

General response

We are grateful to the Editors for considering our manuscript. We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments (*repeated in italics*), which revealed several gaps and options for improvement. These were the basis for substantial improvement of the manuscript. In the following we answer all comments and declare how we changed the manuscript to fulfil the comments.

To fulfil some of the requests, we had to repeat some of the modelling scenarios and add new ones. Doing that we realized that the empirical equation to calculate diffusivity was not the most suitable one to determine D_s at high soil moisture content. To check whether this would have significant impact on our results and conclusions we repeated all simulations using the most suitable equation to calculate D_s (Millington, 1959), finding only minor changes in the results. But nevertheless we replaced all model results with the new simulation results. Moreover, we extended the discussion to cover uncertainty of our approach more detailed. Finally we deleted Figure 3a because we realized that we did not address it in the text and found it to be dispensable.

Underestimation of denitrification rates from field application of the ¹⁵N gas flux method and its correction by gas diffusion modelling

Reinhard Well¹, Martin Maier², Dominika Lewicka-Szczebak¹, Jan-Reent Köster¹; and Nicolas Ruoss¹

¹Thünen Institute, Climate-Smart Agriculture, Braunschweig, Germany

²Forest Research Institute Baden-Württemberg, Dep. Soil and Environment, Freiburg, Germany

Correspondence to: Reinhard Well (reinhard.well@thuenen.de)

Abstract. Common methods for measuring soil denitrification *in situ* include monitoring the accumulation of ¹⁵N-labelled N₂ and N₂O evolved from ¹⁵N-labelled soil nitrate pool in closed chambers that are placed on the soil surface. Gas diffusion is considered to be the main transport process in the soil. Because accumulation of gases within the chamber decreases concentration gradients between soil and chamber over time, the surface efflux of gases decreases as well and gas production rates are underestimated if calculated from chamber concentrations without consideration of this mechanism. Moreover, concentration gradients to the non-labelled subsoil exist, inevitably causing downward diffusion of ¹⁵N-labelled denitrification products. A numerical 3-D model for simulating gas diffusion in soil was used in order to determine the significance of this source of error. Results show that subsoil diffusion of ¹⁵N-labelled N₂ and N₂O - and thus potential underestimation of denitrification derived from chamber fluxes - increases with chamber deployment time as well as with increasing soil gas diffusivity. Simulations based on the range of typical soil gas diffusivities of unsaturated soils showed that the fraction of N₂ and N₂O evolved from ¹⁵N-labelled NO₃⁻ that is not emitted at the soil surface during one hour chamber closing is always significant with values up to >50 % of total production. [This is](#) due to accumulation in the pore space of the ¹⁵N-labelled soil and diffusive flux to the unlabelled subsoil. Empirical coefficients to calculate denitrification from surface fluxes were derived by modelling multiple scenarios with varying soil water content. [Modelling several theoretical experimental set-ups showed that the fraction of produced gases that are retained in soil can be lowered by lowering the depth of ¹⁵N-labelling and/or increasing the length of the confining cylinder.](#)

Field experiments with arable silt loam soil for measuring denitrification with the ¹⁵N gas flux method were conducted to obtain direct evidence for the incomplete surface emission of gaseous denitrification products. We compared surface fluxes of ¹⁵N₂ and ¹⁵N₂O from ¹⁵N-labelled micro-plots confined by cylinders using the closed chamber method with cylinders open or closed at the bottom, finding 37% higher surface fluxes with bottom closed. Modeling fluxes of this experiment confirmed this effect, however with a higher increase in surface flux of 89%.

From our model and experimental results we conclude that field surface fluxes of ¹⁵N-labelled N₂ and N₂O severely underestimate denitrification rates if calculated from chamber accumulation only. The extent of this underestimation increases with closure time. Underestimation also occurs during laboratory incubations in closed systems due to pore space accumulation

Gelöscht:

Gelöscht:

of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O . Due to this bias in past denitrification measurements, denitrification in soils might be more relevant than assumed to date.

Corrected denitrification rates can be obtained by estimating subsurface flux and storage with our model. The observed deviation between experimental and modeled subsurface flux revealed the need for refined model evaluation which must include assessment of the spatial variability in diffusivity and production and the spatial dimension of the chamber.

1 Introduction

N_2O reduction to N_2 is the last step of microbial denitrification, i.e. anoxic reduction of nitrate (NO_3^-) to N_2 with the intermediates NO_2^- , NO and N_2O (Mueller and Clough, 2014). Commonly applied analytical techniques enable us to quantitatively analyse only the intermediate product of this process, N_2O , but not the final product, N_2 . The challenge to quantify denitrification rates is largely due to the difficulty in measuring N_2 production due to its spatial and temporal heterogeneity and the high N_2 -background of the atmosphere (Groffman et al., 2006). There are three principles to overcome the latter problem: (i) adding NO_3^- highly enriched in ^{15}N and monitoring ^{15}N labelled denitrification products (^{15}N gas flux method) (e.g. Siegel et al., 1982) ; (ii) adding acetylene to block N_2O reductase quantitatively and estimating total denitrification from N_2O production (acetylene inhibition technique, e.g. Felber et al., 2012) ; (iii) measuring denitrification gases during incubation of soils in absence of atmospheric N_2 using gas tight containers and artificial Helium/Oxygen atmosphere (HeO₂ method; Scholefield et al., 1997; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2002). Each of these methods to quantify denitrification rates in soils has various limitations with respect to potential analytical bias, applicability at different experimental scales and the necessity of expensive instrumentation that is not available for routine studies. Today the acetylene inhibition technique is considered unsuitable to quantify N_2 fluxes under natural atmosphere, since its main limitation (among several others, e.g. Saggar et al., 2013) is the catalytic decomposition of NO in presence of O_2 (Bollmann and Conrad, 1997a, b). This results in unpredictable underestimation of gross N_2O production (Nadeem et al., 2013). The ^{15}N gas flux method requires homogenous ^{15}N -labelling of the soil (Mulvaney and Vandenheuvel, 1988). Moreover, under natural atmosphere this method is not sensitive enough to detect small N_2 fluxes (Lewicka-Szczepak et al., 2013). Direct measurement of N_2 fluxes using the HeO₂ method is not subject to the problems associated with ^{15}N -based methods (Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2013), but the need for sophisticated gas tight incubation systems limits its use to laboratory incubations only. Consequently, the ^{15}N gas flux method is the only method potentially applicable in field conditions.

Denitrification in ecosystems is complexly controlled by interaction of labile C, abundance and community structure of denitrifiers, pore structure, soil and root respiration, and mineral N dynamics (Müller & Clough, 2014). It is difficult to keep conditions in the lab identical to the field where some conditions dynamically change due to climatic factors, but especially

Gelöscht: to measure

Gelöscht: gastight

Gelöscht: oxygen

Gelöscht: . (

Gelöscht:), resulting

Gelöscht:) and

Gelöscht: it

Gelöscht: gastight

due to the activity of plants. Hence, field measurements are indispensable for reliable determination of denitrification in ecosystems.

When chamber methods are used to determine soil gas fluxes to the atmosphere, a certain fraction of the produced gas is not emitted at the surface but remains in the soil (Parkin et al., 2011). This is because the accumulation of gases in the closed chamber decreases concentration gradients between soil and chamber atmosphere causing lowering of surface fluxes with increasing chamber deployment time (Healy et al., 1996). This effect has been addressed in numerous studies (Venterea et al., 2009; Healy et al., 1996; Sahoo et al., 2010). To correct bias from this effect, several approaches have been developed and compared (Parkin et al., 2011). Denitrification estimates based on measurements of N_2 and N_2O surface fluxes could also be biased by this effect. This had been suggested for the acetylene inhibition technique in the field (Mahmood et al., 1997) and also for the ^{15}N gas flux method (Sgouridis et al., 2016). However, to our knowledge the magnitude in possible underestimation of denitrification rates has not been investigated until now. It can be expected that diffusive loss of ^{15}N -labelled gases to the subsoil is even more relevant than the respective loss of non-labelled soil gases. This is due to the fact that the production of CO_2 and trace gases in soil is ubiquitous, whereas the formation of ^{15}N -labelled denitrification products is limited to the soil volume amended with ^{15}N -labelled NO_3^- .

Estimating bias from the diffusive loss of ^{15}N -labelled gases could be done by modelling. Previously, denitrification in subsoil had been quantified by fitting measured and modelled steady state concentration of $^{15}N_2 + ^{15}N_2O$ (Well and Myrold, 2002). Modelling diffusive fluxes of $^{15}N_2 + ^{15}N_2O$ produced in ^{15}N -labelled surface soil based on measured surface flux and diffusivity could be used to estimate its accumulation in pore space and diffusive loss to the subsoil. This could be used to quantify denitrification from the sum of surface flux, subsoil flux and storage within the ^{15}N -labelled soil volume.

Our objectives were thus to determine the significance of the fraction of ^{15}N -labelled denitrification products produced in ^{15}N -labelled soil in the field that is not emitted at the soil surface. This was done experimentally and by diffusion modelling. Moreover, we aimed to develop a procedure to determine denitrification rates from surface flux data. We hypothesized that (i) a significant fraction of ^{15}N -labelled denitrification products is not emitted at the soil surface, (ii) this fraction depends on diffusivity, chamber deployment time and depth of ^{15}N -labelling, and (iii.) diffusive loss of ^{15}N -labelled gases to the subsoil is more relevant than accumulation in the pore space of the ^{15}N -labelled soil.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Principles of the ^{15}N gas flux method and gas flux dynamics following ^{15}N tracer application

The ^{15}N gas flux method consists of quantifying N_2 and / or N_2O emitted from ^{15}N -labelled nitrate applied to soil in order to quantify fluxes from microbial denitrification (Mulvaney, 1988; Stevens et al., 1993) where N_2 and N_2O are formed from the

Gelösch:

Gelösch: , its bias was assessed

Gelösch:) and various empirical (Hutchinson & Mosier) or numerical (

Gelösch:) correction

Gelösch: While the production of CO_2 and trace gases in soil is ubiquitous, formation of ^{15}N -labelled denitrification products is limited to the soil volume amended with ^{15}N -labelled NO_3^- . Consequently, it

Gelösch: When applying ^{15}N tracer

Gelösch: subsoil to estimate subsoil

Gelösch: , diffusion

Gelösch: was used to determine

Gelösch: rates within the labelled volume

Gelösch: diffusion

Gelösch: labeled

Gelösch: and thus

combination of two NO precursor molecules. To quantify denitrification, experimental soil is typically confined by cylinders installed to a certain depth. These micro-plots are amended with ^{15}N -labelled nitrate either by surface application of the fertilizer (Kulkarni et al., 2011) or by injecting fertilizer solution using needles to achieve homogenous labelling (Sgouridis et al., 2016, Buchen et al., 2016). Emitted ^{15}N -labelled gases are collected in chambers fitted gas tight on top of the cylinders,

Gelösch: Sgouridis

Gelösch: 2016

Gelösch: gastight

typically for periods of one hour or longer. Soil-derived gases mix with background air inside the closed chambers. N_2 and N_2O fluxes from the labelled NO_3^- are calculated from the abundance of N_2 and N_2O isotopologues (i.e. molecular species that differ in the number of isotopic substitutions (Coplen, 2011)) in the gas accumulating in the chamber. To measure denitrification in arable soil, depth of confinement, and also of labelling, typically includes the a_p horizon of the soil, i.e. usually depth of tillage. In this horizon, most of denitrification activity is assumed due to its content in soil organic matter, undecomposed plant litter, organic root exudates, root respiration as well as fertilizer application to the surface (Groffman et al., 2009).

Gelösch:

To keep our modelling as simple as possible we assume a simplified process dynamics where in terms of N transformation only nitrate reduction by microbial denitrification occurs with N_2 and N_2O as emitted products.

The bias in determining denitrification rates from the accumulation of $^{15}\text{N}_2$ and $^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ is illustrated by a conceptual model (Figs. 1 and 2 a,b). After closing a chamber on top of the ^{15}N -labelled soil, the timing and magnitude of $^{15}(\text{N}_2+\text{N}_2\text{O})$ fluxes depend on the chamber volume, denitrification rates of the ^{15}N -labelled soil and on gas diffusivity within and around this soil (Fig. 1).

We define the fluxes of ^{15}N -labelled gases as relative fluxes in relation to the production of these gases as follows:

- The *surface flux* is the flux of ^{15}N -labelled gases to the atmosphere at the soil surface, either into the free atmosphere or into a closed flux chamber. Relative surface flux is the ratio between surface flux rate and production rate.
- Relative *subsoil flux* is the flux rate of ^{15}N -labelled gases at the lower boundary of the ^{15}N -labelled soil in relation to the production rate. Subsoil flux occurs always in downward direction and is thus expressed as negative flux.
- Accumulation of ^{15}N -labelled gases within the ^{15}N -labelled soil is referred to as *storage flux* which is the increase in the concentration of accumulated ^{15}N -labelled gases. Relative storage flux is thus storage flux rate in relation to the production rate.

Gelösch: amount

Assuming constancy of denitrification rates and gas diffusivity, the following dynamics in concentration and gaseous fluxes would establish:

- Following ^{15}N -labelling, production of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O would start at constant rates.
- Before closing the chamber, the upper soil boundary is the free atmosphere where gas exchange is fast enough to preclude ^{15}N accumulation above the soil surface.

- Production leads to accumulation of ^{15}N -labelled gases and thus to build-up of concentration gradients to the surface and to the subsoil (Fig. 2a), which causes increasing surface and subsoil fluxes while the storage flux decreases (Fig. 2b).
- After a certain time, steady state is reached, where all fluxes reach constancy.
- Closing the chamber changes the upper boundary since chamber concentration increases due to surface flux (Fig. 2a).

Consequently, subsoil and storage flux are rising again, whereas surface flux is decreasing.

If diffusivity and volume of ^{15}N -labelled soil is known and constancy of parameters is long enough to achieve steady state before closing the chamber, then the relative surface flux can be determined by modelling production and diffusion with open chamber until steady state and during the subsequent phase of chamber closing. Production can thus be calculated from modelled relative surface flux and measured surface flux rate.

Formatiert: Listenaufsatz, Aufgezählt + Ebene: 1 +
Ausgerichtet an: 0,63 cm + Einzug bei: 1,27 cm

Gelöscht: labelled

Gelöscht:




Fig. 1: Conceptual model describing the dynamics of diffusive fluxes (black dotted arrows) of ^{15}N -labelled gaseous denitrification products evolved in a ^{15}N -labelled soil volume (shaded area) that is confined by a cylinder with open bottom to the subsoil, but temporarily closed from above with a flux chamber to collect emitted gases.





Figure 2a: Increase in pore space concentrations of N_2 evolved from the ^{15}N -labelled pool after start of denitrification with open chamber, when production of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O would start at constant rates, leading to accumulation of ^{15}N -labelled gases and thus to build-up of concentration gradients to the surface and to the subsoil. Concentration trends following chamber closure are shown as dotted lines.

Gelöscht: 1



Formatiert: Schriftart: +Textkörper (Times New Roman)

Formatiert: Zellenabstand: 1,5 Zeilen

Gelöscht: .

Formatiert: Schriftart: +Textkörper (Times New Roman)

Gelöscht: .

Formatiert: Schriftart: +Textkörper (Times New Roman)





Figure 2b: Time course of relative fluxes of N_2 and N_2O evolved from the ^{15}N -labelled pool after start of denitrification with open chamber, showing increasing surface and subsoil fluxes while the storage flux decreases until steady state is reached. Trends of fluxes following chamber closure are shown as dotted lines.

2.2 Numerical Finite Element Modeling of soil gas transport

2.2.1 Conceptual model of the experimental set-up

Numerical finite element modelling (FEM) was used for simulating gas transport during the chamber measurements (COMSOL Multiphysics, Version 5.2 COMSOL Inc., Burlington, Massachusetts, US) to estimate surface and subsurface fluxes of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O . A conceptual 3D model was built based on geometry and properties of the experimental set-up, this means soil and the cylinder containing the labelled NO_3^- , the atmosphere and the chamber. We assumed a soil pore matrix consisting of 2 soil layers with homogenous properties each (total pore volume, soil water content and soil gas diffusivity) into which a gas impermeable cylinder of 15 cm diameter and 35 cm length was vertically installed to a depth of 30 cm. The soil NO_3^- within the cylinder was assumed to be homogeneously distributed and labelled with 50 atom % ^{15}N to produce homogeneously the isotopologues of N_2 and N_2O ($^{14}N^{14}N$, $^{15}N^{14}N$, $^{15}N^{15}N$, $^{14}N^{14}NO$, $^{15}N^{14}NO$, $^{15}N^{15}NO$), while the surrounding soil was not producing any of these gas species. The latter assumption is a simplification to reduce modelling effort, since all of the isotopologues are produced to some extent also from non-labelled N sources outside the ^{15}N -labelled



Gelöscht:

Formatiert: Leerraum zwischen asiatischem und westlichem Text nicht anpassen, Leerraum zwischen asiatischem Text und Zahlen nicht anpassen

Gelöscht:

Gelöscht: .

soil volume. However, due to the high ^{15}N -enrichment in the labelled soil, the abundance of $^{15}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$ is 69 times higher in the ^{15}N pool derived fluxes and the abundance of $^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$ is even 18,600 times higher, compared to natural abundance of ^{15}N . Hence, fluxes from non-labelled N pools would not significantly affect the model result. A cylinder shaped gas impermeable cover chamber of totally 20 cm height was used to close temporarily the base cylinder to measure soil gas fluxes. The model assumes that the chamber atmosphere is always homogeneously mixed and that production is constant within the ^{15}N -labelled soil volume. The cylinder was always assumed open at the bottom unless differently specified.

Two different experimental set-ups were modelled and used in the field. The first experimental set-up (A bottom open) is described by the conceptual model above and includes an open bottom cylinder containing the labelled NO_3^- . In the second set-up (A bottom closed), the lower end of the cylinder was sealed, so that gases could only be emitted via the surface. This was represented by an additional impermeable thin layer (Table 1).

2.2.2 Gas transport modelling

Molecular gas diffusion was assumed to be the only transport mechanism in the soil. The left and right side and the bottom of the modelled domain were defined as impermeable (Neumann boundary condition). The upper boundary of the atmospheric layer was set to atmospheric gas concentrations as Dirichlet boundary condition, and acts therefore as sink for the gases produced. To increase computational efficiency, a 2D axisymmetric modelling approach was chosen since the cylinder and the chamber were round objects. The modelled volume was set to sufficiently large volume with a soil depth of 1.0 m and a diameter of 1.0 m to ensure that the dimension of the modelled area does not affect the modelling outcome within the cylinder and chamber area.

Gas transport was modelled for all isotopologues of N_2 and N_2O . Diffusivity in free air (D_0) was set to $0.193 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for $^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$ and $0.137 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for $^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{NO}$ according to Marrero (1972). Diffusivity in free air of $^{15}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$ ($0.1913 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$), $^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$ ($0.1896 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$), $^{15}\text{N}^{14}\text{NO}$ ($0.1364 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$) and $^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{NO}$ ($0.1358 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$) were derived based on their mass following Jost (1960). The relative diffusion coefficient in soil D_s/D_0 accounts for the reduced diffusivity in a porous system. D_s/D_0 was calculated using the diffusion model of Millington (1959) ($D_s/D_0 = E^2/TP^{2/3}$), where the air-filled pore volume E was calculated as the difference of the total pore volume TP of the soil and the volumetric soil water content SWC , and TP was derived from bulk density. The free atmosphere was assumed to be well mixed single layer and the effective diffusivity was set to $40 \times D_0$, so that the concentration in the atmosphere was kept stable.

2.3 Modelling set-ups and scenarios

Different experimental set-ups and scenarios were modelled with the lower end of the cylinder sealed or open (A bottom closed; A bottom open), describing the actually used field set-up (Table 1). Also further theoretical set-ups have been modelled to evaluate the effect of the dimension of the cylinder and labelled zone (B-scenarios).

[1] verschoben (Einfügung)

Gelöscht:

Formatiert: Schriftart: Fett

Formatiert: Standard

Gelöscht: (

Gelöscht: .

Gelöscht: (

Gelöscht: .

Gelöscht: (

Gelöscht: and Quirk, 1961

Gelöscht: $E^{4/3}$

Formatiert: Hochgestellt

Gelöscht: $) \times D_0$ from

Gelöscht: which

Gelöscht: .

Gelöscht: 2.

Table 1: Modelled set ups

Set up	Bottom	Cylinder length	Labelled zone
<u>A bottom open</u>	Bottom open	30 cm	0- 30 cm
<u>A bottom closed</u>	Bottom closed	30 cm	0- 30 cm
<u>B 30 30</u>	Bottom open	30 cm	0- 30 cm
<u>B 45 30</u>	Bottom open	45 cm	0- 30 cm
<u>B 45 45</u>	Bottom open	45 cm	0- 45 cm
<u>B 60 45</u>	Bottom open	60 cm	0- 45 cm

2.3.1 Time until steady state after labelling

Time dependent modelling of the open chamber set up was performed to assess the time that is needed after the initiation of the system, i.e. after adding labelled NO_3^- , until the production and transport of the N_2O and N_2 isotopologues reach a steady state concentration distribution within the soil cylinder and the surrounding soil (Figs. 2a and 2b). This represents the minimum time to be waited after the label application before the first chamber measurement.

2.3.2 Modelling chamber measurements

To model chamber measurement, two modelling steps were run. In a first modelling step, steady state concentration distributions assuming steady denitrification were modelled for the open chamber. The resulting concentration distributions were then used in a second modelling step as input for time step 0 for the time dependent modelling of the closed chamber (Figs. 2a and 2b). This approach was used for all modelling scenarios.

2.3.3 Modelling the effect of soil moisture

Parameter sweeps were conducted for the set-ups used in the field (A bottom open and A bottom closed, Table 1) to assess the theoretical effect of soil moisture, pore volumes and production rates. This was done to account for these transport related effects in the calculation of the flux measurements. For all parameter combinations a new model was calculated.

Total pore volume was set to $0.51 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ for the parameter sweep which corresponds to a bulk soil density of 1.30 g cm^{-3} . The soil water contents used for the parameter sweep were 0.2, 0.3, 0.35 and $0.4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ and corresponded to a range of D_s/D_0 of 0.053-0.210. The production rates of the gas species used for the parameter sweep were chosen (Table 2) so that the outcome of the parameter sweep models covered the range of the observed concentration of the respective species.

Gelöscht: -

Gelöscht: that means

Gelöscht:

Gelöscht: Fig

Gelöscht: 4

Gelöscht: fluxes

Gelöscht: (Figures 2 a and b).

[1] nach oben verschoben: Two different experimental set-ups were modelled and used in the field.

Gelöscht: The first experimental set-up is represented by the conceptual model described above, and includes an open bottom cylinder containing the labelled NO_3^- . In the second set-up, the lower end of the cylinder was sealed, which was represented by an additional impermeable thin layer (Table 1).
Four additional theoretical experimental set-ups were modelled to assess the effect of the soil cylinder length and the length of the labelled zone within the cylinder. For these set-ups the soil was assumed to consist of one homogenous layer instead of two layers.

Table 1 Modelled scenarios; *indicates the set-ups where additional parameter sweeps of soil moisture and production rates of the gas species were run.

Set up

... [1]

Gelöscht: 1

Gelöscht:

Formatiert: Schriftart: Kursiv

Gelöscht: -

Formatiert: Schriftart: Kursiv

Gelöscht: 1

Formatiert: Schriftart: Kursiv

Formatiert: Schriftart: Kursiv

Gelöscht: to be able

Gelöscht: This means, for

Gelöscht:

Table 2 Range of parameter values used to assess effect of soil gas transport and production rates

Parameter	Parameter range
$^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$ Production	3.0-60 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
$^{15}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$ Production	0.3-6.0 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
$^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$ Production	0.03-6.0 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
$^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{NO}$ Production	0.3-6.0 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
$^{15}\text{N}^{14}\text{NO}$ Production	0.03-1.5 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
$^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{NO}$ Production	0.03-1.5 $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$
Soil water Content	0.2- 0.4 $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$

The output of the parameter sweeps of scenario *A_bottom_open* and scenario *A_bottom_closed* included combinations of soil water content, production rates of the soil core, chamber concentrations, and fluxes into the chamber and into the subsoil of the respective gas species. This dataset allowed for linking the gas concentration in the chamber after 2h at a given soil moisture with the respective production rate. Non-linear functions were fitted to the dataset (PROC NLIN, SAS 9.2, SAS Institute Inc., Cary) so that the original production of a gas species could be directly calculated from the concentration after 2h of the respective gas, the total pore volume and the soil moisture. Instead of soil water content, the soil gas diffusion coefficient D_s was used as factor, which allowed to derive a single functional relationship for all gas species for each scenario. This procedure was chosen as an efficient alternative to inverse modelling of individual datasets as described in Laemmel et al. (2019).

Four additional theoretical experimental set-ups were modelled to assess the effect of the soil cylinder length and the length of the labelled zone within the cylinder (B-scenarios, Table 1). For these set-ups the same soil parameters as for the field scenarios was used. To assess the effect of soil moisture, the model was run at soil water contents of 0.24, 0.34 and 0.44 $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$.

Underestimation of gas production was quantified as difference between the production (P_i) and the mean surface efflux during the chamber closure (mean Efflux_c), divided by P_i [underestimation = $(P_i - \text{mean Efflux}_c)/P_i$]. The mean surface efflux during the chamber closure corresponds to a linear approach, e.g., the flux is calculated using the initial and final gas concentration. Subsoil loss was quantified as mean subsoil flux at the lower end of the core during the chamber closure divided by P_i .

2.3 Field measurements

Experiments were part of a field campaign to measure N_2O fluxes and denitrification in an arable soil cropped with maize. The soil was a Haplic Luvisol developed in loess (silt loam texture with 83±3% silt, 15±3% clay, 2±0.5% sand) with a pH of

Gelösch: .

Gelösch: NN

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: ^{15}NN

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: N_2O

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: ^{15}NNO

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2

Gelösch: 3/

Gelösch: 3

Gelösch: ¶

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: -

Gelösch: /

Gelösch: 2 hours

Gelösch: 2 hours

Gelösch: (

Gelösch: ., 2018).

Gelösch: loamy

6.7±0.1 (in CaCl₂), a total organic carbon content of 1.24 ± 0.18 % (TOC) and a total nitrogen content of 0.16±0.02 % N in the 0-30 cm topsoil layer. Experiments were conducted between May 30 and June 4 2016.

Four aluminium cylinders of 35 cm length and tapered at the lower end were driven into the soil to 30 cm depth, thus leaving the upper end 5 cm above the soil surface. ¹⁵N-labelling was conducted May 30 as described previously (Buchen et al., 2016).

5 Soil columns were fertilized with ¹⁵N-labelled KNO₃ (70 atom % ¹⁵N) at 10 mg N kg⁻¹, resulting in a fertilizer equivalent of 45 kg N per ha. The tracer was dissolved in distilled water and then applied by injections via 12 equidistant steel capillaries. Defined volumes were injected at 2.5, 7.5, 12.5, 17.5, 22.5 and 27.5 cm depth using a peristaltic pump (Ismatec BVP, Wertheim, Germany) to achieve homogenous labelling at 0 to 30 cm depth. Fluxes of N₂O were determined using the closed chamber method (Hutchinson and Mosier, 1981) with opaque PVC chambers with a volume of 4.42 dm³ (diameter 1.5 dm, height 2 dm). At each sampling date, chambers were closed and sealed air tight with rubber bands for 120 minutes. Headspace sampling for GC analysis was performed in evacuated screw-cap exetainers (12 mL) in a sampling interval of 0, 20, 40, 60 minutes using a 30 ml syringe. 120 minutes after closing, duplicate headspace samples were taken for GC and IRMS analysis. Flux measurements were conducted daily, but only the final date of this measurement campaign (June 4) was used to evaluate the extent of diffusive loss of ¹⁵N-labelled N₂ and N₂O to the subsoil. This was done by comparing conventional flux measurements with cylinders open to the subsoil or with cylinders closed at the bottom. For the latter, cylinders were carefully removed from the surrounding soil. Soil material extending below the lower end of the cylinders was cut off with a knife. Bottom ends were sealed with plastic foil that was fixed at the outer cylinder wall with adhesive tape. Finally, sealed cylinders were put back to their original position in the surrounding soil in order to keep temperature within the cylinders identical to the surrounding soil. Chambers were fitted on the cylinders again for 120 minutes. Samples were collected from the chambers as in the conventional flux measurement. Between measurements with open and closed bottom, cylinders remained open at the top for 120 minutes to allow equilibration of soil air with the free atmosphere and thus to release accumulated ¹⁵N₂ and ¹⁵N₂O.

Formatiert: Schriftart: 10 Pt.

2.4 Analysis

25 2.4.1 Soil analyses

Soil water content was determined by weight loss after 24h drying at 110°C. Soil NO₃⁻ and NH₄⁺ were extracted in 0.01 M CaCl₂ solution (1:10 ratio) by shaking at room temperature for one hour and NO₃⁻ and NH₄⁺ concentrations were determined colorimetrically with an automated analyser (Skalar Analytical B.V., Breda, The Netherlands).

2.4.2 Isotopic analysis of NO₃⁻

¹⁵N abundances of NO₃⁻ (a_{NO3}) was measured according to the procedure described in (Eschenbach et al., 2017). NO₃⁻ was reduced to NO by Vanadium –III- chloride (VCl3). ¹⁵N measurement of produced NO was done with a quadrupole mass spectrometer (GAM 200, InProcess, Bremen, Germany).

2.4.3 Total N₂O

Samples were analysed using an Agilent 7890A gas chromatograph (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) equipped with a pulsed discharge detector (VICI, V-D-3-I-7890-220). Precision, as given by the standard deviation (1 σ of four standard gas mixtures) was typically 1.5%.

2.4.4.2 Isotopic analysis of N₂ and N₂O

Gas samples were analysed for m/z 28 (¹⁴N¹⁴N), 29 (¹⁴N¹⁵N) and 30 (¹⁵N¹⁵N) of N₂ using a modified GasBench II preparation system coupled to an IRMS (MAT 253, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) according to Lewicka-Szczebak et al. (2013). This system allows a simultaneous determination of mass ratios ²⁹R (29/28) and ³⁰R (30/28) of three separated gas species (N₂, N₂+N₂O and N₂O), all measured as N₂ gas after N₂O reduction in a Cu oven. For each of the analysed gas species, the fraction originating from the ¹⁵N-labelled pool with respect to total N in the gas sample (f_p) as well as the ¹⁵N enrichment of the ¹⁵N-labelled N pool (a_p) producing N₂O (a_{p,N2O}) or N₂+N₂O (a_{p,N2+N2O}) were calculated after Spott et al. (2006) as described in Lewicka-Szczebak et al. (2017). The residual fraction of N₂O remaining after N₂O reduction to N₂ (r_{N2O}) is given by the ratio f_{p,N2O}/f_{p,N2+N2O}. Typical repeatability of ²⁹R and ³⁰R (1 σ of 3 replicate measurements) was 5×10⁻⁷ for both values.

2.5 Statistics

Results of flux measurements with bottom open or bottom closed were compared by a paired t-test. Fluxes were log-transformed which is a common prerequisite for analysing denitrification data due to its skewed distribution (Folorunso and Rolston, 1984). The measured additional N₂+N₂O flux was compared with the modelled value with a one-sample t-test. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to derive a model of N₂+N₂O production. T-tests and regression analysis were conducted with WinSTAT and SAS, respectively.

3 Results

3.1 Modelling

Gelöscht: ..(Lewicka-Szczebak et al.,

Gelöscht:)

Gelöscht: Modeling

3.1.1 Surface and subsurface fluxes before and after chamber closure

Modelling results of Scenario A bottom open (imitating the field set-up) demonstrated 3D spatial distribution of gas concentrations and the resulting diffusive fluxes with highest concentrations in the centre of the ¹⁵N-labelled soil volume with open chamber at steady state (Fig. 2a, Fig. S1). Time until steady state after the onset of ¹⁵(N₂+N₂O) production increased with decreasing gas diffusivity and increasing soil moisture. For soil water content (SWC) of 0.34 g g⁻¹, it was approximately 3 hours (Fig. 2a). Soil air concentration of ¹⁵(N₂+N₂O) at steady state also increased with SWC (data not shown). Chamber closing leads to an increase of maximum concentrations (Fig. S1) and also to lowering of surface fluxes (Figs. 3 and 4).

After chamber closing, surface flux decreases continuously while subsurface flux increases and the storage flux initially increases before gradually decreasing. This shows that the lowering of surface flux with increasing time of chamber closing results from increasing subsoil flux but also from further accumulation of denitrification products in pore space. While surface flux is largest among all fluxes at chamber closing, it is exceeded by subsoil flux after about one hour. With increasing SWC, and thus decreasing diffusivity, the change in fluxes with time is lowering (Fig. 4). Highest relative subsoil fluxes are thus obtained at lowest SWC. For N₂O, the decrease in surface flux is slightly lower compared to N₂ (Fig. 4). The change in relative

fluxes is almost identical for the different isotopologues of N₂ and N₂O (only shown for N₂ in Fig. S3).

To understand the effect of the labelling design, modelled fluxes of scenario B 30 30, B 45 30, B 45 45, B 60 45 were compared. With decreasing depth of ¹⁵N-labelling, surface flux during the first hours after chamber closing increases, since less denitrification products accumulate or are lost to the subsoil. This is evident by comparing fluxes obtained with 30 cm and 45 cm depth of confined ¹⁵N-labelled soil (Fig. 5). Increasing cylinder length below the depth of labelled soil, e.g., if the length of the cylinder extends 15 cm below the 30 cm or 45 cm deep labelled soil, yields an increase in surface flux and slight decrease in subsoil flux due to more accumulation of ¹⁵N-labelled gases below the ¹⁵N-labelled soil. Hence, underestimation of production based on surface flux is more severe with deeper labelling, but is lowering if the depth of confinement is increased.

Modelled underestimation of N₂ production derived from chamber accumulation is summarized in Table 3. Depending on diffusivity, depth of ¹⁵N-labeling and depth of confinement, underestimation ranges between 28 and 71 %. Possible deviations of these estimates that would result from errors in the determination of diffusivity can be seen by comparing the modelled underestimation at different SWC, giving a range of, e.g., 51 to 61% for the B 30 30 scenario with 2 h closure.

Gelöscht: ¶
The

Gelöscht: shows

Gelöscht: 3a

Gelöscht: /

Gelöscht:))

Gelöscht: 3b

Gelöscht: 40

Gelöscht: and thus smaller concentration gradients to the subsoil.

Table 3. Underestimation of N₂ production by chamber measurements using linear regression over time and mean subsoil loss of N₂ produced within the ¹⁵N-labelled soil. Underestimation and subsoil loss are relative to production rates of the labelled core.

	Scenario	<i>B 30 30</i>		<i>B 45 30</i>		<i>B 45 45</i>		<i>B 60 45</i>	
Soil	Closure	Underest.	Subsoil	Underest.	Subsoil	Underest.	Subsoil	Underest.	Subsoil
Water	time	Chamber	loss	Chamber	loss	Chamber	loss	Chamber	loss
Content									
0.24	1h	57%	36%	45%	21%	55%	42%	53%	28%
0.24	2h	61%	38%	49%	22%	59%	44%	56%	28%
0.24	6h	71%	47%	59%	27%	67%	51%	65%	32%
0.34	1h	53%	36%	41%	22%	52%	44%	50%	29%
0.34	2h	55%	37%	43%	22%	55%	45%	52%	29%
0.34	6h	61%	42%	50%	25%	60%	48%	57%	31%
0.44	1h	51%	40%	42%	26%	55%	51%	53%	34%
0.44	2h	51%	40%	42%	26%	56%	51%	53%	34%
0.44	6h	53%	41%	44%	26%	57%	51%	55%	35%

20 If diffusion to the subsoil was omitted, e.g. by closing the bottom of cylinders in the field, or during laboratory incubations, soil air concentrations and surface fluxes increase (Fig. 6). When comparing values with and without omitted subsoil diffusion, relative surface flux two hours after closure was 0.75 and 0.4, respectively. But with bottom closed, surface flux was still significantly lower than production due to continuing pore space accumulation (relative storage flux of 0.25 after 2 hours).

Gelöscht: 35

Formatiert: Beschriftung




Figure 3: Relative fluxes of ^{15}N after chamber closing in scenario A bottom open.

Gelöscht: ¶ ... [2]


Gelöscht: 3a: Increase in pore space and chamber concentrations of ^{15}N after chamber closing.¶

¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

... [3]

Formatiert: Schriftart: 9 Pt.

Formatiert: Schriftart: Kursiv



Gelöscht:






Figure 4: Relative fluxes following chamber closing with different water contents in scenario A bottom open (surface flux, storage flux and subsoil flux starting positive, at zero and negative, respectively).



Gelöscht:

5

Figure 5: Impact of the depth of the active core (representing depth of ^{15}N labelling) and/or length of cylinder on relative surface and subsurface fluxes (scenarios [B_30_30](#), [B_45_30](#), [B_45_45](#), [B_60_45](#))





Fig. 6: Simulated time course of surface and subsurface fluxes with bottom open or closed bottom (scenario A bottom open and A bottom closed at SWC = 0.35).



Gelöscht: .

Gelöscht: scenario runs with the model, obtaining

Gelöscht: ¶

Gelöscht: ¶

Gelöscht:

Gelöscht: fitting parameters

3.1.2 Determination of denitrification rates based on chamber concentration

We conducted several runs using the field scenarios A bottom open and A bottom closed to generate a dataset that allowed the parametrization of functions that describe the relation of the concentration reached after 2h of chamber closure and the production within the labelled soil volume. This was done to allow a comparison of modelled data with the field measurements (Table 5). Moreover, we hereby give an example how denitrification rates can be calculated using empirical equations, and thus without the need to run the 3D-model for each data evaluation.

We obtained the following equation to calculate the production of each gas species of interest ($x = {}^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{N}$, ${}^{14}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$, ${}^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$, ${}^{14}\text{N}^{14}\text{NO}$, ${}^{14}\text{N}^{15}\text{NO}$ or ${}^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{NO}$) based on chamber concentration after a certain time of closure:

$$P_x = C_x \times \alpha + \delta \times C_x \times D_s \quad (1)$$

where P_x is the production for the respective gas species ($\text{L ha}^{-1} \text{d}^{-1}$), C_x is concentration in ppm, D_s the apparent gas diffusion coefficient ($\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$) and α and δ are fit parameter.

Table 4: Coefficients for the calculation of denitrification rates using Eq. 1 based on chamber concentrations for two hour chamber closing time, 30 cm depth of ¹⁵N labelling, chamber height of 15 cm and 15 cm diameter and assuming subsoil diffusivity identical to diffusivity of the ¹⁵N-labelled soil. Coefficients α and δ were derived by regression analysis of modelled concentration ($R^2 > 0.999$).

	α	δ
Production, Bottom open	35.4975 ± 0.012	432.9 ± 0.797
Production, Bottom closed	18.9469 ± 0.0133	219.4 ± 0.9026
Subsoil flux, bottom open	-15.282 ± 0.0131	-220.2 ± 0.5983
Surface flux, bottom open	16.8918 ± 0.00034	-1.3695 ± 0.8974
Surface flux, bottom closed	16.8918 ± 0.00262	-1.3655 ± 0.0178

3.2 Field measurement

3.2.1 Soil moisture, mineral N and bulk density

Average NO₃⁻-N was 16 mg N kg⁻¹ without significant trends with depth and no significant differences between cylinders (Table S1). NH₄⁺-N was highest in 0 to 10 cm depth (1.8 mg N kg⁻¹) and < 1 mg N kg⁻¹ below 10 cm depth. Average ¹⁵N atom fraction of extracted NO₃⁻ (¹⁵a) was 0.15, but values increased with depth in all cylinders, where 20-30 cm averages (0.2) were more than twice compared to 0-10 cm depth (0.09). Bulk density ranged between 1.48 and 1.52 with highest values at 10 to 20 cm depth. WFPS was higher at 0 to 10 cm depth (72%) than at 10 to 30 cm depth (60 to 62 %) with similar depth trends in all cylinders.

Gelöscht: 3

Gelöscht:

Gelöscht: 34.6310

Gelöscht: 01

Gelöscht: 410.1

Gelöscht: 434

Gelöscht: 7160

Gelöscht: 0115

Gelöscht: 182.6

Gelöscht: 4902

Gelöscht: 5614

Gelöscht: 0115

Gelöscht: 249.7

Gelöscht: 4979

Gelöscht: 5368

Gelöscht: 00467

Gelöscht: -11.5651

Gelöscht: 2021

Gelöscht: 8835

Gelöscht: 00102

Gelöscht: -

Gelöscht: 0918 ±0.0436

Table 5: N₂+N₂O fluxes of field experiments with 2 hours chamber closing with and without closed bottom in comparison with modelled data.

#	Type and determination of data	Result
1	Measured N ₂ + N ₂ O surface flux, bottom open (g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	589 ± 284
2	Measured N ₂ + N ₂ O surface flux, bottom closed (g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	805 ± 369
3	% additional measured surface flux with bottom closed [100×(#2-#1)/#2]	36.7
4	Modelled relative surface flux, bottom open	0.469
5	Modelled relative surface flux, bottom closed	0.879
6	% additional modelled surface flux with bottom closed [100×(#5-#4)/#4]	88.2
7	Modelled N ₂ + N ₂ O production (g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	1055
8	Modelled relative subsoil flux, bottom open	0.432
9	Modelled relative storage flux, bottom open	0.099
10	modelled relative storage flux, bottom closed	0.121

Gelöscht: 4

Gelöscht: 473

Gelöscht: 895

Gelöscht: 89.3

Gelöscht: 451

Gelöscht: 076

Gelöscht: 105

5 3.2.2 Field fluxes

The comparison between surface flux with or without closing the cylinder bottom was conducted on June 4, 2016 with chamber closing at 10:40 AM (bottom open) and 2:40 PM (bottom closed). Mean surface flux of N₂+N₂O with bottom open was 589 g N ha⁻¹ d⁻¹ (Table 4) and thus in between the fluxes observed during preceding two days (460 ± 161 g N ha⁻¹ d⁻¹ on June 2, 6:50 PM; 657 ± 206 g N ha⁻¹ d⁻¹ on June 3 at 11 AM). This shows that denitrification rates were quite stable over several days and that denitrification was a significant N loss, probably due to the coincidence of high soil moisture and NO₃⁻ content (Table S1). The residual fraction of N₂O remaining after N₂O reduction to N₂ (*r*_{N₂O}) was 0.15 on average (Table S2), showing that N₂ dominated N₂+N₂O fluxes. Mean ¹⁵a values for each cylinder were somewhat variable (0.09 to 0.18). Means of ¹⁵a (Table S1) and of the ¹⁵N enrichment of the labelled N pool producing N₂O (*a*_{P-N₂O}, Table S2) were in close agreement (0.15 and 0.16, respectively).

15

Comparing N_2+N_2O surface fluxes when the cylinders were open or closed at the bottom resulted in significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher surface fluxes when closed (Table S2) which was evident for each of the replicate micro-plots (Table S2). Because bottom-closed measurement was conducted as soon as possible immediately after the bottom-open measurement, i.e. after venting of the cylinders with chambers open for two hours and thus four hours after bottom open measurements, we assumed that denitrification rates had not changed significantly and the increase in surface fluxes was due to bottom closing.

The a_{p,N_2O} values of bottom-open and bottom-closed measurements exactly coincided. Conversely, the N_2O residual fraction (r_{N_2O}) of individual cylinders differed inconsistently since r_{N_2O} of bottom-closed measurements were higher in replicates 1 and 4, but were lower in replicates 2 and 3.

3.3 Comparison of modelled and measured surface flux

The ability of the model to predict the time pattern of gas accumulation was evaluated by comparing measured and simulated values. Model runs using the D_s values calculated from measured moisture and bulk density data of the field experiment assuming open or closed bottom yielded relative surface fluxes of 0.47 and 0.88, respectively (Table S2). The additional surface flux with bottom closed was thus quite relevant according to both, model and measurement. However, the magnitude of the modelled additional flux (88%) was more than twice, and thus significantly higher ($P < 0.001$) compared to the measured value. Using Eq. 1 and N_2+N_2O concentration in the chamber measured in the field with open cylinder bottom and using respective coefficients of Table 1 resulted in N_2+N_2O production of $1055 \text{ g N ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The modelled subsurface flux with bottom open was almost half of the N_2+N_2O production. Modelled accumulation of N_2+N_2O in the pore space of the ^{15}N -labelled soil was higher with bottom closed (relative storage flux of 0.42) compared to bottom open (relative storage flux of 0.10). Evaluation of N_2 and N_2O fluxes individually yielded results similar to N_2+N_2O fluxes (data not shown).

4 Discussion

4.1 Field study

Our comparison between $^{15}(N_2+N_2O)$ fluxes from ^{15}N -labelled micro-plots with and without closing the bottom of the cylinders supplied for the first time direct evidence for the underestimation of $^{15}(N_2+N_2O)$ production due to diffusive loss to the subsoil as suggested earlier (Mahmood et al., 1998; Sgouridis et al., 2016). In view of the poor sensitivity of the ^{15}N gas flux method in the field under ambient atmosphere (Well et al., 2018), a prerequisite for this proof was the occurrence of sufficiently high and relatively stable denitrification rates. These conditions were given in our experiment due to the coincidence of high soil moisture and NO_3^-N during the experimental period. Considering the relatively low variation of denitrification rates during

Gelöscht: 4

Gelöscht: 9

Gelöscht: 4

Gelöscht: 89

Gelöscht: 11

Gelöscht: 08

two days preceding the comparison, we conclude that the increase in surface fluxes after closing of the cylinder bottom was mainly due to the exclusion of diffusive loss to the subsoil.

While the increase in $^{15}(\text{N}_2+\text{N}_2\text{O})$ surface flux after bottom closing was comparable among the four replicates, this was not the case for the N_2O flux and $r_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$, which both exhibited considerable variabilities. $r_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$ showed larger deviation probably because the N_2O reduction to N_2 is not only sensitive to N_2O concentration in pore space, but also to changes in control factors like temperature, O_2 , NO_3^- and labile C (Mueller and Clough, 2014). We suspect that the latter factors were somewhat variable within the replicates and that their interaction with N_2O concentration lead to the observed variability in $r_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$. The apparent sensitivity of $r_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$ to bottom closing shows that care should be taken when interpreting N_2O reduction to N_2 from $r_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$ determined in closed laboratory systems. Apart from our observations, an effect of bottom closure on N_2O reduction is to be expected since the resulting increased pore space N_2O concentration would favour N_2O reduction. This effect would thus lead to overestimation of N_2O reduction when extrapolating results to the field.

4.2 Estimating production of N_2 and N_2O based on surface fluxes and diffusion modelling

Modelling diffusive fluxes of N_2 and N_2O evolved from ^{15}N -labelled soil showed that denitrification rates are underestimated by more than 50% when only surface fluxes are taken into account, which has been general practice in the past (Sgouridis et al., 2016 and references therein). Modelling also confirmed that in contrast to our hypothesis, not only subsoil flux is a relevant fraction of $^{15}(\text{N}_2+\text{N}_2\text{O})$ production, but also the increasing accumulation during chamber closing. Several authors increased the chamber deployment time of 40 to 60 minutes as common for N_2O flux measurement (Parkin et al., 2012), e.g., to 2 hours (Tauchnitz et al., 2015; Buchen et al., 2016) or even 24 hours (Sgouridis et al., 2016). This was done to increase $^{15}\text{N}_2+\text{N}_2\text{O}$ concentration in the chamber and thus to improve the detection limit for denitrification at a given IRMS precision. Because surface fluxes are lowering with deployment time, it is clear that the underestimation of surface flux based denitrification rates is also increasing.

For laboratory studies with the ^{15}N gas flux method using closed incubation systems, our findings on $^{15}\text{N}_2$ and $^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ accumulation in pore space is quite relevant. Closing incubation vessels for a limited time and estimating denitrification from headspace concentration (e.g Meyer et al., 2010; Siegel et al., 1982) inevitably leads to underestimation of denitrification rates. Experimental evidence for this underestimation was obtained by destroying pore structure at final sampling to homogenize headspace and pore space (Harter et al., 2016). Because the fraction of denitrification products accumulated in pore space increases with decreasing diffusivity, the problem is most severe for water-saturated soils. While this had also previously been solved by homogenizing headspace and pore space before sampling (Well and Myrold, 1999), other studies with water-saturated substrates did not take accumulated gases into account (e.g. Nielsen, 1992).

Gelöscht:)

Gelöscht: ((

Gelöscht:), (

Gelöscht:))

Gelöscht: -

Gelöscht: Our model approach would be suitable to estimate pore space accumulation of denitrification products in closed laboratory incubations and could also be used to correct previously published data.

Our results show that extending chamber deployment time is not a good strategy to improve the detection limit for denitrification. [This is](#) because the fraction of gaseous denitrification products that is not emitted at the soil surface is increasing with time. Although we can now estimate this fraction with our model, uncertainties of the modelled data lead to increasing uncertainty in denitrification estimates with [chamber](#) deployment time. Another way to improve detection is to lower the N₂ background concentration in the field by flushing chambers with an N₂-depleted gas matrix (Well et al., 2018). Due to the good sensitivity of [that](#) method, [chamber](#) deployment could be kept at one hour. Principally, our [modelling](#) approach could also determine the subsurface flux and pore space accumulation for that method, but will have to be adapted to take diffusion dynamics in the N₂-depleted gas matrix into account.

Because the flux dynamics of gaseous denitrification products in the soil had not been taken into account in past field flux and certain laboratory studies, we assume that numerous studies underestimated denitrification significantly. It can thus be concluded that soil denitrification is probably even more relevant than assumed today.

Our [model approach](#) is [suitable](#) to [estimate pore space accumulation and subsoil diffusion of denitrification products](#). It thus allows to determine production based on surface fluxes [in field flux studies but also in closed laboratory incubations](#). Principally, it could also be used to correct previously published data if necessary information on diffusivity and pore space [was available](#). For experiments with the same dimensions and bulk density as assumed in our regression model it is also possible to calculate production from surface flux using the parameters of Table [4](#). Principally, the regression approach offers an easy way to derive production without the need to run the 3D model. But to obtain a general solution that would fit any experimental conditions in terms of bulk density, depth of labelling, chamber design and deployment time, it will be necessary to conduct multiple model runs, which was beyond the scope of this paper.

Our [approach includes several factors of uncertainty](#). Prerequisite for precise quantification is the knowledge of the vertical distribution in activity and diffusivity. Moreover, we have to assume steady state, which is never perfectly realized due to temporal change of diffusivity and denitrification rates, e.g., following precipitation and thus decreasing diffusivity, increasing moisture and change in the labelled volume. Finally, we did not yet take into account water phase transport. But this has some relevance due to low diffusivity in the water phase. The impact of water phase transport should be largest for N₂O due to its high solubility in water, yet gas diffusivity of N₂O in water is more than 3 orders of magnitude lower than in air (Rabot et al 2015). For CO₂, which has also a high solubility in water, the contribution of the aqueous phase to diffusive fluxes is negligible when the ratio of air-filled porosity and total pore-space is greater than 0.12 (Jassal et al., 2004). But since denitrification occurs often in soil near water saturation, water phase dynamics might be another explanation for the deviations between the N₂O/(N₂+N₂O) ratios determined with bottom open and bottom closed.

Gelöscht: .

Gelöscht: this

Gelöscht: modeling

Gelöscht: Using our 3 D

Gelöscht: it

Gelöscht: possible

Gelöscht: determine

Gelöscht: rates from

Gelöscht: and

Gelöscht: , since this allows to take subsoil diffusion

Gelöscht: accumulation into account

Gelöscht: 3

The general agreement between measured and modelled increase in surface flux after closing the cylinder bottom can be seen as a first proof of our concept to quantify denitrification rates using surface fluxes and modelling. Reasons for the observed deviations between experimental and model results can be manifold. In view of the aforementioned factors of uncertainty, these could include imperfect estimation of D_s by the empirical model (Millington, 1959), spatial variability of diffusivity (Kuhne et al., 2012; Lange et al., 2009; Maier et al., 2017; Maier and Schack-Kirchner, 2014; Marrero, 1972) within the 10 cm layers for which D_s was determined, spatial variability of denitrification rates (Groffman et al., 2009) and incomplete steady state. Further reasons could be the production of $^{15}\text{N}_2$ and $^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ from possibly leached $^{15}\text{NO}_3^-$ below the confined soil cores, and a possible shift in denitrification rates during the 6 hours between the two experiments with bottom open and bottom closed. A quantitative evaluation of the model by ^{15}N gas flux experiments would be quite challenging since it would mean to assess all aforementioned uncertain factors and to include heterogeneity in the modelling. Future attempts are therefore necessary to improve model evaluation and check how our approach will perform under heterogenic conditions. But despite these uncertainties, the general agreement of model and measurements shows that our approach leads to improved denitrification estimates.

Which progress in flux estimation is obtained in view of incomplete knowledge on parameters and could incorrect parameter estimation lead to augmented bias? Even uncertain estimates of subsoil fluxes would improve the outcome of the ^{15}N gas flux method in comparison with current practice (i.e. without taking subsoil diffusion and storage into account) as it would lower the bias in estimating denitrification rates. We can exclude that our approach would increase total bias in estimating denitrification through incorrect determination of diffusivity. A larger overestimation of subsoil diffusion or storage could only occur at high soil gas diffusivity, that means in dry highly porous soils (Table 3). But these conditions are less relevant for our approach since denitrification is inhibited at high diffusivity. Taking into account the uncertainty in subsoil diffusion modelling we demonstrate that worst case scenarios would still improve estimates compared to previous practice: the scenario with 30 cm depth of labelling and confinement of labelled soil (B_{30-30}) yields 51 and 61 % underestimation for highest and lowest modelled water content, respectively. Our approach would thus overestimate production by up to 10 % whereas production derived from surface flux only would underestimate the true production at least by 51 %. Between soil water contents of 0.34 and 0.44, our overestimation would be only 2 % (i.e. 53% - 51%). Consequently, potential bias of our correction approach arising from errors in determination of diffusivity would be quite small under conditions favouring denitrification. Under drier conditions, errors would still be much smaller compared to the errors from neglecting subsurface fluxes. The moderate impact of diffusivity also shows that spatial heterogeneity of diffusivity (Kühne et al. 2012) would not have a large impact and its assessment would not have to be prioritized.

Gelöscht: is

Gelöscht: , e.g.,

Gelöscht: estimate

Gelöscht: & Quirk

Gelöscht:),

While it was beyond the scope of this study to evaluate uncertainty in detail, future work should follow this up in order to explore the achievable accuracy in estimating subsoil flux and storage under given conditions. This should include modelling

[water phase transport, depth of labelling and the impact of spatial and temporal variability in diffusivity and denitrification rates. Moreover, controlled experiments would be needed to validate model results as far as possible.](#)

5 Conclusions

Measurements and production-diffusion modelling showed that field surface fluxes of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O emitted from ^{15}N -labelled soil NO_3^- severely underestimate denitrification due to subsoil flux and accumulation in pore space. The extent of underestimation increases with chamber deployment time. Soil denitrification has thus been underestimated in many previous studies using the ^{15}N gas flux method without taking subsoil flux and accumulation in pore space into account. While production-diffusion modelling is a promising tool to estimate subsoil flux and storage flux, the observed deviations between experimental and modelled subsoil flux reveal the need for refined model evaluation. [To enable correction of previously published data, further model parametrization work should cover all soil and land use types.](#)

Acknowledgements:

This study was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the project LE 3367/1-1 and the research unit 2337: "Denitrification in Agricultural Soils: Integrated Control and Modeling at Various Scales (DASIM)". We thank Frank Hegewald for technical support in experiments, Martina Heuer and Jennifer Ehe for stable isotope analysis, Kerstin Gilke and Andrea Oehns-Rittgerod for analysis by GC, and Roland Fuß for support in statistical analyses. We further thank for supply of an experimental field site by the Faculty of Agriculture, University of Applied Sciences Southern Westphalia.

References

- Bollmann, A., and Conrad, R.: Enhancement by acetylene of the decomposition of nitric oxide in soil, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 29, 1057-1066, 10.1016/s0038-0717(97)00006-0, 1997a.
- Bollmann, A., and Conrad, R.: Acetylene blockage technique leads to underestimation of denitrification rates in oxic soils due to scavenging of intermediate nitric oxide, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 29, 1067-1077, 10.1016/s0038-0717(97)00007-2, 1997b.
- Buchen, C., Lewicka-Szczepak, D., Fuss, R., Helfrich, M., Flessa, H., and Well, R.: Fluxes of N_2 and N_2O and contributing processes in summer after grassland renewal and grassland conversion to maize cropping on a Plaggic Anthrosol and a Histic Gleysol, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 101, 6-19, 10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.06.028, 2016.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Willibald, G., and Papen, H.: Soil core method for direct simultaneous determination of N_2 and N_2O emissions from forest soils, *Plant and Soil*, 240, 105-116, 10.1023/a:1015870518723, 2002.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E. M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R., and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S.: Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls?, *Philos T R Soc B*, 368, 10.1098/rstb.2013.0122, 2013.

- Coplen, T. B.: Guidelines and recommended terms for expression of stable-isotope-ratio and gas-ratio measurement results, *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 25, 2538-2560, 10.1002/rcm.5129, 2011.
- Eschenbach, W., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Stange, C. F., Dyckmans, J., and Well, R.: Measuring N-15 Abundance and Concentration of Aqueous Nitrate, Nitrite, and Ammonium by Membrane Inlet Quadrupole Mass Spectrometry, *Analytical Chemistry*, 89, 6077-6082, 10.1021/acs.analchem.7b00724, 2017.
- 5 Felber, R., Conen, F., Flechard, C. R., and Neftel, A.: Theoretical and practical limitations of the acetylene inhibition technique to determine total denitrification losses, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 4125-4138, 10.5194/bg-9-4125-2012, 2012.
- Folorunso, O., and Rolston, D.: Spatial variability of field-measured denitrification gas fluxes. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 48, 1214-1219, 1984.
- 10 Groffman, P., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Fuhrer, R. W., Gold, A. J., Morse, J. L., Stander, E. K., Tague, C., Tonitto, C., and Vidon, P.: Challenges to incorporating spatially and temporally explicit phenomena (hotspots and hot moments) in denitrification models, *Biogeochemistry*, 93, 49-77, 2009.
- Groffman, P. M., Altabet, M. A., Böhlke, J. K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M. B., Firestone, M. K., Giblin, A. E., Kana, T. M., Nielsen, L. P., and Voytek, M. A.: Methods for measuring denitrification diverse approaches to a difficult problem, *Ecol. Appl.*, 16, 2091-2122, 2006.
- 15 Harter, J., Guzman-Bustamante, I., Kuehfuss, S., Ruser, R., Well, R., Spott, O., Kappler, A., and Behrens, S.: Gas entrapment and microbial N₂O reduction reduce N₂O emissions from a biochar-amended sandy clay loam soil, *Scientific Reports*, 6, 10.1038/srep39574, 2016.
- Hutchinson, G., and Mosier, A.: Improved soil cover method for field measurement of nitrous oxide fluxes, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 45, 311-316, 1981.
- 20 Jost, W.: *Diffusion in Solids, Liquids and Gases*, Academic, San Diego, Calif., 558 pp., 1960.
- Kühne, A., Schack-Kirchner, H., and Hildebrand, E. E.: Gas diffusivity in soils compared to ideal isotropic porous media, *J Plant Nutr Soil Sc*, 175, 34-45, 10.1002/jpln.201000438, 2012.
- 25 Kulkarni, M. V., Burgin, A. J., Groffman, P. M., Yavitt, J. B.: *Direct flux and N-15 tracer methods for measuring denitrification in forest soils*, *Biogeochemistry*, 117, 359-373, 2014.
- Laemmel, T., Mohr, M., Longdoz, B., Schack-Kirchner, H., Lang, F., Schindler, D., and Maier, M.: From above the forest into the soil - how wind affects soil gas transport through air pressure fluctuations. , *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 265, 424-434, 2019.
- 30 Lange, S. F., Allaire, S. E., and Rolston, D. E.: Soil-gas diffusivity in large soil monoliths, *European Journal of Soil Science*, 60, 1065-1077, 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2009.01172.x, 2009.
- Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Well, R., Gieseemann, A., Rohe, L., and Wolf, U.: An enhanced technique for automated determination of N-15 signatures of N₂, (N₂+N₂O) and N₂O in gas samples, *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 27, 1548-1558, Doi 10.1002/Rcm.6605, 2013.
- 35 Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Augustin, J., Gieseemann, A., and Well, R.: Quantifying N₂O reduction to N₂ based on N₂O isotopocules – validation with independent methods (helium incubation and ¹⁵N gas flux method), *Biogeosciences*, 14, 711-732, 10.5194/bg-14-711-2017, 2017.
- Mahmood, T., Malik, K. A., Shamsi, S. R. A., and Sajjad, M. I.: Denitrification and total N losses from an irrigated sandy-clay loam under maize-wheat cropping system, *Plant and Soil*, 199, 239-250, 10.1023/a:1004335132617, 1998.
- 40 Maier, M., and Schack-Kirchner, H.: Using the gradient method to determine soil gas flux: A review, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 192, 78-95, 10.1016/j.agrformet.2014.03.006, 2014.

Gelöscht: Kuhne

Gelöscht: accepted, 2018

Formatiert: Nicht Hochgestellt/ Tiefgestellt

Formatiert: Tiefgestellt

Formatiert: Hochgestellt

Maier, M., Paulus, S., Nicolai, C., Stutz, K. P., and Nauer, P. A.: Drivers of Plot-Scale Variability of CH_4 Consumption in a Well-Aerated Pine Forest Soil, *Forests*, 8, 10.3390/f8060193, 2017.

Marrero, T. R., Mason, E.A.: Gaseous Diffusion Coefficients., *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* 1, 1972.

Meyer, A., Bergmann, J., Butterbach-Bahl, K., and Bruggemann, N.: A new ^{15}N tracer method to determine N turnover and denitrification of *Pseudomonas stutzeri*, *Isotopes in Environmental and Health Studies*, 46, 409-421, 10.1080/10256016.2010.528840, 2010.

Millington, R. J.: Gas diffusion in porous media, *Science*, 130, 100-102, 1959.

Mueller, C., and Clough, T. J.: Advances in understanding nitrogen flows and transformations: gaps and research pathways, *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 152, S34-S44, 10.1017/s0021859613000610, 2014.

Mulvaney, R. L.: Evaluation of N-15 tracer techniques for direct measurement of denitrification in soil. 3. Laboratory studies., *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 52, 1327-1332, 10.2136/sssaj1988.03615995005200050022x, 1988.

Mulvaney, R. L., and Vandenheuvel, R. M.: Evaluation of N-15 tracer techniques for direct measurement of denitrification in soil. 4. Field studies., *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 52, 1332-1337, 10.2136/sssaj1988.03615995005200050023x, 1988.

Nadeem, S., Dörsch, P., and Bakken, L. R.: Autoxidation and acetylene-accelerated oxidation of NO in a 2-phase system: Implications for the expression of denitrification in ex situ experiments, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 57, 606-614, DOI 10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.10.007, 2013.

Nielsen, L. P.: Denitrification in sediment determined from nitrogen isotope pairing, *Fems Microbiol Ecol*, 86, 357-362, 10.1111/j.1574-6968.1992.tb04828.x, 1992.

Parkin, T. B., Venterea, R. T., and Hargreaves, S. K.: Calculating the Detection Limits of Chamber-based Soil Greenhouse Gas Flux Measurements, *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 41, 705-715, 10.2134/jeq2011.0394, 2012.

Saggar, S., Jha, N., Deslippe, J., Bolan, N. S., Luo, J., Giltrap, D. L., Kim, D. G., Zaman, M., and Tillman, R. W.: Denitrification and $\text{N}_2\text{O}:\text{N}_2$ production in temperate grasslands: Processes, measurements, modelling and mitigating negative impacts, *Science of the Total Environment*, 465, 173-195, 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.11.050, 2013.

Scholefield, D., Hawkins, J. M. B., and Jackson, S. M.: Use of a flowing helium atmosphere incubation technique to measure the effects of denitrification controls applied to intact cores of a clay soil, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 29, 1337-1344, 10.1016/s0038-0717(97)00059-x, 1997.

Sgouridis, F., Stott, A., and Ullah, S.: Application of the N-15 gas-flux method for measuring in situ N_2 and N_2O fluxes due to denitrification in natural and semi-natural terrestrial ecosystems and comparison with the acetylene inhibition technique, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 1821-1835, 10.5194/bg-13-1821-2016, 2016.

Siegel, R. S., Hauck, R. D., and Kurtz, L. T.: Determination of $^{30}\text{N}_2$ and application to measurement of N_2 evolution during denitrification, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 46, 68-74, 1982.

Spott, O., Russow, R., Apelt, B., and Stange, C. F.: A N-15-aided artificial atmosphere gas flow technique for online determination of soil N_2 release using the zeolite Kostrolith SX6 (R), *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 20, 3267-3274, 10.1002/rcm.2722, 2006.

Stevens, R. J., Laughlin, R. J., Atkins, G. J., and Prosser, S. J.: Automated determination of nitrogen-15-labelled dinitrogen and nitrous oxide by mass-spectrometry, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 57, 981-988, 10.2136/sssaj1993.03615995005700040017x, 1993.

Tauchnitz, N., Spott, O., Russow, R., Bernsdorf, S., Glaser, B., and Meissner, R.: Release of nitrous oxide and dinitrogen from a transition bog under drained and rewetted conditions due to denitrification: results from a N-15 nitrate-bromide double-tracer study, *Isotopes in Environmental and Health Studies*, 51, 300-321, 10.1080/10256016.2015.1011634, 2015.

Formatiert: Tiefgestellt

Gelöscht: ., and Quirk,

Gelöscht: . P.: Permeability of

Gelöscht: solids, Transactions of the Faraday Society, 57, 1200-&, 10.1039/tf9615701200, 1961

Gelöscht: Dorsch

Gelöscht: labeled


- Well, R., and Myrold, D. D.: Laboratory evaluation of a new method for in situ measurement of denitrification in water-saturated soils, *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 31, 1109-1119, 1999.
- Well, R., and Myrold, D. D.: A proposed method for measuring subsoil denitrification in situ, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 66, 507-518, 2002.
- 5 Well, R., Burkart, S., Gieseemann, A., Grosz, B., Köster, J. R., and Lewicka-Szczebak, D.: Improvement of the ^{15}N gas flux method for in situ measurement of soil denitrification and its product stoichiometry, *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, doi:10.1002/rcm.8363, 2018.

The first experimental set-up is represented by the conceptual model described above, and includes an open bottom cylinder containing the labelled NO_3^- . In the second set-up, the lower end of the cylinder was sealed, which was represented by an additional impermeable thin layer (Table 1).

Four additional theoretical experimental set-ups were modelled to assess the effect of the soil cylinder length and the length of the labelled zone within the cylinder. For these set-ups the soil was assumed to consist of one homogenous layer instead of two layers.

Table 1 Modelled scenarios; *indicates the set-ups where additional parameter sweeps of soil moisture and production rates of the gas species were run.

Set up	Bottom	Cylinder length	Labeled zone
1_bottom_open*	Bottom open	30 cm	30 cm
1_bottom_closed*	Bottom closed	30 cm	30 cm
2_bottom_open	Bottom open	45 cm	30 cm
3_bottom_open	Bottom open	45 cm	45 cm
4_bottom_open	Bottom open	60 cm	45 cm



3a: Increase in pore space and chamber concentrations of $^{15}\text{N}^{15}\text{N}$ after chamber closing.




Figure 3b

Interactive comment on “Underestimation of denitrification rates from field application of the 15 N gas flux method and its correction by gas diffusion modelling” by Reinhard Well et al.

Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 20 December 2018 Review of Biogeosciences [Manuscript #2018-495] Title: Underestimation of denitrification rates from field application of the 15N gas flux method and its correction by gas diffusion modelling.

Dear Associate Editor,

The manuscript in consideration sought to elucidate whether the field application of the 15N gas flux method underestimates denitrification rates and evaluate the possible reasons by using soil diffusion modelling. The topic is of particular interest to terrestrial biogeochemists attempting to constrain N cycling processes since denitrification is notoriously difficult to measure under field conditions. The authors significantly advance knowledge in this field of research by providing a first proof of denitrification rates underestimation due to subsoil diffusion and storage of denitrification products as stipulated previously by research published in this journal.

RC1.1

Even though the authors provide strong indications that subsoil diffusion is indeed occurring during field application of the 15N gas flux method I am not convinced of the practical applicability of soil diffusion modelling for correcting this discrepancy. The significant difference between measured and modelled results suggests there are too many unknown factors (e.g. spatial variability of diffusivity) and that further assumptions (beyond the homogenous soil labelling of the 15N gas flux method) need to be introduced to model surface flux and subsoil diffusion and storage.

I am wondering if the soil diffusivity assumptions (homogenous soil pore structure and water content, absence of stones, roots etc and constancy of diffusion and production rates) are actually introducing more bias than practical improvements to the traditional chamber method (e.g. depth of labelling, size of chamber, open or closed bottom and closure time).

AC1.1

Response: We agree that modelling of subsoil fluxes is associated with a variety of uncertainties which we explained in before in P 19 L 20-31:

“The general agreement between measured and modelled increase in surface flux after closing the cylinder bottom is a first proof of our concept to quantify denitrification rates using surface fluxes and modelling. Reasons for the observed deviations between experimental and model results can be manifold, e.g., imperfect estimate of D_s by the empirical model (Millington & Quirk), spatial variability of diffusivity (Kuhne et al., 2012; Lange et al., 2009; Maier et al., 2017; Maier and Schack-Kirchner, 2014; Marrero, 1972) within the 10 cm layers for which D_s was determined, spatial variability of denitrification rates (Groffman et al., 2009), production of $^{15}\text{N}_2$ and $^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ from possibly leached $^{15}\text{NO}_3^-$ below the confined soil cores, and a possible shift in denitrification rates during the 6 hours between the two experiments with bottom open and bottom closed. A quantitative evaluation of the model by ^{15}N gas flux experiments would be quite challenging since it would mean to assess all aforementioned uncertain factors and to include heterogeneity in the modelling. Future attempts are therefore necessary to improve model evaluation and check how our approach will perform under heterogenic conditions. But despite these uncertainties, the general agreement of model and measurements shows that our approach leads to improved denitrification estimates. “

But even uncertain estimates of subsoil fluxes would improve the outcome of the ^{15}N gas flux method in comparison with current practice (i.e. without taking subsoil diffusion and storage into account) as it would lower the bias in estimating denitrification rates. We can exclude that our approach could increase bias in view of the limited effect by varying diffusivity on relative subsoil diffusion and storage flux (see also AC 2.6 below). Severe overestimation of these quantities could only occur at high soil gas diffusivity, that means in dry highly porous soils. But these conditions are not relevant for our approach since denitrification is inhibited at high diffusivity.

Changes: We added Table 4 to illustrate the range in calculated bias. Moreover, we extended the discussion on uncertainties and demonstrated that an increase in bias by calculating subsoil fluxes is improbable.

RC1.2

The authors suggest that previously published data could be corrected for underestimation by using their model with further parameterisation. This indeed would be something I would be very interested to see and particularly for more challenging soil types than arable land such as grasslands or forests.

AC1.2

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We plan to do this in follow-up studies

In the conclusions we now mention that follow-up studies are needed to obtain further model parametrization to enable correction of previous published in situ $\text{N}_2 + \text{N}_2\text{O}$ fluxes covering all land use types

The manuscript is well structured and clearly written and it seems to me it is a first step towards the right direction for further improving field denitrification measurements. I therefore recommend that the manuscript is accepted for publication following a few minor corrections and clarifications detailed below:

Minor comments:

RC1.3

1. P1 Lines 18: End the sentence after total production and start a new one after it.

AC1.3 Changes: done as suggested

RC1.4

2. P3 L9 and throughout: Please correct spelling of the word labelled throughout the manuscript.

AC 1.4 Changes: done as suggested

RC1.5

3. P3 L25&26: *In Sgouridis et al. 2016 the labelled nitrate was applied via injections to the soil volume. Please correct the reference and replace with one that surface application was used.*

AC1.5 Changes: done as suggested

RC1.6

4. P4 L16: *Was steady state within the first 6 hours after the label application also measured or just modelled? In the next sentence the assumption stated is that gas production starts at constant rates after the label application. Is it therefore necessary to first establish steady state before applying the model?*

AC1.5

Response: Indeed the model can only yield correct values if fluxes are steady state at chamber closing. Hence, surface flux data collected immediately after labelling where activity and fluxes dramatically change over time could not be corrected exactly. Moreover, we did not determine steady state experimentally. However, measurements were conducted 5 days after labelling (section 2.3). Therefore, since this is 20 times the modelled steady state time, we can expect that near steady state was reached, even though we could not check this. But we realize that incomplete steady state, due to changes in activity and/or diffusivity, e.g., following precipitation, could be an issue. We will include this in the discussion.

Changes: In the discussion we added a statement that further uncertainty could arise from incomplete steady state, e.g., following precipitation and thus decreasing diffusivity, increasing moisture and change in the labelled volume (P23, L22-24), and that this effect should be evaluated in follow-up studies (P24, L32f).

RC1.6.

P10 L22: Reference is repeated twice.

AC1.6 Changes: corrected

RC1.7

P11 L26: It would have been useful if measurements with or without closed bottom cylinder and varying labelling depths and lengths of cylinders were also taken. This could have shown whether the model predictions are true and if there is a significant difference in surface fluxes to justify the use of the model. Perhaps a combination of lower labelling depth, deeper cylinder and larger chamber would result in insignificant subsoil diffusion losses.

AC1.7

Response: This is indeed planned for a follow up study

Changes: In the discussion we explained that the applicability of our approach for varying depth of labelling should be checked by future studies (P25, L1).

RC1.8

P19 L2: I agree that it would be a lot easier to apply the model under laboratory closed system conditions. However, pore space/headspace equilibration is relatively easier to achieve than attempting the soil diffusion modelling. The real challenge for the future application of the model would be to apply it under field conditions in more challenging soil types.

AC1.8

Response: We agree. Closed system was mentioned because there is also some effect that had not been taken into account until now. The challenge for the future application of the model would be to apply it under field conditions in more challenging soil types as was already addressed in the following section in page 19, where we discuss the potential and limitation of our approach for field studies.

Changes: In the discussion we deepened the discussion on the challenges to further evaluate our approach. In the conclusions we address the need to cover all soil types.

Interactive comment on “Underestimation of denitrification rates from field application of the 15 N gas flux method and its correction by gas diffusion modelling” by Reinhard Well et al.

Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 30 January 2019

Overall the paper is quite relevant to researchers who have used or are planning to use the 15N labelling method to quantify identification rates in-situ. The researchers convincingly show through modelling and field data that the impact of subsoil diffusion and storage fluxes have a significant impact on the estimated denitrification rates and thus have likely caused under reporting in the current literature.

General comments

R2.1

- My main reservation is regarding the applicability of the modelling more broadly for correction of field results. Parameters like diffusivity are notoriously difficult to estimate in the field, and therefore the discrepancy between model and measured as reported here may never be reconcilable.

AC2.1

Response: This was also addressed by reviewer 1 (RC1.1). We agree that exact prediction of subsoil diffusion is difficult, but determination of D_s in the subsoil is feasible with reasonable effort and can also be modelled based on bulk density and soil moisture. This will lead to D_s estimates accurate enough for subsoil diffusion modelling (see also AC2.6 below).

Changes: In the results we added additional scenarios to illustrate the impact from uncertain estimates of soil moisture and thus diffusivity (Table 3).

In the discussion we added a section (P25, L 15f) to explain that taking into account maximum uncertainty in subsoil diffusion modelling we demonstrate that worst case scenarios would still improve estimates compared to previous practice. Here we also explained that small scale heterogeneity in D_s had little or moderate effect on simulate subsoil diffusion.

R2.2

- While i appreciate the difficulty of including water phase gas transport in a model, especially one with such a complicated isotopologue structure, I feel it should at least be discussed in the paper as another important factor. It would both contribute to pore space storage as well as isotopic fractionation although the latter may not be important given the label strength.

AC2.2

Response: We agree, especially in case of N_2O due its high solubility in water, there would be some storage which would have some impact on the change of fluxes following chamber closing due to the slow diffusion in the water phase. This should be tested in follow up studies.

Changes: In the discussion we now mention that water phase transport was not yet taken into account, but might have some relevance due low diffusivity in the water phase. We also mention that this effect would be largest for N_2O due to its high solubility in water and will add references were the impact of water phase gas transport is addressed with respect to CO_2 flux modelling. We

also mention that water phase dynamics might be another explanation for the deviations between the $N_2O/(N_2+N_2O)$ ratios determined with bottom open and bottom closed (P23 , L 26-32).

RC2.3

- The model results are somewhat dense and difficult to digest - my concern is that someone who is not a modeller/gas diffusion specialist would get lost in the current brief narrative. Suggest being more verbose but for the benefit on enhanced clarity.

AC2.3

Response: Wwe are sorry for this.

Changes: The modelling results were restructured and extended.

RC2.4

- Section 3.1.2 requires significantly more explanation. I would have expected to see a more normal flux calculation as a proxy for production as is done with CO₂ or CH₄, however the fitting approach is applied here. Why did the authors not use a linear or exponential flux model as is commonly used for other gases. What do the parameters alpha and delta signify or what is their physical manifestation - are they related to chamber volume and surface area, cylinder depth, etc? Is this approach/equation commonly applied outside of this paper?

AC 2.4 Response: we are sorry for this. We will supply adequate explanations.

Changes: We added additional explanations to section 3.1.2 to clarify that the empirical equation was used to generate data for our field comparison and also as an example how denitrification rates could be obtained in future without the need to run the 3 D model for each experiment or sampling event.

- Discussion and conclusions

RC2.6

- If the modelling approach cannot be applied quite yet to correct the values, perhaps there should be a small table or histogram or similar of "likely errors" that may have been incurred in past experiments using this method. This would at least allow the community to make an educated guess on how far off our current estimates are from reality (and may allow some reconciliation across methods as well).

AC 2.6

Response: We agree that this is would be useful..

Changes: We generated Table 3 based on the scenarios we already included in the manuscript, and added additional new scenarios. Table 3 shows % underestimation for our micro-plot and chamber geometry in dependence of soil moisture (and thus Ds) and chamber deployment time. We discussed how results would change with differing depth in labelling or size of the micro-plots.

RC2.7

- Overall the flow of the paper could be improved, this is partly due to sections with poor sentence structure or run-on thoughts mostly in the introduction and discussion portion of the paper.

AC2.7

Response: We are sorry for this. We evaluated and improve the flow of the paper and checked sentence structures.

Changes: We worked on the flow and sentence structure as requested. In the introduction, long sentences were shortened and some sections were restructured.

Specific Comments

Page 2

RC2.8

- Line 9 - "to measure" should be "in measuring" or similar.

AC2.8 Response/changes: done as suggested

RC2.9

- Line 14 - gastight should be gas tight unless this is a brand of container

AC2.9 Response/changes: done as suggested

RC2.10

- Line 25 - suggest inserting several sentences explaining to the reader why in-situ measurements are important. Is there literature to cite comparing in-situ to lab incubations or similar?

AC 2-10

Response: Denitrification is complexly controlled by interaction of labile C, abundance and community structure of denitrifiers, pore structure, soil and root respiration, mineral N dynamics. Hence, it is difficult to keep conditions in the lab identical to the field where some conditions dynamically change due to climatic factors but especially due to the activity of plants. Field measurements are therefore needed for reliable determination of denitrification in ecosystems.

There are numerous lab studies but few field measurements. To the best of our knowledge respective comparisons are still missing for unsaturated soils. We conducted such a comparison only for denitrification in shallow groundwater (Well, R., et al. (2003). "Comparison of field and laboratory measurement of denitrification and N₂O production in the saturated zone of hydromorphic soils." Soil Biology & Biochemistry 35(6): 783-799.

Changes: The explanation for the need of field studies was included in the introduction.

Page 3

RC 2.11

- Line 8 - some more detail around why we don't just measure these parameters instead of modelling them

AC 2.11

Response: we are not sure if we understand this question correctly. Line 8 f reads: "Modelling diffusion of $^{15}\text{N}_2 + ^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ produced in ^{15}N -labelled surface soil could be used to estimate its accumulation in pore space and diffusive loss to the subsoil and thus to quantify denitrification from the sum of surface flux, subsoil flux and storage within the ^{15}N -labelled soil volume." By modelling diffusion we mean: modelling the diffusive flux. But the diffusive flux can not be measured directly. But unfortunately we failed to mention that this approach would include measurement of surface flux.

Changes: We reformulated this sentence as: "Modelling diffusive fluxes of $^{15}\text{N}_2 + ^{15}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ produced in ^{15}N -labelled surface soil based on measured surface flux and diffusivity could be used to estimate its accumulation in pore space and diffusive loss to the subsoil. This could be used to quantify denitrification from the sum of surface flux, subsoil flux and storage within the ^{15}N -labelled soil volume. " (P3, L 18f)

RC2.12

- Line 14 - change amount to concentration

AC 2.12 done as suggested

RC2.13

- Lines 18-29 - consider separating into bullets.

AC 2.13 done as suggested

RC2.14

-Consider annotating figures with some of the details contained in lines 18-29

AC 2.14

Response: done as suggested:

Changes: Modified caption of Fig. 2a,b:

Figure 2a: Increase in pore space concentrations of N_2 evolved from the ^{15}N -labelled pool after start of denitrification with open chamber when **production of ^{15}N -labelled N_2 and N_2O would start at constant rates, leading to accumulation of ^{15}N -labelled gases and thus to build-up of concentration gradients to the surface and to the subsoil.** Concentration trends following chamber closure are shown as dotted lines.

Figure 2b: Time course of relative fluxes of N₂ and N₂O evolved from the ¹⁵N-labelled pool after start of denitrification with open chamber **showing increasing surface and subsoil fluxes while the storage flux decreases until steady state is reached**. Trends of fluxes following chamber closure are shown as dotted lines.

RC 2.15

Page 6 - Figure 2b

- What is the origin of the oscillation in the flux data Page 7

AC 2.15:

Response: The oscillation is a numerical artefact, that affected only the simulation of the steady state dynamics. This problem is now solved, i.e. numerical oscillation is now much smaller.

Changes: We replaced the figure with a the results of the updated model

RC 2.16

Line 1- is the chamber here fully/homogeneously mixed?

AC 2.16

Response: Yes, the model assumes a fully mixed chamber.

Changes: we will added the information that the model assumes a homogeneously mixed chamber

RC2.17

Line 18 - Is the atmosphere multi-layer? This isn't clear

AC 2.17 Response /changes: We added the explanation that the free atmosphere was simulated as a well mixed single layer.

RC2.18:

Line 22 (and elsewhere) - NO₃ is often used, but are there any chemical or biological processes modelled that convert NO₃ to other species? If not then perhaps its best to clarify that gases are produced independent of NO₃ transformation.

AC2.18

Response: In the methods we explain that we assume a simplified process dynamics where in terms of N transformation only nitrate reduction by denitrification occurs with N₂ and N₂O as emitted products. Our estimation of subsoil diffusion is based on the assumption that N₂ and N₂O production stay constant long enough to reach steady state before chamber closure and also do not change during chamber closure. Other nitrate transformations, e.g., microbial immobilisation, plant uptake or leaching, would only be relevant for our approach if they cause a rapid change in N₂ and N₂O

production so that near steady state fluxes are not reached. To exclude a discussion on the potential impact of numerous pathways of nitrate transformations we will clarify in the methods that we address N₂ and N₂O production from ¹⁵N labelled nitrate pool via microbial denitrification and that we assume relative constant rates so that near steady state is established.

Changes: statements mentioned above were added in the methods and discussion sections

Page 8

RC2.19

Line 10 - Is production constant with depth over the length of the collar? Page 11

AC 2.19

Response: yes

Changes: we added that production rates are assumed constant within in the labelled soil

RC 2.20

- Line 11 - Clarify that these initial results are from the bottom open scenario

AC 2.20

Response: We are sorry that we did not make this clear enough

Changes: We updated Table 1 to include all scenarios used in the manuscript. Moreover we referred to these scenarios in the caption of the figures and tables where scenarios results are shown.

Underestimation of denitrification rates from field application of the ¹⁵N gas flux method and its correction by gas diffusion modelling

Reinhard Well¹, Martin Maier², Dominika Lewicka-Szczebak¹, Jan-Reent Köster¹, Nicolas Ruoss¹

¹Thünen Institute, Climate-Smart Agriculture, Braunschweig, Germany
²Forest Research Institute Baden-Württemberg, Dep. Soil and Environment, Freiburg, Germany
Correspondence to: Reinhard Well (reinhard.well@thuenen.de)

Supplement

Table S1: Soil data (WFPS = water-filled pores space; means± standard deviation of four replicate micro-plots)

Depth of sample	WFPS	NO ₃ ⁻	NH ₄ ⁺	¹⁵ N atom fraction of NO ₃ ⁻	Bulk density
	%	mg N kg ⁻¹	mg N kg ⁻¹		g cm ⁻³
0-10 cm	71.8±2.6	16.6±1.9	1.76±1.05	0.092±0.014	1.48
10-20 cm	61.5±2.4	14.4±2.5	0.81±0.32	0.150±0.045	1.54
20-30 c.	60.0±1.5	16.6±4.1	0.70±0.18	0.201±0.045	1.48
0-30 cm (average)	64.4±1.7	15.9±2.5	1.1±0.4	0.148±0.030	1.50

Gelöscht: ; and

Table S2: Field fluxes of pool-derived N₂, N₂O and N₂+N₂O, residual fraction of N₂O remaining after N₂O reduction to N₂ (r_{N2O}) and ¹⁵N enrichment of the ¹⁵N-labelled N pool producing N₂O (a_{p_N2O}) with bottom open and bottom closed (individual replicates and mean values \pm standard deviation). Unequal uppercase letter indicate significant ($P < 0.05$) differences between mean values with bottom open and bottom closed.

ID	N ₂ flux	N ₂ O flux	N ₂ +N ₂ O flux	r_{N2O}	a_{p_N2O}
	g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹	g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹	g N ha ⁻¹ d ⁻¹		
Cylinder 1 / bottom open	286.3	62.1	348.4	0.178	0.126
Cylinder 2 / bottom open	436.0	73.9	509.9	0.145	0.194
Cylinder 3/ bottom open	763.9	237.6	1001.4	0.237	0.113
Cylinder 4 / bottom open	488.2	9.6	497.8	0.019	0.174
average, bottom open	493.6 ^a \pm 199.5	95.8 ^a \pm 98.5	589.4 ^a \pm 284.3	0.145 ^a \pm 0.092	0.152 ^a \pm 0.038
Cylinder 1 / bottom closed	349.9	139.4	489.3	0.285	0.120
Cylinder 2 / bottom closed	776.2	30.3	806.5	0.038	0.202
Cylinder 3/ bottom closed	1150.7	170.7	1321.3	0.129	0.121
Cylinder 4 / bottom closed	540.0	62.5	602.5	0.104	0.177
average, bottom closed	704.2 ^a \pm 345.0	100.7 ^a \pm 65.4	804.9 ^b \pm 368.5	0.139 ^a \pm 0.105	0.155 ^a \pm 0.041





Figure S1: Simulation of concentrations (colours, ppm) and fluxes (arrows) with open chamber at steady state.





Figure S2: Simulation of concentrations (colours, ppm) and fluxes (arrows) 5 hours after chamber closure.






Figure S3 Relative fluxes of N₂ isotopologues (¹⁴N¹⁴N, ¹⁵N¹⁴N, ¹⁵N¹⁵N) following chamber closing.

Gelöscht: <Objekt>