Stable Isotopes of Water Vapor in the Vadose Zone: A Review of Measurement and Modeling Techniques

The stable isotopes of soil water vapor are useful tracers of hydrologic processes occurring in the vadose zone. The measurement of soil water vapor isotopic composition ($\delta^{18}O$, $\delta^2H$) is challenging due to difficulties inherent in sampling the vadose zone airspace in situ. Historically, these parameters have therefore been modeled, as opposed to directly measured, and typically soil water vapor is treated as being in isotopic equilibrium with liquid soil water. We reviewed the measurement and modeling of soil water vapor isotopes, with implications for studies of the soil–plant–atmosphere continuum. We also investigated a case study with in situ measurements from a soil profile in a semi-arid African savanna, which supports the assumption of liquid–vapor isotopic equilibrium. A contribution of this work is to introduce the effect of soil water potential ($\psi$) on kinetic fractionation during soil evaporation within the Craig–Gordon modeling framework. Including $\psi$ in these calculations becomes important for relatively dry soils ($\psi < -10$ MPa). Additionally, we assert that the recent development of laser-based isotope analytical systems may allow regular in situ measurement of the vadose zone isotopic composition of water in the vapor phase. Wet soils pose particular sampling difficulties, and novel techniques are being developed to address these issues.

**Soil water dynamics are the part of the hydrologic cycle** that is most directly relevant to vegetation dynamics and productivity (e.g., Rodriguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004). Measuring the presence, character, and fate of soil water has become standard in agricultural and ecosystem sciences. The stable isotopes of liquid soil water are routinely measured to investigate processes related to plant water uptake such as relative rooting depth (Jackson et al., 1999), recharge rates (Cane and Clark, 1999), and hydraulic redistribution (Dawson, 1993). The isotopic values of liquid soil water change in response to fractionation processes such as evaporation and condensation (Gat, 1996) and are thus dynamically linked to the isotopic values of the soil water vapor. The isotopic composition of the vapor component of soil water has been much less studied than the liquid water component, mainly due to sampling difficulties. The recent development of laser-based isotope analysis, however, may allow rapid, in situ measurement of soil vapor isotopes. Here we review the measurement and modeling of soil water vapor isotopes, with a focus on the implications of isotope fractionation processes on our understanding of ecohydrology.

The stable isotopic composition of water (δ) is defined as $\delta = \left( \frac{R}{R_{\text{std}}} - 1 \right) \times 1000$, where $R$ is the ratio of a rare (denoted $i$, e.g., $^{18}O$) to a common isotope ($^{2}H$/$^{1}H$ or $^{18}O$/$^{16}O$) in sample water, and $R_{\text{std}}$ is the same ratio of the international standard, Vienna standard mean ocean water (VSMOW) (de Laeter et al., 2003; Gonfiantini, 1978). The stable isotope composition of water is a powerful process tracer in ecology, plant physiology, meteorology, and hydrology (e.g., Brunel et al., 1992; Dawson et al., 2002; Gat, 1996; Wang et al., 2010). One of the three landmark studies that were identified in physical meteorology (Lee and Massman, 2011) is about stable isotopes of water. In this study, Craig (1961) discovered a robust relationship between O and H isotopic abundance in precipitation, a relationship now widely known as the global meteoric water line (GMWL), which has become part of the general scientific language today.

The stable isotopic composition of soil water has been used to trace water movement in the unsaturated zone (Barnes and Allison, 1988), estimate the evaporation rate (Allison and...
The isotopic composition of water in stems and roots usually reflects the isotopic composition of plant-available soil water (Flanagan and Ehleringer, 1991; White et al., 1985), although exceptions can exist in extreme environments (Ellsworth and Williams, 2007). Thus, the isotopic composition of plant stem water has been widely used to identify plant water sources (e.g., irrigation, rainwater, or groundwater) in various ecosystems (Dawson, 1996; Ehleringer and Dawson, 1992; Ehleringer et al., 1999). At the watershed scale, water isotopes can be used to trace catchment water movement and storage mechanisms (Brooks et al., 2010). At the global scale, water isotopes can be used to explore global-scale land–atmosphere interactions (Hoffmann et al., 2000), to reconstruct the past environmental parameters such as ambient temperature and relative humidity (e.g., Helliker and Richter, 2008), and to constrain primary productivity (Welp et al., 2011).

Evaporation from soil, and thus the underlying soil water vapor, can play an important role in the hydrologic cycle, particularly in dryland ecosystems (D’Odorico et al., 2007; Nicholson, 2000; Risi et al., 2010a; Yoshimura et al., 2006). These ecosystems, such as semi-arid African savannas, often have significant unvegetated patches and large diurnal and seasonal shifts in temperature and water availability, leading to important feedbacks in vegetation structure (D’Odorico et al., 2007; Nicholson, 2000; Scanlon et al., 2007). For soils in wetter environments, water movement in the liquid phase is more prominent than in the vapor phase, although vapor flux out of the soil could still be a significant component of the water cycle in these environments. These wet soils pose particular vapor sampling difficulties, which are discussed below.

The redistribution of soil water from wetter layers to drier layers at night (hydraulic redistribution) is a widespread phenomenon affecting plant community dynamics and the evaporative flux of soil water (e.g., Feidls et al., 2001; Mooney et al., 1980). In dry soils, however, diurnal shifts in soil temperature gradients can induce the movement of soil water vapor, which flows from warmer to cooler layers where it may condense (Abramova, 1969; Bittelii et al., 2008; Harmathy, 1969; Philip and de Vries, 1957) and become available to plants (Abramova, 1969). This vapor movement can occur in bare soil and have the same effect as hydraulic redistribution. For example, observations of soil water content demonstrated that the movement of water vapor in soils may enhance the ability of Larrea tridentata (DC.) Coville to maintain its photosynthesis level at lower soil water potential (Syvertsen et al., 1975) and contribute up to 40% of hourly increases in nocturnal soil moisture within the 15- to 35-cm layer in a seasonally dry ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa P. Lawson & C. Lawson) forest (Warren et al., 2011). Soil water vapor can also be transported within the soil in response to large gradients in the salt content of the soil (Kelly and Selker, 2001). In extremely dry soils, the intrusion of atmospheric vapor into the upper few centimeters of soil and its condensation can lead to biologically significant increases in the liquid soil water content (Henschel and Seely, 2008).

Land–atmosphere exchange modeling has shown that including a more spatially complex and variable evapotranspiration signal relative to precipitation improves the comparison with observations (Jouzel and Koster, 1996; Yoshimura et al., 2006). Soil water vapor isotopes can help with this parameterization through a combination of measurements and modeling. Due to practical difficulties in sampling, soil evaporation isotopic composition has traditionally been modeled rather than measured. The most commonly used model is the Craig–Gordon (CG) model (Craig and Gordon, 1965; Horita et al., 2008) formulated to estimate equilibrium and kinetic isotopic fractionation during evaporation from the ocean surface. This model has been modified for various applications (Horita et al., 2008), and recently numerical models of isotope flux from the soil have also been developed as alternatives to the CG model (Braud et al., 2005a, 2009b; Haverd and Cuntz, 2010; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; Melayah et al., 1996a). Comparisons among measured and modeled values of soil evaporate isotopic composition have shown significant deviations from the CG model (Braud et al., 2009a; Haverd et al., 2011; Rothfuss et al., 2010).

### Measurement

Measurements of soil water vapor isotopic composition are scarce (Braud et al., 2009b; Haverd et al., 2011; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; Rothfuss et al., 2010; Stewart, 1972; Striegl, 1988) due to sampling difficulties. Table 1 lists measurement and modeling methods and relevant references.

### Water Vapor Sampling and Isotope Analysis

The traditional “cold trap” sampling technique for isotope analysis of water vapor involves drawing air through a tube immersed in a dry ice–alcohol mixture (for H$_2$O) or liquid N$_2$ (for H$_2$O and CO$_2$), where the water freezes (Dansgaard, 1953; Pollock et al., 1980; Yakir and Wang, 1996). The method has been optimized for efficiency, bringing sampling times below 15 min depending on the humidity level (Helliker et al., 2002), and for portability (Peters and Yakir, 2010). Another recent approach has been the use of a molecular sieve to trap water vapor quantitatively, from which the collected sample is distilled in the laboratory (Han et al., 2006). The water sample then undergoes preparation and analysis—most commonly via isotope ratio mass spectrometry after equilibration with CO$_2$ for $\delta^{18}$O determination and reduction via Zn or U for $\delta^2$H determination, although there are many alternative preparation and sample introduction techniques as well as new optical analytical methods available (de Groot, 2009).

Cryogenic sampling of atmospheric water vapor has been performed at various scales since the first vertical profile collections in the 1960s over North America and Europe, which included sampling in both troposphere and stratosphere (Araguás-Araguás et al., 2000; Pollock et al., 1980; Rozanski, 2005). Near-surface cryogenic atmospheric water vapor sample collections have been performed in Europe, Asia, Brazil, and Israel (Risi et al., 2010b; Rozanski, 2005; Twining et
al., 2006; Yamanaka and Shimizu, 2007; Yu et al., 2005), with one group making routine collections since the early 1980s at a surface collection station in Heidelberg, Germany (Jacob and Sonntag, 1991; Rozanski, 2005).

With the development of relatively portable laser isotope analyzers (Kerstel et al., 1999), many airborne and ground-based measurements of $\delta^{18}$O and $\delta^{2}$H have been made (Griffis et al., 2010; Hanisco et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2005; Webster and Heymsfield, 2003). The laser isotope instrumentation allows direct, rapid (1–10 Hz) determination of water vapor isotopic composition, with uncertainties approaching those of traditional mass spectrometric methods (de Groot, 2009; Wang et al., 2009). There are now also remote sensing technologies that produce water isotope data for the atmosphere (Worden et al., 2007), and ground-based Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy is developing into a source of this information for the lower troposphere (Schneider et al., 2010).

### Soil Water Vapor Sampling and Isotope Analysis

Sampling of soil water vapor has been performed in the past using soil gas sampling apparatus and, as with atmospheric water vapor, cryogenic traps either in the laboratory (Stewart, 1972) or the field (Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; Striegl, 1988). The pioneering work of Zimmerman et al. (1967) on evaporative enrichment in liquid soil water isotopes included an apparatus that directly collected the vapor resulting from soil evaporation, but this condensed vapor was not analyzed. Soil gas sampling via pumping is routinely performed during the monitoring and remediation of organic solvent contamination of the subsurface. The solvent sampling and pumping devices, however, are not designed for the high concentrations and low vapor pressures that characterize soil water vapor relative to organic solvents (e.g., trichloroethylene). The vadose zone modeling efforts surrounding soil gas sampling, however, can help in estimating the area of influence for a given pumping rate and time span. For example, the USGS modeling framework MODFLOW now has a module for vadose zone gaseous transport (Panday and Huyakorn, 2008).

The main concern in the sampling of soil water vapor for isotopic analysis is the fractionation of the original isotopic composition through (i) inducing evaporation of the liquid soil water during sampling, and (ii) condensing vapor inside the sampling apparatus due to the typically saturated conditions of soil water vapor (Campbell and Norman, 1998). An approach to reduce the risk of inducing evaporation is to pump at low flow rates (<200 mL min$^{-1}$), which has produced reasonable results during initial testing (see the case study in the African savanna below). Condensation in the sampling apparatus is reduced by minimizing the tubing length, using all Teflon or high-density polyethylene materials on wettable surfaces, and insulating or even heating the tubing if necessary (Griffis et al., 2010). In wet soils, various membranes could be used to exclude liquid water from the sampling apparatus up to a certain level of pore space saturation. Once the soils reach a low air-filled porosity level, however, authentic vapor sampling becomes impossible. At this critical level, which still needs to be determined empirically for each sampling method and soil type, liquid–vapor equilibrium needs to be assumed and the liquid itself analyzed. In a novel approach

### Table 1. Summary of measurement and modeling techniques to quantify isotopic compositions of soil water vapor and soil evaporation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential methods</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isothermal equilibrium (H$_2$O, CO$_2$, H$_2$)†</td>
<td>inside the laboratory</td>
<td>Stewart (1972), Scrimgeour (1995), Hsieh et al. (1998), Richard et al. (2007), Wassenaar et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ CO$_2$–H$_2$O equilibrium†</td>
<td>in the vadose zone</td>
<td>Hesterberg and Siegenthaler (1991), Hsieh et al. (1998), Tang and Feng (2001), Wingate et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryogenic soil column vapor collection</td>
<td>inside the laboratory</td>
<td>Zimmerman et al. (1967), Stewart (1972), Braud et al. (2009a, 2009b), Rothfuss et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ cryogenic soil gas sampling</td>
<td>in the vadose zone</td>
<td>Striegl (1988), references in Mathieu and Bariac (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ sealed chamber</td>
<td>from soil surface</td>
<td>Haverd et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open chamber with mass balance</td>
<td>from soil surface</td>
<td>Wang et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ direct measurement with laser spectroscopy</td>
<td>in the vadose zone</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† These methods are used to estimate liquid soil water isotopic composition, but the details of the equilibrium and sampling methods are relevant to soil water vapor isotopes.
aimed at estimating this liquid soil water isotopic composition in situ, a membrane contactor (Membrana) has been shown to provide reliable results across a fairly wide soil temperature range (8–21°C) through the controlled evaporation of liquid soil water (Herbstreit et al., 2012).

There are two methods for estimating the liquid soil water isotopic composition that are related to soil water vapor sampling. They involve sampling and analyzing CO₂ or water vapor that is in isotopic equilibrium with the liquid soil water. The CO₂ sampling method is based on isotope equilibrium between the soil CO₂ and liquid soil water (Scrimgeour, 1995), which has been shown to be complete below the depth of atmospheric CO₂ invasion into the soil surface (Wingate et al., 2009). This depth of invasion was found to be shallower than 5 cm in Mediterranean soils (Wingate et al., 2009), which is consistent with other investigations that found good agreement between liquid soil water and CO₂ at their shallowest depths: 20 cm (Tang and Feng, 2001) and 30 cm (Hesterberg and Siegenthaler, 1991). Interestingly, although the uncatalyzed equilibrium reaction between CO₂ and H₂O reaches equilibrium in about 3 h (Dansgaard, 1953), the enzyme carbonic anhydrase acts as a catalyst in both plant leaves and soil, such that the δ¹⁸O of CO₂ is a good tracer of photosynthetic and respiratory CO₂ exchange with the atmosphere (Wingate et al., 2009). It is not clear whether soil water vapor plays a significant role in this reaction, but a calculation by Hsieh et al. (1998) estimated the added uncertainty due to reactions between different phases of water in the soil at 0.36% for δ¹⁸O. The sampling method for CO₂ is either with a chamber placed above the soil surface (e.g., Wingate et al., 2008) or a tube buried in the ground (Tang and Feng, 2001).

The second equilibration method involves placing a soil sample in a sealed plastic bag, filling the bag with dry air, and allowing the atmosphere inside the bag to reach 100% relative humidity at a constant temperature (Wassenaar et al., 2008). The bag is then punctured with a syringe connected directly to a laser isotope analyzer, the vapor is analyzed directly, and its isotopic composition is used along with the equilibration temperature to calculate the soil liquid isotopic composition. This method is instructive with respect to the rate of equilibration between liquid and vapor phases—from 10 min (free water) to 3 d (clay) at 22°C—as well as the time for the laser isotope analyzer to provide a stable signal (~300 s with a flow rate of ~150 mL min⁻¹ and a headspace of ~900 mL). For comparison with equilibration in the field, a study in the volcanic soils of Hawaii estimated an in situ equilibration time of 48 h between the δ¹⁸O of liquid soil water and soil CO₂ (Hsieh et al., 1998). Another interesting aspect of the plastic bag equilibration method is that below 5% volumetric water content, the data were apparently not useable even though the headspace reached 100% relative humidity. This method is similar to direct equilibration of soils and plants with CO₂ and H₂ in the laboratory (Scrimgeour, 1995), which was proposed as a good method for obtaining results for very dry samples (<0.5 mL of water). A comparison among CO₂ equilibration, vacuum distillation, and azeotropic distillation found fair agreement among the methods but also showed distinctly poor results for the CO₂ method in samples drier than about 5% moisture content (Hsieh et al., 1998). The equilibration methods for liquid soil water are potentially quite useful in studies of plant xylem and transpired water isotopic composition in that they could provide a better representation of plant-available water than vacuum and chemical distillation methods, which are performed at elevated temperatures and thus can access more tightly bound water in the soil (Araguás-Araguás et al., 1995; Hsieh et al., 1998; Walker et al., 1994). Further studies are needed, however, to relate soil water held at various water potentials to plant water uptake (e.g., Brooks et al., 2010), liquid–vapor equilibration times, and liquid–vapor fractionation factors.

Measuring the Isotopic Composition of Soil Evaporation

The isotopic composition of soil evaporation can be estimated through sampling the water vapor above the soil. Measurements of the near-surface atmosphere have been used for this purpose to measure vapor efflux from terrestrial ecosystems, including the “Keeling plot” approach using gradients in the isotopic composition and bulk concentration of CO₂ (Keeling, 1958), which has also been applied to water vapor (Wang et al., 2010; Yakir and Sternberg, 2000; Yépez et al., 2003). Additional methods include the flux gradient (Griffis et al., 2004; Yakir and Wang, 1996) and eddy covariance techniques (Griffis et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2005). Each of these methods involves making measurements at some altitude above the ground surface, and thus their results are applicable to a certain horizontal “footprint” from which the vapor originated. If this footprint is unvegetated, then the water vapor flux signal can be completely attributed to soil evaporation. If there is some vegetation present, however, the measured flux is from the combined evapotranspiration. Decomposing this combined signal is possible (Haverd et al., 2011; Rothfuss et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010), but the assumptions involved in estimating the transpiration and evaporation end members currently lead to a high degree of uncertainty (Good et al., 2012). Specifically, the isotopic end member for transpiration represents an integrated signal weighted by the amount of transpired water delivered by each root of each transpiring plant with the active flux footprint. If the mean rooting depth changes (e.g., grasses become active), the transpiration end member will change. Thus, characterizing this end member with time requires regular measurement of soil water isotopic composition profiles in a way that captures heterogeneity across the footprint, as well as measurement of the transpiring leaf area for plant groups with differing rooting depths (e.g., grasses, shrubs, and trees). Numerical models of soil evaporation isotopic composition, discussed below, coupled with land surface dynamic models have made some advances in this field (Braud et al., 2009a; Haverd et al., 2011).

Another method for measuring soil efflux involves placing a sealed chamber over the soil and measuring the vapors that move up into
the chamber (Haverd et al., 2011; Wingate et al., 2008). The issues with this type of measurement include making a good seal with the soil surface to avoid drawing in atmospheric air, and altering the ambient conditions of the soil. If these sources of error can be minimized, chamber methods have the potential to provide good point estimates of CO₂ and H₂O releases from the soil. Chamber measurements are still challenging, however, because they necessarily change the ambient conditions, especially with respect to wind velocities and concentration gradients for the gases of interest. Improvements are still being made, particularly with open-chamber methods (Midwood et al., 2008) and open-path isotopic composition sensors (Humphries et al., 2010).

Point estimates, however, whether from chamber methods, sampling, or in situ measurements, must be viewed with caution given the typically large degree of heterogeneity in a soil landscape (Ogée et al., 2004). For this reason, integrated landscape-scale estimates of soil evaporation will be more useful for investigating overall ecosystem functioning. Thus increasing the size of an atmospheric measurement's footprint can increase its relevance for scaling up to regional and global levels. The next step toward understanding the distribution of the soil evaporation isotopic composition across a wider range of temporal and spatial scales is modeling based on more readily available data (Braud et al., 2009a; Haverd et al., 2011) and improved mechanistic understanding (e.g., the effect of water potential on the soil evaporation isotopic composition as proposed below).

### Modeling Soil Water Vapor Isotopic Composition

Modeling efforts relating to the soil water vapor isotopic composition (δ_E) have focused on estimating the isotopic composition of soil evaporation (δ_E), with reference to the fractionation that occurs during the evaporation of liquid soil water (δ_L). The δ_E modeling has typically been performed in the framework of open-water evaporative fractionation developed by Craig and Gordon (1965), and recently numerical isotope transport models have been developed as an alternative (Braud et al., 2005a, 2009a; Haverd and Cuntz, 2010; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; Melayah et al., 1996a; Shurbaji and Phillips, 1995).

### Liquid–Vapor Equilibrium Isotopic Fractionation

Every isotope fractionation model relies on estimates of the liquid–vapor equilibrium fractionation factors \( \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O) \) and \( \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{2}H) \):

\[
\alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O) = \frac{^{18}R_L}{^{18}R_V} \tag{1}
\]

These parameters change under different environmental conditions. Temperature is the environmental parameter used for the \( \alpha_{e,L/V} \) estimates, and this relationship (\( \alpha_{e,L/V} - T \)) has been well characterized experimentally (Horita and Wesolowski, 1994; Majoube, 1971).

Efforts to model the underlying processes of the \( \alpha_{e,L/V} - T \) relationship from theory (Chialvo and Horita, 2009; Oi, 2003) have not improved on the empirical relationships that have been implemented in studies of evaporation for more than four decades (Horita et al., 2008). Thermodynamic modeling based on equations of state for various water molecule isotopolques captures the purely empirical relationships well (Japas et al., 1995; Polyakov et al., 2007). The \( \alpha_{e,L/V} - T \) relationship has only been modified slightly since Majoube (1971) to cover a larger temperature range (Horita and Wesolowski, 1994), with the current formulations given as

\[
10^3 \ln \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O) = -7.685 + 6.7123 \left( \frac{10^3}{T} \right) - 1.6664 \left( \frac{10^6}{T} \right) + 0.35041 \left( \frac{10^9}{T} \right) \tag{2}
\]

\[
10^3 \ln \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{2}H) = 1158.8 \left( \frac{T^3}{10^9} \right) - 1620.1 \left( \frac{T^2}{10^6} \right) + 794.84 \left( \frac{T}{10^3} \right) - 161.04 + 2.9992 \left( \frac{10^9}{T^3} \right) \tag{3}
\]

where \( T \) is the water temperature (K).

Three modeling approaches using (i) molecular simulation, (ii) theoretical (ab initio) calculations, and (iii) thermodynamics have recently been compiled to examine the effects of isotopic substitutions on the properties of the water molecule (Chialvo and Horita, 2009). These three approaches capture the shape of the observed \( \alpha_{e,L/V} - T \) relationships (Eq. [2] and [3]), but the difference among the models is large relative to the level of fractionation seen empirically (Table 2).

Molecular modeling is used by chemists as a supplement to experiments in an effort to understand the underlying dynamics in chemical reactions. Various modeling approaches are used to depict electron densities and molecular orbital dynamics based on energies associated with all bonded and unbounded atomic interactions.

Using molecular-based simulation, \( \alpha_{e,L/V} \) was estimated based on two contrasting models of the water molecule: Gaussian charge polarizable (GCP) and nonpolarizable extended simple point charge (SPC/E). The GCP model performed better than SPC/E but produced fractionation factors (\( \alpha_{e,L/V} \)) around 5% higher for \( \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O) \) and 500% higher for \( \alpha_{e,L/V}(^{2}H) \) than those \( \alpha_{e,L/V} \) values found experimentally at 25°C (Horita and Wesolowski, 1994; Majoube, 1971). Chialvo and Horita (2009) recognized the large
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deviations of their models from experimental data and suggested a parameterization of their $\alpha_{e,L/V}-T$ relationship that would allow experimental data to create more accurate molecular dynamics models in the future. Two ab initio ("from first principles") models using molecular orbital calculations performed somewhat better relative to empirical data, within 4% for $\alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O)$ and 66% for $\alpha_{e,L/V}(^{2}H)$ (Oi, 2003).

Lastly, two thermodynamic modeling efforts produced much better results applying solute dissolution (Japas et al., 1995) and corresponding states principle (Polyakov et al., 2007) approaches, apparently with deviations from empirical data of <0.1 and 1% for $\alpha_{e,L/V}(^{18}O)$ and $\alpha_{e,L/V}(^{2}H)$, respectively, at typical environmental temperatures. Despite their different approaches, these two thermodynamic models show very good agreement with each other, especially below 50°C. These approaches do incorporate some empirical data—e.g., vapor pressures for solutions of pure isotopically substituted water ($D_2O$ and $H_2^{18}O$).

Overall, the somewhat empirical thermodynamic modeling (Japas et al., 1995; Polyakov et al., 2007) performed much better than the purely theoretical ab initio (Oi, 2003) and molecular simulation (Chialvo and Horita, 2009) models. Most importantly, all three approaches, in spite of drastic differences in $\alpha_{e,L/V}$ show the same shape and limit characteristics. Therefore these models have the potential to provide insight into the underlying mechanisms of the robust empirical $\alpha_{e,L/V}-T$ relationships (Eq. [2] and [3]), which are still preferred for estimating $\alpha_{e,L/V}$ (Gat, 1996; Horita et al., 2008; Kim and Lee, 2011).

**Isotopic Fractionation during Evaporation from Free Water**

The empirical $\alpha_{e,L/V}$ values discussed above can be used to calculate the isotopic composition of vapor that is in isotopic equilibrium with liquid water at a given temperature. This equilibrium is probably reached in soil pore spaces where sufficient moisture is available (Braud et al., 2005a, 2005b; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996), as is illustrated with a case study below. The fractionation during evaporation from a free surface (e.g., the ocean) involves both equilibrium ($\alpha_e$) and kinetic ($\alpha_k$) fractionation, and is described here as a basis for the soil evaporation discussion that follows.

Modeling efforts that include both equilibrium and kinetic fractionation were motivated by early observations of marine water vapor being isotopically depleted relative to the equilibrium fractionation factor for a given temperature (Craig and Gordon, 1965). Thus, in addition to $\alpha_{e,L/V}$ for a given temperature at the evaporating surface ($T_0$), the parameters required for the estimation of the kinetic fractionation include relative humidity ($\theta$), diffusivity ratios of the isotopologues of interest ($D/D_i$), and an aerodynamic parameter ($\alpha$, Table 3). The variability in these kinetic parameters is dominated by the relative humidity of the air into which the water is evaporating ($\theta_A$).
which must be recalculated ($h_A'$) from the measured value at some height above the evaporating surface based on the temperature and activity of water ($a_w$) at the evaporating surface (Craig and Gordon, 1965; Horita, 2005; Horita et al., 2008; Sofer and Gat, 1975). The overall relationship was first described by Craig and Gordon (1965) and is still used to estimate isotopic fractionation during evaporation from both a free surface and soil (Gat, 1996; Horita et al., 2008):

$$
\delta_E = \frac{\delta_L/a_{e,L/V} - h_A' \delta_A - (\alpha e_{L,V} - 1) - \varepsilon_{k,L/V}}{1 - h_A' + \varepsilon_{k,L/V}}
$$

where $\delta$ are the measured isotope values at the evaporating surface, $\delta_A$ and $\varepsilon_{k,L/V}$ are the saturated vapor pressures at the atmospheric air temperature and the temperature of the evaporating surface, respectively. See the Appendix for full parameter descriptions with units. The weighting term $r_m/r$ is assumed to be 1 for small
water bodies, but can reach 0.5 for strongly evaporating systems like the Mediterranean Sea (Gat, 1996). As summarized in Horita et al. (2008), the CG model is a physically based model where the air–water interface is at isotopic equilibrium. Above this interface is a laminar flow layer of variable thickness, which accounts for additional fractionation due to differences in the molecular diffusivities of isotopologues. This laminar layer is followed by a turbulent mixing layer, which does not contribute to isotope fractionation. The effect of the aerodynamic parameter \( n \) (\( n = 0.5 \) for free water, \( 1 \) for completely laminar flow as in very dry soil, see below) is to reduce the kinetic fractionation due to the reduced role of molecular diffusion when the turbulent layer interacts strongly with the evaporating surface. Higher humidity leads to reduced kinetic fractionation, but its overall effect on \( \delta_E \) is not straightforward because an increased \( h_A \) leads to both a larger numerator and a lower denominator in Eq. [4]. Interestingly, the thermodynamic activity of water \( (a_w \text{, between } \sim 0.6 \text{ in brines to } 1 \text{ in fresh water}) \) acts to increase the normalized humidity \( h_A^{-1} \) for evaporation from saline water. The same is true for evaporation from soils, as introduced below, when the soil water potential is used to calculate the activity of soil water. Thus, a reduced activity of water leads to limited evaporative enrichment in saline water relative to fresh water exposed to the same conditions (Horita, 2005). The necessary field measurements to make a CG calculation are discussed below with the case study. The appropriate height for making the atmospheric measurements is above the turbulent mixing layer, given that these values are meant to represent the “free atmosphere” (Craig and Gordon, 1965; Horita et al., 2008), although this condition is probably not fully satisfied for many applications of the CG model.

In addition to normalized humidity, the representation of diffusive fractionation has a great effect on \( \delta_E \) modeled from CG (Braud et al., 2009a). Cappa et al. (2003) provided significantly revised diffusivities of water isotopologues \( (D/D, \text{ in Eq. [7]}) \) Table 2) based on gas kinetic theory as well as experimental results and emphasized the use of skin temperature rather than bulk temperature for fractionation calculations; however, evidence for surface cooling during evaporation from natural water bodies is not yet available. Thus, the diffusivities of Merlivat (1978) are still generally preferred (Lee et al., 2007). Recent evaluations and experimental results from Luz et al. (2009) have also suggested that the Merlivat (1978) values are still valid. If an evaporating body is not well mixed, however, lower temperatures apparently do develop in the top 0.5 mm, and if this temperature structure persists, Cappa et al. (2003) clearly showed that diffusivities and associated kinetic fractionation factors can be quite different from those calculated based on the temperature of the bulk water. This enhanced fractionation may be counteracted by the accumulation of enriched isotopologues at the surface, given the lack of mixing required for significant surface cooling to occur (Horita et al., 2008).

Modeling the Isotopic Composition of Soil Water Vapor and Soil Evaporation

Due to the difficulty in soil water vapor isotope (\( \delta_V \)) sampling in the past, there is little information on \( \delta_V \) directly collected from soil profiles (Mathieu and Bariac, 1996). Direct measurements of in situ soil water vapor \( \delta_V \) are now possible and will provide a direct check for the utilization of the CG model under various conditions, especially for dry soils. An important missing component in the application of the CG model to soil evaporation is the effect of the water potential on the activity of water, which can be easily incorporated with measurements of soil moisture or soil water potential, as developed below.

In recent years, transport-based isotope models such as SiSPAT-Isotope (Braud et al., 2005a, 2009a) and Soil-Litter-Iso (Haverd and Cuntz, 2010; Haverd et al., 2011) have been developed to model soil \( \delta_V \), building from analytical solutions for idealized cases that were developed previously (Barnes and Allison, 1983). The Soil-Litter-Iso model was compared with other analytical frameworks (Haverd and Cuntz, 2010), and recent testing of the model against water vapor isotopic composition data from a chamber placed on top of the soil yielded very promising results. The model captured diurnal patterns and a 10-d dry-down quite well, although a mean deviation of around 10‰ was observed for \( \delta^2H \) between measured and modeled values (Haverd et al., 2011). The SiSPAT-Isotope model was tested using a laboratory column setup, and parameters were calibrated to maximize the model–data agreements. The results indicate that the evaporative enrichment process is very sensitive to changes in kinetic fractionation (Braud et al., 2009a).

The numerical models have introduced many important soil parameters, such as soil moisture, tortuosity, and water potential, which are not explicitly considered in the CG modeling framework. The effect of these parameters could be lumped into the kinetic isotope fractionation factor \( (\alpha_k) \) to improve the agreement between model output and observational data for each time step and soil layer in the model. The missing key component to test these effects is the direct measurement of \( \delta_E \) and authentic \( \delta_V \) measurements. The mass-balance framework developed by Wang et al. (2012) for direct and continuous quantification of the isotopic composition of leaf transpiration could be adopted for quantifying soil \( \delta_V \) from measurements, which then can be verified using authentic in situ soil water vapor \( \delta_V \) measurements.

The surface boundary condition of the most recent bare soil evaporation numerical model provides an isotope evaporative flux based on equilibrium \( (\alpha_e) \) and kinetic fractionation \( (\alpha_k) \) factors, as well as heat and moisture conservation equations solved for the soil–air interface (Haverd and Cuntz, 2010). The \( \alpha_k \) calculation involves adjusting the molecular diffusivity ratio of isotopologues by the aerodynamic parameter \( n \), analogous to Eq. [5]:

\[
\alpha_{k,L/V} = \left( \frac{D_{L}}{D} \right)^n
\]
This equation has taken on various forms in models, as summarized and evaluated by Braud et al. (2005b). In an attempt to incorporate the laminar flow development of the soil as it dries, \( n \) is related to the volumetric soil moisture (\( \theta \)) as first proposed by Mathieu and Bariac (1996) and adopted in subsequent numerical models (Braud et al., 2005b, 2009a; Haverd and Cuntz, 2010). This relationship allows \( n \) to vary between 0.5 for saturated conditions and 1 for dry soil ("residual" soil moisture) where the laminar layer will have fully developed:

\[
n = \left( \frac{\theta_0 - \theta_r}{\theta_s - \theta_r} \right) n_s + \left( \frac{\theta_0 - \theta_r}{\theta_s - \theta_r} \right) n_a
\]

where \( n_a = 0.5 \) and \( n_s = 1 \), and subscripts \( r, s \), and 0 refer to saturated, residual, and ambient soil moisture content at the evaporating surface, respectively. In the original formulation, \( \theta_s \) was defined as the minimum soil moisture reached when the soil is in equilibrium with the atmosphere (Mathieu and Bariac, 1996).

The numerical models also include the humidity of the soil modeled from the soil water potential as part of their evaporative flux formulation (Braud et al., 2005a, 2009a; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996); however, they do not take into account the relationship between the water potential and the activity of the water, \( a_w \), which is provided by the Kelvin equation (Barnes and Gentile, 2011; Gee et al., 1992):

\[
\ln(a_w) = \frac{\psi_0 M_w}{R T_0 \rho_w}
\]

where \( \psi_0 \) is soil water potential (kPa) of the evaporating surface, \( M_w \) is the molecular weight of water (18.0148 g mol\(^{-1}\)), \( R \) is the ideal gas constant (8.3145 mL MPa mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)), \( \rho_w \) is the density of water, and \( T_0 \) is the temperature (K) of the evaporating surface.

The activity of water is equivalent to the relative humidity in the soil under liquid–vapor equilibrium, a relationship that is commonly used to measure the water potential in soils through devices that measure the dew point in a sealed chamber that contains a soil sample (Gee et al., 1992). When considered with the CG model framework, a reduction in \( a_w \) increases the normalized humidity \( \hat{b}_h \) (Eq. [6]), reducing the normalized humidity \( \hat{b}_h \) (Eq. [5]), and ultimately affecting the \( \hat{b}_c \) calculation (Eq. [4]). This modification of \( \hat{b}_h \) is identical to normalizing using the activity of water in saline waters (Horita et al., 2008). Thus, it can be easily incorporated into CG formulations by combining Eq. [6] and [9]. The effect of including the water potential in a CG model calculation of \( \hat{b}_c \) is illustrated with measurements of a soil profile at Mpala Research Center, Kenya in the case study below.

In addition to the effects of the water potential on fractionation during evaporation, the relationship between equilibrium fractionation in soils and the water potential has yet to be rigorously described. There are strong indications from the equilibration of CO\(_2\) with soil water that dry soils exhibit a different equilibrium behavior than wet soils (Hsieh et al., 1998; Wassenaar et al., 2008).

An interesting early experiment on water isotopic fractionation in clays (Stewart, 1972) used a saturated KCl solution as the moisture source for vapor that was allowed to equilibrate with a thin layer of dried clay. In this KCl vapor–clay system, a wide range of isotopic fractionation factors was observed [\( \alpha_{L/V}^{2H} \text{KCl} = 0.93–1.06 \)] with a median of 1.04; HDO concentration ratios of Stewart (1972) were divided by the estimated \( \alpha_{L/V}^{2H} \text{KCl} = 1.06 \). The temperatures weren’t controlled, and a value of \( \alpha_{L/V}^{2H} \text{KCl} = 1.06 \) would require a temperature >40°C using Eq. [3] (Horita and Wesolowski, 1994). Nevertheless, the indication is that \( \alpha_{L/V}^{2H} \text{KCl} \) can have a wide range but with values below the isotopic fractionation factor for free water at a given temperature. Interestingly, the recent analogous work with porous silica tubes instead of clays (Richard et al., 2007) found \( \alpha_{L/V}^{2H} \) values of around 1.03 at 20% relative humidity and 1.05 at 80% relative humidity at around 20°C, compared with 1.085 from Eq. [3]. Thus, these results are somewhat consistent with the less-controlled early study with clays, suggesting that the equilibrium isotopic fractionation between vapor and water adsorbed on clays is lower than the free water value at the same temperature.

A final consideration toward understanding the isotopic composition of soil water vapor is the organization of water molecules within the liquid phase. It has been shown that enriched isotopologues exist at higher concentrations near dissolved ions and thus near particle surfaces (Phillips and Bentley, 1987). Given this structure, there could potentially be a concentration of depleted isotopes near the evaporating surface of pore water. This “hydration sphere isotope effect” would cause isotopic differences between the bulk water and the evaporating surface and require a stagnant solution, similar to the skin temperature effect shown by Cappa et al. (2003). The impact of isotopic gradients within individual pockets of liquid soil water on \( \hat{b}_c \) has not been explored. If an isotopic difference exists between the bulk water and the evaporating surface, this could be another reason to use equilibration analytical methods on undisturbed soils for estimating the liquid isotopic composition (Herbstritt et al., 2012; Hsieh et al., 1998; Scrimgeour, 1995; Wassenaar et al., 2008).

The isotopic composition of soil evaporation is the result of several different fractionation processes. First, the phase change
and equilibrium processes within the soil matrix are governed by temperature and the soil water potential. Kinetic fractionation is affected by the physical characteristics of the diffusion path (e.g., tortuosity) as well as isotopic gradients between the site of evaporation and the initiation of turbulent mixing just above the soil surface. Vapor moving vertically through the soil will also probably re-equilibrate with the liquid water along its path. The overall apparent fractionation between liquid water at any given depth and the resultant evaporative flux leaving the soil surface reflects all of these fractionation processes. As the liquid water sources for soil evaporation fluctuate in depth and isotopic composition, modeling the soil evaporation isotopic end member accurately at any given time becomes very difficult. Thus, techniques for measuring the evaporated vapor itself will be very important as this field moves forward.

**Case Study: Soil Water Vapor in an African Savanna**

An example of direct soil water vapor isotope measurement is shown in Fig. 1, with data from a single profile collected at Mpala Research Centre, Kenya, on 29 Mar. 2011 from 12:45 to 13:00 h. The soil is a red sandy loam with a bulk density of 1.45 g cm$^{-3}$ and a porosity of 0.45. The vegetation is mixed semiarid savanna, and the local mean annual precipitation is around 600 mm. Soil vapor was sampled at four depths (5, 10, 20, and 30 cm; sampled in depth order starting with 5 cm) via buried Teflon tubing, with the final 10 cm of each tube perforated and packed with glass wool. Soil vapor was drawn directly into a laser water vapor isotope analyzer (DLT100, Los Gatos Research) at a flow rate of 150 to 180 mL min$^{-1}$, diluted with ambient air (intake at 2 m above ground) for a total flow of 400 mL min$^{-1}$. This dilution allowed reduced flow rates at the soil vapor intakes and lowered the humidity in the tubing and analytical equipment to reduce the chance of condensation forming. Data were collected for around 90 s at each depth. The soil temperature was measured with Campbell Scientific TCAV averaging soil temperature probes at 5 and 20 cm, and a linear profile was assumed for 10 and 30 cm. The ambient atmospheric water vapor isotopic composition, humidity, and temperature were sampled at 2 m above the ground surface. Soil samples were collected from an auger hole adjacent to the buried tubing immediately after vapor sampling. The water potential was measured via a Decagon Devices WP4T dew point potentiometer. Liquid soil water was isolated via cryogenic vacuum distillation (West et al., 2006) and analyzed with a continuous-flow water vapor isotope analyzer using a heated nebulizer for sample introduction (WVISS, Los Gatos Research).

Equilibrium water vapor isotopic compositions were calculated for each depth based on the respective measured liquid soil water isotopic composition, soil temperature, and the associated fractionation factors (Eq. [1–3]). For each depth, the corresponding CG modeled values were calculated in two ways: (i) conventionally, using Eq. [2–8] assuming $a_w = 1$ [Fig. 1; Table 3; $\delta_{E}(0,T')$]; and (ii) including the soil water potential by calculating $a_w$ with Eq. [9] [$\delta_{E}(0,T',\psi)$]. The parameters for CG calculations are given in Table 3 with specific examples and typical ranges.

The measured soil vapor isotopic values fell close to those that would be expected for isotopic equilibrium at the temperature for each depth (Fig. 1). The measured values cover a reduced range (−4.0 to −2.2‰ for $\delta^{18}O$ relative to the equilibrium values (−75 to 4.1‰ for $\delta^{18}O$), but have similar mean values of −2.8 and −3.0‰ for $\delta^{18}O$ and −57 and −65‰ for $\delta^2H$, respectively. These mean values are weighted by soil moisture contents ($\theta_s$) of 5.3, 6.0, 6.2, and 6.6% (v/v) for the 5-, 10-, 20-, and 30-cm depths, respectively. The fact that the measured vapor isotopic values fall in a smaller range, but within the calculated equilibrium values, suggests that either the sampling process induced mixing of vapor from various depths or that the vapor is somewhat mixed within the sampling depths at this time of day. Sampling-induced mixing is likely given that around 0.5 to 0.6 L of soil was influenced by the sampling at each depth. Subtracting the volumetric water contents from a porosity of 0.45 gives air-filled porosity values of 0.38 to 0.39, resulting in a radius of influence of about 7 cm around each perforated section of tubing, suggesting that the sampling depths overlapped to some degree. The three sets of values—liquid, measured vapor, and equilibrium vapor—have similar slopes of 3.1, 3.4, and 3.0 ($\delta^2H$ vs. $\delta^{18}O$). Although this

![Fig. 1. Measured and calculated isotope values of liquid- ($\delta_l$) and vapor-phase ($\delta_v$) water from a soil profile sampled 29 Mar. 2011 in a sandy loam soil at the Mpala Research Center, Kenya (see Table 3). Sampling depths are shown for the liquid soil water samples, and each set of vapor values follows the same depth sequence. Two sets of $\delta_v$ values are shown: $\delta_v$(meas) was measured directly in the field with a water vapor isotope analyzer (DLT-100, Los Gatos Research Inc.); $\delta_v$(equil) was calculated using soil temperature and liquid soil water isotopic composition (Eq. [1–3]). Craig–Gordon model isotopic values of the evaporate ($\delta_E$) were calculated in two ways: $\delta_E(0,T)$ was calculated conventionally, considering volumetric water content $\theta$ and soil temperature $T$ (Eq. [2–8]); $\delta_E(0,T,\psi)$ was calculated by adding by considering soil water potential $\psi$ (Eq. [2–9]). Also shown is the isotopic ratio of the atmosphere ($\delta_A$); GMWL is the global meteoric water line.](www.VadoseZoneJournal.org)
level of consistency among slopes is encouraging within the scope of this study, a second study is needed to examine the differences in these slopes relative to differences in fractionation factors as well as the combined uncertainties in $\delta^2$H and $\delta^{18}$O. Interestingly, the measured soil water vapor isotope values are much closer to the equilibrium vapor isotope values than the CG-modeled $\delta_E$ values (Fig. 1). This example is therefore consistent with the typical assumption of isotopic equilibrium between liquid and vapor in the soil (e.g., Mathieu and Bariac, 1996).

The effect of including water activity (i.e., the soil water potential, $\psi$) in the CG calculations depends on the relationships among equilibrium vapor, ambient vapor, and ambient humidity. To examine these relationships as well as the effect of including soil water content ($\theta$), we made a series of CG calculations starting with the 5-cm-depth parameters of Fig. 1 and Table 3. We varied $\psi_0$ and calculated $\theta_0$ using a relationship of the form

$$\theta = \left( \frac{a}{-\psi} \right)^{1/b}$$

[10]

where $a = 0.00109$ and $b = 3.46$ based on 410 paired measurements of $\psi$ and $\theta$ for 14 separate drying experiments. The measured values ranged from $-0.2$ to $-61$ MPa for $\psi$ and 1 to 41% (v/v) for $\theta$.

We then calculated $\delta_E$ using Eq. [2–9] (Fig. 2, solid black lines). We also varied three atmospheric parameters: $T_A^h$, the isotopic ratio of the atmosphere $\delta_A^h$, and $h_A$ (Fig. 2, dashed black lines). Lastly, we made the same calculations without considering $\psi$ (i.e., $n = 1$) or $\psi$ (i.e., $a_w = 1$), and used both conventional (Merlivat, 1978) and revised (Cappa et al., 2003) values for equilibrium isotope fractionation factors (Fig. 2, gray lines). From these calculations it is clear that for drying soils, the effect of including $\psi$ can be similar to or greater than the effect of changing $\theta$ (i.e., changing $n$ from 0.5 to 1). Including $\psi$ (Eq. [8]), which leads to $n = 0.5$ in the wettest soils ($\theta_0$ close to 0 MPa), leads to more enriched $\delta_E$ values in wetter soils. Including $\psi$ (Eq. [9]) apparently leads to the opposite effect, with more enriched $\delta_E$ values in drier soils. Both mechanisms can be correct, with the former (lower $n$ and higher $\delta_E$ in wetter soils) describing the decrease in kinetic fractionation as the soil evaporation becomes more controlled by atmospheric turbulence than by diffusion in the soil (Mathieu and Bariac, 1996). The latter (higher $b_A^h$ and higher $\delta_E$ in drier soils) simply describes the effect of lower water activity on the saturation vapor pressure in the soil. This soil water potential effect can also be as large as the effect of using the drastically different diffusivity ratios of Cappa et al. (2003) rather than those of Merlivat (1978).

**Conclusions**

We have summarized all the available modeling and field methods to quantify the isotopic composition of water vapor, with a focus on the soil–plant–atmosphere continuum. When applying the CG modeling framework to soil evaporation, we suggest the inclusion of the soil water potential in the normalization of “free atmosphere” humidity to the evaporating surface (Eq. [6] and [9]), just as water activity is included in the normalization for evaporation from saline waters. This will reduce the total fractionation for evaporation from unsaturated soils as predicted by the CG model. Such a reduction is consistent with observations of enriched soil water vapor and can be significant in soils with water potentials drier than around $-10$ MPa. This improvement is easily implemented in all CG formulations, and the only additional measurement required is the soil water potential. This parameter can also be calculated from the soil water content using an appropriate soil water retention curve. There is also a possibility that leaf water potential could be used to improve the use of normalized humidity in application of the CG model to evaporative isotopic enrichment in leaves (e.g., Cuntz et al., 2007), although the
leaf water potential is highly variable and more difficult to estimate than the soil water potential.

Another feature of isotopic fractionation in soil water that is likely to change through experimentation is the equilibrium fractionation factor. The equilibrium fractionation for free water is still represented empirically. The indication from experiments between vapor and water adsorbed onto clay and silica tubes is that liquid–vapor equilibrium fractionation is substantially reduced in a porous medium setting relative to free water. The structure of water changes in confined spaces, and it is expected that the nature of pore spaces in different types of soils will lead to different equilibrium fractionation factors. The use of stable isotopes of water vapor in understanding the soil–plant–atmosphere continuum at various scales depends on an accurate understanding of fractionation processes and the associated modeling of isotopic fluxes in the environment. The relatively new analytical capabilities for water vapor isotopes coupled with novel sampling approaches under development will provide the necessary data to follow these fractionation processes in situ.

**Appendix: Definitions**

The isotope nomenclature used here is consistent with the most recent guidelines (Coplen, 2011) where the decimal values are used in all calculations and per-mil (‰) values are used for display purposes only. We use the term "vapor" to refer to water vapor only, and other gaseous constituents are referred to as gas. We are explicit about the direction of the isotopic fractionation factors (e.g., $\alpha_{LV} = R_L/R_V = \varepsilon_{LV}/(1 + \varepsilon_{LV})$), and where no isotope is specified, $\alpha$ can refer to either O or H fractionation.

- $a_w$ thermodynamic activity of water
- $D$ diffusion coefficient, with subscript $i$ indicating the minor isotopologue, m$^2$ s$^{-1}$
- $e_{i0}$ saturation vapor pressure at the evaporating surface, kPa
- $e_{iA}$ saturation vapor pressure in the atmosphere, kPa
- $b_{i0}$ humidity of the evaporating surface
- $b_{iA}$ humidity of the atmosphere; $b_{iA}$ is normalized to the evaporating surface
- $n$ aerodynamic parameter for adjusting diffusivity ratios
- $iR_p$ isotope ratio of minor isotopologue $i$ to the abundant isotopologue in phase $p$
- $R$ ideal gas constant, L kPa mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$, distinguished from the isotope ratio (e.g., $^{18}R_1$) by having no superscripts or subscripts
- $T_0$ temperature of the evaporating surface, K
- $T_A$ temperature of the atmosphere, K
- $\alpha_k$ kinetic isotopic fractionation factor
- $\alpha_k$ equilibrium isotopic fractionation factor
- $\delta_A$ relative difference of isotope ratios of the atmosphere
- $\delta_E$ relative difference of isotope ratios of the evaporate
- $\delta_L$ relative difference of isotope ratios of soil liquid
- $\delta_V$ relative difference of isotope ratios of soil vapor
- $\varepsilon_k$ kinetic isotopic fractionation ($\varepsilon_k = \alpha_k - 1$)
- $\rho_w$ density of water, kg m$^{-3}$
- $\psi_0$ water potential at the evaporating surface, MPa
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