- 1 Comparison of <u>slant open-path</u> flux gradient and <u>static closed</u> chamber techniques to
- 2 measure soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions
- 3 Mei Bai<sup>1,\*</sup>, Helen Suter<sup>1</sup>, Shu Kee Lam<sup>1</sup>, Thomas K. Flesch<sup>2</sup>, Deli Chen<sup>1</sup>
- <sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC

5 3010, Australia

- <sup>6</sup> <sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB <del>T6G</del>
- 7 **2R3**<u>T6E 2H4</u>, Canada
- 8 Correspondence to: Mei Bai (<u>mei.bai@unimelb.edu.au</u>)
- 9

### 10 Abstract

11 Improving the direct field measurement techniques to quantify gases emissions from the large agriculture farmcropped agricultural fields is challenging. We compared nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) 12 emissions measured with static closed chambers to those from a newly developed 13 micrometeorologicalaerodynamic flux gradient (FG) approach. Measurements were made at a 14 vegetable farm following chicken manure application. The FG calculations were made with a 15 single open-path Fourier transform infrared (OP-FTIR) spectrometer (height of 1.45 m) 16 deployed in a slant-path configuration: sequentially aimed at retro reflectors at heights of 0.8 17 18 and 1.8 m above ground. Hourly emissions were measured with the FG technique, but once a day between 10:00 and 13:00 with chambers. We compared the concurrent emission ratios 19 (FG/Chambers) between these two techniques, and found N<sub>2</sub>O emission rates from celery crop 20 21 farm measured at mid-day by FG were statistically higher (1.422–1.40 times) than those from the chambers measured at the same time. Our results suggest the OP-FTIR slant-path FG 22 configuration worked well in this study: it was sufficiently sensitive to detect the N<sub>2</sub>O gradients 23 over our site, giving high temporal resolution N<sub>2</sub>O emissions corresponding to a large 24 measurement footprint. 25

Keywords: chamber techniques, chicken manure, flux gradient, N<sub>2</sub>O emission, OP-FTIR
spectroscopy

29

Abbreviations: FG, flux gradient; OP-FTIR, open-path Fourier transform infrared
spectroscopy

32

# 33 **1 Introduction**

The accurate measurement of soil nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions from agricultural land is 34 35 challenging. Chambers are commonly used for these measurements (Hutchinson and Mosier, 1981), and chamber based observations are widely used to calculate greenhouse gas inventories 36 (Dalal et al., 2008). The principle behind the most common type of chamber measurement 37 (static, or non-steady state) is to create a sealed control volume over the soil surface, such that 38 by monitoring the gas concentration change during the chamber deployment, one can calculate 39 the surface emission rate (Denmead, 2008). One of the advantages of chambers is that they can 40 be employed at relatively low cost, with simplicity and easy field operation (de Klein et al., 41 2001). However, chambers have a fundamental limitation – the control volume inevitably 42 perturbs the soil-atmosphere interface (e.g., temperature, pressure), which has the potential to 43 modify the ambient soil emission rate (Denmead, 1979). Moreover, manually operated static 44 45 chambers are not well-suited to measure temporal variations in emissions (Denmead et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2011). These weaknesses The temporal variation issue can be addressed by 46 alternative approaches, e.g. a dynamic measurement with automated-chamber opening and 47 closing by pneumatic actuators (Yao et al., 2009) and can be run for many months. However, 48 in many situations the most important disadvantage of chambers is their small surface 49 measurement footprint. With a surface enclosure typically less than 1 m<sup>2</sup>, and the likelihood 50 that soil emissions vary dramatically at length scales greater than 1 m (Denmead, 2008; Griffith 51

- and Galle, 2000; Turner et al., 2008), many replications are needed to adequately quantify the
  emissions from an agricultural field (Christensen et al., 1996; Denmead, 1995).
- 54

Micrometeorological measurements avoid some of the problems associated with chamber 55 methods (Christensen et al., 1996; Denmead et al., 2010; Li et al., 2008; Pattey et al., 2006). 56 These techniques are based on concentration and windflow measurements made in the free air 57 58 above the surface, and they do not perturb the surface environment. They also measure emissions over footprints much larger than those from chambers (Hargreaves et al., 1996). The 59 60 aerodynamic flux gradient (FG) technique is a well-used micrometeorological method, where the vertical flux of gas is inferred from a height gradient in concentration (multiplied by an 61 estimate of the gasturbulent diffusivity). When measured above a large and homogeneous 62 surface, this atmospheric flux is assumed equal to the underlying surface emission or 63 absorption rate. In this study we used a recently developed modification of the technique. 64 Rather than vertically separated point concentrations, we used a slant-path configuration based 65 on vertically separated long line-averaged measurements (Flesch et al., 2016; Wilson and 66 Flesch, 2016). A single open-path Fourier transform infrared (OP-FTIR) concentration sensor 67 with motorized aiming gives the gas concentrations along the two paths, from which we can 68 calculate the surface emission/deposition rate. 69

70

In this study we conducted a set of N<sub>2</sub>O emission measurements from a vegetable farm following manure application. Measurements were made with both static chambers and the slant-path FG approach. Our objective was to 1) demonstrate the newly developed slant-path FG method at a vegetable farm; and 2) compare the emission rates measured by the static chamber and FG techniques.

#### 77 2 Materials and methods

#### 78 **2.1 Experimental site**

This study was conducted at an intensive vegetable farm in Clyde, Victoria, Australia (38.1° 79 S, 145.3° E). The site consisted of two adjacent fields of 5.4 ha (Site 1) and 3.1 ha (Site 2). 80 These sites differ only in the addition of a fertilizer amendment at Site 2. A celery crop at the 81 4-5 leaf stage was transplanted to these two sites on 27 Febuary 2014 (Fig. 1). Chicken manure 82  $(4.3\% \text{ N}, \text{NH}_4^+-\text{N}: 4633 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}, \text{NO}_3-\text{N}: 313 \text{ mg kg}^{-1})$  was applied at rate of 8.2 tonne ha<sup>-1</sup> at 83 both sites on 28 March. Fertiliser Cal-Gran (a blend of calcium ammonium nitrate and 84 ammonium sulphate, total 23.9% N) was also applied at both sites at rate of 200 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> on 15 85 April. Emission measurements began just prior to manure application and ended on 6 May 86 2014. The terrain was open and flat with sandy loam topsoils. Prevailing winds were southeast 87 or northwest during this period. The average daily minimum and maximum temperature 88 waswere 6 and 33°C, respectively. The total precipitation (including rainfall and irrigation) 89 during the measurement period was 186 mm. 90

91 Figure 1

92

### 93 2.2 Methodologies

### 94 2.2.1 Static chamber

Four static chambers  $(50 \times 50 \times 25 \text{ cm})$  were located at each site (Fig. 1). The metal base for each chamber was placed into the soil to a depth of 8 cm prior to the experiment, and remained in place through the study. The chamber was made of plexiglass with a built in ventilation system. Reflective aluminium foil was attached inside the lid to minimize changes in ambient pressure and temperature after the chamber was placed onto the base. A thermocouple Tinytag Transit 2 (TG-4080 temperature loggers, West Sussex, UK) was placed on the soil surface inside the chamber to monitor the headspace air temperature. Gas samples (20 mL) were collected into evacuated 12 mL vials (Exetainer®, Labco Ltd., Ceredigion, UK) at 0, 30 and
60 minutes after chamber placement and analysed at an off-site laboratory by gas
chromatography (GC) (Agilent 7890A, Wilmington, USA). The sensitivity of GC for N<sub>2</sub>O
concentration was 0.01 ppm. Gas samples were collected daily between 10:00 and 13:00 from
29 March to 7 April and on 9, 11 and 16 April. The N<sub>2</sub>O flux was calculated as (Ruser et al.,
1998) (Eq. 1):

108 
$$Q_{chamber} = \underbrace{\mathsf{K}_{N20}}_{(273/T)} (V/A) \, dC/dt \tag{1}$$

109 where  $Q_{chamber}$  is the gas flux ( $\mu$ g N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>), K);  $K_{N2O}$  is a density factor for N<sub>2</sub>O gas, 1.25 110 ( $\mu$ g N  $\mu$ L<sup>-1</sup>), according to the ideal gas law, where  $K_{N2O} = P m/R T_0$ , and P is air pressure (at 111 1 atm), m is molecular mass (28 g mol<sup>-1</sup>), R is gas constant (0.0821 L atm K<sup>-1</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_0$  is 112 273 K; T is the air temperature within the chamber (K), Y is the total volume of headspace 113 (L), Y is a surface area inside the chamber (m<sup>2</sup>), Y is the rate of change in 114 concentrationmole fraction of N<sub>2</sub>O in the chamber ( $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>). determined by linear 115 regression model. The N<sub>2</sub>O mole fraction is provide by GC, in ppm.

116

# 117 **2.2.2 Flux gradient**

The basic principle of the FG method has been well-described (Judd et al., 1999; Laubach and Kelliher, 2004; Webb et al., 1980). We followed a modification described in Flesch et al. (2016), in which an open-path sensor was used to measure the concentration difference ( $\Delta C_L$ ) between two <u>vertically offset</u> slant-paths. The open-path sensor measures gas concentration between the sensor and a distant retro reflector. The concentration difference  $\Delta C_L$  is calculated by sequentially aiming the sensor at high and low retro reflectors (Eqs. 2, 3):. Flesch et al. (2016) showed that the conventional FG eqution can be transformed into Eqs. 2, 3:

125 
$$Q_{FG} = (k_{\nu}\rho_a \, u_{\ast}/S_c)(M_s/M_a) \, *\kappa \, *\Delta C_L$$
(2)

126 
$$\kappa = l_{PATH} / \int_{\chi_1}^{\chi_2} [\ln(z_{p2}/z_{p1}) - \varphi(z_{p2}/L) + \varphi(z_{p1}/L)] dx$$
 (3)

where  $Q_{FG}$  is the gas flux (g m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>),  $k_v$  is von Karman's constant (0.4),  $\rho_a$  is dry air density (g 127 m<sup>-3</sup>),  $u_*$  is friction velocity (m s<sup>-1</sup>),  $S_c$  is the turbulent Schmidt number (0.64),  $M_s$  and  $M_a$  are 128 the molar mass of N<sub>2</sub>O (44 g mol<sup>-1</sup>) and dry air (29 g mol<sup>-1</sup>), respectively,  $\Delta C_L$  (ppb) is the 129 difference in the line-average volumetric mixing ratio of the gas (relative to dry air) from the 130 lower  $(z_{p1})$  and upper  $(z_{p2})$  paths (m, relative to celery beds surface),  $\kappa$  is proportional to the 131 height integral of the gas diffusivity along the FTIR path pair, *l*<sub>PATH</sub> is the sensor-retro reflector 132 133 path length (m, equal for the two paths), L is atmospheric Obukhov stability length (m). Path heights  $(z_{p1} \text{ and } z_{p2})$  along the path length are given by a 5th-order polynomial fit of height vs. 134 distance from the OP-FTIR spectrometer (path heights were measured in the field at 5 m 135 136 intervals). We used the stability correction factor  $\varphi$  from Flesch et al. (2016).

137

138 An estimate of the uncertainty in  $Q_{FG}$  ( $\delta_{QFG}$ ) was calculated as the sum in quadrature of the 139 relative uncertainties in  $S_c$ ,  $\Delta C_L$  and  $\kappa$  according to the formula described in Flesch et al. (2016). 140  $Q_{FG}$  values were not calculated when  $u^* < 0.05$  m s<sup>-1</sup>.

141

The FG calculations relied on open-path concentrations measured with a robust Bruker OP-142 FTIR spectrometer (Matrix-M IRcube, Bruker Optics, Ettlingen, Germany) and two retro 143 144 reflectors located 80 m from the spectrometer (PLX Industries, New York, USA). Briefly, the OP-FTIR system measures multiple gas concentrations (N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and water 145 vapour) with high precision (N<sub>2</sub>O < 0.3 ppb, CH<sub>4</sub> < 2 ppb, NH<sub>3</sub>, 0.4ppb, CO<sub>2</sub>, 1 ppm, CO, 0.1 146 147 ppb, and water vapour < 5%) (Griffith, 1996; Griffith et al., 2008; Griffith et al., 2012). More 148 details on the OP-FTIR system can be found in Bai (2010). The spectrometer was mounted at a height of 1.45 m above ground. A motorized mounting head sequentially aimed the 149

spectrometer to the retro reflectors at 0.8 and 1.8 m above ground. Line-averaged N<sub>2</sub>O 150 concentrations with an averaging time of 2.5-min were measured. Background  $N_{2}O$ 151 152 concentrations were measured prior to manure application in order to assess measurement 153 precision. A sequence of obsevations were averaged, the standard deviation of the mean was retrieved and the precision of N<sub>2</sub>O concentration measurements (less than 0.3 ppb) was 154 determined according to Bai (2010). The OP-FTIR measurements were made continuously 155 156 from 25 March until 16 April, and thereafter measurements were made for three days (continuously) per week until 6 May. 157

158

A weather station coupled with a three-dimensional sonic anemometer (CSAT3, Campbell 159 Scientific, Logan, UT, USA) was established at a height of 3.0 m above ground, 50 m east of 160 Site 2. Fifteen-min average climatic data including ambient temperature, pressure and wind 161 162 statistics were recorded by a data logger (CR23X, Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA) at a frequency of 10 Hz. Atmospheric stability parameters of friction velocity  $(u^*)$ , surface 163 164 roughness (z<sub>0</sub>) and Obukhov stability length (L) were calculated. from the ultrasonic 165 anemometer data. We used a data filtering procedure to remove error-prone observations in the FG calculation according to Flesch et al. (2014). 166

167 <del>To</del>

The FG flux measurements correspond to surface emissions within a flux "footprint". The 168 169 footprint generally extends upwind of the concentration sensors, but its spatial size varies with 170 wind conditions. A concern of this study is that the FG footprint extends beyond our plots, and the calculated emission rates are "contaminated" by emissions occurring outside the plot. This 171 172 possibility was investigated by modelling the FG footprint for our smaller Site 2, where the 173 contamination concerns are greater. The WindTrax dispersion software 174 (thunderbeachscientific.com) was used to simulate the OP-FTIR slant-path setup, and calculate 175 the fraction of the FG measured flux occurring within the Site 2 plot. We looked at the wind direction that results in a short fetch (NE), and looked at different atmospheric stability 176 conditions and roughness lengths. The results for  $z_0 = 0.1$  m (representative of the plot) are 177 178 shown in Figure 2. We concluded that during stable night-time conditions the FG emission calculations for Site 2 maybe contaminated by up to 40% by outside fluxes. This may result in 179 either over- or under-estimation of Site 2 emissions depending on the emission rate outside the 180 181 plot. In unstable daytime conditions the contamination potential falls to 0–10%. Contamination at Site 1 will not be as serious due to the larger fetches. 182

183

The main objective of our study is to compare the two measurement techniques we chamber 184 and FG emission estimates. We looked at periods with concurrent measurements from FG and 185 the chamberstwo techniques, and hourly flux ratios of QFG/Qchamber measured between 10:00 186 187 and 13:00 are compared. Because the comparison took place during the day when conditions were generally unstable, the FG contamination potential is low (and will be ignored). The 188 contamination potential does highlight a concern with micrometeorological measurements, that 189 a large measurement footprint may extend outside the study area and result in measurement 190 191 errors.

192 <u>Figure 2</u>

193

# 194 **3 Results and discussion**

195 **3.1 Daily N<sub>2</sub>O flux** 

The FG measurements gave high temporal resolution of fluxes and this provides an opportunity
to study the pattern of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in detail. Here we only describe the temporal flux
measurements from Site 1.

### 200 **3.1.1 The <b>FG**<u>flux gradient</u> fluxes

Hourly N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes showed large temporal variation during the experimental period in response 201 to fertilisation. There was a rapid increase in N<sub>2</sub>O emission from a background level of 0.6 mg 202 N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> before manure application to a peak of 158.0 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> within 24 h 203 after application, which could be attributed to both nitrification and denitrification. After the 204 peak, several spikes between 16-17 April were also observed associated with fertilizer 205 application, followed by a decline in emissions to an average of 2.5 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup>  $h^{-1}$  (Fig. 206 207 2A3A). One of the conclusions we draw from Figure 2B3B is that the slant path FG system is 208 sensitive enough to measure the N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes that accompanied fertilisation at our site, i.e., the measurement uncertainty as represented by  $1-\sigma$  is generally well below the flux magnitude. 209

210

In addition to the long-term pattern of decreasing emissions after manure application, we 211 observed a diurnal pattern where maximum emission tended to occur in the late afternoon 212 (16:00) (Fig. 2B3B). We believe this is related to the time of maximum soil surface 213 temperature, which occurs after the peak air temperature (Christensen et al., 1996; Wang et al., 214 2013). A strong diurnal emission pattern implies that once-a-day snapshot emission 215 measurements (e.g., chambers) would almost certainly give a biased estimate of the daily 216 average emission rate. We also noticed occasional high emissions at night, which was closely 217 related to precipitation events. Negative N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes calculated from the FG measurements most 218 219 likely represent instrument noise, as the flux magnitudes were below the detectable limit of our 220 OP-FTIR system, i.e.g., the uncertainty represented by the 1- $\sigma$  error bars in Fig. 23 span zero. Figure  $\frac{23}{2}$ 221

222

# 223 **3.1.2 Chamber fluxes**

Nitrous oxide fluxes from the static chambers (once-a-day snapshots) were in general agreement with the FG measurements in terms of the long-term <u>patternbackground exchange</u> <u>patterns</u> (Fig. <u>23</u>): hourly fluxes rose from a background level of 1.12 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> (before manure application, data is not shown), reached a spike of 3.48 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> 48 hours after manure application, then dropped to a minimum of 1.02 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> on 5 April. A maximum emission peak of 3.55 mg N<sub>2</sub>O–N m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> was measured on 16 April and was most likely related to fertilizer application.

231

# 232 **3.2** Comparison of the two <u>emissionmeasurement</u> techniques

We selected the concurrent measurements from FG and the chambers and a total of 23 comparison pairs were obtained during the study period (note that each chamber observation is an average from four replicate chambers). We calculated the ratio Q<sub>FG</sub>/Q<sub>chamber</sub> of these concurrent pairs.

237

The  $O_{FG}/O_{chamber}$  ratio showed large variation, with values ranging between 0.4 and 4.9. The 238 Q<sub>FG</sub>/Q<sub>chamber</sub> data follows a non-normal distribution. To better interpret these data we log-239 transformed the ratios (Abdi et al., 2015). The average of the natural logarithm of the ratio, 240 converted back to the ratio units, gives the geometric mean (the process was duplicated to 241 calculate the confidence interval  $\alpha = 0.9$ ). The geometric mean of Q<sub>FG</sub>/Q<sub>chamber</sub> was 1.40, with 242 a confidence interval ranging from 1.15 to 1.69. This means that on average the FG measured 243 fluxes were 40% higher than those from the chambers, and this difference was statistically 244 significant. 245

246

247 Differences between chamber and micrometeorological measurements have been previously
248 noted. Some studies have reported that micrometeorological techniques gave emission rates

that were 50–60% of those from chambers (Christensen et al., 1996; Neftel et al., 2010). In
contrast, Wang et al. (2013) reported N<sub>2</sub>O emissions measured by chambers were 17–20%
lower than from the eddy covariance micrometeorological technique, and Norman et al. (1997)
reported that chamber measurements were 30% lower than micrometeorological
measurements. Sommer et al. (2004) found static vented chambers underestimated N<sub>2</sub>O
emissions from manure piles by 12–22% compared to mass balance measurements.

255

Discrepancies between FG and chamber fluxes could be due to very different measurement 256 257 footprints. Large spatial variability is a characteristic of soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. For example, Turner et al. (2008) reported N<sub>2</sub>O emissions varied from 30 to 800 ng N<sub>2</sub>O-N  $m^{-2}$  s<sup>-1</sup> over an 258 irrigated dairy pasture (8,100 m<sup>2</sup>). This high variability, together with the substantial difference 259 in measurement footprint size (chambers  $< 1 \text{ m}^2 \text{ vs } \text{FG} > 1000 \text{ m}^2$ ) will likely result in 260 differences between the two techniques because the chambers are not capable of accounting 261 for this variability, unless many chambers are used, whilst the FG method can. If this explains 262 the difference between the two techniques, then discrepancies between chambers and 263 micrometeorological techniques should be site dependent, i.e., dependent on the degree of 264 spatial variability in emissions at each site. 265

266

Several researchers have reported that chamber <u>flux calculation</u> procedures introduced large uncertainty in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions (Levy et al., 2011; Venterea et al., 2010). In particular, using linear regression to determine the rate of change dC/dt in Eq. (1) can lead to an underestimate of emissions (Anthony et al., 1995; Matthias et al., 1978). Venterea (2013) concluded that the typical calculations used for non-steady state chambers underestimated N<sub>2</sub>O emissions by 20-50%. Our results are in line with this conclusion. To examine the potential bias in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions when dC/dt is estimated with a linear regression model, we also calculated the results

274	using a non-linear monomolecular model (Bolker, 2007). The monomolecular model is one of
275	the simplest saturating functions and follows (Eq. 4):
276	$\underline{C_{N20}} = \underline{a_0} + \underline{a_1} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\underline{a_2}/\underline{a_1} * t\right)\right) \tag{4}$
277	where $C_{N20}$ is the mole fraction of N <sub>2</sub> O, $a_0$ is the intercept corresponding to the N <sub>2</sub> O mole
278	fraction at time $t = 0$ , $a_1$ is the horizontal asymptote at $t = +\infty$ , $a_2$ is the slope $(dC/dt)$ at $t = 0$ ,
279	and t is time after chamber placement (h).
280	
281	Chamber fluxes calculated using the non-linear $dC/dt$ (Q <sub>chamber-non-linear</sub> ) were 1.15 times higher
282	than Q <sub>chamber</sub> estimated using linear regression. Comparing the concurrent fluxes of Q <sub>FG</sub> and
283	<u>Q</u> <sub>chamber-non-linear</sub> , we found the geometric mean of $Q_{FG}/Q_{chamber-non-linear}$ to be 1.22 (confidence
284	interval of 0.99 to 1.49). Using 10,000 bootstrap re-samples (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), we
285	computed 10,000 potential mean fluxes from the non-linear model, of which 9540 of the means
286	were greater than 1, and 460 were lower than 1. This result suggests the use of the non-linear
287	dC/dt calculation has resulted in better agreement with the FG estimates.
288	
289	While there is a long and successful history of FG applications, there are still questions about
290	its implementation. The value of the turbulent Schmidt number $(S_c)$ in Eq. (2) is debated (Flesch
291	et al., 2002). In addition, concerns about FG arise if the fetch (upwind distance from the
292	concentration measurement to the source edge) is not large. In our case the ratio of $z_{\pm}$ (the
293	maximum height of the OP-FTIR measurement path, 1.8 m) to the upwind fetch (minimum of
294	90-68 m for Sites 1 and 2, respectively) was < 1:35. This is considered to be sufficient in most
295	conditions, but during stable night-time conditions the fetch may not have been large enough
296	to satisfy the FG assumption of a constant flux layer (Flesch et al., 2016). In this case the FG
297	measurements would have been contaminated by emissions occurring upwind of our sites.
298	There is also a concern regarding the accuracy of FG during light winds. In our study the light

wind data (0.05–0.15 m s<sup>-1</sup>) accounted for 24% of the measurement periods. We found the FG uncertainty ( $\delta_{QFG}/Q_{FG}$ ) increased from 0.41 to 1.25 when the friction velocity (*u*\*) dropped from 0.15 to 0.05 m s<sup>-1</sup>. However, we note that in this study the periods in which we compared FG and chamber measurements were not light wind periods.

303

# 304 4 Conclusions

305 Our results showed that FG and static chamber measurements of soil N2O emissions measured by FG and static chambers (linear dC/dt) were statistically different, with fluxes from FG being 306 307 on average 40% higher. Using a non-linear calculation of dC/dt in the chambers decreased the disagreement to 22%. Given the likelihood of large spatial variability in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, and 308 the vastly different measurement footprints of the two methods, it is not surprising the two 309 techniques give different results. It is difficult to conclude that one technique or the other is 310 biased based on this experiment alone. However, the relationship we observed, together with 311 other reports on the biases created by chamber calculation procedures, supports an 312 interpretation that our FG emission calculations were accurate and in this instance the chamber 313 measurements were biased too low. 314

315

The OP-FTIR flux gradient system used here showed the capability for real-time emission measurements over a large spatial footprint with no surface interference. Furthermore, being free from pumps and tubing, the open-path FG system would be particularly advantageous for measuring multiple gas emissions including "sticky" gases like NH<sub>3</sub>.

320

# 321 **5** Author contribution

322	DC, HS, SKL, MB and TF designed the experiments and MB and SKL carried them out. TF
323	and MB developed the techniques. MB prepared the manuscript with contributions from all
324	co-authors.

#### **326 6 Competing interests**

- 327 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
- 328

# 329 7 Acknowledgments

- 330 This study was funded by the Australian Department of Agriculture (DA), and the Canadian
- 331 Agricultural Greenhouse Gases Program (AGGP). The authors thank Schruers' vegetable farm,
- 332 Adam Schruers and staff for their great support. The authors also thank Rohan Davies from
- BASF Australia Ltd. for providing assistance. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the
- staff and students from Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences soil research group at
- the University of Melbourne during this campaign. <u>We specially thank Dr Raphaël Trouvé for</u>
- 336 <u>helping with non-linear model analysis.</u> The valuable comments from three unknownall
- 337 reviewers were appreciated.
- 338

# 339 **References**

- Abdi, D., Cade-Menun, B.J., Ziadi, N., Parent, L.-É., 2015. Compositional statistical analysis
  of soil <sup>31</sup>P-NMR forms. Geoderma. 257–258, 40-47.
- Anthony, W.H., Hutchinson, G.L., Livingston, G.P., 1995. Chamber measurement of soil-
- atmosphere gas exchange: Linear vs. diffusion-based flux models. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 59,
  1308-1310.
- Bai, M., 2010. Methane emissions from livestock measured by novel spectroscopic
  techniques, School of Chemistry. University of Wollongong, p. 303.
- Bolker, B., 2007. Ecological Models and Data in R. Princeton University Press, The United
   States of America.
- 349 Christensen, S., Ambus, P., Arah, J.R.M., Clayton, H., Galle, B., Griffith, D.W.T.,
- Hargreaves, K.J., Klemedtsson, L., Lind, A.M., Maag, M., Scott, A., Skiba, U., Smith, K.A.,

- Welling, M., Wienhold, F.G., 1996. Nitrous oxide emission from an agricultural field:
- 352 comparison between measurements by flux chamber and micrometerological techniques.353 Atmos. Environ. 30, 4183.
- Dalal, R.C., Allen, D.E., Livesley, S.J., Richards, G., 2008. Magnitude and biophysical
  regulators of methane emission and consumption in the Australian agricultural, forest, and
  submerged landscapes: a review. Plant Soil. 309, 43-76.
- de Klein, C.A.M., Sherlock, R.R., Cameron, K.C., van der Weerden, T.J., 2001. Nitrous
- oxide emissions from agricultural soils in New Zealand—A review of current knowledge and
   directions for future research. J. Roy. Soc. New Zeal. 31, 543-574.
- Denmead, O.T., 1979. Chamber systems for measuring nitrous oxide emission from soils inthe field. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 43, 89-95.
- 362 Denmead, O.T., 1995. Novel meteorological methods for measuing trace gas fluxes. Philos.
  363 T. R. Soc. A. 351, 383-396.
- Denmead, O.T., 2008. Approaches to measuring fluxes of methane and nitrous oxide betweenlandscapes and the atmosphere. Plant and Soil. 309, 5-24.
- Denmead, O.T., Chen, D., Griffith, D.W.T., Loh, Z.M., Bai, M., Naylor, T., 2008. Emissions
  of the indirect greenhouse gases NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from Australian beef cattle feedlots. Aust. J.
  Exp. Agr. 48, 213-218.
- 369 Denmead, O.T., Macdonald, B.C.T., Bryant, G., Naylor, T., Wilson, S., Griffith, D.W.T.,
- 370 Wang, W.J., Salter, B., White, I., Moody, P.W., 2010. Emissions of methane and nitrous
- 371 oxide from Australian sugarcane soils. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 150, 748-756.
- <u>Efron, B., Tibshirani, R.J., 1994. An intruduction to bookstrap. Chapman&Hall/CRC, Boca</u>
   <u>Raton, London, New York, Washington, D.C.</u>
- Flesch, K.T., Baron, V., Wilson, J., Griffith, D.W.T., Basarab, J., Carlson, P., 2016.
- Agricultural gas emissions during the spring thaw: Applying a new measuremnt technique.Agric. Forest Meteorol. 221, 111-121.
- Flesch, T.K., McGinn, S.M., Chen, D.L., Wilson, J.D., Desjardins, R.L., 2014. Data filtering
  for inverse dispersion emission calculations. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 198-199, 1-6.
- Flesch, T.K., Prueger, J.H., Hatfield, J.L., 2002. Turbulent Schmidt number from a tracer
  experiment. J. Appl. Meteorol. 111, 299-307.
- Griffith, D.W.T., 1996. Synthetic calibration and quantitative analysis of gas-phase FT-IR
  spectra. Appl. Spectrosc. 50, 59-70.
- Griffith, D.W.T., Bryant, G.R., Hsu, D., Reisinger, A.R., 2008. Methane emissions from free ranging cattle: comparison of tracer and integrated horizontal flux techniques. J. Environ.
   Qual. 37, 582-591.
- 386 <u>Griffith, D.W.T.,</u> Deutscher, N.M., Caldow, C., Kettlewell, G., Riggenbach, M., Hammer, S.,
- 2012. A Fourier transform infrared trace gas and isotope analyser for atmospheric
- applications. Atmos. Meas. Tech. 5, 2481-2498.

- Griffith, D.W.T., Galle, B., 2000. Flux measurements of NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> using dual beam
  FTIR spectroscopy and the flux gradient technique. Atmos. Environ. 34, 1087-1098.
- Hargreaves, K.J., Wienhold, F.G., Klemedtsson, L., Arah, J.R.M., Beverland, I.J., Fowler, D.,
- Galle, B., Griffith, D.W.T., Skiba, U., Smith, K.A., Welling, M., Harrris, G.W., 1996.
- Measurement of nitrous oxide from Agricultural land using micrometeorological methods.Atmos. Environ. 30, 1563-1571.
- Hutchinson, G.L., Mosier, A.R., 1981. Improved soil cover method for field measurement of
  nitrous oxide fluxes. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 45, 311-316.
- Jones, S.K., Famulari, D., Di Marco, C.F., Nemitz, E., Skiba, U.M., Rees, R.M., Sutton,
- 398 M.A., 2011. Nitrous oxide emissions from managed grassland: a comparison of eddy
- 399 covariance and static chamber measurements. Atmos. Meas. Tech. 4, 2179-2194.
- Judd, M.J., Kellier, F.M., Ulyatt, M.J., Lassey, K.R., Tate, K.R., Shelton, D., Harvey, M.J.,
- 401 Walker, C.F., 1999. Net methane emissions from grazing sheep. Global Change Biol. 5, 647-
- 402 657.
- Laubach, J., Kelliher, F.M., 2004. Measuring methane emission rates of a dairy cow herd by
  two micrometeorological techniques. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 125, 279-303.
- Levy, P.E., Gray, A., Leeson, S.R., Gaiawyn, J., Kelly, M.P.C., Cooper, M.D.A., Dinsmore,
- 406 K.J., Jones, S.K., Sheppard, L.J., 2011. Quantification of uncertainty in trace gas fluxes
- 407 measured by the static chamber method. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 62, 811-821.
- Li, J., Tong, X., Yu, Q., Dong, Y., Peng, C., 2008. Micrometeorological measurements of
  nitrous oxide exchange above a cropland. Atmos. Environ. 42, 6992-7001.
- Matthias, A.D., Yarger, D.N., Weinback, R.S., 1978. A numerical evaluation of chamber
  methods for determining gas fluxes. Geophys. Res. Lett. 5, 765-768.
- 412 Neftel, A., Ammanna, C., Fischer, C., Spirig, C., Conen, F., Emmenegger, L., Tuzson, B.,
- Wahlen, S., 2010. N<sub>2</sub>O exchange over managed grassland: Application of a quantum cascade
  laser spectrometer for micrometeorological flux measurements. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 150,
  775-785.
- 416 Norman, J.M., Kucharik, C.J., Gower, S.T., Baldocchi, D.D., Crill, P.M., Rayment, M.,
- Savage, K., Striegl, R.G., 1997. A comparison of six methods for measuring soil-surface
  carbon dioxide fluxes. J. Geophys. Res. 102, 28771-28777.
- Pattey, E., Strachan, I.B., Desjardins, R.L., Edwards, G.C., Dow, D., MacPherson, J.I., 2006.
  Application of a tunable diode laser to the measurement of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from field to
  landscape scale using several micrometeorological techniques. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 136,
  222-236.
- Ruser, R., Flessa, H., Schilling, R., Steindl, H., Beese, F., 1998. Soil compaction and
  fertilization effects on nitrous oxide and methane fluxes in potato fields. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.
  62, 1587-1595.
- 426 Sommer, S.G., McGinn, S.M., Hao, X., Larney, F.J., 2004. Techniques for measuring gas 427 amissions from a compositing stock pile of cettle menure. Atmos Environ 28, 4642, 4652
- 427 emissions from a composting stock pile of cattle manure. Atmos. Environ. 38, 4643-4652.

- 428 Turner, D.A., Chen, D., Galbally, I.E., Leuning, R., Edis, R.B., Li, Y., Kelly, K., Phillips, F.,
- 2008. Spatial variability of nitrous oxide emissions from an Australian irrigated dairy pasture.
  Plant and Soil. 309, 77-88.
- Venterea, R.T., 2013. Theoretical comparison of advanced methods for calculating nitrous
  oxide fluxes using non-steady state chambers. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 77, 709-720.
- 433 Venterea, R.T., Dolan, M., Ochsner, T.E., 2010. Urea decreases nitrous oxide emissions
- 434 compared with anhydrous ammonia in a Minnesota corn cropping system. Soil Sci. Soc. Am.435 J. 74, 407-418.
- 436 Wang, K., Zheng, X., Pihlatie, M., Vesala, T., Liu, C., Haapanala, S., Mammarella, I.,
- Rannik, Ü., Liu, H., 2013. Comparison between static chamber and tunable diode laser-based
  eddy covariance techniques for measuring nitrous oxide fluxes from a cotton field. Agric.
- 439 Forest Meteorol. 171–172, 9-19.
- 440 Webb, E.K., Pearman, G.I., Leuning, R., 1980. Correction of flux measurements for
- chemistry effects due to heat and water vapour transfer. Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 106, 85-100.
- Wilson, J.D., Flesch, T.K., 2016. Generalized flux-gradient technique pairing line-average
  concentrations on vertically separated paths. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 220, 170-176.
- 445 Yao, Z., Zheng, X., Xie, B., Liu, C., Mei, B., Dong, H., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Zhu, J., 2009.
- Comparison of manual and automated chambers for field measurements of N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>
  fluxes from cultivated land. Atmos. Environ. 43, 1888-1896.
- 448
- 449 **Figures**
- 450 Figure 1



Figure 1 The design of the study (upper panel) and photo of experimental site with OP-FTIR
set up (lower panel). Emission measurements were conducted with static chambers (four per
site) and FG using the OP-FTIR spectroscopy system with retro reflectors at 0.8 and 1.8 m
above ground. The figure is not in scale.







#### 487 Anonymous refere#1

488 Re: Revision of manuscript Number: AMT-2018-90, Title: Comparison of flux gradient and
 489 chamber techniques to measure soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions

- 490
- 491

### 492 We thank the positive feedback on the manuscript.

Reviewer is aware of the difference in N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes between these two techniques that is mainly because
 that the static chamber measurements were obtained periodically (no measurements during night time or morning). Reviewer suggested to compare the cumulative flux over the first 10 days after N
 fertilizer was applied.

497 we agree, and the chamber vs. FG comparison was only evaluated during periods of concurrent

498 measurements. In the revised manuscript, we have summarised our footprint analysis on FG fluxes

499 and the investigation of the bias of chamber measurements using linear dC/dt.

500 The cumulative flux is often estimated by summing the mean daily flux over a period of time. Ideally, 501 a continuous real time series (or regular measurements during the day) should be used as emissions 502 can vary throughout the day. As we used chambers measurements only from 11 am to noon each day, 503 calculating cumulative fluxes using the chamber data would result in a biased

- solution. Furthermore, a cumulative flux ratio between the two measurement methods would only
- 505 provide one data point, which would preclude inference.
- 506
- 507
- 508
- 509
- 510
- 511
- 512
- 513
- 514
- 515
- 516
- \_ . \_
- 517
- 518

- 519 Refere #2
- 520 Dear Dr. Flechard,

Re: Revision of manuscript Number: AMT-2018-90, Title: Comparison of flux gradient and 521 522 chamber techniques to measure soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions 523 524 We thank the positive feedback on the manuscript. We have addressed the comments thoroughly, 525 526 our response to every issue raised is given point by point in **blue text** below. 527 528 529 The reviewer is aware of the conclusions that should count two aspects: 1) quantitative footprint 530 analysis, 2) recalculate the chamber fluxes using non-linear algorithms. 531 532 Authors agree with the reviewer. 533 We conducted a footprint analysis using the Windtrax dispersion model to examine the contribution 534 of area outside our plot to the slant-path FG fluxes. We examined Site 2 (the smaller plot) and 535 considered a wind direction which would be the worst-case scenario for a footprint (wind from 536 NE). We also considered the atmospheric stability (1/L) and surface roughness  $(z_0)$ . We estimated the 537 footprint of the slant-path configuration, and what fraction of the surface flux occurred within the plot

538 boundary. Figure A shows the Estimated flux footprint fraction at Site 2 increased from stable to

539 unstable conditions at  $z_0 = 0.1$  m.



**Fig. A** Estimated flux footprint fraction at Site 2, plotted versus atmospheric stability (the reciprocal of the Obukhov length *L*). The model results are for a roughness length  $z_0 = 0.1$  m.

This result suggests the OP-FTIR flux estimates at night-time could be contaminated by emissions
outside the plot (up to 40% contaminated). However, the contamination decreases to < 10% during</li>
the day time.

546

547 The results are summarised in the revised manuscript, see on page 7-8, Line 166-188 and Figure 2.

548 "The FG flux measurements correspond to surface emissions within a flux "footprint". The footprint 549 generally extends upwind of the concentration sensors, but its spatial size varies with wind conditions. A concern of this study is that the FG footprint extends beyond our plots, and the calculated 550 551 emission rates are "contaminated" by emissions occurring outside the plot. This possibility was 552 investigated by modelling the FG footprint for our smaller Site 2, where the contamination concerns 553 are greater. The WindTrax dispersion software (thunderbeachscientific.com) was used to simulate the 554 *OP-FTIR slant-path setup, and calculate the fraction of the FG measured flux occurring within the Site* 555 2 plot. We looked at the wind direction that results in a short fetch (NE), and looked at different atmospheric stability conditions and roughness lengths. The results for  $z_0 = 0.1 m$  (representative of 556 557 the plot) are shown in Figure 2. We concluded that during stable night-time conditions the FG emission 558 calculations for Site 2 maybe contaminated by up to 40% by outside fluxes. This may result in either 559 over- or under-estimation of Site 2 emissions depending on the emission rate outside the plot. In 560 unstable daytime conditions the contamination potential falls to 0 - 10%. Contamination at Site 1 will 561 not be as serious due to the larger fetches.

The main objective of our study is to compare chamber and FG emission estimates. We looked at periods with concurrent measurements from the two techniques, and hourly flux ratios of Q<sub>FG</sub>/Q<sub>chamber</sub> measured between 10:00 and 13:00 are compared. Because the comparison took place during the day when conditions were generally unstable, the FG contamination potential is low (and will be ignored). The contamination potential does highlight a concern with micrometeorological measurements, that a large measurement footprint may extend outside the study area and result in measurement errors."

569

2) For our chamber analysis we added an alternative estimation of the rate of dC/dt, using a non-linear monomolecular model (Bolker, 2007). This follows the equation:  $C_{N2O} = a_0 + a_1 (1 - \exp(-a_2/a_1 * t))$ , where  $C_{N2O}$  is the mole fraction of N<sub>2</sub>O,  $a_0$  is the intercept corresponding to N<sub>2</sub>O mole fraction at time  $t = 0, a_1$  is the horizontal asymptote at  $t = +\infty$ ,  $a_2$  is the slope (dC/dt) at t = 0, and t is time after the chamber is chamber placement time (h).

We plotted dC/dt estimated from both the original linear regression and non-linear monomolecular model in Figs. B, C. The chamber fluxes using the non-linear dC/dt estimate is 1.15 times higher than that using linear dC/dt estimate. This improved the geometric mean  $Q_{FG}/Q_{chamber_non-linear}$  to 1.22 (confidence interval of 0.99 to 1.49). We still concluded that chamber measurements are underestimating the flux, but the use of a non-linear calculation of dC/dt decreases the disagreement to 22% compared to that of 40% using linear regression model.

- 581 We also added this discussion in the revised manuscript, see page 11-12, Line 269-284.
- 582"To examine the potential bias in  $N_2O$  emissions when dC/dt is estimated with a linear regression583model, we also calculated the results using a non-linear monomolecular model (Bolker, 2007). The
- 584 monomolecular model is one of the simplest saturating functions and follows (Eq. 4):

585 
$$C_{N20} = a_0 + a_1 (1 - exp (-a_2/a_1 * t))$$
 (4)

where  $C_{N2O}$  is the mole fraction of  $N_2O$ ,  $a_0$  is the intercept corresponding to the  $N_2O$  mole fraction at time t = 0,  $a_1$  is the horizontal asymptote at  $t = +\infty$ ,  $a_2$  is the slope (dC/dt) at t = 0, and t is time after chamber placement (h).

589

Chamber fluxes calculated using the non-linear dC/dt (Q<sub>chamber-non-linear</sub>) were 1.15 times higher than
Q<sub>chamber</sub> estimated using linear regression. Comparing the concurrent fluxes of Q<sub>FG</sub> and Q<sub>chamber-non-linear</sub>,
we found the geometric mean of Q<sub>FG</sub>/Q<sub>chamber-non-linear</sub> to be 1.22 (confidence interval of 0.99 to 1.49).
Using 10,000 bootstrap re-samples (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), we computed 10,000 potential mean
fluxes from the non-linear model, of which 9540 of the means were greater than 1, and 460 were lower
than 1. This result suggests the use of the non-linear dC/dt calculation has resulted in better agreement
with the FG estimates."





- **Fig. B.** the N<sub>2</sub>O concentration (ppm) changes with time (hour). The slope of the regression (dC/dt) using linear regression (black) and non-linear monomolecular model (red).
- 600

#### 601 Special comments

- **602** Title. Agree with the reviewer, and the title has been changed.
- 603 P5, L109. We calculated the rate of dC/dt using a simple linear regression model. Following the
- reviewer's suggestion, we calculated the dC/dt using a non-linear monomolecular model.
- We added couple of paragraphs in the revised manuscript, see page 11-12, Line 269-284. Refer toabove text.
- 607 And Conclusions on page 12, Line 295-297.

608 "Our results showed that soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions measured by FG and static chambers (linear dC/dt) were 609 statistically different, with fluxes from FG being on average 40% higher. Using a non-linear calculation 610 of dC/dt in the chambers decreased the disagreement to 22%."

- 611
- 612 P6, L140. We have provided the precisions on page 6, Line 144-145. "OP-FTIR system measures

613 multiple gas concentrations ( $N_2O$ ,  $CH_4$ ,  $NH_3$ ,  $CO_2$ , CO and water vapour) with high precision ( $N_2O < 0.3$ 614 ppb,  $CH_4 < 2$  ppb,  $NH_3$ , 0.4ppb,  $CO_2$ , 1 ppm, CO, 0.1 ppb, and water vapour < 5%)."

- 615 P7, Line 170-171 and Fig.2. The background  $N_2O$  flux is about 0.6 mg  $N_2O-N$  m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> prior to manure
- application. In this study, the topsoil (0–15 cm) had high N contents: 52 mg  $NH_4^+$ –N kg<sup>-1</sup> and 118 mg
- 617 NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>–N kg<sup>-1</sup> before manure application. Therefore, the high background N<sub>2</sub>O flux is reasonable.
- P8, Line 192-193. We agree with the reviewer. We made the changes to be "agreement with the FG
  measurements in terms of the long-term background exchange patterns...". See page 9, Line 222.
- 620 P10. Line 237. As suggested, we calculated the chamber fluxes using the rate of *dC/dt* estimated
- using non-linear monomolecular model. The changes can be seen on page 11-12, Line 269-284, and
- 622 Conclusions, Line 295-297.
- 623 P10, Line 247-248. We agree with the reviewer. As mentioned previously, we conducted a footprint
- 624 analysis using Windtrax dispersion model, and added the results at page 7-8, Line 166-188 and
- Figure 2. We also removed the statement "In addition, concerns about FG arise if the
- 626 fetch...occurring upwind of our sites." The changes can be seen on page 12, Line 286-288.

- P 11, Line 249-250. The reviewer is correct. We have addressed this comment and added the footprint
  analysis results on page 7-8, Line 166-188. Refer to the above text.
- 629

630 P11. Conclusion, Line 263-265. In the Conclusions, we added a sentence "*Our results showed that soil* 

631  $N_2O$  emissions measured by FG and static chambers (linear dC/dt) were statistically different, with

- 632 fluxes from FG being on average 40% higher. Using a non-linear calculation of dC/dt in the chambers
- 633 *decreased the disagreement to 22%.*" see page 12, Line 295-297.
- 634 Our study supports the statement that chamber measurements underestimate the fluxes. See page635 13, Line 301-303.
- 636 *"However, the relationship we observed, together with other reports on the biases created by chamber"*
- 637 calculation procedures, supports an interpretation that our FG emission calculations were accurate
- 638 and in this instance the chamber measurements were biased too low."
- 639

### 640 Technical Corrections

- 641 P1. Abstract. Agree with the reviewer, the changes have been made.
- P1, Line 12. Agree. Have added "aerodynamic" and removed "micrometeorological". See page 1, Line13, and P3, Line 59.
- 644 P2, Line 42. Agree. "manually operated" has been added to "static chambers", see page 2, Line 43.
- P2, Line 44. Agree. Change has been made to be" The temporal variation issue can be addressed by...",
  see page 2, Line 45.
- P3, Line 59-60. We agree with the reviewer. Change has been made to be" an estimate of the turbulentdiffusivity", see page 3, Line 61.
- P4, Line 86. Agree with the reviewer. The sentence has been changed to be "The average daily
  minimum and maximum temperature were 6 and 33°C, respectively." See page 4, Line 87.
- 651 P5, Eq. 1. Agree. We have modified the equation, see page 5, Line 107-113.
- 652

653  $"Q_{chamber} = K_{N2O} (273/T) (V/A) dC/dt$ 

(1)

- 654 where  $Q_{chamber}$  is the gas flux ( $\mu g N_2 O N m^{-2} h^{-1}$ );  $K_{N2O}$  is 1.25 ( $\mu g N \mu L^{-1}$ ) according to the ideal gas law,
- 655 where  $K_{N2O} = P m/R T_0$ , and P is air pressure (at 1 atm), m is molecular mass (28 g mol<sup>-1</sup>), R is gas
- 656 constant (0.0821 L atm  $K^{-1}$  mol<sup>-1</sup>), and  $T_0$  is 273 K; T is the air temperature within the chamber (K); V is

- 657 the total volume of headspace (L); A is a surface area inside the chamber  $(m^2)$ ; and dC/dt is the rate of
- 658 change in mole fraction of  $N_2O$  in the chamber ( $\mu L L^{-1} h^{-1}$ ) determined by linear regression model. The
- $N_2O$  mole fraction is provide by GC, in ppm."
- 660 P6, Line 126. Because the path height is a function of x, when "kappa" is integrated with x, there is an
- 661 implicit integration with z. Therefore, there is no error in the formula and the statement.
- P7, Line 153-154. Agree. The sentence has been modified as "...at a frequency of 10 Hz." See page 7,
  Line 160.
- 664 P7, Line 155. Agree. The sentence has been changed to be "Atmospheric stability parameters of
- 665 friction velocity  $(u_*)$ , surface roughness  $(z_0)$  and Obukhov stability length (L) were calculated from the
- 666 ultrasonic anemometer data." See page 7, Line 162-163.
- P7, Line 168. We agree with the reviewer. The subtitle has been changed to be "The flux gradientfluxes". See page 8, Line 197.
- P9, Line 200. We agree with the reviewer. The subtitle has been changed to "Comparison of the twomeasurement techniques". See page 10, Line 229.
- 671 P10, Line 235. We agree with the reviewer. The sentence has been changed to be "Several researchers
- 672 have reported that chamber flux calculation procedures introduced large uncertainty in N<sub>2</sub>O
- 673 emissions.", see page 11, Line 264.
- 674
- 675

#### 676 References

- Abdi, D., Cade-Menun, B.J., Ziadi, N., Parent, L.-É., 2015. Compositional statistical analysis
  of soil <sup>31</sup>P-NMR forms. Geoderma. 257–258, 40-47.
- Anthony, W.H., Hutchinson, G.L., Livingston, G.P., 1995. Chamber measurement of soilatmosphere gas exchange: Linear vs. diffusion-based flux models. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 59,
  1308-1310.
- Bai, M., 2010. Methane emissions from livestock measured by novel spectroscopic
  techniques, School of Chemistry. University of Wollongong, p. 303.
- Bolker, B., 2007. Ecological Models and Data in R. Princeton University Press, The United
  States of America.
- 686 Christensen, S., Ambus, P., Arah, J.R.M., Clayton, H., Galle, B., Griffith, D.W.T.,
- Hargreaves, K.J., Klemedtsson, L., Lind, A.M., Maag, M., Scott, A., Skiba, U., Smith, K.A.,
- 688 Welling, M., Wienhold, F.G., 1996. Nitrous oxide emission from an agricultural field:
- 689 comparison between measurements by flux chamber and micrometerological techniques.
- 690 Atmos. Environ. 30, 4183.

- Dalal, R.C., Allen, D.E., Livesley, S.J., Richards, G., 2008. Magnitude and biophysical
- regulators of methane emission and consumption in the Australian agricultural, forest, and
- submerged landscapes: a review. Plant Soil. 309, 43-76.
- de Klein, C.A.M., Sherlock, R.R., Cameron, K.C., van der Weerden, T.J., 2001. Nitrous
- 695 oxide emissions from agricultural soils in New Zealand—A review of current knowledge and 696 directions for future research. J. Roy. Soc. New Zeal. 31, 543-574.
- Denmead, O.T., 1979. Chamber systems for measuring nitrous oxide emission from soils in
  the field. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 43, 89-95.
- Denmead, O.T., 1995. Novel meteorological methods for measuing trace gas fluxes. Philos.
  T. R. Soc. A. 351, 383-396.
- Denmead, O.T., 2008. Approaches to measuring fluxes of methane and nitrous oxide between
  landscapes and the atmosphere. Plant and Soil. 309, 5-24.
- Denmead, O.T., Chen, D., Griffith, D.W.T., Loh, Z.M., Bai, M., Naylor, T., 2008. Emissions
  of the indirect greenhouse gases NH<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from Australian beef cattle feedlots. Aust. J.
  Exp. Agr. 48, 213-218.
- Denmead, O.T., Macdonald, B.C.T., Bryant, G., Naylor, T., Wilson, S., Griffith, D.W.T.,
  Wang, W.J., Salter, B., White, I., Moody, P.W., 2010. Emissions of methane and nitrous
- 708 oxide from Australian sugarcane soils. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 150, 748-756.
- Efron, B., Tibshirani, R.J., 1994. An intruduction to bookstrap. Chapman&Hall/CRC, Boca
  Raton, London, New York, Washington, D.C.
- Flesch, K.T., Baron, V., Wilson, J., Griffith, D.W.T., Basarab, J., Carlson, P., 2016.
- Agricultural gas emissions during the spring thaw: Applying a new measuremnt technique.
   Agric. Forest Meteorol. 221, 111-121.
- Flesch, T.K., McGinn, S.M., Chen, D.L., Wilson, J.D., Desjardins, R.L., 2014. Data filtering
  for inverse dispersion emission calculations. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 198-199, 1-6.
- Flesch, T.K., Prueger, J.H., Hatfield, J.L., 2002. Turbulent Schmidt number from a tracerexperiment. J. Appl. Meteorol. 111, 299-307.
- Griffith, D.W.T., 1996. Synthetic calibration and quantitative analysis of gas-phase FT-IR
  spectra. Appl. Spectrosc. 50, 59-70.
- 720 Griffith, D.W.T., Bryant, G.R., Hsu, D., Reisinger, A.R., 2008. Methane emissions from free-
- ranging cattle: comparison of tracer and integrated horizontal flux techniques. J. Environ.Qual. 37, 582-591.
- 723 Griffith, D.W.T., Deutscher, N.M., Caldow, C., Kettlewell, G., Riggenbach, M., Hammer, S.,
- 2012. A Fourier transform infrared trace gas and isotope analyser for atmospheric
- applications. Atmos. Meas. Tech. 5, 2481-2498.
- Griffith, D.W.T., Galle, B., 2000. Flux measurements of NH<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> using dual beam
- FTIR spectroscopy and the flux gradient technique. Atmos. Environ. 34, 1087-1098.

- Hargreaves, K.J., Wienhold, F.G., Klemedtsson, L., Arah, J.R.M., Beverland, I.J., Fowler, D.,
- Galle, B., Griffith, D.W.T., Skiba, U., Smith, K.A., Welling, M., Harrris, G.W., 1996.
- 730 Measurement of nitrous oxide from Agricultural land using micrometeorological methods.
- 731 Atmos. Environ. 30, 1563-1571.
- Hutchinson, G.L., Mosier, A.R., 1981. Improved soil cover method for field measurement of
  nitrous oxide fluxes. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 45, 311-316.
- Jones, S.K., Famulari, D., Di Marco, C.F., Nemitz, E., Skiba, U.M., Rees, R.M., Sutton,
- M.A., 2011. Nitrous oxide emissions from managed grassland: a comparison of eddy
- covariance and static chamber measurements. Atmos. Meas. Tech. 4, 2179-2194.
- Judd, M.J., Kellier, F.M., Ulyatt, M.J., Lassey, K.R., Tate, K.R., Shelton, D., Harvey, M.J.,
  Walker, C.F., 1999. Net methane emissions from grazing sheep. Global Change Biol. 5, 647657.
- Laubach, J., Kelliher, F.M., 2004. Measuring methane emission rates of a dairy cow herd by
  two micrometeorological techniques. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 125, 279-303.
- Levy, P.E., Gray, A., Leeson, S.R., Gaiawyn, J., Kelly, M.P.C., Cooper, M.D.A., Dinsmore,
- 743 K.J., Jones, S.K., Sheppard, L.J., 2011. Quantification of uncertainty in trace gas fluxes
- measured by the static chamber method. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 62, 811-821.
- Li, J., Tong, X., Yu, Q., Dong, Y., Peng, C., 2008. Micrometeorological measurements of
  nitrous oxide exchange above a cropland. Atmos. Environ. 42, 6992-7001.
- Matthias, A.D., Yarger, D.N., Weinback, R.S., 1978. A numerical evaluation of chamber
  methods for determining gas fluxes. Geophys. Res. Lett. 5, 765-768.
- Neftel, A., Ammanna, C., Fischer, C., Spirig, C., Conen, F., Emmenegger, L., Tuzson, B.,
- Wahlen, S., 2010. N<sub>2</sub>O exchange over managed grassland: Application of a quantum cascade
  laser spectrometer for micrometeorological flux measurements. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 150,
  775-785.
- Norman, J.M., Kucharik, C.J., Gower, S.T., Baldocchi, D.D., Crill, P.M., Rayment, M.,
- Savage, K., Striegl, R.G., 1997. A comparison of six methods for measuring soil-surface
  carbon dioxide fluxes. J. Geophys. Res. 102, 28771-28777.
- Pattey, E., Strachan, I.B., Desjardins, R.L., Edwards, G.C., Dow, D., MacPherson, J.I., 2006.
  Application of a tunable diode laser to the measurement of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from field to
  landscape scale using several micrometeorological techniques. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 136,
  222-236.
- 760 Ruser, R., Flessa, H., Schilling, R., Steindl, H., Beese, F., 1998. Soil compaction and
- fertilization effects on nitrous oxide and methane fluxes in potato fields. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.62, 1587-1595.
- Sommer, S.G., McGinn, S.M., Hao, X., Larney, F.J., 2004. Techniques for measuring gas
  emissions from a composting stock pile of cattle manure. Atmos. Environ. 38, 4643-4652.

- Turner, D.A., Chen, D., Galbally, I.E., Leuning, R., Edis, R.B., Li, Y., Kelly, K., Phillips, F.,
- 2008. Spatial variability of nitrous oxide emissions from an Australian irrigated dairy pasture.Plant and Soil. 309, 77-88.
- Venterea, R.T., 2013. Theoretical comparison of advanced methods for calculating nitrous
  oxide fluxes using non-steady state chambers. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 77, 709-720.
- 770 Venterea, R.T., Dolan, M., Ochsner, T.E., 2010. Urea decreases nitrous oxide emissions
- compared with anhydrous ammonia in a Minnesota corn cropping system. Soil Sci. Soc. Am.J. 74, 407-418.
- Wang, K., Zheng, X., Pihlatie, M., Vesala, T., Liu, C., Haapanala, S., Mammarella, I.,
- Rannik, Ü., Liu, H., 2013. Comparison between static chamber and tunable diode laser-based
  eddy covariance techniques for measuring nitrous oxide fluxes from a cotton field. Agric.
  Forest Meteorol. 171–172, 9-19.
- Webb, E.K., Pearman, G.I., Leuning, R., 1980. Correction of flux measurements for
- chemistry effects due to heat and water vapour transfer. Quart. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 106, 85100.
- Wilson, J.D., Flesch, T.K., 2016. Generalized flux-gradient technique pairing line-average
   concentrations on vertically separated paths. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 220, 170-176.
- Yao, Z., Zheng, X., Xie, B., Liu, C., Mei, B., Dong, H., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Zhu, J., 2009.
  Comparison of manual and automated chambers for field measurements of N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>
  fluxes from cultivated lond. Atmos. Environ. 42, 1888, 1806.
- fluxes from cultivated land. Atmos. Environ. 43, 1888-1896.
- 785

787

788

789

790