The isotopic composition of atmospheric nitrous oxide observed at the high-altitude research station Jungfraujoch, Switzerland

- 4 Longfei Yu^{1*}, Eliza Harris^{1†}, Stephan Henne¹, Sarah Eggleston¹, Martin Steinbacher¹, Lukas
 5 Emmenegger¹, Christoph Zellweger¹ and Joachim Mohn¹
- ⁶ ¹Laboratory for Air Pollution & Environmental Technology, Empa, Swiss Federal Laboratories
- 7 for Materials Science and Technology, Ueberlandstr. 129, CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland.
- 8 [†]Current address: Institute of Ecology, University of Innsbruck, Sternwartestrasse 15, A-6020
- 9 Innsbruck, Austria
- 10 * Correspondence: L. Yu (<u>longfei.yu@empa.ch</u>)

11 Abstract

Atmospheric nitrous oxide (N₂O) levels have been continuously growing since preindustrial times. 12 Mitigation requires information about sources and sinks on the regional and global scales. Isotopic 13 composition of N₂O in the atmosphere could contribute valuable constraints. However, isotopic 14 records of N₂O in the unpolluted atmosphere remain too scarce for large-scale N₂O models. Here, 15 we report the results of discrete air samples collected weekly to bi-weekly over a five-year period 16 at the high-altitude research station Jungfraujoch, located in central Switzerland. High-precision 17 18 N2O isotopic measurements were made using a recently developed preconcentration-laser 19 spectroscopy technique. The measurements of discrete samples were accompanied by in situ continuous measurements of N₂O mixing ratios. Our results indicate a pronounced seasonal pattern 20 with minimum N₂O mixing ratios in late summer, associated with a maximum in $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ and a 21 minimum in intramolecular ¹⁵N site preference ($\delta^{15}N^{SP}$). This pattern is most likely due to 22 stratosphere-troposphere exchange (STE), which delivers N₂O-depleted but ¹⁵N-enriched air from 23 the stratosphere into the troposphere. Variability in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ induced by changes in STE may be 24 masked by biogeochemical N₂O production processes in late summer, which are possibly 25 dominated by a low- $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ pathway of N₂O production (denitrification), providing an explanation 26 for the observed seasonality of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$. Footprint analyses and atmospheric transport simulations 27 of N₂O for Jungfraujoch suggest that regional emissions from the planetary boundary layer 28 29 contribute to seasonal variations of atmospheric N₂O isotopic composition at Jungfraujoch, albeit more clearly for $\delta^{15} N^{SP}$ and $\delta^{18} O$ than for $\delta^{15} N^{bulk}$. With the time-series of five years, we obtained 30 a significant interannual trend for δ^{15} N^{bulk} after deseasonalization (-0.052±0.012‰ a⁻¹), indicating 31 that the atmospheric N₂O increase is due to isotopically depleted N₂O sources. We estimated the 32 average isotopic signature of anthropogenic N₂O sources with a two-box model to be -8.6±0.6‰ 33

for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, 34.8±3‰ for $\delta^{18}O$ and 10.7±4‰ for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$. Our study demonstrates that seasonal variation of N₂O isotopic composition in the background atmosphere is important when determining interannual trends. More frequent, high-precision and inter-laboratory compatible measurements of atmospheric N₂O isotopocules, especially for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$, are needed to better constrain anthropogenic N₂O sources, and thus the contribution of biogeochemical processes to N₂O growth on the global scale.

40 **1 Introduction**

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is a potent greenhouse gas (Fowler et al., 2015) and a strong stratospheric 41 ozone-depleting substance (Ravishankara et al., 2009). For several decades, near-surface 42 atmospheric N₂O mixing ratios have been continuously measured at a series of remote sites, within 43 44 the networks of the Global Atmosphere Watch Programme (JMA and WMO, 2018), the Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE) (Prinn et al., 2018), and the National Oceanic 45 and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Earth System Research Laboratory (ESRL) Global 46 47 Monitoring Division (GMD) (Nevison et al., 2011). These measurements have shown a significant increase in atmospheric N₂O mixing ratio, at a current growth rate of about 0.93 nmol mol⁻¹ a⁻¹ 48 (WMO, 2018). On the global scale, given excessive nitrogen (N) fertilizer application, agriculture 49 is known to be the largest and most important anthropogenic source of N₂O (Reay et al., 2012; 50 Tian et al., 2019). However, long-term observations of N₂O in the unpolluted atmosphere have 51 shown seasonal and interannual variabilities as well as interhemispheric differences in N₂O mixing 52 ratios (Nevison et al., 2011; Thompson et al., 2014a, 2014b), which cannot yet be resolved by 53 atmospheric transport models and existing emission inventories. Moreover, regional contributions 54 of N2O emissions and the strengths of individual N2O production pathways remain difficult to 55 quantify. 56

Isotopic signatures of atmospheric N₂O can provide important constraints on N₂O sources (Denk et al., 2017) and trends (Kim and Craig, 1993). The ratios of ${}^{15}N/{}^{14}N$ and ${}^{18}O/{}^{16}O$ in N₂O are often reported in δ notation as $\delta({}^{15}N/{}^{14}N)$ and $\delta({}^{18}O/{}^{16}O)$, abbreviated as $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ (average for ${}^{14}N^{15}N^{16}O$ and ${}^{15}N^{14}N^{16}O$) and $\delta^{18}O$, respectively. A large fraction of N₂O emitted to the atmosphere originates from soil bacterial processes, which usually emit N₂O that is more enriched in light (${}^{14}N$, ${}^{16}O$) isotopes than the tropospheric background (Pérez et al., 2001; Snider et al., 2015a; Toyoda et

al., 2017). By contrast, N₂O produced in the oceans (Bourbonnais et al., 2017; Fujii et al., 2013) 63 and emitted from fossil fuel combustion (Ogawa and Yoshida, 2005; Toyoda et al., 2008) has 64 higher δ^{15} N^{bulk} and δ^{18} O values which are comparable to the tropospheric background. A recent 65 study has summarized isotopic signatures of anthropogenic N₂O sources divided into the EDGAR 66 (Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research) emission categories (Janssens-Maenhout 67 et al., 2019), showing differences in isotopic signatures between agricultural ($\delta^{15}N^{bulk} = -17.8$ to -68 1.0% and $\delta^{18}O = 23.9$ to 29%) and industrial sources ($\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}} = -28.7$ to 5.5% and $\delta^{18}O = 28.6$ 69 70 to 40.3‰) (Harris et al., 2017). These empirical ranges, together with isotopic mixing models, provide a valuable approach to interpret variability in atmospheric N₂O mixing ratios. 71

72 A number of studies have analyzed temporal trends in N₂O isotopic composition in the modern 73 atmosphere (Kaiser et al., 2003; Park et al., 2012; Röckmann and Levin, 2005; Toyoda et al., 2013) and in the past from firn and ice cores (Bernard et al., 2006; Ishijima et al., 2007; Prokopiou et al., 74 2018; Röckmann et al., 2003; Sowers et al., 2002). These isotopic measurements have shown a 75 decrease in both $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ - and $\delta^{18}O$ -N₂O associated with an increasing trend in atmospheric N₂O 76 mixing ratios since preindustrial times, indicating that the recent increase of atmospheric N₂O may 77 be due to agricultural emissions (¹⁵N and ¹⁸O depleted). The reported trend since the 1960s seems 78 rather steady (-0.034±0.005 ‰ a⁻¹ for δ^{15} N^{bulk} and -0.016 ‰±0.006 a⁻¹ for δ^{18} O) (Bernard et al., 79 2006; Ishijima et al., 2007; Park et al., 2012; Prokopiou et al., 2017; Röckmann et al., 2003; 80 Röckmann and Levin, 2005). However, a more recent (1999-2010) study reported a smaller 81 decreasing trend in $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and only an insignificant trend in $\delta^{18}O$ for the Northern Hemisphere 82 (Toyoda et al., 2013). Several hypotheses were proposed to explain the differences in the observed 83 84 trends: 1) the interhemispheric difference in N₂O emission sources results in inconsistent isotopic signatures among different studies (Thompson et al., 2014b); 2) uncertainties in isotopic 85

measurements and variable sampling schemes (air type, sampling frequency and time) mask the small secular trend of N₂O isotopic composition in the background atmosphere (Toyoda et al., 2013); and/or 3) N₂O source isotopic signatures have changed in recent years, possibly due to shifts in N fertilizer type and climatic forcing (Tian et al., 2019). Hence, further investigation into the global N₂O source inventory and its evolution over time requires more frequent, precise measurements of N₂O isotopocules in the unpolluted atmosphere, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere.

Recently, site-specific composition of N₂O isotopomers (site preference: $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$), which denotes 93 the difference of ¹⁵N between the central (¹⁴N¹⁵N¹⁶O, α position) and terminal (¹⁵N¹⁴N¹⁶O, β 94 position) N atoms, has been applied to constrain sources contributing to atmospheric N2O (Toyoda 95 et al., 2013; Yoshida and Toyoda, 2000). δ^{15} N^{SP} of N₂O is particularly effective for distinguishing 96 between the major N₂O production processes, i.e. nitrification and denitrification, generally 97 referred to as aerobic and anaerobic N₂O production, with high and low δ^{15} N^{SP}, respectively (Sutka 98 et al., 2006). However, despite the advantages of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ measurements, existing long-term studies 99 have not yet been able to reach a definitive understanding of the $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ -N₂O trend, showing both 100 positive (Bernard et al., 2006; Park et al., 2012; Röckmann and Levin, 2005) and negative 101 tendencies (Röckmann et al., 2003) over the last four decades. This is probably due to an 102 insufficient analytical precision and poor inter-laboratory agreement, in particular as the 103 aforementioned studies are all based on isotope ratio mass spectrometry (IRMS). To retrieve site-104 specific isotopic information by IRMS, the N₂O⁺ molecular ions and the NO⁺ fragment ions are 105 analyzed and raw data have to be corrected for rearrangements of central and terminal N and ¹⁷O 106 107 content (Toyoda et al., 2001). Inappropriate correction algorithms and the limited availability of reference materials (Ostrom et al., 2018) further enlarge the analytical uncertainty (Mohn et al.,2014).

Seasonal variability in atmospheric N₂O isotopic composition, which could affect the longer-term 110 trends, is still rarely reported in the literature (Park et al., 2012; Toyoda et al., 2013). Moreover, 111 studies of seasonality of N2O isotopic composition are limited to the recent past since the air 112 samples derived from firn and ice cores suffer from coarse temporal resolution (< 2 samples per 113 year). Park et al. (2012) studied seasonality of atmospheric N₂O isotopic composition by analyzing 114 a set of archived air samples collected from Cape Grim (Australia) using a sophisticated 115 mathematical modeling approach. They found consistent seasonal patterns in $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, $\delta^{18}O$ and 116 δ^{15} N^{SP} of atmospheric N₂O, showing highest ¹⁵N/¹⁸O enrichment in June and lowest in December. 117 This pattern was negatively correlated with the seasonality of the N₂O mixing ratios (lowest in 118 April-May and highest in December), which is in agreement with a previous study by Nevison et 119 al. (2011). The negative correlation between isotopic composition and mixing ratios has been 120 explained by stratosphere-troposphere exchange (STE), which transports N2O-depleted but 121 isotopically enriched stratospheric air (prevailing reduction process) into the lower atmosphere 122 123 (Yung and Miller, 1997). However, in a more recent study from Hateruma Island (Japan), Toyoda et al. (2013) reported insignificant seasonal patterns in atmospheric N₂O isotopocules (smaller 124 variability than measurement precision), despite their finding of a somewhat similar seasonal 125 pattern in N₂O mixing ratio (minimum in July). Although there are interhemispheric differences 126 in N₂O sources and distinct sampling frequencies in the two studies discussed above (2-3 times 127 per year versus monthly), it is noteworthy that both studies observed significantly larger variability 128 in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ than in $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ and $\delta^{18}O$. Whether the fluctuations in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ are mainly caused by the 129

limited repeatability of the chosen analytical techniques or interplay of processes or mechanisms
regulating atmospheric N₂O remains to be tested (Park et al., 2012).

With inherent selectiveness, in particular for site-specific isotopic composition, laser spectroscopy 132 provides a new analytical approach for direct, precise measurements of all four N₂O isotopocules 133 (Harris et al., 2014; Mohn et al., 2012). The recent development of quantum cascade laser 134 absorption spectroscopy (QCLAS) coupled with an automated preconcentration unit has been 135 applied to measure N₂O isotopocules in ambient air, with comparable precision for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and 136 δ^{18} O and superior precision for δ^{15} N^{SP} relative to IRMS systems (Harris et al., 2017; Mohn et al., 137 2014). Here, we present results from the application of a preconcentration unit coupled to QCLAS 138 139 to measure atmospheric N₂O isotopocules in background air collected at the high altitude research station Jungfraujoch, Switzerland. Between April 2014 and December 2018, we collected weekly 140 to bi-weekly air samples for N₂O isotopic analyses, in parallel with online measurement of N₂O 141 mixing ratios. To our knowledge, this work reports the first time-series of background atmospheric 142 N₂O isotopic composition using laser spectroscopy. With this unique dataset, we aim to 1) 143 constrain seasonal patterns of three N₂O isotopic signatures at the Jungfraujoch observatory; 2) 144 determine interannual trends in N₂O isotopocules, especially $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$; and 3) interpret the observed 145 patterns in N₂O mixing ratios using temporal trends in N₂O isotopic composition and reported 146 isotopic signatures of anthropogenic sources. 147

148 **2 Materials and Method**

149 **2.1 Site description**

The high altitude research station Jungfraujoch (3580 m above sea level), located on the northern 150 ridge of the Swiss Alps, is a well-established site for studying unpolluted atmosphere over Central 151 152 Europe (e.g. Buchmann et al., 2016). Although the station is located in the free troposphere most of the time, it is occasionally affected by air recently lifted from the planetary boundary layer 153 (Herrmann et al., 2015; Zellweger et al., 2003). Henne et al. (2010) investigated the 154 representativeness of 35 European monitoring stations and categorized Jungfraujoch as "mostly 155 remote". The Jungfraujoch station is part of several national and international networks, like the 156 meteorological SwissMetNet network operated by MeteoSwiss, the Swiss National Air Pollution 157 Monitoring Network (NABEL), the Global Atmospheric Watch Programme (GAW) of the World 158 Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the Integrated Carbon Observation Systems (ICOS) 159 Research Infrastructure. This results in an extended set of long-term and continuously available 160 parameters such as meteorological variables (Appenzeller et al., 2008), greenhouse gases (Schibig 161 et al., 2015; Sepúlveda et al., 2014; Yuan et al., 2018), CO₂ isotopic composition (Sturm et al., 162 2013; Tuzson et al., 2011), ozone-depleting substances and their replacement products (Reimann 163 164 et al., 2008), atmospheric pollutants (Logan et al., 2012; Pandey Deolal et al., 2012; Zellweger et 165 al., 2009) and aerosol parameters (Bukowiecki et al., 2016).

166 2.2 In situ measurements and discrete air sampling (flasks)

In situ observations of N₂O mixing ratios commenced at Jungfraujoch in December 2004. Initially,
 measurements were made with gas chromatograph (GC) (Agilent 6890N, USA) followed by
 electron capture detection (ECD). The time resolution of these measurements was 24 to 30 minutes.

In late 2014, we implemented a cavity-enhanced off-axis integrated cavity out-put spectroscopy 170 analyzer (OA-ICOS, Los Gatos Research Inc., Mountain View, CA, USA), which measures the 171 atmospheric N₂O mixing ratio continuously. Measurements of N₂O mixing ratios at Jungfraujoch 172 were calibrated with three standard gases (319, 327 and 342 nmol mol⁻¹) and accompanied with 173 measurement of a working standard (331 nmol mol⁻¹) every 160 minutes to account for 174 instrumental drift. In addition, short- (two times every 40 hours) and long-term (every 40 hours) 175 target measurements were included to monitor the data quality. Due to the superior measurement 176 precision compared to the GC-ECD method (Lebegue et al., 2016), the OA-ICOS record has 177 become the primary time-series since January 2015. The GC-ECD observations continued until 178 179 summer 2016 for comparison and quality control.

Additional parameters, recorded within the NABEL network and the ICOS infrastructure, were 180 included in the analysis below. These data were carbon monoxide (CO) (measured by cavity ring-181 down spectroscopy; Model G2401, Picarro Inc., USA), the sum of oxidized nitrogen species (NO_y) 182 (measured by chemiluminescence detection after conversion of NOy to NO on a heated gold 183 catalyst; CLD 89p, Eco Physics, Switzerland) and O₃ (measured by UV absorption; TEI 49i, 184 185 Thermo Scientific, USA). Details on measurement methods and calibration strategies can be found in Zellweger et al. (2009) for CO, Pandey Deolal et al. (2012) for NO_y and Logan et al. (2012) for 186 O3. 187

In conjunction with the online measurements, we deployed an automated sampling system (Fig. S1) to collect pressurized air samples in aluminum cylinders from the same air inlet at the Sphinx observatory of the Jungfraujoch station, for subsequent N₂O mixing ratio and isotopic analyses. The sample collection was conducted weekly from April 2014 to February 2016. After a sampling gap of five months due to a technical failure, we reinitiated a bi-weekly sampling, which continued

from August 2016 to December 2018. The sampling system, automated by a customized LabVIEW 193 program (National Instruments Corp., USA), consisted of a Nation drier (PD-100T-48MSS, Perma 194 Pure LLC, USA), a membrane gas compressor (KNF Neuberger, USA; Type N286 series), a 16-195 port selector valve (EMT2CSD16MWEPH, VICI AG, Swtizerland), and a rack to accommodate 196 nine 2-L aluminum flasks (Luxfer, Messer Schweiz AG, Switzerland). During sample filling, pre-197 evacuated flasks were first purged with ambient air five times (1 hour), and then filled to 12000 198 199 hPa within 40 min, resulting in approximately 24 L (298 K and 1000 hPa) of air per flask for 200 isotopic analysis. Air sample filling generally took place between 2:00 and 3:00 pm local time at each sampling day. Sample flasks were sent back to the laboratory at Empa for analyses every few 201 202 months. For this study, 142 air samples were collected in flasks and analyzed for N₂O isotopocules.

203 2.3 Analyses of discrete air samples

Discrete air samples were regularly analyzed in batches but note in chronological order to prevent the imprint of analytical drifts on temporal trends of the samples. N₂O mole fractions were analyzed by QCLAS (CW-QC-TILDAS-76-CS, Aerodyne Research Inc., USA) against NOAA standards on the WMO-X2006A calibration scale (Hall et al., 2007), at a precision around 0.1 nmol mol⁻¹ (determined with the average of 1-min data).

The four most abundant N₂O isotopocules (${}^{14}N{}^{16}N{}^{16}O$, 99.03%; ${}^{14}N{}^{15}N{}^{16}O$, 0.36%; ${}^{15}N{}^{14}N{}^{16}O$, 0.36%; ${}^{14}N{}^{14}N{}^{18}O$, 0.20%) were analyzed using a customized QCLAS system (Aerodyne Research, Inc., USA) (Heil et al., 2014) coupled with an automated preconcentration device (Mohn et al., 2010). Before entering the pre-concentration unit, sample air is passed through a Sofnocat 423 trap (Molecular Products Limited, GB) to remove CO, and subsequently through an Ascarite trap (Ascarite: 6 g, 10–35 mesh, Sigma Aldrich, Switzerland, bracketed by Mg(ClO₄)₂, 2 × 1.5 g, Alfa Aesar, Germany) to remove CO₂ and water. Approximately 5.5 L of air with a flow of 250 ml min⁻ 216 ¹ (at 295 K and 3500 hPa) is then passed through a HayeSep D trap cooled to -145 °C to collect N₂O (Mohn et al., 2010). For N₂O release to the multipath cell of the QCLAS, the HaveSep D trap 217 is quickly heated to 10 °C and flushed with high-purity synthetic air (20.5% of O₂ in N₂) carrier 218 gas at a flow rate of 25 ml min⁻¹ (at 295 K and 3500 hPa). A final cell pressure around 16 hPa is 219 achieved, which results in an N₂O mixing ratio of about 45 µmol mol⁻¹. More instrumental details 220 can be found in previous studies (Harris et al., 2017; Mohn et al., 2010, 2012). Sample tanks were 221 222 each analyzed twice to yield duplicates for N2O isotopic results, which left sufficient air for amount 223 fraction analysis as described in the previous paragraph.

224 2.4 Data analyses

We used 10-minute averages of the continuous *in situ* measurements from the Jungfraujoch station across this study. For a point-to-point comparison of continuous and discrete measurements of N₂O mixing ratio, we aggregated 10-minute averages of *in situ* data for the same period when the discrete sample was filled into the cylinder (40 min).

In this study, we report abundances of N₂O isotopocules using δ notation (‰) as below:

230
$$\delta X = \frac{(R_{sample} - R_{standard})}{R_{standard}}$$
(1)

where X refers to ${}^{15}N^{\alpha}$ (${}^{14}N^{15}N^{16}O$), ${}^{15}N^{\beta}$ (${}^{15}N^{14}N^{16}O$) and ${}^{18}O$ (${}^{14}N^{14}N^{18}O$); R refers to the ratio between the amount fractions of the rare isotopocules as mentioned above and the amount fraction of ${}^{14}N^{14}N^{16}O$; isotope standards refer to atmospheric N₂ for ${}^{15}N$ and Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW) for ${}^{18}O$.

Hence, the total ¹⁵N content of N₂O and site-specific composition of N₂O isotopomers could be further illustrated as δ^{15} N^{bulk} and δ^{15} N^{SP}, respectively, according to the equations below:

237
$$\delta^{15} N^{bulk} = (\delta^{15} N^{\alpha} + \delta^{15} N^{\beta})/2$$
(2)

(3)

$$\delta^{15}N^{SP} = \delta^{15}N^{\alpha} - \delta^{15}N^{\beta}$$

Two standards (CG1 and CG2; in 79.5% N₂ and 20.5% O₂) with distinct isotopic signatures ($\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ 239 = $16.29 \pm 0.07\%$ (CG1) and $-51.09 \pm 0.07\%$ (CG2); $\delta^{15}N^{\beta} = -2.59 \pm 0.06\%$ and $-48.12 \pm 0.04\%$; 240 δ^{18} O = 39.37 ± 0.04‰ and 30.81 ± 0.03‰) were used for calibrating isotopic composition. The 241 calibration gases CG1 and CG2 were calibrated on the Tokyo Institute of Technology (TIT) scale, 242 243 based on cross-calibration with primary standards assigned by TIT (Mohn et al., 2012, 2014). In 244 addition, CG1 was measured repeatedly between samples and target gases to account for instrumental drift. Both CG1 and CG2 have N₂O mixing ratios of 45 µmol mol⁻¹, similar to the 245 N₂O amount fraction of the samples after preconcentration. However, to correct for possible 246 instrumental dependence on N₂O mixing ratio, CG1 was diluted to N₂O mole fractions of 35-40 247 umol mol⁻¹ within each measurement batch. In general, duplicated isotopic measurements of flask 248 samples yielded values of repeatability of 0.10-0.20% for δ^{15} N^{bulk} and δ^{18} O, and 0.15-0.25% for 249 $\delta^{15} N^{SP}$. 250

At the beginning of the project, a batch of three cylinders (50 L water volume, Luxfer, Italy) were filled with pressurized ambient air in Dübendorf with an oil-free, three stage compressor (SA-3, Rix Industries, USA) and used as long-term target gases. The pressurized ambient air target gas was analyzed with identical treatment as Jungfraujoch air samples during every analysis batch, to monitor long-term analytical drift. Standard deviations for repeated target gas measurements throughout the period of Jungfraujoch sample measurements, were 0.13‰ for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, 0.21‰ for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$, and 0.11‰ for $\delta^{18}O$ (Fig. S2).

258 2.5 Surface air footprint analysis and simulated regional N₂O enhancement

We analyzed the air mass origin at Jungfraujoch by applying the Lagrangian particle dispersion 259 model (LPDM) FLEX-PART in the backward mode (Stohl et al., 2005). The model was driven by 260 meteorological fields taken from the ECMWF-IFS operational analysis cycle, extracted at a 261 resolution of $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$, 90/137 levels globally, and at higher horizontal resolution of $0.2^{\circ} \times 0.2^{\circ}$ for 262 central Europe. We released 50000 virtual air parcels every 3 hours at 3000 m a.s.l. from 263 Jungfraujoch to perform backward dispersion simulations over 10 days, which allowed us to 264 calculate surface source sensitivities (concentration footprints). A release height of 3000 m a.s.l. 265 was previously determined to be an optimum for simulating concentration footprints at 266 Jungfraujoch, given the stated horizontal resolution which results in a considerable smoothing of 267 the complex, alpine orography (Keller et al., 2012). The 3-hourly surface footprints for the whole 268 observation period were used to categorize different transport regimes using the clustering 269 approach outlined in Sturm et al. (2013). This allowed us to distinguish among six different source 270 regions: Free Troposphere (FT), Southwest (SW), East (E), Local (L), West (W) and Northwest 271 272 (NW).

Similar to Henne et al. (2016) for CH₄ and based on spatially resolved N₂O emission inventories 273 (Meteotest for Switzerland; EDGAR for Europe), we used the FLEXPART concentration 274 footprints to calculate time-series of atmospheric mole fraction increases at Jungfraujoch resolved 275 276 by emission sectors (Henne et al., 2016). The emission inventory by Meteotest consists of 12 277 emission sectors, among which all sectors except "organic soils" are comparable to sectors in the EDGAR inventory (See Table 1) (Janssens-Maenhout et al., 2019). To improve seasonal 278 279 representation of the emissions in our model, we used a monthly resolved, optimized version of 280 the emission inventory, which was obtained through inverse modeling using the N₂O atmospheric 281 mole fractions observed between March 2017 and September 2018 at the tall tower site

Beromuenster on the Swiss plateau (Henne et al., 2019). Therefore, in this study, sourcecontributions to Jungfraujoch were estimated specifically for the period mentioned above.

284 **2.6** Evaluation of seasonal pattern and interannual trend for time-series

To explore seasonality and interannual trends, we fit the time-series of in situ measurements of 285 N₂O and O₃ mixing ratios, NO_v-to-CO ratios and isotopic measurements of N₂O with polynomial 286 functions and Fourier series (four harmonics for in situ measurements and two harmonics for 287 discrete measurements) (Thoning et al., 1989). Time-series were then decomposed into a linear 288 trend, seasonal variability (per 12 months) and residuals. This fit was conducted with a nonlinear 289 least-squares (NLS) model with R-3.5.3 (R Core Team, 2016). The detrended seasonality was 290 examined by comparing peak-to-peak amplitudes with our analytical precisions and the 291 uncertainty given by the one standard deviation of monthly residuals. To determine interannual 292 293 trends, a linear regression was applied to both the raw and the deseasonalized datasets. The significance level is set to p < 0.01. The interannual trends for N₂O mixing ratios were found to be 294 little affected by seasonality, so growth rates were determined only based on the raw datasets. 295

Although Jungfraujoch is a remote site, episodic influence from the planetary boundary layer can 296 be observed at the station (Pandey Deolal et al., 2012; Zellweger et al., 2003). For evaluating trends 297 of N₂O mixing ratio measurements, we filtered out *in situ* data with significant influence of plenary 298 boundary layer, in order to represent a major air mass footprint from the free troposphere (FT). In 299 addition to the air transport regimes, an alternative filtering criterion for the free troposphere was 300 based on the published mean ranges of NO_v mixing ratios (501-748 pmol mol⁻¹ depending on the 301 season) and NO_V to CO ratios (0.003-0.005 depending on the season) at Jungfraujoch (Zellweger 302 et al., 2003). This criterion is less strict than that given by footprint analyses (Herrmann et al., 303

2015). After applying this criterion to the isotopic time-series (which led to the exclusion of 32 measurement points), we re-evaluated the seasonal and interannual trends in the N₂O isotopic composition. In addition, because of the strong variability observed for isotopic data during the first 1.5 years (until February 2016), we performed an independent evaluation for the time-series starting from August 2016.

309 2.7 Two-box model simulation

A two-box model representing a well-mixed troposphere and stratosphere was used to estimate the 310 anthropogenic N₂O source strength and isotopic composition from the trends measured at 311 Jungfraujoch, similar to the approaches used by several previous studies (Ishijima et al., 2007; 312 Röckmann et al., 2003; Schilt et al., 2014; Sowers et al., 2002). The input variables used to run the 313 model are given in Table 2. 200 iterations of the model were run using a Monte Carlo-style 314 315 approach to approximate the uncertainty considering the uncertainty distribution for each input variable as given in Table 2. All variables were set independently within the Monte Carlo 316 approximation except for preindustrial N₂O life time (τ_{PI}), which was fixed to 106% of the present-317 day N₂O life time τ_{PD} (Prather et al., 2015). 318

Within each iteration of the model, the preindustrial N₂O burden was first described, assuming steady state in the preindustrial era. The preindustrial stratospheric N₂O mixing ratio ($c_{S,PI}$) (270±7.5 nmol mol⁻¹) was taken from Sowers et al. (2002):

322
$$0 = F_{ex} (c_{PI} - c_{S,PI}) - (M_{PI} + M_{S,PI}) / \tau_{PI}$$
(4)

where F_{ex} refers to the troposphere-stratosphere exchange rate; c_{PI} refers to the preindustrial tropospheric N₂O mixing ratio; and M_{PI} and $M_{S,PI}$ are the masses of N₂O in the troposphere and stratosphere respectively. The preindustrial terrestrial flux in Sowers et al. (2002) (equation 2) was used here assuming no anthropogenic emissions. The delta values for the preindustrial stratosphere
and the fractionation factor for the stratospheric sink were taken from equations 6 and 7 from
Sowers et al. (2002) assuming steady state and no anthropogenic emissions. The model was run
with a yearly time step starting from the preindustrial assuming that anthropogenic emissions
began in 1845 (Sowers et al., 2002). For each year of the model run, the anthropogenic flux was
calculated according to the exponential increase described by Sowers et al. (2002):

332
$$F_{\text{anth},t} = e^{\alpha(t-t_0)} - 1$$
 (5)

where *t* is the current year, $t_0 = 1845$ and α is the growth rate (assumed to be constant). The rates of change for tropospheric and stratospheric N₂O mixing ratios were then retrieved from equations 2 and 3 in Sowers et al. (2002), and for the isotopic composition of stratospheric and tropospheric N₂O from equations 6 and 7 in Sowers et al. (2002).

The values of the parameters describing the anthropogenic flux were optimized to fit both the trend and the absolute values for the five years of Jungfraujoch isotope data, and the mixing ratio data from the Jungfraujoch flasks and *in situ* data since 2005 (GAW data source). The uncertainties in α and in the anthropogenic source isotopic signatures were approximated by one standard deviation of values derived from repeated model runs.

342 2.8 Evaluation of the combined effects from STE and soil emission on $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$

- To evaluate the combined effects of STE and soil emission on the seasonal variability of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ (i.e. August minima), we made a mixing calculation as below:
- Soil emission: Based on the determined seasonality of N_2O mole fraction at Jungfraujoch, the maximum N₂O mole fraction enhancement was approximately 0.2 nmol mol⁻¹ above baseline (Fig.

1). Hence, we assumed N₂O enhancement from soil emission to be close to 0.15 to 0.20 nmol mol⁻¹, which is close to the maximum N₂O enhancement in our observation. The isotopic effect from soil emission can be derived from the difference between soil emission (7.2‰; Table 1) and tropospheric air (18‰, Fig. 2) in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$, i.e. -10.8‰.

Mixing with stratospheric air: The minimum of N₂O mole fraction in August (-0.20 nmol mol⁻¹) 351 is likely to be the result of both N2O mole fraction enhancement from soil emission and N2O mole 352 fraction depletion due to STE. Given the assumed N2O enhancement from soil emission, we 353 estimated the N₂O depletion due to STE as -0.35 to -0.40 nmol mol⁻¹. The isotopic effect due to 354 355 mixing with stratospheric air can be approximated using the apparent isotopic fractionation ε_{app} (Kaiser et al., 2006), which was derived from the slope of Rayleigh plot with normalized N_2O 356 mole and isotope ratios. For ${}^{15}N^{SP}$, ε_{app} is calculated from the difference between ${}^{15}N/{}^{14}N$ isotope 357 fractionations at the central and terminal N atoms, i.e. $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{app}}$ - $\beta_{\varepsilon_{app}}$. Therefore, for the lower 358 stratosphere, ε_{app} (¹⁵N^{SP}) was calculated to be about -15‰ (see more details in Kaiser et al., 2006). 359

360 *Overall effect*: Combing the isotope effects and contributions to the change of N₂O mole fraction 361 by the two processes, the net effect is $[(-0.35 \text{ to } -0.40 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1})(-15\%) + (0.15 \text{ to } 0.20 \text{ nmol}^{-1})$ 362 mol⁻¹) (-10.8‰)] / (330 nmol mol⁻¹) $\approx 0.01\%$. Such isotope effect is below our analytical 363 precision and too small to be measured in the background atmosphere.

364 2.9 "Bottom-up" estimates of source isotopic signatures

To gauge the accuracy of the two-box model, we deployed a "bottom-up" approach as an alternative method of estimating the N₂O source signatures. The isotopic signatures of most N₂O source sectors given in the Meteotest/EDGAR emission inventory are available from the literature, except for the "Refinery" (Table 1). As "Refinery" generally contributes only about 0.02% of the N₂O emission at Jungfraujoch, it was excluded for source isotopic signature estimation. The simulated N₂O emissions by variable sources were categorized according to the EDGAR emission types (Janssens-Maenhout et al., 2019). We then calculated isotopic signatures for the overall source and the anthropogenic sources alone (excluding indirect natural emission) as weighted averages.

374 3 Results

375 3.1 Atmospheric N₂O mixing ratios at Jungfraujoch

We observed a linear growth of atmospheric N₂O at Jungfraujoch during the period 2014-2018 376 (Fig. 1a). A point-to-point comparison of discrete and in situ measurements showed good 377 378 agreement, in particular after the first year (2015-2018), where the data quality of in situ measurements was largely improved due to the implementation of the more precise laser 379 spectroscopy method as compared to GC-ECD (Fig. 1b). The improvement in analytical precision 380 for N₂O mixing ratio was due to better temporal coverage by the OA-ICOS instrument, in contrast 381 with the GC analyses which conduct one measurement per 24-30 minutes. The annual growth rates 382 from 2014 to 2018 determined with *in situ* measurements were 0.880 ± 0.001 and 0.993 ± 0.001 383 nmol mol⁻¹ a⁻¹ with and without GC-ECD measurements in 2014, respectively. This difference in 384 N₂O growth rates is probably due to the limited data quality of GC-ECD, although a lower growth 385 rate in 2014 compared to 2015-2018 cannot be excluded. It is noteworthy that the N₂O growth rate 386 determined for 2015 to 2019 at Jungfraujoch is slightly above the global mean growth rate for the 387 recent decade reported by NOAA (0.93 \pm 0.03 nmol mol⁻¹ a⁻¹) (WMO, 2018). If we filter the *in* 388 situ dataset to examine only the "free troposphere" periods, we obtain a lower increase 389 $(0.858\pm0.002 \text{ nmol mol}^{-1} \text{ a}^{-1})$. By comparison, the absolute growth rate determined from the 390 discrete gas samples was even lower albeit larger uncertainty (0.813 ± 0.027 nmol mol⁻¹ a⁻¹). 391

A significant seasonal pattern was observed for N₂O mixing ratios measured *in situ*, with a maximum in early summer and a minimum in late summer (Fig. 1c). For discrete N₂O measurements a similar trend was observed, but the detrended seasonality was not significant (Fig. S3), which might be due to the much lower number of samples.

396 **3.2 Interannual trends of N₂O isotopic composition and anthropogenic source signatures**

Time-series of $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ and $\delta^{18}O$ for atmospheric N₂O at Jungfraujoch are shown in Figure 397 2. The NLS model simulation accounts well for the variabilities of isotopic time-series. Interannual 398 399 trends of three isotopic deltas were determined for both raw and deseasonalized datasets by linear regression (Table 3). The deseasonalized interannual trends were slightly smaller than the trends 400 determined with the raw datasets. For the whole dataset, the deseasonalized trend indicates a 401 significant decrease in δ^{15} N^{bulk}, of -0.052±0.012‰ a⁻¹. In contrast, deseasonalized time-series of 402 δ^{15} N^{SP} and δ^{18} O increased, albeit insignificantly, by 0.065±0.027‰ a⁻¹ and 0.019±0.011‰ a⁻¹, 403 respectively. The trends determined for periods with major air mass footprints from the free 404 troposphere were close to those calculated for the whole dataset, except that $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ trends 405 decreased after filtering out the samples with significant impact from plenary boundary layer. This 406 indicates that N₂O interannual trends observed at Jungfraujoch are of regional relevance, despite 407 the fact that a small impact from local sources can be seen. Because of the observed irregular 408 variability and the change in sampling frequency (though no change in daily sampling time) in our 409 dataset, we separated the time-series into two phases: April 2014-February 2016 (first phase; 410 411 weekly sampling) and August 2016-December 2018 (second phase; bi-weekly sampling). In the first phase, the rates of increase in $\delta^{15} N^{SP}$ and $\delta^{18} O$ were almost one order of magnitude larger than 412 over the whole dataset. This is most likely due to the unexpectedly low δ^{15} N^{SP} and δ^{18} O in summer 413 2014 followed by a distinct increase in winter 2014-2015, which results in large rates of increase 414 over short periods. Such growth rates were not seen in the second phase, when both $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ and 415 δ^{18} O showed small and insignificant variations. δ^{15} N^{bulk} displayed a decreasing interannual trend 416 in both phases; however, the rate of decrease was larger in the second phase ($-0.130\pm0.045\%$ a⁻¹). 417

We tuned our two-box model to best match the observed N₂O mixing ratios and isotopic composition at Jungfraujoch. An estimate of anthropogenic emissions and source signatures is given in Table 4. For 2018, annual N₂O emissions were estimated to be 8.6 ± 0.6 Tg N₂O-N a⁻¹ equivalents. The average isotopic signatures for anthropogenic sources were $-8.6\pm4\%$, $34.8\pm3\%$ and $10.7\pm4\%$ for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ and δ^{18} O, respectively, which are clearly lower than those for preindustrial N₂O in the tropospheric background (Table 2; Toyoda et al., 2013).

424 3.3 Seasonal variation of N₂O isotopic composition

 $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ of N₂O showed the most pronounced variability among all isotopic time-series (Fig. 2), 425 spanning 2.5% for individual flask sample measurements. Seasonal variability was estimated with 426 the NLS model and presented as mean seasonal cycles (Fig. 3). For $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ a "summer minimum" 427 was found regardless of whether the entire dataset or only the second phase was considered (Fig. 428 429 3), although seasonal variability of the second time-series was smaller and showed the minimum occurring earlier. The seasonal pattern of $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ determined from the whole dataset indicates a 430 significant summer maximum, but this was not seen when only the data from the second phase 431 was taken, as there was no significant seasonal pattern over this period alone. For δ^{18} O, we 432 observed only small temporal variability and a lack of seasonal pattern. In addition, seasonal 433 434 variations of time-series filtered for free troposphere were evaluated; these show temporal patterns 435 similar to the whole dataset (Fig. 3).

436 3.4 Air mass origin and *in situ* measurements at Jungfraujoch

Back-trajectory simulations indicate six major transport clusters during 2014-2018, as shown in
Figure 4a. Four of these transport regimes (SW, E, L and NW) dominate, accounting for about 6090% coverage of the whole period. By contrast, the free troposphere cluster only represents 10-

440 20% of the data. Averaged monthly contributions of transport clusters are shown in Figure 4b, 441 with more pronounced impact by the L, E and NW regions in summer and stronger contribution 442 by FT and SW in winter. The source patterns of the air masses at Jungfraujoch were generally 443 consistent across the years in the present study. However, an apparent discrepancy was found for 444 discrete sampling times in the last two years (e.g. particularly low contribution from SW) which 445 is most likely due to the low and variable sampling frequency of the discrete sample collection 446 (Fig. 4b).

The detrended seasonal variability of *in situ* measurements indicates summer maxima for NO_y 447 mixing ratios as well as NO_v-to-CO ratios at Jungfraujoch (Fig. 5). This likely indicates stronger 448 exchange with the polluted planetary boundary layer in summer (Herrmann et al., 2015; Zellweger 449 et al., 2003), which is consistent with the seasonal pattern of air mass footprint derived from back-450 trajectory simulations. The late spring-to-summer maxima for O₃ mixing ratios may be attributed 451 to air mixing with stratosphere and/or planetary boundary layer, similar to the findings from a 452 previous study at Jungfraujoch (Tarasova et al., 2009). On the other hand, CO shows a maximum 453 in early spring and decreases in summer when its atmospheric lifetime is shortest. Atmospheric 454 O₃, NO_y and CO measurements during our discrete sampling periods also well represented 455 seasonal variability shown for in situ measurements, except for 2016-2017 where there was a five-456 month sampling gap (Fig. 5). 457

458 Comparisons of air mass footprints as well as O₃, NO_y and CO mixing ratios between *in situ* and 459 discrete sampling indicate that the discrete sampling covers the main air source regions and 460 variabilities in local pollution/free troposphere fairly well (Figs. 4 and 5). In the second phase 461 (2016-2018), the less frequent sampling impedes evaluation of the seasonal and interannual 462 variabilities.

463 **3.5** Relationship between N₂O isotopic signatures and air mass footprints

We categorized N₂O mixing ratio and isotopic signature time-series into subsets based on the six air mass transport clusters. One-way ANOVA among clusters indicates that N₂O mixing ratios in air masses originating from cluster L were significantly higher and those from clusters FT and W were significantly lower than the others (Fig. 6). In accordance with the pattern found for mixing ratios, $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ and $\delta^{18}O$ were high for cluster FT, and low for cluster L. For $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$, little difference between transport clusters was detected.

470 **4 Discussion**

471 4.1 Quality assurance of isotopic measurements

This study reports the first results of background N2O isotopic measurements based on a laser 472 spectroscopic technique. Benefiting from the preconcentration process, we achieved measurement 473 repeatability for a target gas of 0.10-0.20% for δ^{15} N^{bulk} and δ^{18} O (Fig. S2), which is comparable 474 to that of IRMS measurements of ambient atmosphere (Park et al., 2012; Prokopiou et al., 2017; 475 Röckmann et al., 2003; Toyoda et al., 2013). The long-term robustness of our technique is adequate 476 for disentangling both seasonal and interannual temporal variability as shown in Figure 2. In 477 particular, our repeatability of target measurements for $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ (0.15-0.25‰) appears to be better 478 than previous studies measuring background atmosphere or firn air (0.8‰, Park et al., 2012; 0.3‰, 479 480 Prokopiou et al., 2017; 0.3‰, Toyoda et al., 2013).

481 4.2 Seasonal variabilities of atmospheric N₂O isotopic composition

In situ measurements of N2O mixing ratios showed a clear early summer maximum and late 482 summer minimum (Fig. 1). Such a seasonal pattern was previously found for a number of NOAA 483 and AGAGE sites analyzing long-term N₂O records in the NH (Jiang et al., 2007; Nevison et al., 484 485 2011). One explanation of the late-summer minimum is a strong influence of the STE process in this period, which transports N₂O-depleted but isotopically enriched air downward from the 486 stratosphere into the troposphere (Park et al., 2012; Snider et al., 2015b). During the late summer 487 at Jungfraujoch, we find strong enrichment of ¹⁵N in atmospheric N₂O according to the detrended 488 seasonality for the whole dataset (Fig. 3). This is supported by a FLEXPART model simulation of 489 the contribution of upper tropospheric air to Jungfraujoch station, showing highest contributions 490 491 in August (Fig. S4; Henne et al., Personal Communication). At Hateruma Island, Japan, Toyoda

et al. (2013) observed a seasonal pattern of atmospheric N_2O mixing ratios which is comparable 492 with our study, but found insignificant variations of isotopic composition. On the other hand, N2O 493 seasonal variability could be influenced by oceanic emission sources (Jiang et al., 2007; Nevison 494 et al., 2005), complicating the explanations for the observed temporal patterns. For example, in 495 another study looking at archived air from Cape Grim, Australia, Park et al. (2012) detected an 496 April-May minimum and a November-December maximum for N₂O. This is expected for the SH, 497 as STE is most prevalent in April (Nevison et al., 2011). They observed negative correlations of 498 δ^{15} N^{bulk}, δ^{15} N^{α} and δ^{18} O with N₂O mixing ratios, appearing to support the idea that the STE process 499 is responsible for seasonal variabilities in N2O mixing ratios and isotopic composition at Cape 500 Grim. However, the seasonal cycle for $\delta^{15}N^{\alpha}$ was much larger than $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and $\delta^{18}O$, which could 501 not be explained by STE alone. They suggested that the seasonal patterns of N₂O isotopes at Cape 502 Grim may be due to mixing between oceanic sources (high N₂O with low ¹⁵N and ¹⁸O) and STE 503 (low N₂O with high ¹⁵N and ¹⁸O) (Nevison et al., 2011; Park et al., 2012). However, because we 504 observed a concurrent minimum of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ and maximum of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ in July-August with low N₂O 505 at Jungfraujoch (Fig. 3), additional mechanisms must be considered here. 506

507 Regional model simulations based on Swiss N2O emissions derived from the inverse method were used to explore contributions from different sources to the variability in N2O enhancements at 508 Jungfraujoch. As shown in Figure 7a&7b, soil emissions, including direct and indirect emissions 509 from agricultural lands and emissions from (semi-)natural areas, account for more than 70% of the 510 total N₂O enhancements, while manure and waste management contribute another 20%. Total N₂O 511 enhancements appeared to be highest in May to July (Fig. 7c), in accordance with the highest 512 513 contribution by soil emissions. The early-to-middle summer maximum in the simulated N2O enhancements is comparable with maximum of N₂O mixing ratios in early summer as observed at 514

Jungfraujoch (Fig. 1c). This underlines the importance of soil emission in accounting for 515 atmospheric N₂O variability (Saikawa et al., 2014). In late summer, the minimum of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ (Fig. 516 3) may be then attributed to the influence of soil emitted N₂O, which has lower $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ (7.2±3.8‰; 517 Table 1) than the troposphere (Fig. 2). However, the STE process, which resulted in the minimum 518 of N₂O mixing ratio, likely contributes a positive isotope effect in the meanwhile (Kaiser et al., 519 2006). In order to evaluate the combined effect of STE and soil emission on $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ in late summer, 520 we applied a mixing calculation. Such estimate was made based on the approximated N₂O 521 enhancement/depletion contributed by the two processes and the assumed isotope effects (see more 522 details in M&M). The mixing calculation indicated an overall isotope effect of about 0.01‰, which 523 524 is extremely small and below our analytic precision. This practice suggests that it is still challenging to build a direct link between N2O sources/processes and the observed isotope 525 signature in the background atmosphere. It is also noteworthy that the $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ used in the 526 527 calculation $(7.2\pm3.8\%)$ may underestimate the isotope effects of soil emission, given that denitrification, as a major N₂O process in soils, produces N₂O with $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ close to 0‰ (Sutka et 528 al., 2006). Previous field studies have demonstrated that low- $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ N₂O emissions (~0‰), i.e. 529 following the denitrification pathway, predominates during summer periods at Swiss (Wolf et al., 530 2015) and German (Ibraim et al., 2019) grasslands. By contrast, the influence of biogeochemical 531 processes (nitrification and denitrification) on $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ is generally smaller than that on $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ 532 (Toyoda et al., 2011), and such effect on $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ are usually overwritten by the wide range of 533 isotopic signatures in soil N substrates (Sutka et al., 2006). Hence, given the distinct $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ 534 maximum and N₂O minimum in late summer during our observation (Figs. 1 and 3), we suggest 535 that the STE process is mainly responsible for the seasonal variability in δ^{15} N^{bulk}. 536

537 The footprint analyses based on air mass residence time revealed a seasonal pattern, with a higher

contribution of background air from the FT and SW regions in winter and more pronounced 538 contribution of local planetary boundary layer air from the L, E and NW regions in summer (Fig. 539 4b). The higher frequency of air mass footprints recently in contact with the surface in summer is 540 consistent with inverse modeling results, indicating a larger contribution of soil N₂O emissions in 541 June/July (Fig. 7). For the air mass regime representing the free troposphere, N₂O mixing ratios 542 observed at Jungfraujoch were significantly below the average, while δ^{15} N^{SP} and δ^{18} O were higher 543 (Fig. 6). By contrast, the local cluster (L) representing a strong impact from the planetary boundary 544 layer had higher N₂O mixing ratios and lower isotopic signatures (except $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$) than the other 545 source regions. In addition, the ratio of NO_v to CO, which is a more straightforward indicator of 546 the free troposphere (Zellweger et al., 2003), show significant negative correlations with $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ 547 and δ^{18} O, but not with δ^{15} N^{bulk} (Fig. 8). This further suggests that the seasonal variability of δ^{15} N^{SP} 548 and δ^{18} O observed at Jungfraujoch is most likely influenced by ground-derived emissions, while 549 fluctuations in N₂O mixing ratios and δ^{15} N^{bulk} are possibly driven by STE. 550

Considering the complexity in mechanisms responsible for N₂O isotopic variations, we strongly 551 552 recommend more field measurements of N2O isotopic signatures at higher frequency and at 553 different background sites, in order to cover spatial and temporal variability in N₂O sources. For example, in the second phase, we only detected a significant seasonality of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$, with a minimum 554 in July, which is one month earlier than the summer minimum found for the whole dataset (Fig. 555 3). This may be attributed to a difference in source regions, as Northwest regions appeared to be 556 significantly more important during 2017 (second phase). However, due to low sampling 557 frequency, it is challenging to overcome the large uncertainty in seasonality analysis for a two-558 559 year period such as the second phase.

560 Based on our bottom-up approach, we simulated isotopic signatures for the overall N₂O sources

responsible for the N₂O mixing ratio increase in the atmosphere (Fig. 9). However, the 561 interpretation of simulated versus observed variability in N2O isotopic composition was difficult, 562 except for the somewhat similar patterns in δ^{18} O. Our results suggest a limitation in the current 563 knowledge and literature values on isotopic signatures of most N2O sources. In addition, most N2O 564 sources may not exhibit a well-defined isotopic signature but a range of values regulated under a 565 number of processes/environmental factors. For example, isotopic signatures of soil-derived N2O 566 are often determined by an interaction of several soil and climatic factors. It might be possible in 567 the future to model these changes implementing isotopes in ecosystem models, as recently 568 demonstrated by Denk et al. (2019). 569

570 4.3 Interannual trends of atmospheric N₂O isotopic composition

Over a period of almost five years, our observations show an interannual increase in N₂O mixing 571 ratio and decrease in δ^{15} N^{bulk} (Fig. 10). This is to be expected, assuming that the atmospheric N₂O 572 increase is primarily attributed to anthropogenic sources, which emit isotopically lighter N2O 573 relative to the tropospheric background (Table 1) (Rahn and Wahlen, 2000). Compared to several 574 studies on firn air (Ishijima et al., 2007; Röckmann et al., 2003) and surface air (Park et al., 2012; 575 Röckmann and Levin, 2005; Toyoda et al., 2013), the rate of decrease for δ^{15} N^{bulk} at Jungfraujoch 576 is relatively high (-0.05 to -0.06 % a⁻¹, Table 3). Such a discrepancy in the δ^{15} N^{bulk} trend could be 577 due to a large contribution of terrestrial N₂O emission from the European continent to Jungfraujoch 578 579 (Figs. 6 and 7), as N₂O originating from soil emissions is significantly more isotopically depleted than that of oceanic sources (Snider et al., 2015b). Nevertheless, our observation period is shorter 580 than that of other studies, so the interannual trends determined here are more likely affected by 581 year-to-year variability. Among all reported records, the decrease of δ^{15} N^{bulk} observed at Hateruma 582 Island was the most up-to-date and smallest (-0.020-0.026‰ a⁻¹) (Toyoda et al., 2013). The authors 583

argued that the smaller declining trend for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ may be explained by the recent increase in anthropogenic isotopic ratios particularly for agricultural N₂O emissions, although Ishijima et al. (2007) suggested a decline in both $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and $\delta^{18}O$ in anthropogenic N₂O from 1952-1970 to 1970-2001 based on inverse modeling.

For the interannual trends observed at Jungfraujoch, it is noteworthy to point out that our 588 observations covering a rather short period may lead to large uncertainties despite statistical 589 significance. The discrepancy found in the trends between the first and second phases indicates 590 that variability of N₂O isotopic composition is likely to obscure interannual trends over shorter 591 periods (Toyoda et al., 2013). Hence, extended time-series of isotopic measurements are needed 592 to reevaluate, for example, the observed tendency of increase in δ^{18} O and δ^{15} N^{SP} at Jungfraujoch 593 (Table 3; only significant during the first phase). For δ^{18} O of atmospheric N₂O, a generally 594 declining trend smaller than that of $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ has been indicated by a number of observations 595 (Bernard et al., 2006; Ishijima et al., 2007; Park et al., 2012; Röckmann et al., 2003; Röckmann 596 and Levin, 2005). This is expected as δ^{18} O of anthropogenic N₂O is not much different from that 597 of the natural background, assuming that the oxygen atom in N₂O is largely derived from soil water 598 599 and ambient oxygen during production (Rahn and Wahlen, 2000).

It is still a challenging task to disentangle interannual trends of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}-N_2O$ in the background atmosphere, due to limitations in analytical repeatability and precision (Harris et al., 2017; Mohn et al., 2014). Past results have reached inconsistent conclusions, showing positive (Bernard et al., 2006; Park et al., 2012; Prokopiou et al., 2017; Röckmann and Levin, 2005) or negative (Röckmann et al., 2003; Toyoda et al., 2013) trends of similar magnitude (Fig. 10). On the one hand, the negative trend in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ could be explained by the significantly lower $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ from anthropogenic sources (e.g. agricultural sources; Table 1) than of the tropospheric background

(near 18%; Fig. 10). On the other hand, Park et al. (2012) suggested that the increase of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ in 607 the atmospheric N₂O may reflect a global increase in importance of the contribution by nitrification 608 (high- $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ process) to agricultural N₂O emissions. This is based on the assumption that the 609 growth of N₂O emissions is largely due to enhanced fertilizer application which promotes 610 nitrification activity (Pérez et al., 2001; Tian et al., 2019). The observed mean increase rate of 0.02‰ 611 a^{-1} for $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ by Park et al. (2012) could then be translated into an increase of 13-23% for the 612 relative amount of nitrification-derived N2O between 1750 and 2005. However, this should be 613 614 further evaluated with more frequent sampling (Park et al. (2012) only sampled 1-6 times per year) and tested with isotopic measurements across the NH, where agricultural N₂O emissions are more 615 dominant than in the SH. In addition, the strong seasonal pattern of $\delta^{15} N^{SP}$ at Jungfraujoch suggests 616 that seasonal variations of δ^{15} N^{SP} in response to climatic or source factors are crucial and must be 617 taken into consideration for evaluating interannual $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ trends. 618

4.4 Simulated anthropogenic N₂O sources with the two-box model and comparison with other studies

To further evaluate anthropogenic source signatures of N₂O isotopic composition, we applied a 621 two-box model representing a well-mixed troposphere and stratosphere (Röckmann et al., 2003; 622 Schilt et al., 2014; Sowers et al., 2002). The model runs with the whole dataset and the dataset 623 filtered for free-troposphere only (Table 4) exhibit statistically identical results, supporting that 624 625 our model estimates, with observations at Jungfraujoch, are representative of the background atmosphere. The simulated trends of the N2O mixing ratios and isotopic composition show a 626 gradual increase in N₂O and decrease in the isotopic signatures (see Fig. 10), which agree with 627 existing observations within the model uncertainty. However, this does not hold for individual 628 studies considered separately. For example, the N₂O mixing ratios observed by Röckmann et al. 629

(2003) and Prokopiou et al. (2017) would lead to a higher preindustrial N₂O compared to our
model simulation, which is likely due to the uncertainty in the firm air records (Prokopiou et al.,
2017).

We compared the anthropogenic isotopic signatures determined by our two-box model with other 633 similar studies in Table 4. Our estimates generally lie within the ranges given in the earlier studies 634 (Ishijima et al., 2007; Park et al., 2012; Prokopiou et al., 2017; Röckmann et al., 2003; Sowers et 635 al., 2002; Toyoda et al., 2013). However, isotopic signatures of N₂O sources estimated for 2018 in 636 this study are higher in $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and $\delta^{18}O$ (by 4-8‰), and lower in $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ (by 2-7‰) than model 637 estimates for the early 2000s from two other studies from SH (Park et al., 2012; Prokopiou et al., 638 2017). Such differences in $\delta^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ and $\delta^{18} O$ could be related to interhemispheric differences, as 639 640 the relative contributions of N_2O sources vary between the two hemispheres (Toyoda et al., 2013). Also, more interestingly, this could suggest a shift in the N₂O source isotopic signatures over the 641 last few decades. For example, an increase of $\delta^{15}N^{bulk}$ in anthropogenic N₂O sources over time 642 may be attributed to growing contributions of other industrial/waste sources with high $\delta^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ 643 (Prokopiou et al., 2017). In addition, if the assumption of increasing $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ and decreasing $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ 644 645 in anthropogenic N₂O sources over time holds, it points to a recently growing contribution of denitrification relative to nitrification, to the global atmospheric N₂O increase (Sutka et al., 2006; 646 Toyoda et al., 2013). By contrast, Park et al. (2012) and Prokopiou et al. (2017) proposed an 647 increasing importance of nitrification for anthropogenic N₂O emissions based on the increasing 648 δ^{15} N^{SP} trend since 1940. This may suggest that a strong climate change feedback has recently 649 resulted in significant shifts in N2O source process, hence twisting the isotopic signatures of 650 651 anthropogenic sources (Griffis et al., 2017; Xu-Ri et al., 2012). Alternatively, the uncertainty in determining N₂O isotopic signatures in the background atmosphere and inter-laboratory 652

653 comparability may play a role in the observed discrepancy.

Given the strong heterogeneity in source contributions to N₂O emissions around the globe 654 (Saikawa et al., 2014), current two- and four-box model estimates based on observations at 655 individual sites or regions are likely to reflect latitudinal or even interhemispheric differences in 656 anthropogenic isotopic signatures. On the other hand, previous discussions of the model 657 sensitivities by Röckmann et al. (2003) and Toyoda et al. (2013) have suggested that anthropogenic 658 isotopic values are most sensitive to the trends in tropospheric isotopic values and the relative 659 difference in tropospheric isotopic values between present and preindustrial times. For example, 660 given the similar parameters used for preindustrial times as our study, Park et al. (2012) observed 661 much lower $\delta^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ in the recent troposphere than in our case, hence resulting in significantly 662 lower $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ for the anthropogenic source. Furthermore, Park et al. (2012) and Prokopiou et al. 663 (2017) simulated a positive trend in $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ relative to preindustrial times, which in return resulted 664 in a much higher $\delta^{15} N^{SP}$ for the anthropogenic sources. 665

Using an alternative bottom-up approach, we estimated the anthropogenic source isotopic 666 signatures based on the N₂O emission inventory simulated for Jungfraujoch and published source 667 isotopic signatures as summarized by Harris et al. (2017) (Table 1). The retrieved anthropogenic 668 isotopic signatures (Table 5) were largely in agreement with the isotopic signature of agricultural 669 670 soil emissions (Snider et al., 2015b; Wolf et al., 2015), indicating that this source could explain 671 more than 60% of the total N₂O emissions. However, the anthropogenic isotopic signatures estimated by this approach were lower than the results from our two-box model (Table 4). In 672 contrast, another similar bottom-up estimate based on the global N2O emission inventory (Toyoda 673 et al., 2013) reported anthropogenic isotopic values that agree well with our box-model results. 674 675 This may be explained by the different isotopic signatures used to describe agricultural N_2O

emissions, as those values used for the bottom-up estimates by Toyoda et al. (2013) were significantly lower (Toyoda et al., 2011) than those used in this study (Snider et al., 2015b; Wolf et al., 2015). Such bottom-up estimation suggests that more isotopic measurements of the background atmosphere from different regions, and better constraints on individual anthropogenic (especially agricultural) N₂O isotopic signatures, are necessary for a better representation of N₂O isotopic composition in atmospheric modeling studies.

682 **5** Conclusions

With the recently developed laser spectroscopic technique coupled with a preconcentration device, 683 we achieved good repeatability in measurements of N₂O isotopic composition from the 684 background atmosphere at Jungfraujoch, Switzerland. This time-series covered a period of five 685 years and showed a distinct seasonality, with $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ maxima and $\delta^{15}N^{\text{SP}}$ minima in late summer, 686 associated with the lowest N₂O mixing ratios over the year. The seasonal fluctuation of $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$ 687 was associated with the stratosphere-troposphere exchange process, in agreement with other 688 monitoring networks (Nevison et al., 2011), while the contrasting depletion of $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ in later 689 690 summer is possibly a combined result of STE and agricultural emissions, with the latter being more important. The analyses of air mass transport regimes together with the simulation of N₂O 691 enhancements for Jungfraujoch supported our explanations and highlighted that the fluctuation 692 between the free troposphere and local contributions dominated by soil emission drives the 693 seasonality of δ^{15} N^{SP} and δ^{18} O as observed at Jungfraujoch. 694

We found statistically significant interannual trends for $\delta^{15}N^{\text{bulk}}$, which is expected as 695 anthropogenic N₂O sources are characterized by low ¹⁵N abundance. For $\delta^{15}N^{SP}$ and $\delta^{18}O$, 696 interannual trends were highly uncertain and possibly masked by their large temporal variabilities. 697 698 Using a two-box model approach, we simulated the evolution of N₂O isotopic composition from 699 preindustrial times to the present. This model suggests an overall decreasing trend for all isotopic deltas in conjunction with the atmospheric N₂O increase. The anthropogenic source signatures 700 given by the model generally agreed with previous studies. However, these model results are still 701 sensitive to the ranges and trends of the observed N2O isotopic signatures in the present 702 troposphere. In the future, more extended records of high-precision N₂O isotopic measurements 703

- and application of multiple-box modeling approaches (Rigby et al., 2013) are necessary to account
- $\label{eq:sources} \text{for the global N_2O}$ budget and evolution of anthropogenic sources.}$

706 Data availability

- 707 Data for this study have been deposited in a general data repository 708 (https://figshare.com/s/077562ab408dd1bd0880; doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.12032760.v1, 2020).
- 709 Author contribution:

LY, EH and JM led and designed this study. LY, EH, SE conducted sample collection at Jungfraujoch; LY and EH analyzed discrete samples at Empa; MS and CZ contributed *in situ* measurements of N₂O, NO_y, CO and O₃ at Jungfraujoch; LY, EH and SH performed data analyses for the time-series and conducted model simulations. LY wrote the main manuscript; EH, SH and JM were involved in the revisions of the manuscript and commenting. SE, MS, LE and CZ were also involved in scientific discussion and commenting on the manuscript.

716 Competing interests

717 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

718 Acknowledgements

719 We are thankful to the research infrastructure provided by the High Altitude Research Stations 720 Jungfraujoch and Gornergrat. We are grateful to the help from the custodians (Mr. and Mrs. Fischer and Mr. and Mrs. Käser) at the research station of Jungfraujoch. We would like to thank Simon 721 Wyss, Kerstin Zeyer, Patrik Zanchetta and Flurin Dietz for their support with the sample collection 722 as well as laboratory assistance. The NABEL network is operated by Empa in collaboration with 723 724 the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment. Prof. Sakae Toyoda and Prof. Naohiro Yoshida from Tokyo Institute of Technology are acknowledged for their analyses of the applied reference 725 standards. This study was financially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 726 number 200021 163075) and the Swiss contribution to the Integrated Carbon Observation System 727

(ICOS) Research Infrastructure (ICOS-CH). ICOS-CH is funded by the Swiss National Science
Foundation and in-house contributions. Longfei Yu was additionally supported by the
EMPAPOSTDOCS-II program, which receives funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020
research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number
754364.

733 **References**

- 734 Appenzeller, C., Begert, M., Zenklusen, E. and Scherrer, S. C.: Monitoring climate at Jungfraujoch in the
- high Swiss Alpine region, Sci. Total Environ., 391(2–3), 262–268, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.10.005,
 2008.
- 737 Bernard, S., Röckmann, T., Kaiser, J., Barnola, J.-M., Fischer, H., Blunier, T. and Chappellaz, J.:
- 738 Constraints on N₂O budget changes since pre-industrial time from new firn air and ice core isotope
- 739 measurements, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5(4), 7547–7575, doi:10.5194/acpd-5-7547-2005, 2006.
- 740 Bourbonnais, A., Letscher, R. T., Bange, H. W., Échevin, V., Larkum, J., Mohn, J., Yoshida, N. and
- Altabet, M. A.: N₂O production and consumption from stable isotopic and concentration data in the
- Peruvian coastal upwelling system, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 31(4), 678–698,
- 743 doi:10.1002/2016GB005567, 2017.
- 744 Buchmann, B., Hueglin, C., Reimann, S., Vollmer, M. K., Steinbacher, M. and Emmenegger, L.: Reactive
- 745 gases, ozone depleting substances and greenhouse gases, in From weather observations to atmospheric
- and climate sciences in Switzerland, edited by S. Willemse and M. Furger, vdf Hochschulverlag AG.,2016.
- 748 Bukowiecki, N., Weingartner, E., Gysel, M., Coen, M. C., Zieger, P., Herrmann, E., Steinbacher, M.,
- 749 Gäggeler, H. W. and Baltensperger, U.: A review of more than 20 years of aerosol observation at the high
- altitude research station Jungfraujoch, Switzerland (3580 m asl), Aerosol Air Qual. Res., 16(3), 764–788,
 doi:10.4209/aaqr.2015.05.0305, 2016.
- Butterbach-Bahl, K., Baggs, E. M., Dannenmann, M., Kiese, R. and Zechmeister-Boltenstern, S.: Nitrous
 oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls?, Philos. Trans.
 R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci., 368, 20130122, doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0122, 2013.
- 755 Decock, C. and Six, J.: How reliable is the intramolecular distribution of ${}^{15}N$ in N₂O to source partition 756 N₂O emitted from soil?, Soil Biol. Biochem., 65(2), 114–127, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.05.012, 2013.
- 757 Denk, T. R. A., Mohn, J., Decock, C., Lewicka-Szczebak, D., Harris, E., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Kiese, R.
- and Wolf, B.: The nitrogen cycle: A review of isotope effects and isotope modeling approaches, Soil Biol.
 Biochem., 105, 121–137, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.11.015, 2017.
- Denk, T. R. A., Kraus, D., Kiese, R., Butterbach-Bahl, K. and Wolf, B.: Constraining N cycling in the
 ecosystem model LandscapeDNDC with the stable isotope model SIMONE, Ecology, 100(5), c02675,
 doi:10.1002/ecy.2675, 2019.
- 763 Fowler, D., Steadman, C. E., Stevenson, D., Coyle, M., Rees, R. M., Skiba, U. M., Sutton, M. a., Cape, J.
- 764 N., Dore, a. J., Vieno, M., Simpson, D., Zaehle, S., Stocker, B. D., Rinaldi, M., Facchini, M. C.,
- Flechard, C. R., Nemitz, E., Twigg, M., Erisman, J. W. and Galloway, J. N.: Effects of global change
- during the 21st century on the nitrogen cycle, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15(2), 1747–1868,
- 767 doi:10.5194/acpd-15-1747-2015, 2015.
- 768 Fujii, A., Toyoda, S., Yoshida, O., Watanabe, S., Sasaki, K. and Yoshida, N.: Distribution of nitrous
- oxide dissolved in water masses in the eastern subtropical North Pacific and its origin inferred from (0/2) 147, 157, 1 i 10, 1007/, 10072, 012, 01/2, 4, 2012
- isotopomer analysis, J. Oceanogr., 69(2), 147–157, doi:10.1007/s10872-012-0162-4, 2013.
- 771 Griffis, T. J., Chen, Z., Baker, J. M., Wood, J. D., Millet, D. B., Lee, X., Venterea, R. T. and Turner, P.
- A.: Nitrous oxide emissions are enhanced in a warmer and wetter world, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.,
 201704552, doi:10.1073/pnas.1704552114, 2017.
- Hall, B. D., Dutton, G. S. and Elkins, J. W.: The NOAA nitrous oxide standard scale for atmospheric observations, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 112(9), 1–9, doi:10.1029/2006JD007954, 2007.

- Harris, E. J., Nelson, D. D., Olsewski, W., Zahniser, M., Potter, E., Mcmanus, B. J., Whitehill, A., Prinn,
- 777 R. G., Ono, S. and Harris, E.: Development of a spectroscopic technique for continuous online monitoring
- of oxygen and site-specific nitrogen isotopic com, Anal. Chem., 86(3), 1726–1734, 2014.
- Harris, E., Zeyer, K., Kegel, R., Müller, B., Emmenegger, L. and Mohn, J.: Nitrous oxide and methane
- 780 emissions and nitrous oxide isotopic composition from waste incineration in Switzerland, Waste Manag.,
- 781 35(x), 135–140, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2014.10.016, 2015.
- 782 Harris, E., Ibraim, E., Henne, S., Hüglin, C., Zellweger, C., Tuzson, B., Emmenegger, L. and Mohn, J.:
- 783 Tracking nitrous oxide emission processes at a suburban site with semicontinuous , in situ measurements
- of isotopic composition, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 122, 1850–1870, doi:10.1002/2016JD025906, 2017.
- Heil, J., Wolf, B., Brüggemann, N., Emmenegger, L., Tuzson, B., Vereecken, H. and Mohn, J.: Site-
- specific 15N isotopic signatures of abiotically produced N₂O, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 139, 72–82, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2014.04.037, 2014.
- Henne, S., Brunner, D., Folini, D., Solberg, S., Klausen, J. and Buchmann, B.: Assessment of parameters
 describing representativeness of air quality in-situ measurement sites, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10(8), 3561–
 2581, dai:10.5104/sup.10.25(1.2010, 2010)
- 790 3581, doi:10.5194/acp-10-3561-2010, 2010.
- 791 Henne, S., Brunner, D., Oney, B., Leuenberger, M., Eugster, W., Bamberger, I., Meinhardt, F.,
- Steinbacher, M. and Emmenegger, L.: Validation of the Swiss methane emission inventory by
 atmospheric observations and inverse modelling, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16(6), 3683–3710,
- 794 doi:10.5194/acp-16-3683-2016, 2016.
- Henne, S., Mohn, J. and Brunner, D.: Quantification of Swiss nitrous oxide emissions through
 atmospheric observations and inverse modelling, Final Report, Project of FOEN, 2019.
- 797 Herrmann, E., Weingartner, E., Henne, S., Vuilleumier, L., Bukowiecki, N., Steinbacher, M., Conen, F.,
- 798 Coen, M. C., Hammer, E., Juranyi, Z., Baltensperger, U. and Gysel, M.: Analysis of long-term aerosol
- size distribution data from Jungfraujoch with emphasis on free tropospheric conditions, cloud influence,
 and air mass transport, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 120, 1751–1762, doi:10.1002/2015JD023660, 2015.
- 801 Ibraim, E., Wolf, B., Harris, E., Gasche, R., Wei, J., Yu, L., Kiese, R., Eggleston, S., Butterbach-Bahl, K.,
- Zeeman, M., Tuzson, B., Emmenegger, L., Six, J., Henne, S. and Mohn, J.: Attribution of N₂O sources in
 a grassland soil with laser spectroscopy based isotopocule analysis, Biogeosciences, 16, 3247–3266,
 doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-3247-2019, 2019.
- 805 Ishijima, K., Sugawara, S., Kawamura, K., Hashida, G., Morimoto, S., Murayama, S., Aoki, S. and
- 806 Nakazawa, T.: Temporal variations of the atmospheric nitrous oxide concentration and its δ^{15} N and δ^{18} O 807 for the latter half of the 20th century reconstructed from firn air analyses, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.,
- 808 112(3), doi:10.1029/2006JD007208, 2007.
- Janssens-Maenhout, G., Crippa, M., Guizzardi, D., Muntean, M., Schaaf, E., Dentener, F., Bergamaschi,
- 810 P., Pagliari, V., Olivier, J., Peters, J., van Aardenne, J., Monni, S., Doering, U., Petrescu, R., Solazzo, E.
- and Oreggioni, G.: EDGAR v4.3.2 Global Atlas of the three major Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the
- 812 period 1970-2012, Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 2010, 1–52, doi:10.5194/essd-2018-164, 2019.
- Jiang, X., Ku, W. L., Shia, R. L., Li, Q., Elkins, J. W., Prinn, R. G. and Yung, Y. L.: Seasonal cycle of
 N₂O: Analysis of data, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 21, GB1006, doi:10.1029/2006GB002691, 2007.
- 815 JMA and WMO: World Meteorological Organization Global Atmosphere Watch World Data Centre
- 816 for Greenhouse Gases, Data Summary, No. 42, 101 p.,. [online] Available from:
- 817 https://gaw.kishou.go.jp/static/publications/summary/sum42/sum42.pdf, 2018.
- 818 Kaiser, J., Röckmann, T. and Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M.: Complete and accurate mass spectrometric
- 819 isotope analysis of tropospheric nitrous oxide, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 108, 4476,

- doi:10.1029/2003JD003613, D15, 2003.
- 821 Kaiser, J., Engel, A., Borchers, R. and Röckmann, T.: Probing stratospheric transport and chemistry with
- new balloon and aircraft observations of the meridional and vertical N₂O isotope distribution, Atmos.
- 823 Chem. Phys., 6(11), 3535–3556, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3535-2006, 2006.
- 824 Keller, C. A., Hill, M., Vollmer, M. K., Henne, S., Brunner, D., Reimann, S., O'Doherty, S., Arduini, J.,
- 825 Maione, M., Ferenczi, Z., Haszpra, L., Manning, A. J. and Peter, T.: European emissions of halogenated
- greenhouse gases inferred from atmospheric measurements, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46(1), 217–225,
 doi:10.1021/es202453j, 2012.
- Kim, K.-R. and Craig, H.: Nitrogen-15 and Oxygen-18 Characacteristics of Nitrous Oxide: A Global
 Perspective, Science , 262, 1855-1857, 1993.
- 830 Lebegue, B., Schmidt, M., Ramonet, M., Wastine, B., Yver Kwok, C., Laurent, O., Belviso, S., Guemri,
- A., Philippon, C., Smith, J. and Conil, S.: Comparison of nitrous oxide (N₂O) analyzers for high-precision
 measurements of atmospheric mole fractions, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 9(3), 1221–1238, doi:10.5194/amt-9-
- 833 1221-2016, 2016.
- 834 Logan, J. A., Staehelin, J., Megretskaia, I. A., Cammas, J. P., Thouret, V., Claude, H., De Backer, H.,
- 835 Steinbacher, M., Scheel, H. E., Stbi, R., Frhlich, M. and Derwent, R.: Changes in ozone over Europe:
- 836 Analysis of ozone measurements from sondes, regular aircraft (MOZAIC) and alpine surface sites, J.
- 837 Geophys. Res. Atmos., 117(9), 1–23, doi:10.1029/2011JD016952, 2012.
- Maeda, K., Toyoda, S., Shimojima, R., Osada, T., Hanajima, D., Morioka, R. and Yoshida, N.: Source of
 nitrous oxide emissions during the cow manure composting process as revealed by isotopomer analysis of
 and amoa abundance in betaproteobacterial ammonia-oxidizing bacteria, Appl. Environ. Microbiol.,
- 841 76(5), 1555–1562, doi:10.1128/AEM.01394-09, 2010.
- 842 Mohn, J., Guggenheim, C., Tuzson, B., Vollmer, M. K., Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N. and Emmenegger, L.: A
- 843 liquid nitrogen-free preconcentration unit for measurements of ambient N₂O isotopomers by QCLAS,
 844 Atmos. Meas. Tech., 3(3), 609–618, doi:10.5194/amt-3-609-2010, 2010.
- Mohn, J., Tuzson, B., Manninen, A., Yoshida, N., Toyoda, S., Brand, W. A. and Emmenegger, L.: Site
 selective real-time measurements of atmospheric N2O isotopomers by laser spectroscopy, Atmos. Meas.
 Tech., 5(7), 1601–1609, doi:10.5194/amt-5-1601-2012, 2012.
- 848 Mohn, J., Wolf, B., Toyoda, S., Lin, C. T., Liang, M. C., Brüggemann, N., Wissel, H., Steiker, A. E.,
- 849 Dyckmans, J., Szwec, L., Ostrom, N. E., Casciotti, K. L., Forbes, M., Giesemann, A., Well, R., Doucett,
- 850 R. R., Yarnes, C. T., Ridley, A. R., Kaiser, J. and Yoshida, N.: Interlaboratory assessment of nitrous
- oxide isotopomer analysis by isotope ratio mass spectrometry and laser spectroscopy: Current status and
- 852 perspectives, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 28(18), 1995–2007, doi:10.1002/rcm.6982, 2014.
- 853 Nevison, C. D., Keeling, R. F., Weiss, R. F., Popp, B. N., Jin, X., Fraser, P. J., Porter, L. W. and Hess, P.
- 855 Grim, Tasmania, Tellus, Ser. B Chem. Phys. Meteorol., 57(3), 218–229, doi:10.1111/j.1600-
- 856 0889.2005.00143.x, 2005.
- 857 Nevison, C. D., Dlugokencky, E., Dutton, G., Elkins, J. W., Fraser, P., Hall, B., Krummel, P. B.,
- Langenfelds, R. L., O'Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Steele, L. P. and Weiss, R. F.: Exploring causes of
- interannual variability in the seasonal cycles of tropospheric nitrous oxide, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(8),
 3713–3730, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3713-2011, 2011.
- 861 Ogawa, M. and Yoshida, N.: Intramolecular distribution of stable nitrogen and oxygen isotopes of nitrous
- oxide emitted during coal combustion, Chemosphere, 61(6), 877–887,
- 863 doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.04.096, 2005a.
- 864 Ogawa, M. and Yoshida, N.: Nitrous oxide emission from the burning of agricultural residue, Atmos.

- 865 Environ., 39(19), 3421–3429, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.01.059, 2005b.
- 866 Ostrom, N. E., Gandhi, H., Coplen, T. B., Toyoda, S., Böhlke, J. K., Brand, W. A., Casciotti, K. L.,
- 867 Dyckmans, J., Giesemann, A., Mohn, J., Well, R., Yu, L. and Yoshida, N.: Preliminary assessment of
- stable nitrogen and oxygen isotopic composition of USGS51 and USGS52 nitrous oxide reference gases
- and perspectives on calibration needs, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 32(15), 1207–1214,
- doi:10.1002/rcm.8157, 2018.
- 871 Pandey Deolal, S., Brunner, D., Steinbacher, M., Weers, U. and Staehelin, J.: Long-term in situ
- measurements of NO_x and NO_y at Jungfraujoch 1998-2009: Time series analysis and evaluation, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12(5), 2551-2566, doi:10.5194/acp-12-2551-2012, 2012.
- Park, S., Croteau, P., Boering, K. A., Etheridge, D. M., Ferretti, D., Fraser, P. J., Kim, K.-R., Krummel, P.
- 875 B., Langenfelds, R. L., van Ommen, T. D., Steele, L. P. and Trudinger, C. M.: Trends and seasonal cycles
- in the isotopic composition of nitrous oxide since 1940, Nat. Geosci., 5(4), 261–265,
- doi:10.1038/ngeo1421, 2012.
- 878 Pérez, T., Trumbore, S. E., Tyler, S. C., Matson, P. A., I., O.-M., Rahn, T. and Griffiths, D. W. T.:
- Identifying the agricultural imprint on the global N2O budget using stable isotopes, J. Geophys. Res.,
 106, 9869–9878, doi:10.1179/1607845413y.000000087, 2001.
- 881 Prather, M. J., Hsu, J., Deluca, N. M., Jackman, C. H., Oman, L. D., Douglass, A. R., Fleming, E. L.,
- 882 Strahan, S. E., Steenrod, S. D., Søvde, O. A., Isaksen, I. S. A., Froidevaux, L. and Funke, B.: Measuring
- and modeling the lifetime of nitrous oxide including its variability Michael, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.,
 120, 5693–5705, doi:10.1002/2015JD023267.Received, 2015.
- Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Arduini, J., Arnold, T., Dewitt, H. L., Fraser, P. J., Ganesan, A. L., Gasore, J.,
- 886 Harth, C. M., Hermansen, O., Kim, J., Krummel, P. B., Li, S., Loh, Z. M., Lunder, C. R. and Maione, M.:
- History of chemically and radiatively important atmospheric gases from the Advanced Global
- 888 Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE), Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 10, 985–1018, 2018.
- 889 Prokopiou, M., Martinerie, P., Sapart, C. J., Witrant, E., Monteil, G. A., Ishijima, K., Bernard, S., Kaiser,
- J., Levin, I., Sowers, T., Blunier, T., Etheridge, D., Dlugokencky, E., van de Wal, R. S. W. and
- $\label{eq:solution} 891 \qquad \hbox{R\"ockmann, T.: Constraining N_2O emissions since 1940 using firm air isotope measurements in both}$
- hemispheres, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 2011(June), 1–50, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-487, 2017.
- Prokopiou, M., Sapart, C. J., Rosen, J., Sperlich, P., Blunier, T., Brook, E., van de Wal, R. S. W. and
- Röckmann, T.: Changes in the Isotopic Signature of Atmospheric Nitrous Oxide and Its Global Average
 Source During the Last Three Millennia, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 1–17, doi:10.1029/2018JD029008,
- **896** 2018.
- 897 Rahn, T. and Wahlen, M.: A reassessment of the global isotopic budget of atmospheric nitrous oxide,
- 898 Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 14(2), 537–543, doi:10.1029/1999GB900070, 2000.
- 899 Ravishankara, A. R., Daniel, J. S. and Portmann, R. W.: Nitrous oxide (N₂O): the dominant ozone-
- 900 depleting substance emitted in the 21st century., Science, 326(5949), 123–5,
- 901 doi:10.1126/science.1176985, 2009.
- 902 Reay, D. S., Davidson, E. a., Smith, K. a., Smith, P., Melillo, J. M., Dentener, F. and Crutzen, P. J.:
- 903 Global agriculture and nitrous oxide emissions, Nat. Clim. Chang., 2(6), 410–416,
- 904 doi:10.1038/nclimate1458, 2012.
- 905 Reimann, S., Vollmer, M. K., Folini, D., Steinbacher, M., Hill, M., Buchmann, B., Zander, R. and
- Mahieu, E.: Observations of long-lived anthropogenic halocarbons at the high-Alpine site of Jungfraujoch
 (Switzerland) for assessment of trends and European sources, Sci. Total Environ., 391(2–3), 224–231,
- 908 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.10.022, 2008.
- 909 Rigby, M., Prinn, R. G., O'Doherty, S., Montzka, S. A., McCulloch, A., Harth, C. M., Mühle, J.,

- 910 Salameh, P. K., Weiss, R. F., Young, D., Simmonds, P. G., Hall, B. D., Dutton, G. S., Nance, D.,
- 911 Mondeel, D. J., Elkins, J. W., Krummel, P. B., Steele, L. P. and Fraser, P. J.: Re-evaluation of the
- 912 lifetimes of the major CFCs and CH3CCl3 using atmospheric trends, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13(5), 2691–
- 913 2702, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2691-2013, 2013.

Röckmann, T., Kaiser, J. and Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M.: The isotopic fingerprint of the pre-industrial and
 the anthropogenic N₂O source, Atmos. Chem. Phys., (3), 315–323, 2003.

- 916 Röckmann, T. and Levin, I.: High-precision determination of the changing isotopic composition of
- 917 atmospheric N₂O from 1990 to 2002, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 110(21), 1–8,
- 918 doi:10.1029/2005JD006066, 2005.
- 919 Saikawa, E., Prinn, R. G., Dlugokencky, E., Ishijima, K., Dutton, G. S., Hall, B. D., Langenfelds, R.,
- 920 Tohjima, Y., Machida, T., Manizza, M., Rigby, M., O'Doherty, S., Patra, P. K., Harth, C. M., Weiss, R.
- 921 F., Krummel, P. B., Van Der Schoot, M., Fraser, P. J., Steele, L. P., Aoki, S., Nakazawa, T. and Elkins, J.
- 922 W.: Global and regional emissions estimates for N₂O, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14(9), 4617–4641,
- 923 doi:10.5194/acp-14-4617-2014, 2014.
- 924 Schibig, M. F., Steinbacher, M., Buchmann, B., Van Der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., Van Der Laan, S., Ranjan, S.
- and Leuenberger, M. C.: Comparison of continuous in situ CO₂ observations at Jungfraujoch using two
- different measurement techniques, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 8(1), 57–68, doi:10.5194/amt-8-57-2015, 2015.
- 927 Schilt, A., Brook, E. J., Bauska, T. K., Baggenstos, D., Fischer, H., Joos, F., Petrenko, V. V., Schaefer,
- 928 H., Schmitt, J., Severinghaus, J. P., Spahni, R. and Stocker, T. F.: Isotopic constraints on marine and
- terrestrial N₂O emissions during the last deglaciation, Nature, 516(7530), 234-237,
- 930 doi:10.1038/nature13971, 2014.
- 931 Sepúlveda, E., Schneider, M., Hase, F., Barthlott, S., Dubravica, D., García, O. E., Gomez-Pelaez, A.,
- 932 González, Y., Guerra, J.C., Gisi, M., Kohlhepp, R., Dohe, S., Blumenstock, T., Strong, K., Weaver, D.,
- 933 Palm, N., Sadeghi, A., Deutscher, N. M., Warneke, T., Notholt, J., Jones, N., Griffith, D. W. T., Smale,
- 934 D., Brailsford, G. W., Robinson, J., Meinhardt, F., Steinbacher, M., Aalto, T. and Worthy, D.:
- 935 Tropospheric CH₄ signals as observed by NDACC FTIR at globally distributed sites and comparison to
- 936 GAW surface in situ measurements, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 7(7), 2337–2360, doi:10.5194/amt-7-2337-
- 937 2014, 2014.
- 938 Snider, D., Thompson, K., Wagner-Riddle, C., Spoelstra, J. and Dunfield, K.: Molecular techniques and
- 939 stable isotope ratios at natural abundance give complementary inferences about N₂O production pathways
- 940 in an agricultural soil following a rainfall event, Soil Biol. Biochem., 88, 197–213,
- 941 doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.05.021, 2015a.
- 942 Snider, D. M., Venkiteswaran, J. J., Schiff, S. L. and Spoelstra, J.: From the ground up: Global nitrous
- 943 oxide sources are constrained by stable isotope values, PLoS One, 10(3), 1–19,
- 944 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118954, 2015b.
- 945 Sowers, T., Rodebaugh, A., Yoshida, N. and Toyoda, S.: Extending records of the isotopic composition of
- atmospheric N₂O back to 1800 A.D. from air trapped in snow at the South Pole and the Greenland Ice
- 947 Sheet Project II ice core, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 16(4), 1–10, doi:10.1029/2002GB001911, 2002.
- Stohl, A., Forster, C., Frank, A., Seibert, P. and Wotawa, G.: Technical note: The Lagrangian particle
 dispersion model FLEXPART version 6.2, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 2461–2474,
- 950 doi:10.3390/atmos9020076, 2005.
- Sturm, P., Tuzson, B., Henne, S. and Emmenegger, L.: Tracking isotopic signatures of CO₂ at the high
- altitude site Jungfraujoch with laser spectroscopy: Analytical improvements and representative results,
 Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6(7), 1659–1671, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1659-2013, 2013.
- 954 Sutka, R. L., Ostrom, N. E., Ostrom, P. H., Breznak, J. a, Pitt, a J., Li, F. and Gandhi, H.: Distinguishing

- 955 Nitrous Oxide Production from Nitrification and Denitrification on the Basis of Isotopomer Abundances
- 956 Distinguishing Nitrous Oxide Production from Nitrification and Denitrification on the Basis of
- Isotopomer Abundances, Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 72(1), 638-644, doi:10.1128/AEM.72.1.638, 2006. 957
- Tarasova, O. A., Senik, I. A., Sosonkin, M. G., Cui, J., Staehelin, J. and Péevot, A. S. H.: Surface ozone 958
- 959 at the Caucasian site Kislovodsk High Mountain Station and the Swiss Alpine site Jungfraujoch: Data
- 960 analysis and trends (1990-2006), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9(12), 4157–4175, doi:10.5194/acp-9-4157-2009, 2009.
- 961
- Team, R. C.: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for statistical 962 computing, 2015; Vienna, Austria, 2016. 963
- Thiemens, M. H. and Trogler, W. C.: Nylon Production: An Unknown Source of Atmospheric Nitrous 964 965 Oxide, Science, 251(4996), 932-934, doi:10.1126/science.251.4996.932, 1991.
- Thompson, R. L., Patra, P. K., Ishijima, K., Saikawa, E., Corazza, M., Karstens, U., Wilson, C., 966
- Bergamaschi, P., Dlugokencky, E., Sweeney, C., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., O'Doherty, S., Fraser, P. J., 967
- Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Saunois, M., Chipperfield, M. and Bousquet, P.: TransCom N₂O model 968
- inter-comparison-Part 1: Assessing the influence of transport and surface fluxes on tropospheric N₂O 969
- 970 variability, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14(8), 4349–4368, doi:10.5194/acp-14-4349-2014, 2014a.
- Thompson, R. L., Ishijima, K., Saikawa, E., Corazza, M., Karstens, U., Patra, P. K., Bergamaschi, P., 971
- Chevallier, F., Dlugokencky, E., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., O'Doherty, S., Fraser, P. J., Steele, L. P., 972
- Krummel, P. B., Vermeulen, A., Tohjima, Y., Jordan, A., Haszpra, L., Steinbacher, M., Van Der Laan, S., 973
- 974 Aalto, T., Meinhardt, F., Popa, M. E., Moncrieff, J. and Bousquet, P.: TransCom N₂O model inter-
- 975 comparison - Part 2: Atmospheric inversion estimates of N₂O emissions, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14(12), 6177-6194, doi:10.5194/acp-14-6177-2014, 2014b. 976
- Thoning, K. W., Tans, P. P. and Komhyr, W. D.: Atmospheric carbon dioxide at Mauna Loa Observatory: 977
- 2. Analysis of the NOAA GMCC data, 1974-1985, J. Geophys. Res., 94(D6), 8549-8565, 978 979 doi:10.1029/jd094id06p08549, 1989.
- 980 Tian, H., Yang, J., Xu, R., Lu, C., Canadell, J., Davidson, E. A., Jackson, R., Arneth, A., Chang, J., Ciais,
- P., Gerber, S., Ito, A., Joos, F., Lienert, S., Messina, P., Olin, S., Pan, S., Peng, C., Saikawa, E., 981
- 982 Thompson, R., Vuichard, N., Winiwarter, W., Zaehle, S. and Zhang, B.: Global soil nitrous oxide
- 983 emissions since the preindustrial era estimated by an ensemble of terrestrial biosphere models:
- Magnitude, attribution, and uncertainty, Glob. Chang. Biol., 25(2), 640-659, doi:10.1111/gcb.14514, 984 985 2019.
- 986 Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N., Urabe, T., Aoki, S., Nakazawa, T., Sugawara, S. and Honda, H.: Fractionation
- of N₂O isotopomers in the stratosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 106(D7), 7515, doi:10.1029/2000JD900680, 987 2001. 988
- Toyoda, S., Yamamoto, S., Arai, S., Nara, H., Yoshida, N., Kashiwakura, K. and Akiyama, K.: 989
- 990 Isotopomeric characterization of N2O produced, consumed, and emitted by automobiles, rapid comm, 22, 991 603-612, doi:10.1002/rcm, 2008.
- Toyoda, S., Yano, M., Nishimura, S., Akiyama, H., Hayakawa, A., Koba, K., Sudo, S., Yagi, K., Makabe, 992
- A., Tobari, Y., Ogawa, N. O., Ohkouchi, N., Yamada, K. and Yoshida, N.: Characterization and 993
- production and consumption processes of N2O emitted from temperate agricultural soils determined via 994 995 isotopomer ratio analysis, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 25(2), 1–17, doi:10.1029/2009GB003769, 2011.
- Toyoda, S., Kuroki, N., Yoshida, N., Ishijima, K., Tohjima, Y. and Machida, T.: Decadal time series of 996
- 997 tropospheric abundance of N₂O isotopomers and isotopologues in the Northern Hemisphere obtained by 998 the long-term observation at Hateruma Island, Japan, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 118(8), 3369–3381,
- doi:10.1002/jgrd.50221, 2013. 999

- Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N. and Koba, K.: Isotopocule analysis of biologically produced nitrous oxide in
 various environments, Mass Spectrom. Rev., (36), 135–160, doi:doi:10.1002/mas.21459, 2017.
- 1002 Toyoda, S., Yoshida, N., Morimoto, S., Aoki, S., Nakazawa, T., Sugawara, S., Ishidoya, S., Uematsu, M.,
- Inai, Y., Hasebe, F., Ikeda, C., Honda, H. and Ishijima, K.: Vertical distributions of N₂O isotopocules in
 the equatorial stratosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., (18), 833–844, 2018.
- 1005 Tuzson, B., Henne, S., Brunner, D., Steinbacher, M., Mohn, J., Buchmann, B. and Emmenegger, L.:
- 1006 Continuous isotopic composition measurements of tropospheric CO₂ at Jungfraujoch (3580 m a.s.l.),
- Switzerland: Real-time observation of regional pollution events, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(4), 1685–1696,
 doi:10.5194/acp-11-1685-2011, 2011.
- 1009 WMO: WMO Greenhouse Gas Bulletin., 2018.
- 1010 Wolf, B., Merbold, L., Decock, C., Tuzson, B., Harris, E., Six, J., Emmenegger, L. and Mohn, J.: First
- on-line isotopic characterization of N2O above intensively managed grassland, Biogeosciences, 12(8),
 2517–2531, doi:10.5194/bg-12-2517-2015, 2015.
- 1013 Xu-Ri, Prentice, I. C., Spahni, R. and Niu, H. S.: Modelling terrestrial nitrous oxide emissions and
- 1014 implications for climate feedback, New Phytol., 196(2), 472–488, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04269.x,
 1015 2012.
- Yoshida, N. and Toyoda, S.: Constraining the atmospheric N₂O budget from intramolecular site
 preference in N₂O isotopomers, Nature, 405(6784), 330–4, doi:10.1038/35012558, 2000.
- 1018 Yuan, Y., Ries, L., Petermeier, H., Steinbacher, M., Gómez-Pelaéz, A. J., Leuenberger, M. C.,
- 1019 Schumacher, M., Trickl, T., Couret, C., Meinhardt, F. and Menzel, A.: Adaptive selection of diurnal
- 1020 minimum variation: A statistical strategy to obtain representative atmospheric CO₂ data and its
- application to European elevated mountain stations, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 11(3), 1501–1514,
 doi:10.5194/amt-11-1501-2018, 2018.
- Yung, Y. L. and Miller, C. E.: Isotopic fractionation of stratospheric nitrous oxide, Science, 278(5344),
 1778–1780, doi:10.1126/science.278.5344.1778, 1997.
- 1025 Zellweger, C., Forrer, J., Hofer, P., Nyeki, S., Schwarzenbach, B., Weingartner, E., Ammann, M. and
- 1026 Baltensperger, U.: Partitioning of reactive nitrogen (NO_y) and dependence on meteorological conditions
- 1027 in the lower free troposphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 3(3), 779–796, doi:10.5194/acp-3-779-2003, 2003.
- 1028 Zellweger, C., Hüglin, C., Klausen, J., Steinbacher, M., Vollmer, M. and Buchmann, B.: Inter-comparison
- 1029 of four different carbon monoxide measurement techniques and evaluation of the long-term carbon
- monoxide time series of Jungfraujoch, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9(11), 3491–3503, doi:10.5194/acp-9-3491 2009, 2009.

1032 Table 1 An overview of N₂O emission sectors for Swiss Meteotest Inventory and global EDAGR Inventory and available source isotopic 1033 signatures (‰)*

Meteotest Category	Meteotest Source(s)	EDGAR Category ^ø	EDGAR Primary source(s) ^o	$\delta^{18}\mathrm{O}$	$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{bulk}}$	6 ¹⁵ N ^{SP}	References
Orgs	Organic soils	7B, 7C	Indirect soil emissions	29.0±3.7	-17.8±5.7	7.2±3.8	Snider et al. (2015b), Wolf et al. (2015)
IndustrialHeating	Cement production, industrial combustion, furnaces, waste incinerator, other industrial	1A1, 1A2	deNO _x use in fossil fuel and MSW incineration plants	35.9±13.1	3.9±2.9	17.6±0.5	Ogawa et al. (2005a), Harris et al. (2015)
Transport	Agricultural and construction machinery, road traffic	1A3a, 1A3c, 1A3d, 1A3e, 1A3b	Fuel combustion in non-road transportation	28.6±9.9	-28.7±3.6	4.2±2.4	Toyoda et al., (2008)
			Fuel combustion for road transportation	40.3±3.7	-7.2±1.2	10.0±4.3	Toyoda et al., (2008)
Heating	Agricultural, commercial and private heating	1A4	Fuel combustion: other sectors (dominantly household heating)	37±10	5.5±6	3.5±4	Ogawa et al. (2005a), Ogawa et al. (2005b)
Refinery	Refineries	1B2a	Refineries	-	-	-	-
IndustryAndUse	Nitric acid production, use in households and hospitals	2 and 3	Nitric acid production (adipic acid, medical, and private (aerosol) use)	29.1±18.8	-8.3±10.6	3.3±5.5	Toyoda et al., (2008), Thiemens et al. (1991)
Manure	Manure management	4B	Manure management	23.9±3.8	-17.5±6.2	6.5±4.1	Maeda et al. (2010)
DirectAgri	Crop residues/soil organic matter, animal waste on pastures, synthetic fertilizer use, manure application	4C, 4D	Direct soil emissions	29.0±3.7	-17.8±5.7	7.2±3.8	Snider et al. (2015b), Wolf et al. (2015)
IndirectAgri	Leaching, other indirect emissions from agri. Soils	4D3	Direct soil emissions	29.0±3.7	-17.8±5.7	7.2±3.8	Snider et al. (2015b), Wolf et al. (2015)

WastBurning	Illegal waste burning	4F	Agricultural waste burning	25±3.0	-1.0±3.0	2.8±3.0	Ogawa et al. (2005b)
Waste	Industrial fermentation, wastewater treatment, sewage sludge burning	6	Waste (wastewater treatment)	31.5±14.1	-11.6±12.7	10.5±5.7	Snider et al. (2015b)
IndirectNat	Indirect emissions from (semi-)natural ecosystems	7B, and 7C	Indirect soil emissions	29.0±3.7	-17.8±5.7	7.2±3.8	Snider et al. (2015b), Wolf et al. (2015)

1034 *Isotopic signatures for anthropogenic sources are obtained from the summary by Harris et al. (2017).

1035 ^(e) These are the primary sources contributing to N₂O emissions in Switzerland

Variable	Description	Value	Error distribution	References
m _{trop}	Air in the troposphere (mol)	1.5 x 10 ²⁰	Constant	Röckmann et al. (2003), Schilt et al. (2014)
m _{strat}	Air in the stratosphere (mol)	2.7 x 10 ¹⁹	Constant	Röckmann et al. (2003), Schilt et al. (2014)
F _{ex}	Troposphere-stratosphere exchange rate (kg a ⁻¹)	$(5.37\pm1.26) \ge 10^{17}$	Uniform	Röckmann et al. (2003), Schilt et al. (2014)
F _{ocean}	Oceanic N ₂ O flux (Tg a ⁻¹ N equivalents)	4±1	Gaussian	Schilt et al. (2014)
$ au_{ m PI}$	Preindustrial N ₂ O lifetime (year)	123±10	Gaussian	Prather et al. (2015)
$ au_{ m PD}$	Present day N ₂ O lifetime (year)	116±9	Gaussian	Prather et al. (2015)
C _{PI}	Mixing ratio in the preindustrial troposphere (nmol mol ⁻¹)	270±7.5	Uniform	Sowers et al. (2002), Röckmann et al. (2003)
$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{bulk}}$ PI	Mean $\delta^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ of preindustrial tropospheric N ₂ O (‰)	8.9±2	Gaussian	Toyoda et al. (2013)
∂ ¹⁸ O _{PI}	Mean δ^{18} O of preindustrial tropospheric N ₂ O (‰)	46.1±2	Gaussian	Toyoda et al. (2013)
∂ ¹⁵ N ^{SP} _{PI}	Mean $\partial^{15} N^{SP}$ of preindustrial tropospheric N ₂ O (‰)	19.05±2	Gaussian	Toyoda et al. (2013)
∂ ¹⁵ N _{ocean}	Mean $\partial^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ for oceanic emissions (‰)	5.1±1.9	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)
∂ ¹⁸ O _{ocean}	Mean ∂^{18} O for oceanic emissions (‰)	44.8±3.6	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)
$\delta^{15} N^{SP}_{ocean}$	Mean $\partial^{15} N^{SP}$ for oceanic emissions (‰)	15.8±7.1	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)
$\delta^{15} \mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{bulk}}_{\mathrm{terr}}$	Mean $\partial^{15} N^{\text{bulk}}$ for emissions from terrestrial soils (‰)	-16.7±11.2	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)
∂ ¹⁸ O _{terr}	Mean δ^{18} O for emissions from terrestrial soils (‰)	30.1±9.6	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)
$\delta^{15} N^{SP}_{terr}$	Mean δ^{15} N ^{SP} for emissions from terrestrial soils (‰)	10.1±11.2	Uniform	Snider et al. (2015b)

1036 Table 2 Input variables for simple two-box model

Table 3 Trends of amospheric δ¹⁵N^{bulk}, δ¹⁵N^{SP} and δ¹⁸O at Jungfraujoch determined using discrete measurements between April 2014 and December 2018. The trends are determined for the whole dataset, the dataset filtered for free troposphere (removing data points with significant influence from plenary boundary layer) and the second-phase dataset with bi-weekly measurements (August 2016 to December 2018).

	$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{bulk}}$ (‰ a ⁻¹)		$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{Sl}}$	^P (‰ a ⁻¹)	δ^{18} O (‰ a ⁻¹)		
-	Raw	Deseasonalized	Raw	Deseasonalized	Raw	Deseasonalized	
Whole dataset	-0.059±0.012*	-0.052±0.012*	0.069±0.029	0.065±0.027	0.020±0.011	0.019±0.011	
Free troposphere	-0.060±0.014*	-0.054±0.013*	0.054±0.034	0.036±0.030	0.024±0.013	0.019±0.011	
First phase (Apr. 2014-Feb. 2016)	-0.036±0.038	-0.041±0.035	0.449±0.100 [*]	0.314±0.082 [*]	0.238±0.029*	0.207±0.026 [*]	
Second phase (Aug. 2016-Dec. 2018)	-0.105±0.049	-0.130±0.045*	0.028±0.067	-0.007±0.066	-0.007±0.042	-0.001±0.040	

* Indicate significance of linear regression.

	This	study	RMSE ^φ	Sowers et al. (2002) ^a	Röckmann et al. (2003) ^b	Ishijima et al. (2007) ^c	Toyoda et al. (2013) ^d	Park et al. (2012) ^e	Prokopiou et al. (2017) ^f
Air sample	NH [†]	NH(FT ^η)		$FA^{\dagger}, IC^{\dagger}$	FA	FA	NH	SH [†] , FA	FA
age	2014-2018	2014-2018		1785-1995	NA	1960-2001	1999-2010	1940-2005	1940-2008
α*	0.0154±0.004	0.0154±0.004	0.65 nmol mol ⁻¹	0.0111 to 0.0128	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F _{anth,2018} (Tg N a ⁻¹)	8.6±0.6	8.5±0.6	NA^\dagger	4.2 to 5.7	6.9	NA	5.5	6.6	5.4±1.7
$\delta^{15} N^{bulk}$ - anth (‰)	-8.6±4	-8.5±4	0.23	-7 to -13	-11.4	-11.6	-9.84	-15.6±1.2	-18.2±2.6
∂ ¹⁸ O-anth (‰)	34.8±3	34.3±3	0.22	17 to 26	31.7	NA	35.95	32.0±1.3	27.2±2.6
∂ ¹⁵ N ^{SP} -anth (‰)	10.7±4	10.7±4	0.50	NA	11.3	NA	8.52	13.1±9.4	18.0±8.6

Table 4 Results of the two-box model simulations and selected literature values for comparison.

1045 [†]NH and SH: surface atmosphere from the Northern and Southern Hemisphere, respectively; FA: firn air; IC: ice core air; NA: not available.

ⁿ FT: Jungfraujoch dataset filtered for free troposphere (based on NO_y:CO).

* "Value" is the dimensionless constant α describing the exponential increase in the anthropogenic flux ^{\circ} RMSE refers to root mean square error. It is in nmol mol⁻¹ for α , referring to the present day

tropospheric mixing ratio for N₂O. For source isotopic values, RMSE is in the unit of ‰. Simulations 1050 with the whole dataset and the dataset filtered for free troposphere yielded the same RMSE.

^a Estimates are for 1995.

^b Estimates are for 1998; isotopic signatures of anthropogenic sources were calculated assuming modern tropospheric values to be the same as this study.

^c Estimate is for 2000, for δ^{48} O calibration is not comparable. ^d Estimates are for 2012 using the "Base" scenario.

^e Estimates are for 2005.

1055

^f δ_{anth} values are averaged values for the period of 1940-2008.

Table 5 Isotopic signatures for the overall, anthropogenic and major N₂O sources contributing to N₂O
 variations at Jungfraujoch. Source signatures were estimated based on a "bottom-up" approach, with literature-derived isotopic signatures and fluxes for variable sources under the Swiss Meteotest emission inventory.

	Emission inventory (%)	$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{bulk}}$ (%)	$\delta^{15}\mathrm{N^{SP}}\left(\% ight)$	$\delta^{18} { m O} \ (\%)$	Reference
Overall source	100	-15.8 (6.2)	7.3 (3.9)	29.4 (5.5)	-
Anthropogenic source	89.4	-15.6 (6.3)	7.4 (4.0)	29.5 (5.7)	-
Agricultural emission	61.5	-17.8 (5.7)	7.2 (3.8)	29.0 (3.7)	Snider et al. (2015) Wolf et al. (2015)
Manure management	7.4	-17.5 (6.2)	6.5 (4.1)	23.9 (3.8)	Maeda et al. (2010)
Waste*	7.2	-11.5 (12.6)	10.4 (5.7)	31.3 (14.0)	Ogawa and Yoshida (2005) Snider et al. (2015)
Natural emission	10.9	-17.8 (5.7)	7.2 (3.8)	29.0 (3.7)	Snider et al. (2015) Wolf et al. (2015)

* "Waste" sources consist of both wastewater treatment and agricultural waste burning (biomass burning).

Figures



1065

1070

1075

1080

Figure 1a *In situ* (10-min averages) and discrete measurements of N₂O mixing ratios from April 2014 to December 2018 at Jungfraujoch. *In situ* N₂O mixing ratio measurements were performed with GC-ECD method between April and December 2014. After that, OA-ICOS became the major analytical method for *in situ* measurements. Discrete sample points are presented as averages with error bars (one standard deviation). Annual N₂O growth rates determined by linear regression are given in the figure (uncertainty shown as one standard deviation). A sampling gap exists for discrete samples between February and August 2016.

1b Comparison of in situ and discrete measurements of N_2O mixing ratios; in situ measurements were 10minute values averaged over the exact period of discrete sampling time (~ 40 min); in situ measurements were performed with GC-ECD method in 2014, and this was replaced with OA-ICOS method from January 2015.

1c Seasonality of N_2O mixing ratios at Jungfraujoch derived from *in situ* measurements. Datasets with/without GC-ECD measurements are compared for seasonality evaluation. The NLS model simulation for time-series gives the detrended seasonality, with error bars indicating one standard deviation of monthly residuals.

52



Figure 2 Time-series of isotopic composition of atmospheric N_2O observed at Jungfraujoch from April 2014 to December 2018. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of repeated measurements. Blue lines indicate the simulated trends by the NLS model.



Figure 3 Seasonality of isotopic signatures of atmospheric N₂O observed at Jungfraujoch. Top panels: seasonality obtained using the whole dataset from April 2014 to December 2018; middle panels: seasonality obtained using bi-weekly data collected between August 2016 and December 2018; lower panels: seasonality obtained using dataset filtered for free troposphere from April 2014 to December 2018. Red dashed lines refer to zero variability. The NLS model simulation for time-series gives the detrended seasonality, with error bars indicating one standard deviation of monthly residuals.



Figure 4a Clusters of air mass transport regimes for Jungfraujoch shown as normalized surface source sensitivities over our sampling period. Cluster abbreviations refer to Free Troposphere (FT), Southwest
(SW), East (E), Local (L), West (W) and Northwest (NW). The normalization was done by calculating the difference between cluster average source sensitivity and whole period average source sensitivities, divided by the period average. Orange colors indicate the main source regimes in each cluster, whereas blue colors indicate little to no influence on Jungfraujoch observations. The free tropospheric cluster showed lower than average surface sensitivity everywhere.

4b Cluster frequency of air mass transport regimes (%) shown as a monthly pattern (left) and interannual patterns for the whole periods (middle) and for the periods of discrete sampling (right). Numbers above the right figure indicate the total number of discrete samples per year.



Figure 5 Left and middle: Seasonality of *in situ* measurements of O₃, NO_y and CO mixing ratios and NO_y/CO at Jungfraujoch; error bars represent the one standard deviation of monthly residuals from the NLS model simulation for time-series. 10-minute data were used for seasonality analysis.

Right: *In situ* measurements of O_3 , NO_y and CO mixing ratios averaged over the exact period of discrete sampling (~40 min).

1110



Figure 6 Comparison of N_2O mixing ratios and isotopic signatures (with linear trends removed) for the six air mass footprint clusters used in the present study. Green and blue stars indicate significantly larger and smaller values than the others, respectively; red dashed lines indicate mean levels; grey points indicate outliers.



Figure 7a Mean monthly stacked-bar plots of source contributions (%) to atmospheric N₂O at Jungfraujoch derived from inversion modeling.

7b Overall contributions of N₂O sources responsible for emission to Jungfraujoch.

1120

7c Simulated 3-hourly N₂O mixing ratios, N₂O mixing ratio baseline and N₂O enhancements in nmol mol¹.



1125 Figure 8 Relationship between the NO_y to CO ratios and isotopic signatures of N₂O; only data points with NO_y/CO>0.007 are presented here (which refers to scenarios with strong pollution from local air).



Figure 9 Simulated seasonal variations of isotopic signatures for overall N₂O sources based on the
 "bottom-up" approach; uncertainties shown in figures are comparable to the ranges of isotopic signatures for variable sources as found in literature.



Figure 10 Two-box model results showing the influence of anthropogenic emissions on N₂O mixing ratio
 and isotopic composition in the troposphere. Left: full time range from the start of the anthropogenic period (1845) to present day; Right: zoom to the last two decades. Isotopic measurements at Jungfraujoch were used as the only constraint of current tropospheric N₂O isotopic composition for the model. See the materials and method as well as the SI for more details and other input parameters. Atmospheric as well as firn air measurements of δ¹⁵N^{bulk}, δ¹⁵N^{SP} and δ¹⁸O from the literature are presented for comparison.
 Blue shaded areas indicate one standard deviation of the model iterations.