

We thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments, which we address below. The reviewer comments are shown in italic, and our response is in regular type-face. The line numbers in our quoted text refer to the revised manuscript version.

*Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 18 April 2020*

*The authors present here a significant promise in implementing low-cost but robust automated chambers for intensive temporal soilborne GHG flux measurements. The paper describes the details of the hardware of chamber design, chamber operation, measurement principles, troubleshooting, and data to support the sound functioning of the design. Given the high temporal variability, especially for N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes, high-resolution measurements are critical and often achieved by automated chambers. However, their use has been limited due to the expensive nature of the technology. Therefore, ~\$40,000 USD for 16 automated chambers with the level of accuracy and robustness as shown in this study is a significant development. This could lead to greater adoption of automated chambers to curb the uncertainty of N<sub>2</sub>O flux estimates. Therefore, I think the paper should be published in AMT.*

We appreciate the reviewer's interest in our manuscript.

*I have listed a few questions and suggestions below for the authors' consideration. 1) I was a little confused about how many chambers were closed at a time. For example, with ~30 min closure period/chamber, only eight chambers could be measured in a four-hour sampling loop. A bit more clarification could be helpful. Also, how did you program the sequence of chamber closure (chamber #1 to 16) during each sampling loop? Was it random or fixed? This might impact bias.*

Good point. Section 2.5 "Measurement Principle" has been amended to clarify chamber closure with 16 chambers and chamber measurement sequence.

L252: "When sixteen chambers were deployed, a new chamber was closed every fifteen minutes and two chambers were closed simultaneously with the sample gases vented during a 15-minute equilibration period prior to a 15-minute measurement period. Here we describe the eight-chamber arrangement. To reduce possible conflation between measurement time and plot topographic position, we chose a consistent but staggered measurement sequence for each four-hour period (1, 5, 3, 7, 2, 6, 4, 8), where plot one was the lowest topographic position. When sixteen chambers were deployed, the plot sequence was maintained so paired chambers at each plot were measured in a single half-hour cycle."

We also added text in section 2.4 "Principles of Gas Sampling" to briefly explain the mechanics of how the chamber sample selection was modified to accommodate more chambers.

L236: "To operate sixteen chambers without reducing measurement period or frequency, separate parallel selection manifolds, additional mass flow controllers for chamber inlet/outlet, and diaphragm pumps were added. Two additional solenoid valves on the sample selection manifold allowed selection between each of the two inlet and outlet manifolds."

*2) One potential pitfall of automated chambers operating at a sub-daily scale is that they can keep the chamber close for a substantial amount of time in a day that can intercept the rainfall. This can impact soil moisture content inside the chamber relative to outside soils. However, this design reduces the closure period to 30 min (usually 45 min to 1 hour in other designs). With 6 sampling loops (4 hours long each), this could keep the chambers closed for 3 hours a day. I am interested to know if this design can be programmed in such a way to not close the chamber when there is rainfall/precipitation happening to allow the water inside the chamber?*

This is a good point that bears addressing in further detail in subsequent work. Potential impacts of chambers on soil moisture are one limitation of any chamber method. In principle, a voltage signal from a rain gauge could be easily programmed to signal the chambers to remain open during rainfall events as implemented by Butterbach-Bahl and Dannenmann (2011). We are providing our datalogger code associated with this paper in a public repository at Iowa State University (doi to be assigned following manuscript acceptance), which illustrates the method by which chamber movement is controlled and could be modified. However, there are logistical complications of this approach. In our region, prolonged low-intensity rainfall events are common, and this could result in long periods of time (many hours to days) without any measurements. Including a rainfall rate threshold (i.e.  $>0.25$  cm in a measurement period) required to open chambers could limit the frequency and duration of data gaps.

Reducing the measurement frequency or measurement period would also limit the proportion of time that the chambers are closed. Both solutions would limit the amount of data collected. We plan on quantifying the magnitude of any soil moisture effect of chamber closure in our ongoing work. A description of this issue has been added to section 3.1 “Troubleshooting” including a citation to a more detailed discussion of the issue.

L351: “During periods of chamber closure (3 out of every 24 hours during typical operation), rainfall was excluded from the chamber enclosure, which could potentially alter soil moisture. Elsewhere, a rain gauge has been used to signal automated chambers to remain open during rainfall events (Butterbach-Bahl and Dannenmann, 2011). Here, we elected to maintain a consistent measurement schedule irrespective of rainfall, due to the logistical challenges posed by prolonged rainfall events (when no measurements would be collected). A rainfall rate threshold to open the automated chambers could limit the frequency and duration of data gaps in future studies.. Future measurements will quantify the potential magnitude of any soil moisture effect associated with our auto-chamber system. To reduce the duration that the chambers were closed when the system was off for power conservation or maintenance, we either left the compressor on and the chambers in the open position, or propped the chambers open.”

*3) A table outlining side-by-side similarities and differences (pros and cons) with other automated systems would be interesting. I understand that the authors have discussed that here and there, but a summary would be helpful.*

Good point. Text has been significantly expanded in section 1 “Introduction” (lines 61-81) summarizing the benefits and limitations of various analyzer/chamber options in field settings, along with citations describing these approaches. We did not provide an explicit table in the

manuscript because this issue has been addressed in detail elsewhere (e.g. Fassbinder et al. 2013), and because of the difficulty of categorizing the diversity of commercial and custom-built automated chamber methodologies. We further elaborate on the basic principles of static and dynamic chamber operation (pros/cons) on lines 99-116.

L61: “Prefabricated automated chambers capable of measuring soil trace gas fluxes are available commercially and can be plumbed to a wide range of analyzers—most commonly, infrared gas analyzers that measure CO<sub>2</sub>. Commercially available chambers typically rely on electric components for movement which are sensitive to moisture, and they are substantially more expensive (often many thousands of USD) than the chamber design described here (materials costs of ~500 USD/chamber). Other custom-built chamber designs have been developed to address specific research needs (Ambus and Robertson 1998; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 1997; Savage et al., 2014). Chambers have been paired with analyzers to measure other trace gases, including N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, by utilizing methods such as gas chromatography (GC), photo-acoustic infrared detection, tunable diode laser (TDL), or cavity ring-down laser spectroscopy (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Breuer et al., 2000; Courtois et al., 2019; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999; Pihlatie et al., 2005). Fassbinder et al. (2013) provide a detailed summary of the advantages and limitations of each analyzer option that we briefly summarize here. GC systems equipped with electron capture detectors (ECD) have been used to measure N<sub>2</sub>O from automated chambers (Breuer et al., 2000; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999). However, GC systems have high power demand and require carrier gases and radioactive elements for ECD operation that may limit their field practicality. Interference by water vapor potentially limits the use of photoacoustic analyzers in the field (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Fassbinder et al., 2013). Laser-based analytical approaches are capable of rapid (e.g. 10 Hz) and precise N<sub>2</sub>O measurements, but these analyzers may be prohibitively expensive (>70,000 USD) and also have relatively high power requirements for autonomous field deployment (Fassbinder et al., 2013; Pihlatie et al., 2005). We sought to implement a lower-cost, solar powered, soil gas flux measurement system capable of operating unattended in a harsh field environment, and where analyzers could feasibly be replaced if stolen or damaged. For these reasons, we utilized a gas filter correlation (GFC) infrared N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer in our study (~16,000 USD), similar to that described previously by Fassbinder et al. (2013), along with an infrared gas analyzer for CO<sub>2</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O measurement (~4,000 USD). However, other analyzers could be readily employed with the chamber and manifold system described below.”

*Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 29 April 2020*

*An interesting and useful paper outlining a relatively simple and robust technique for automated field chambers. Only a few minor comments on the operation and design of the chambers themselves, but I'd like to see more discussion around the construction labour costs (important if claiming "low cost" but not including them in the budget) and also the availability/cost of replacement parts - particularly if these are custom built.*

Good point. We had noted the manufacturers of the major components in the original manuscript but we have now presented all of this information more explicitly in a table of chamber

component cost, supplier, and use which has been added as Appendix A. We have also included estimates of labor hours for construction/assembly (labor costs would vary greatly depending on the wage of the person doing the work) along with a more detailed enumeration of materials costs.

L473: “Despite these challenges, we were able to construct and maintain 8 (+1 spare) high-frequency automated chambers for sub-daily N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements in a temperate agricultural field, with a total materials cost (~\$40,000 US dollars, including parts for 9 chambers, gas analyzers, control system, and power supply) that is a fraction of the cost of many laser-based N<sub>2</sub>O analyzers alone. We estimate that the chambers and control system took us 130–260 hours in total to construct and troubleshoot (with concomitant labor/salary costs) and did not require specialized tools beyond those available in a typical workshop.”

*Some comment on the technical requirements for the data analysis would also be useful for handling such a large dataset.*

Good Point. We amended section 2.5 “Measurement Principle” to describe ancillary data files that will accompany the final manuscript to describe these analyses. We are providing our datalogger and analysis code associated with this paper in a public repository at Iowa State University (doi to be assigned following manuscript acceptance).

L292: “All data cleaning, flux calculation, and data analysis were conducted with R statistical software version 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019). Cleaning and calibration required R packages lubridate, nlme, and reshape (Spinu, 2020; Wickham, 2018; Willigen, 2020). The CR3000 datalogger code we used to operate the chambers and record data, along with an example dataset and R script for data cleaning and flux calculations, are provided as archived files associated with this publication.”

*Other comments: Introduction line 63. Some references to these other measurement types are required here.*

We have amended this to include reference to more measurement types, including GC systems.

L66: “Chambers have been paired with analyzers to measure other trace gases, including N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, by utilizing methods such as gas chromatography (GC), photo-acoustic infrared detection, tunable diode laser (TDL), or cavity ring-down laser spectroscopy (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Breuer et al., 2000; Courtois et al., 2019; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999; Pihlatie et al., 2005).”

*Line 65: There are a lot of automated systems that use GC’s as well which need to be referenced here. These are also relatively inexpensive (<\$20,000 USD) compared to the lasers and have been used in extreme environments (e.g. Wolf 2010 in Inner Mongolia and Kiese 2003 in tropical rainforests). These need to be mentioned as existing options.*

This is a relevant point, but we note that whereas chamber systems themselves may be < \$20,000, we are unaware of any modern gas chromatographs (with electron capture detector for N<sub>2</sub>O analysis) that can themselves be purchased for less than many tens of thousands of dollars. We have added GC measurement systems (as described above) and cited additional studies to

demonstrate applications of each analyzer type. We also expanded a paragraph in the Introduction to cover more analyzer options and details.

L61: “Prefabricated automated chambers capable of measuring soil trace gas fluxes are available commercially and can be plumbed to a wide range of analyzers—most commonly, infrared gas analyzers that measure CO<sub>2</sub>. Commercially available chambers typically rely on electric components for movement which are sensitive to moisture, and they are substantially more expensive (often many thousands of USD) than the chamber design described here (materials costs of ~500 USD/chamber). Other custom-built chamber designs have been developed to address specific research needs (Ambus and Robertson 1998; Butterbach-Bahl et al., 1997; Savage et al., 2014). Chambers have been paired with analyzers to measure other trace gases, including N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, by utilizing methods such as gas chromatography (GC), photo-acoustic infrared detection, tunable diode laser (TDL), or cavity ring-down laser spectroscopy (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Breuer et al., 2000; Courtois et al., 2019; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999; Pihlatie et al., 2005). Fassbinder et al. (2013) provide a detailed summary of the advantages and limitations of each analyzer option that we briefly summarize here. GC systems equipped with electron capture detectors (ECD) have been used to measure N<sub>2</sub>O from automated chambers (Breuer et al., 2000; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999). However, GC systems have high power demand and require carrier gases and radioactive elements for ECD operation that may limit their field practicality. Interference by water vapor potentially limits the use of photoacoustic analyzers in the field (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Fassbinder et al., 2013). Laser-based analytical approaches such are capable of rapid (e.g. 10 Hz) and precise N<sub>2</sub>O measurements, but these analyzers may be prohibitively expensive (>70,000 USD) and also have relatively high power requirements for autonomous field deployment (Fassbinder et al., 2013; Pihlatie et al., 2005). We sought to implement a lower-cost, solar powered, soil gas flux measurement system capable of operating unattended in a harsh field environment, and where analyzers could feasibly be replaced if stolen or damaged. For these reasons, we utilized a gas filter correlation (GFC) infrared N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer in our study (~16,000 USD), similar to that described previously by Fassbinder et al. (2013), along with an infrared gas analyzer for CO<sub>2</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O measurement (~4,000 USD). However, other analyzers could be readily employed with the chamber and manifold system described below.”

*Line 125: Clarify that these measurements are referring to the frame and not the "collar". Chamber base and collar are both often used to describe the same thing*

Good point. In the context of this paper, frame refers to the stainless-steel tubing while “base” refers to the plastic structure that the frame is attached to. This has been clarified in section 2.2 “Chamber Design”.

L147: “Here we define the chamber base as the rigid, rectangular polyethylene structure (Figure 3a) and the chamber frame as the metal structure superior to the base which allows for movement of the chamber lid (Figure 3). The chamber collar is defined as the length of polyvinylchloride (PVC) pipe that forms the interface between the chamber lid and the soil.”

*Line 167: I imagine this would be a major limitation in highly shrink/swell soils such as vertisols, or large vigorous crops (please comment)*

We now clarify that these soils did in fact contain swelling clays, albeit not to the extent of a true Vertisol. We found that pounding rebar into the soil on either side of the chamber base and affixing the frame to the rebar (described in the text below that referenced in this comment) addressed problems associated with chamber movement. This solution is noted in section 2.2 “Chamber Design”. Application of this method in true Vertisols could likely be achieved by deeper installation of rebar to secure the chamber. We periodically checked that the chamber lids were effectively sealing against the collars. See clarified text:

L190: “However, we found that pressure exerted by the pneumatic arm when opening or closing the chamber occasionally shifted the position of the chamber base or collar and prevented a seal between the chamber lid, collar, and soil. This occasionally occurred following tillage or when soils were extremely dry, given that these soils contained swelling clays. To address this problem, we anchored the chamber base using two steel rebar rods (60 cm length, 1.27 cm diameter) pounded 45 cm into the ground on either side of the chamber base and affixed to the outside of the chamber base with U-bolts positioned along the central axis of the collar (Fig. 3). We periodically checked that the chamber lids were effectively sealing against the collars. Application of this method to true Vertisols, with even greater shrink/swell behavior, could likely be achieved using similar use of rebar to anchor the chamber.”

We acknowledge that vegetation can be a challenge for chamber-based measurements. We added details about how we dealt with vegetation management in section 2.1 “Study Site”

L131: “Chambers were placed immediately adjacent to crop plants; due to frequent tillage and herbicide application, recruitment of other plants inside the chamber collars was uncommon, but any plants were removed from the chamber interiors as soon as they were observed. Roots from crop plants were not excluded and likely grew beneath chambers.”

*Line 195: What diameter and material is used for the chamber lines (I may have missed elsewhere)*

This was unclear, good point. The pressurized tubing details are noted in section 2.3 “Chamber Lid Operation”. The chamber lines are the same material, we have added the material details to section 2.4 “Principles of chamber gas sampling” as well to make that more clear.

L200: “We used 0.64 cm OD, 0.43 cm ID low-density polyethylene (LDPE) plastic tubing. We initially used aluminum composite tubing (Synflex 1300), which has been commonly used in other field trace gas measurement studies (e.g. Bowling et al. 2015), but we found this to be impractical for our application given its vulnerability to kinking during chamber installation and removal through dense vegetation.”

5

10

# **Capturing temporal heterogeneity in soil nitrous oxide fluxes with a robust and low-cost automated chamber apparatus**

Nathaniel C. Lawrence<sup>1</sup>, Steven J. Hall<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA

15

*Correspondence to:* Steven J. Hall (stevenjh@iastate.edu)

20

25

30 **Abstract.** Soils play an important role in Earth's climate system through their regulation of trace greenhouse gases. Despite decades of soil gas flux measurements using manual chamber methods, limited temporal coverage has led to high uncertainty in flux magnitude and variability, particularly during peak emission events. Automated chamber measurement systems can collect high-frequency (sub-daily) measurements across various spatial scales but may be prohibitively expensive or incompatible with field conditions. Here we describe the construction and operational details for a robust, relatively

35 inexpensive, and adaptable automated dynamic (steady-state) chamber measurement system modified from previously published methods, using relatively low-cost analyzers to measure nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). The system was robust to intermittent flooding of chambers, long tubing runs (> 100 m), operational temperature extremes (-12–39 °C), and was entirely powered by solar energy. Using data collected between 2017–2019 we tested the underlying principles of chamber operation and examined N<sub>2</sub>O diel variation and rain-pulse timing that would be difficult to characterize using

40 infrequent manual measurements. Stable steady-state [flux](#) dynamics were achieved during 29-minute chamber closure periods at relatively low flow rate (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>). Instrument performance and calculated fluxes were minimally impacted by variation in air temperature and water vapor. Measurements between 08:00 and 12:00 were closest to the daily mean N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> emission. Afternoon fluxes (12:00–16:00) were 28% higher than the daily mean for N<sub>2</sub>O (4.04 versus 3.15 nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) and were 22% higher for CO<sub>2</sub> (4.38 versus 3.60 umol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>). High rates of N<sub>2</sub>O emission are frequently observed after

45 precipitation. Following four discrete rainfall events, we found a 12 to 26-hour delay before peak N<sub>2</sub>O flux, which would be difficult to capture with manual measurements. Our observation of substantial and variable diel trends and rapid but variable onset of high N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following rainfall support the need for high-frequency measurements.

**Deleted:** the

**Deleted:** an

## 1 Introduction

Soils play a critical role in Earth's carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) cycles. [Managing soils to sequester C or reduce the emission of trace greenhouse gases N<sub>2</sub>O and methane \(CH<sub>4</sub>\) is often suggested as an effective tool to combat climate change \(Minasny et al., 2017; Paustian et al., 2016\). Therefore, reliable trace gas measurements are critical for informing management. Although manual soil gas flux measurements have been collected for several decades, the high temporal and spatial variability of emissions has plagued attempts to obtain accurate and precise flux estimates needed to calculate annual budgets \(Davidson et al., 2002; Groffman et al., 2009; Hutchinson and Mosier, 1981\). Sampling at higher frequency than is practical with manual](#)

50 [measurements may be required to constrain the role of soils in global biogeochemical cycles and validate the impacts of management practices on trace gas emissions \(Barton et al., 2015; Merbold et al., 2015; Parkin, 2008\). N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are particularly variable, so relatively less is known about peak emissions such as the time between rainfall and the subsequent N<sub>2</sub>O pulse that is frequently observed \(Groffman et al., 2006, 2009\). High frequency automated flux measurements that can span the large \(>100 m\) spatial scales that frequently accompany local topographical and hydrological variation may be critical](#)

55 [to capture the dual spatial-temporal dynamics which are key to generating robust emission estimates.](#)

60

**Deleted:** Managing soils to sequester C or reduce the emission of trace greenhouse gases N<sub>2</sub>O and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is often suggested as an effective tool to combat climate change (Minasny et al., 2017; Paustian et al., 2016). Therefore, reliable trace gas measurements are critical for informing management. Although manual soil gas flux measurements have been collected for several decades, the high temporal and spatial variability of emissions has plagued attempts to obtain accurate and precise flux estimates needed to calculate annual budgets (Davidson et al., 2002; Groffman et al., 2009; Hutchinson and Mosier, 1981). Sampling at higher frequency than is practical with manual measurements may be required to constrain the role of soils in global biogeochemical cycles and validate the impacts of management practices on trace gas emissions (Barton et al., 2015; Merbold et al., 2015; Parkin, 2008). N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are particularly variable, so relatively less is known about peak emissions such as the time between rainfall and the subsequent N<sub>2</sub>O pulse that is frequently observed (Groffman et al., 2006, 2009). High frequency automated flux measurements that can span the large (>100 m) spatial scales that frequently accompany local topographical and hydrological variation may be critical to capture the dual spatial-temporal dynamics which are key to generating robust emission estimates....



85 Prefabricated automated chambers capable of measuring soil trace gas fluxes are available commercially and can be  
plumbed to a wide range of analyzers—most commonly, infrared gas analyzers that measure CO<sub>2</sub>. Commercially available  
chambers typically rely on electric components for movement which are sensitive to moisture, and they are substantially more  
expensive (often many thousands of USD) than the chamber design described here (materials costs of ~500 USD/chamber).  
Other custom-built chamber designs have been developed to address specific research needs (Ambus and Robertson 1998;  
90 Butterbach-Bahl et al., 1997; Savage et al., 2014). Chambers have been paired with analyzers to measure other trace gases,  
including N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, by utilizing methods such as gas chromatography (GC), photo-acoustic infrared detection, tunable  
diode laser (TDL), or cavity ring-down laser spectroscopy (Ambus and Robertson, 1998; Breuer et al., 2000; Courtois et al.,  
2019; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl, 1999; Pihlatie et al., 2005). Fassbinder et al. (2013) provide a detailed summary of the  
advantages and limitations of each analyzer option that we briefly summarize here. GC systems equipped with electron capture  
95 detectors (ECD) have been used to measure N<sub>2</sub>O from automated chambers (Breuer et al., 2000; Papen and Butterbach-Bahl,  
1999). However, GC systems have high power demand and require carrier gases and radioactive elements for ECD operation  
that may limit their field practicality. Interference by water vapor potentially limits the use of photoacoustic analyzers in the  
field (Rosenstock et al., 2013). Laser-based analytical approaches are capable of rapid (e.g. 10 Hz) and precise N<sub>2</sub>O  
measurements, but these analyzers may be prohibitively expensive (>70,000 USD) and also have relatively high power  
100 requirements for autonomous field deployment (Fassbinder et al., 2013; Pihlatie et al., 2005). We sought to implement a lower-  
cost, solar powered, soil gas flux measurement system capable of operating unattended in a harsh field environment, and where  
analyzers could feasibly be replaced if stolen or damaged. For these reasons, we utilized a gas filter correlation (GFC) infrared  
N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer in our study (~16,000 USD), similar to that described previously by Fassbinder et al. (2013), along with an  
infrared gas analyzer for CO<sub>2</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O measurement (~4,000 USD). However, other analyzers could be readily employed with the  
105 chamber and manifold system described below.

**Deleted:** → Prefabricated automated chambers capable of measuring soil trace gas fluxes are available commercially and can be plumbed to a wide range of analyzers—most commonly, infrared gas analyzers that measure CO<sub>2</sub>. Additional methods have been developed to measure other trace gases, including N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, by utilizing methods such as tunable diode laser or cavity ring-down spectroscopy technology. However, the high cost of the commercially available chambers and laser-based analyzers, as well as their often-stringent operation and logistical requirements, put these methods out of reach for many field projects. We sought to implement a lower-cost soil gas flux measurement system capable of operating in a harsh field environment.¶

Environmental conditions, particularly those posed by flooding and agricultural management, created several unique  
challenges for trace gas measurement in our study system that could be expected in many field settings. Extreme heat and cold  
(-12 – 39 °C) and occasional submergence of chambers mandated that our apparatus be tolerant of a wide range of conditions.  
Frequent agricultural management (tillage, planting, fertilization, harvest, etc.) at our field site required the chambers and  
associated equipment to be relatively portable so they could be removed to the field edge (~100 m away) and reinstalled several  
110 times per year (Fig. 1a). To avoid damaging crops, all equipment had to be movable on foot. Because electric power was  
unavailable, solar panels and batteries had to provide all necessary energy. Our core measurement system consisted of eight  
steady-state, flow-through chambers that quantified soil gas fluxes at each chamber every four hours. For one year, a second  
set of chambers was paired with the original eight for a total of sixteen chambers without sacrificing measurement frequency.  
115 With our design, chamber number and measurement frequency can be readily adjusted to fit study questions. The gas analyzers  
were maintained in an instrument shed at the field edge (Fig. 1a). This location was not impacted by flooding or agricultural  
management but was subjected to the temperature extremes noted above.¶

**Deleted:** it

**Deleted:** each

**Deleted:** We utilized two gas analyzers capable of measuring carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) concentration, respectively, although other gas analyzers could be employed with the chamber and manifold system described below.

**Deleted:** We required analyzers that could operate effectively in these field conditions.

There is a rich literature on the impacts of chamber design and the potential biases of soil trace gas flux measurements. We chose a chamber design that has been shown in field and laboratory experiments to provide accurate estimation of soil gas fluxes and isotopic composition (Bowling et al., 2015; Moyes et al., 2010a; Norman et al., 1997; Pumpanen et al., 2004). In one comparison of different chambers, a variant of the open, flow-through design we used here measured known CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes produced in the laboratory to within 2–4 % of the actual values, which was relatively accurate compared to the other designs tested (Pumpanen et al., 2004). Pressure differential between the inside and outside of some chamber designs can create measurement artifacts (Fang and Moncrieff, 1998; Xu et al., 2006). The chambers described here utilize an open lid design (Fig. 2) that limits pressure differential to less than -0.2 Pa at the flow rate (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>) we utilized (Moyes et al., 2010b; Rayment and Jarvis, 1997). When using static chamber designs, soil gas flux is calculated as a function of the change in gas concentration over time within a closed chamber headspace. In contrast, with dynamic chambers we derive gas flux from the steady-state difference in concentration between air at the chamber inlet and pumped out of a chamber outlet (Fig. 2). When the outlet gas concentration is approximately constant, the chamber is at steady state. Steady-state chambers with low pressure differential have been shown to reproduce known δ<sup>13</sup>C values of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (Moyes et al., 2010b), possibly because they have less impact on the diffusive profile than many non-steady-state chamber designs (Nickerson and Risk, 2009). For our study, an additional consideration was that chambers needed to be located at variable distances (80–115-m) from the gas analyzers (Fig. 1a). We required this attribute to span a large (120 horizontal m) topographic gradient and to maintain analyzers and related instruments in a permanent location with vehicle access. As sampled gas can be vented downstream of the analyzers instead of routed back to the chamber (as is required for closed-loop static chamber designs), dynamic chambers can be located at varying distances from the instruments without impacting the effective volume of the chamber headspace.

In this publication we present a method to construct a robust system of dynamic automated soil trace gas chambers along with the maintenance and troubleshooting lessons learned over the three-year period the chambers were running. In addition to presenting these operational details, we tested three underlying assumptions of our chamber design: (1) did chambers reach steady-state dynamics, (2) how did broad temperature fluctuations effect instrument performance in the field, and (3) to what extent could water vapor impact our measurement values? We further utilized the high-frequency flux data to test two questions related to the temporal dynamics of gas emissions to inform manual sampling efforts: (4) how strong was the diel signal in trace gas emissions, and (5) what was the average delay between isolated rainfall events and the elevated N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that frequently followed.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Study Site

Our chambers were located at eight plots on 20 m intervals along a topographic gradient in a conventionally managed corn-soybean (*Zea mays*–*Glycine max*) agricultural field in central Iowa, USA (41.98° N, 93.69° W). The transect spanned 120 linear m (Fig. 1a), 2.25 m elevation, and included very poorly to moderately poorly drained soils (Mollisols classified as Okoboji to

**Deleted:** → There is a rich literature on the impacts of chamber design and the potential biases of soil trace gas flux measurements. We chose a design that has been shown in field and laboratory experiments to provide accurate estimation of soil gas fluxes and isotopic composition (Bowling et al., 2015; Moyes et al., 2010a; Norman et al., 1997; Pumpanen et al., 2004). In one comparison of different chambers, a variant of the open, flow-through design we used here measured known CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes produced in the laboratory to within 2–4 % of the actual values, which was relatively accurate compared to the other designs tested (Pumpanen et al., 2004). Pressure differential between the inside and outside of some chamber designs can create measurement artifacts (Fang and Moncrieff, 1998; Xu et al., 2006). The chambers described here utilize an open lid design (Fig. 2) that limits pressure differential to less than -0.2 Pa at the flow rate (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>) we utilized (Rayment and Jarvis, 1997; Moyes et al., 2010b). When using static chamber designs, soil gas flux is calculated as a function of the change in gas concentration over time within a closed chamber headspace. In contrast, with dynamic chambers we derive gas flux from the steady-state difference in concentration between air at the chamber inlet and pumped out of a chamber outlet (Fig. 2). When the outlet gas concentration is approximately constant, the chamber is at steady state. Steady-state chambers with low pressure differential have been shown to reproduce known δ<sup>13</sup>C values of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (Moyes et al., 2010b), possibly because they have less impact on the diffusive profile than many non-steady-state chamber designs (Nickerson and Risk, 2009). For our study, an additional consideration was that chambers needed to be located at variable distances (80–115-m) from the gas analyzers (Fig. 1a). We required this attribute to span a large (120 horizontal m) topographic gradient and to maintain analyzers and related instruments in a permanent location with vehicle access. As sampled gas can be vented downstream of the analyzers instead of routed back to the chamber (as is required for closed-loop static chamber designs), dynamic chambers can be located at varying distances from the instruments without impacting the effective volume of the chamber headspace.

→ In this publication we present a method to construct a robust system of dynamic automated soil trace gas chambers along with the maintenance and troubleshooting lessons learned over the three-year period the chambers were running. In addition to presenting these operational details, we tested three underlying assumptions of our chamber design: (1) did chambers reach steady-state dynamics, (2) how did broad temperature fluctuations effect instrument performance in the field, and (3) to what extent could water vapor impact our measurement values? We further utilized the high-frequency flux data to test two questions related to the temporal dynamics of gas emissions to inform manual sampling efforts: (4) how strong was the diel signal in trace gas emissions, and (5) what was the average delay between isolated rainfall events and the elevated N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that frequently followed.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Study Site

Our chambers were located at eight plots on 20 m intervals along a topographic gradient in a conventionally managed corn-soybean (*Zea mays*–*Glycine max*) agricultural field in central Iowa, USA (41.98° N, 93.69° W). The transect spanned 120 linear m (Fig. 1a), 2.25 m elevation, and included very poorly to moderately poorly drained soils (Mollisols classified as Okoboji to Clarion series under the USDA taxonomy). The lower half of the transect often experienced flooding after large rain events (Logsdon and James, 2014)...

Clarion series under the USDA taxonomy). Chambers were placed immediately adjacent to crop plants; due to frequent tillage and herbicide application, recruitment of other plants inside the chamber collars was uncommon, but any plants were removed from the chamber interiors as soon as they were observed. Roots from crop plants were not excluded and likely grew beneath chambers. The lower half of the transect often experienced flooding after large rain events (Logsdon and James, 2014) and chambers were occasionally completely inundated. The foreground of Fig. 1b shows one open and one closed chamber located in the lowest topographic position. The open chambers in the background are positioned along the topographic transect.

## 2.2 Chamber Design

The chambers we utilized were constructed in-house and various aspects were modified from previously published methods. The chamber lid was first described by Rayment and Jarvis (1997), and Riggs and Stannard (2009) pioneered a pneumatic piston and stainless frame that opened and closed a chamber lid relative to a collar installed in the soil. Bowling et al. (2015) implemented a similar chamber design to measure CO<sub>2</sub> and δ<sup>13</sup>C fluxes from a forest, but did not include extensive details on chamber design, construction, or operation.

The dimensions of many of the materials used were commercially specified with Imperial units but are reported here in metric equivalents for consistency. A table providing the instrument part names in order that they are described, along with use, supplier, part number, and total cost is supplied in Appendix A. Small, unspecified items (e.g. bolts) which do not require exact dimensions are not listed. Approximately 120-260 hours of labor were required to construct the chambers and assemble the associated control system. Fig. 3 shows the chamber design. Here we define the chamber base as the rigid, rectangular polyethylene structure (Figure 3a) and the chamber frame as the metal structure superior to the base which allows for movement of the chamber lid (Figure 3). The chamber collar is defined as the length of polyvinylchloride (PVC) pipe that forms the interface between the chamber lid and the soil. Chamber bases were constructed from 2.54 x 7.62 cm high-density polyethylene (HDPE) plastic (Fig. 3a). Custom L-brackets cut from 5.08 cm aluminum angle stock and bolted to the plastic base provided two horizontal platforms to attach female spherical rod ends that served as the pivot point for opening and closing the chamber (Fig. 3b). By routing vertical slots in the L-brackets, we provided a means to adjust the lateral orientation of the pivot rod on each chamber after installation in the field (Fig. 3b). This was useful to ensure that the chamber lid sealed against the collar given the inherent variability of soil microtopography. A 0.64 cm diameter threaded rod between the rod ends provided an axle to attach the chamber frame (Fig. 3c). Most of the chamber frame was constructed from 0.95 cm diameter stainless steel tubing; dimensions can be found in the caption and correspond to the numbered labels in Fig. 3. To drill holes in the stainless tubing, we flattened the ends of each piece of tubing to a length of 1 cm in a bench vise and then drilled holes through the flattened portion to accommodate attachment bolts. The stainless tubing was attached to the threaded rod described above or to aluminum angle brackets bolted to the chamber lid, noted by yellow or red circles respectively in Fig. 3. Two lengths of 1.27 cm diameter stainless steel tubing surrounding a second 0.64 cm diameter threaded rod and inserted into a 5.08 x 2.54-cm HDPE bar with a slot for a spherical rod end were attached to the end of a pneumatic cylinder rod piston (Clippard, UDR-

**Deleted:** The chamber lid was first described by Rayment and Jarvis (1997), and Riggs and Stannard (2009) pioneered a pneumatic piston and stainless frame that opened and closed a chamber lid relative to a collar installed in the soil. Bowling et al. (2015) implemented a similar chamber design to measure CO<sub>2</sub> and δ<sup>13</sup>C fluxes from a forest, but did not include extensive details on chamber design, construction, or operation.

**Deleted:** Fig. 3 shows the chamber design. Chamber bases were constructed from 2.54 x 10.16

**Deleted:** rather than drilling holes

17-6) (Fig. 3d). Extension of the piston moved the chamber lid open or closed and the HDPE bar and stainless tubing were used to prevent the threaded rod from flexing during movement of the chamber lid. The three spherical rod ends, two located on the pivot point and one at the end of the cylinder piston served as rotational degrees of motion (Fig. 3—yellow circles). All other connection points were rigid (Fig. 3—red circles).

The chamber lid followed a previous design which was shown to minimize the pressure differential between the inside and outside of the chamber ( $< 0.2$  Pa at flow rates of  $4.5 \text{ L min}^{-1}$ ) (Moyes et al., 2010b; Rayment and Jarvis, 1997). The circular chamber lid (38 cm diameter) was cut from HDPE panel (1.27 cm thick). A 2.54 cm diameter hole cut into the center of the lid allowed a vertical gas inlet tube (Fig. 2a) to be fixed to the lid via custom-machined threads and a nut on the bottom of the tube. The inlet tube (15 cm length) was machined from aluminum barstock and had internal and external diameters of 2.54 and 3.81 cm, respectively and a 2.54 cm length taper at the superior end (Fig. 2a). The inlet tube was covered by a polyvinyl chloride (PVC) cap (10.16 cm diameter and 16 cm length; Fig. 2b) attached to the lid surface with three bolts, each with 1 cm spacers to create an air gap between the cap and the lid surface (Fig. 2). The gap created by the spacers allowed atmospheric air to flow to the inlet while preventing the direct horizontal flow of wind over the inlet tube opening. On the lower surface of the lid, a D-shaped rubber seal (EPDM foam, 2.54 cm width) was affixed with silicone caulk in a ring where the lid contacted the collar to create an air-tight seal when pressure was applied to the piston that closed the chamber (Fig. 1b). Early in our study, we observed that high pressure ( $> 550$  kPa) was needed to ensure a tight seal between the collar and chamber lid. To minimize the piston air pressure required to seal the chamber lid against the collar, and thus conserve power, we bolted two nested, 26 cm sections of slotted steel construction strut to the top of the chamber lid to provide additional mass (Fig. 3). Gas from the inside of the chamber was sampled via a circular outlet manifold consisting of polyethylene tubing (6.4 mm OD, 3.2 mm ID) perforated by drilling 2 mm diameter holes through the tubing at 2 cm intervals, and was held in place approximately 3 cm below the lower surface of the lid with three stainless steel eyebolts. All tubing connections in our chamber and instrument manifolds were made using 0.64 cm brass Swagelok compression fittings. A threaded bulkhead union and tee fitting were used to connect to the outlet manifold to external tubing above the chamber lid.

Chamber collars were made from PVC pipe segments (20 cm length, 30.48 cm ID) with the lower edge beveled with a belt sander to facilitate insertion into the soil. The beveled edge was pounded 10 cm into the soil for a total collar height of 10 cm and volume of approximately 7.3 L. The volume of air inside the longest length of tubing (120 m) connecting the chamber lid to the gas analyzers was  $< 1.8$  L. To hold the chamber base in place relative to the collar, we initially used a ratchet strap. However, we found that pressure exerted by the pneumatic arm when opening or closing the chamber occasionally shifted the position of the chamber base or collar and prevented a seal between the chamber lid, collar, and soil. This occasionally occurred following tillage or when soils were extremely dry, given that these soils contained swelling clays. To address this problem, we anchored the chamber base using two steel rebar rods (60 cm length, 1.27 cm diameter) pounded 45 cm into the ground on either side of the chamber base and affixed to the outside of the chamber base with U-bolts positioned along the central axis of the collar (Fig. 3). We periodically checked that the chamber lids were effectively sealing against the

Deleted: (Moyes et al., 2010b; Rayment and Jarvis, 1997)

Deleted: .

collars. Application of this method to true Vertisols, with even greater shrink/swell behavior, could likely be achieved using similar use of rebar to anchor the chamber.

Formatted: Font: Bold, Underline

### 2.3 Chamber Lid Operation

Deleted: ¶

Chambers were opened and sealed by alternatively applying 550 kPa pressurized air to either side of the pneumatic cylinder described above via two lengths of tubing connecting each chamber and the instrument shed (Fig. 4a). We used 0.64 cm OD, 0.43 cm ID low-density polyethylene (LDPE) plastic tubing. We initially used aluminum composite tubing (Synflex 1300), which has been commonly used in other field trace gas measurement studies (e.g. Bowling et al. 2015), but we found this to be impractical for our application given its vulnerability to kinking during chamber installation and removal through dense vegetation. Pressurized gas tubing was connected to the pneumatic cylinder via National Pipe Thread (NPT) to Swagelok connections (Fig. 4a). Needle valves (Clippard JFC-2a) located between the pressurized tubing and either side of the pneumatic piston were used to manually adjust the rate of chamber opening and closing to prevent damage to the frame. Pressurized gas was initially supplied by a pressurized cylinder and regulator as described in Riggs et al. (2009). However, we found that cylinders were impractical to supply the volume of gas necessary to pressurize the ~100 m lengths of tubing between the cylinder and chambers with frequent opening/closing. To provide a less labor-intensive source of pressurized air, we installed a Gast 12 VDC oil-less air compressor regulated by an air compressor switch (Condor MDR 3) with cut-in pressure set to 450 kPa and cut-out pressure set to 550 kPa (Fig. 4b). It was important to remove excess moisture from the pressurized air to maintain downstream metal components and valves. A 15.24 m coil of copper tubing immediately downstream of the compressor allowed the pressurized air to cool and water to condense. Excess moisture was removed by a water trap (Speedaire #4ZL49) connected to an additional 1-liter reservoir made from PVC pipe and Swagelok fittings, which was periodically drained via a needle valve to the exterior of the instrument enclosure (Fig. 4c). From the water trap, the pressurized air flowed to a manifold of four-channel, two-way valves (Clippard MME-41PEEC-W012) which controlled the open/sealed position of each chamber by supplying pressure to either of two lengths of tubing extending to each chamber (Fig. 4a,d). Each valve was wired to one channel of a 12 V datalogger-controlled relay controller (Campbell Scientific SDM-CD16AC) such that pressurized air maintained the chamber in an open position when the relay was closed.

Deleted: (2009)

Deleted: fifty-foot

### 2.4 Principles of Chamber Gas Sampling

Fig. 5 outlines the movement of sample gas between chamber and analyzers. Air was pulled through two separate 0.64 cm OD, 0.43 cm ID low-density polyethylene (LDPE) plastic tubes. One tube sampled gas adjacent to the chamber inlet tube (Fig. 2), while the second pulled air from the perforated tubing manifold inside the chamber (Fig. 2). The second sampling tube is referred to here as the chamber outlet, as it served to pull ambient air from the chamber inlet tube through the chamber. Both sampling tubes were filtered through 1 µm Teflon (i.e., hydrophobic) filters (Pall Corporation) affixed to LDPE tubing via

Swagelok connections immediately outside the chamber to prevent any particulates and liquid water from being pulled through the tubing (Fig. 5a).

Chamber sample selection was achieved by two sets of eight normally closed solenoid valves, one for inlet and one for outlet selection (Clippard, DV-2M-12-L, Fig. 5b). [Solenoid valves were controlled by a second Campbell relay controller.](#)

Downstream of the chamber selection manifolds, both inlet and outlet gases flowed through additional 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters. Inlet and outlet flow rates were set independently by two mass flow controllers (Aalborg, GFCS-010201) upstream of two 12V diaphragm gas pumps (KNF Neuberger UNMP830; Fig. 5c). Both flow rates were set to 2  $\text{L min}^{-1}$  by the mass flow controllers, and actual flow rates were recorded on the datalogger (which was important for diagnosing potential problems during operation, as discussed later). To mediate selection of the gas sample that flowed to the analyzers, a third sample selection manifold with four normally closed solenoid valves selected [among gas sources: chamber inlet, chamber outlet, high concentration standard, or low concentration standard](#) (Fig. 5d). [To operate sixteen chambers without reducing measurement period or frequency, separate parallel selection manifolds, additional mass flow controllers for chamber inlet/outlet, and diaphragm pumps were added. Two additional solenoid valves on the sample selection manifold allowed selection between each of the two inlet and outlet manifolds.](#) To maintain a constant flow rate through the inlet and outlet sampling tubes when the sample was not being routed to the analyzers, needle valves vented excess flow between the gas pumps and the selection manifold (Fig. 5). The selected sample gas flowed through a common sample gas mass flow controller set to 0.9  $\text{L min}^{-1}$  (Fig. 5e). An internal pump in the  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  analyzer sampled gas at 0.8  $\text{L min}^{-1}$ , and this pump also served to pull sample through the  $\text{CO}_2$  analyzer which had no internal pump. The remaining 0.1  $\text{L min}^{-1}$  was vented through a final needle valve placed upstream of the  $\text{CO}_2$  analyzer (Fig. 5e).

Two instruments in series were used to analyze  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ , respectively (Fig. 5e). The  $\text{CO}_2$  analyzer was placed upstream of the  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  analyzer to avoid [artifacts](#) from the high oven temperature [and Nafion drying column](#) in the latter. We used either a LI-COR 830 (or subsequently, LI-COR 850) Infrared Gas Analyzer to measure  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations by infrared absorbance. Downstream, a Teledyne 320U gas filter correlation analyzer measured  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  concentration via infrared absorbance by frequently comparing the sample to a reference gas in a rotating filter [\(Fassbinder et al., 2013\)](#). Instantaneous gas concentrations, as well as the air temperature, inlet flow, outlet flow, and sample flow were measured every 10 seconds and recorded on a datalogger (Campbell CR3000).

## 2.5 Measurement Principle

Each chamber flux measurement was conducted over the course of a half-hour cycle. [When sixteen chambers were deployed, a new chamber was closed every fifteen minutes and two chambers were closed simultaneously with the sample gases vented during a 15-minute equilibration period prior to a 15-minute measurement period. Here we describe the eight-chamber arrangement. To reduce possible conflation between measurement time and plot topographic position, we chose a consistent but staggered measurement sequence for each four-hour period \(1, 5, 3, 7, 2, 6, 4, 8\), where plot one was the lowest topographic](#)

Deleted: between

Deleted: and

Deleted: two

Deleted: artefacts

Deleted: (Fassbinder et al., 2013)

position. When sixteen chambers were deployed, the plot sequence was maintained so paired chambers at each plot were measured in a single half-hour cycle.

At the beginning of each half-hour cycle when a new chamber was going to be measured, a chamber lid was closed by triggering a relay to apply pneumatic pressure to the piston, and the inlet and outlet sampling tubes of the respective chamber began to be sampled at 2 L min<sup>-1</sup>. Both inlet and outlet tubes were sampled continuously at a constant rate during the half-hour cycle while a downstream selection manifold alternated which gas was routed to the instruments with residual flow vented to the instrument shed through needle valves (Fig. 5). All pneumatic and sample selection valves were controlled by the datalogger. Calibration gases (standards) were measured every two hours (Fig. 5d). If standards were measured during a given chamber measurement sequence, this was conducted at the beginning of the half-hour period: each standard was measured for three minutes by opening a valve on the gas selection manifold while chamber inlet and outlet flows were vented (Fig. 6a,b). During measurement periods where standards were not measured, the inlet sample was opened first on the selection manifold (Fig. 6c). After 11 minutes, the inlet was vented while the outlet sample was routed to the instruments until the 16<sup>th</sup> minute of the half hour (Fig. 6d). The first inlet and outlet gas concentration values from a given chamber measurement cycle (Fig. 6c and 7d respectively) were not used to calculate fluxes, as the chamber headspace concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O were often not at steady state during this time. These values, however, were useful for troubleshooting and assessing temporal trends in chamber gas concentrations. Between minutes 16–21 and 21–29, the inlet and outlet were respectively measured for a second time (Fig. 6e,f). The minimum 5-minute measurement period for inlet and outlet samples was chosen to overcome a lagged response in the N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer following a switch in sample gas composition, which was as long as two minutes when there were large concentration differences between inlet and outlet samples; the CO<sub>2</sub> analyzer typically stabilized much faster (tens of seconds). The difference between the inlet and outlet gas concentrations averaged over the last two minutes of their second respective measurement periods (Fig. 6e,f) were used to calculate soil gas fluxes (units of  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) using Eq. (1). The last 10 seconds of data from each period were excluded because of transient values during valve switching.

$$\text{Flux} = \frac{(PF)(\text{ConcOut} - \text{ConcIn})}{(R \cdot T \cdot A)} \quad (1)$$

Where P is equal to mean atmospheric pressure at our study site (atm), F is outflow rate (L s<sup>-1</sup>), ConcOut is the standard-corrected second outlet measurement period gas concentration ( $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ ) (Fig. 6f), ConcIn is the standard-corrected second inlet gas concentration ( $\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$ ) (Fig. 6e), R is the ideal gas constant (L atm K<sup>-1</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>), T is temperature (K), and A is the area covered by the chamber (m<sup>2</sup>). Following the end of the measurement period (29 min total), the chamber was opened by applying pneumatic pressure to the opposite end of the piston via the open/sealed manifold (Fig. 4a, d) and would remain open prior to the next measurement sequence.

Corrected gas concentration values were obtained by applying two-point linear standard corrections updated every two hours (e.g. Fig. 6a,b). The instrument output during the last minute of each standard measurement, again excluding the last 10 seconds, was averaged for calibration. Corrected gas concentrations were obtained by regressing measured standard values against known values to obtain a linear slope and intercept used to correct raw values. Working standards were prepared

Deleted: period

by filling two 50-L gas cylinders with higher and lower concentrations of analytes by mixing CO<sub>2</sub>- and N<sub>2</sub>O-free air (zero air) with a concentrated standard gas to achieve values that approximately spanned the range of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations observed in the field. The mole fractions of each standard gas were verified [in our laboratory](#) by analyzing five replicates each on a gas chromatograph (Shimadzu 2014A) with thermal conductivity and electron capture detectors, which were calibrated according to additional NIST-traceable standards using a four-point curve. Gas cylinders filled to 140 MPa lasted approximately nine months.

[All data cleaning, flux calculation, and data analysis were conducted with R statistical software version 3.6.1 \(R Core Team, 2019\). Cleaning and calibration required R packages lubridate, nlme, and reshape \(Spinu, 2020; Wickham, 2018; Willigen, 2020\). The CR3000 datalogger code we used to operate the chambers and record data, along with an example dataset and R script for data cleaning and flux calculations, are provided as archived files associated with this publication.](#)

## 2.6 Power Supply: Solar Panel/Batteries

At our field site, six 265-W solar panels (Kyocera) with 16 deep cell marine batteries (Trojan J305E-AC 6V) were able to power the analysis system for much of the year. Figure 7 illustrates the solar charging and battery storage system. Two sets of three solar panels each were wired in series through parallel 15-amp circuit breakers within a combiner box. The positive lead flows through a 30-amp circuit breaker with a second combiner box before joining the negative at a charge controller (Morningstar TS-MPPT-60, Fig. 7). Indicator lights on the charge controller were used to assess the remaining battery charge, and we occasionally shut the entire system down during prolonged periods of low sunlight to avoid completely discharging the batteries. The charge controller positive output flowed through a 63-amp circuit breaker (Fig. 7) to the final positive lead of a battery bank consisting of four sets of four serially wired batteries, each connected in parallel (Fig. 7). The negative output from the charge controller flowed to the negative lead at the opposite end of the battery bank. A 24 VDC output connected to a 60-amp breaker (Fig. 7) and a DC/AC converter provided power for the 110 VAC N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer. A subset of two batteries provided 12 VDC power to the other components (datalogger, CO<sub>2</sub> analyzer, switches, valves, and additional sensors).

## 3 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Troubleshooting

While often no maintenance was required, we typically checked the measurement system every several days to prevent data gaps if a failure occurred. Under ideal conditions (permanent chamber installation, ample sunlight, no flooding), the analysis system may be able to operate over periods of weeks to months without maintenance. However, we found that problems related to chamber submergence, component failure, or unintended faunal interactions occurred on occasion. This section highlights some common issues and practices that we found helpful for addressing them.



### 3.1.1 Excess Moisture

Periodic flooding presented one of the greatest challenges at our field site. Chambers could not sample gas when the water level was above the height of the perforated outlet manifold suspended from the chamber lid (~7 cm above the soil surface). When water exceeded this height, the filter located at the chamber outlet (Fig. 5a) became saturated with water and stopped flow, preventing damage to the downstream components. If flooding exceeded the height of the inlet (~30 cm depth), the inlet filter was similarly impacted. Data affected by saturated filters was flagged by noting below-normal inlet/outlet flows during post-processing and was removed. We replaced saturated filters after the water level receded to return the chamber to operation. Wet filters were dried at 100°C and reused. Excess water also created problems when it condensed downstream of the air compressor. During humid summer conditions the compressor water trap reservoir (Fig. 4c) was emptied at least once every two weeks. In sub-freezing conditions the trap rarely collected water but was emptied after warmer periods to prevent expansive bursting when temperatures returned below 0°C. Pumps and valves occasionally failed for unknown reasons. In general, we identified problems related to gas flow and sample selection by plotting flow rates over time for each chamber measurement sequence during data post-processing and replaced any faulty components.

### 3.1.2 Gnawing Animals

Early in our experiment, animals occasionally chewed through the gas tubing between the instrument shed and the chambers. For protection and organization, all four tubes connecting each chamber to the instrument shed (comprising chamber inlet and outlet gas samples, and compressed air for opening and closing the chamber, respectively) were subsequently wrapped in 2.54-cm diameter polyethylene split corrugated wire loom tubing (Drossbach 25D260). The last several cm of each of the four tubes must be able to move independently to allow the piston to move and the chamber lid to open and close. To protect these final portions of tubing which could not be wrapped in protective loom tubing, we replaced the last 30 cm of tubing with semi-flexible 0.64-cm diameter copper tubing connected with Swagelok fittings. The copper tubing was molded to enable necessary movement of chamber components and was not impacted by animals. We documented and isolated leaks by capping the chamber end of each tubing line, applying pressure with an air tank to each individual tube, and checking for a drop in regulator pressure. Large leaks were audible and could be easily found and repaired by splicing in replacement tubing using Swagelok union fittings. To test for small leaks, we plumbed the valves to a tank of industrial-grade helium and used a helium-specific leak detector (Restek 28500). After protecting against animal damage, leaks were infrequent.

### 3.1.3 Power Limitation

We experienced occasional power outages during extended periods of cloudy weather and during winter. By periodically turning the analysis system off for several days to allow the batteries to reach full charge, we could collect 2–3 days of measurements even in cold/cloudy conditions. [During periods of chamber closure \(3 out of every 24 hours during typical](#)

operation), rainfall was excluded from the chamber enclosure, which could potentially alter soil moisture. Elsewhere, a rain gauge has been used to signal automated chambers to remain open during rainfall events (Butterbach-Bahl and Dannenmann, 2011). Here, we elected to maintain a consistent measurement schedule irrespective of rainfall, due to the logistical challenges posed by prolonged rainfall events (when no measurements would be collected). A rainfall rate threshold required to open the automated chambers could be useful in future studies to limit the frequency and duration of data gaps. Future measurements will also quantify the potential magnitude of any soil moisture effect associated with our automated chamber system. To reduce the duration that the chambers were closed when the system was off for power conservation or maintenance, we either left the compressor on and the chambers in the open position, or propped the chambers open. The Teledyne N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer has an internal component (heated to near 70°C) which consumed additional power during cold weather. We found that enclosing the N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer in a plywood box with 2.54 cm polystyrene foam insulation on four sides (leaving one side and the back open for ventilation) reduced power use. We also adjusted the angle of the solar array at least twice a year to increase efficiency. Collectively, these energy efficient measures allowed the instrument to operate for longer periods when solar energy was limiting. Occasionally, however, the DC/AC converter would shut down during the night due to power limitation and would turn on again when sunlight was available. Data from the N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer were consistently biased during an 8-hour period as the instrument warmed up. We flagged and discarded these data during post-processing by plotting analyzer output over time and removing peaks following periods where no output was recorded.

### 3.2 Measurement Assumptions

A key principle of steady-state chamber operation is that the gas concentration inside the chamber headspace is approximately at equilibrium (gas flux from the soil is balanced with gas removed via the chamber outlet) when the flux measurement is made. The time to achieve steady-state conditions is a balance between the soil flux rate and the flow of gas through the chamber. Here, to enable the use of smaller pumps and conserve power we employed lower flow rates (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>) than often employed previously in dynamic chambers (e.g. 4 L min<sup>-1</sup>; Bowling et al., 2015). Initial tests revealed that use of larger pumps needed to achieve 4 L min<sup>-1</sup> flow rates over > 100 m tubing runs was not sustainable from the perspective of power supply. To validate the steady-state assumption at 2 L min<sup>-1</sup>, we analyzed the slope of a linear regression between concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O and time over the final outlet measurement period (Fig. 6f, approximately minutes 27–29) using data from three separate periods chosen to cover a broad range of fluxes and spanning two weeks in total. We found an average increase of 0.18 ± 10.51 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> min<sup>-1</sup> (mean and SD) and 0.57 ± 8.40 ppb N<sub>2</sub>O min<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, indicating that both gases were approximately at steady state at the end of the measurement period (relative to mean chamber outlet values of 684 ppm and 494 ppb for CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O, respectively). We repeated this analysis for the final inlet measurement period (Fig. 6e, approximately minutes 19–21) and found a change of less than one ppm or ppb min<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O relative to mean chamber inlet concentrations of 539 ppm and 331 ppb, respectively.

To assess temperature sensitivity of both gas analyzers under field conditions we examined the slope and intercept of standard curves measured during a 20-day period when air temperature ranged from -4 °C to 21°C and during which the instruments ran continuously. There was no significant directional trend in air temperature over this period to avoid conflating temperature-related drift and drift of the instrument over time unrelated to temperature. All four metrics examined (slope and intercept of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O calibration curves) displayed correlations with temperature. However, the impact of temperature on the slope of the CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O calibrations was less than 10<sup>-3</sup> ppm °C<sup>-1</sup> for both values. These values correspond to less than 1% difference in instrument output between the highest and lowest temperature near ambient gas concentration for CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O (400 and 0.3 ppm respectively). The intercept values showed greater sensitivity (0.02 and 0.003 ppm °C<sup>-1</sup> for CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O respectively). These values correspond to approximately 0.5 ppm difference in CO<sub>2</sub> and 0.08 ppm difference in N<sub>2</sub>O at the high and low temperature range observed. Taken together, we found that the N<sub>2</sub>O instrument had a -0.006 ppm °C<sup>-1</sup> sensitivity, in close agreement to the -0.009 ppm °C<sup>-1</sup> found by Fassbinder et al. (2013). As detailed above, standards were measured every two hours to account for instrument sensitivity to environmental conditions. Additionally, because gas flux was calculated as the difference between inlet and outlet concentration the intercept values cancelled mathematically, thereby removing any additional bias due to temperature-related intercept drift between standard measurements. Therefore, temperature variation between measurements had negligible impact on the final flux calculation.

Optical trace gas measurements may be affected by a number of interacting factors including temperature, pressure, and water vapor pressure (McDermitt et al., 1993). Water vapor can be removed through chemical traps. However, the high gas flow in our system (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>) made reagent replacement in chemical traps impractical, and preliminary work showed that membrane-based driers did not always completely remove water vapor in our operating environment, where relative humidity often reached 100%. The N<sub>2</sub>O analyzer we utilized removed moisture through a multi-tube Nafion dryer (Model NMP850KNDCEB, KNF Neuberger Inc.). Water vapor was not removed prior to measuring CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. As we calculated the soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux as proportional to the concentration difference between inlet and outlet gases, we were primarily concerned with a change in water vapor between the inlet and outlet measurement (Fig. 6e, f). In 2019, measurements were made with a LI-COR 850 that included a water vapor correction and measurement, which we used to constrain the potential impact of water vapor on our previous CO<sub>2</sub> measurements. McDermitt et al. (1993) found that the required water vapor correction using a similar analysis was < 10 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> at water vapor pressure of 25.3 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration up to 1000 ppm. Water vapor pressure in the gases we measured spanned 1.0–53.6 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup>, with an average difference between inlet and outlet gas of 1.8 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup> and a maximum of 36.4 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup>. These small observed changes in water vapor between inlet and outlet measurements indicate a minor impact on measured CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes: if the water vapor difference between inlet and outlet caused a <10 ppm bias in the measured CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (as expected in >99.9% of our observations), this would impact the average measured CO<sub>2</sub> flux (3.47 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) by <5.2% (0.18 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>), which is within the typical range of measurement uncertainty for reproducing a known flux value under controlled conditions (Pumpanen et al., 2004). The correction under a more moderate water vapor difference between inlet and outlet (<12.6 millimoles mole<sup>-1</sup>) that spans >97% of observed differences is approximately half the impact of this extreme example (0.09 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>). Unrelated to its

Field Code Changed

Deleted: (McDermitt et al., 1993)

Deleted: (1993)

Deleted: Unrelated to its impacts on instrument performance, water vapor can also impact flux measurements by dilution (Harazono et al., 2015)

impacts on instrument performance, water vapor can also impact flux measurements by dilution (Harazono et al., 2015). Given an average water vapor difference between inlet and outlet of 1.8 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup> and maximum of 36.4 mmol mole<sup>-1</sup>, impacts of dilution on measured fluxes would also be small: typically <0.18% and as much as 3.6%.

To constrain the potential impacts of water vapor on measured N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations, we conducted a simple laboratory experiment comparing the N<sub>2</sub>O instrument output between a high and low moisture measurement on a three-point standard curve. Water vapor was assessed with a LI-COR 850 installed in-line and upstream of the N<sub>2</sub>O sensor. To quantify the impact of water vapor on instrument output, we compared the standard curve created from dry standards to a curve created after bubbling the gas through a jar of deionized water. The bubbling technique added on average 25.4 millimoles mole<sup>-1</sup>, spanning >99.9% of observations of the difference between water vapor at the inlet and outlet in the field. Standard gases ranged up to 9.96 ppm N<sub>2</sub>O, greater than all differences between inlet and outlet observed in the field. No difference was noted in N<sub>2</sub>O instrument output due to the presence of water vapor, which suggested the drying column was effective at removing water vapor or that the gas filter correlation method corrected for any impacts of residual vapor.

### 3.3 Temporal Dynamics

Manual trace gas sampling by field crews is generally accomplished during normal daytime work hours. In contrast, automated measurements can be scheduled throughout the 24-hour diel period. Figure 8 displays boxplots of N<sub>2</sub>O emission from days when chambers were measured at each four-hour interval during 2017 and 2019 (the years of *Zea mays* cultivation). Though infrequent, we observed occasional instantaneous negative N<sub>2</sub>O flux values, as observed in other ecosystems including in cultivated soils (Schlesinger, 2013; Wu et al., 2013). Figure 9 shows the N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from two typical one-week periods from September 2017 and August 2018. A diel trend is visible for most chambers in August and some chambers and time periods in September. In general agreement with previously published automated chamber N<sub>2</sub>O studies from agricultural soils, we found the lowest rates of emission during early morning (04:00–08:00) and highest emissions during early afternoon (12:00–16:00) (Akiyama et al., 2000; Alves et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2019; Flessa et al., 2002; Savage et al., 2014). Early afternoon measurements were on average 28% greater than the daily average from each chamber (4.04 versus 3.15 nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) and this difference varied from -13.9 to 110 nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> among all chambers/days that were compared. The relative difference between average and peak daily emissions was in reasonable agreement with previous data from agricultural fields in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States (approximately 31, 47, and 33% respectively [Alves et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2019; Savage et al., 2014]). Although CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes were highest and lowest during the same time periods as N<sub>2</sub>O, early afternoon CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes averaged only 22% greater emissions than the daily average (4.38 and 3.60 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>), and this difference varied between -7.72 and 21.1 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> among all chambers/days that were compared.

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions pulses have often been observed following rain events (Savage et al., 2014; Sehy et al., 2003). To assess the length of the delay between rainfall and peak emissions, we analyzed the number of hours between heavy rainfall (>2 cm total over 24 h) and subsequent peak N<sub>2</sub>O emission rate averaged over all chambers. A rain gauge located on-site

**Delayed:** Manual sampling by field crews is generally accomplished during normal daytime work hours. In contrast, automated measurements can be scheduled throughout the 24-hour diel period. Figure 8 displays boxplots of N<sub>2</sub>O emission from days when chambers were measured at each four-hour interval during 2017 and 2019 (the years of *Zea mays* cultivation). Though infrequent, we observed occasional instantaneous negative N<sub>2</sub>O flux values, as observed in other ecosystems including in cultivated soils (Schlesinger, 2013; Wu et al., 2013). Figure 9 shows the N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from two typical one-week periods from September 2017 and August 2018. A diel trend is visible for most chambers in August and some chambers and time periods in September. In general agreement with previously published automated chamber N<sub>2</sub>O studies from agricultural soils, we found the lowest rates of emission during early morning (04:00–08:00) and highest emissions during early afternoon (12:00–16:00) (Akiyama et al., 2000; Alves et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2019; Flessa et al., 2002; Savage et al., 2014). Estimates created for each day and chamber using early afternoon measurements were on average 28% greater than the daily average from each chamber (4.04 versus 3.15 nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) and this difference varied from -13.9 to 110 nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. The relative difference between average and peak daily emissions was in reasonable agreement with previous data from agricultural fields in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States (approximately 31, 47, and 33% respectively [Alves et al., 2012; Bai et al., 2019; Savage et al., 2014]). Although CO<sub>2</sub> emissions displayed highest and lowest fluxes during the same time periods as N<sub>2</sub>O, the early afternoon CO<sub>2</sub> values averaged only 22% greater emissions than the daily average (4.38 and 3.60 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>), and this difference varied between -7.72 and 21.1 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions pulses have often been observed following rain events (Savage et al., 2014; Sehy et al., 2003). To assess the length of the delay between rainfall and peak emissions, we analyzed the number of hours between heavy rainfall (>2 cm total over 24 h) and subsequent peak N<sub>2</sub>O emission rate averaged over all chambers. A rain gauge located on-site recorded precipitation data that was collected and obtained through the Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS, 2017). There were 45 days with total rainfall over 2 cm. To avoid conflating more than one rain event, we chose isolated events without rainfall in excess of 4 mm d<sup>-1</sup> in the preceding or the following two days. Of the 15 isolated rain events observed, four were analyzed that did not span data gaps (Fig. 10). The rain to peak emission delay varied from 12 to 26 hours among precipitation events which varied from 2.4 to 4.4 cm.

#### 4 Conclusions

620 recorded precipitation data that was collected and obtained through the Iowa Flood Information System (IFIS, 2017). There were 45 days with total rainfall over 2 cm. To avoid conflating more than one rain event, we chose isolated events without rainfall in excess of 4 mm d<sup>-1</sup> in the preceding or the following two days. Of the 15 isolated rain events observed, four were analyzed that did not span data gaps (Fig. 10). The rain to peak emission delay varied from 12 to 26 hours among precipitation events which varied from 2.4 to 4.4 cm.

4 Conclusions

625 Our results indicate that steady-state conditions were achieved under reasonable periods of chamber closure (29 min; equivalent to the common 30-min averaging interval for eddy covariance measurements [Loescher et al., 2006]) and flow rates (2 L min<sup>-1</sup>) that could be attained using low-power 12V pumps. The results were minimally impacted by measurement error due to water vapor and were robust to changes in air temperature. We applied our high frequency data to address two questions, how strong does diel variation impact trace gas emissions and how long is the delay between precipitation and the frequently observed pulse in N<sub>2</sub>O. Our observations showed that the average daily emissions were most closely approximated by 630 measurements made between 08:00 and 12:00. Though CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were best approximated during the same time interval, the difference between peak emissions and the daily average was less pronounced and displayed less variability. We found the delay between rainfall and peak N<sub>2</sub>O emissions varied between 12 and 26 hours, intervals that would be difficult to capture using manual sampling methods. Both findings of temporal variability support the need for high-frequency measurements to calculate annual soil trace-gas emissions budgets. This measurement system could also be adapted to study other gases 635 provided that the gas analyzers chosen are able to tolerate field conditions. In particular, the steady-state chamber design used here provides a powerful tool for future studies to couple gas flux with isotopic measurements that may uncover the source and processes underlying the observed flux.

Agricultural management required us to remove the chambers and associated equipment several times of year, by hand. Without these constraints, experiments utilizing this method could examine processes that take place on even greater 640 spatial scales than those utilized here (tubing runs > 100 m) and with a greater number of chambers. Despite these challenges, we were able to construct and maintain 8 (+1 spare) high-frequency automated chambers for sub-daily N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements in a temperate agricultural field, with a total materials cost (~\$40,000 US dollars, including parts for 9 chambers, gas analyzers, control system, and power supply) that is a fraction of the cost of many laser-based N<sub>2</sub>O analyzers alone. We estimate that the chambers and control system took us 130–260 hours in total to construct and troubleshoot (with concomitant 645 labor/salary costs) and did not require specialized tools beyond those available in a typical workshop.

Code/data availability

Raw data, datalogger code, and data processing scripts will be publicly available from the Iowa State University Datashare repository (doi will be added here following manuscript acceptance).

Deleted: [Loescher et al., 2006])

Deleted: 16

Deleted: most optical

Deleted: post-

Deleted: are

Deleted: corresponding author on request.

Author Contribution

N. C. L. and S. J. H. jointly designed and carried out research and prepared the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded in part by USDA NIFA (award 2018-67019-27886), the Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture (award E2017-02), the Iowa Nutrient Research Center (award 109-47-03-39-3650), and Iowa State University faculty startup funds. We thank Carlos Tenesaca, Anthony Mirabito, Lucio Reyes, and Lindsay Mack for field assistance.

References

Akiyama, H., Tsuruta, H. and Watanabe, T.: N<sub>2</sub>O and NO emissions from soils after the application of different chemical fertilizers, *Chemosphere - Global Change Science*, 2(3), 313–320, doi:10.1016/S1465-9972(00)00010-6, 2000.

Alves, B. J. R., Smith, K. A., Flores, R. A., Cardoso, A. S., Oliveira, W. R. D., Jantalia, C. P., Urquiaga, S. and Boddey, R. M.: Selection of the most suitable sampling time for static chambers for the estimation of daily mean N<sub>2</sub>O flux from soils, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 46, 129–135, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.11.022, 2012.

Ambus, P. and Robertson, G. P.: Automated near-continuous measurement of carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide fluxes from soil, *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 62(2), 394–400, doi:10.2136/sssaj1998.03615995006200020015x, 1998.

Bai, M., Suter, H., Lam, S. K., Flesch, T. K. and Chen, D.: Comparison of slant open-path flux gradient and static closed chamber techniques to measure soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 12(2), 1095–1102, doi:doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-1095-2019, 2019.

Barton, L., Wolf, B., Rowlings, D., Scheer, C., Kiese, R., Grace, P., Stefanova, K. and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: Sampling frequency affects estimates of annual nitrous oxide fluxes, *Scientific Reports*, 5, 15912, doi:10.1038/srep15912, 2015.

Bowling, D. R., Egan, J. E., Hall, S. J. and Risk, D. A.: Environmental forcing does not induce diel or synoptic variation in the carbon isotope content of forest soil respiration, *Biogeosciences*, 12(16), 5143–5160, doi:10.5194/bg-12-5143-2015, 2015.

Breuer, L., Papen, H. and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: N<sub>2</sub>O emission from tropical forest soils of Australia, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 105(D21), 26353–26367, doi:10.1029/2000JD900424, 2000.

Butterbach-Bahl, K. and Dannenmann, M.: Denitrification and associated soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions due to agricultural activities in a changing climate, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 3(5), 389–395, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2011.08.004, 2011.

Deleted:

Deleted: Akiyama, H., Tsuruta, H. and Watanabe, T.: N<sub>2</sub>O and NO emissions from soils after the application of different chemical fertilizers, *Chemosphere - Glob. Change Sci.*, 2(3), 313–320, doi:10.1016/S1465-9972(00)00010-6, 2000.

Alves, B. J. R., Smith, K. A., Flores, R. A., Cardoso, A. S., Oliveira, W. R. D., Jantalia, C. P., Urquiaga, S. and Boddey, R. M.: Selection of the most suitable sampling time for static chambers for the estimation of daily mean N<sub>2</sub>O flux from soils, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 46, 129–135, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.11.022, 2012.

Bai, M., Suter, H., Lam, S. K., Flesch, T. K. and Chen, D.: Comparison of slant open-path flux gradient and static closed chamber techniques to measure soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 12(2), 1095–1102, doi:10.5194/amt-12-1095-2019, 2019.

Barton, L., Wolf, B., Rowlings, D., Scheer, C., Kiese, R., Grace, P., Stefanova, K. and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: Sampling frequency affects estimates of annual nitrous oxide fluxes, *Sci. Rep.*, 5, 15912, doi:10.1038/srep15912, 2015.

Bowling, D. R., Egan, J. E., Hall, S. J. and Risk, D. A.: Environmental forcing does not induce diel or synoptic variation in the carbon isotope content of forest soil respiration, *Biogeosciences*, 12(16), 5143–5160, doi:10.5194/bg-12-5143-2015, 2015.

Davidson, E. A., Savage, K., Verchot, L. V. and Navarro, R.: Minimizing artifacts and biases in chamber-based measurements of soil respiration, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 113(1), 21–37, doi:10.1016/S0168-1923(02)00100-4, 2002.

Fang, C. and Moncrieff, J. B.: An open-top chamber for measuring soil respiration and the influence of pressure difference on CO<sub>2</sub> efflux measurement, *Funct. Ecol.*, 12(2), 319–325, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2435.1998.00189.x, 1998.

Fassbinder, J. J., Schultz, N. M., Baker, J. M. and Griffiths, T. J.: Automated, low-power chamber system for measuring nitrous oxide emissions, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 42(2), 606–614, doi:10.2134/jeq2012.0283, 2013.

Flessa, H., Ruser, R., Schilling, R., Löffelth, N., Munch, J. C., Kaiser, E. A. and Beese, F.: N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in potato fields: automated measurement, management effects and temporal variation, *Geoderma*, 105(3), 307–325, doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(01)00110-0, 2002.

Groffman, P. M., Altabet, M. A., Böhlke, J. K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M. B., Firestone, M. K., Giblin, A. E., Kana, T. M., Nielsen, L. P. and Voytek, M. A.: Methods for measuring denitrification: diverse approaches to a difficult problem, *Ecological Applications*, 16(6), 2091–2122, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[2091:MFMDDA]2.0.CO;2, 2006.


Groffman, P. M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Fulweiler, R. W., Gold, A. J., Morse, J. L., Stander, E. K., Tague, C., Tonitto, C. and Vidon, P.: Challenges to incorporating spatially and temporally explicit ... [1]

- 820 [Courtois, E. A., Stahl, C., Burban, B., Berge, J. V. den, Berveiller, D., Bréchet, L., Soong, J. L., Arriga, N., Peñuelas, J. and Janssens, I. A.: Automatic high-frequency measurements of full soil greenhouse gas fluxes in a tropical forest, \*Biogeosciences\*, 16\(3\), 785–796, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-785-2019>, 2019.](#)  
[Davidson, E. A., Savage, K., Verchot, L. V. and Navarro, R.: Minimizing artifacts and biases in chamber-based measurements of soil respiration, \*Agricultural and Forest Meteorology\*, 113\(1\), 21–37, doi:10.1016/S0168-1923\(02\)00100-4, 2002.](#)
- 825 [Fang, C. and Moncrieff, J. B.: An open-top chamber for measuring soil respiration and the influence of pressure difference on CO<sub>2</sub> efflux measurement, \*Functional Ecology\*, 12\(2\), 319–325, 1998.](#)  
[Fassbinder, J. J., Schultz, N. M., Baker, J. M. and Griffis, T. J.: Automated, low-power chamber system for measuring nitrous oxide emissions, \*J. Environ. Qual.\*, 42\(2\), 606–614, doi:10.2134/jeq2012.0283, 2013.](#)
- 830 [Flessa, H., Ruser, R., Schilling, R., Loftfield, N., Munch, J. C., Kaiser, E. A. and Beese, F.: N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in potato fields: automated measurement, management effects and temporal variation, \*Geoderma\*, 105\(3\), 307–325, doi:10.1016/S0016-7061\(01\)00110-0, 2002.](#)  
[Groffman, P. M., Altabet, M. A., Böhlke, J. K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M. B., Firestone, M. K., Giblin, A. E., Kana, T. M., Nielsen, L. P. and Voytek, M. A.: Methods for measuring denitrification: diverse approaches to a difficult problem, \*Ecological Applications\*, 16\(6\), 2091–2122, 2006.](#)
- 835 [Groffman, P. M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Fulweiler, R. W., Gold, A. J., Morse, J. L., Stander, E. K., Tague, C., Tonitto, C. and Vidon, P.: Challenges to incorporating spatially and temporally explicit phenomena \(hotspots and hot moments\) in denitrification models, \*Biogeochemistry\*, 93\(1–2\), 49–77, doi:10.1007/s10533-008-9277-5, 2009.](#)  
[Harazono, Y., Iwata, H., Sakabe, A., Ueyama, M., Takahashi, K., Nagano, H., Nakai, T. and Kosugi, Y.: Effects of water vapor dilution on trace gas flux, and practical correction methods, \*Journal of Agricultural Meteorology\*, 71\(2\), 65–76, doi:10.2480/agrmet.D-14-00003, 2015.](#)
- 840 [Hutchinson, G. L. and Mosier, A. R.: Improved soil cover method for field measurement of nitrous oxide fluxes, \*Soil Science Society of America Journal\*, 45\(2\), 311, doi:10.2136/sssaj1981.03615995004500020017x, 1981.](#)  
[IFIS: Iowa Flood Information System, \[online\] Available from: <http://ifis.iowafloodcenter.org> \(last accessed: 21 November 2019\), 2017.](#)
- 845 [Loescher, H. W., Law, B. E., Mahrt, L., Hollinger, D. Y., Campbell, J. and Wofsy, S. C.: Uncertainties in, and interpretation of, carbon flux estimates using the eddy covariance technique, \*Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres\*, 111\(D21\), doi:10.1029/2005JD006932, 2006.](#)  
[Logsdon, S. D. and James, D. E.: Closed depression topography Harps soil, revisited, \*Soil Horizons\*, 55\(2\), doi:10.2136/sh13-11-0025, 2014.](#)
- 850 [McDermitt, D. K., Welles, J. M. and Eckles, R. D.: Effects of temperature, pressure and water vapor on gas phase infrared absorption by CO<sub>2</sub>, \[online\] Available from: <https://www.licor.com/documents/sul40zcvtnr8t71arbua> \(last accessed: 21 November 2019\), 1993.](#)  
[Merbold, L., Wohlfahrt, G., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Pilegaard, K., DelSontro, T., Stoy, P. and Zona, D.: Preface: Towards a full greenhouse gas balance of the biosphere, \*Biogeosciences\*, 12\(2\), 453–456, doi:10.5194/bg-12-453-2015, 2015.](#)

- 855 [Minasny, B., Malone, B. P., McBratney, A. B., Angers, D. A., Arrouays, D., Chambers, A., Chaplot, V., Chen, Z.-S., Cheng, K., Das, B. S., Field, D. J., Gimona, A., Hedley, C. B., Hong, S. Y., Mandal, B., Marchant, B. P., Martin, M., McConkey, B. G., Mulder, V. L., O'Rourke, S., Richer-de-Forges, A. C., Odeh, I., Padarian, J., Paustian, K., Pan, G., Poggio, L., Savin, I., Stolbovoy, V., Stockmann, U., Sulaeman, Y., Tsui, C.-C., Vågen, T.-G., van Wesemael, B. and Winowiecki, L.: Soil carbon 4 per mille, \*Geoderma\*, 292, 59–86, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.01.002, 2017.](#)
- 860 [Moyes, A. B., Schauer, A. J., Siegwolf, R. T. W. and Bowling, D. R.: An injection method for measuring the carbon isotope content of soil carbon dioxide and soil respiration with a tunable diode laser absorption spectrometer, \*Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry\*, 24\(7\), 894–900, doi:10.1002/rcm.4466, 2010a.](#)  
[Moyes, A. B., Gaines, S. J., Siegwolf, R. T. W. and Bowling, D. R.: Diffusive fractionation complicates isotopic partitioning of autotrophic and heterotrophic sources of soil respiration, \*Plant Cell Environ.\*, 33\(11\), 1804–1819, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2010.02185.x, 2010b.](#)
- 865 [Nickerson, N. and Risk, D.: Physical controls on the isotopic composition of soil-respired CO<sub>2</sub>, \*Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences\*, 114\(G1\), doi:10.1029/2008JG000766, 2009.](#)  
[Norman, J. M., Kucharik, C. J., Gower, S. T., Baldocchi, D. D., Crill, P. M., Rayment, M., Savage, K. and Striegl, R. G.: A comparison of six methods for measuring soil-surface carbon dioxide fluxes, \*Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres\*, 102\(D24\), 28771–28777, doi:10.1029/97JD01440, 1997.](#)
- 870 [Papen, H. and Butterbach-Bahl, K.: A 3-year continuous record of nitrogen trace gas fluxes from untreated and limed soil of a N-saturated spruce and beech forest ecosystem in Germany: 1. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, \*Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres\*, 104\(D15\), 18487–18503, doi:10.1029/1999JD900293, 1999.](#)  
[Parkin, T. B.: Effect of sampling frequency on estimates of cumulative nitrous oxide emissions, \*J. Environ. Qual.\*, 37\(4\), 1390–1395, doi:10.2134/jeq2007.0333, 2008.](#)
- 875 [Paustian, K., Lehmann, J., Ogle, S., Reay, D., Robertson, G. P. and Smith, P.: Climate-smart soils, \*Nature\*, 532\(7597\), 49–57, doi:10.1038/nature17174, 2016.](#)  
[Pihlatie, M., Rinne, J., Ambus, P., Pilegaard, K., Dorsey, J. R., Rannik, Ü., Markkanen, T., Launiainen, S. and Vesala, T.: Nitrous oxide emissions from a beech forest floor measured by eddy covariance and soil enclosure techniques, \*Biogeosciences\*, 2\(4\), 377–387, doi:https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2-377-2005, 2005.](#)
- 880 [Pumpanen, J., Kolari, P., Ilvesniemi, H., Minkkinen, K., Vesala, T., Niinistö, S., Lohila, A., Larmola, T., Morero, M., Pihlatie, M., Janssens, I., Yuste, J. C., Grünzweig, J. M., Reth, S., Subke, J.-A., Savage, K., Kutsch, W., Østreng, G., Ziegler, W., Anthoni, P., Lindroth, A. and Hari, P.: Comparison of different chamber techniques for measuring soil CO<sub>2</sub> efflux, \*Agricultural and Forest Meteorology\*, 123\(3\), 159–176, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2003.12.001, 2004.](#)
- 885 [R Core Team: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. \[online\] Available from: <http://www.R-project.org/>, 2013.](#)  
[Rayment, M. B. and Jarvis, P. G.: An improved open chamber system for measuring soil CO<sub>2</sub> effluxes in the field, \*Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres\*, 102\(D24\), 28779–28784, doi:10.1029/97JD01103, 1997.](#)
- 890 [Riggs, A. C., Stannard, D. I., Maestas, F. B., Karlinger, M. R. and Striegl, R. G.: Soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the Amargosa Desert, Nevada, during El Nino 1998 and La Nina 1999, \*US Geol. Surv. Sci. Investig. Rep.\* 2009–5061 \[online\] Available from: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2009/5061/> \(last access: 8 October 2019\), 2009.](#)







925

Fig. 1a Aerial image of the field site with plot locations. 1b Image from the lowest topographic position along the transect. Front left:  
 a closed chamber. Front right: an open chamber between measurements. The transect is visible in the background. Image Source:  
 930 Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User  
 Community.

935




Fig. 2. Illustration modified from Rayment and Jarvis (1997) depicting the chamber lid with cut-out to show the inlet tube a and the PVC cap b. Inlet and outlet sampling points are noted.

940

945





Fig. 3. Image of chamber design: HDPE base a, aluminum L bracket b, threaded rod c, pneumatic cylinder rod end d. The length of each numbered stainless steel tube is as follows: 1 (16 cm), 2 (47 cm), 3 (41 cm), 4 (56 cm), 5 (65 cm), 6 (18 cm). The yellow circles indicate rotational degrees of motion while red circles denote rigid, fixed connection points.




Deleted:

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5



**Fig. 4. Illustration of the chamber pneumatic system that controls opening and closing of chambers. The red arrow denotes the tube to drain the water trap reservoir.**





Fig. 5. Schematic of the sample selection system. Mass flow controllers are abbreviated MFC. Filters are denoted by black ovals.

965 Red arrows indicate where needle valves vent excess flow.



**Fig. 6.** Raw instrument output over a representative half-hour chamber measurement period: low standard a, high standard b, first inlet measurement c, first outlet measurement d, second inlet measurement e, second outlet measurement f. The second set of inlet/outlet measurements was used for flux calculations. Shaded bars indicate periods where output was averaged for subsequent calculations.




Fig. 7. Schematic of the solar and power supply system with wiring and circuit breakers. Wires are noted positive (+) and black are negative (-). Arrows from the DC-AC inverter supply 120-volt AC. Arrows from the battery bank supply 12-volt DC. Circuit breakers are labelled by their ampere (amp) rating. Batteries for the battery bank are labelled by individual battery voltage.






Fig. 8. Boxplot of  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  fluxes during each four-hour interval. Positive outliers that comprised 1.9% of the total dataset were greater than  $14 \text{ nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ .




Fig. 9.  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  flux time series shaded by plot topographic location over two one-week periods in September 2017 and August 2018.




Fig. 10. N<sub>2</sub>O flux time series shaded by plot topographic location over four one-week periods in May 2017, August 2017, September 2017, and May 2019. Black dashed lines denote rain events analyzed for peak delay, grey lines indicate rain events that did not fit our selection criteria and were over 2 mm d<sup>-1</sup>.



.....