack the enzyme nitrous oxide reductase. The enzymes responsible for the reduction of nitrogen species appear in boxes with rounded corners and are indicated by three letter sequences: nitrate reductase (NAR), nitrite reductase (NIR), and nitric oxide reductase (NOR). A nitrate/nitrite transporter protein is presented as a hexagon. The position of the enzymes with respect to the periplasm, membrane, or cytoplasm identify the location of the enzymes in the cell. Vertical dashed arrows indicate diffusion of various nitrogen species into and out of the cell, and curved dashed arrows represent transport across the membrane. Solid arrows represent enzyme catalysed reduction steps.

5

10

15