

## **Authors' response to to peer review**

We would like to once again thank the two anonymous referees and associate editor for reviewing our work and providing both encouraging and critical comments.

We have directly responded to each of the referee comments with author replies. We have also already replied directly to the editor on related matters. Below we discuss a specific issue concerning suitability for publication in AMT.

From all this, we have subsequently revised our paper. Further below we list the relevant amendments and improvements.

After the change lists, we attach a copy of the revised manuscript with all changes tracked and marked.

We also attach copies of our earlier replies to reviewers.

### **Specific note to editor:**

One of the referees suggested that we should combine two papers into one (the editor also made a similar intimation).

Our response to this notion:

A combined publication of our work would be inappropriate for 4 key reasons:

- First, our other paper in RCM concerns only measurements of  $^{13}\text{C}$ -enriched  $\text{CO}_2$  by CRDS. This is not a subject relevant to AMT and is primarily interesting only to researchers working with  $^{13}\text{C}$ -tracers. That the present paper here draws on that other work is unimportant for a researcher wishing to make syringe sample measurements of natural isotopic abundance  $\text{CO}_2$ . The present paper could be written to exclude any mention of our other work although we see no good reason to do this. The purpose of using  $^{13}\text{C}$ -enriched standards in this work was to test syringe measures over a wide range of  $\text{CO}_2$  compositions and to investigate the possibility of different isotopologues having different (independent) behaviour during infilling of the optical cavity (which would lead to additional error in isotope ratio measurements of small samples).
- Second, the two manuscripts address entirely separate causes of inaccuracy in gas measurements that should be corrected separately. The present work primarily documents a new method for making discrete sample measurements by continuous sampling CRDS instruments and thus the key inaccuracy to address is contamination / memory effects from the syringe method. The other paper only covers errors from spectroscopic cross-talk between  $^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $^{13}\text{CO}_2$  isotopologues.
- Third, the body of text for such a combined paper (excluding captions and references) would comprise in excess of 8000 words, as it would describe two unrelated physical processes with very little overlap. In addition, there would be several dozen supplementary files. We do not share the reviewer's view that one

long cumbersome paper would be more valuable than two shortish papers each addressing separate and compartmentalised problems.

- Fourth but most importantly, our other publication is accepted in RCM and is forthcoming:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/rcm.7969/full>

### **Significant changes in revised manuscript:**

- Clarified all discussion points about achieved precision of our method and eliminated the confusion stemming from comments about sample-throughput performance (sample turnover rate and measurement precision are entirely independent of each other).
- Added a new discussion section (Sect. 3.4) to outline the potential applications of the method (with particular regard to soil headspace studies). Made clear expected precision for sample measurements in headspace studies:
  - For natural abundance samples, precision in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  of repeated measures (inter-sample) is ca. 0.15 ‰ .
  - The precision of a single sample measurement (intra-sample) will be ca. 0.2 to 0.5 ‰ (which reflects the noise of the CRDS analysis over the short 30s measurement period of the sample) and this also depends upon  $x\text{CO}_2$  level (higher  $x\text{CO}_2$  gives better precision; Fig. S1a).
- Have better explained the functionality of our software script that manages the measurement process:
  - The script's data analysis works in real-time.
  - The trigger and dettrigger points are detected and the operator prompted accordingly.
  - The software directs the user when to introduce the samples.

### **Minor changes in revised manuscript:**

- Incorporated comparisons of previous methods' sample throughputs in order to give context to performance of our system.
- Altered legends for Figs. 5, 6, and S1 to accord the “inter-sample” and “intra-sample” terminology used in the body text for describing measurement precision / data variance. We also have rectified the unintended omission of the caption to Fig. S1.
- We have adjusted our reports of precision so as to not give the impression that our measurement method provides better precision than previous / other methods. We have more explicitly explained that precision achieved in our method chiefly reflects the precision of the underlying CRDS analyser.
- Clarified and more thoroughly discussed the sources of variance in the long-term repeated measurements data (9-month period, 200 measures). More directly explained that the observed increase in variance in these data is likely due to instrument drift but could equally be due to transient inconsistencies in the

syringe method.

- Removed the reference of CF-IRMS measurement performance (Prosser et al., 1991) to avoid a direct performance comparison.
- Various improvements in wording, grammar. Fixes of typos and formatting mistakes.

**Other comments:**

- One point raised during peer-review concerned our citation of a separate paper of ours that we recently submitted to *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry* (RCM). That paper covered calibration of CRDS gas analyser under conditions of highly enriched  $^{13}\text{C}$  abundance. We are pleased to report that the peer-review process of that paper is completed and publication in RCM is forthcoming.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/rcm.7969/full>
- We have produced a short supplementary video showing our method in operation. This provides a demonstration of how to perform the syringe measurements as well as visual depiction of the physical measurement set-up. The video is currently available at (later to become formal video supplement):  
<https://youtu.be/jqVFUO-EuCk>

# System for $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$ and $x\text{CO}_2$ analysis of discrete gas samples by cavity ring-down spectroscopy

Dane Dickinson<sup>1</sup>, Samuel Bodé<sup>2</sup>, Pascal Boeckx<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Biosystems Engineering, Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium

5 <sup>2</sup> Isotope Bioscience Laboratory – ISOFYS, Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium

**Abstract.** A method was devised for analysing small discrete gas samples (50 ml syringe) by cavity ring-down spectroscopy (CRDS). Measurements were accomplished by inletting 50 ml syringed samples into an isotopic- $\text{CO}_2$  CRDS analyser (Picarro G2131-i) between baseline readings of a standard reference air, which produced sharp peaks in the CRDS data feed.

10 | A custom software script was developed to manage the measurement process and aggregate sample data in real-time. The method was successfully tested with  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fractions ( $x\text{CO}_2$ ) ranging from  $<0.1$  to  $>20000$  ppm and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$  values from -100 up to +30000 ‰ vs VPDB. Throughput was typically 10 samples  $\text{h}^{-1}$ , with 13  $\text{h}^{-1}$  possible under ideal conditions. The measurement failure rate in routine use was ca. 1 %. Calibration to correct for memory effects was performed with gravimetric gas standards ranging from 0.05 to 2109 ppm  $x\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$  levels varying from -27.3 to +21740 ‰.

15 | Repeatability tests demonstrated that method precision for 50 ml samples was ca. 0.05 % in  $x\text{CO}_2$  and 0.15 ‰ in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$  for  $\text{CO}_2$  compositions from 300 to 2000 ppm with natural abundance  $^{13}\text{C}$ . Long-term method consistency was tested over a 9-month period, with results showing no systematic measurement drift over time. Standardised analysis of discrete gas samples expands the scope of applications for isotopic- $\text{CO}_2$  CRDS and enhances its potential for replacing conventional isotope ratio measurement techniques. Our method involves minimal set-up costs and can be readily implemented in Picarro

20 | G2131-i and G2201-i analysers or tailored for use with other CRDS instruments and trace-gases.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: systematise measures

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: natural abundance

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: ‰.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: 8 to

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: 12

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: normal atmospheric

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: setup

## 1 Introduction

Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy (CRDS) is a high-sensitivity laser absorption technology becoming increasingly common for trace-gas analysis (Wang et al., 2008). As well as returning high-resolution mole fraction measurements (Crosson, 2008), CRDS is used for stable isotope analysis of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O, and N<sub>2</sub>O (Crosson et al., 2002; Dahnke et al., 2001; Kerstel et al., 2006; Sigrist et al., 2008). Commercial deployment of CRDS has created novel analytical possibilities with greater stability, precision, instrument portability, and a lower cost-basis compared with many traditional spectroscopic, chromatographic, and mass spectrometric techniques (Berryman et al., 2011; Hancock and Orr-Ewing, 2010; Mürtz and Hering, 2010; Picarro, 2009).

Crosson et al. (2002) provide a description of the working principles for making isotopic measurements by CRDS. Commonly used in atmospheric research, isotopic CRDS gas analysers are normally on-line instruments whereby sample gas is continuously pumped through an optical cavity. While such continuous measurement systems are useful for monitoring applications, technical adaption is necessary for routine handling of small discrete gas samples. Commercial add-on modules are available for this purpose (McAlexander et al., 2010; Picarro, 2013), but these are unable to match the rapidity of conventional methods like gas chromatography (GC) and isotope ratio mass spectrometry (IRMS).

CRDS analysis with discrete sample throughput and handling comparable to IRMS could significantly improve a variety of empirical research. For example, simultaneous high-precision isotope ratio and mole fraction measurements from isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> CRDS will reduce empirical workload and increase accuracy of CO<sub>2</sub> flux partitioning calculations in soil and plant respiration experiments (Midwood and Millard, 2011; Snell et al., 2014). However, realising these benefits requires regular batch analysis of discrete samples – existing arrangements that couple CRDS instruments directly to soil headspace chambers are generally constrained to measuring just one experiment at a time (Albanito et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2011; Midwood et al., 2008).

Berryman et al. (2011) describe a syringe sample delivery system for isotope ratio CRDS that allows small air samples (20 to 30 ml) to be analysed. In their method, the optical cavity of the CRDS analyser is flushed and completely evacuated prior to direct sample injection to ensure consistency and prevent sample-to-sample contamination. Although an important technical innovation with handling and cost advantages over IRMS, the set-up is limited by slow sample turnover rates ( $3 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ).

In this paper, we present a new method for measuring discrete syringed gas samples (50 ml) by CRDS. Like Berryman et al. (2011), this method was conceived for isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> CRDS to provide  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  and CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction ( $x_{\text{CO}_2}$ ) analysis in

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** , especially those involving <sup>13</sup>C-enriched tracers

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** setup

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** .

soil respiration studies, but remains general enough to be used in other contexts and adjusted for other gas species. Instead of evacuating the cavity prior to sample introduction, our process intersperses samples against background measurements of a fixed reference air and post-corrects for bias in the measurements. This results in considerably faster throughput for typical atmospheric samples (up to 13 h<sup>-1</sup>) than the method of Berryman et al. (2011). Additionally, with precision and discrete sample measurement rates comparable to automated continuous-flow IRMS, this method further advances CRDS as an attractive alternative for trace-gas isotope analysis.

## 2 Materials and methods

### 2.1 Analyser and sampling system

The CRDS instrument adapted for discrete sample measurement was a Picarro G2131-i isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> gas analyser (Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, CA, USA). Detailed description of the operation and spectroscopy of the G2131-i and predecessor units can be found in Dickinson et al. (2017), Hoffnagle (2015), Rella (2010a, 2010b, 2010c), and Wahl et al. (2006). In brief, sample air is circulated through a high-reflectivity optical cavity (35 cm<sup>3</sup>) at an inlet flow rate of ca. 25 ml min<sup>-1</sup> (NTP). Internal controls maintain the cavity at 318.150 ± 0.002 K and 18.67 ± 0.02 kPa. Spectroscopic ring-down time constants are measured across spectral bands of <sup>12</sup>C<sup>16</sup>O<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>C<sup>16</sup>O<sub>2</sub> to determine optical absorption peak heights, which are computed into <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C isotope ratio and CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction data (Hoffnagle, 2015). Spectral lines of <sup>12</sup>C<sup>1</sup>H<sub>4</sub> and <sup>1</sup>H<sub>2</sub><sup>16</sup>O are also measured for correcting direct and indirect spectral interferences from H<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> on the CO<sub>2</sub> bands. The normal measurement range for the G2131-i is set at 380 to 2000 ppm xCO<sub>2</sub> and natural abundance to +5000 ‰ in δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub> (Picarro, 2011).

All measurements made by the G2131-i are continually recorded at a rate of ca. 0.8 Hz; specific data must be extracted from log files for further treatment. Although discrete sample measurement is thus possible without special provision – by inletting the G2131-i with 200 to 300 ml of sample from a gasbag or chamber and retrieving the relevant data (Picarro, 2012) – such procedure is time inefficient and prone to errors from operator inconsistency. Furthermore, in many research settings it is impractical or impossible to gather such large samples (e.g. headspace chamber analyses). By instead applying a controlled procedure for inletting smaller volumes and software to automatically process the raw data in real-time, a more feasible method of discrete sample measurement was created.

A schematic of our measurement set-up is shown in Fig. 1. The system was simple in construction and concept: hermetic sample collection and delivery was achieved by high-quality gas-tight syringe with push-button valve and Luer lock fitting (50 ml, SGE Analytical Sci., Australia). A low permeability multi-layer foil gasbag (27 L Plastigas, Linde AG, Germany) functioned as a reservoir for a standard reference air, which was analysed between individual samples so as to give a 'baseline' for accurate data delineation. The large, non-pressurised volume of the reservoir meant pressure induced mixing

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: a

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: .

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: the

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: Hermetic

and back-flow risks were excluded, and allowed prolonged operation before refilling (>15 h). Gas-proof fluorinated-ethylene-propylene (FEP) tubing (Rotilabo, Carl Roth GmbH, Germany), Luer lock fittings, and Luer lock 3-way valves completed the set-up. All permanent tube fittings and joints were adhered with Loctite 406/770 (Henkel AG, Germany) to ensure robustness and prevent leakage. The FEP tubing between the syringe sample inlet point and the CRDS inlet port (Fig. 1) was minimised ( $\frac{1}{8}$ " OD  $\times$  44 cm, connected to the  $\frac{1}{4}$ " CRDS inlet port with reducing ferrule) to decrease mixing and lag time between sample delivery and measurement.

## 2.2 Sample measurement

The G2131-i and discrete sample measurement system were installed in an environmentally controlled laboratory (20 °C) to ensure stable operation. Syringed sample measurement was performed as follows: After instrument start-up and commencement of normal function, reference air measurement was initiated to establish stable baselines of  $x\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ . When a sample was ready for analysis, the syringe was connected to the sample inlet point (Fig. 1), and the 3-way valve manually actuated to stop the flow of reference air and supply the sample directly to the analyser. Upon opening the syringe valve the gas sample was drawn into the G2131-i, causing steady, unassisted collapse of the syringe plunger. Sample evacuation was completed in ca. 2.5 min, after which the sample inlet point valve was immediately reset and reference air intake resumed. Once  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  readings had returned to initial baseline levels (thereby safeguarding against sample-to-sample carryover), the process was repeated for the next sample. In this way, reference air readings were punctuated by syringe samples to create 'peaks' in the raw data output with a sample-to-sample time of ca. 5 min (Fig. 2). The gas aliquot size for all measurements was nominally 50 ml NTP. (Analysis of smaller amounts may be possible but 50 ml was assessed as a minimum for reliable operation. Samples larger than 50 ml would be easily handled, although adjustment of peak truncation parameters and re-calibration may be necessary for accurate performance – see below and Sect. 2.3.)

To achieve unambiguous sample peak identification, distinction in  $\text{CO}_2$  was required between reference air and sample. In practice this meant a relative change of ca. 2 % in  $x\text{CO}_2$  or ca. 5 % in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ . However, very large differences resulted in slower sample turnover (see Sect. 3.1). Best throughput was obtained using reference air that was similar to samples in  $x\text{CO}_2$  but contrasting in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  (e.g. 15 ‰ difference). In this work, dry standard air with 496 ppm  $x\text{CO}_2$  and -36.1 ‰  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  was used as the reference for all formal measurements (NA1, Table 1).

While sample measurement was performed manually (i.e. syringe connection and disconnection, valve operation etc.), to ensure method consistency we composed a custom computer software script to manage the process in real-time (script available in the Supplement). Running through the built-in 'Coordinator' software program of the G2131-i, our script prompted the user for correct timing of sample introduction, detected and extracted sample peak data, monitored reference air values, filtered problem measures, and recorded measurement results. The software script isolated individual samples

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: (>15 h)

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: .

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: )

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: ) to reduce

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: instrument

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: automatically

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: manually

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: throughput

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: results were

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted:  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: In the course of system testing, a basic algorithm for peak recognition and data extraction was developed. Due to the difficulty of real-time data flagging on the G2131-i, specific events and timings in the measurement process were used to isolate samples (Fig.

from the CRDS data-stream by using specific events and timings in the measurement process as cues (e.g. a basic peak recognition algorithm; Fig. 3a). Prior to introduction of a sample, a reference air baseline was recorded for 30 s and averaged. Sample detection (trigger) then occurred when  $x\text{CO}_2$  or  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  values deviated from the baseline beyond a fixed threshold (default: 0.5 % of  $x\text{CO}_2$  or 2 ‰ in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ ). The sample end (detrigger) was detected when measures returned halfway to baseline values (Fig. 3b). By truncating the sample peak data +80 s from the trigger and -29 s from the detrigger, ca. 30 s of representative measurement data was obtained for each sample (Fig. 3a). Upon completion of a sample measurement, the script computed means and standard deviations (SDs) of all data elements reported by the G2131-i (i.e.  $x\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $x\text{CH}_4$  values together with  $x\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ ). These statistics were compiled along with corresponding baseline measures, timestamped, assigned sample descriptors, and then outputted into a concise results file (see example in the Supplement). After each detrigger event the software monitored CRDS readings for return to initial reference air baseline values before directing the operator to proceed with the next sample.

In addition to the G2131-i analyser, our method was successfully trialled on a sister CRDS instrument (Picarro G2201-i). The G2201-i differs from the G2131-i only in additionally measuring  $^{13}\text{C}^1\text{H}_4$  to give  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$  data (Picarro, 2015). To assist method adoption, we supply software scripts customised for each instrument (Supplement). The scripts include provision for user-adjustment of peak identification and truncation parameters to suit individual set-ups. A short video recording of the system and measurement demonstration is also available (<https://youtu.be/jqVFUO-EuCk>).

### 2.3 Measurement calibration

As discussed in studies by Gkinis et al. (2011) and Stowasser et al. (2012), stepwise changes to the inlet gas composition (as occur with discrete samples) do not give rise to correspondingly abrupt jumps in CRDS measurements, and instead result in sigmoid-shaped steps in the data (Fig. 3b). These smoothed transitions are the combined result of (i) the rate of gas replenishment in the optical cavity (Stowasser et al., 2014), (ii) partial mixing (turbulence and diffusion) of gas compositions downstream of the sample inlet (Gkinis et al., 2011), and (iii) molecular sorption and desorption on internal surfaces of the cavity and inlet tubes (Friedrichs et al., 2010). Although 'response times' of CRDS instruments typically range 1 to 3 min (Picarro, 2011; Sumner et al., 2011), the actual time required for an optical cavity to completely transition to a new gas composition can be substantially longer. In testing the G2131-i, we observed remnants of previous gases persisting with asymptotical decline for as long as 40 min following very large shifts in  $\text{CO}_2$  composition (e.g.  $|\Delta x\text{CO}_2| > 10000$  ppm or  $|\Delta \delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2| > 5000$  ‰). While the error caused by the residual gases may sometimes be relatively trivial, all measurements that occur prior to the cavity attaining equilibrium will experience these 'memory effects'.

In the case of our 50 ml syringe samples, memory effects were clearly present, as evidenced by the asymptotic curvature in the data peaks (Fig. 2). This meant that reported measures of syringe samples were biased towards reference air compared to 'true' values that would be determined from measurements of indeterminately large sample volumes and monitoring for

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: -

... [1]

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: along

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: then

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: finally

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: files



asymptotic closure. Other researchers have mitigated memory effects by evacuating the optical cavity before sample [introduction](#) (Berryman et al., 2011), or through several replicate measurements (Gupta et al., 2009; Leffler and Welker, 2013). In this work however, we elected to post-correct for reference air contamination by calibrating our measurement method with bottled gas standards. More specifically, we compared discrete sample measurements of gas standards against 5 measures of the same standards directly inlet to the G2131-i for prolonged periods (>1 h). Importantly, no attempt was made to calibrate the syringe measurements directly against the gravimetric values of the standards – we were only concerned with isolating the bias associated with syringe sampling and not with any inaccuracies internal to the instrument spectroscopy (calibration of which should be undertaken separately; see for instance Dickinson et al., 2017). In this way we prevented convolution of errors that might have occurred if combining multiple layers of corrections into one step.

To this end, seven gravimetric gas standards with wide variation in CO<sub>2</sub> composition (0.05 to 2109 ppm xCO<sub>2</sub>, -27.3 to +21740 ‰ δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub>) were used as fixed source calibrants (see Table 1; exact compositions detailed in Dickinson et al., 2017). Direct measurements were performed by inleting the bottled standards to the G2131-i for more than one hour to ensure the absence of memory effects before taking formal measures for 10 min (ca. 460 data points; averages reported in 15 Table 1). Next, 50 ml syringe samples of the standards were taken directly from bottles (syringe was pre-flushed several times to preclude contamination) and measured using our method as outlined (ca. 8 samples of each standard, for 56 measures in total – dataset in the Supplement). Before further analysis, due to the high <sup>13</sup>C [abundance](#) in several gas standards, all reported CO<sub>2</sub> data were adjusted for accuracy by the formulae in Dickinson et al. (2017), thereby eliminating unaddressed interferences and calculation abnormalities in the internal spectroscopy of the G2131-i.

The relationship between syringe and bottle measurements was established by recognising that the data peaks generated by syringe samples could be approximated by generalised logistic curves (Fig. 3b; also Gkinis et al., 2011). From this, together with a constant aliquot size for all syringe measures, we were able to predict a simple linear scaling of syringe values:

$$\textit{syringe} = \textit{base} + (\textit{bottle} - \textit{base}) / K \quad (1)$$

25 where *syringe* refers to the measurement value obtained for a syringe sample of a gas standard, *base* to the baseline measurement of reference air prior to sample introduction, *bottle* to the direct [bottle](#) measurement of the same standard, and *K* is a dimensionless empirical constant.

30 While all CO<sub>2</sub> data elements reported by the G2131-i exhibited reasonably similar sample peak geometry, the empirical constants for <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> were expected to differ due to (de)sorption and diffusion induced isotope fractionation during sample filling of the optical cavity. Further, theoretical gas mixing considerations entailed Eq. (1) would not consistently hold for <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C isotope ratio data (*R*<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub>) where a simultaneous change in total-xCO<sub>2</sub> also occurred. Consequently, only x<sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and x<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> data were explicitly calibrated, with *R*<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> being subsequently recalculated. (Moreover, only the dry mole

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: injection

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: -enrichment

fraction data of  $^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $^{13}\text{CO}_2$  were used due to the high likelihood of different transition equalisation rates for  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . For explanation of dry and wet mole fraction data see: Hoffnagle, 2015; Rella, 2010a; Rella et al., 2013.) Accordingly, the following correction formulae were derived from Eq. (1):

$$x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected}) = x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{base}) + [x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{syringe}) - x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{base})] \cdot K_{C12} \quad (2)$$

$$5 \quad x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected}) = x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{base}) + [x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{syringe}) - x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{base})] \cdot K_{C13} \quad (3)$$

Total- $x\text{CO}_2$ ,  $R_{\text{CO}_2}$ , and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  data were then determined from the resulting corrected values of  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $x^{13}\text{CO}_2$ :

$$x\text{CO}_2 = x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected}) + x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected}) \quad (4)$$

$$R_{\text{CO}_2} = \frac{x^{13}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected})}{x^{12}\text{CO}_2(\text{corrected})} \quad (5)$$

$$\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2 = \left[ \left( \frac{R_{\text{CO}_2}}{R_{\text{VPDB}}} \right) - 1 \right] \cdot 1000 \text{ ‰} \quad (6)$$

- 10 The correction constants,  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$ , were found through weighted least squares analysis (WLS) of Eqs. (2) and (3) with syringe and bottle measurements of gas standards as input data (i.e. reverse regression of Eq. 1; bottle measures substituting for the left-hand-sides of Eqs. 2 and 3). To increase statistical power,  $R_{\text{CO}_2}$  and total- $x\text{CO}_2$  data from bottle measurements were also incorporated into the analysis with Eqs. (4) and (5), thereby forming an extended optimisation problem ( $n = 216$ ). In a similar vein to the WLS approach used by both Dickinson et al. (2017) and Stowasser et al. (2014) for calibrating CRDS
- 15 measures, residuals weights were taken as the reciprocals of the individual summed variances resulting from the SDs of each syringe sample and bottle measurement (see Supplement and Table 1). The WLS solution was determined in R (version 3.2.1; R Core Team, 2015) by general purpose optimisation using the L-BFGS-B algorithm (Zhu et al., 1997) to yield the best-fit correction constants for all available  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction and  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  isotope ratio data.

#### 2.4 Precision and consistency tests

- 20 The gas standards used for compensating memory effects in syringe sample measurements covered a wide span of  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fractions and very high  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  values. While this was necessary for ensuring calibration accuracy and applicability, because several of the standards contained  $\text{CO}_2$  compositions beyond the normal operating range of the G2131-i, those data were inappropriate for drawing conclusions about measurement precision.
- 25 Precision of method was therefore evaluated by replicate measurements of a systematic set of  $\text{CO}_2$  mixtures that better conformed to G2131-i specifications. Using gas standards as blending sources (Table 1; Dickinson et al., 2017), 20 unique mixes with varied  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fractions (ca. 300, 600, 1000, 1500, 2000 ppm) and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  values (ca. -30, +800, +1750, +2700, +3600 ‰) were prepared into multi-layer foil gasbags (1000 ml Supel Inert, Sigma-~~Aldrich Corp., St. Louis, MO, USA~~). (The set of mixtures formed an orthogonal array of cross combinations of  $x\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ ; cf. Fig. S1 in the

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25  
Deleted: Aldrich).

Supplement.) Each mix was sampled and measured with the syringe method three times in succession, and results analysed for inter- and intra-measurement variability.

5 Long-term consistency and reliability of our syringe method was assessed by periodic analysis of a standard air (NA2, Table 1) during the course of 9 months of routine instrument use. More than 200 measurements were conducted and results examined for precision and drift.

### 3 Results and discussion

#### 3.1 System operation

10 | Though somewhat labour intensive and requiring continual operator attention, the syringe sample measurement process was uncomplicated, reliable, and economical. Sample handling and CRDS operation was non-specialist in comparison to conventional IRMS. The method was flexible to CO<sub>2</sub> composition, successfully handling samples <0.1 to >20000 ppm xCO<sub>2</sub> and -100 to +30000 ‰ δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub>. The only significant methodological constraint observed was a reduction in sample turnover rate for compositions greater than either 3000 ppm xCO<sub>2</sub> or +4000 ‰ δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub>. This was because post-sample reference air measures took longer to return to pre-sample baselines due to memory effects, thereby extending the inter-sample period. Keeping CO<sub>2</sub> levels within G2131-i specifications resulted in a throughput of ca. 10 samples h<sup>-1</sup>. Best  
15 | measurement rates of 12 to 13 samples h<sup>-1</sup> occurred when sample CO<sub>2</sub> compositions neighboured the reference air (e.g. within ca. 100 ppm xCO<sub>2</sub> and ca. 20 ‰ δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub> of reference). These throughput rates are at least a 2-fold improvement over both the method of Berryman et al. (2011) and specialty peripheral devices (Picarro, 2013).

20 Following initial development, the syringe method was incorporated into our general laboratory practices and during the first year of implementation more than 10000 samples were measured. Despite intense instrument usage, we noticed no changes or adverse impacts on G2131-i function, although increased external pressure variations caused by frequent syringe evacuations may conceivably reduce mechanical lifetimes of optical cavity pressure control valves. Failures occurred in ca. 1 % of measurements, principally due to operator mistakes, but occasionally because of leakage in sample inlet valve, syringe  
25 | fault, or complications from the peak identification algorithm for samples very similar to the reference air (see Sect. 2.2). Very rarely, minor instabilities in reference air readings caused false peak detections and baseline return problems, but such instances were usually identified by the software script and internally resolved.

30 Durability of the gas-tight syringes used for sample delivery was excellent, although regular monitoring and maintenance was important to ensure smooth sample evacuation during the measurement process. Excessive plunger friction led to significant 'jumpiness' in syringe collapse, which manifested as small pressure fluctuations to the optical cavity and increased measurement noise (evidenced by larger reported SDs). Careful cleaning and exact silicone lubrication was carried

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: presence

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: 8 to

out every few hundred samples to ensure uniform plunger operation and prolongation of syringe life. Syringe push-button and sample inlet point valves also required periodic attention and were replaced as necessary to pre-empt leaks and breakages.

### 3.2 Correction of memory effects

- 5 From rearranging Eq. (1), the discrepancy between syringe and bottle measurements (syringe bias) was predicted to be proportional to the difference of the syringe value and reference air baseline (sample peak height):

$$(syringe - bottle) = (syringe - base) \cdot (1 - K) \quad (7)$$

- Comparing the actual syringe sample and bottle measurements of gas standards, we observed systematic memory effect bias that was indeed consistent with this postulated relationship (Fig. 4). WLS across all CO<sub>2</sub> data yielded estimates of 1.00341 for  $K_{C12}$  and 1.00440 for  $K_{C13}$ , with a coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) of 0.84 (weighted residuals) for the complete correction model. Standard errors for  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$  estimates were respectively 0.00017 and 0.00014 (see confidence intervals in Fig. 4). The Pearson's correlation coefficient between  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$  estimates was 0.26. The observed divergence in correction constants for <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> was statistically significant (t-test: P < 0.0001) with a larger memory effect present in <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> measurements. This result corroborates the expectation of isotope fractionation occurring during gas equalisation in the CRDS optical cavity, putatively due to surface (de)sorption and diffusion phenomena.

- Having determined  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$ , syringe CO<sub>2</sub> measurements can be adjusted for bias with Eqs. (2)–(6). Accuracy of these corrections is very good: The standard errors on  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$  add uncertainty to  $xCO_2$  and  $\delta^{13}C-CO_2$  data of less than 0.02 % of the difference between the sample and baseline values. For typical atmospheric samples, this additional source of error is entirely negligible compared to the uncertainty deriving from measurement precision and gas standard analytical accuracy.

- While the correction coefficients ( $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$ ) found in this work are unique to our sampling equipment and G2131-i analyser, the equivalent calibration may be easily performed on replica set-ups. We provide a generic spreadsheet to post-correct syringe sample CO<sub>2</sub> data for any values of  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$ , and a template for simultaneously applying the syringe correction with the spectroscopic calibration strategy of Dickinson et al. (2017) for <sup>13</sup>C-enriched samples (Supplement). Although our work only addresses memory effect bias in CO<sub>2</sub> data, we are confident the same strategy (Eq. 1) is straightforwardly applicable to other gas species (and isotopes) that can be similarly analysed by syringed samples and CRDS (e.g. CH<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O, N<sub>2</sub>O).

### 3.3 Measurement precision and consistency

- 30 Precision of CRDS data can be evaluated in several ways: The SD of a moving average is a common approach in continuous analyses of a dynamic source (e.g. the ambient atmosphere; Zellweger et al., 2016) while measures of homogenous gas

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: prospectively

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: setups

sources can be assessed by the SD of replicated samples (e.g. Wang et al., 2013) or by the SD of aggregated data in a single long-duration measurement (e.g.  $\geq 10$  min; as in Sect. 2.3 for bottle measurements, also Pang et al., 2016; and Stowasser et al., 2014). For our case of 50 ml syringe samples, replicate tests provided a detailed account of precision throughout the normal operational CO<sub>2</sub> range of the G2131-i, quantified in terms of both internal variation in individual sample analyses (i.e. intra-sample SD of the ca. 30 s of CRDS data comprising each measure, see Sect. 2.2) and the statistical dispersion of repeated samples (i.e. inter-sample SD).

Figure 5 shows inter- and intra-sample SDs and relative SDs for <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction data (complete dataset in the Supplement). The SDs of both species were generally proportional to their measured values and unaffected by  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  level (i.e. precision in <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> measurements were mutually independent). Relative SDs for both isotopologues remained near constant at  $\leq 0.05$  % across the tested ranges however (Fig. 5c, d). Notably, the majority of intra-sample SDs for both  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $x^{13}\text{CO}_2$  data were found to be in general agreement with counterpart inter-sample SDs (see trendlines in Fig. 5). This means that the SDs reported by our software script for <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions in individual syringe sample measures will reasonably approximate the expected precision for replicated measurements of those samples.

On the other hand, inter- and intra-sample SDs in <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C isotope ratio data were dependent on the  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  level and CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction, increasing with higher  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  and lower  $x\text{CO}_2$  (see Fig. S1a, b in the Supplement). The relative SDs of isotope ratio measurements were unaffected by  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  level but steadily decreased with increasing  $x\text{CO}_2$  – declining from between 0.07 and 0.04 % at 300 ppm  $x\text{CO}_2$  to between 0.03 and 0.015 % at 2000 ppm (Fig. S1d). One exception was at natural abundance isotope ratios ( $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2 \approx -30$  ‰) where inter-sample relative SDs of  $R_{\text{CO}_2}$  were steady at ca. 0.015 % (i.e. 0.15 ‰) across the tested  $x\text{CO}_2$  range (Fig. S1b). Somewhat opposing CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction data, intra-sample SDs of isotope ratio data were almost always greater than corresponding inter-sample SDs, which largely reflects the summation of variance from the <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> spectral measurements used to generate the <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C ratios. Nevertheless, as with <sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>, the SD reported for  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  in individual syringe sample measures may be used as a conservative proxy of  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  replicate precision.

Consistency of the syringed sample method was established by long-term repeated analysis of a standard air (NA2, Table 1). Figure 6 shows  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  data from 200 measurements covering a 9-month period (dataset available in the Supplement). Calibrating each measure for memory effects inherent to the syringe sample method (i.e. by Eqs. 2–6) but without correcting for instrument errors, these measures averaged 1024.18 ppm in  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and -27.35 ‰ in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  with respective SDs of 0.50 ppm and 0.33 ‰. The latter SD is larger than the inter-sample SD found in replicate measure testing (0.15 ‰, see above), possibly indicating the presence of instrument drift in the data in addition to random errors of repeated syringe sampling. However, because these data were only adjusted for systematic memory effects, they represent a simultaneous time-series test of instrument accuracy and methodological noise. While the separate components of error

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: levels (ca.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: Slightly

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: These

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: slightly

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: SDs

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: , likely

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: from

cannot be resolved here., moving-means (red lines in Fig. 6) show neither a sustained trend nor method discontinuity, and imply that reasonable measurement accuracy is possible under typical laboratory practices without perpetual calibration against gas standards (compare syringe sample measures against the direct bottle measurement of NA2; Fig. 6). The mean of intra-sample SDs in the 200 measures was 0.42 ppm for  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and 0.35 ‰ for  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ , both corresponding well to the aforementioned SDs of all measurements and the intra-sample SDs in the replicate tests. This consistency further supports our proposition that a single syringe measure and its intra-sample SD can deliver a similar (although inherently less reliable) statistical estimate to one generated through multiple sample measurements, potentially making replicate CRDS analyses unnecessary in research contexts where statistical uncertainty is not a critical consideration.

In sum, despite the short CRDS analysis period for a syringe sample (ca. 30 s), and limited number of replicates in performance testing, achieved measurement precision was excellent. With our system and G2131-i analyser, replicate sample SDs of  $\leq 0.05$  ‰ may be expected for  $^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and  $^{13}\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction data, while typical resolution in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  measurements will be ca. 0.15 ‰ at natural  $^{13}\text{C}$  abundance. Moreover, to a first approximation, similar precisions can be obtained from intra-sample SDs of single syringe sample measures. Our results are an improvement upon the 0.3 ‰ ( $x\text{CO}_2$ ) and 0.3 ‰ ( $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ ) precision attained by the system of Berryman et al. (2011), although this is likely due to the enhanced spectroscopic sensitivity of the G2131-i compared to the older G1101-i analyser used in their study. Additionally, our method delivers precision in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  comparable to the Picarro SSIM2 discrete sample peripheral device (0.11 ‰; Picarro, 2013) and traditional continuous-flow IRMS (typically 0.1 ‰), which, by contrast, are single-purpose instruments that do not also report accurate  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction measurements. And finally, although finer measurement resolution is possible with CRDS (e.g. by analysing larger gas aliquots or with continuous sampling; Pang et al., 2016), the uncertainties deriving from the precision of our discrete sample measures will be, in many cases, no worse than the typical tolerances on gravimetric gas standards used for instrument calibrations (e.g. Brewer et al., 2014; Dickinson et al., 2017). In such contexts, applying our method for isotopic and mole fraction analyses of trace-gases should generally not result in significantly poorer absolute accuracy compared to other sampling techniques (i.e. uncertainties on gas standards, rather than measurement precision, may limit overall accuracy).

### 3.4 Potential applications

At present, isotope ratio analysis of fixed trace-gas samples is usually achieved by IRMS interfaced to autosampling GC systems. Such instruments require specialised user training and carry high consumable costs however. Similarly capable CRDS-based techniques can avoid both these limitations and represent an advance in stable isotope analysis. Although not suitable for all sample types (e.g. non-atmospheric compositions of background gases; Friedrichs et al., 2010), adapting the present generation of CRDS gas analysers for rapid discrete sample measurement has promising application in contexts where syringe or flask sampling is frequently performed – especially where accurate gas mole fraction data is also valuable –

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: there was

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: time-series

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: cf.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: of NA2

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: (~

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: at atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: improve

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: partly

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: almost equal

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: cf

such as in ecosystem respiration and emission studies (e.g. Zeeman et al., 2008), analysing dissolved gases in terrestrial waters (Hope et al., 1995; Loose et al., 2009), and certain instances of trapped air in ice-cores (e.g. Sowers et al., 2005).

A specific example where our method has immediate relevance is in measuring CO<sub>2</sub> respiration in soil microcosm headspace studies. To date, applying CRDS gas analysers to such research is mostly achieved through closed-loop recirculation (Christiansen et al., 2015; Ramlow and Cotrufo, 2017) or continuous analysis of open chamber systems (Bai et al., 2011; Jassal et al., 2016). Apart from cost and complexity, these solutions typically restrict the number of experiments that can be concurrently measured by a single instrument. Our system significantly eases this constraint however. For instance, assuming a sample turnover of 10 h<sup>-1</sup> and conducting four syringed headspace measures per microcosm over the course of a 10 h workday, it is feasible to use one analyser for measuring daily respiration rates in 25 simultaneous experiments. Further, where CO<sub>2</sub> flux partitioning by isotopic analysis is undertaken, achieving sample measurement precision of ca. 0.05 % in  $\chi$ CO<sub>2</sub> and ca. 0.15 ‰ in  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  means that the resulting uncertainties on efflux partitions will be comparable (if not smaller) to those in studies using infrared gas analysis and IRMS or IRMS alone (compare Joos et al., 2008 and Munksgaard et al., 2013).

The primary drawbacks of employing our method for isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> measurement of discrete samples compared to an automated GC-IRMS system are (i) the larger sampling size, (ii) a more constrained operational  $\chi$ CO<sub>2</sub> range, and (iii) the necessity of near-continuous operator presence at the instrument. However, implementation of smaller volume CRDS optical cavities (8.5 cm<sup>3</sup>) could dramatically decrease the required sample amount and allow even shorter measurement times (e.g. Stowasser et al., 2014), while dilution methods and calibration can expand the  $\chi$ CO<sub>2</sub> measurement range of CRDS. Similarly, methodological refinement to integrate automated syringe sampling and valve systems would curtail labour requirements.

#### 4 Conclusions and outlook

Discrete sample analysis of trace-gases by CRDS is possible through basic instrument adaptation. We have set forth a scheme for  $\chi$ CO<sub>2</sub> and  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  determination of 50 ml syringed samples on a Picarro G2131-i isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> analyser. With software to manage the measurement process and compute results data, our method offers substantially faster analysis of small gas volumes with equal or better precision than comparable set-ups. Memory effects present in syringe sample measurements can be accurately compensated by calibration against large-volume measures of gravimetric gas standards.

Although CRDS is gaining scientific acceptance for isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> measurement, so far the technology has not seriously challenged IRMS in discrete gas sample analysis, despite lower running and capital costs, simpler operation, less measurement drift, and the added benefit of providing more accurate  $\chi$ CO<sub>2</sub> data concurrently with  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$ . In achieving

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: systems

similar precision and sample throughput to IRMS, our syringe sample method helps position CRDS as a tenable competitor for isotopic analysis of discrete samples.

5 The chief disadvantages of our process compared to IRMS for isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> analysis are a narrower CO<sub>2</sub> performance range, higher labour demands, and a comparatively large sample size (50 ml NTP). Method improvements towards automation may greatly ease user workload however, and the development of smaller optical cavities could reduce the sample gas needed for discrete analysis on future CRDS analysers as well as increasing sample throughput rates even further.

10 This system can be applied with any Picarro G2131-i or G2201-i CRDS analyser, though calibration and tuning of parameters in the software script may be necessary to account for variations in set-up, sample volume (and pressure), and reference air composition. Implementation on other CRDS instruments and conversion for measurements of other trace-gases are anticipated with only minor software amendments.

#### Supplement items

- 15
- Fig. S1. Precision in syringe sample <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C isotope ratio data
  - Discrete sampling software scripts for Picarro G2131-i and G2201-i analysers
  - Example\_discrete\_sample\_data\_output.csv
  - Measurement\_data.xlsx
  - Templates for bias correction (2)

20 *Acknowledgements.*

We are grateful to our ISOFYS colleagues Stijn Vandevoorde, Hannes De Schepper, and Katja Van Nieuland, for their assistance with instrument operation and numerous sample measurements. We also thank Lei Liu (CREAF-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain) for testing our method on a Picarro G2201-i CRDS unit and for providing feedback on method efficacy. Renato Winkler from Picarro Inc. aided this work with his useful advice on developing software scripts for the G2131-i analyser.

25 Finally, we thank two anonymous referees whose comments helped refine this paper.

#### References

Albanito, F., McAllister, J. L., Cescatti, A., Smith, P., and Robinson, D.: Dual-chamber measurements of δ<sup>13</sup>C of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> partitioned using a field-based three end-member model, Soil Biol. Biochem., 47, 106-115, 2012.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** operational

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** larger

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** requirement

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** ), and higher labour demands.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** refinements that integrate automatic syringes and valve systems

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** operator

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** volume

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** sample

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** instruments (e.g. Stowasser et al., 2014).

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** at ISOFYS (Ghent University, Belgium)



- Bai, M., Köstler, M., Kunstmann, J., Wilske, B., Gattinger, A., Frede, H.-G., and Breuer, L.: Biodegradability screening of soil amendments through coupling of wavelength-scanned cavity ring-down spectroscopy to multiple dynamic chambers, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 25, 3683-3689, 2011.
- Berryman, E. M., Marshall, J. D., Rahn, T., Cook, S. P., and Litvak, M.: Adaptation of continuous-flow cavity ring-down spectroscopy for batch analysis of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of  $\text{CO}_2$  and comparison with isotope ratio mass spectrometry, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 25, 2355-2360, 2011.
- Brewer, P. J., Brown, R. J., Miller, M. N., Miñarro, M. D., Murugan, A., Milton, M. J., and Rhoderick, G. C.: Preparation and Validation of Fully Synthetic Standard Gas Mixtures with Atmospheric Isotopic Composition for Global  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{CH}_4$  Monitoring, *Anal. Chem.*, 86, 1887-1893, 2014.
- 10 | [Christiansen, J. R., Outhwaite, J., and Smukler, S. M.: Comparison of  \$\text{CO}\_2\$ ,  \$\text{CH}\_4\$  and  \$\text{N}\_2\text{O}\$  soil-atmosphere exchange measured in static chambers with cavity ring-down spectroscopy and gas chromatography, \*Agr. Forest. Meteorol.\*, 211–212, 48-57, 2015.](#)
- Crosson, E. R.: A cavity ring-down analyzer for measuring atmospheric levels of methane, carbon dioxide, and water vapor, *Appl. Phys. B*, 92, 403-408, 2008.
- 15 | Crosson, E. R., Ricci, K. N., Richman, B. A., Chilese, F. C., Owano, T. G., Provencal, R. A., Todd, M. W., Glasser, J., Kachanov, A. A., Paldus, B. A., Spence, T. G., and Zare, R. N.: Stable isotope ratios using cavity ring-down spectroscopy: Determination of  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  for carbon dioxide in human breath, *Anal. Chem.*, 74, 2002.
- Dahnke, H., Kleine, D., Urban, W., Hering, P., and Mürtz, M.: Isotopic ratio measurement of methane in ambient air using mid-infrared cavity leak-out spectroscopy, *Appl. Phys. B*, 72, 121-125, 2001.
- 20 | Dickinson, D., Bodé, S., and Boeckx, P.: Measuring  $^{13}\text{C}$ -enriched  $\text{CO}_2$  in air [with a cavity ring-down spectroscopy gas analyser](#): Evaluation and calibration, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, doi: 10.1002/rcm.7969, 2017.
- Friedrichs, G., Bock, J., Temps, F., Fietzek, P., Körtzinger, A., and Wallace, D. W. R.: Toward continuous monitoring of seawater  $^{13}\text{CO}_2/^{12}\text{CO}_2$  isotope ratio and  $\text{pCO}_2$ : Performance of cavity ringdown spectroscopy and gas matrix effects, *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods*, 8, 539-551, 2010.
- 25 | Gkinis, V., Popp, T. J., Blunier, T., Bigler, M., Schupbach, S., Kettner, E., and Johnsen, S. J.: Water isotopic ratios from a continuously melted ice core sample, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 4, 2531-2542, 2011.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: , 2003-2007

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: by

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: of an isotopic- $\text{CO}_2$  gas analyser.  
Submitted to

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: Communications in

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: Spectrometry

Gupta, P., Noone, D., Galewsky, J., Sweeney, C., and Vaughn, B. H.: Demonstration of high-precision continuous measurements of water vapor isotopologues in laboratory and remote field deployments using wavelength-scanned cavity ring-down spectroscopy (WS-CRDS) technology, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 23, 2534-2542, 2009.

Hancock, G. and Orr-Ewing, A. J.: Applications of Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy in Atmospheric Chemistry. In: *Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2010.

Hoffnagle, J.: Understanding the G2131-i isotopic carbon dioxide data log. Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, California, USA, 2015.

[Hope, D., Dawson, J. J. C., Cresser, M. S., and Billett, M. F.: A method for measuring free CO<sub>2</sub> in upland streamwater using headspace analysis. \*J. Hydrol.\*, 166, 1-14, 1995.](#)

[Jassal, R. S., Webster, C., Black, T. A., Hawthorne, I., and Johnson, M. S.: Simultaneous Measurements of Soil CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> Fluxes Using Laser Absorption Spectroscopy. \*Agric. Environ. Lett.\*, 1, 2016.](#)

[Joos, O., Saurer, M., Heim, A., Hagedorn, F., Schmidt, M. W. I., and Siegwolf, R. T. W.: Can we use the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations determined by continuous-flow isotope ratio mass spectrometry from small samples for the Keeling plot approach?. \*Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.\*, 22, 4029-4034, 2008.](#)

Kerstel, E. R. T., Iannone, R. Q., Chenevier, M., Kass, S., Jost, H. J., and Romanini, D.: A water isotope (<sup>2</sup>H, <sup>17</sup>O, and <sup>18</sup>O) spectrometer based on optical feedback cavity-enhanced absorption for in situ airborne applications, *Appl. Phys. B*, 85, 397-406, 2006.

Leffler, A. J. and Welker, J. M.: Long-term increases in snow pack elevate leaf N and photosynthesis in *Salix arctica*: responses to a snow fence experiment in the High Arctic of NW Greenland, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 8, 025023, 2013.

[Loose, B., Stute, M., Alexander, P., and Smethie, W. M.: Design and deployment of a portable membrane equilibrators for sampling aqueous dissolved gases. \*Water Resour. Res.\*, 45, 6, 2009.](#)

McAlexander, W. I., Fellers, R., Owano, T. G., and Baer, D. S.: Carbon isotope analysis of discrete CO<sub>2</sub> samples ranging from 300 ppmv to 100% using cavity enhanced laser absorption, European Geophysical Union General Assembly, Vienna, Austria, 2010.

Midwood, A. J. and Millard, P.: Challenges in measuring the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of the soil surface CO<sub>2</sub> efflux, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 25, 232-242, 2011.

Midwood, A. J., Thornton, B., and Millard, P.: Measuring the <sup>13</sup>C content of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub> using a novel open chamber system, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 22, 2073-2081, 2008.

[Munksgaard, N. C., Davies, K., Wurster, C. M., Bass, A. M., and Bird, M. I.: Field-based cavity ring-down spectrometry of  \$\delta^{13}\text{C}\$  in soil-respired  \$\text{CO}\_2\$ , \*Isotopes Environ. Health Stud.\*, 49, 232-242, 2013.](#)

Mürtz, M. and Hering, P.: Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy for Medical Applications. In: Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2010.

- 5 Pang, J., Wen, X., Sun, X., and Huang, K.: Intercomparison of two cavity ring-down spectroscopy analyzers for atmospheric  $^{13}\text{CO}_2/^{12}\text{CO}_2$  measurement, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 3879-3891, 2016.

Picarro: G2131-i Analyser for Isotopic  $\text{CO}_2$  User's Guide. Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, California, USA, 2012.

Picarro: Picarro A0314 Small Sample Isotope Module 2. Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, California, USA, 2013.

- Picarro: Picarro G2131-i  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  High-Precision Isotopic  $\text{CO}_2$  CRDS Analyzer. Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, California, USA,  
10 2011.

Picarro: Picarro G2201-i CRDS Analyzer for Isotopic Carbon in  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{CH}_4$ . Picarro Inc., Santa Clara, California, USA, 2015.

Picarro: WS-CRDS for Isotopes – Cost of Measurement Comparison with IRMS for Liquid Water. Picarro Inc., Sunnyvale, California, USA, 2009.

- 15 [R Core Team: R: A Language Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2015.](#)

[Ramlow, M. and Cotrufo, M. F.: Woody biochar's greenhouse gas mitigation potential across fertilized and unfertilized agricultural soils and soil moisture regimes, \*GCB Bioenergy\*, doi: 10.1111/gcbb.12474, 2017.](#)

- 20 Rella, C.: Accurate stable carbon isotope ratio measurements in humid gas streams using the Picarro  $\delta^{13}\text{CO}_2$  G2101-i gas analyzer. Picarro Inc., Sunnyvale, California, USA, 2010a.

Rella, C.: Accurate stable carbon isotope ratio measurements with rapidly varying carbon dioxide concentrations using the Picarro  $\delta^{13}\text{CO}_2$  G2101-i gas analyzer. Picarro Inc., Sunnyvale, California, USA, 2010b.

Rella, C.: Reduced drift, high accuracy stable carbon isotope ratio measurements using a reference gas with the Picarro  $\delta^{13}\text{CO}_2$  G2101-i gas analyzer. Picarro Inc., Sunnyvale, California, USA, 2010c.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** Prosser, S. J., Brookes, S. T., Linton, A., and Preston, T.: Rapid, automated analysis of  $^{13}\text{C}$  and  $^{18}\text{O}$  of  $\text{CO}_2$  in gas samples by continuous-flow, isotope ratio mass spectrometry, *Biological Mass Spectrometry*, 20, 724-730, 1991. .

- Rella, C. W., Chen, H., Andrews, A. E., Filges, A., Gerbig, C., Hatakka, J., Karion, A., Miles, N. L., Richardson, S. J., Steinbacher, M., Sweeney, C., Wastine, B., and Zellweger, C.: High accuracy measurements of dry mole fractions of carbon dioxide and methane in humid air, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 837-860, 2013.
- Sigrist, M. W., Bartolome, R., Marinov, D., Rey, J. M., Vogler, D. E., and Wächter, H.: Trace gas monitoring with infrared laser-based detection schemes, *Appl. Phys. B*, 90, 289-300, 2008.
- Snell, H. S. K., Robinson, D., and Midwood, A. J.: Minimising methodological biases to improve the accuracy of partitioning soil respiration using natural abundance  $^{13}\text{C}$ , *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 28, 2341-2351, 2014.
- [Sowers, T., Bernard, S., Aballain, O., Chappellaz, J., Barnola, J. M., and Marik, T.: Records of the  \$\delta^{13}\text{C}\$  of atmospheric  \$\text{CH}\_4\$  over the last 2 centuries as recorded in Antarctic snow and ice, \*Global Biogeochem. Cycles\*, 19, 14, 2005.](#)
- Stowasser, C., Buizert, C., Gkinis, V., Chappellaz, J., Schüpbach, S., Bigler, M., Faïn, X., Sperlich, P., Baumgartner, M., Schilt, A., and Blunier, T.: Continuous measurements of methane mixing ratios from ice cores, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 5, 999-1013, 2012.
- Stowasser, C., Farinas, A. D., Ware, J., Wistisen, D. W., Rella, C., Wahl, E., Crosson, E., and Blunier, T.: A low-volume cavity ring-down spectrometer for sample-limited applications, *Appl. Phys. B*, 116, 255-270, 2014.
- Sumner, A. L., Hanft, E., Dindal, A., and McKernan, J.: Isotopic Carbon Dioxide Analyzers For Carbon Sequestration Monitoring Picarro Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy Analyzer For Isotopic  $\text{CO}_2$  - Model G1101-i, Battelle Memorial Institute, Environmental Technology Verification Report 600F11053, 2011.
- Wahl, E. H., Fidric, B., Rella, C. W., Koulikov, S., Kharlamov, B., Tan, S., Kachanov, A. A., Richman, B. A., Crosson, E. R., Paldus, B. A., Kalaskar, S., and Bowling, D. R.: Applications of cavity ring-down spectroscopy to high precision isotope ratio measurement of  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  in carbon dioxide, *Isotopes Environ. Health Stud.*, 42, 21-35, 2006.
- Wang, C., Miller, G. P., and Winstead, C. B.: Cavity Ringdown Laser Absorption Spectroscopy. In: *Encyclopedia of Analytical Chemistry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2008.
- Wang, J. L., Jacobson, G., Rella, C. W., Chang, C. Y., Liu, I., Liu, W. T., Chew, C., Ou-Yang, C. F., Liao, W. C., and Chang, C. C.: Flask sample measurements for  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  and CO using cavity ring-down spectrometry, *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 6, 7633-7657, 2013.
- Werner, R. A. and Brand, W. A.: Referencing strategies and techniques in stable isotope ratio analysis, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.*, 15, 501-519, 2001.

[Zeeman, M. J., Werner, R. A., Eugster, W., Siegwolf, R. T. W., Wehrle, G., Mohn, J., and Buchmann, N.: Optimization of automated gas sample collection and isotope ratio mass spectrometric analysis of  \$\delta^{13}\text{C}\$  of  \$\text{CO}\_2\$  in air, \*Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.\*, \*\*22\*\*, 3883-3892, 2008.](#)

5 Zellweger, C., Emmenegger, L., Firdaus, M., Hatakka, J., Heimann, M., Kozlova, E., Spain, T. G., Steinbacher, M., van der Schoot, M. V., and Buchmann, B.: Assessment of recent advances in measurement techniques for atmospheric carbon dioxide and methane observations, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, **9**, 4737-4757, 2016.

Zhu, C., Byrd, R. H., Lu, P., and Nocedal, J.: Algorithm 778: L-BFGS-B: Fortran subroutines for large-scale bound-constrained optimization, *ACM T. Math. Software*, **23**, 550-560, 1997.




Figure 1: Schematic diagram of the discrete gas sample measurement system coupled to the isotopic-CO<sub>2</sub> CRDS analyser.




Figure 2: Example CRDS data feed for syringe samples. Reference air measurements (ca. 425 ppm x<sup>12</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and -37 ‰ δ<sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub>) are interrupted by successive samples to form consistently identifiable peaks in the data.




Figure 3: (a) Example of raw G2131-i measurement data and breakdown of events during analysis of a 50 ml syringe sample. Blue segments are truncated from the sample peak by our software script while red segments are the extracted measurement data. All timings and thresholds are user-customisable in the software for variation in sample size and equipment. (b) The most reliable sample end time (dettrigger) was established as the point when measures returned to half the difference between peak-maximum (or minimum in the case of samples with lower  $x\text{CO}_2$  than reference air) and the baseline value. Grey lines are amplitude-normalised tailing segments from 23 test samples widely varying in  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$ . The broken green curve denotes a generalised logistic function fit to these test data by non-linear least squares optimisation. Solving the fitted function determined that  $29 \pm 2$  s elapsed between peak-maximum and half-maximum irrespective of sample composition.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: the data

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: and

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: measurements.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

Deleted: measurement






Figure 4: Discrepancies between syringe sample and direct bottle measurements (syringe bias) of gas standards as a function of the syringe sample peak height (Eq. 7) for (a)  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$ ; and (b)  $x^{13}\text{CO}_2$ . The WLS fitted linear models (see Sect. 2.3) are overlaid for comparison (solid lines; slopes =  $1-K$ , Eq. 7), with 95 % confidence intervals (shaded) and 95 % prediction intervals (dashed lines) as determined from the standard error estimates of  $K_{\text{C12}}$  and  $K_{\text{C13}}$  (Sect. 3.2).





Figure 5: Precision in syringe sample data for  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  (left: a, b) and  $x^{13}\text{CO}_2$  (right: c, d) as quantified by standard deviations (top: a, c) and relative standard deviations (bottom: b, d) for individual measures (red) and replicate measurements (blue).



5 Figure 6: Repeated syringe sample measurements in (a)  $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$  and (b)  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$  of standard gas NA2 (Table 1) over a 9-month period ( $n = 200$ ). Error bars denote  $\pm 1$  intra-sample SD of each individual measure. Grand means are the solid black horizontal lines with dotted lines indicating  $\pm 1$  SD of all measurements. 10-sample moving averages are shown in red. Histograms inset right depict cumulative distributions of syringe measures. Blue dashed lines indicate the direct bottle measurement of NA2 with blue shaded areas covering  $\pm 1$  SD of the bottle measure.

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** the data comprising

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** Blue dashed lines and shaded areas indicate the direct bottle measurement values and  $\pm 1$  SD. 10-measure

Dane Dickinson 29/8/2017 21:25

**Deleted:** measurements




Figure S1: Precision in syringe sample  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  isotope ratio data ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$ ,  $R_{\text{CO}_2}$ ) for individual measures (red) and replicate measurements (blue). (a) Standard deviations and (b) relative standard deviations as a function of total-CO<sub>2</sub> mole fraction and grouped by  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$ . (c) Standard deviations and (d) relative standard deviations as a function of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$  and grouped by total- $x\text{CO}_2$ .

| Standard ID       | $x^{12}\text{CO}_2$ (ppm) | $x^{13}\text{CO}_2$ (ppm) | $x\text{CO}_2$ (ppm) | $R_{\text{CO}_2}$<br>( $^{13}\text{CO}_2/^{12}\text{CO}_2$ ) <sup>*</sup> | $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$<br>(‰) <sup>**</sup> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| NA1<br>(Ref. air) | 490.55 (0.13)             | 5.286 (0.004)             | 495.84 (0.13)        | 1.0776 (0.0006)   | -36.14 (0.57)                                   |
| NA2               | 1024.26 (0.21)            | 11.137 (0.004)            | 1035.39 (0.21)       | 1.0874 (0.0003)   | -27.43 (0.28)                                   |
| ZERO              | 0.05 (0.04)               | 0.004 (0.004)             | 0.05 (0.04)          | -   | -   |
| HE1               | 2028.98 (0.47)            | 25.528 (0.007)            | 2054.51 (0.47)       | 1.2582 (0.0004)   | +125.35 (0.34)                                  |
| HE2               | 2009.15 (0.53)            | 100.11 (0.02)             | 2109.26 (0.53)       | 4.983 (0.001)   | +3456.9 (1.1)                                   |
| TT                | 1002.18 (0.22)            | 50.216 (0.008)            | 1052.40 (0.22)       | 5.011 (0.001)   | +3481.7 (1.1)                                   |
| LE1               | 402.24 (0.11)             | 25.249 (0.005)            | 427.49 (0.11)        | 6.277 (0.002)   | +4614.5 (1.7)                                   |
| LE2               | 398.21 (0.16)             | 101.24 (0.01)             | 499.45 (0.16)        | 25.42 (0.01)  | +21739 (9)                                      |

<sup>\*</sup>  $R_{\text{CO}_2}$  data are scaled by  $10^2$  for ease of comprehension.

<sup>\*\*</sup>  $\delta^{13}\text{C-CO}_2$  values are reported against VPDB (Werner and Brand, 2001).

**Table 1: Bottle measurement data of the standard air used as baseline for syringe sample measures (NA1) and the gas standards used in method calibration (NA2 through LE2). Values are the averages (SDs in parentheses) of 10 min measurements taken for each standard directly inlet to the CRDS analyser (see Sect. 2.3). Data have been **post**-corrected as per the calibration of Dickinson et al. (2017).**

## **Authors' reply to Anonymous Referee #1 interactive comment (RC1):**

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate both the encouraging comments and criticisms.

In terms of line-by-line edits, thank you for spotting the typos and areas of confusion. All of the points will be accommodated without difficulty in revision of the paper.

The more significant issues that were mentioned:

- (a) Confusion over the operation of the data-processing software script
- (b) Clarifying the application to soil headspace samples
- (c) Ambiguity over the achieved precision of the method

Regarding point (a): Our software script operates in real-time – processing data, monitoring the measurement process, and prompting the user to introduce syringe samples at the correct time. We will re-write part of the methods section and emphasise the utility of the script. We also intend to produce a short demonstration video to accompany the paper, which should provide the audience with a clear understanding of the measurement procedure and software.

For point (b): We will improve the discussion to explicitly mention application to headspace samples and likely performance in such cases.

For point (c): There has been a misunderstanding of method performance / precision. This was not helped by the unintended omission of the caption to Supplementary Figure S1. We will revise our discussion and other relevant sections to clarify our findings and reduce the risk of confusion in the final paper. For completeness, here below we answer specific issues that were queried on this point:

- Measurement precision is independent of reference gas composition. There is no effect on precision (or accuracy) by measuring a sequence of samples with CO<sub>2</sub> conc. very variable and different to the reference gas compared to a sequence of uniform samples similar to the reference gas. We meant to report that the method works best in terms of sample throughput rate when CO<sub>2</sub> concentration of the sample is similar to the reference gas, not that measurement precision was improved.
- For headspace samples much higher in CO<sub>2</sub> conc. than the reference gas, the only real challenge is a potential slow-down in the sample throughput rate due to increased inter-sample waiting time for memory effects dissipate (NB: this is a separate issue post-correction of memory effects in actual sample measurements). Our software script monitors the CRDS data-stream, in real-time, and ensures that memory effects from the previous sample are gone before prompting the operator to introduce the next sample. The bigger the difference in CO<sub>2</sub> composition between the reference and the sample, the longer the waiting time between samples (thus reducing sample turnover rate). For instance, if the reference gas is

500 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> and samples ranged 400-600 ppm (all natural <sup>13</sup>C abundances), measuring 12 samples h<sup>-1</sup> is realistic. However, if the difference in CO<sub>2</sub> conc. between samples and the reference were larger, e.g. if the reference is 500 ppm and samples 2000-3000 ppm, then throughput would reduce to around 8 samples h<sup>-1</sup>. With a sample CO<sub>2</sub> conc. >6000 ppm, the memory effect after each sample takes perhaps 15 minutes to clear, and so throughput would be <5 samples h<sup>-1</sup>. The situation is similar for samples highly enriched in <sup>13</sup>C. An additional (but separate) issue in such examples is that because the normal operating range of G2131-i/G2201-i is 380-2000 ppm and natural abundance <sup>13</sup>C, actual CRDS accuracy may become a question at very high concentrations or <sup>13</sup>C-enrichments (although we found that up to ca. 5000 ppm and +2000 ‰ vs. VPDB, CRDS accuracy is still very good).

- In terms of precision, the repeatability for CO<sub>2</sub> concentration measurements is ca. 0.05 % of the measured value, irrespective of the actual concentration (e.g. it's 0.2 ppm for 400 ppm samples, 1 ppm at 2000 ppm). An exception is at low concentrations (e.g. CO<sub>2</sub> <100 ppm) when CRDS resolution holds constant in absolute terms at around 0.02-0.05 ppm instead of a relative 0.05 %. Precision in δ<sup>13</sup>C is difficult to communicate because δ<sup>13</sup>C is a relative measure itself and describing the precision of a relative measure becomes confusing and misleading when a large range of values is covered, as in our precision tests. The most important point to understand is that, all else being equal, higher CO<sub>2</sub> conc. improves precision in isotope ratio measurement. For samples with natural <sup>13</sup>C abundance and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> conc., we found that precision in δ<sup>13</sup>C is ca. 0.15 ‰ (inter-sample SD). The reported 0.33 ‰ is the SD of 200 samples over a 9-month period. However, that is not a good indication of the repeatability from successive samples during 1 day in the lab. The gap between 0.15 ‰ and 0.33 ‰ shows the additional presence of small random instrument/methodological drift (inaccuracy) over the course of 9-months of operation. The report of 0.35 ‰ is the mean intra-sample SD of the 200 samples, and this value does indeed match our observations from the systematic precision testing. For the case of soil headspace samples (with natural abundance <sup>13</sup>C-CO<sub>2</sub>), if multiple samples are taken at a time, then precision of ca. 0.15 ‰ can be expected (inter-sample SD). However if only one headspace sample is taken at each time-point, the only precision value available is the intra-sample SD of that single sample, which will be ca. 0.3 ‰. At higher CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, both these precisions may improve slightly.

**Authors' reply to Anonymous Referee #2 interactive comment (RC2):**

NB: Original referee comments in black text. Author comments in red text.

We thank the reviewer for critiquing/commenting on our manuscript. We have included the complete text of RC2 below and made embedded replies in red so as to address directly the comments in context.

Dickinson et al. present a new and rather simple method that can easily analyze small discrete gas samples using a commercially available cavity ring-down spectroscopy gas analyzer. The major advancement in the performance of the system, compared to other methods, is a two-fold improvement in the throughput rate, which may be appreciated when such a system is regularly used for analysis of a large number of samples in the laboratory, as is the case described in the manuscript. Although it was developed for analysis of  $x\text{CO}_2$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$ , the method can be extended to analyze other species with similar instrumentation. My general impression is that the real content of the manuscript is thin, and a significant part of the text focuses on apparent technical description/maintenance rather than technical advancement. For example, it is unclear whether there is any advantage in the precision/accuracy of the system compared to other methods, other than the precision improvement of the commercially available CRDS itself. The accuracy of the measurements is not included due to the separation of one story into two manuscripts that are simultaneously in review for two different journals, which I found it, at several places, inconvenient to be forced to read another manuscript of the same author to obtain necessary details. Considering the abovementioned points, I strongly recommend (even I know it is hard to convince) the authors combining the two manuscripts and publish one piece of nice work. One good paper is worth more than two OK papers.

We understand the impression of the reviewer – it might seem like a trivial adaptation to transform a continuous flow instrument into a discrete analyser. However, we strongly believe that there is considerable need for a detailed description of 'simple' discrete sample laser based isotope analyser. At present, there is no time and cost effective method for reliably measuring discrete gas samples by continuous sampling CRDS instruments such as the Picarro G2131-i and other models. Commercial peripheries (e.g. Picarro A0314 SSIM2) and previous published method (Berryman et al. 2011) are slow, complex, and cannot provide gas mole fraction data due to dilution processes inherent to the measurement process. There is clear need (in soil respiration headspace studies as just



one example) for a practical simple way to make accurate measurements of small discrete samples with CRDS instruments (both for isotope ratio and mole fraction measurements).

The rationale given for the reviewer's concerns were as follows:

1. That the work does not constitute a technical advancement.
2. That the paper does not properly compare the precision and accuracy of the presented method with previous/other methods.
3. That accuracy of our system is not addressed, which is instead referred to in a separate publication.

To point 1:

To the best of our knowledge there is no published description of an equivalent method for conducting discrete gas sample measurements by CRDS instruments at a rate of 12 h<sup>-1</sup> that gives both accurate isotope ratio and mole fraction data. Hence we stand by our work as an important advance to the state-of-the-art.

To point 2:

This is not correct – we have compared our method against existing methods and equipment (Sect. 3.3). We do not make major claim that our method significantly improves precision compared to other methods, but we do report the precision we achieved, and we note that it is at least similar to other methods. As for accuracy, any measurement system or method that is “properly calibrated” is “accurate”, by definition. In addition to performing an appropriate calibration, we have reported the uncertainty associated with applying our calibration to correct for memory effects inherent in syringe measures (p. 9: 0.02% of the sample peak height).

And to point 3:

This is not correct – we have addressed the accuracy / bias of our method in Sections 2.3, 3.2, and Figure 4. It is true however that we have not addressed the accuracy of CRDS instrumentation in this work. We believe that such a question should be examined separately so as to not confuse or conflate the multiple phenomena that may cause errors in different CRDS measurements. There are numerous published papers that evaluate accuracy / calibration of CRDS instruments. Researchers that do not need to measure CO<sub>2</sub> compositions with high <sup>13</sup>C abundances will not find our other publication interesting, but they may nonetheless wish to perform measurements of small discrete syringe samples and find the present work extremely useful. A vice-versa scenario is also probable.

**Other comments:**

1) Comparing the precision of the system and that of previous systems, how much of the improvement is due to the enhanced spectroscopic sensitivity of the CRDS?

We do not know. We have explicitly acknowledged that the improved precision we report

may be due to improved CRDS instrumentation rather than advantage in our method. We do not mean to claim that our method gives significant advancement in precision (but it is important that our method is not worse in precision). Our primary claims are: high throughput rate, accurate simultaneous mole fraction and isotope ratio data, practicality, low cost, time-efficiency. In revision we will adjust some of the text to make our reports of achieved precision more modest.

2) The method uses ~30 sample data for the analysis. Have the authors considered making a curve fit to the data set and using the steady value of the fit instead? In this way, the measurement will not be sensitive to the baseline signal any more.

We understand this suggestion to mean that a steady baseline reading might not be necessary if we used a curve-fitting algorithm on the syringe sample data. We did think about this, but we foresaw two major problems:

- First, gas replacement / mixing in the optical cavity entails that the composition in the cavity prior to introduction of a syringe sample affects the CRDS measurement (memory effect), and consequently, for such an algorithm to work, the CRDS data prior to the syringe sample introduction would need to be an input variable. This is practically the same as recording the baseline.
- Secondly, designing a software script to perform such a task in real-time is not trivial. Aside from such curve-fitting probably requiring computationally expensive non-linear optimisation, Picarro instrumentation and software is not user-friendly for real-time data flagging and analysis. Yet in order to realise the suggestion, the fitting algorithm would need to “know” the exact time when the syringe sample was introduced into the analyser so as to provide a start-point. Building a computerised device to signal the position of the manual syringe input valve is not a simple solution in comparison to our baseline recording and peak detection process.

Detailed comments:

P3/L29: what does “stable operation” imply here? As the cavity temperature is strictly controlled, is any difference expected if the whole system is located in an unconditional room?

It is true that the optical cavity is well controlled, however other researchers have nevertheless noted environmentally induced variations in measurements, which are thought to arise out of residual uncompensated fluctuations to the cavity (Kwok et al. 2015). Ambient temperature fluctuation is also mentioned as a potential source of instrument drift in pamphlets published by the instrument manufacturer. An environmentally controlled lab simply mitigates all risk for error in this regard.

P5/L26: Can the authors explain why zero air (0.05 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>) is

included and why is the range claimed to include the zero air? I do not see the value of adding zero air, and the isotopic signature of the zero seems strange.

The greater the range of data used in the WLS optimisation of Eqs. 2-5, the lower the resulting uncertainty for correcting syringe bias / memory effects. By measuring zero air, we acquired excellent “negative peak” data, which thus improved the statistical estimates of the correction constants  $K_{C12}$  and  $K_{C13}$  (see Fig. 4). In terms of isotope ratio signature for zero air, well there is no sensible/measurable ratio that can be made: isotopic ratio “measurements” of zero air must be recognised as spurious given the CRDS instrument develops too much noise at ppb levels of  $^{13}\text{CO}_2$  for meaningful ratio assessments. (Isotope ratio data for ZERO were excluded from WLS optimisation.)

P5: I wonder whether there is systematic but significant bias between the “true” value of the syringe sample and the bottle sample, which could be introduced during the sampling process.

We compared the syringe sample values against CRDS measurements of bottle standards (not against gravimetric values of the standards). The calibration/post-correction therefore transforms “syringe measurements” into “bottle measurements” eliminating the systematic bias between those two gas delivery methods. Any constant bias introduced by the syringe sampling process (e.g. ambient air contamination) would be seen as a linear offset (constant term) within the dataset shown in Figure 4, however no such offset was observed. Any other error or “inconsistent bias” from sampling would simply add to the random errors of the syringe measurements (and give worse inter-sample precision).

P10/L10: Were the 9-month period measurements calibrated? It is difficult to judge when the accuracy of the system is not mentioned in the manuscript.

Each individual sample measurement from the 9-month dataset was calibrated for syringe bias, but was not individually calibrated for random instrument drift. The reviewer is correct in noting that these data are therefore a simultaneous test of method accuracy and instrument accuracy. However, the purpose of these data is to examine consistency of the syringe method under typical laboratory practices over a long period of time. We have explicitly explained that the observed increase in variance seen in these data is likely due to instrument drift but could equally be due to transient inconsistencies in the syringe method. We will further clarify this point in revision.

P10/L31: The traditional continuous-flow IRMS can do much better than  $\sim 0.1\%$ . The reference should not be limited to an old paper Prosser et al., 1991.

The reference was simply mentioned as a guideline value: From our experience and with

current information of CF-IRMS producers, 0.1‰ is a typical value and not entirely obsolete. However, to avoid any misrepresentation, we will remove this out-dated reference and avoid making a direct performance comparison to state-of-the-art CF-IRMS.

#### References:

E. M. Berryman, J. D. Marshall, T. Rahn, S. P. Cook, M. Litvak. Adaptation of continuous-flow cavity ring-down spectroscopy for batch analysis of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of  $\text{CO}_2$  and comparison with isotope ratio mass spectrometry. *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 2011, 25, 2355

C. Y. Kwok, O. Laurent, A. Guemri, C. Philippon, B. Wastine, C. W. Rella, C. Vuillemin, F. Truong, M. Delmotte, V. Kazan, M. Darding, B. Lebegue, C. Kaiser, I. Xueref-Remy, M. Ramonet. Comprehensive laboratory and field testing of cavity ring-down spectroscopy analyzers measuring  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{CO}$ . *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 2015, 8, 3867