

Comment on hess-2021-146

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee 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-RC2>, 2021

General Comments

The authors of the comment (referred to below as Stewart, 2021) provide a detailed discussion of the value of tritium analyses to constrain the travel time of streamflow, in response to a previously published paper in HESS (referred to below as Rodriguez, 2021). The comment (Stewart, 2021) specifically discusses the apparent "truncation" of travel time distributions (TTDs) derived from stable isotopes when compared to TTDs derived from tritium. This "truncation" is discussed by Rodriguez, 2021, as one of the incentives for the original study, to include both stable isotopes (i.e. 2H) and tritium, within the age-ranked storage selection framework (SAS). By doing that, the original paper (Rodriguez, 2021) is a very valuable contribution to the scientific literature.

Specific Comments

It appears that the comment (Stewart, 2021) hinges on the interpretation of one sentence in the abstract of Rodriguez, 2021, quoted in Stewart, 2021 on line 23:

"We conclude that stable isotopes do not seem to systematically underestimate travel times or storage compared to tritium." (Rodriguez, 2021)

More specifically, in the conclusion section of Rodriguez, 2021, the authors "conclude that the perception that stable isotopes systematically truncate the tails of TTDs may not be valid." (Rodriguez, 2021)

They continue and recommend to "compare streamflow TTD and storage

from the two tracers in larger catchments where older water is expected in order to give tritium more time to decay and to better leverage its ability to point out the presence of very old water." (Rodriguez, 2021)

Considering the sentences in the conclusion section, I interpret the abstract line to be a site-specific conclusion, rather than a broad conclusion that the truncation hypothesis is "generally invalidated" (as stated by Stewart, 2021, on line 34).

The comment (Stewart, 2021) expands the interpretation of the limited conclusion by Rodriguez and states that it "does not mean that such old water does not exist in other catchments and therefore that the truncation hypothesis should be rejected for all catchments." I do not think Rodriguez intended to convey such a broad conclusion.

Recommendation

In my view, the commentary does not specifically respond to the conclusions of the Rodriguez paper, but rather to a broader interpretation that the original authors may not have intended to convey. As such, I have recommended to reject the publication of this comment as a response to the Rodriguez paper.

In case the comment proceeds to publication, I have provided additional comments and suggestions below.

Specific Comments (continued)

L70 (Figure 1) It would be insightful to include the model curves for samples collected in 2010 or 2000 or 1990. For those decades, tritium may have been even less conclusive as an age tracer in streams in the Northern hemisphere. At the same time, high-frequency stable isotope studies became accessible, and was applied in northern hemisphere high-precipitation, low-ET catchments. The collective understanding of watershed response times may have been influenced by the availability of data during these decades.

L77: WHY $f=0.7$? This seems arbitrary.

L94: "significant seasonal variation"

This is very relevant if precipitation and evapotranspiration are out of phase. Obviously, evapotranspiration is expected to remove more water in summer (when tritium concentrations in precipitation are higher) than in winter (when tritium concentrations in precipitation are lower). The degree of seasonality in evapotranspiration and tritium in precipitation, as well as the amount of mixing in the root zone, contribute to a possible bias of lower tritium concentrations in the stream, which would be interpreted as older ages.

An example (related to the cold-season-bias) is given by:

Jasechko, S.; Wassenaar, L. I.; Mayer, B., Isotopic evidence for widespread cold-season-biased groundwater recharge and young streamflow across central Canada. *Hydrological Processes* 2017, 31, (12), 2196-2209.

L160: In addition, even if older TTs derived from tritium were selectively collected during base flow conditions, that would still be evidence that the stable isotope data collected year-round fail to capture the old component in baseflow.

L163: This first point also reflects (in my opinion) a sampling bias with respect to stable isotopes and tritium to derive residence times, specifically related to the choice of the isotope applied, sampled, analyzed, interpreted, and published. Isotopic tracer studies often build on prior hydrological investigations and limited research funds are directed towards the isotopic analyses that are expected to be most valuable. Stable isotopes have been applied more often in smaller catchments with faster response times and shorter (expected) residence times, whereas tritium has more often been applied in larger river basins with longer residence times. Recent studies combining both tracers have shown that a residence time interpretation of stable isotopes may be hiding the longer tail of the distribution that can be observed by tritium. However, Rodriguez shows that this is not the case in the Weierbach catchment.

L183: "no issue... of interest." is not clear to me.

L186: The short term variability of tritium is still poorly understood and so far have mostly been a nuisance for applying tritium as a short-term age tracer, although recent advances using the origin of precipitation are promising:

van Rooyen, J. D.; Palcsu, L.; Visser, A.; Vennemann, T. W.; Miller, J. A., Spatial and temporal variability of tritium in precipitation within South Africa and its bearing on hydrological studies. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 2021, 226, 106354.

Visser, A.; Thaw, M.; Esser, B., Analysis of air mass trajectories to explain observed variability of tritium in precipitation at the Southern Sierra Critical Zone Observatory, California, USA. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 2018, 181, 42-51.

L197: "Instead .. favoured." The design of such long term studies would also benefit from deliberately collecting tritium samples during high and low flow conditions throughout the

study period to capture the time-variance of TTDs in response to hydrological conditions.

L198: "Eventually, ... single tritium measurements." In my opinion, no single tritium measurement will be able to capture the TTD of streamflow. This statement should be removed or reworded.

One tritium measurement may be able to constrain the mean travel time parameter of a TTD which shape needs to be assumed a priori.

Technical Comments

L19: Please also include the Van der Velde paper presenting the SAS/STOP function concept:

Van der Velde, Y.; Torfs, P. J. J. F.; Van der Zee, S. E. A. T. M.; Uijlenhoet, R., Quantifying catchment-scale mixing and its effect on time-varying travel time distributions. *Water Resources Research* 2012, 48, (6), W06536.

L45: As the travel times are a consequence of the physical and climatic characteristics of the watershed, b) should/could precede a).

L50: I find it more useful to express catchment fluxes per unit area (in terms of m or mm, rather than volumetrically)

L100: "using": That study didn't really "use" the variation of tritium in precipitation, but rather carefully incorporated it into the SAS modeling to avoid an old-tritium-age bias due to the strong seasonality of both ET and precipitation variation.

L140: A thorough analysis of the (in)ability of seasonal tracer cycles to quantify mean transit times is provided by Kirchner (2016, HESS).

Kirchner, J. W., Aggregation in environmental systems–Part 1: Seasonal tracer cycles quantify young water fractions, but not mean transit times, in spatially heterogeneous catchments. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 2016, 20, (1), 279-297.

L170: It would be helpful to provide a rebuttal to each argument listed here. (As is done

for 1.)

L186: "In addition, to" Remove comma.