Power law scaling model predicts $N_2O$ emissions along the Upper Mississippi River basin
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Abstract
Nitrous oxide, N$_2$O, is widely recognized as one of the most important greenhouse gases, and responsible for stratospheric ozone destruction. A significant fraction of N$_2$O emissions to the atmosphere is from rivers. Reliable catchment-scale estimates of these emissions require both high-resolution field data and suitable models able to capture the main processes controlling nitrogen transformation within surface and subsurface riverine environments. Here, we test and validate a recently proposed parsimonious, yet effective, model to predict riverine N$_2$O fluxes along the main stem of the Upper Mississippi River (UMR). The model parameterizes N$_2$O emissions by means of two denitrification Damköhler numbers; one accounting for processes occurring within the hyporheic and benthic zones, and the other one within the water column, as a function of river size. Comparison of predicted N$_2$O gradients between water and air ($\Delta$N$_2$O) with those quantified from field measurements validates the predictive performance of the model and allow extending previous findings to large river networks including highly regulated rivers with cascade reservoirs and locks. Results show the major role played by the water column processes in contributing to N$_2$O emissions in large rivers. Consequently, we infer that along the UMR, characterized by regulated flows and large channel size, N$_2$O production occurs chiefly within this surficial riverine compartment, where the suspended particles may create anoxic microsites, which favor denitrification.
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1. Introduction

The use of synthetic fertilizers and fossil fuel combustion, led the atmospheric concentration of nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) to increase, reaching the today high levels [1]. Besides being an important greenhouse gas (GHG), N\textsubscript{2}O is recognized as the dominant stratospheric ozone-depleting substance [2]. According to the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) [3] 4.5 million tonnes of N\textsubscript{2}O per year [3] are produced by agriculture, with 25% consisting of indirect emissions originating from runoff and leaching of fertilizers. Excess of fertilizers used for food and energy production enters the stream network from run-off, groundwater flow or atmospheric deposition and here they undergo a number of transformations and ultimately part of the reactive nitrogen returns to the atmosphere as N\textsubscript{2}O, chiefly through denitrification. In this paper, we focus on the contribution to N\textsubscript{2}O emissions of the following three riverine environmental compartments: water column, benthic area and hyporheic zone [4, 5]; which together accounts for \(\sim 10\%\) of the total N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from lotic systems [6, 7, 8]. In these systems, N\textsubscript{2}O emissions are attributable to different biogeochemical processes (i.e. nitrification, denitrification and reduction of nitrate to ammonia (DNRA)) [9] but still nitrification-denitrification represents the most important pathway that converts dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) species (ammonium, NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}, and nitrate, NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}) to N\textsubscript{2}O. Production of N\textsubscript{2}O may be controlled by numerous geochemical (i.e., pH, temperature, DIN, dissolved oxygen: DO, and dissolved organic carbon: DOC) and hydrological (i.e. water discharge, river morphology and surface water conditions) factors [6, 10, 4, 11, 12, 13]. Although the main processes and the environmental factors controlling N\textsubscript{2}O emissions have been the subject of recent studies, [see e.g. 14, and citations therein], few tools are available to estimate these emissions at the catchment and larger scales [14, 15, 5].

A major difficulty in modeling N\textsubscript{2}O emissions at the catchment scale is the large spatial and temporal variability of reactive nitrogen input as well as of the parameters controlling its transformations [16, 17]. The lack of detailed continuous measurements of in-stream N\textsubscript{2}O concentrations and the low spatial coverage of data, led to a major development of regression models that bind observed emissions with specific biogeochemical quantities such as nitrate [7, 18, 10, 19], dissolved oxygen [11], dissolved organic carbon [20] and temperature [21]. Looking at the river networks spatial scale, several studies showed that N\textsubscript{2}O emissions decrease exponentially as a function of
stream order [22]. This suggests that not only reactive nitrogen loads but also hydromorphology influence N$_2$O emissions. Recently, Marzadri et al. [5] proposed a parsimonious, in term of parameters, model that was able to interpret the data collected in both the LINXII experiment [23, 4] and a detailed survey in the Kalamazoo river basin [24, 18]. The model provides N$_2$O emissions, normalized with respect to the DIN mass flux, as a function of a suitable Damköhler number, defined as the ratio between a characteristic transport time and a characteristic reaction time [25], which quantifies the effect on emissions of the permanence of the reactive nitrogen in an environment favourable to reaction. The model identified two end-member expressions, under the form of scaling laws: an upper bound (UB) scaling law to be applied when emissions are controlled by hyporheic and benthic processes and a lower bound (LB) scaling law when benthic processes dominate and hyporheic processes are weak. The analysis of 400 reaches around the world, suggested the introduction of a third scaling law, coined as stream water column (WC) scaling law, which accounts for processes occurring chiefly within the water column. The use of the WC equation is recommended in large and deep rivers where the hyporheic zone has negligible effects on N$_2$O emissions [5]. In this formulation, the proposed 3-equation model accounts for the decline in the relative contribution of the hyporheic zone to N$_2$O emissions with respect to benthos and water column, as stream size increases. It is also fully characterized with measured or derived quantities and does not require any calibration or fitting to data. This is a key condition for its use as a predictive model.

The UB and LB scaling laws were verified on an independent data set of 400 stream and river reaches (not used to develop the models) in three continents, obtaining good performances [5]. However, the WC scaling laws was derived from that 400-reaches data set because no large and deep rivers were contained in the original set of data used to derive UB and LB (i.e. the LINXII and Kalamazoo river data). Consequently, the WC scaling law was not validated. Additionally, Marzadri et al. [5] did not identify nor suggested the conditions under which LB performs better than WC scaling law and whether their performance is stream size dependent. Moreover, both LB and WC scaling laws depend on denitrification uptake rate [23, 26], whose effects on model performance has not been previously addressed.

Here, we addressed these issues and we also tested our hypothesis that there is a river size threshold beyond which the WC equation is a better predictor of N$_2$O emissions than LB because the importance of the benthic
processes reduces as the stream size increases. We addressed our goal by comparing LB and WC models’ predicted N\textsubscript{2}O emissions against an independent set of high-spatial resolution field measurements recently collected by Turner et al. [13] along the Upper Mississippi River (hereafter UMR). The UMR is a large system (widths larger than 80 m) with increasing size and discharge suitable for the validation of the WC scaling law.

2. Materials and Methods

UMR drains one of the most intensive agricultural areas of the world. The study reach is the 350 km long portion of the UMR between the Lower St. Anthony Falls (MN) Lock and Dam to the Lock and Dam 8 near Genoa (WI) for a total of 64,770 \textit{mi}\textsuperscript{2} contributing area. Streambed material is mainly composed by sand and finer sediments [27, 28], with median grain size, \textit{d}_{50} \approx 0.7 mm [27]. There are 13 gauging stations along the study site with 3 major tributaries: the Minnesota, St. Croix and Chippewa. Flows is regulated by several dams and locks that form backwaters. Data were collected by Turner et al. [13] between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} of August 2015 when mean daily discharges varied spatially between 145 and 936 \textit{m}^3/s and channel widths between 80 and 3,200 m.

2.1. Input data

2.1.1. Water quality data

We used a data set composed by 1,553 GPS geo-referenced (uniquely identifiable by latitude and longitude) field measurements of in-stream dissolved N\textsubscript{2}O concentration ([N\textsubscript{2}O], mgN\textsubscript{2}O/\textit{L}) [13], the saturation percentage of nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{sat}, \%) [13] and the in-stream nitrate concentration, [NO\textsubscript{3}] (mgN/\textit{L}) [29]. Data were collected with a boat-mounted flow-through sampling system [30] with a 200 m average spatial resolution (minimum distance \textsim 7 cm and maximum distance \textsim 1 km) along the study reach (see Figure 1). Measurements were performed at daylight [30, 13, 29] with the overall objective to obtain "a regional-scale assessment of N\textsubscript{2}O concentration patterns in the UMR" [13]. Consequently, even if all the collected data represented conditions at a given time, their spatial coverage supported well our goal to test the upscaling capability of the Marzadri et al.’s model [5], namely to predict N\textsubscript{2}O emissions at the large regional scale. After removing 358 measurements taken from lateral (i.e., outside the river’s main stem) natural
lakes or reservoirs and averaging 279 replicates the final usable dataset was composed by 916 independent measurements.

The work by Turner et al. [13] reported only the mean water temperature for the entire UMR \( T = 23.8^\circ C \) with a standard deviation of 0.6\(^\circ C\) during the surveying period (August 1-3, 2015). To spatially distribute the water temperature along the UMR, we assigned to the reaches, identified according to their Hydrological Unic Code (HUC-8) shown in Figure 1 and Table 1, the median temperature reported by Loken et al. [29] for the same sampling period. The mean of the assigned temperatures \( (T = 23.6^\circ C \text{ and } 0.6 \text{ standard deviation}) \) compared well with the mean value of 23.8\(^\circ C\) reported by Turner et al. [13].

Similarly, the in-stream NH\(_4\) concentrations (mgN/L) along the UMR were spatially distributed proportionally to the spatial distribution of ammonium plus ammonia values, NH\(_4\), reported in Loken et al. [29].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUC8</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Range of measurements</th>
<th>Median NH(_4) (mgN/L)</th>
<th>Median ( T ) ((^\circ C))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07010206</td>
<td>Twin - Cities</td>
<td>1 - 367</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>23.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07040001</td>
<td>Rush - Vermillion</td>
<td>369 - 911</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>24.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07040003</td>
<td>Buffalo - Whitewater</td>
<td>912 - 1429</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07040006</td>
<td>La Crosse - Pine</td>
<td>1430 - 1500</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07060001</td>
<td>Coon - Yellow</td>
<td>1500 -1522</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Median values of ammonium plus ammonia (NH\(_4\)) and water temperature \( (T) \) variation along the main stem of the Upper Mississippi River.

2.1.2. Stream hydraulics data

Discharge values, \( Q \), were quantified as the average of the daily values measured between August 1\(^{st}\) and 3\(^{rd}\), 2015 at the 13 gauging stations operated by the U. S. Geological Survey, USGS, and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers stations, USACE, [31] (see Figure 1 and Table 2) along the study site. Their measurements accounted for the in-flows of the major tributaries and showed sudden increases in discharge at their confluences. Overall measured water discharge increases almost linearly with distance (see Figure A.1 in the Appendix), with major confluences, thereby allowing the use of linear interpolation to compute \( Q \) in the reaches between them. This is consistent with the hypothesis of a contribution proportional to the upstream drainage area, as showed in Figure A.1 of the Appendix.
Figure 1: Map of the analyzed part of the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) for which data of water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($\Delta N_2O$) are provided by Turner et al. [13] (red points).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>River</th>
<th>Station name</th>
<th>Lat.</th>
<th>Long.</th>
<th>Q&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>MNR</td>
<td>Fort Snelling Park, MN</td>
<td>44.87028</td>
<td>-93.1922</td>
<td>145.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Lower St. Anthony Falls, MN</td>
<td>44.97833</td>
<td>-93.2469</td>
<td>198.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Lock and Dam 1, MN</td>
<td>44.91528</td>
<td>-93.2006</td>
<td>331.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>44.94444</td>
<td>-93.0881</td>
<td>352.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Hasting, MN (Lock and Dam 2)</td>
<td>44.75972</td>
<td>-92.8686</td>
<td>352.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Prescott, MN</td>
<td>44.74583</td>
<td>-92.8000</td>
<td>530.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Red Wing, MN (Lock and Dam 3)</td>
<td>44.6100</td>
<td>-92.6103</td>
<td>494.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Alma, WI (Lock and Dam 4)</td>
<td>44.32556</td>
<td>-91.9203</td>
<td>722.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Minneska, MN (Lock and Dam 5)</td>
<td>44.16111</td>
<td>-91.8108</td>
<td>814.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Winona, MN (Lock and Dam 5A)</td>
<td>44.08833</td>
<td>-91.6689</td>
<td>824.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Trempeleau, WI (Lock and Dam 6)</td>
<td>43.99972</td>
<td>-91.4383</td>
<td>878.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Dresbach, MN (Lock and Dam 7)</td>
<td>43.86694</td>
<td>-91.3072</td>
<td>838.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>Genoa, WI (Lock and Dam 8)</td>
<td>43.5700</td>
<td>-91.2317</td>
<td>936.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(a)</sup> Q is the average daily discharge at the gauging station between 1-3 August 2015.

Table 2: Characteristics of the twelve gauging stations along the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) and the gauging station along the Minnesota River (MNR).
Reach scale estimates of hydraulic depth, \( D \) (m), were obtained as a function of \( Q \), expressed in \( \text{m}^3/\text{s} \), through the power law scaling proposed by Miller et al. [32]:

\[
D = 0.18 Q^{0.47} (r^2 = 0.73)
\]  

(1)

and those of channel width, \( W \) (m), were obtained from Google Earth Pro (Google Earth Pro, 2017) at each sampling site location. Reach-scale flow velocities, \( V \) (m/s), were obtained as the ratio between \( Q \) and the cross sectional channel area \((W \cdot D)\) under the hypothesis of wide rectangular channel:

\[
V = \frac{Q}{W \cdot D}
\]  

(2)

The stream slope \( s_0 \) (-) was quantified by means of the Manning’s formula [33]:

\[
s_0 = \left( \frac{Mn \cdot V}{D^{2/3}} \right)^2
\]  

(3)

by assuming prevailing uniform flow conditions in a wide channel, such that the hydraulic water depth \( D \) can be used in lieu of the hydraulic radius. The Manning’s coefficient \( Mn = 0.026 \) (s/m\(^{1/3}\)) was inherited from previous hydraulic analysis of this system [34].

The resulting gentle stream slope, \( s_0 < 0.02\% \) and fine streambed material are conducive to bed forms primarily composed by dunes [35], whose mean length \((L)\) and height \((H_d)\) were quantified with the formulation proposed by Yalin [36]: \( L = 6D \) and \( H_d = 0.167D \), respectively. The head variation at the water-sediment interface \((h_m)\) is the main mechanism that drives stream water in and out of the streambed sediment through the hyporheic zone along the dune. It was quantified according to the formulation proposed by Shen et al. [37]:

\[
h_m = \frac{0.28 \cdot V^2}{2g} \left( \frac{H_d}{0.34D} \right)^{3/8}
\]  

(4)

where \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration (m/s\(^2\)).

Finally, we estimated the streambed hydraulic conductivity, \( K_h \) (m/s), according to the following expression proposed by Gomez-Velez et al. [38]:

\[

8
\]
which leaded to $K_h = 9.2 \times 10^{-4} \text{m/s}$ (in agreement with typical values of fine-medium sand [39]) and was assumed homogeneous and isotropic [40].

2.2. $N_2O$ emission model

According to Marzadri et al. [5], we quantified the $N_2O$ flux, $F_{N_2O}$, as the product between its dimensionless expression, $F^*N_2O$, and the in-stream total flux of ammonium ($[\text{NH}_4^+]$) and nitrate ($[\text{NO}_3^-]$) (the two major species of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, DIN, responsible of $N_2O$ production [41]):

$$FDIN_0 = V([\text{NH}_4^+] + [\text{NO}_3^-]).$$

The dimensionless flux $F^*N_2O$ assumes the following expressions

$$F^*N_2O,_{UB} = 1.55 \times 10^{-7}(Da_{DHZ})^{0.43}, W \leq 10m
F^*N_2O,_{LB} = 1.91 \times 10^{-8}(Da_{DHZ})^{0.58}, W > 30m
F^*N_2O,_{WC} = 4.56 \times 10^{-6}(Da_{DS})^{0.72}, W > 30m$$

depending on the stream size. In equation (6), $Da_{DHZ}$ and $Da_{DS}$ are the two denitrification Damkohler numbers identified by Marzadri et al. [5] and whose importance depends on the size of riverine system, which was classified as small (width, $W \leq 10m$) and intermediate ($10 < W \leq 30m$) streams and rivers ($W > 30m$) [42, 43]. $Da_{DHZ}$ was defined as:

$$Da_{DHZ} = \frac{\tau_{50}}{\tau_D} = 17.810 \frac{Df_{den}}{K_hV^2}$$

where $\tau_{50}$ is the median hyporheic residence time evaluated according to the formulation proposed by Elliott and Brooks [44] (see major details in Marzadri et al. [5]), $\tau_D$ is the time of denitrification ($\tau_D = D/v_{fden}$) with $v_{fden}$ being the uptake rate of denitrification[41]. This equation assumed dune topography with Yalin [36] scaling and Shen et al. [37] formulation for head variation at the water sediment interface.

In WC model, $\tau_{50}$ is replaced with the characteristic time of turbulent vertical mixing [45]:

$$t_m = \frac{D}{0.067 \sqrt{gDS_0}},$$

thereby $Da_{DS}$ assumes the following form [5]:

$$Da_{DS} = \frac{\tau_{50}}{\tau_D} = 9.$$
2.2.1. Uptake rate of denitrification

The uptake rate of denitrification, $v_{\text{fden}}$, was evaluated according to two formulations, one proposed by Mulholland et al. [23] and the other one by Böhlke et al. [26].

Böhlke et al. [26] defined $v_{\text{fden}}$ as the ratio between the areal uptake rate of denitrification, $U_{\text{den}}$, and the mean flow depth $(v_{\text{fden}} = U_{\text{den}}/D)$ and proposed four different models to estimate $U_{\text{den}}$ as a power law function of in-stream NO$_3$ concentrations. Here, we adopted the model that they obtained by combining and weighting the data from the LINXII [23] and UMR datasets in order to reflect the relative contributions of the different environments characterizing the two datasets and to attribute some preference for $^{15}$N$_2$ data.

The formulation of Mulholland et al. [23] is:

$$\log(v_{\text{fden,M}}) = -0.493\log[\text{NO}_3] - 2.975$$

with $v_{\text{fden,M}}$ expressed in cm/s and [NO$_3$] in µgN/L, whereas that of Böhlke et al. [26] is:

$$v_{\text{fden,B}} = \frac{17[\text{NO}_3]^{0.51}}{D}$$

with $v_{\text{fden,B}}$ expressed in m/s and [NO$_3$] expressed as µmolN/L.

2.3. Comparison between simulated and predicted values

The performance of the LB and WC models against measurements was assessed by comparing the water-air nitrous oxide gradient, $\Delta$N$_2$O, provided by the model of Marzadri et al. [5] (equation (13)) against the estimate obtained from the field data provided by Turner et al. [13]:

$$\Delta \text{N}_2\text{O} = [\text{N}_2\text{O}] - [\text{N}_2\text{O}]_{eq} = [\text{N}_2\text{O}] - 100\frac{[\text{N}_2\text{O}]}{\% \text{N}_2\text{O}_{\text{sat}}},$$

where $[\text{N}_2\text{O}]$ and $\%$N$_2$O$_{\text{sat}}$ were measured, and:

$$\Delta \text{N}_2\text{O} = \frac{F\text{N}_2\text{O}}{10^{-3}k_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}}$$
where \( k_{N_2O} \) (m/h) is the water-air piston velocity for N\(_2\)O and \( FN_2O \) is the estimated nitrous oxide emissions per unit area (\( \mu gN_2O - N/m^2/h \)). The former is represented as [46, 47, 48]:

\[
 k_{N_2O} = k_{600} \left( \frac{Sc_{N_2O}}{600} \right)^{-nw} \tag{14}
\]

where \( nw \) is a dimensionless exponent, whose value depends on the state of the surface water [46], and \( Sc_{N_2O} \) is the Schmidt number [-] evaluated as a function of the water temperature \( T \) (°C) by the following expression [47]:

\[
 Sc_{N_2O} = 2056 - 137.11 T + 4.317 T^2 - 0.054 T^3 \tag{15}
\]

Here, we assumed \( nw = 1/2 \) because the UMR large width and discharge favours the development of waves at the air-water interface [46]. The gas transfer velocity, \( k_{600} \), at a Schmidt number of 600 was evaluated by means of model 5 of Raymond et al. [48]:

\[
 k_{600} = 2841 (V \cdot s_0) + 2.02 \tag{16}
\]

where \( V \) and \( s_0 \) are estimated according to equation (2) and (3), respectively.

We evaluated the model’s performance by using several metrics: the absolute error (\( AE_i \)), defined as:

\[
 AE_i = |\Delta N_2O_i^{obs} - \Delta N_2O_i^{sim}|, \tag{17}
\]

its average value \( \overline{AE} \):

\[
 \overline{AE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} AE_i, \tag{18}
\]

the Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency index (\( NSE \)) [49]:

\[
 NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_2O_i^{obs} - \Delta N_2O_i^{sim})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_2O_i^{obs} - \Delta N_2O_i^{obs})^2}, \tag{19}
\]

the root mean square error (\( RMSE \)):

\[
 RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_2O_i^{obs} - \Delta N_2O_i^{sim})^2}, \tag{20}
\]
the percentage of bias (PBIAS)

\[
PBIAS = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_{2O}^{obs} - \Delta N_{2O}^{sim})}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_{2O}^{obs})} \cdot 100
\]  

(21)

and the ratio of RMSE to the standard deviation (SD) of the measured data (RSR):

\[
RSR = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_{2O}^{obs} - \Delta N_{2O}^{sim})}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\Delta N_{2O}^{obs} - \Delta N_{2O}^{obs})}}
\]  

(22)

where \(N\) is the number of data (i.e. \(N = 916\)), and the superscripts \(^{obs}\) and \(^{sim}\) represent measured and simulated values of \(\Delta N_{2O}\), respectively. Furthermore, \(\bar{\Delta N_{2O}^{obs}}\) is the mean of the observations.

Interpretation of these indexes to quantify whether a model is satisfactory or not were based on the guidelines suggested by Moriasi et al. [50], who proposed that model simulations are satisfactory when \(NSE > 0.50\), \(RSR < 0.70\), and \(PBIAS < \pm 25\%\).

3. Results and Discussion

All performance indexes indicated that the WC scaling law performed better than the LB and UB scaling laws for large rivers (Table 3). Only the WC model met all targets for the metrics used to assess the errors [50] (Table 3). Visual inspection of Figure 2, which shows predicted vs measured \(\Delta N_{2O}\), also confirms the better performance of WC scaling law compared to the other two scaling laws (with the 1:1 line passing through the data) and the poor performance of both UB and LB models. These results were supported by the analysis of correlation between \(AE_{i}\) and \(\Delta N_{2O}^{obs}\) shown in Figure A.2. \(AE_{i}\) obtained with the WC and LB scaling laws were uncorrelated with the measured \(\Delta N_{2O}\). Therefore, the total error may reduce significantly when the emissions are aggregated (i.e. integrated) over the relevant (sub)catchments or higher scales.

As expected, the UB scaling law strongly overestimated \(\Delta N_{2O}\) (Figure 2a), because it was developed for small streams, where \(N_{2O}\) emissions chiefly originate from the hyporheic zone, while measurements analyzed here were taken in a large river. This result confirmed the observation of Marzadri et al. [5], who argued that hyporheic zone was a negligible source of \(N_{2O}\) in rivers. The LB scaling law, which was applied for large rivers in the original
work of Marzadri et al. [5], overestimated $\Delta N_2O$ and had poor performance for the UMR data. This suggests that also the role of the benthic zone as a source of $N_2O$ was negligible along the UMR (Figure 2b). Conversely the high performance indexes for the WC scaling law combined with the lack of correlation between $AE_i$ and $\Delta N_2O_i^{obs}$ (notice the very small value of $r^2$ in Figure A.2c), suggests that processes within the water column were the main source of $N_2O$ emissions.

In large riverine systems, such as UMR, we relate the major role played by the water column in controlling $N_2O$ emissions to the presence of anoxic conditions. Three expressions (equation (6)) for small (UB) and large (LB and WC) rivers were studied, and the results are presented in Table 3.

### Table 3: Main statistical parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>UB model (NSE=-1046.23)</th>
<th>LB model (NSE=-3.91)</th>
<th>WC model (NSE=0.55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSE</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>-1046.235</td>
<td>-3.912</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIAS (%)</td>
<td>-1583.319</td>
<td>-107.512</td>
<td>-4.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>32.361</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Comparison between predicted and measured water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($\Delta N_2O$) along the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) by using: (a) the Upper Bound, UB, power law scaling; (b) the Lower Bound, LB, power law scaling and (c) the Water Column, WC, power law scaling (as in Marzadri et al. [5]). Color of the symbols shift from green to yellow as the width of the channel increases. The uptake rate of denitrification ($v_{f,denB}$) is estimated by using the equation (11)[26].
micro-sites associated to the suspended particle load that favor the micro-
biologically mediated process of denitrification along the surface water column
rather than in the hyporheic and benthic zones [51, 52, 53]. Suspended sed-
iments provide the supporting matrix of microbial colonies and biofilms and
their density increase with discharge as reported in literature, since the pio-
neering work of Leopold and Maddock [54]. Empirical observations showed
that suspended sediment concentration (SSC) depends on Q through the
following power law expression: \( SSC = aQ^b \) (with \( a \) and \( b \) obtained by
regression with the specific experimental data) [55, 56]. We suggest that
the negligible role of the hyporheic zone in large rivers was due to low hy-
porheic exchange, which in turn was due to low hydraulic conductivity of the
streambed and low reaction rate constants as reported in the recent work by
Reeder et al. [57]. This latter effect is due to the positive feedback between
reaction and hyporheic exchange rate; higher downwelling velocities corre-
late with higher reaction rate constants [57], and the associate delivery of
substrate biogeochemical components (i.e. \( \text{NO}_3 \)) [58].

Figure 3 shows \( NSE \) as a function of the average channel width (14 bins
of 61 data points and one bin with 62 points as described in the caption of
table A.2 of the Appendix) with the modeled data obtained with LB and
WC scaling laws (6) and with \( v_{fden} \) proposed by Mulholland et al. [23] (3a)
and by Böhlke et al. [26] (3b). All performance indexes were reported for
completeness in Tables A.2 and A.3 of the Appendix. The LB scaling law
(red circle) with \( v_{fden,M} \) showed better performance values than the WC
scaling law for \( W < \approx 175 \text{ m} \), although both scaling laws had satisfactory
performance (Figure 3a and Table A.2). However, as \( W \) increased \( NSE \)
values of the LB scaling law decreased sharply becoming negative for \( W >
286 \text{ m} \) and with values of \( PBIAS \) larger than 40\% (see Appendix Table
A.2 where the negative sign indicate that the model tends to overestimate
the observations). For the WC scaling law, \( NSE \) gently decreases with \( W \)
to almost a constant value of 0.36 after \( W \) nearly equal 400 m. All other
indexes showed similar trends.

For LB and WC scaling laws with \( v_{fden} = v_{fden,B} \), the LB scaling law
had always negative \( NSE \) values and \( PBIAS \) larger than 50\%, regardless of
reach size (Figure 3b and Table A.3). Conversely, with the WC scaling law
\( NSE \) were almost constant and equal to 0.59 for \( W > 230 \text{ m} \) and increased
steeply with \( W \) smaller than 300 m, peaking to value of 0.93 for \( W \approx 100 \text{ m} \).
Accordingly, the \( PBIAS \) values were always negative and < 15\% in absolute
terms (Table A.3).
Figure 3: Goodness of prediction (Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency, $NSE$) of the Lower Bound, (LB red symbols), and the Water Column (WC blue symbols) power law models as a function of the average channel width. In panel (a) the uptake rate of denitrification, $v_{fden,M}$, is estimated using the relation proposed by Mulholland et al. [23]; while in panel (b) $v_{fden,B}$ is estimated using the relation proposed by Böhlke et al. [26]. Data are grouped in fifteen bins (14 with 61 points and the last one with 62 points).
These results are in agreement with previous studies [59, 60, 61, 62, 63] underlying how nutrient removal processes and consequently $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ production scale across a broad range of stream sizes. According to Wollheim et al. [64], $v_{\text{fden}}$ is a biological measure well suited for comparing biological activity in streams of different sizes and here, we showed the importance of this parameter to accurately predict $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ emissions. The local physical and biogeochemical conditions that control the characteristic time of reaction (accounted here by using two different formulations for $v_{\text{fden}}$) influence the riverine environment that mainly controls $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ emissions. For $W < \sim 175$ m similar results are obtained either by using LB and $v_{\text{fden}} = v_{\text{fden},M}$ or WC and $v_{\text{fden}} = v_{\text{fden},B}$ (see Figures 3a and 3b, respectively). Therefore, we suggest that accurate local measurements of this parameter are important to model $\Delta\text{N}_2\text{O}$ emissions accurately. It also underlines the strength of the proposed power law model to capture correctly these emissions as the boundary conditions change (i.e., the NO$_3$ load).

To emphasize this aspect, Figures 4a and 4b show the bin averaged values (bars represents ± 1 standard deviation) of $\Delta\text{N}_2\text{O}$ measured and predicted with LB and WC scaling laws, respectively with $v_{\text{fden},M}$, and $v_{\text{fden},B}$ (results of Figure 4 are supplemented by Appendix Tables A.2 and A.3). The performance of the LB scaling law decreased with increasing river size regardless the model of $v_{\text{fden}}$, and it was lower than that of WC scaling law (Figure 4). Using $v_{\text{fden},M}$, the LB scaling law predicted the measured emissions better than the WC scaling law for $W < 175$ m and the measured $\Delta\text{N}_2\text{O}$ values fell between the two scaling law with LB overestimating and WC underestimating emissions for $W > 265$ m. Conversely, the WC scaling law predicted well the measured average values of $\Delta\text{N}_2\text{O}$ with $v_{\text{fden},B}$ (Figure 4b).

The impact of $v_{\text{fden}}$ on the prediction is associated to the control that it exerts on the characteristic time of denitrification. Using $v_{\text{fden},B}$ ($> v_{\text{fden},M}$), obtained combing data of small headwaters streams [23] with data of larger rivers [26], the characteristic time of denitrification decreases ($\tau_D$ reduces as $v_{\text{fden}}$ increases) and consequently denitrification, both within the benthic zone and the surface water, occurs at higher rate and therefore it results in a larger $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ production. Accordingly, in the dimensionless framework proposed by Marzadri et al. [5], an increase of $v_{\text{fden}}$ (i.e., a reduction of $\tau_D$) leads to an increase in both the denitrification Damköhler numbers ($D_{a\text{DHZ}}$ and $D_{a\text{DS}}$) and the associated dimensionless fluxes of $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ($F^*\text{N}_2\text{O}_{\text{LB}}$ and $F^*\text{N}_2\text{O}_{\text{WC}}$) that, under the same hydrological and water quality conditions,
Figure 4: Comparison between predicted (red and blue bullets) and measured (green bullets) water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($\Delta N_2O$) along the reaches of Upper Mississippi River (UMR) as a function of the average channel width. Red bullets represent predictions with the Lower Bound model (LB); while blue bullets represent predictions with the Water Column model (WC) when (a) the uptake rate of denitrification, $v_{fden,M}$, is estimated using the relation proposed by Mulholland et al. [23] and (b) $v_{fden,B}$, is estimated using the relation proposed by Böhlke et al. [26]. Data are grouped in fifteen bins (fourteen with 61 points and the last one with 62 points) and error bars represent $\pm$ standard deviation.
drive LB and WC scaling laws to predict higher N\(_2\)O emissions.

Figure 4 confirms that the WC scaling law captured with satisfactory accuracy \(\Delta N_2O\) measured by Turner et al. [13] along the UMR. Accordingly, Figure 5 shows the map of measured (panel a) and predicted \(\Delta N_2O\) (panel b) and their absolute error (panel c) for the WC scaling law. Although with some underestimation, the WC scaling law captured the spatial distribution of \(\Delta N_2O\) by matching the zone with high and low \(\Delta N_2O\). The absolute error (Figure 5c) is larger mainly in the upper part of the analyzed reach where several locks and dams are closely spaced. Within backwaters, the system may not longer behave as riverine but potentially as lentic, thereby introducing processes that the Marzadri et al.’s model [5] does not scale properly. However, the error associated with the model predictions is acceptable based on performance indexes analyzed in the present work.

These results confirm the fading importance of both hyporheic and benthic zones with size from streams to rivers. Accordingly, we conclude that the
third equation for river of the Marzadri et al.'s model [5], (WC with $v_{fden} = v_{fden,B}$), was the most adequate to represent UMR data and performed well ($NSE_{WC,average} = 0.64$, $NSE_{WC,min} = 0.55$, $PBIAS_{WC,average} = -10.10\%$, $PBIAS_{min} = -15.66\%$, $RSR_{WC,average} = 0.56$, $RSR_{WC,min} = 0.27$) in predicting the water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($\Delta N_2O$) measured by Turner et al. [13].

4. Conclusions

Results showed the robustness of Marzadri et al.'s model [5] and the importance of local measurements. The performance of the model as expected increased with better inputs and specialized information. Finally, the present work underlined how with a parsimonious predictive tool, we were able to characterize $N_2O$ emissions along the UMR using readily available reach-scale biogeochemical measurements and hydromorphological data. The model does not require any calibration or fitting but only relays on measured or estimated quantities.

Based on these results, we suggested the use of LB scaling law with $v_{fden,M}$ for river reaches up to $W = 100$ m and the WC scaling law with $v_{fden,B}$ for rivers reaches with $W > 100$ m but potentially even smaller as in this study we were not able to resolve this issue (because of the limited amount of narrower reaches within this dataset, see Figure 4b). The WC scaling law may be applicable even to small widths until about $W = 30$ m as shown in Marzadri et al. [5].
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Along the analyzed reach of the UMR, the average water discharge was obtained at 13 gauging stations from Fort Snelling Park (MN) to Genoa (WI) (see Figure 1) during typical summer baseflow conditions. Figure A.1 shows the trend of variation of the drainage area (DA, mi²) and the water discharge (Q, m³/s) as a function of the downstream distance (mi) and supports our assumptions to consider negligible the influence of the major tributaries during the sampling time (between 1st and 3rd of August 2015) and to expect a linear variation of Q between successive sampling points.

Figure A.1: Trend of variation of (a) drainage area and (b) water discharge as a function of the downstream distance from the gauging station of Lower St. Anthony Falls (MN) to the gauging station of Genoa (WI).

Starting from these assumptions and using the sufficient and necessary input parameters summarized in Table A.1 we applied the model proposed and validated by Marzadri et al. [5] to analyze which riverine environmental compartment (i.e. hyporheic zone, benthic area or water column) controls N₂O emissions.

We conclude that the WC model produces good predictions of local emissions respect to the UB and LB models as remarked by the degree of correlation between the measured ∆N₂O and the error (Absolute Error, \( A\varepsilon_i = \mu gN_2O - N/L \)) in Figure A.2. Accordingly, we expect that the total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter (description)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (cell latitude WGS84)</td>
<td>[Decimal Degree]</td>
<td>Turner et al. [13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (cell longitude WGS84)</td>
<td>[Decimal Degree]</td>
<td>Turner et al. [13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (water discharge)</td>
<td>[m$^3$/s]</td>
<td>USGS-USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_0$ (stream slope)</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Manning’s equation [33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (water temperature)</td>
<td>[$^\circ$C]</td>
<td>Sullivan et al. [65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{50}$ (median grain size)</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
<td>Danivory [27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[NO_3^-]$ (in-stream nitrate concentration)</td>
<td>[$\mu$mol/L]</td>
<td>Loken et al. [29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[NH_4^+]$ (in-stream ammonium concentration)</td>
<td>[$\mu$mol/L]</td>
<td>Loken et al. [29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[N_2O]$ (in-stream nitrous oxide concentration)</td>
<td>[mgN$_2$O − N/L]</td>
<td>Turner et al. [13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$%N_2O_{sat}$ (saturation percentage of nitrous oxide)</td>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>P. Turner (a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Values provided by P. Turner personal communication.

Table A.1: Sufficient and necessary input parameters to capture the N$_2$O emissions from the main stem of the Upper Mississippi River (UMR).

Error will reduce significantly when the emissions are aggregated (integrated) over the relevant (sub)catchments.

Finally, Table A.2 and Table A.3 provide some main statistical parameters (NSE, PBIAS, RMSE and RSR) to assess the performance and the accuracy of the LB and WC model in predicting the measured $\Delta N_2O (mgN_2O - N/L)$.

In particular, these tables support the results proposed in Figure 4 when $v_{fden}$ is estimated using the relation proposed by Mulholland et al. [23] and by Böhlke et al. [26], respectively.
Figure A.2: Comparison between the Absolute Error ($AE_i$) and the measured water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($AE_i = |\Delta N_2O_{i}^{obs} - \Delta N_2O_{i}^{sim}|$) along the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) by using: (a) the Upper Bound, UB, power law scaling; (b) the Lower Bound, LB, power law scaling and (c) the Water Column, WC, power law scaling (as in Marzadri et al. [5]). Color of the symbols shift from green to yellow as the width of the channel increases. The uptake rate of denitrification ($v_{f,denB}$) is estimated by using the equation (11) [26].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin (-)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>RMSE $LB_M$, $WC_M$</th>
<th>NSE $LB_M$, $WC_M$</th>
<th>PBIAS $LB_M$, $WC_M$</th>
<th>RSR $LB_M$, $WC_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>0.087 0.151 0.856 0.570</td>
<td>-11.255 26.679 0.380 0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>142.05</td>
<td>0.101 0.130 0.844 0.741</td>
<td>-18.192 23.162 0.394 0.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>173.79</td>
<td>0.132 0.134 0.594 0.582</td>
<td>-25.123 22.217 0.637 0.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>193.71</td>
<td>0.154 0.134 0.393 0.538</td>
<td>-31.553 21.056 0.779 0.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>207.14</td>
<td>0.169 0.129 0.148 0.506</td>
<td>-37.456 19.804 0.923 0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>229.96</td>
<td>0.173 0.135 0.081 0.443</td>
<td>-38.588 21.137 0.959 0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>260.85</td>
<td>0.175 0.139 0.040 0.391</td>
<td>-39.551 22.455 0.980 0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>285.90</td>
<td>0.178 0.138 0.099 0.463</td>
<td>-42.290 22.370 0.949 0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>310.34</td>
<td>0.178 0.138 -0.062 0.359</td>
<td>-43.233 23.393 1.031 0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>325.49</td>
<td>0.177 0.139 -0.109 0.319</td>
<td>-43.755 24.567 1.053 0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>364.24</td>
<td>0.180 0.137 0.010 0.426</td>
<td>-46.209 24.496 0.995 0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>421.49</td>
<td>0.182 0.137 -0.103 0.377</td>
<td>-47.891 24.944 1.050 0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>502.96</td>
<td>0.187 0.137 -0.175 0.364</td>
<td>-50.088 25.362 1.084 0.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>657.11</td>
<td>0.191 0.136 -0.266 0.362</td>
<td>-52.638 25.921 1.125 0.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1198.10</td>
<td>0.195 0.136 -0.454 0.294</td>
<td>-54.601 27.230 1.206 0.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2: Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency Index (NSE), percentage of bias (PBIAS) and ratio of the root mean square error to the standard deviation of measured data (RSR) between measured and predicted water-air nitrous oxide gradient ($\Delta N_2O (\mu g N_2O - N/L)$) as a function of channel width. Data are grouped in fifteen bins (fourteen with 61 points and the last one with 62 points) with the second column representing the average channel width (m). Predictions are obtained with the Lower Bound model ($LB_M$) and the Water Column model ($WC_M$) when the uptake rate of denitrification ($v_{fden}$) is estimated using the relation proposed by Mulholland et al. [23] ($LB_M$, $WC_M$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin Width (m)</th>
<th>RMSE LB, B</th>
<th>RMSE WC, B</th>
<th>NSE LB, B</th>
<th>NSE WC, B</th>
<th>PBIAS LB, B</th>
<th>PBIAS WC, B</th>
<th>RSR LB, B</th>
<th>RSR WC, B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>-49.616</td>
<td>-5.904</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>142.05</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>-58.820</td>
<td>-10.880</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>173.79</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>-68.090</td>
<td>-12.210</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>193.71</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-1.186</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>-76.704</td>
<td>-13.868</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>207.14</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-1.936</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>-84.621</td>
<td>-15.664</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>229.96</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-2.138</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>-86.130</td>
<td>-13.734</td>
<td>1.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>260.85</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-2.267</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>-87.411</td>
<td>-11.824</td>
<td>1.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>285.90</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-1.993</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>-91.071</td>
<td>-11.935</td>
<td>1.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>310.34</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-2.561</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>-92.325</td>
<td>-10.451</td>
<td>1.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>325.49</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-2.769</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>-93.018</td>
<td>-8.754</td>
<td>1.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>364.24</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-2.298</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>-96.298</td>
<td>-8.848</td>
<td>1.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>421.49</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-2.617</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>-98.542</td>
<td>-8.193</td>
<td>1.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>502.96</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-2.768</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>-101.480</td>
<td>-7.584</td>
<td>1.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>657.11</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-2.991</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>-104.890</td>
<td>-6.772</td>
<td>1.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1198.10</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-3.515</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>-107.512</td>
<td>-4.881</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.3: Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Nash Sutcliffe Efficiency Index (NSE), percentage of bias (PBIAS) and ratio of the root mean square error to the standard deviation of measured data (RSR) between measured and predicted water-air nitrous oxide gradient \( \Delta N_2O \ (\mu g N_2O / N/L) \) as a function of channel width. Data are grouped in fifteen bins (fourteen with 61 points and the last one with 62 points) with the first column representing the average channel width (m). Predictions are obtained with the Lower Bound model (LB) and the Water Column model (WC) when the uptake rate of denitrification \( (v_{fden}) \) is estimated using the relation proposed by Böhlke et al. [26] \( (LB, B, WC, B) \).
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