Physical and isotopic characterization of evaporation from Sphagnum moss
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S U M M A R Y

Evaporation from and water transfer within living and dead (but undecomposed) Sphagnum mosses is important biologically and hydrologically, but understanding of the internal mass-transfer mechanisms remains incomplete. A column experiment was conducted to characterize liquid and vapour fluxes and the profiles of relative humidity, temperature and the hydrogen- and oxygen-isotope composition of Sphagnum pore waters evaporating under controlled conditions. A constant water table at 20 cm depth was established in six identical columns fed by a common water reservoir ($\delta^{18}O = -13.0\%e$; $\delta^2H = -85.8\%e$). Evaporation from the columns averaged 4.5 mm d\textsuperscript{-1} at the average chamber temperature and relative humidity of 20.7 \degree C and 27.1\%, respectively. The columns developed upward-convex profiles of relative humidity and isotopic composition within the first day that persisted throughout the experiment. Isotopic data from columns sampled after 1, 2, 4, 7 and 15 days were strongly constrained by an evaporation line with the linear relation $\delta^{18}O = 3.8\delta^2H - 36.1$ ($R^2 = 0.99$; $n = 25$), consistent with the expected evaporative-enrichment trajectory under chamber conditions. Calculated vapour flux accounted for only $\sim 1\%$ of the total mass flux within the columns, reflecting the dominance of liquid-phase capillary flow. While this calculated vapour flux was small, it decreased markedly near the surface, where evaporative cooling may have resulted in condensation of vapour, simultaneously increasing the liquid water content of the surface mosses. The presence of a vapour pressure deficit down to about 15 cm below the surface indicate that both evaporation and upward vapour diffusion were occurring at depth within the Sphagnum columns, but modelling shows that in situ fractionation alone within the columns cannot explain the extent of the observed enrichment. Rather, the enrichment of the heavy isotopes wherever evaporation is occurring and their consequent downward diffusion are needed to explain the observed profiles. Coupled advection–diffusion modelling of these profiles yielded estimates of the effective liquid-phase diffusivities in Sphagnum pore waters of 2.380 ($\pm 0.020$) $\times 10^{-5}$ cm\textsuperscript{2} s\textsuperscript{-1} for $^1H^2H^16O$ and 2.415 ($\pm 0.015$) $\times 10^{-5}$ cm\textsuperscript{2} s\textsuperscript{-1} for $^1H^1H^18O$, in good agreement with accepted values.

© 2009 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Water movement in Sphagnum mosses is a poorly understood phenomenon, yet it is critically important to peatland evaporation processes (Kellner, 2002), carbon exchanges (McNeil and Waddington, 2003), nutrient translocation (Rydin and Clymo, 1989) and heat flow (Kim and Verma, 1996). Here we refer not to the water exchanges in the peat substrate, for which we have recently gained considerable understanding (e.g. Drexler et al., 1999; Kennedy and Van Geel, 2000; Reeve et al., 2000; Price, 2003; Kellner et al., 2005); rather, we seek to clarify the nature of water fluxes through the matrix of living and dead mosses near the peatland–atmosphere interface.

Mosses comprise a matrix of large pores arising between and within the structure of leaves and branches (Hayward and Clymo, 1982; Clymo and Hayward, 1982) that impart a huge potential range (e.g., $\sim 2$–95\%) of moisture contents (Boelter, 1970). Saturated water flow can be too fast to measure (e.g. Boelter, 1965), but when the moss is dry the liquid flux is negligible (Ingram, 1983). Upward migration of water above the water table in Sphagnum mosses is typically attributed to capillary flow (Hayward and Clymo, 1982). When this flow is inadequate to meet the evaporative demand, the moss begins to dry and the water pressure ($\psi$) falls quickly. Water can be withdrawn from storage within hyaline cells when $\psi$ drops below $\sim 100$ kPa and then the moss desiccates (Hayward and Clymo, 1982). At this stage capillary water flow is negligible, but vapour diffusion can still occur. Under these conditions, evaporation cannot proceed efficiently, and several studies have noted a sharp drop in the evaporation rate from mosses as they dry (Price, 1991; Kim and Verma, 1996), suggesting a limited ability to move water up from the water table (see also Kellner and Halldin, 2002). However, field studies report that water lost to evaporation is mostly replaced by upward flow (Yazaki et al., 2006). How does this occur?
Typically, evaporation is assumed to occur at the Sphagnum surface (e.g. Nichols and Brown, 1980), which would require delivery of water by capillary action to the sites where turbulent and radiant exchanges occur. However, latent heat exchanges can also occur below the soil surface (Cahill and Parlange, 1998), indicating that water moves in both liquid and vapour phases. The vapour flux increases where there are large pores and strong thermal and moisture gradients (Yoshikawa et al., 2002; Williams and Flanagan, 1996), especially when there is a strong surface wind (Ishihara et al., 1992). In dry soils the vapour flux can be comparable to the liquid flux (Rose, 1968) and is typically attributed to diffusion, but occurs by advection caused by temperature and pressure changes in some cases, and by wind pumping (Stern et al., 1999) and water infiltration (Touma et al., 1984). In forest mosses, Carleton and Dunham (2003) showed that vapour diffusion accompanied by diurnal cooling of the upper moss layers caused “distillation” or condensation of vapour in the upper layers. While physiologically important, this yields a relatively small quantity of water.

Insight into the evaporation process and water flux in the soil can be gained by observing the nature and extent of isotopic fractionation and redistribution in a soil profile. Evaporation from peatlands causes enrichment of $^{18}$O and $^2$H in the near-surface pore waters (Williams and Flanagan, 1996; Flanagan et al., 1997) and signals from this evaporative enrichment are subsequently incorporated into associated plant tissues (Brennikmeyer et al., 1982; Edwards, 1993). Aravena and Warner (1992) showed that differences in evaporation rates between adjacent hummocks and hollows could be detected in the $^{18}$O content of Sphagnum cellulos, suggesting that pore-water isotopic composition may be a sensitive monitor of water dynamics within peatlands.

Exponentially-declining $^{18}$O and $^2$H abundances occur in saturated and unsaturated soil columns undergoing evaporation (Zimmermann et al., 1967; Münich et al., 1980; Allison et al., 1983; Allison and Barnes, 1983; Barnes and Allison, 1983, 1988; Walker et al., 1988; Barnes and Walker, 1989; Hsieh et al., 1998; DePaolo et al., 2004). These upward-convex profiles reflect competition between the downward diffusion of $^{1}$H$^{18}$O and $^{1}$H$^{2}$H$^{16}$O molecules concentrated at the surface and the upward flow of liquid water that sustains the evaporation flux. The profiles can be modelled to estimate evaporation rates under steady and non-steady conditions, assuming knowledge of the liquid-phase diffusivities of the respective isotope species. As highlighted by Barnes and Allison (1988), however, vapour-phase diffusion and vapour–liquid exchange also play key roles in the evaporation process in unsaturated soils by “short-circuiting” across air-filled pores, thus transmitting isotopic signals downward more quickly than liquid-phase diffusion alone would allow in a saturated soil.

Here we report results from similar experiments designed to improve our understanding of water transport in Sphagnum moss undergoing evaporation. Specifically, our analysis included (1) quantitative partitioning of the net liquid and vapour fluxes, confirming the overwhelming importance of liquid-phase mass transfer by capillary flow, and (2) advection–diffusion modelling to probe the nature of the pore-water isotopic profiles that were obtained. The latter sheds new light on the fundamental influence that vapour diffusion and vapour–liquid exchange have on hydrologic and isotopic processes in the unsaturated zone of Sphagnum-dominated peatlands.

**Methods**

**Experimental procedure**

Our approach was to allow evaporation from columns of relatively undisturbed Sphagnum rubellum moss samples having a constant water table supplied with water from a common isotopic source. During the experiment, we determined depth profiles of water content, relative humidity of pore gas, isotopic composition of pore water and soil properties. A large ($45 \times 45 \times 25$ cm) block of hummock peat was extracted from a southern Ontario bog ($43^\circ$ 90' N, 80° 40' W) in December 2005. The hummock was frozen during removal and thus compression and disturbance during cutting were minimal. In the laboratory, the frozen sample was subdivided and trimmed to fit snugly into six 15 cm diameter $\times$ 25 cm long PVC cylinders; vascular vegetation protruding from the samples was clipped. PVC end caps fitted to the bottom end of each core were connected by a screened flexible manometer hose to a common reservoir. The samples were twice completely filled with deionised water from a reservoir and allowed to drain for 24 hours before commencing the experiment. Tests conducted with waters of two different isotopic compositions using a Sphagnum column from the same block of hummock peat confirmed that this double-flushing procedure effectively re-sets the $^{18}$O and $^2$H of Sphagnum pore waters to that of the reservoir water.

The six manometer tubes and common water supply reservoir were positioned to hold the water table 5 cm above the base of each core (20 cm below the surface) and a secondary reservoir maintained a constant head in the primary reservoir (Fig. 1). The secondary reservoir was covered to prevent any changes in isotopic signature due to evaporation but had a small vent to maintain atmospheric pressure. The apparatus was set-up in a darkened chamber ($\sim 3 \times 4 \times 4$ m), with a grow light set to a 12-h cycle. A fan in the chamber directed air away from the samples to maintain air circulation, and a Hobo U10 relative humidity sensor simultaneously logged chamber air temperature ($T$) and relative humidity ($RH$).

One of the six samples in the chamber had thermocouples embedded at the surface (0–1 cm), 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 cm, respectively, connected to a Campbell Scientific 10x logger to record mass temperature ($T_0$, $T_s$, etc.) every 30 min. Temperature at 2.5 cm depth was linearly interpolated from the 0–1 and 5 cm thermocouples. This and the remaining columns were left to allow evaporation for 1, 2, 4, 7 and 15 days, respectively. At the designated time, each column was disconnected from the water supply, but

![Fig. 1. Schematic of laboratory instrumentation. The primary and secondary reservoirs were sealed to the air and connected with a tube clamped to control flow. The primary reservoir was smaller and narrower than the secondary so that a more accurate water table could be maintained. The reservoir was coupled to separate columns that were sectioned after 1, 2, 4, 7 and 15 days, plus an additional column that was instrumented with thermocouples at 0 to 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 cm. RH was measured at 2.5 cm depth increments to 15 cm depth on the day the respective column was sectioned.](image)
prior to disconnection $\text{RH}$ was measured at 2.5 cm depth increments to 15 cm depth with a Vaisala relative humidity micro probe (HMP42). At the ambient humidity levels (93–100%) its reported accuracy and precision are 3% and 0.1%, respectively. Immediately after removal, the sample was sectioned as follows. The PVC column was gently removed by sliding it upwards out of the end-cap and over the core, leaving the Sphagnum core standing undisturbed in the end-cap with the water table maintained 5 cm above the base. First, a 5-cm section was cut from the top of the core and placed immediately into a plastic bag and sealed after removing most of the air, followed sequentially by the four remaining sections. This process was accomplished in less than 5 min so that evaporation from the sides of the sample (briefly exposed to the air) was negligible. The sample was then squeezed inside the plastic bag until water pooled – the elution being decanted into a 30 ml sample bottle and sealed. Two additional samples were taken from the secondary water supply reservoir on Day 1 and Day 15 to confirm that no changes had occurred in the source water isotopic composition.

The sixth column (instrumented with thermocouples) was similarly sectioned to evaluate the volumetric moisture content, porosity, particle density and bulk density using standard methods (Klute, 1986). The evaporation rate from this and the other columns was determined by the rate of water loss from the secondary reservoir, based on the appropriate time and number of columns left in the series. This assumes that the evaporation rate was identical for all columns at any given time, although fluctuations in chamber humidity (and thus evaporation rate) did occur during the course of the experiment.

**Isotopic analysis**

Water samples were analyzed in the Environmental Isotope Laboratory at the University of Waterloo, where $^{18}$O/$^{16}$O and $^2$H/$^1$H ratios were measured using standard methods (Epstein and Mayeda, 1953; Coleman et al., 1982; see Dirmie and Heemskerk, 1993). Results are reported in $\delta$ values, representing deviations in per mil (‰) from Vienna-Standard Mean Ocean Water (V-SMOW) on a scale normalized such that Standard Light Antarctic Precipitation (SLAP) has values of $-55.55$‰ ($\delta^{18}$O) and $-428.2$‰ ($\delta^2$H) as recommended by Copley (1996). $\delta$ is the ratio of $^{18}$O/$^{16}$O or $^2$H/$^1$H in the sample and V-SMOW, respectively. Analytical uncertainties are ±0.2‰ for $\delta^{18}$O and ±2.0‰ for $\delta^2$H.

**Partitioning of vapour and liquid mass fluxes**

The bulk upward flux of water is a combination of vapour diffusion and liquid advection. Vapour diffusion flux ($F_v$) in the columns can be calculated according to Fick’s first law (Millington, 1959) accounting for the effects of soil porosity ($\phi$) and air-filled porosity ($\psi$) (Millington and Quirk, 1961, cited in Moldrup et al., 2000) such that

$$F_v = D_v^e \frac{\partial C_v}{\partial z}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $D_v^e$ is the diffusion coefficient of water vapour in air, $C_v$ is the concentration of water vapour and $z$ is the depth ordinate. Air-filled porosity is determined as

$$\psi = 1 - \frac{\rho_p}{\rho_b}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\psi$ is volumetric moisture content, $\rho_p$ is bulk density and $\rho_b$ is particle density. $D_v^e$ may be calculated as (Gates, 1980)

$$D_v^e = 0.212(1 + 0.00717T) \text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $T$ is temperature ($^\circ$C). Vapour concentration ($C_v$) can be determined from the ideal gas law using the partial pressure of moisture ($e$), calculated from measurements of relative humidity ($\text{RH}$), temperature ($T$) and saturation vapour pressure ($e_{sat}$), where

$$\text{RH} = \frac{e}{e_{sat}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

and

$$e_{sat} = 610.78 \left(\frac{T}{T_0 + 273.15}\right) \text{kPa}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

(Teten, 1930; see Govardhan and Alex, 2005), so that $C_v = 0.002166 e/(T + 273.15) \text{kg/m}^3$.

**Modelling of the isotopic profiles**

We used advection–diffusion modelling to analyze the observed isotopic profiles, following a similar approach to that of Barnes and Allison (1983, 1988) and Allison et al. (1983), though modified to allow for mass-dependent differences in the liquid-phase diffusivities of the different water-isotope species (cf. Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; DePaolo et al., 2004).

According to Darcy’s Law:

$$F_i = -K \frac{\partial h}{\partial z}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $F_i$ is the flux in the liquid phase (g cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), $\rho$ is the density of liquid water (g cm$^{-3}$), $K$ is the hydraulic conductivity of the Sphagnum column (cm s$^{-1}$), $h$ is the water head (cm), and $z$ is the depth (cm). Water is evaporatively enriched in the heavy-isotope species ($^{1}$H/$^{1}$H and $^2$H/$^1$H) at the top of the columns and relatively depleted in these species at the bottom. Under conditions of hydrologic and isotopic steady-state, the net fluxes in heavy-isotope species, which are the respective differences between upward advective flux and downward diffusive fluxes, will also reach a constant value at any given depth within the profile.

The net flux of heavy-isotope species therefore can be expressed by the equation:

$$F_i = F_i \cdot R_l + \left( -D_i \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where the superscript $i$ indicates water molecules containing the respective heavy isotopes, $R_l$ is the isotopic ratio of liquid water ($R_l = ^{16}$O/$^{16}$O or $^2$H/$^1$H), $D_i$ is the effective liquid-phase diffusivity (cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$), with $D_i^e$ signifying water molecules containing heavy isotopes, and $C_i$ (g cm$^{-3}$) is the concentration of heavy water molecules in the liquid phase.

By definition, $C_i$ is the mass divided by volume, therefore:

$$C_i = \frac{M}{V} = \frac{M}{V} = \frac{N m}{V} \rho = \frac{m}{M} R_i \rho$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $M$ is the mass of water, $V$ is the volume of the water, $m$ (g mol$^{-1}$) is the molecular weight of water molecules, $N$ (mol) represents the number of water molecules, and $\rho$ (g cm$^{-3}$) is the density of the water.

Substituting (8) into (7), and treating $\rho$ as constant because of the small range of temperature, yields the expression:

$$F_l = F_l \cdot R_l - D_i^e \frac{m}{M} \frac{d R_i}{d z}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

which describes the relationship among isotopic fluxes in the liquid phase ($F_l$ and $F_i$), the isotope ratio of water ($R_l$) and depth ($z$).

The respective steady-state fluxes can be described by $F_i + F_v = \text{Inflow}$ and $F_i + F_v = \text{Inflow}'$, which can be combined to give:
which is consistent with steady-state quantitative conversion of water from the liquid to vapour phase (i.e., without isotopic fractionation).

This can be simplified to a good first-order approximation knowing \( F_l \gg F_v \) and \( F_l \gg F_p \) (calculated above), such that:

\[
\frac{F_l}{F_l + F_v} = R_{\text{Input}}
\]

which is representative of the respective kinetic fractionations of 1.0142 and 1.0125 expressed as:

\[
\delta_{\text{Input}} = \frac{m_{\text{Input}}}{m_{\text{L}} \cdot D_{\text{L}}^1} \cdot \rho
\]

Rearranging Eq. (11) and substituting in Eq. (9) then yields:

\[
F_l \cdot R_{\text{Input}} = F_l \cdot R_l - D_{\text{L}}^1 \cdot \frac{m_{\text{Input}} \cdot \rho \cdot dr_l}{dz}
\]

Rearrangement of (12) gives

\[
\frac{dr_l}{R_l - R_{\text{Input}}} = \frac{m_{\text{Input}}}{m_{\text{L}} \cdot D_{\text{L}}^1} \cdot \rho \cdot dz
\]

which expresses the isotopic ratio of water \( R_l \) as a function of depth. Integrating (13) from the surface \((z = 0)\) to depth \( z \) yields:

\[
\int_{z_{\text{surface}}}^{y} \frac{dr_l}{R_l - R_{\text{Input}}} = \int_{0}^{z} \frac{m_{\text{Input}}}{m_{\text{L}} \cdot D_{\text{L}}^1} \cdot \rho \cdot dz
\]

Since \( R_{\text{Input}}, \rho \) and \( D_{\text{L}}^1 \) are constant, the results of integration can be expressed as:

\[
\ln \left( \frac{R_l - R_{\text{Input}}}{R_{\text{Input}} - R_{\text{Surface}}} \right) = \frac{m_{\text{Input}}}{m_{\text{L}} \cdot D_{\text{L}}^1} \cdot \rho \cdot z
\]

Converting Eq. (15) into \( \delta \) notation gives:

\[
\ln \left( \frac{\delta_l - \delta_{\text{Input}}}{\delta_{\text{Surface}} - \delta_{\text{Input}}} \right) = \frac{m_{\text{Input}}}{m_{\text{L}} \cdot D_{\text{L}}^1} \cdot \rho \cdot z
\]

which expresses the relation between the isotopic composition of pore water \((\delta_l)\) and the sampling depth \((z)\). Plotting \( \delta_{\text{Input}} \) against \( z \) yields an exponential profile, thus affording the opportunity to test whether the measured Sphagnum pore-water isotopic profiles obtained from the column experiment reflect steady-state conditions and, if so, to determine the effective liquid-phase diffusivities for \(^{1}H^{16}O\) and \(^{1}H^{18}O\) in this porous medium.

The evaporative-enrichment response of the Sphagnum pore waters can be assessed by considering the special case of the Craig and Gordon (1965) model describing the isotopic composition of a terminal reservoir evaporating in isotopic and hydrologic steady-state:

\[
\delta_{\text{Water}} = \alpha_{q} \delta_{q} (1 - RH)(\delta_{\text{Input}} + 1000) + \alpha_{RH}(\delta_{\text{Surface}} + 1000) - 1000
\]

where \( \alpha_{q} \), \( \alpha_{RH} \) represents the respective temperature-dependent liquid-vapour equilibrium fractionalization factors of 1.0097 and 1.0835 for \(^{18}O\) and \(^{2}H\) at mean experimental temperature of 20.7 °C (calculated from equations reported by Horita and Wesolowski, 1994); \( \alpha_{q} \) represents the respective kinetic fractionalations of 1.0142 and 1.0125 for open-water evaporation (see Gonfiantini, 1986); \( RH \) represents mean relative humidity in decimal notation (0.271); \( \delta_{\text{Input}} \) represents the respective \( \delta^{18}O \) and \( \delta^{2}H \) values of input water (−13.0‰ and −85.8‰) and \( \delta_{\text{Surface}} \) represents the respective \( \delta^{18}O \) and \( \delta^{2}H \) values of ambient atmospheric moisture (−20.5‰ and −149.1‰; based on isotopic equilibrium with local tap water used to humidify the laboratory ventilation system).

The slope of the evaporation line \((S_{EL})\) is then given by:

\[
S_{EL} = (\delta^{2}H_{\text{Water}} - \delta^{2}H_{\text{Input}})/(\delta^{18}O_{\text{Water}} - \delta^{18}O_{\text{Input}}).
\]

### Results

Bulk density \((\rho_{b})\) increased with depth, but in the unsaturated zone \((0–20\, \text{cm})\) was fairly constant at 0.15–0.20 g cm\(^{-3}\) (Table 1). Porosity \((\phi)\) decreased with depth. The moisture content ranged from 14.1% near the surface to 25.9% near the base of the unsaturated zone.

Chamber temperature \((T)\) was relatively stable during the experiment (average ± standard deviation = 20.7 ± 0.6 °C (Tables 2 and 3). Instrument failure meant no RH data were available until partway through Day 2 (see Table 2). Variably high RH subsequently occurred during the Day 3–10 period (average 31.3%) because of servicing of the laboratory ventilation system, before stabilizing over the Day 11–15 period (average 23.0%). The average evaporation loss from the columns over the span of the experiment was 4.5 mm d\(^{-1}\). Weighting to account for variations in chamber RH yielded estimated average daily evaporation ranging from 3.9 mm d\(^{-1}\) (Day 7) to 4.8 mm d\(^{-1}\) (Day 15).

The columns were distinctly cooler at the surface (Fig. 2a), and the temperature gradient above the water table was similar in each column. The temperature profile was distinctly lower on Day 15 (Fig. 2) reflecting the coolest daily average temperature (19.0 °C) in the chamber, compared to the average of 20.7 °C (Table 2). On Day 7 the temperature in the profile was highest, reflecting relatively warm conditions in the chamber, and resulted in the highest profile RH (Fig. 2). Relative humidity was lowest near the surface (Fig. 2b), thus vapour concentration \((C_v)\) decreased upward (Fig. 3a). The vapour concentration gradient \((dC_v/dz)\) was similar in each column. Calculated upward vapour flux in the columns (Eq. (1)) averaged less than 0.04 mm d\(^{-1}\) (Fig. 3b).

Relative to the \( \delta^{18}O \) and \( \delta^{2}H \) values of source water (average −13.0‰ and −85.8‰, respectively) enrichment was greatest near

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Bulk density (g/cm(^3))</th>
<th>VMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average particle density \((\rho_{b})\) 1.2 g cm\(^{-3}\).

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>RH (%)</th>
<th>E (mm d(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Dev</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the surface (average –6.6‰ and –61.0‰, respectively) (Fig. 4a and b). The enrichment decreased exponentially with depth, converging on the isotopic composition of the reservoir at the base of each column (20–25 cm interval). The profiles exhibited small systematic variations between successive sample days, although nearly identical profiles within analytical uncertainties were obtained on Days 2 and 15. The isotopic data from all columns cluster tightly along a line in δ18O–δ2H space (Fig. 4c) described by:

$$\delta^2H = 3.8\delta^{18}O - 36.1 \quad (r^2 = 0.99)$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

which exactly matches the expected trajectory of evaporative enrichment for surface waters evaporating under our experimental conditions using Eqs. (17) and (18).

**Discussion**

**Physical processes**

Evaporation from the samples caused cooling, and consequently temperature gradients developed in each column. Variations in air temperature in the chamber were not large (Table 2). Nevertheless, they caused a shift in the absolute temperature of the samples, which exactly matches the expected trajectory of evaporative enrichment for surface waters evaporating under our experimental conditions using Eqs. (17) and (18).

**Isotopic processes**

The presence of a vapour pressure deficit in the Sphagnum columns indicates potential for in situ fractionation. However, the abrupt decrease in the calculated flux near the surface (Fig. 3b) is an artefact of the inflection point (i.e. slight decrease) of the temperature gradient above 5 cm depth (Fig. 2a), since RH is related to temperature. Advection vapour exchange can also occur due to the expansion and contraction of gas with temperature change and by atmospheric pressure changes (Stern et al., 1999). Based on the ideal gas law, changes in gas volume can be determined for given changes in temperature and pressure. In the chamber the diurnal temperature change (±2°C) caused less than 1% gas volume change. Over the duration of the experiment the range of atmospheric pressure changes of 3.66 kPa (University of Waterloo, 2006) would result in ~5% gas volume change (daily pressure changes averaged <1 kPa). Thus we believe that temperature and pressure changes had a negligible effect on vapour exchanges, and conclude that vapour diffusion is more important than advective vapour flow. While this vapour flux is small, it may be important in maintaining sufficiently moist conditions for biological productivity (Carleton and Dunham, 2003).

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>δ18O (%)</th>
<th>Repeat</th>
<th>δ2H (%)</th>
<th>Repeat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 0</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>–12.81</td>
<td>–85.41</td>
<td>–85.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>–6.58</td>
<td>–6.87</td>
<td>–60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>–11.23</td>
<td>–80.04</td>
<td>–79.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>–11.87</td>
<td>–81.42</td>
<td>–81.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>–12.15</td>
<td>–83.52</td>
<td>–84.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>–12.51</td>
<td>–84.19</td>
<td>–84.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>–7.66</td>
<td>–7.62</td>
<td>–64.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>–11.02</td>
<td>–76.51</td>
<td>–76.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>–12.22</td>
<td>–82.34</td>
<td>–82.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>–12.72</td>
<td>–84.20</td>
<td>–84.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>–12.80</td>
<td>–84.13</td>
<td>–84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>–4.89</td>
<td>–55.10</td>
<td>–56.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>–11.15</td>
<td>–76.87</td>
<td>–77.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>–12.44</td>
<td>–82.46</td>
<td>–82.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>–12.53</td>
<td>–84.63</td>
<td>–84.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>–12.96</td>
<td>–83.87</td>
<td>–84.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 7</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>–6.03</td>
<td>–61.25</td>
<td>–59.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 7</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>–11.92</td>
<td>–80.73</td>
<td>–81.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 7</td>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>–12.66</td>
<td>–84.00</td>
<td>–83.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 7</td>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>–12.87</td>
<td>–84.25</td>
<td>–84.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 7</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>–12.91</td>
<td>–85.06</td>
<td>–85.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 15</td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>–7.67</td>
<td>–64.84</td>
<td>–64.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 15</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>–11.11</td>
<td>–78.77</td>
<td>–77.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 15</td>
<td>10–15</td>
<td>–12.37</td>
<td>–84.14</td>
<td>–85.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 15</td>
<td>15–20</td>
<td>–13.07</td>
<td>–85.31</td>
<td>–86.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 15</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>–13.09</td>
<td>–85.55</td>
<td>–85.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 15</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>–13.13</td>
<td>–86.68</td>
<td>–85.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 2.** Profiles of average daily T (a) measured in the instrumented column and RH (b) on Days 2, 4, 7 and 15 measured in the respective columns prior to sectioning.

**Fig. 3.** Profiles of measured vapour concentration (a) and calculated diffusive vapour flux (b) on Days 2, 4, 7 and 15.
calculated steady-state evaporative enrichment using the Craig and Gordon (1965) model alone cannot fully account for the observed profiles (Fig. 5). Rather, downward heavy-isotope diffusion is required to magnify the signal.

Simulation of the pore-water isotopic profiles on different sampling days was undertaken assuming that the upward advective flux was 99% of the estimated net evaporation rate, and that pore water δ¹⁸O and δ²H values were constrained to the observed evaporation line (Eq. (18)). Pairs of exponential curves generated using Eq. (16) were then compared to the observed profiles, adjusting the respective δSurface values and effective liquid-phase diffusion coefficients to explore possible matches. This approach differs somewhat from that taken by Barnes and Allison (1983) and many subsequent authors by not assuming the same liquid-phase diffusion coefficients to explore possible matches. This approach differs somewhat from that taken by Barnes and Allison (1983) and many subsequent authors by not assuming the same liquid-phase diffusion coefficients to explore possible matches.

As shown in Fig. 6, an exact overall match for pairs of profiles simulated in this manner could only be obtained for the measured data from Days 2 and 15, whereas pairs of exponential profiles could not be fitted to data from Days 1, 4 or 7 within analytical uncertainties. The resulting pair of best-fit profiles for Days 2 and 15 yielded δ¹⁸OSurface and δ²HSurface values of 4.2‰ and 52.0‰, and D¹⁸O estimates of 2.3 (±0.11) × 10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹ for ¹H¹H¹⁸O and 2.6 (±0.2) × 10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹ for ¹H¹H¹⁶O. These D¹⁸O estimates agree well with values in the range 2.2–2.7 × 10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹ that are commonly assumed for ¹H¹H¹⁸O and ¹H¹H¹⁶O in studies of soil and leaf waters (e.g., Barnes and Allison, 1988; Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; Gan et al., 2003; DePaolo et al., 2004; Farquhar and Cernusak, 2005; Ogée et al., 2007; etc.). As often noted, however, such values are typically higher than would be expected for reported experimental temperatures. Our estimates, for example, correspond to a “best-fit” temperature of 27.6 ± 0.4 °C according to the temperature-dependent relations presented in Braud et al. (2005), versus temperatures of 16–20 °C measured in the Sphagnum columns. Notably, this also places slightly tighter constraints on our estimates of the respective D¹⁸O values in order to maintain the expected mass-dependent D¹⁸O/D²H ratio of 0.9833 (Mathieu and Bariac, 1996; DePaolo et al., 2004), yielding 2.380 (±0.020) × 10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹ for ¹H¹H¹⁸O and 2.415 (±0.015) × 10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹ for ¹H¹H¹⁶O under the conditions of our experiment.

The exact agreement between simulated and measured isotopic profiles on Days 2 and 15 strongly suggest that the Sphagnum col-
ums were in isotopic steady-state on these days. There is little doubt that this is the case on Day 15, which had the most stable antecedent conditions, especially with respect to RH (Table 2). Even a fully saturated soil column (i.e., absent the effects of vapour diffusion and exchange) would be expected to attain steady-state for both isotopes under these experimental conditions after about ten days, as estimated from the effective liquid-phase diffusivities and evaporation rate (E), based on the equation:

\[ \tau = D^{18}/E^2 \]  

(20)

where \( \tau \) is the characteristic time for profile development (Zimmermann et al., 1967; Allison and Barnes, 1983). Interestingly, the prior occurrence of identical profiles on Day 2 suggests that steady-state had already been attained, at least briefly, for both isotopes prior to the period of higher and variable chamber RH during Days 3–10. While we have incomplete documentation of antecedent RH for Day 2, its similarity to that of Day 15 suggests RH was similar to that of the Day 11–15 interval. The rapid development of isotopic steady-state is thus consistent with the expected importance of vapour–liquid exchange and vapour diffusion within the air-filled porosity of the Sphagnum moss, promoted by the four orders-of-magnitude higher vapour-phase diffusivities of the heavy-isotope species (similar to that of bulk water, see Eq. (3) above). That is, liquid-phase diffusion alone cannot explain the rapid establishment of the observed isotopic profiles; the relatively high vapour-phase diffusivities and vapour–liquid exchange thus accelerate their development. These processes also mask the effects of liquid-phase tortuosity in the unsaturated zone by short-circuiting the more tortuous liquid flow paths.

The simulated profiles additionally provide convenient reference lines for assessing the transient behaviour of the profiles on other days. For example, the higher \( ^{13}O \) and \( ^2H \) values in the 0–5 cm layer on Days 4 and 7 likely reflect "excess" downward diffusion of heavy-isotope species from the surface because of decreased evaporation (and hence advection) rate in response to higher RH, while the slightly lower \( ^{17}O \) and \( ^3H \) values in the underlying 5–10 cm layer (most clearly apparent on Day 7) reflect associated capillary rise, drawing up isotopically-depleted pore waters from below. Because of incomplete chamber RH data, the similarly-distorted profile on Day 1 is more equivocal, yet it also clearly indicates the existence of non-steady-state for both isotopes only one day (and perhaps much less) prior to sampling on Day 2. This suggests that the behaviour of the Sphagnum moss pore waters is remarkably analogous to that of water in transpiring leaves, which develop isotopic steady-state within hours (e.g., see Gan et al., 2003; Cuntz et al., 2007; Ogée et al., 2007). Indeed, water mass and isotope transport in the Sphagnum columns appears to bear striking similarity to new conceptualizations of how water is transported within transpiring leaves, although the understanding of vapour-phase processes remains incomplete (Cuntz et al., 2007).

Conclusions and implications

These results confirm that water flux in Sphagnum moss undergoing evaporation is predominantly liquid capillary flow. In spite of the large air-filled pore spaces, water vapour transport by diffusion represents a negligible fraction of the net mass flow. On the other hand, vapour-phase processes foster rapid development of isotopic steady-state. The dynamic balance between liquid–phase advection and diffusion determines the shapes of the isotopic profiles, while vapour diffusion and vapour–liquid exchange control the rate at which the profiles form and how rapidly they adjust to changing conditions, especially shifts in atmospheric relative humidity. Changes in relative humidity strongly affect upward advection, via changes in evaporation rate, as well as the enrichment of heavy-isotope species near the Sphagnum surface, which determines the isotopic concentration gradients within underlying layers. In spite of the rudimentary nature of our experimental set-up, we obtained remarkably robust estimates of the effective liquid-phase diffusivities of \( ^1H^{18}O \) and \( ^1H^2H^{16}O \) for Sphagnum pore waters, suggesting that potential also exists for application of water-isotope tracers in field-based studies to probe hydrologic processes in Sphagnum-dominated wetlands.

These findings have several other important implications. First, they suggest that water flux in mosses can be modelled considering only liquid flow, given the appropriate parameter and boundary conditions. Second, while the change of state from liquid to gas may generate little water volume for vapour flow, it likely results in latent heat exchanges in the profile and thus affects the thermodynamics of the moss system. This has implications for carbon exchange, which is closely tied to moisture and temperature (McNeil and Waddington, 2003). Finally, it is noteworthy that latent heat exchanges caused by evaporation below the soil surface will also affect the determination of soil heat flux, thus potentially causing error in determining available energy for evaporation.

Models of evapotranspiration such as the Penman-Monteith (Monteith, 1965) assume that the radiative and convective fluxes occur at a common surface, which may therefore limit their validity in moss-dominated systems.

In Sphagnum-dominated systems, translocation of water and presumably other chemical species occur predominantly as liquid capillary flow, but vapour movement also has several implications: (1) upwardly flowing vapour may condense near the evaporatively cooled surface, providing a quantitatively small but potentially important water source for dry surface mosses; and (2) vapour-phase processes accelerate the development of steady-state isotope profiles. Furthermore, the shape of steady-state pore-water isotopic profiles obtained from mosses subjected to evaporation may be useful in estimating evaporation rates in field studies. Samples taken simultaneously from different moss species or in a different setting within a given bog that exhibit distinctively different isotopic profiles may be indicative of differing evaporation rates. Further testing of this possibility in field and laboratory studies is certainly warranted.
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