

Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., community comment CC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-146-CC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on hess-2021-146

Nicolas Rodriguez

Community comment on "Comment on "A comparison of catchment travel times and storage deduced from deuterium and tritium tracers using StorAge Selection functions" by Rodriguez et al. (2021)" by Michael Kilgour Stewart et al., Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-146-CC1>, 2021

We thank Stewart et al. for engaging in a discussion on our contribution. We also thank Francesc Gallart for contributing to this discussion. Here, we take the opportunity to clarify and re-iterate on several key points.

While we agree with Stewart et al. that tritium is an extremely useful tracer in catchment hydrology, with a high information content (in the case of Rodriguez et al. 2021, higher than stable isotopes), we believe that the reasoning put forward in the comment is flawed. Indeed, in the comment, catchments (as highly dynamic systems) are treated as systems at steady state. Thus, the finding of different travel times can simply be an artifact of the mathematical approach chosen by Stewart et al. because the latter is nowadays known to be a hindrance to deriving more realistic travel times.

We would like to clarify on the claim "that no significant old water (beyond the range that can be resolved by stable isotopes) was identified by ^3H in the Weierbach Catchment stream does not mean that such old water does not exist in other catchments". We agree that old water contributions exist in other catchments, and that those can be older than the ones observed in the Weierbach. However, we disagree with the notion that different travel times are identified with both tracers, as this notion lacks any physical process-based explanation, and it can most likely be explained by limitations in the previously applied age-dating models for stable isotopes and tritium. With increasing mean/median travel times and contributions of old water in streamflow, we can surely assume that the identifiability of model parameters solely based on stable isotopes becomes increasingly difficult. However, the travel time of a water parcel physically has only one median age, and the parameters calibrated with stable isotopes can still suggest the presence of old water even if they are not clearly identifiable due to increased uncertainties.

Furthermore, in the framework of time-varying travel times derived through SAS functions, the discussion on the differences between SH and NH tritium concentrations in precipitation is not completely relevant. We did not need the current tritium values in the stream to be very different from the water that was recharged decades ago. As explained in the discussion section of Rodriguez et al. (2021), we did not only rely on tritium radioactive decay to age-date water. The method we used can accommodate any tritium input signal. The tritium input signal will, however, affect how much information on water ages can be extracted with the method (we showed how this information can be quantified). We simply accounted for radioactive decay, and the decay likely allows

identifying model parameters more precisely compared to stable isotopes for catchments with longer travel times and larger contributions of old water. That being said, it would be interesting to evaluate whether the information content in the tritium input is higher in the SH compared to the NH. This can be tested in a more robust way than in this comment, and we invite Stewart et al. to apply our framework to test whether their suggestion holds against data.

We do not support the recommendation in the comment by Stewart et al. to keep sampling tritium sparsely over longer periods. This will very likely bias the tritium data towards hydrological recessions, which by definition will more likely contain older water. Also, this will most likely entirely miss the short-lasting events associated with younger water. We want to re-iterate here that findings from early work with tritium showed the potential of tritium for revealing young water contributions. These studies tend to be overlooked. Contrary to the suggestion in this comment, we encouraged sampling tritium across the full range of flow stages in catchments to avoid this potential issue.

We perceive some circular reasoning in the submitted comment, which is problematic. In the comment, the TTD is assumed, to deduce what the tracer signal in the stream should be, to deduce that the tracer should not allow for discriminating young and old water *in cases where the TTD is exactly as assumed* (this point is not emphasized enough in the comment). The real question is: is the assumed TTD realistic and accurate (especially bearing in mind the steady-state assumption)? A completely different TTD model (for example, multimodal, with both young and old water) could yield a very different perspective. More importantly, this reasoning is based on a steady-state assumption, while many more situations are possible in unsteady conditions. Virtually anything is possible in unsteady conditions, while the steady-state assumption is extremely constraining for deriving general conclusions on the link between TTDs and tracers. The presented comparison between ^2H and ^3H in the comment is based on different sampling strategies, which by design target different portions of the TTD. It is not so surprising that the MTTs differ, especially with a steady-state approach. Travel times are highly dynamic, even if inferred from tritium only, and the same discharge can be associated with vastly different median travel times (for instance, see figure 9 in Rodriguez et al., 2018). We thus argued that a fair comparison between the tracers needs to use tracer data sets that are as close to each other as possible, in a consistent time-varying mathematical framework.

Other comments:

- L45-47: This “range” is a strong a priori assumption based on several limitations, and it is precisely what we questioned in our work.
- L48-54: We already discussed about storage S in the Weierbach catchment (section 4.4.1 in our paper). Estimating MTT from S/Q with Q the catchment runoff is wrong. The total flux through the catchment needs to be used instead. Moreover, this method too is valid only in steady-state conditions.

To conclude, recent work suggests that there is no absolute truncation issue. The perceived “truncation” may rather have resulted from what was a too restrictive conceptualization of tritium-based TTD estimations, as also suggested by recent progress in travel time research.

We fully agree with the authors of this comment on the importance of using tritium for travel time analyses, but we disagree on the fact that keeping this long-standing perception that tritium can, by default, show us this “invisible” old water will be helpful. This old water is invisible only if we choose to make it mathematically or numerically inexistent (of course there may be additional challenges of equifinality when working with a single tracer). We think that it is time to challenge our long-standing assumptions, to

give up our limiting strong a priori assumptions, and to embrace the possibilities offered by the new theoretical frameworks and by the new sampling and measurement techniques. We would like to invite Stewart et al. to apply our proposed mathematical framework allowing for time variance and multimodality in TTDs to their available datasets for testing and quantifying their proposed claims. Our code is accessible online:

https://git.lis.lu/catchment-eco-hydro/composite_sas_model_2h_3h_weierbach

Rodriguez, N. B., McGuire, K. J., & Klaus, J. (2018). Time-varying storage–Water age relationships in a catchment with a Mediterranean climate. *Water Resources Research*, 54, 3988– 4008. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017WR021964>