Reviewer 1

While the authors have done a nice job in revision, there is still a lack of a clear central research question or gap being filled. While the presentation has improved, I still miss a clear statement at the end of the introduction motivating what the goal of the study is. P4L29-P5L29 is poorly written and does not address this concern. This is a critical need that must be addressed. This was a weakness in the first submission and it remains a fundamental shortcoming. The current study characterizes some variability and applies a model. These alone (without a strong context and motivation) are likely of limited interest to the readers of HESS where there is an expectation to see advancements of process understanding and fundamental hydrological understanding.

As a general comment, the language gets rather loose throughout the text. The terminology and presentation must be improved and tightened. Too often are blanket statements or generalizations made without clear support. The language is often not precise and rather vague. I have tried to target several examples in the minor comments section of this review, but I am sure there are more. Please improve.

Further, the study needs streamlined (this goes hand-in-hand with the comment regarding the main question). The use of a hydrologic model is a good addition to the manuscript. However, the presentation of the modeling setup (section 2.5) leaves something to be desired. Rather than lengthen an already long manuscript, I would suggest shortening the text in the manuscript and adding an extended appendix or supplementary text section. This will allow you to list equations, have schematics and cover in detail the calibration/validation aspects of the modeling. As it is currently presented, the modeling is not fully described at a level of detail needed to understand the steps to create a working model. Rather than expanding this in the manuscript, I am suggesting to expand it in an appendix. If the central question for the study is to use the chemical data to improve the modeling, then much more is needed with regards to presenting the modeling without considering the tracer data in comparison with the model results considering the tracer data (and more information would be need on exactly how the data were considered).

In connection with the two previous general comments, I suggest also moving the methods and results text pertaining to the travel time modeling into an appendix or supplementary text section. As they are currently presented, the come across as “extra” and just confuse the flow of the study. The level of detail is underdeveloped. Moving them to a separate text section would really help streamline the presentation of this study. This is something that is needed as the current presentation is overly complicated and gets confusing with all the information jumbled together. This will allow you to focus in on the central research question of the study.

Lastly, from my reading, the discussion section 4.3 appears to be the main discussion section. The other two subsections more or less are just reiterating the results. This section 4.3 (while well written) could do a better job relating to more current studies on mixing assumptions (both temporal and spatial). The authors start into that consideration (at P28L26-30) but do not go further. I suggest reducing the emphasis on sections 4.1 and 4.2 (which cover the empirical and site-specific aspects of the research) and breaking the section 4.3 up into smaller subsections that potentially relate back to central research question(s). Explore the literature on these mixing-storage topics over the past 5 year. Placing findings in that context will significantly raise the level of presentation.

Apologies for harping on the presentation and structuring. I think the study presents a nice set of data. The challenge to the authors is to leverage these data into a fundamental advancement with regards to catchment hydrology. Taking a critical view of the research question and the general manuscript structure (i.e. how the results answer the question and the discussion provides relevance) should help elucidate this aspect.

We thank Referee #1 for the comments which were very useful to improve the paper. We followed the reviewer’s comments by strengthening and shortening the manuscript (by 7 pages) now having a stronger focus on process understanding. We rewrote the Introduction including our research motivation. We further moved the Material and methods sections about MTT estimations and groundwater age modelling to Appendix I and II which also include paragraphs about the objective of our modelling approach, model setup, model's boundary conditions, parameters, and lists equations. We think that the applied groundwater model is fully described now. With our model we were able to get a rough estimate of residence times greater than the limit of stable water isotopes (>5 years).

We split the Discussion section and included an additional section 4.4 to further discuss our modelling results with regard to current studies on mixing assumptions.

Minor comments

P1: J. Pferdmenges does not have an affiliation.

Corrected.

P2L1: "smoothed out" is not precise. Adjusted terminology.

Changed to "became less pronounced".

P2L27: Provide here a clear definition of what you mean with "low angle". Also, make it clear that "low angle" is different from "lowland" since that is the focus of the next few sentences.

There does not exist an international standard definition of a mountain (Goudie and Goudie, 2013) and thus, a low-mountainous terrain. The definition of mountain regions is largely arbitrary because multiple criteria can be used to define such areas, e.g. relative relief, threshold altitude (1000 m) etc. (Perry and Taylor, 2009). Following Perry and Taylor (2009) a hilly terrain, which we equate with a low-mountainous terrain, has an altitudinal difference of 50-100 m (over 5 km distance) which applies to our catchment. Thus we included the following: "altitudinal difference of 50–100 m over 5 km distance (Perry and Taylor, 2009)".

P2L27: Remove "very early,"

Followed reviewer's suggestion.

P3L22: Again, see work by van der Velde ([Van der Velde Y, Torfs PJJF, van der Zee SEATM, Uijlenhoet R. 2012. Quantifying catchment-scale mixing and its effects on time-varying travel time distributions. Water Resources Research 48: W06536])

We included the reference in Discussion section 4.4.

P4L10: "Following the way"? This is vague and confusing.

We deleted the whole section.

P4L29-P5L29: This section is poorly written and disconnected from the rest of the introduction. Parts seem like methods. It should be removed since it adds no value to presenting the study. Rather, end the introduction here with a simple statement of the gap in research being targeted and the research question(s) answered. Be concise and clear to motivate the research.

We removed most of this section and rewrote the Introduction including a research motivation.

P8L5: Change "was fallen" to "fall"

Followed reviewer's suggestion.

P8L19: Change "was" to "were"

Followed reviewer's suggestion.

P8L28: "as connecting compartment"? Vague and confusing.

We deleted "as connecting compartment between precipitation and groundwater".

P10L10: I think it should be "connection" rather than "connectivity". Connectivity has taken on special meaning in the literature that is not consistent with how it is necessarily being used here.

We changed it to "connection" throughout the manuscript.

P11L9: Check the significant figures in your numbers.

Edited in Appendix II.

P15L28: Perhaps you mean “proposed”?

Edited accordingly.

P16L4: “higher than further below”” is confusing. Re-write.

Edited as follows: “are higher than in the subsoil”.

P18L13-L23: This should be its own results subsection and not presented with the section on stream water variability. Further, perhaps consider taking this and the methods text describing this approach into their own stand-alone appendix or supplementary text section. This would really help streamline the presentation.

We moved the methods text to Appendix I. However, we disagree with the reviewer that the respective lines should be moved to their own results section as this would add additional text to an already long manuscript. We also think that the results are not relevant enough to justify their own subsection. We therefore kept this paragraph under heading 3.3. However, we restructured the Discussion section and added a section on “Water age dynamics”.

P19L12-13: Confusing sentence. Re-write.

We rephrased the sentence as follows: “Due to different water flow paths of groundwater along the studied stream, we expected to find distinguished groundwater isotopic signatures.”

P20L28: Change “:” to “.”

Edited accordingly.

Reviewer 2

Review of Revision: Exploring water cycle dynamics by sampling multiple stable water isotope pools in a small developed landscape of Germany by Orlowski et al. in HESS

The authors improved several aspects of the paper with this revision and accounted for three of my main concerns:

- They use a rigorous statistical methodology for analysing their stable isotope data
- The present the results from transfer function analysis of stable isotope data to determine catchment transit times (no good fit achieved- which is also a result)
- And restructured the paper, eventually increasing readability

The paper is well written. Yet, I don’t think the paper is ready to be published, and still requires some work. Besides the changes and the rework the introduction does not sufficiently frame the research question. The authors outline four objectives: 1. Linkages between water cycle components, 2. investigate transformation of precipitation to soil and groundwater, 3. Analysis of landscape characteristics …. On soil water isotopic composition and 4. estimate groundwater ages and flow directions… via … model.

While these are definitely interesting questions to ask, the “why” remains unclear. Several times the other use the term “poorly understood” in the introduction, while it is never clear to me, what exactly is poorly understood. For example, the authors claim that groundwater-surface water interactions and mechanism that explain the release of old water to streams fall in this category. I think there exist a plurality of work for both problems; so why not pinpointing on what exactly is not understood? For me, this needs some more attention. The big question: What brings this work beyond the local case study?

Moreover, the use of the CMF model seems a little bit weak. As there is no calculation of streamflow age, nor any validation of the modelled ages, it seems somewhat useless to me.

What would generally be interesting, seeing the claimed decoupeling of precipitation with groundwater and streamflow, is the calculation of the isotopic signal in groundwater recharge. Can the soil profiles, and meterological data combined with a simple approach be used to show that the soils modify the precipitation isotope signal in a way that it is consistent with the values in stream and groundwater. This would show that the system is not decoupled, but the soils behave in a translator flow way, or at least as a filter for incoming precipitation. This could also underpin the claim in the conclusion that it was shown "that groundwater was predominantly recharged during winter". I think this interpretation is right, but the proof is not convincingly presented. An alternative could be that a larger groundwater system controls the streamflow.

We gratefully acknowledge the comments of the reviewer, which helped us to improve the manuscript. In general, we shortened (by 7 pages) and streamlined the whole manuscript, rewrote the Introduction focusing on our research motivation, and included new studies, e.g. by Hrachowitz et al. (2016) or McDonnell and Beven (2014). By moving the Material and methods section about the MTT estimations and our hydrological model to the Appendix, we were able to describe our approach in more detail (objective of our modelling approach, model setup, model's boundary conditions, parameters, and equations). As mentioned in the manuscript, we estimated MTTs for the two studied streams (Schwingbach and Vollnkirchener Bach) as well as mean residence times from precipitation to groundwater comprising thirteen groundwater sampling points (therewith covering water fluxes through the vadose zone). The improved discussion and streamlined structure should cover the issues raised by the reviewer.

Some minor comments:

Title: "small" is rather subjective here with catchments of >3km2 and ~10km2

We deleted "small".

Abstract, L19 "decoupled" is a strange word for me in this perspective. As precipitation contributes to groundwater, but with the soils acting as filter.

We replaced "decoupled" by "disconnected".

P2L16: origion of? Formation of?

We revised the sentence as follows: "The application of stable water isotopes as natural tracers in combination with hydrodynamic methods has been proven to be a valuable tool for studying the origin and formation of recharged water as well as the interrelationship between surface water and groundwater (Blasch and Bryson, 2007)…"

P3L23-28: this is not done yet?

We deleted and rephrased most of this paragraph.

P4L14: I think this sentence is grammatically wrong

We deleted "thus" from the sentence.

P4L18: Replace "This" with "The enrichment…"

Rephrased as follows: "The isotopic enrichment decreases exponentially with depth…"

P5L21: What is your hypothesis? What is the question that differentiates this work from a local case study?

We shortened and rewrote the Introduction focusing on our research motivation.

P10L28ff. How is the model validated? How useful is it to leave out soil processes if they are the only component where stable isotopes change? I am not convinced about the added value of the GW model (and I don`t think it is needed for the work)

We added Appendix I and II to account for this. We included a subsection describing the objectives of our groundwater modelling approach as follows: "Stable water isotopes are only a tool to determine the residence time for a few years (McDonnell et al., 2010). In cases of longer residence times and a strong mixing effect, seasonal variation of isotopes vanishes and results in stable flat lines of the isotopic signal. To get a rough estimate of residence times greater than the limit of stable water isotopes (>5 years), we split the water flow path in our catchment in two parts: the flow from precipitation to groundwater, which was calculated via FlowPC and the longer groundwater transport. The simplest method to estimate the residence time of groundwater transport is via the storage-to-input-relation, with the storage as the aquifer size and the input as the groundwater recharge time. However, this method ignores the topographic setting, and water input heterogeneity. In our study we used a simplified groundwater flow model with tracer transport to calculate the groundwater age dynamics. The numerical output of water ages cannot be validated with the given isotope data, since the model is used to fill a residence time gap, where stable water isotopes are not feasible to apply. The model is falsified however, if the residence time is short enough (<5 years) to be calculable via FlowPC. Hence, the results of the groundwater age model should be handled with care and only seen as the order of magnitude of flow time scales."

P15L13ff. Now you mention the stream water in the precipitation results, this is a little bit strange, since the stream results are not presented yet

We deleted this paragraph and shifted stream water results to the respective section (3.3).

P15L26: Insert "they" before "exhibited"

We deleted this sentence and moved the previous sentence to the Discussion section (4.2.1).

P15L27-30. These lines seem unnecessary, since repetitive.

We deleted this paragraph.

P18L20/21: This conclusion only related to Transfer function based methods.

We rewrote the sentence as follows: "Therefore, we conclude that transfer function based MTT estimation methods applying stable water isotope data failed for the Schwingbach."

P21L3: Any change for streamflow age infromation?

The model confirms that the stream contains water with different transit times. Therefore, the stream water does not have a discrete age, but a distribution of ages due to variable flow paths, which is also mentioned in the manuscript. MTTs for both streams were further calculated using FlowPC and the groundwater model for different reaches of the Vollnkirchner Bach.

P21L5ff.: Since there was no objective in the introduction that relates to precipitation, this discussion is somewhat oversized (but good)

In general, we shortened the length of the manuscript by 7 pages from the Abstract to the Conclusions. We have also cut down the length of this section.

P23-25: Can you calculate the stable isotope composition of recharge from your data? That would be very helpful. So you have a Hewlett and Hibbert like translator flow for GW recharge? Or is only winter rainfall contributing?

We measured spatial isotopic uniformity of the subsurface soil water (chapter 3.2) similar to the groundwater composition throughout the study area. We would not expect different values in the groundwater recharge. Hence, variable source area effects are not detectable via the isotopic composition in our case.

P14: How do you define baseflow? I would rather say, that the stream is always groundwater dominated, but you also observe higher flows, which are not really baseflow situations. But again, here the stream is groundwater fed.

In our catchment baseflow is defined as discharge <10 $L \cdot s^{-1}$ (Orlowski et al., 2014), which is also defined in the manuscript now.

P27-30: They work; they just show 100% groundwater contributions for the observed samples.

We rephrased the sentence as follows: "Just by comparing mean precipitation, stream, and groundwater isotopic signatures (Table 1), it is obvious that simple mixing calculations do not work, i.e. showing predominant groundwater contribution."

P28L4: I am not fully happy with the term “disconnected”, as GW levels react instantaneously.

We rewrote the sentence and included “isotopically disconnected”.

P29L14ff. - So what is new? What is the beyond study area relevance?

- Show clearer that it is winter precipitation recharging

We have added some key points to the Conclusion section, especially the partitioning of the flow path as an analytical tool.

P29L21-22: Delte “old water paradox” as this is repetitive and vague. There is a wide range of processes that are behind this paradox. It would be better to clarify this functioning

Followed reviewer’s suggestion.

Relevant changes

- Shortened (by 7 pages) and streamlined the whole manuscript
- Restructured the manuscript: Revised the Introduction completely and moved the MTT estimation and hydrological modelling methods parts to Appendix I and II
- Extended the description about the hydrological model including: Objectives, model setup, boundary conditions, parameters, groundwater age calculations, as well as relevant equations
- Included an additional section 4.4 to further discuss our modelling results with regard to current studies on mixing assumptions

All changes we made to the manuscript can be found in the “Manuscript version showing changes” below.

Manuscript version showing changes

Exploring water cycle dynamics by sampling multiple stable water isotope pools in a ~~small~~ developed landscape of Germany

N. Orlowski[1,2], P. Kraft[1] , J. ~~Pferdmenges~~Pferdmenges[1] and L. Breuer[1,3]

[1]{Institute for Landscape Ecology and Resources Management (ILR), Research Centre for BioSystems, Land Use and Nutrition (~~IFZ~~iFZ), Justus~~-~~ Liebig~~-~~ University Giessen, Giessen, Germany}

[2]{Global Institute for Water Security~~, School of Environment and Sustainability~~, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada}

[3]{Centre for International Development and Environmental Research, Justus Liebig University Giessen, Germany

Correspondence to: N. Orlowski (Natalie.Orlowski@umwelt.uni-giessen.de)

Abstract

A dual stable water isotope (δ^2H and δ^{18}O) study was conducted in the developed (managed) landscape of the Schwingbach catchment (Germany). The two-year weekly to biweekly measurements of precipitation, stream, and groundwater isotopes revealed that surface and groundwater are ~~decoupled~~isotopically disconnected from the annual precipitation cycle but showed bidirectional interactions between each other. Apparently, snowmelt played a fundamental role for groundwater recharge explaining the observed differences to precipitation δ-values.

A spatially distributed snapshot sampling of soil water isotopes in two soil depths at 52 sampling points across different land uses (arable land, forest, and grassland) revealed that top soil isotopic signatures were similar to the precipitation input signal. Preferential water flow paths occurred under forested soils explaining the isotopic similarities between top and subsoil isotopic signatures. Due to human-impacted agricultural land use (tilling and compression) of arable and grassland soils, water delivery to the deeper soil layers was reduced, resulting in significant different isotopic signatures. However, the land use influence

~~smoothed out~~became less pronounced with depth and soil water approached groundwater δ-values. Seasonally tracing stable water isotopes through soil profiles showed that the influence of new percolating soil water decreased with depth as no remarkable seasonality in soil isotopic signatures was obvious at depth >0.9 m and constant values were observed through space and time.

Since classic isotope evaluation methods such as transfer function based mean transit time ~~calculation~~calculations failed, we established a hydrological model to estimate spatially distributed groundwater ages and flow directions within the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment. Our model revealed that complex age dynamics exist within the subcatchment and that much of the runoff must has been stored ~~in the catchment~~ for much longer than event water~~.~~

(average water age is 16 years). Tracing stable water isotopes through the water cycle in combination with ~~a~~our hydrological model was valuable for determining interactions between different water cycle components and unravelling age dynamics within the study area. This knowledge can further improve catchment specific process understanding of developed, human-impacted landscapes.

Introduction

The application of stable water isotopes as natural tracers in combination with hydrodynamic methods has been proven to be a valuable tool for studying the origin~~,~~ and formation~~, and~~ of recharged water as well as the interrelationship between surface water and groundwater ~~(Blasch and Bryson, 2007; Goni, 2006), partitioning evaporation and transpiration (Phillips and Gregg, 2003; Rothfuss et al., 2010, 2012; Wang and Yakir, 2000)~~(Blasch and Bryson, 2007), partitioning evaporation and transpiration (Wang and Yakir, 2000), and further mixing processes between various water sources ~~(Aggarwal et al., 2007; Clark and Fritz, 1997c; Kendall and Coplen, 2001; Wu et al., 2012).~~(Clark and Fritz, 1997c). Particularly in catchment hydrology, stable water isotopes play a major role since they can be utilised for hydrograph separations ~~(Buttle, 2006; Hoeg et al., 2000; Ladouche et al., 2001; Munyaneza et al., 2012), to calculate the mean transit time (McGuire et al., 2002, 2005; Rodgers et al., 2005b), to investigate water flow paths (Barthold et al., 2011; Goller et al., 2005; Rodgers et al., 2005a), or to improve hydrological model simulations (Birkel et al., 2010; Koivusalo et al., 1999; Liebminger et al., 2007; Rodgers et al., 2005b). However, spatio-temporal sources of stream water in low angle, developed catchments are still poorly understood.~~(Buttle, 2006), to calculate the mean transit time (McGuire and McDonnell, 2006), to investigate water flow paths (Barthold et al., 2011), or to improve hydrological model simulations (Windhorst et al., 2014). However, most of our current understanding is resulting from studies in forested catchments. Spatio-temporal studies of stream water in low angle, developed, agricultural dominated, and managed catchments are less abundant. This is partly caused by damped stream water isotopic signatures excluding traditional hydrograph separations in low-relief catchments (Klaus et al., 2015). Unlike the distinct watershed components found in steeper headwater counterparts, lowland areas often exhibit a complex groundwater–surface water interaction (Klaus et al., 2015). ~~This interaction between groundwater and surface water remains poorly understood in many catchments throughout the world but process understanding is fundamental to effectively manage the quantity and quality of water resources (Ivkovic, 2009). Sklash and Farvolden (1979) showed very early,~~Sklash and Farvolden (1979) showed that groundwater plays an important role as a generating factor for storm and snowmelt runoff processes. In many catchments, streamflow responds promptly to rainfall inputs but variations in passive tracers such as water isotopes are often strongly damped (Kirchner, 2003). ~~This indicates that storm runoff in these catchments is dominated mostly by “old water” (Buttle, 1994; Neal and Rosier, 1990; Sklash, 1990)~~This indicates that storm runoff in these catchments is dominated mostly by “old water” (Buttle, 1994; Neal and Rosier, 1990; Sklash, 1990). However, not all “old water” is the same (Kirchner, 2003). This catchment behaviour was described by Kirchner (2003) as the old water paradox. Thus, there is evidence of complex age dynamics within catchments and~~ that~~ much of the runoff is stored in the catchment for much longer than event water (Rinaldo et al., 2015). Still, some of the physical processes controlling the release of “old water” from catchments are poorly understood, roughly modelled, and the observed data do not suggest a common catchment behaviour (Botter et al., 2010). However, old water paradox behaviour was observed in many catchments worldwide but it may have the strongest effect in agriculturally managed catchments, where surprisingly only small changes in stream chemistry have been observed (Hrachowitz et al., 2016).

~~Moreover, due to human-induced alterations of river systems (e.g. channelisation of streambeds or draining) (O’Driscoll et al., 2010), water fluxes in developed (managed) landscapes can be especially diverse. Almost all European river systems were already substantially modified by humans before river ecology research developed (Klapper, 1990; Allan, 2004). Through changes in land use, land cover and irrigation, agriculture has~~

~~substantially modified the hydrological cycle in terms of both water quality and quantity (Gordon et al., 2010) as well as altered the functioning of aquatic ecosystem processes (Pierce et al., 2012; Rockström et al., 2014). This complex character of developed, agricultural dominated catchments is often disregarded and established research approaches often failed to fully capture agro-ecosystem functioning at multiple scales (Orlowski et al., 2014). Since agricultural land use (arable land, permanent crops, and grassland) is the most dominant land use in Europe (UNEP, 2002), there exists a pressing need to understand biogeochemical fluxes (e.g. nitrogen compounds or pesticides) coupled with water fluxes in these managed landscapes (Orlowski et al., 2014) and to figure out a way to embed this landscape heterogeneity or the consequence of the heterogeneity into models (McDonnell et al., 2007).~~

Moreover, almost all European river systems were already substantially modified by humans before river ecology research developed (Allan, 2004). Through changes in land use, land cover, irrigation, and draining, agriculture has substantially modified the water cycle in terms of both quality and quantity (Gordon et al., 2010) as well as hydrological functioning (Pierce et al., 2012). Hrachowitz et al. (2016) recently stated the need for a stronger linkage between catchment-scale hydrological and water quality communities. Further, McDonnell et al. (2007) concluded that we need to figure out a way to embed landscape heterogeneity or the consequence of the heterogeneity (i.e. of agricultural dominated and managed catchments) into models as current generation catchment-scale hydrological and water quality models are poorly linked (Hrachowitz et al., 2016).

One way to better understand ~~the relationship between precipitation, stream, soil, and groundwater, is detailed knowledge about the isotopic composition of the different~~catchment behaviour and the interaction among the various water sources (surface, subsurface, and groundwater) and their variation in space and time is a detailed knowledge about their isotopic composition. In principal, isotopic signatures of precipitation are altered by temperature, amount (or rainout), continental, altitudinal, and seasonal effects. ~~They are mainly influenced by prevailing atmospheric conditions during rainfall and snowfall causing a depletion of isotopes (Araguás-Araguás et al., 2000; Blasch and Bryson, 2007; Clark and Fritz, 1997c; Gat, 1996; Rohde, 1998). The input signal becomes more pronounced in snow-dominated systems where snowfall and snowmelt are depleted in heavy stable water isotopes relative to rainfall (Maule et al., 1994; O'Driscoll et al., 2005).~~ Stream water isotopic signatures can reflect precipitation isotopic composition and moreover, ~~depend~~dependent on discharge variations be affected by seasonally variable contributions of different water sources such as bidirectional water exchange with the groundwater body during baseflow, or high event-water contributions during stormflow (Genereux and Hooper, 1998; Koeniger et al., 2009). ~~Following the way of precipitation over the unsaturated zone to the groundwater, the process of infiltration in itself is known to be a non-fractionating process (Gonfiantini et al., 1998), except for mixing between different water pools (e.g. moving and standing water) (Gat, 1996). However, precipitation falling on vegetated areas is intercepted by plants and re-evaporated thus isotopically fractionated.~~Precipitation falling on vegetated areas is intercepted by plants and re-evaporated isotopically fractionated. The remaining throughfall infiltrates slower and can be affected by evaporation resulting in an enrichment of heavy isotopes, particularly in the upper soil layers (Gonfiantini et al., 1998; Kendall and Caldwell, 1998). In the soil, specific isotopic profiles develop, characterized by an evaporative layer near the surface~~ especially under arid and semi-arid climate. This decreases exponentially with depth (Zimmermann et al., 1968),~~. The isotopic enrichment decreases exponentially with depth, representing a balance between the upward convective flux and the downward diffusion of the evaporative signature (Barnes and Allison, 1988). In humid and semi-humid areas, this exponential decrease is generally interrupted by the precipitation isotopic signal. Hence, the combination of the evaporation effect and the precipitation isotopic signature determine the isotope profile in the soil (Song et al., 2011). Once soil water reaches the saturated zone, this isotope information is finally transferred to the groundwater (Song et al., 2011). Soil water can therefore be seen as a link between precipitation and groundwater, and the dynamics of isotopic composition in soil water are indicative of the processes of precipitation infiltration, evaporation of soil water, and recharge to groundwater (Blasch and Bryson, 2007; Song et al., 2011).

To compare different water sources on the catchment-scale, ~~a local meteoric water (LMWL) line is developed and evaporation water lines (EWLs) are used.~~We started our research with results obtained through an earlier study in the managed Schwingbach catchment that implied a high responsiveness of the system to precipitation inputs indicated by very fast rises in discharge and groundwater head levels They represent the linear relationship between δ^2H and δ^{18}O of meteoric waters (Cooper, 1998) in contrast to the global meteoric water line (GMWL), which describes the world-wide average stable isotopic composition in precipitation (Craig, 1961a). ~~Thus, the comparison of stable isotope data for stream, soil, or~~

~~groundwater samples relative to the global or local meteoric water lines can provide general understandings on water cycle processes at specific research sites (Song et al., 2011).~~

~~Identifying the origin of water vapour sources and moisture recycling (Gat et al., 2001; Lai and Ehleringer, 2011), the deuterium-excess (d-excess), defined by Dansgaard (1964) as $d = \delta^{2}H - 8 \times \delta^{18}O$ can be used, since the d-excess mainly depends on the mean relative humidity of the air masses formed above the ocean surface (Zhang et al., 2013). In addition, the d-excess reflects the prevailing conditions during evolution, interaction, or mixing of air masses en route to the precipitation site (Froehlich et al., 2002).~~

~~To capture spatial landscape heterogeneity, but to keep data acquisition simple, stable water isotope data were coupled with hydrodynamic data from a previous study by Orlowski et al. (2014) in the developed Schwingbach catchment (Germany) to unravel water flow paths and interactions between different water cycle components. Results obtained through this earlier study imply that the Schwingbach catchment is highly responsive, indicated by fast runoff responses to precipitation inputs (Orlowski et al., 2014). Moreover, groundwater reacted almost as quickly as streamflow to precipitation events with raising head levels. Thus, the catchment exhibited "old water" paradox like behaviour (Kirchner, 2003). We further showed that streamflow was predominantly generated in the catchment headwater area and that gaining and losing stream reaches occurred in parallel along the studied stream affected by the underlying geology.~~

~~Thus, stable water isotopes in combination with hydrodynamic data of a two-year monitoring period (July 2011 to July 2013) were utilised to explore spatio-temporal isotopic variations, unravel linkages between the different water cycle components, investigate the transformations from precipitation to soil and groundwater, and analyse the effect of small-scale landscape characteristics (i.e. soil physical properties, topographic wetness index (TWI), distance to stream, and vegetation cover) on soil water isotopic composition. Further, stable water isotope data was utilized to estimate groundwater ages and flow directions in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment via an hydrological model setup based on the findings of Orlowski et al. (2014).~~

(Orlowski et al., 2014). However, as there was only a negligible influence of the precipitation input signal on the stable water isotopic composition in streams, our initial data set showed evidence for complex age dynamics within the catchment. Nevertheless, a rapid flow response to a precipitation input may also be mistaken (as conceptualized in the vast majority of catchment-scale conceptual hydrological models) as the actual input signal already reaching the stream, while in reality it is the remainder of past input signals that slowly travelled through the system (Hrachowitz et al., 2016). The observable hydrological response therefore acts at different time scales than the tracer response (Hrachowitz et al., 2016) as described by the celerity vs. velocity concept (McDonnell and Beven, 2014). The observed patterns in our catchment therefore inspired us to use a combined approach of hydrodynamic data analyses, stable water isotope investigations, and data-driven hydrological modelling to determine catchment dynamics (response times and groundwater age patterns) and unravel water flow paths at multiple spatial scales. This work should further improve our knowledge on hydrological flow paths in developed, human-impacted catchments.

Materials and methods

Study area

The research was carried out in the Schwingbach catchment (50°30'4.23"N, 8°33'2.82"E) (Germany) (Fig. 1a). The Schwingbach and its main tributary the Vollnkirchener Bach are low-mountainous creeks ~~(Fig.~~having an altitudinal difference of 50–100 m over 5 km distance (Perry and Taylor, 2009) (Fig. 1c) with an altered physical structure of the stream system (channelled stream reaches, pipes, drainage systems, fishponds). The ~~whole~~ Schwingbach catchment ~~encompasses an area of~~ (9.6 km^2~~, with an altitude range~~) ranges from 233–415 m a.s.l. in altitude. The Vollnkirchener Bach tributary is ~~about~~ 4.7- km in length and drains a 3.7 km^2 subcatchment area (Fig. 1c), ~~which ranges in elevation~~with elevations from 235–351 m a.s.l. Almost 46% of the overall Schwingbach catchment is forested, which slightly exceeds agricultural land use (35%) (Fig. 1c). Grassland (10%) is mainly distributed along streams and smaller meadow orchards are located around the villages.

~~The Schwingbach~~ main catchment is underlain by argillaceous shale in the northern parts, serving as aquicludes~~ (Mazor, 2003).~~. Graywacke zones with lydit in the central, as well as limestone, quartzite, and sandstone regions in the headwater area provide aquifers with large storage capacities ~~(Choi, 1997; Mazor, 2003) (Fig.~~(Fig. 1f). Loess covers Paleozoic bedrock at north- and east bounded hillsides (Fig. 1f). Streambeds consists of sand and debris covered by loam and some larger rocks (Lauer et al., 2013). Many downstream sections of both creeks are framed by armor stones (Orlowski et al., 2014). ~~Figure 1e shows that the~~The dominant soil types in the overall study area are Stagnosols (41%) and mostly forested Cambisols

(38%). Stagnic Luvisols with thick loess layers~~ are under agricultural use. The same is true for~~, Regosol, Luvisols, and Anthrosols~~, which encompass an area of 7%.~~ are found under agricultural use and Gleysols ~~are found predominantly~~ under grassland~~ sites~~ along the creeks.

[Figure 1 near here]

The climate~~ in the study area~~ is classified as temperate with a mean annual temperature of 8.2°C. An annual precipitation sum of 633 mm (for the hydrological year 1 November 2012 to 31 October 2013) was measured at the catchment's climate station (site 13, Fig. 1b). The year 2012 to 2013 was an average hydrometeorological year. For comparison, the climate station Giessen/Wettenberg (25 km N of the catchment) operated by the German Meteorological Service (DWD, 2014) records a mean annual temperature of 9.6 °C and a mean annual precipitation sum of 666~~ ± ~~±103 mm for the period 1980~~ to ~~–2010. Discharge peaks from December to April (measured by the use of RBC-flumes with maximum peak flow of 114 L s^{-1}, Eijkelkamp Agrisearch Equipment, Giesbeek, NL) and low flows occur from July until November. Substantial snowmelt peaks were observed during December 2012 and February 2013. Furthermore, May 2013 was an exceptional wet month characterised by discharge of 2–3 mm d^{-1}. A~~ more~~ detailed description of runoff characteristics~~, especially for the Vollnkirchener Bach~~ is given~~ in a previous study~~ by Orlowski et al. (2014).

Monitoring network and water isotope sampling

~~The monitoring network consists of an automated~~ climate station (site 13, Fig. 1 b–c) (Campbell Scientific Inc., AQ5, UK; equipped with a CR1000 data logger~~ collecting air temperature at 2 m height, wind speed and direction, relative humidity, and solar radiation~~), three tipping buckets, and 15 precipitation collectors, six stream water sampling points, and 22 piezometers (Fig. 1 b–c). Precipitation data were corrected according to Xia (2006).

Two stream water sampling points (sites 13 and 18) in the Vollnkirchener Bach are installed with trapezium shaped RBC-flumes for gauging discharge (Eijkelkamp Agrisearch Equipment, Giesbeek, NL~~)~~), and a V-weir is located at sampling point 64. RBC-flumes and V-weir are equipped with Mini-Divers® (Eigenbrodt Inc. & Co. KG, Königsmoor, DE) for automatically recording water levels~~ and deriving continuous discharge data through the~~

~~given stage-discharge relationships (Eijkelkamp, 2014).~~. Discharge at the remaining stream sampling points was manually measured applying the salt dilution method (WTW-cond340i, WTW, Weilheim, DE~~), which can be precise to ±5% (Day, 1976; Moore, 2004). The 22 piezometers (Fig. 1b) situated between the conjunction of the Schwingbach with the Vollnkirchener Bach and the upper RBC-flume of the Vollnkirchener Bach (site 18) are made from perforated PVC tubes sealed with a bentonite clay~~). The 22 piezometers (Fig. 1b) are made from perforated PVC tubes sealed with bentonite at the upper part of the tube to prevent contamination by surface water. For monitoring shallow groundwater levels, either combined water level/temperature loggers (Odyssey Data Flow System, Christchurch, NZ) or Mini-Diver® water level loggers (Eigenbrodt Inc. & Co. KG, Königsmoor, DE) are installed. Accuracy of Mini-Diver® is ±5 mm and for Odyssey data logger ±1 mm. For calibration purposes, groundwater levels are additionally measured manually via an electric contact gauge.

Stable water isotope samples of rainfall, stream-, and groundwater were taken ~~over a two-year observation period (~~from July 2011 to July 2013~~) approximately~~ on weekly intervals~~, except for the winter period.~~. In winter 2012~~ to ~~–2013, snow core samples over the entire snow depth of <0.15 m were collected in tightly sealed jars at same sites as open rainfall was sampled. We sampled shortly after snow ~~was fallen~~fall because sublimation, recrystallization, partial melting, rainfall on snow, and redistribution by wind can alter the ~~primary~~ isotopic composition~~ of the snowfall~~ (Clark and Fritz, 1997b). Samples were melted overnight following Kendall and Caldwell (1998)~~,~~ and analysed for their isotopic composition. Open rainfall was collected in self-constructed samplers~~. Each collector was made from a 1 L glass bottle prepared with a circular funnel of 0.10 m in diameter. Funnels were covered with a mosquito net to keep out leaves, insects, or windblown debris. Bottles were placed in PVC tubes to avoid heating, screwed to wooden pales, and installed 1 m above ground. To avoid sample evaporation, a table tennis ball was placed into each funnel and two layers of small plastic balls were inserted into the glass bottles (Windhorst et al., 2013).~~

~~Stream water samples were taken as grab samples at six locations – three sampling points at each stream (Vollnkirchener Bach sites: 13, 18, and 94; Schwingbach sites: 11, 19, and 64) (Fig. 1b–c). To account for possible spatial variation in groundwater, grab samples were collected from 17 piezometers (Fig. 1b). Since spatial variations between the piezometers under meadow was small, the amount of sampled piezometers was reduced to three~~ as per

Windhorst et al. (2013). Grab samples of stream water were taken at six locations, three sampling points at each stream (Fig. 1b–c). Since spatial isotopic variations of groundwater among piezometers under meadow were small, samples were collected at three out of eight sampling points under meadow (sites 1, 6, and 21), five under the arable field (sites 25–29), and four ~~beside~~next to the Vollnkirchener Bach (sites 24, 31, 32, and 35) (Fig. 1b). Additionally, a drainage pipe (site 15) located ~226 m downstream of site 18 was sampled. According to IAEA standard procedures, all samples were filled and stored in 2 mL brown glass vials, sealed with a solid lid, and wrapped up with Parafilm~~® (Mook, 2001).~~®.

Isotopic soil sampling

Spatial variability

In order to analyse the effect of small-scale characteristics such as distance to stream, TWI, and land use on soil isotopic signatures~~ as connecting compartment between precipitation and groundwater~~, we sampled a snapshot of 52 points evenly distributed over a 200 m grid around the Vollnkirchener Bach (Fig. 1d). Soil samples were taken at four consecutive rainless days (1 to 4 November 2011) at altitudes of 235–294 m a.s.l.. Sampling sites were selected via a stratified, GIS-based sampling plan (ArcGIS, Arc Map 10.2.1, Esri, California, USA), including three classes of topographic wetness indices (TWIs: 4.4–6.5; 6.5–7.7; 7.7–18.4), two different distances to stream (0–121 m, 121–250 m), and three land ~~use units~~uses (arable land, forest, and grassland), with each class containing the same number of sampling points. Samples were collected at depths of 0.2 m and 0.5 m. Gravimetric water content was measured according to DIN-ISO 11465 by drying soils for 24 h at 110 °C. Soil pH was analysed following DIN-ISO 10390 on 1:1 soil-water-mixture with a handheld pH-meter (WTW cond340i, WTW Inc., DE). Bulk density was determined according to DIN-ISO 11272, and soil texture by finger testing~~ (Whitefield, 2004).~~.

Seasonal isotope soil profiling and isotope analysis

~~In order to trace the seasonal development of stable water isotopes from rainfall to groundwater, seven soil profiles were taken in the dry summer season (28 August 2011), seven in the wet winter period (28 March 2013), and two profiles in the transitional season~~ spring (24 April 2013) under different vegetation cover (arable land and grassland) (Fig. 1d). Soil was sampled utilising a hand-auger (Eijkelkamp Agrisearch Equipment BV, Giesbeek, DE~~). Samples were taken~~) from the soil surface to 2 m depth. Samples were collected in greater detail near the soil surface since this area is known to have the greatest isotopic variability (Barnes and Allison, 1988~~; Hsieh et al., 1998; Zimmermann et al., 1968~~).

~~Soil samples were stored in amber glass tubes, sealed with Parafilm®, and kept frozen until water extraction (Orlowski et al., 2013).~~. Soil water was extracted cryogenically with 180 min extraction duration, a vacuum threshold of 0.3 Pa, and an extraction temperature of 90°C following Orlowski et al. (2013). Isotopic signatures of $\delta^{18}O$ and $\delta^{2}H$ were analysed via off-axis integrated cavity output spectroscopy (OA-ICOS) (DLT-100, Los Gatos Research Inc., Mountain View, ~~CA,~~ USA). Within each isotope analysis three calibrated stable water isotope standards of different water isotope ratios were included (LGR working standard number 1, 3, and 5; Los Gatos Research Inc., CA, US). After every fifth sample the LGR working standards are measured. For each sample, six sequential 900 µL aliquot of a water sample are injected into the analyser. Then, the first three measurements are discarded. The remaining are averaged and corrected for per mil scale linearity following the IAEA laser spreadsheet template (Newman et al., 2009). Following this IAEA standard procedure allows for drift and memory corrections. Isotopic ratios are reported in per mil (‰) relative to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW) (Craig, 1961b). Accuracy of analyses was 0.6‰ for $\delta^{2}H$ and 0.2‰ for $\delta^{18}O$ (LGR, 2013). Leaf water extracts typically contain a high fraction of organic contaminations~~ (West et al., 2010),~~, which might lead to spectral interferences when using isotope ratio infrared absorption spectroscopy~~ (Leen et al., 2012),~~, causing erroneous isotope values (Schultz et al., 2011). ~~Therefore, isotopic data of plant water extracts are usually checked for spectral interferences using the Spectral Contamination Identifier (LWIA-SCI) post-processing software (Los Gatos Research Inc.). However, for soil water extracts no evidence for such interferences have been observed so far~~However, for soil water extracts there exists no need to check or correct such data (Schultz et al., 2011; Zhao et al., 2011). ~~Thus, there exists no need to check or correct such data.~~

Mean transit time estimation

~~To understand the connectivity between the different water cycle components in the Schwingbach catchment, the mean transit times (MTT) for the Vollnkirchner Bach (sites 13, 18, and 94) and the Schwingbach (sites 11, 19, and 64) were calculated using FlowPC (Maloszewski and Zuber, 1996). Different models (dispersion model with different dispersion parameters D_p = 0.05, 0.4, and 0.8, exponential model, exponential-piston-flow model, linear~~

~~model, and linear-piston-flow model) were compared for their results (sigma as goodness of fit and model efficiencies (ME)). A model efficiency ME = 1 indicates an ideal fit of the model to the concentrations observed, while ME = 0 indicates that the model fits the data no better than a horizontal line through the mean concentration observed~~ (Maloszewski and Zuber, 2002). The same is true for sigma.

~~For calculations with FlowPC, weekly averages of precipitation and stream water isotopic signatures were calculated. We also bias-corrected the precipitation input data with two different approaches: the mean precipitation value was subtracted from every single precipitation value and then divided by the standard deviation of precipitation isotopic signatures. Afterwards, this value was subtracted from the weekly precipitation values (bias1). For the second approach, the difference of the mean stream water isotopic value and the mean precipitation value was calculated and also subtracted from the weekly precipitation values (bias2).~~

~~Hydrological model setup~~

~~To estimate the age dynamics of the groundwater body in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment, a hydrological model was established on the basis of the conceptual model presented by Orlowski et al. (2014). For this purpose the *Catchment Modelling Framework* (CMF) by Kraft et al. (2011) was used.~~ CMF is a modular framework for hydrological modelling based on the concept of finite volume method by Qu and Duffy (2007). CMF is applicable for simulating one- to three-dimensional water fluxes but also advective transport of stable water isotopes (^{18}O and ^{2}H). Thus, it is especially suitable for our tracer study and can be used to study the origin ~~(Windhorst et al., 2014) and age of water.~~

~~The generated model is a highly simplified representation of the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment's groundwater body. The subcatchment is divided into 353 polygonal shaped cells ranging from 101.7–38940.1 m², manually adjusted on the basis of land use, soil types, and contour lines following Qu and Duffy (2007) and Windhorst et al. (2014). Each cell contains two layers, one comprises a water storage. The upper layer, representing the groundwater body, is generated based on soil depth measurements and reaches down to 20 m below the surface. Due to the fact that groundwater depth was not measured, the layer-thickness is a rough estimation. The second layer (20–40 m below the surface) represents the bedrock. The main fresh water input is the groundwater recharge, which is a constant value~~

~~over time for each cell. It is calculated as the difference between rainfall, evapotranspiration, and the change in stored water. Precipitation and evapotranspiration values are calculated using a fully distributed 3D model established through CMF with a one year simulation period of the same subcatchment. The change in stored water is set to zero since a steady state is simulated (see below) and therefore the water content in the system is stable.~~

~~Besides the groundwater recharge, a combined sewer overflow (site 38) is considered as an additional water input~~ based on findings of Orlowski et al. (2014). ~~Moreover, there are two water outlets in the two lowest cells for efficient draining. Both cells are located in the very north of the subcatchment. The compartments within the system are linked by a series of flow-accounting equations: Richards equation for percolation, Darcy equation for lateral subsurface flow, Neumann boundary condition for input of fresh water (groundwater recharge, pipe source), and constant Dirichlet boundary conditions representing the system outlets.~~

~~For estimating the groundwater age, a virtual tracer is used. It is modelled as a radioactive decay tracer with a fixed concentration at the input to the system. From the modelled concentration of the tracer in each cell, the mean age of the water for this cell is derived.~~

~~Model assumptions:~~ The saturated hydraulic conductivity of the groundwater body is set to 0.1007 m d^{-1}, as measured in the study area. ~~For the~~ bedrock compartment there is no data available. However, expecting a high rate of joints, preliminary testing revealed that a saturated hydraulic conductivity of 0.25 m d^{-1} seemed to be a realistic estimation (based on field measurements).

To understand the connection between the different water cycle components in the Schwingbach catchment, mean transit times (MTT) for both streams as well as mean residence times (MRT) from precipitation to groundwater were calculated using FlowPC (Maloszewski and Zuber, 2002). See Appendix I for details about the applied method.

Model-based groundwater age dynamics

To estimate the age dynamics of the groundwater body in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment, a hydrological model was established on the basis of the conceptual model presented by Orlowski et al. (2014) and the isotopic measurements presented here. Appendix II outlines the modelling concept, model set up, and its parameterization.

Statistical analyses

For statistical analyses, we used IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 22, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, US) and R (version Rx64 3.2.2). The R package igraph was utilized for plotting (Csardi and Nepusz, 2006). Studying temporal and spatial variations in meteoric and groundwater, isotope data were tested for normal distribution. Subsequently, t-tests or Multivariate Analyses of Variances (MANOVAs) were applied and Tukey-HSD tests were run to determine which groups were significantly different (p~~ ≤ ~~≤0.05). Event mean values of isotopes in precipitation, stream, and groundwater were calculated when no spatial variation was observed. Regression analyses were run to determine the effect of small-scale characteristics such as distance to stream, TWI, and land use on soil isotopic signatures.

We used a topology inference network map (Kolaczyk, 2014) in combination with a principal component analysis ~~(Jolliffe, 2002) to show δ^{18}O isotope relationships between surface and groundwater sampling points.~~to show δ^{18}O isotope relationships between surface and groundwater sampling points. To explore the sensitivity of missing data, we used both the complete isotope time series and randomly selected 80% of the whole data sets. Overall, the cluster relationships of the surface and groundwater sampling points are largely similar for both whole and subsets of isotope data sets, despite some differences of the exact cluster centroid locations. We therefore decided to use randomly selected 80% of the isotope time series to illustrate our results. In the network map, each node of the network represents an isotope sampling point. The locations of the nodes are based on the first two components (PC1 and PC2). The correlations between isotope time series are represented by the edges connecting nodes. The thickness of edges characterizes the strength of the correlations. The p-values of correlations are approximated by using the F-distributions and mid-ranks are used for the ties (Hollander et al., 2013). Only statistically significant connections ($p<0.05$) are shown~~ in the network diagram. Basic background information related to graph theory can be found in Wallis (2007).~~.

To compare different water sources on the catchment-scale, a local meteoric water (LMWL) line was developed and evaporation water lines (EWLs) were used. They represent the linear relationship between δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O of meteoric waters (Cooper, 1998) in contrast to the global meteoric water line (GMWL), which describes the world-wide average stable isotopic composition in precipitation (Craig, 1961a). Identifying the origin of water vapour sources and moisture recycling (Gat et al., 2001; Lai and Ehleringer, 2011), the deuterium-excess (d-excess), defined by Dansgaard (1964) as $d=\delta^2H-8\times\delta^{18}O$ was used.

For comparisons, precipitation isotope data from the closest GNIP (Global Network of Isotopes in Precipitation) station Koblenz (DE; ~~73.8~~74 km SW of the study area, 97 m a.s.l~~)~~.) was used (IAEA, 2014; Stumpp et al., 2014). For monthly comparisons with Schwingbach d~~-~~-excess values, we used a data set from the GNIP station Koblenz that includes 24 values starting from July 2011 to July 2013.

Results

~~Descriptive statistics of isotopic composition in precipitation, stream-, and groundwater are shown along with d-excess values in Table 1 and are described in detail in the following:~~

~~[Table 1 near here]~~

Variations of precipitation isotopes and d-excess

The δ^2H values of all precipitation isotope samples ~~(N = 592) taken throughout the observation period (July 2011 to July 2013)~~ ranged from −167.6 to −8.3~~‰.~~‰ (Table 1). To examine the spatial isotopic ~~variation~~variations, rainfall was collected at 15 open field site locations throughout the Schwingbach main catchment (Fig. 1b–c) for a 7-month period~~.~~ ~~However,~~, but no spatial variation could be observed~~ in the Schwingbach catchment.~~. Thus, rainfall was collected at the catchment outlet (site 13) from 23 October 2014 onward~~ and event mean δ-values were calculated for the previous isotope data.~~

. Analysing effects that influence the isotopic composition of precipitation, neither an amount effect nor an altitude effect ~~was~~were found – not surprisingly, as the greatest altitudinal difference between sampling points was only 101 m. Nevertheless, a slight temperature effect (R^2~~ = ~~=0.5 for δ^2H and R^2~~ = ~~=0.6 for δ^{18}O, respectively) was observed showing enriched isotopic signatures at higher temperatures.

[Table 1 near here]

Strong temporal variations in precipitation isotopic signatures, as well as pronounced seasonal isotopic effects were measured with greatest isotopic differences occurring between summer and winter. Samples taken in the fall and spring were isotopically similar, however, differed from winter isotopic signature, which were somewhat lighter (Fig. 2). Furthermore, in the winter of 2012–13 snow could be sampled, which decreased the mean winter isotopic values for this period in comparison to the previous winter period (2011–12). ~~No~~The mean δ^2H isotope values of snow samples were approximately 84‰ lighter that mean precipitation isotopic signatures (Fig. 3). Further, no statistically significant (p>0.05) inter-annual variation was detected between the summer periods of 2011 and 2012 (Fig. ~~2), which could have reflected varying local climate conditions (Koeniger et al., 2009).~~2).

[Figure 2 near here]

Examining the influence of moisture recycling on the isotopic compositions of precipitation, the ~~deuterium-excess (~~d-excess~~)~~ was calculated for each individual rain event at the Schwingbach catchment. ~~For the two-year observation period, d~~D-excess values ~~(N = 108)~~ ranged from –7.8‰ to +19.4‰ and averaged +7.1‰ (Fig. 2). In general, 37% of all events were ~~sampled~~sampl ed in summer periods (21 June to 21/22 September) and showed lower d-excess values in comparison to the 19% winter precipitation events (21/22 December to 19/20 March) (Fig. 2). D-excess greater than +10‰ was determined for 22% of all events. ~~As a reference the d-excess of the GMWL d = 10 is depicted in Figure 2 (solid line).~~ Lowest values corresponded to summer precipitation events ~~with~~where evaporation of the raindrops below the cloud base ~~at mean daily air temperatures between 12–18°C~~may occur. Most of the higher values (>+10‰) appeared in cold seasons (fall/winter) and winter snow samples of the Schwingbach catchment with ~~very~~much depleted δ-values showed highest d-excess ~~values~~ (Fig. 2).

In comparison with the GNIP station Koblenz (~~years~~ 2011–2013), the mean annual d-excess at the Schwingbach catchment was on average 3.9‰ higher~~ (7.1‰ for 2011–12 and 2012–13, respectively),~~, showing a greater impact of oceanic moisture sources than the further south-west located station Koblenz. The ~~unweighted mean annual d-excess at the GNIP station Koblenz was 2.9‰ for July 2011 to June 2012 and 3.6‰ for July 2012 to June 2013, whereas the~~ long-term mean d-excess was 4.4‰ for the Koblenz station (1978–2009) (Stumpp et al., 2014). ~~Nevertheless, highest~~Highest d-excesses at the GNIP station matched highest values in the Schwingbach catchment, both occurring in the cold seasons (October to December 2011 and November to December 2012).~~ Since no amount effect on the δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O values was observed in the Schwingbach, also no linear regression of event d-excess with precipitation amount was detected.~~

~~The linear relationship of ~~δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O content in local precipitation, results in a local meteoric water line (LMWL) (Fig. ~~3), which can be utilised to link the relative contribution of seasonal precipitation to ground and surface water sources (Wassenaar et al., 2011). The global meteoric water line (GMWL) established by Craig (1961a), and more recently refined by Rozanski et al. (1993) is δ^{2}H = 8.13 × δ^{18}O+10.8 ‰, provides a valuable benchmark against which regional or local waters can be compared (Song et al., 2011). The slope of the LMWL of the Schwingbach catchment is well in agreement with the one from the closest GNIP station in Koblenz (δ^{2}H = 7.66 × δ^{18}O + 2.0 ‰; R^2 = ~~3). The slope of the Schwingbach LMWL is well in agreement with the one from the GNIP station Koblenz (δ^{2}H=7.66×δ^{18}O+2.0‰; R^2=0.97; 1978–2009 (Stumpp et al., 2014)), but is slightly lower in comparison to the ~~revised ~~GMWL, showing stronger local evaporation conditions. Since evaporation causes a differential increase in δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O values of the remaining water, the slope for the linear relationship between δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O is lower in comparison to the GMWL (Rozanski et al., 2001; Wu et al., 2012).~~ The lower intercept (d-excess), dependent on the humidity and temperature conditions in the evaporation region (Mook, 2001), nevertheless shows that moisture recycling did obviously not play a major role in the study area.~~

[Figure 3 near here]

~~Considering isotope samples of the different water cycle components in comparison with the LMWL revealed that mean isotope values of snow samples were for δ^{2}H approximately 84‰ lighter that mean precipitation isotopic signatures (Fig. 3). Stream water isotope samples of both creeks (Schwingbach and Vollnkirchener Bach) fell on the LMWL, showing slight evaporative enrichment for few samples (Fig. 3). Moreover, isotopic values for stream water were almost identical to those found in groundwater (Table 1, Fig. 3).~~

Isotopes of soil water

Spatial variability

Determining the impact of landscape characteristics on soil water isotopic signatures, we found no ~~relationship~~statistically significant connection between the parameters distance to stream, TWI, soil water content, soil texture, pH, and bulk density with the soil isotopic signatures in ~~two depths (0.2 and 0.5 m), except for land use~~both soil depths, except for land use. This was potentially attributed to the small variation in soil textures (mainly clayey silts and loamy sandy silts), bulk densities, and pH values for both soil depths (Table 2). ~~Water contents showed the greatest standard deviation within the two soil depths (Table 2), however, exhibited no effect on soil water isotopes. Moreover, no tendency of higher TWI values with decreasing distance to stream was obvious. Distances to the stream are linked to water flow path lengths and were therefore supposed to be a controlling factor. However, no impact of different distances to the stream on soil water isotopic signatures could be observed~~.

[Table 2 near here]

~~The mean δ-values in the~~ top 0.2 m of the soil profile ~~is~~are higher than ~~further below~~in the subsoil, reflecting a stronger impact of precipitation in the topsoil (Table 2, Fig. 4). ~~The~~While the δ-values ~~of top soil~~for subsoil and precipitation ~~did not vary~~differed significantly ~~statistically~~ (p~~>~~≤0.05), ~~which is~~they did not ~~the case~~ for ~~precipitation and subsoil~~topsoil (Fig. 4). Subsoil isotopic values were statistically equal to stream water and groundwater ~~isotopic values~~ (Fig. 4).

[Figure 4 near here]

Generally, all soil water isotopic values fell on the ~~local meteoric water line~~LMWL, indicating no evaporative enrichment ~~of soil water~~ (Fig. 5). Comparing soil isotopic signatures between different land covers showed generally higher and statistically significantly different δ-values (p~~≤~~ ≤0.05) at 0.2 m soil depth under arable land as compared to forests and grasslands. ~~However, all top soil isotopic values reflected precipitation isotopic~~

~~signals (Fig. 5, top).~~ For the lower 0.5 m of the soil column, isotopic signatures under all land ~~use units~~uses showed statistically similar values~~; nevertheless, differing significantly from precipitation ($p \leq 0.05$) (Fig. 5, bottom).~~

~~.~~ [Figure 5 near here]

Comparing soil water δ^2H values between top and subsoil under different land use units showed significant differences (p~~$\leq$~~≤ 0.05) under arable and grassland but not under forested sites (Fig. ~~5, capital letters~~5).

[Figure 5 near here]

Seasonal isotope soil profiling

Isotope compositions of soil water varied seasonally: More depleted soil water was found in the winter and spring (Fig. 6); contrary, soil water was enriched in summer due to evaporation during warmer and drier periods (Darling, 2004). For summer soil profiles in the Vollnkirchener subcatchment, no evidence for evaporation was obvious below 0.4 m soil depth. However, snowmelt isotopic signatures could be traced down to a soil depth of 0.9 m during spring rather than winter, pointing to a depth-translocation of meltwater in the soil, more remarkable for the deeper profile under arable land (Fig. 6, upper left panel). Furthermore, shallow soil water (<0.4 m) showed larger standard deviations with values closer to mean seasonal precipitation inputs (Fig. 6, upper panels). Winter profiles exhibited somewhat greater standard deviations in comparison to summer isotopic soil profiles. The observed seasonal amplitude ~~smoothed out~~became less pronounced with depth as soil water isotope signals approached groundwater average in >0.9 m depth. Generally, deeper soil water isotope values were relatively constant through time and space.

[Figure 6 near here]

Isotopes of stream water

~~Analysing spatial~~No statistically significant differences ~~in isotopic compositions~~were found between the Schwingbach ~~(sites 11, 19, and 64)~~ and Vollnkirchener Bach ~~(sites 13, 18, and 94)~~ stream water ~~resulted in no statistically significant differences for all sampling points~~ (Fig. ~~7). In general,~~7) with isotope data falling on the LMWL but showing slight evaporative enrichment for few samples (Fig. 3). δ^{18}O values varied for the Vollnkirchener Bach by −8.4±0.4‰ and for the Schwingbach by −8.4±0.6‰ ~~over the two-year observation period~~(Table 1). Stream water isotopic signatures were by approximately −15‰ in δ^{2}H more depleted than precipitation signatures and similar to groundwater (Table 1).

[Figure 7 near here]

~~Stream water isotopic signatures in the Schwingbach catchment were by approximately −15‰ in δ^{2}H more depleted than precipitation signatures (Table 1). However, surface water isotopic compositions were similar to groundwaters (Table 1).~~

Examining temporal isotopic variations,A damped seasonality ~~(less variation)~~ of the isotope concentration in stream water ~~in comparison to~~versus precipitation was ~~measured with main seasonal differences~~ occurring between summer and winter ~~periods~~ (Fig. 7). Most outlying depleted stream water isotopic signatures (e.g. in March 2012 and 2013) ~~could~~can be explained by snowmelt (Fig. 7). However, the outlier at the Schwingbach stream water sampling site 64 (−66.7‰ for δ^{2}H) is by 8.5‰ more depleted than the two-year average of Schwingbach stream water (Table 1). Rainfall falling on 24 September 2012 was −31.9‰ for δ^{2}H. This period in September was generally characterized by low flow and little rainfall ~~(antecedent precipitation index: AP8 was 8mm).~~. Thus, little contribution of new water was observed and stream water isotopic signatures were groundwater-dominated. For site 13, the outlier in May 2012 (−44.2‰ for δ^{2}H) was by 13.8‰ more enriched than the average stream water isotopic composition of the Vollnkirchener Bach over the two-year observation period (Table 1). A runoff peak at site 13 of 0.~~152~~15 mm d^{-1} and a 2.9 mm rainfall event were recorded on 23 May 2012.~~ Moreover, AP8 was 23.2 mm.~~ Thus, this outlier could be explained by precipitation contributing to stream flow causing more enriched isotopic values in stream water, which approached average precipitation δ-values (−43.9±23.4).

Calculated MTT for the Schwingbach ranged ~~between~~from 52~~ and ~~–67 weeks and for the Vollnkirchener Bach ~~between~~from 47~~ and ~~–66 weeks, whereby linear and exponential models provided the best fits for all sampling points. However, the calculated output data did not fit the observed values in terms of the quality ~~criterion~~criteria sigma and model efficiency (Timbe et al., 2014)~~. Model efficiencies for the Schwingbach sampling points were~~ ($\mathrm{ME}_{\mathrm{Schwingbach}}$ −0.1–0.0~~ and for the Vollnkirchener~~, $\mathrm{ME}_{\mathrm{Vollnkirchener}}$ Bach 0.0–0.4~~. Sigma values~~; sigma for all sampling points ~~were ~~0.1~~ for the best fit models, respectively.~~). Even a bias correction of the input data ~~(precipitation) ~~did not improve the model outputs (sigma~~ = ~~=0.1). Therefore, we conclude that ~~the application of ~~transfer function based MTT estimation methods ~~based on stable water isotopes failed in the Schwingbach catchment and developed a new data-driven groundwater model to simulate observed~~applying stable water isotope data failed for the Schwingbach.

~~Isotopes of groundwater~~

~~Since groundwater head levels responded almost as quickly as streamflow to rainfall events, rainfall isotopic signatures were assumed to be rapidly transferred to the groundwater. This was likewise underlined by the fact that Orlowski et al. (2014) observed bidirectional water interactions between the groundwater body and the stream. Studying groundwater isotopic signatures at the downstream section of the Vollnkirchener Bach, almost constant isotopic values (Fig. 8, Table 1) throughout the study period were observed (δ^{2}H: −57.6±1.6‰ for piezometers under meadow). Most depleted groundwater isotopic values (<−80‰ for δ^{2}H) were measured for piezometer 32 during snowmelt events in March and April 2013 as well as for piezometer 27 from December 2012 to February 2013. As shown by Orlowski et al. (2014) piezometer 32 is highly responsive to rainfall-runoff events and groundwater head elevations showed significant correlations with mean daily discharge at this site. Further, effluent conditions and lowest K_{sat} values (7–14 mm h^{-1}) were measured in this stream section (piezometers 32–35) (Orlowski et al., 2014).~~

In the Schwingbach catchment, groundwaterIsotopes of groundwater

Since groundwater head levels responded almost as quickly as streamflow to rainfall events, rainfall isotopic signatures were assumed to be rapidly transferred to the groundwater. For the piezometers under meadow, almost constant isotopic values (Fig. 8, Table 1) were observed (δ^{2}H: −57.6±1.6‰). Most depleted groundwater isotopic values (<−80‰ for δ^{2}H) were measured for piezometer 32 during snowmelt events in March and April 2013 as well as for piezometer 27 from December 2012 to February 2013. Piezometer 32 is highly responsive to rainfall-runoff events and groundwater head elevations showed significant correlations with mean daily discharge at this site (Orlowski et al., 2014).

Groundwater under meadow differed from mean precipitation values by about –14‰ for δ^2H showing no evidence of a rapid transfer of rainfall isotopic signatures to the groundwater~~.~~ (Fig. 8). This was underlined by the results of our MRT estimations which varied between 56–65 weeks for the thirteen considered piezometers. However, the calculated output data did not fit the observed values showing very low MEs (ME: −0.62–−0.09 for δ^{18}O and −0.49–0.16 for δ^2H; sigma: 0.08–0.15 for δ^{18}O and 0.62–1.11 for δ^2H).

[Figure 8 near here]

Due to different water flow paths of groundwater along the studied stream, we expected to find distinguished groundwater isotopic signatures~~ were assumed to be found.~~. In fact, we could identify spatial statistical differences between grassland and arable land groundwater isotopic signatures (Fig. 9). Groundwater isotopic signatures under arable land (sites: 25–29, Fig. 1b) showed more enriched values (Fig. 8) and showed significant correlations ($p<0.05$) among each other (Fig. 9). Arable land groundwater plotted furthest away from surface water sampling points in our network map~~,~~ showing no significant correlations to either the Schwingbach or the Vollnkirchener Bach. ~~This hydrological disconnectivity was already observed in the study of Orlowski et al. (2014). In general, ~~δ^{18}O time series of piezometers along the stream and under the meadow showed ~~close~~closest relations to surface water sampling points (Fig. 9). We further found high correlations ($R^2>0.6$) of δ^{18}O time series of piezometers located under the meadow ~~(sites: 3, 6, and 21) ~~among each other. Additionally, δ^{18}O values of piezometer 3 correlated significantly ($p<0.05$) with surface water sampling points 18 and 94 (R^2=0.6 and 0.8, respectively) and piezometer 32 with sampling points 13 and 64 (R^2=0.8 and 0.6, respectively).

[Figure 9 near here]

We further observed close relations ($p<0.05$) among $\delta^{18}O$ values of Vollnkirchener Bach sampling sites 13, 18, and 94 as well as of Schwingbach sites 11, 19, and 64 along with significant correlations between each other.

~~1.1.1~~ Modelled groundwaterGroundwater age dynamics

Since MTT calculations failed, we modelled the groundwater age in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment using CMF~~, involving~~ (Appendix II), applying observed hydrometric as well as stable water isotope data (Fig. 10).

[Figure 10 near here]

The maximum age of water is highly variable throughout the subcatchment, which results in a ~~very~~ heterogeneous spatial age distribution. The groundwater in most of the outer cells is ~~very~~ young (0–10 years), whereas the inner cells, which incorporate the ~~Vollnkirchner~~Vollnkirchener Bach, contain older water (>30 years). The oldest water (≥55 years) can be found in the Northern part of the catchment (Fig. 10, detail view), where the ~~Vollnkirchner~~Vollnkirchener Bach drains into the Schwingbach. The main outlets of the subcatchment (dark red coloured cell and green cell) even reach an age of 100 and 55 years, respectively. This can be explained by the fact that ~~these are~~it is the lowest ~~cells~~cell within the subcatchment~~. Thus,~~ and that water ~~flows from the higher to the lower cells and water from the whole subcatchment~~ accumulates ~~at these cells.~~here. The overall flow path to ~~these cells~~this cell is the longest and as a consequence the groundwater age ~~of these cells~~in this cell is the highest.

In general, ~~six~~2% of cells contain groundwater that is older than 50 years~~ ~~(, <1~~.7% of cells), and two cells~~% reveal ages >70 years~~ (0.6%). In contrast, 47 cells ~~(, 13~~.3%)~~% contain water with an age of less than one year, and 52~~.4~~% with an age <15 years. Thus, most of the cells contain young to moderately old water (<15 years), while few cells comprise old water (>50 years). The average groundwater age in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment is 16 years. ~~Relating~~Correlating the groundwater age ~~to~~against the distance to the stream, we found a linear correlation (R~~^{2} = ~~^{2}=0.3) with a distinct trend~~:~~. The water tends to be younger with greater distance to the stream.

~~The modelled main flow direction is towards the Vollnkirchener Bach (Fig. 10).~~ The amount of flowing water depicted by the length of the arrows is generally higher near the stream, whereas in most of the outer cells the amount ~~of water is very low (Fig. 10).~~is very low (Fig. 10). The modelled main flow direction is towards the Vollnkirchener Bach but many arrows show flow direction across the stream indicating bidirectional water exchange between the stream and the groundwater body.

Discussion

Variations of precipitation isotopes and d-excess

Analysing effects that influence the precipitation isotopic ~~composition,~~We found no spatial variation in precipitation isotopes ~~was observed~~ throughout the Schwingbach catchment. Mook et al. (1974) also observed for north-western Europe that precipitation collected over periods of 8 and 24 h from three different locations within 6 km^2 at the same altitude were consistent within 0.3‰ for δ^{18}O. ~~Further, no amount or altitude effect for isotopes in precipition was found. However, the observed linear relationship (δ^{18}O =~~ Further, we detected no amount or altitude effect on isotopes in precipitation. Amount effects generally occur most likely in the tropics or for intense convective rain events and are not a key factor for explaining isotope distributions in German precipitation (Stumpp et al., 2014).

The observed linear relationship ($\delta^{18}O=0.44T-12.05$‰) between air temperature and precipitation δ^{18}O values compares reasonably well with a correlation reported by Yurtsever (1975) based on north Atlantic and European stations from the GNIP network δ^{18}O~~ = (~~=(0.521±0.014)T−(14.96±0.21)‰. The same is true for a correlation found by Rozanski et al. (1982) ~~calculated $\delta^2H = (2.4\pm0.3)T-(80.5\pm4.2)$‰ ($R^2 = 0.89$) at the~~ for the GNIP station Stuttgart, ~~which is located~~ 196 km South of the Schwingbach~~ study area. This relationship is similar to the correlation found for the Schwingbach catchment~~. Stumpp et al. (2014) analysed long-term precipitation data from meteorological stations across Germany and found that 23 out of 24 tested stations showed a positive long-term temperature trend over time~~, whereas the precipitation amount was not a key factor for explaining isotope distributions or average values in German precipitation. The temperature–isotope relationship was likewise strongly influenced by seasonality (Stumpp et al., 2014). For the Schwingbach catchment, 53% of the events were sampled at mean daily temperatures >10°C, resulting in a slight overrepresentation of values measured at warmer temperatures. Nevertheless, the~~. The observed correspondence between the degree of isotope depletion and the temperature reflects the influence of the temperature effect in the Schwingbach catchment, which mainly appears in continental, middle–high latitudes ~~(Jouzel et al., 1997; Wu et al., 2012).~~(Jouzel et al., 1997). Furthermore, the correlation between δ^{2}H in monthly precipitations and local surface air temperature becomes increasingly stronger towards the centre of the continent (Rozanski et al., 1982). Thus, the observed seasonal differences in precipitation δ-values in the Schwingbach catchment could mainly be attributed to seasonal differences in air temperature and the presence of snow in the winter of 2012–13 (Fig. 2).

~~Thus, the observed inter-seasonal differences in precipitation δ-values in the Schwingbach catchment could mainly be attributed to seasonal differences in air temperature and water vapour and their effect on evaporation (Schürch et al., 2003) and the presence of snow in the winter of 2012–13 (Fig. 2). This observation is well in agreement with Gat et al. (2001) who stated that for temperate climates the δ^{18}O values generally do not vary by more than 1‰ inter-annually, and a large part of the spread is caused by variations in the average annual temperature. Moreover, the interior of the continent is obviously far more stable with regard to isotopic inputs than areas under greater influence of Atlantic weather patterns. Perhaps in view of this stability, only few isotope data are available for this region, apart from the general GNIP maps (Bowen and Wilkinson, 2002; Darling, 2004; IAEA, 2014) and recent work (Stumpp et al., 2014), for which this work contributes valuable information.~~

Considering d~~-excess values, it is well-known that precipitation~~Precipitation events originating from oceanic moisture show d-excess values close to +10‰ (Craig, 1961a; Dansgaard, 1964; Wu et al., 2012) and one of the main sources for precipitation in Germany is moisture from the Atlantic Ocean (Stumpp et al., 2014). Lowest values corresponded to summer precipitation events ~~with~~where evaporation of the falling raindrops below the cloud base ~~at mean daily air temperatures between 12–18°C~~occurs. Same observations were made by Rozanski et al. (1982) for European GNIP stations. ~~Accordingly, even more negative summer d-excess values were measured at air temperatures around 26–27°C for a study site in Greece (Argiriou and Lykoudis, 2006). Most of the higher values measured in the Schwingbach catchment (>+10‰) appeared in cold seasons (fall/winter) (Fig. 2), similar to d-excess values observed by Wu et al. (2012) for a continental, semi-arid study area in Inner Mongolia (China). Winter snow samples of the Schwingbach catchment with very depleted δ-values showed highest d-excess values, which was again~~Winter snow samples of the

Schwingbach catchment with very depleted δ-values showed highest d-excess values (>+10‰), well in agreement with results of Rozanski et al. (1982) for European GNIP stations. ~~Continental precipitation events originating from oceanic moisture can approach d-excess values of +10‰ (Wu et al., 2012) (Fig. 2, solid line). Air mass trajectories at intercontinental, southern and eastern regions are suggested to be more stable with less variable moisture sources in these regions compared to sites near the coast (Stumpp et al., 2014). Therefore, rainout histories on the continent itself are more stable (Stumpp et al., 2014).~~ The observed differences in d-excess values between the Schwingbach catchment and the GNIP station Koblenz can be attributed to differences in elevation range and the different regional climatic settings at both sites (Koblenz is located in the relatively warmer Rhine river valley).~~ Further, no amount effect on d-excess could be determined for the Schwingbach catchment, which generally occurs most likely in the tropics (Bony et al., 2008) or for intense convective rain events (Gat et al., 2001) at monsoon-dominated sites (Risi et al., 2008).~~

Isotopes of soil water

Spatial variability

~~Determining potential relationships between small-scale characteristics such as distance to stream, TWI, and land use on soil isotopic signatures, no tendency of higher TWI values with decreasing distance to stream was obvious. Garvelmann et al. (2012) investigated two hillslopes in a humid 0.9 km^2 catchment in the southern Black Forest (Germany) and found that soil profiles upslope or with a weak affinity for saturation (low TWIs) preserved the precipitation isotopic signal. In our study, the δ-values of top soil and precipitation did not vary significantly statistically (Fig. 4), which is not the case for precipitation and subsoil. A~~ mixing and homogenization of new and old soil water with depth could not clearly be seen in 0.5 m soil depth, which would have resulted in a lower standard deviation (Song et al., 2011), but standard deviations of isotopic signatures in top and subsoil were similar (Table 2). Subsoil isotopic values were statistically equal to stream We found no statistically significant connection between the parameters distance to stream, TWI, soil water content, soil texture, pH, and bulk density with the soil isotopic signatures in both soil depths. This was potentially attributed to the small variation in soil textures (mainly clayey silts and loamy sandy silts), bulk densities, and pH values for both soil depths (Table 2). ~~and groundwater isotopic values (Fig. 4) implying that the catchment was under baseflow conditions during the sampling~~

~~campaign and that capillary rise of groundwater occurred. Nevertheless, the rainfall isotopic signal was not directly transferred through the soil to the groundwater body, even so prompt groundwater head level raises as a result of rainfall-runoff events occurred. This supports the assumption of double paradox-like catchment behaviour.~~

Garvelmann et al. (2012) obtained high resolution δ^2H vertical depth profiles of pore water at various points along two fall lines of a pasture hillslope in the ~~southern~~ Black Forest (Germany) by applying the H_2O(liquid)–H_2O(vapor) equilibration laser spectroscopy method. The authors showed that groundwater was flowing through the soil in the riparian zone (downslope profiles) and dominated streamflow during baseflow conditions. Their comparison indicated that the percentage of pore water soil samples with a very similar stream water δ^2H signature is increasing towards the stream channel (Garvelmann et al., 2012). In contrast, we found no such relationship between the distance to stream or TWI and soil isotopic values in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment over various heights ~~above sea level~~ (235–294~~-~~ m a.s.l~~.).~~.) and locations. We attributed this to the gentle, low angle hillslopes and the low subsurface flow contribution in large parts of the catchment.

~~Comparing soil water δ^2H values between top and subsoil under different land use units showed significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) under arable and grassland but not under forested sites (Fig. 5). This could be explained through the occurrence of vertical preferential flow paths and interconnected macropore flow such as continuous root channels or earthworm burrows~~In our study, the δ-values of top soil and precipitation did not differ statistically (Fig. 4), but for precipitation and subsoil they did. The latter indicates either the influence of evaporation in the topsoil or the mixing with groundwater in the subsoil. However, a mixing and homogenization of new and old soil water with depth could not clearly be seen in 0.5 m soil depth, which would have resulted in a lower standard deviation (Song et al., 2011), but standard deviations of isotopic signatures in top and subsoil were similar (Table 2). Subsoil isotopic values were statistically equal to stream water and groundwater (Fig. 4) implying that capillary rise of groundwater occurred. Overall, the rainfall isotopic signal was not directly transferred through the soil to the groundwater; even so groundwater head level rose promptly after rainfall events. This behaviour reflects the differences of celerity and velocity in the catchment's rainfall-runoff response (McDonnell and Beven, 2014).

Soil water δ^2H between top and subsoil showed significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) under arable and grassland but not under forested sites (Fig. 5). This could be explained through the occurrence of vertical preferential flow paths and interconnected macropore flow (Buttle and McDonald, 2002) characteristic for forested soils~~ (Alaoui et al., 2011).~~. Alaoui et al. (2011) showed that macropore flow with high interaction with the surrounding soil matrix occurred in forest soils, while macropore flow with low to mixed interaction with the surrounding soil matrix dominates in grassland soils. ~~The authors attributed~~Seasonal tilling prevents the ~~low efficiency~~establishment of ~~grassland soil macropores in transporting all water vertically downward to the fine and dense few topsoil layers caused by the land use that limit water flux into the underlying macropores. In general, the upper part of most~~preferential flow paths under agricultural ~~human-impacted soils is restructured annually due to seasonal tilling~~sites and is regularly done in the Schwingbach catchment, whereas the structure of forest soils, may remain ~~unchanged for years and be~~ uninterrupted throughout the entire soil profile for years (in particular the macropores and biopores) (Alaoui et al., 2011)~~. Considering the bulk density in the Schwingbach catchment increasing values from forest (1.10 g cm^{-3}) over grassland (1.25 g cm^{-3}) to arable land soils (1.41 g cm^{-3}) were measured in the top soil. As reported in a study by Price et al. (2010) for North Carolina (USA), soils underlying forest trees generally feature low bulk density in a comparison with soils impacted by human land use. The reduced hydrological connectivity between top and subsoil under arable and grassland observed in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment therefore led to different isotopic signatures (Fig.~~. This is reflected in the bulk density of the soils in the Schwingbach catchment that increases from forests (1.10 g cm^{-3}) over grassland (1.25 g cm^{-3}) to arable land (1.41 g cm^{-3}) in the top soil. We infer that reduced hydrological connection between top and subsoil under arable and grassland led to different isotopic signatures (Fig. 5).

~~Although, vegetation cover has been proven to have~~often shown an impact on soil water isotopes ~~(Brodersen et al., 2000; Gat, 1996; Li et al., 2007)~~(Gat, 1996), only few data are available for Central Europe (Darling, 2004). ~~Burger and Seiler (1992)~~Burger and Seiler (1992) found that soil water isotopic enrichment under spruce forest in Upper Bavaria was double that beneath neighbouring arable land~~. However,~~ but soil ~~water isotopic signatures~~isotope values were not comparable to groundwater ~~isotope values (Burger and Seiler, 1992)~~(Burger and Seiler, 1992). ~~Brodersen et al. (2000) reported the effect of vegetation structure on δ^{18}O values of rainwater and soil water in the unsaturated zone in southern Germany. In their study,~~Gehrels et al. (1998) also detected (though only slightly) heavier isotopic signatures under forested sites in the Netherlands in comparison to non-forested sites (grassland and heathland). Contrasting, in southern Germany Brodersen et al.

(2000) observed only a negligible effect of throughfall isotopic signatures (of ~~different tree species (~~spruce and beech) ~~seemed to have a negligible effect~~ on soil water isotopes, since soil water in the upper layers followed the seasonal trend in the precipitation input and had a very constant signature in greater depth. ~~In contrast, Gehrels et al. (1998) detected slightly heavier isotopic signatures under forested sites at a field site in the Netherlands in comparison to non-forested sites (grassland and heathland), both showing isotopic signatures comparable to precipitation signals.~~ For the Schwingbach catchment~~,~~ we conclude that the observed land use effect in the upper soil column is mainly attributed to different preservation and transmission of the precipitation input signal. It is most likely not ~~attributed~~attributable to distinguished throughfall isotopic signatures, impact of evaporation or interception losses, since top soil water isotopic signals followed the precipitation input signal under all land use units. ~~The precipitation influence smoothed out with depth since soil water isotopes approached groundwater signatures at 0.5 m soil depth.~~

Seasonal isotope soil profiling

~~Soil water was enriched in summer due to evaporation during warmer and drier periods (Darling, 2004).~~. The depth to which soil water isotopes are significantly affected by evaporation is rarely more than 1–2 m below ground, and often less under temperate climates (Darling, 2004). In contrast, winter profiles exhibited somewhat greater standard deviations in comparison to summer isotopic soil profiles, indicative for wetter soils (Fig. 6, lower panels) and shorter residence times (Thomas et al., 2013). Generally, deeper soil water isotope values were relatively constant through time and space. Similar findings were made by Foerstel et al. (1991) on a sandy soil ~~at Juelich,~~in western Germany ~~and by~~, McConville et al. (2001) under predominately agriculturally used gley and till soils in Northern Ireland~~.~~, and Thomas et al. (2013) ~~likewise observed that soil water isotope samples from shallow soils (≤30 cm) were comparable to precipitation isotopic composition, while samples from intermediate soils (40-100 cm) plot near the groundwater average for~~ in a forested catchment ~~located~~ in central Pennsylvania, USA. Furthermore, Tang and Feng (2001) showed for a sandy loam ~~soil sampling site~~ in New Hampshire (USA) that the influence of summer precipitation decreased with increasing depth, and ~~soil~~soils at 0.5 m ~~can~~ only ~~receive~~received water from large storms. ~~For~~In our summer soil profiles under arable land, precipitation input signals similarly decreased with depth (Fig. 6, upper left panel). Generally, the replacement of old soil water with new infiltrating water is dependent on the frequency and intensity of precipitation and the soil texture, structure, wetness, and water potential of the soil (Li et al., 2007; Tang and Feng, 2001). ~~It is usually more efficient in a wet year than in a dry year (Tang and Feng, 2001). As a result of soil water recharge near the surface~~As a result, the amount of percolating water decreases with depth and consequently, deeper soil layers have less chance to obtain new water (Tang and Feng, 2001). ~~Summer and winter profiles show higher water contents in the upper 0.2 m than further down (Fig. 6, lower panels). Furthermore, in~~In the growing season, the percolation depth is additionally limited by plants' transpiration (Tang and Feng, 2001). For the Schwingbach catchment we conclude that the ~~influence~~percolation of new ~~percolating~~ soil water ~~decreased with depth~~is low as no remarkable seasonality in soil isotopic signatures was obvious at >0.9~~-~~ m and constant values were observed through space and time. Although replications over several years are missing, this result indicates a transit time through the rooting zone (1m) of approximately one year.

Linkages between water cycle components

~~In general, stream~~Stream water isotopic time series of the Vollnkirchener Bach and Schwingbach showed~~ (with few exceptions)~~ little deflections through time and, consequently, provided little insight into time and source-components ~~connectivity. Schürch et al. (2003) likewise observed damped river water isotopic signatures as compared with precipitation isotopic signatures for sampling points of the "Swiss National Network for the Observation of Isotopes in the Water Cycle". For larger rivers like the Elbe at Torgau in eastern Germany seasonal isotopic composition varied with an amplitude of 1.5‰ in δ^{18}O (Darling, 2004).~~

~~As described above, MTT calculations did not provide meaningful results. The failure of the MTT estimations is mainly attributed to the little variation in stream water isotopic signatures~~connection. . Just as in the here presented results, Klaus et al. (2015) had difficulties to apply traditional methods of isotope hydrology (MTT estimation, hydrograph separation) to their dataset due to the lack of temporal isotopic variation in stream water of a forested low-mountainous catchment in South Carolina (USA). Furthermore, stable water isotopes can only be utilised for estimations of younger water (<5 years) ~~(McGuire et al., 2005; Stewart et al., 2010), suggesting that transit times in the Schwingbach catchment are longer than the range used for stable water isotopes.~~

Due to the observed isotopic similarities of stream and groundwater, we ~~assume~~conclude that groundwater predominantly feeds baseflow~~.~~ (discharge <10 L·s^{-1}). Even during peak flow occurring in January 2012, December to April or May 2013, rainfall input did not play a major role for stream water isotopic composition although fast rainfall-runoff behaviours were observed by Orlowski et al. (2014). The damped groundwater isotopic signaturesSame observations were made by Jin et al. (2010) ~~for the Red Canyon Creek watershed (Wyoming, USA), indicating good hydraulic connection between surface water and shallow groundwater and by Klaus et al. (2015) for a low mountainous forested watershed in South Carolina (USA), comparable to the Schwingbach catchment. The damped groundwater isotopic signatures, which likewise showed little variation through time, rather~~ seemed to be a mixture of former lighter precipitation events and snowmelt, since meltwater is known to be depleted in stable isotopes as compared to ~~the annual mean of~~ precipitation or groundwater (Rohde, 1998)~~.~~ (Figure 3). However,~~ one should be aware that~~ differences in the snow sampling method (new snow, snow pit layers, meltwater) can affect the isotopic composition (Penna et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2001). As groundwater at the observed piezometers in the Vollnkirchener subcatchment is shallow (Orlowski et al., 2014), the snowmelt signal is allowed to move rapidly through the soil. Pulses of snowmelt water causing a depletion in spring and early summer was also observed by other studies (Darling, 2004; Kortelainen and Karhu, 2004). ~~We therefore assume that groundwater is mainly recharged throughout the winter. Generally, less than 5 to 25% of precipitation infiltrates to the groundwater table in temperate climates; the rest is lost to runoff, evaporation from soils, and transpiration by vegetation (Clark and Fritz, 1997a).~~We therefore conclude that groundwater is mainly recharged throughout the winter. During spring runoff when soils are saturated, temperatures are low, and vegetation is inactive, recharge rates are generally highest. In contrast, recharge is very low during summer when most precipitation is transpired back to the atmosphere (Clark and Fritz, 1997a). Similarly, O'Driscoll et al. (2005) showed that summer precipitation does not significantly contribute to recharge in the Spring Creek watershed ~~of central~~ (Pennsylvania~~ (~~, USA) since δ^{18}O values in summer precipitation were enriched compared to mean annual groundwater composition.

Further, Orlowski et al. (2014) showed that influent and effluent conditions (bidirectional water exchange) occurred simultaneously at different stream sections of the Vollnkirchener Bach affecting stream and groundwater isotopic compositions, equally. ~~Since groundwater head levels in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment closely followed stream runoff-dynamics and responded to stormflow events with rising head levels (Fig. 8), we conclude that bidirectional water exchange between the groundwater body and the Vollnkirchener Bach~~

~~occurred. ~~Our network map supported this assumption (Fig. 9) as surface water ~~samplings~~sampling points plotted close to groundwater sampling points (especially to the sampling points under the meadow and along the stream). ~~However, both water compartments~~ This was also underlined by our groundwater model showing flow directions across the Vollnkirchener Bach. Nevertheless, both stream and groundwater differed significantly from rainfall isotopic signatures (Table 1). ~~These divergent isotopic signatures but the prompt reaction of the groundwater body to rainfall-runoff events indicate that 'old' groundwater can be released during very short times (Kirchner, 2003).~~ Thus, our catchment showed double water paradox behaviour as ~~described earlier by~~ per Kirchner (2003) ~~as the~~with fast ~~releasing~~release of very old water ~~with~~but little variation in tracer concentration.~~ This paradox behaviour could likewise be a reason for the failure of the MTT estimation.~~

Water age dynamics

Our MTT and MRT calculations did not provide meaningful results. Just by comparing mean precipitation~~ ($\delta^{18}O = -6.2\pm3.1$),~~, stream~~ (e.g. $\delta^{18}O = -8.4\pm0.4$ for the Vollnkirchener Bach),~~, and groundwater isotopic signatures ~~($\delta^{18}O = -8.2\pm0.4$ for the meadow)~~ (Table 1), it is obvious that simple mixing calculations do not work, i.e. showing predominant groundwater contribution. Same observations were made by Jin et al. (2010) indicating good hydraulic connectivity between surface water and shallow groundwater. Just as in the here presented results, Klaus et al. (2015) had difficulties to apply traditional methods of isotope hydrology (MTT estimation, hydrograph separation) to their dataset due to the lack of temporal isotopic variation in stream water of a forested low-mountainous catchment in South Carolina (USA). Furthermore, stable water isotopes can only be utilised for estimations of younger water (<5 years) ~~ either~~(Stewart et al., 2010) as they are blind to older contributions (Duvert et al., 2016). In our catchment, transit times are orders of magnitudes longer than the timescale of hydrologic response (prompt discharge of old water) (McDonnell et al., 2010) and the range used for stable water isotopes.

~~Nevertheless, to still estimate groundwater ages in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment, we established a hydrological model. Our model results suggest that the main groundwater flow direction is towards the stream and the quantity of flowing water is highest near the stream (Fig. 10). This further supports the assumption that stream water is mainly fed by groundwater. Moreover, the simulation underlines the conclusion that the groundwater body and stream water are disconnected from the precipitation cycle, since only 13.3% of cells~~

~~contained water with and age <1 year. The results of the model reveal a spatially highly heterogeneous age distribution of groundwater throughout the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment. The age varies from about two days to more than 100 years with oldest water near the stream.~~Accurately capturing the transit time of the old water fraction is essential (Duvert et al., 2016) and could previously only be determined via other tracers such as tritium (e.g. Thus, our model provides the opportunity to make use of stable water isotope information along with climate, land use, and soil type data, in combination with a digital elevation map to estimate residence times >5 years. ~~Such long residence times could previously only be determined via other tracers such as tritium (e.g.~~ Michel (1992)). Current studies on mixing assumptions either consider spatial or time-varying MTTs. Heidbüchel et al. (2012) proposed the concept of the master transit time distribution that accounts for the temporal variability of MTT. The time-varying transit time concept of Botter et al. (2011) and van der Velde et al. (2012), was recently reformulated by Harman (2015) so that the storage selection function became a function of the watershed storage and actual time. Instead of quantifying time-variant travel times, our model facilitates the estimation of spatially distributed groundwater ages, which opens up new opportunities to compare groundwater ages from over a range of scales within catchments. It further gives a deeper understanding of the groundwater-surface water connection across the landscape than a classical MTT calculation could provide. Our work complements recent advances in spatially distributed modelling of age distributions through transient groundwater flows (e.g. Gomez and Wilson, 2013; Woolfenden and Ginn, 2009). The results of our model reveal a spatially highly heterogeneous age distribution of groundwater throughout the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment (ages of 2 days–100 years) with oldest water near the stream. Thus, our model provides the opportunity to make use of stable water isotope information along with climate, land use, and soil type data, in combination with a digital elevation map to estimate residence times >5 years. If stable water isotope information is used alone, it is known to cause a truncation of stream residence time distributions (Stewart et al., 2010). ~~Moreover, our model facilitates the estimation of spatially distributed groundwater ages, which opens up new opportunities to compare groundwater ages from over a range of scales within catchments~~Further, our groundwater model suggests that the main groundwater flow direction is towards and across the stream and the quantity of flowing water is highest near the stream (Fig. 10). This further supports the assumption that stream water is mainly fed by older groundwater. Moreover, the simulation underlines the conclusion that the groundwater body and stream water are isotopically disconnected from the precipitation cycle, since only 13% of cells contained water with and age <1 year.

~~The observation that gaining and losing stream reaches occur simultaneously along the Vollnkirchner Bach could similarly be supported by our model results. However, due to the model assumption of a constant groundwater recharge over the course of a year, no seasonality was simulated. Moreover, model results differ somewhat from the conceptual model of Orlowski et al. (2014). This is due to the fact that the hydrological model only estimates groundwater fluxes but not surface water fluxes. Moreover, no spatial differences in soil properties of the groundwater layer were considered. Nevertheless, as shown by the diverse ages of water in the stream cells and the assumption of spatially gaining conditions, the model confirms that the stream contains water with different transit times. Therefore, the stream water does not have a discrete age, but a distribution of ages due to variable flow paths throughout the subcatchment (Stewart et al., 2010). Heidbüchel et al. (2012) proposed the concept of the master transit time distribution that accounts for temporal variability of MTT. Our model provides a different approach that considers spatial aspects of transit times and gives a much deeper understanding of the groundwater-surface water connectivity across the landscape than a classical MTT calculation could provide.~~

However, our semi-conceptual model approach has also some limitations. During model setup a series of assumptions and simplifications were made to develop a realistic hydrologic model without a severe loss in performance. ~~Therefore~~Due to the assumption of a constant groundwater recharge over the course of a year, no seasonality was simulated. Moreover, no spatial differences in soil properties of the groundwater layer were considered. Further, several parameters such as the depth of the groundwater body are only rough estimations, while others like evapotranspiration are based on simulations. Moreover, the groundwater body is highly simplified since e.g. properties of the simulated aquifer are assumed to be constant over the subcatchment. ~~However, the complexity of the model is higher than in a simple one dimensional model (with only one cell and one layer), which results in a better spatial resolution, but lower than in a fully distributed variable saturated 3D model.~~Nevertheless, as shown by the diverse ages of water in the stream cells and the assumption of spatially gaining conditions, the model confirms that the stream contains water with different transit times and supports the assumption that surface and groundwater are isotopically disconnected from precipitation. Therefore, the stream water does not have a discrete age, but a distribution of ages due to variable flow paths (Stewart et al., 2010). In future models a more diverse groundwater body based on small-scale measurements of aquifer parameters should be implemented. Especially data of saturated hydraulic conductivity with high spatial resolution, as well as the implementation of a temporal dynamic groundwater recharge could lead to an enhanced model performance. ~~Nevertheless, our hydrological model enables a good assessment of the groundwater age for the Vollnkirchner Bach subcatchment and supports the assumption that surface and groundwater are disconnected from precipitation.~~

Conclusions

Conducting a stable water isotope study in the Schwingbach catchment helped to identify relationships between precipitation, stream, soil, and groundwater in a developed (managed) catchment. The close isotopic link between groundwater and the streams revealed that groundwater controls streamflow. Moreover, it could be shown that groundwater was predominately recharged during winter but was decoupled from the annual precipitation cycle. Even so streamflow and groundwater head levels promptly responded to precipitation inputs, there was no obvious change in their isotopic composition due to rain events ~~(old water paradox behaviour). This was underlined by the fact that no remarkable seasonality in soil isotopic signatures as interface between precipitation and groundwater was obvious at >0.9 m and constant values were observed through space and time~~.

Nevertheless, the lack of temporal variation in stable isotope time series of stream and groundwater ~~(with few exceptions)~~ limited the application of classical methods of isotope hydrology, i.e. ~~mean transit time~~ transfer function based MTT estimations. By splitting the flow path into different compartments (upper and lower vadose zone, groundwater, stream), we were able to determine, where the water age passes the limit of using stable isotopes for age calculations. This limit is in the ~~Schwingbach catchment. We therefore setup~~lower vadose zone approximately 1–2 m below ground. To estimate the total transit time to the stream, we set up a hydrological model ~~with CMF to estimate~~ calculating spatially distributed groundwater ages and flow directions in the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment. Our model ~~result~~results supported the finding that the water in the catchment is >5 years (on average 16 years) and that stream water is mainly fed by groundwater. Our modelling approach was valuable to overcome the limitations of MTT calculations with traditional methods and/or models. ~~Thus~~Further, our dual isotope study in combination with ~~a~~the hydrological model approach ~~was valuable for determining the connectivity~~enabled the determination of connection and ~~disconnectivity~~disconnection between different water cycle components.

Acknowledgements

The first author acknowledges finical support by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Bonn, DE). Furthermore, this work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under Grant BR2238/10-1. Thanks also to the student assistants, BSc. and MSc. students for their help during field sampling campaigns and hydrological modelling. In this regard we like to acknowledge especially Julia Mechsner, Julia Klöber, and Judith Henkel. We thank Dr. Christine Stumpp from the Helmholtz Zentrum München for providing us the isotope data from GNIP station Koblenz.

References

~~Aggarwal, P. K., Gat, J. R. and Froehlich, K. F., Eds.: Isotopes in the Water Cycle: Past, Present and Future of a Developing Science, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands., 2007.~~

~~Alaoui, A., Caduff, U., Gerke, H. H. and Weingartner, R.: Preferential Flow Effects on Infiltration and Runoff in Grassland and Forest Soils, Vadose Zone J., 10(1), 367, doi:10.2136/vzj2010.0076, 2011.~~

~~Allan, J. D.: Landscapes and Riverscapes: The Influence of Land Use on Stream Ecosystems, Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 35, 257–284, 2004.~~

~~Araguás-Araguás, L., Froehlich, K. and Rozanski, K.: Deuterium and oxygen-18 isotope composition of precipitation and atmospheric moisture, Hydrol. Process., 14(8), 1341–1355, 2000.~~

~~Argiriou, A. A. and Lykoudis, S.: Isotopic composition of precipitation in Greece, J. Hydrol., 327(3–4), 486–495, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.11.053, 2006.~~

~~Barnes, C. J. and Allison, G. B.: Tracing of water movement in the unsaturated zone using stable isotopes of hydrogen and oxygen, J. Hydrol., 100(1–3), 143–176, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(88)90184-9, 1988.~~

~~Barthold, F. K., Tyralla, C., Schneider, K., Vaché, K. B., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: How many tracers do we need for end member mixing analysis (EMMA)? A sensitivity analysis, Water Resour. Res., 47(8), doi:10.1029/2011WR010604, 2011.~~

~~Birkel, C., Dunn, S. M., Tetzlaff, D. and Soulsby, C.: Assessing the value of high-resolution isotope tracer data in the stepwise development of a lumped conceptual rainfall–runoff model, Hydrol. Process., 24(16), 2335–2348, doi:10.1002/hyp.7763, 2010.~~

~~Blasch, K. W. and Bryson, J. R.: Distinguishing Sources of Ground Water Recharge by Using δ^2H and δ^{18}O, Ground Water, 45(3), 294–308, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2006.00289.x, 2007.~~

~~Bony, S., Risi, C. and Vimeux, F.: Influence of convective processes on the isotopic composition (δ^{18}O and δD) of precipitation and water vapor in the tropics: 1. Radiative-convective equilibrium and Tropical Ocean–Global Atmosphere–Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere Response Experiment (TOGA-COARE) simulations, J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres, 113(D19), D19305, doi:10.1029/2008JD009942, 2008.~~

~~Botter, G., Bertuzzo, E. and Rinaldo, A.: Transport in the hydrologic response: Travel time distributions, soil moisture dynamics, and the old water paradox, Water Resour. Res., 46(3), W03514, doi:10.1029/2009WR008371, 2010.~~

~~Bowen, G. J. and Wilkinson, B.: Spatial distribution of δ^{18}O in meteoric precipitation, Geology, 30(4), 315–318, doi:10.1130/0091-7613(2002)030<0315:SDOOIM>2.0.CO;2, 2002.~~

~~Brodersen, C., Pohl, S., Lindenlaub, M., Leibundgut, C. and Wilpert, K. v: Influence of vegetation structure on isotope content of throughfall and soil water, Hydrol. Process., 14(8), 1439–1448, doi:10.1002/1099-1085(20000615)14:8<1439::AID-HYP985>3.0.CO;2-3, 2000.~~

~~Burger, H. M. and Seiler, K. P.: Evaporation from soil water under humid climate conditions and its impact on deuterium and 18O concentrations in groundwater., edited by International Atomic Energy Agency, pp. 674–678, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1992.~~

~~Buttle, J. M.: Isotope hydrograph separations and rapid delivery of pre-event water from drainage basins, Prog. Phys. Geogr., 18(1), 16–41, doi:10.1177/030913339401800102, 1994.~~

~~Buttle, J. M.: Isotope Hydrograph Separation of Runoff Sources, in Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences, edited by M. G. Anderson, p. 10:116, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, Great Britain, 2006.~~

~~Buttle, J. M. and McDonald, D. J.: Coupled vertical and lateral preferential flow on a forested slope, Water Resour. Res., 38(5), 18–1, doi:10.1029/2001WR000773, 2002.~~

~~Choi, S. H.: Characteristics of hydrogeologic units of groundwater resources in the Republic of Korea, in Engineering Geology and the Environment, vol. 4, edited by P. G. Marinos, G. C. Koukis, G. C. Tsiambaos, and G. C. Stournaras, pp. 1219–1224, CRC Press, Florida, USA., 1997.~~

~~Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: Groundwater, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, p.80, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997a.~~

~~Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: Methods for Field Sampling, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, p. 283, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997b.~~

~~Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: The Environmental Isotopes, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, pp. 2–34, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997c.~~

~~Cooper, L. W.: Isotopic Fractionation in Snow Cover, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 119–136, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.~~

~~Craig, H.: Isotopic Variations in Meteoric Waters, Science, 133(3465), 1702–1703, doi:10.1126/science.133.3465.1702, 1961a.~~

~~Craig, H.: Standard for reporting concentrations of deuterium and oxygen-18 in natural waters, Science, 133(3467), 1833, 1961b.~~

~~Csardi, G. and Nepusz, T.: The igraph software package for complex network research, Complex Systems 1695. [online] Available from: http://igraph.sf.net (Accessed 24 December 2015), 2006.~~

~~Dansgaard, W.: Stable isotopes in precipitation, Tellus, 16(4), 436–468, doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1964.tb00181.x, 1964.~~

~~Darling, W. G.: Hydrological factors in the interpretation of stable isotopic proxy data present and past: a European perspective, Quat. Sci. Rev., 23(7-8), 743-770, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2003.06.016, 2004.~~

~~Day, T. J.: On the precision of salt dilution gauging, J. Hydrol., 31(3-4), 293-306, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(76)90130-X, 1976.~~

~~DWD: Deutscher Wetterdienst - Wetter und Klima, Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, [online] Available from: http://dwd.de/ (Accessed 17 February 2014), 2014.~~

~~Eijkelkamp: RBC flumes, [online] Available from: http://en.eijkelkamp.com/products/water/hydrological-research/water-discharge-measurements/rbc-flumes.htm (Accessed 13 January 2014), 2014.~~

~~Foerstel, H., Frinken, J., Huetzen, H., Lembrich, D. and Puetz, T.: Application of $H_2^{18}O$ as a tracer of water flow in soil, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria, 1991.~~

~~Froehlich, K., Gibson, J. J. and Aggarwal, P. K.: Deuterium excess in precipitation and its climatological significance, in Study of Environmental Changes Using Isotope Techniques, pp. 54-65, C&S Paper Series 13/P, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 2002.~~

~~Garvelmann, J., Kuells, C. and Weiler, M.: A porewater-based stable isotope approach for the investigation of subsurface hydrological processes, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 16(2), 631-640, doi:10.5194/hess-16-631-2012, 2012.~~

~~Gat, J. R.: Oxygen and Hydrogen Isotopes in the Hydrologic Cycle, Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci., 24(1), 225-262, doi:10.1146/annurev.earth.24.1.225, 1996.~~

~~Gat, J., R., Mook, W. G. and Meijer, H. A. J.: Environmental isotopes in the hydrological cycle: Principles and Applications, edited by W. G. Mook, International Hydrological Programme; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Atomic Energy Agency, Paris, France., 2001.~~

~~Gehrels, J. C., Peeters, J. E. M., de Vries, J. J. and Dekkers, M.: The mechanism of soil water movement as inferred from ^{18}O stable isotope studies, Hydrol. Sci. J., 43(4), 579-594, doi:10.1080/02626669809492154, 1998.~~

~~Genereux, D. P. and Hooper, R. P.: Oxygen and Hydrogen Isotopes in Rainfall-Runoff Studies, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 319-346, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.~~

~~Goller, R., Wilcke, W., Leng, M. J., Tobschall, H. J., Wagner, K., Valarezo, C. and Zech, W.: Tracing water paths through small catchments under a tropical montane rain forest in south Ecuador by an oxygen isotope approach, J. Hydrol., 308(1-4), 67-80, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.10.022, 2005.~~

~~Gonfiantini, R., Fröhlich, K., Araguás-Araguás, L. and Rozanski, K.: Isotopes in Groundwater Hydrology, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 203-246, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.~~

~~Goni, I. B.: Tracing stable isotope values from meteoric water to groundwater in the southwestern part of the Chad basin, Hydrogeol. J., 14(5), 742–752, doi:10.1007/s10040-005-0469-y, 2006.~~

~~Gordon, L. J., Finlayson, C. M. and Falkenmark, M.: Managing water in agriculture for food production and other ecosystem services, Agric. Water Manag., 97(4), 512–519, doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2009.03.017, 2010.~~

~~Heidbüchel, I., Troch, P. A., Lyon, S. W. and Weiler, M.: The master transit time distribution of variable flow systems, Water Resour. Res., 48(6), W06520, doi:10.1029/2011WR011293, 2012.~~

~~Hoeg, S., Uhlenbrook, S. and Leibundgut, C.: Hydrograph separation in a mountainous catchment — combining hydrochemical and isotopic tracers, Hydrol. Process., 14(7), 1199–1216, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(200005)14:7<1199::AID-HYP35>3.0.CO;2-K, 2000.~~

~~Hollander, M., Wolfe, D. A. and Chicken, E.: Nonparametric Statistical Methods, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA., 2013.~~

~~Hsieh, J. C. C., Chadwick, O. A., Kelly, E. F. and Savin, S. M.: Oxygen isotopic composition of soil water: quantifying evaporation and transpiration, Geoderma, 82(1-3), 269–293, doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(97)00105-5, 1998.~~

~~IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency: Water Resources Programme – Global Network of Isotopes in Precipitation, [online] Available from: http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/ih/IHS_resources_gnip.html (Accessed 11 August 2014), 2014.~~

~~Ivkovic, K. M.: A top–down approach to characterise aquifer–river interaction processes, J. Hydrol., 365(3–4), 145–155, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.11.021, 2009.~~

~~Jin, L., Siegel, D. I., Lautz, L. K., Mitchell, M. J., Dahms, D. E. and Mayer, B.: Calcite precipitation driven by the common ion effect during groundwater–surface-water mixing: A potentially common process in streams with geologic settings containing gypsum, Geol. Soc. Am. Bull., 122(7/8), B30011.1, doi:10.1130/B30011.1, 2010.~~

~~Jin, L., Siegel, D. I., Lautz, L. K. and Lu, Z.: Identifying streamflow sources during spring snowmelt using water chemistry and isotopic composition in semi-arid mountain streams, J. Hydrol., 470–471, 289–301, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.09.009, 2012.~~

~~Jolliffe, I. T.: Principal Component Analysis, 2nd ed., Springer Science & Business Media, New York, NY, USA., 2002.~~

~~Jouzel, J., Alley, R. B., Cuffey, K. M., Dansgaard, W., Grootes, P., Hoffmann, G., Johnsen, S. J., Koster, R. D., Peel, D., Shuman, C. A., Stievenard, M., Stuiver, M. and White, J.: Validity of the temperature reconstruction from water isotopes in ice cores, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 26471–26487, doi:10.1029/97JC01283, 1997.~~

~~Kendall, C. and Caldwell, E. A.: Fundamentals of Isotope Geochemistry, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 51–86, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.~~

~~Kendall, C. and Coplen, T. B.: Distribution of oxygen-18 and deuterium in river waters across the United States, Hydrol. Process., 15, 1363–1393, doi:10.1002/hyp.217, 2001.~~

~~Kirchner, J. W.: A double paradox in catchment hydrology and geochemistry, Hydrol. Process., 17(4), 871–874, doi:10.1002/hyp.5108, 2003.~~

~~Klapper, H.: Historical Change of Large Alluvial Rivers: Western Europe, edited by G. E. Petts, H. Möller, and A. L. Roux, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., Chichester, Great Britain, 1990.~~

~~Klaus, J., McDonnell, J. J., Jackson, C. R., Du, E. and Griffiths, N. A.: Where does streamwater come from in low-relief forested watersheds? A dual-isotope approach, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19(1), 125–135, 2015.~~

~~Koeniger, P., Leibundgut, C. and Stichler, W.: Spatial and temporal characterisation of stable isotopes in river water as indicators of groundwater contribution and confirmation of modelling results; a study of the Weser river, Germany, Isotopes Environ. Health Stud., 45(4), 289–302, doi:10.1080/10256010903356953, 2009.~~

~~Koivusalo, H., Karvonen, T. and Lepistö, A.: A quasi-three-dimensional model for predicting rainfall-runoff processes in a forested catchment in Southern Finland, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 4(1), 65–78, doi:10.5194/hess-4-65-2000, 1999.~~

~~Kolaczyk, E. D.: Statistical Analysis of Network Data with R, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, NY, USA., 2014.~~

~~Kortelainen, N. M. and Karhu, J. A.: Regional and seasonal trends in the oxygen and hydrogen isotope ratios of Finnish groundwaters: a key for mean annual precipitation, J. Hydrol., 285(1–4), 143–157, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.08.014, 2004.~~

~~Kraft, P., Vaché, K. B., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: CMF: A Hydrological Programming Language Extension For Integrated Catchment Models, Environ. Model. Softw., 26(6), 828–830, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.12.009, 2011.~~

~~Ladouche, B., Probst, A., Viville, D., Idir, S., Baqu'e, D., Loubet, M., Probst, J. L. and Bariac, T.: Hydrograph separation using isotopic, chemical and hydrological approaches (Strengbach catchment, France), J. Hydrol., 242(3), 255–274, 2001.~~

~~Lai, C.-T. and Ehleringer, J. R.: Deuterium excess reveals diurnal sources of water vapor in forest air, Oecologia, 165(1), 213–223, doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1721-2, 2011.~~

~~Lauer, F., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Uncertainty assessment of quantifying spatially concentrated groundwater discharge to small streams by distributed temperature sensing, Water Resour. Res., 49(1), 400–407, doi:10.1029/2012WR012537, 2013.~~

~~Leen, J. B., Berman, E. S. F., Liebson, L. and Gupta, M.: Spectral contaminant identifier for off-axis integrated cavity output spectroscopy measurements of liquid water isotopes, Rev. Sci. Instrum., 83(4), doi:10.1063/1.4704843, 2012.~~

~~LGR: Los Gatos Research, Greenhouse Gas, isotope and trace gas analyzers, [online] Available from: http://www.lgrinc.com/ (Accessed 5 February 2013), 2013.~~

~~Liebminger, A., Haberhauer, G., Papesch, W., Heiss, G. and others: Footprints of climate in groundwater and precipitation, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 11(2), 785–791, doi:10.5194/hess-11-785-2007, 2007.~~

~~Li, F., Song, X., Tang, C., Liu, C., Yu, J. and Zhang, W.: Tracing infiltration and recharge using stable isotope in Taihang Mt., North China, Environ. Geol., 53(3), 687–696, doi:10.1007/s00254-007-0683-0, 2007.~~

~~Małoszewski, P. and Zuber, A.: Lumped parameter models for interpretation of environmental tracer data, in Manual on Mathematical Models in Isotope Hydrogeology, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1996.~~

~~Maloszewski, P. and Zuber, A.: Manual on lumped parameter models used for the interpretation of environmental tracer data in groundwaters, in Use of isotopes for analyses of flow and transport dynamics in groundwater systems, p. 50, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 2002.~~

~~Maule, C. P., Chanasyk, D. S. and Muehlenbachs, K.: Isotopic determination of snow-water contribution to soil water and groundwater, J. Hydrol., 155(1-2), 73–91, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(94)90159-7, 1994.~~

~~Mazor, E.: Part I. Physical and Geological Concepts, 2. Basic Hydrological Concepts, in Chemical and Isotopic Groundwater Hydrology, pp. 15–48, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, USA., 2003.~~

~~McConville, C., Kalin, R. m., Johnston, H. and McNeill, G. w.: Evaluation of Recharge in a Small Temperate Catchment Using Natural and Applied δ^{18}O Profiles in the Unsaturated Zone, Ground Water, 39(4), 616–623, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2001.tb02349.x, 2001.~~

~~McDonnell, J. J., Sivapalan, M., Vaché, K., Dunn, S., Grant, G., Haggerty, R., Hinz, C., Hooper, R., Kirchner, J., Roderick, M. L. and others: Moving beyond heterogeneity and process complexity: a new vision for watershed hydrology, Water Resour. Res., 43(7), W07301, 2007.~~

~~McGuire, K. ., DeWalle, D. . and Gburek, W. .: Evaluation of mean residence time in subsurface waters using oxygen-18 fluctuations during drought conditions in the mid-Appalachians, J. Hydrol., 261(1–4), 132–149, doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(02)00006-9, 2002.~~

~~McGuire, K. J., McDonnell, J. J., Weiler, M., Kendall, C., McGlynn, B. L., Welker, J. M. and Seibert, J.: The role of topography on catchment-scale water residence time, Water Resour. Res., 41(5), W05002, doi:10.1029/2004WR003657, 2005.~~

~~Michel, R. L.: Residence times in river basins as determined by analysis of long-term tritium records, J. Hydrol., 130(1), 367–378, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(92)90117-E, 1992.~~

~~Mook, W. G., Ed.: Environmental Isotopes in the Hydrological Cycle: Principles and Applications, International Hydrological Programme; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Atomic Energy Agency, Paris, Vienna., 2001.~~

~~Mook, W. G., Groeneveld, D. J., Brouwn, A. E. and Ganswijk, A. J. van: Analysis of a run-off hydrograph by means of natural ^{18}O, in Isotope techniques in groundwater hydrology, vol. 1, pp. 159–169, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1974.~~

~~Moore, R. D.: Introduction to Salt Dilution Gauging for Streamflow Measurement: Part 1, Streamline Watershed Manag. Bull., 7(4), 20–23, 2004.~~

~~Munyaneza, O., Wenninger, J. and Uhlenbrook, S.: Identification of runoff generation processes using hydrometric and tracer methods in a meso-scale catchment in Rwanda, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 16(7), 1991–2004, doi:10.5194/hess-16-1991-2012, 2012.~~

~~Neal, C. and Rosier, P. T. W.: Chemical studies of chloride and stable oxygen isotopes in two conifer afforested and moorland sites in the British uplands, J. Hydrol., 115(1–4), 269–283, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(90)90209-G, 1990.~~

~~O'Driscoll, M., Clinton, S., Jefferson, A., Manda, A. and McMillan, S.: Urbanization Effects on Watershed Hydrology and In-Stream Processes in the Southern United States, Water, 2(3), 605–648, doi:10.3390/w2030605, 2010.~~

~~O'Driscoll, M. A., DeWalle, D. R., McGuire, K. J. and Gburek, W. J.: Seasonal ^{18}O variations and groundwater recharge for three landscape types in central Pennsylvania, USA, J. Hydrol., 303(1–4), 108–124, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.08.020, 2005.~~

~~Orlowski, N., Frede, H. G., Brüggemann, N. and Breuer, L.: Validation and application of a cryogenic vacuum extraction system for soil and plant water extraction for isotope analysis, J. Sens. Sens. Syst., 2(2), 179–193, doi:10.5194/jsss-2-179-2013, 2013.~~

~~Orlowski, N., Lauer, F., Kraft, P., Frede, H. G. and Breuer, L.: Linking Spatial Patterns of Groundwater Table Dynamics and Streamflow Generation Processes in a Small Developed Catchment, Water, 6(10), 3085–3117, doi:10.3390/w6103085, 2014.~~

~~Penna, D., Ahmad, M., Birks, S. J., Bouchaou, L., Brenčič, M., Butt, S., Holko, L., Jeelani, G., Martínez, D. E., Melikadze, G., Shanley, J. B., Sokratov, S. A., Stadnyk, T., Sugimoto, A. and Vreča, P.: A new method of snowmelt sampling for water stable isotopes, Hydrol. Process., 28(22), 5637–5644, doi:10.1002/hyp.10273, 2014.~~

~~Phillips, D. L. and Gregg, J. W.: Source partitioning using stable isotopes: coping with too many sources, Oecologia, 136(2), 261–269, doi:10.1007/s00442-003-1218-3, 2003.~~

~~Pierce, S. C., Kröger, R. and Pezeshki, R.: Managing Artificially Drained Low-Gradient Agricultural Headwaters for Enhanced Ecosystem Functions, Biology, 1(3), 794–856, doi:10.3390/biology1030794, 2012.~~

~~Price, K., Jackson, C. R. and Parker, A. J.: Variation of surficial soil hydraulic properties across land uses in the southern Blue Ridge Mountains, North Carolina, USA, J. Hydrol., 383(3–4), 256–268, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.12.041, 2010.~~

~~Qu, Y. and Duffy, C. J.: A semidiscrete finite volume formulation for multiprocess watershed simulation, Water Resour. Res., 43(8), W08419, doi:10.1029/2006WR005752, 2007.~~

~~Rinaldo, A., Benettin, P., Harman, C. J., Hrachowitz, M., McGuire, K. J., van der Velde, Y., Bertuzzo, E. and Botter, G.: Storage selection functions: A coherent framework for quantifying how catchments store and release water and solutes, Water Resour. Res., 51(6), 4840–4847, doi:10.1002/2015WR017273, 2015.~~

~~Risi, C., Bony, S., Vimeux, F., Descroix, L., Ibrahim, B., Lebreton, E., Mamadou, I. and Sultan, B.: What controls the isotopic composition of the African monsoon precipitation? Insights from event-based precipitation collected during the 2006 AMMA field campaign, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35(24), L24808, doi:10.1029/2008GL035920, 2008.~~

~~Rockström, J., Falkenmark, M., Allan, T., Folke, C., Gordon, L., Jägerskog, A., Kummu, M., Lannerstad, M., Meybeck, M., Molden, D., Postel, S., Savenije, H. h. g., Svedin, U., Turton, A. and Varis, O.: The unfolding water drama in the Anthropocene: towards a resilience-based perspective on water for global sustainability, Ecohydrol., 7(5), 1249–1261, doi:10.1002/eco.1562, 2014.~~

~~Rodgers, P., Soulsby, C. and Waldron, S.: Stable isotope tracers as diagnostic tools in upscaling flow path understanding and residence time estimates in a mountainous mesoscale catchment, Hydrol. Process., 19(11), 2291–2307, doi:10.1002/hyp.5677, 2005a.~~

~~Rodgers, P., Soulsby, C., Waldron, S. and Tetzlaff, D.: Using stable isotope tracers to assess hydrological flow paths, residence times and landscape influences in a nested mesoscale catchment, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 9(3), 139–155, 2005b.~~

~~Rohde, A.: Snowmelt-Dominated Systems, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 391–433, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.~~

~~Rothfuss, Y., Biron, P., Braud, I., Canale, L., Durand, J.-L., Gaudet, J.-P., Richard, P., Vauclin, M. and Bariac, T.: Partitioning evapotranspiration fluxes into soil evaporation and plant transpiration using water stable isotopes under controlled conditions, Hydrol. Process., 24(22), 3177–3194, doi:10.1002/hyp.7743, 2010.~~

~~Rothfuss, Y., Braud, I., Le Moine, N., Biron, P., Durand, J.-L., Vauclin, M. and Bariac, T.: Factors controlling the isotopic partitioning between soil evaporation and plant transpiration: Assessment using a multi-objective calibration of SiSPAT-Isotope under controlled conditions, J. Hydrol., 442-443, 75–88, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.03.041, 2012.~~

~~Rozanski, K., Sonntag, C. and Münnich, K. O.: Factors controlling stable isotope composition of European precipitation, Tellus, 34(2), 142–150, doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1982.tb01801.x, 1982.~~

~~Rozanski, K., Araguás-Araguás, L. and Gonfiantini, R.: Isotopic Patterns in Modern Global Precipitation, in Climate Change in Continental Isotopic Records, edited by P. K. Swart, K. C. Lohmann, J. Mckenzie, and S. Savin, pp. 1–36, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D. C., US. [online] Available from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/GM078p0001/summary (Accessed 13 August 2014), 1993.~~

~~Rozanski, K., Froehlich, K. and Mook, W. G.: in Environmental isotopes in the hydrological cycle: Principles and Applications, vol. 3, International Hydrological Programme; United~~

~~Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Atomic Energy Agency, Paris, Vienna., 2001.~~

~~Schultz, N. M., Griffis, T. J., Lee, X. and Baker, J. M.: Identification and correction of spectral contamination in ^{2}H/^{1}H and ^{18}O/^{16}O measured in leaf, stem, and soil water, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 25(21), 3360–3368, doi:10.1002/rcm.5236, 2011.~~

~~Schürch, M., Kozel, R., Schotterer, U. and Tripet, J. P.: Observation of isotopes in the water cycle the Swiss National Network (NISOT), Environ. Geol., 45(1), 1–11, doi:10.1007/s00254-003-0843-9, 2003.~~

~~Sklash, M. G.: Environmental isotope studies of storm and snowmelt runoff generation, in Process studies in hillslope hydrology, edited by M. G. Anderson, pp. 410–435, Wiley, New York, NY, USA., 1990.~~

~~Sklash, M. G. and Farvolden, R. N.: The Role Of Groundwater In Storm Runoff, in Developments in Water Science, vol. 12, edited by W. B. and D. A. Stephenson, pp. 45–65, Elsevier. [online] Available from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167564809700097 (Accessed 8 October 2015), 1979.~~

~~Song, X., Wang, P., Yu, J., Liu, X., Liu, J. and Yuan, R.: Relationships between precipitation, soil water and groundwater at Chongling catchment with the typical vegetation cover in the Taihang mountainous region, China, Environ. Earth Sci., 62(4), 787–796, doi:10.1007/s12665-010-0566-7, 2011.~~

~~Stewart, M. K., Morgenstern, U. and McDonnell, J. J.: Truncation of stream residence time: how the use of stable isotopes has skewed our concept of streamwater age and origin, Hydrol. Process., 24(12), 1646–1659, doi:10.1002/hyp.7576, 2010.~~

~~Stumpp, C., Klaus, J. and Stichler, W.: Analysis of long-term stable isotopic composition in German precipitation, J. Hydrol., 517, 351–361, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.05.034, 2014.~~

~~Tang, K. and Feng, X.: The effect of soil hydrology on the oxygen and hydrogen isotopic compositions of plants' source water, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 185(3-4), 355–367, 2001.~~

~~Taylor, S., Feng, X., Kirchner, J. W., Osterhuber, R., Klaue, B. and Renshaw, C. E.: Isotopic evolution of a seasonal snowpack and its melt, Water Resour. Res., 37(3), 759–769, doi:10.1029/2000WR900341, 2001.~~

~~Thomas, E. M., Lin, H., Duffy, C. J., Sullivan, P. L., Holmes, G. H., Brantley, S. L. and Jin, L.: Spatiotemporal Patterns of Water Stable Isotope Compositions at the Shale Hills Critical Zone Observatory: Linkages to Subsurface Hydrologic Processes, Vadose Zone J., 12(4), 0, doi:10.2136/vzj2013.01.0029, 2013.~~

~~Timbe, E., Windhorst, D., Crespo, P., Frede, H. G., Feyen, J. and Breuer, L.: Understanding uncertainties when inferring mean transit times of water trough tracer-based lumped-parameter models in Andean tropical montane cloud forest catchments, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(4), 1503–1523, doi:10.5194/hess-18-1503-2014, 2014.~~

~~UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme: Global Environment Outlook 3: Past, Present and Future Perspectives, Earthscan Publications Ltd, London, United Kingdom., 2002.~~

~~Wallis, W. D.: A Beginner's Guide to Graph Theory, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, USA., 2007.~~

~~Wang, X. F. and Yakir, D.: Using stable isotopes of water in evapotranspiration studies, Hydrol. Process., 14(8), 1407–1421, doi:10.1002/1099-1085(20000615)14:8<1407::AID-HYP992>3.0.CO;2-K, 2000.~~

~~Wassenaar, L. I., Athanasopoulos, P. and Hendry, M. J.: Isotope hydrology of precipitation, surface and ground waters in the Okanagan Valley, British Columbia, Canada, J. Hydrol., 411(1–2), 37–48, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.09.032, 2011.~~

~~Whitefield, P.: Chapter 3: Soil, in Earth Care Manual: A Permaculture Handbook for Britain & Other Temperate Climates, pp. 39–66, Permanent Publications, East Meon, UK., 2004.~~

~~Windhorst, D., Waltz, T., Timbe, E., Frede, H. G. and Breuer, L.: Impact of elevation and weather patterns on the isotopic composition of precipitation in a tropical montane rainforest, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17(1), 409–419, doi:10.5194/hess-17-409-2013, 2013.~~

~~Windhorst, D., Kraft, P., Timbe, E., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Stable water isotope tracing through hydrological models for disentangling runoff generation processes at the hillslope scale, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(10), 4113–4127, doi:10.5194/hess-18-4113-2014, 2014.~~

~~Wu, J., Ding, Y., Ye, B., Yang, Q., Hou, D. and Xue, L.: Stable isotopes in precipitation in Xilin River Basin, northern China and their implications, Chin. Geogr. Sci., 22(5), 531–540, doi:10.1007/s11769-012-0543-z, 2012.~~

~~Xia, Y.: Optimization and uncertainty estimates of WMO regression models for the systematic bias adjustment of NLDAS precipitation in the United States, J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres, 111(D8), D08102, doi:10.1029/2005JD006188, 2006.~~

~~Yurtsever, Y.: Worldwide survey of stable isotopes in precipitation, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1975.~~

~~Zhang, Y., Shen, Y., Chen, Y. and Wang, Y.: Spatial characteristics of surface water and groundwater using water stable isotope in the Tarim River Basin, northwestern China, Ecohydrol., 6(6), 1031–1039, doi:10.1002/eco.1416, 2013.~~

~~Zhao, L., Xiao, H., Zhou, J., Wang, L., Cheng, G., Zhou, M., Yin, L. and McCabe, M. F.: Detailed assessment of isotope ratio infrared spectroscopy and isotope ratio mass spectrometry for the stable isotope analysis of plant and soil waters, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 25(20), 3071–3082, doi:10.1002/rcm.5204, 2011.~~

~~Zimmermann, U., Ehhalt, D. and Muennich, K. O.: Soil-Water Movement and Evapotranspiration: Changes in the Isotopic Composition of the Water., in Isotopes in Hydrology., pp. 567–85, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1968.~~

Alaoui, A., Caduff, U., Gerke, H. H. and Weingartner, R.: Preferential Flow Effects on Infiltration and Runoff in Grassland and Forest Soils, Vadose Zone J., 10(1), 367, doi:10.2136/vzj2010.0076, 2011.

Allan, J. D.: Landscapes and Riverscapes: The Influence of Land Use on Stream Ecosystems, Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 35, 257–284, doi:10.1 146/annurev.ecolsys.35.120202.110122, 2004.

Barnes, C. J. and Allison, G. B.: Tracing of water movement in the unsaturated zone using stable isotopes of hydrogen and oxygen, J. Hydrol., 100(1–3), 143–176, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(88)90184-9, 1988.

Barthold, F. K., Tyralla, C., Schneider, K., Vaché, K. B., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: How many tracers do we need for end member mixing analysis (EMMA)? A sensitivity analysis, Water Resour. Res., 47(8), doi:10.1029/2011WR010604, 2011.

Blasch, K. W. and Bryson, J. R.: Distinguishing Sources of Ground Water Recharge by Using δ^{2}H and δ^{18}O, Ground Water, 45(3), 294–308, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2006.00289.x, 2007.

Botter, G., Bertuzzo, E. and Rinaldo, A.: Transport in the hydrologic response: Travel time distributions, soil moisture dynamics, and the old water paradox, Water Resour. Res., 46(3), W03514, doi:10.1029/2009WR008371, 2010.

Botter, G., Bertuzzo, E. and Rinaldo, A.: Catchment residence and travel time distributions: The master equation, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(11), L11403, doi:10.1029/2011GL047666, 2011.

Brodersen, C., Pohl, S., Lindenlaub, M., Leibundgut, C. and Wilpert, K. v: Influence of vegetation structure on isotope content of throughfall and soil water, Hydrol. Process., 14(8), 1439–1448, doi:10.1002/1099-1085(20000615)14:8<1439::AID-HYP985>3.0.CO;2-3, 2000.

Burger, H. M. and Seiler, K. P.: Evaporation from soil water under humid climate conditions and its impact on deuterium and ^{18}O concentrations in groundwater, edited by International Atomic Energy Agency, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1992.

Buttle, J. M.: Isotope hydrograph separations and rapid delivery of pre-event water from drainage basins, Prog. Phys. Geogr., 18(1), 16–41, doi:10.1177/030913339401800102, 1994.

Buttle, J. M.: Isotope Hydrograph Separation of Runoff Sources, in Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences, edited by M. G. Anderson, p. 10:116, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, Great Britain., 2006.

Buttle, J. M. and McDonald, D. J.: Coupled vertical and lateral preferential flow on a forested slope, Water Resour. Res., 38(5), 18–1, doi:10.1029/2001WR000773, 2002.

Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: Groundwater, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, p. 80, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997a.

Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: Methods for Field Sampling, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, p. 283, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997b.

Clark, I. D. and Fritz, P.: The Environmental Isotopes, in Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology, pp. 2–34, CRC Press, Florida, FL, USA., 1997c.

Cooper, L. W.: Isotopic Fractionation in Snow Cover, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 119–136, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.

Craig, H.: Isotopic Variations in Meteoric Waters, Science, 133(3465), 1702–1703, doi:10.1126/science.133.3465.1702, 1961a.

Craig, H.: Standard for reporting concentrations of deuterium and oxygen-18 in natural waters, Science, 133(3467), 1833, 1961b.

Csardi, G. and Nepusz, T.: The igraph software package for complex network research, Complex Systems 1695. [online] Available from: http://igraph.sf.net (Accessed 24 December 2015), 2006.

Dansgaard, W.: Stable isotopes in precipitation, Tellus, 16(4), 436–468, doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1964.tb00181.x, 1964.

Darling, W. G.: Hydrological factors in the interpretation of stable isotopic proxy data present and past: a European perspective, Quat. Sci. Rev., 23(7–8), 743–770, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2003.06.016, 2004.

Duvert, C., Stewart, M. K., Cendón, D. I. and Raiber, M.: Time series of tritium, stable isotopes and chloride reveal short-term variations in groundwater contribution to a stream, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20(1), 257–277, doi:10.5194/hess-20-257-2016, 2016.

DWD: Deutscher Wetterdienst - Wetter und Klima, Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, [online] Available from: http://dwd.de/ (Accessed 17 February 2014), 2014.

Foerstel, H., Frinken, J., Huetzen, H., Lembrich, D. and Puetz, T.: Application of $H_2{}^{18}O$ as a tracer of water flow in soil, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1991.

Garvelmann, J., Kuells, C. and Weiler, M.: A porewater-based stable isotope approach for the investigation of subsurface hydrological processes, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 16(2), 631–640, doi:10.5194/hess-16-631-2012, 2012.

Gat, J. R.: Oxygen and Hydrogen Isotopes in the Hydrologic Cycle, Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci., 24(1), 225–262, doi:10.1146/annurev.earth.24.1.225, 1996.

Gat, J., R., Mook, W. G. and Meijer, H. A. J.: Environmental isotopes in the hydrological cycle: Principles and Applications, edited by W. G. Mook, International Hydrological Programme; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Atomic Energy Agency, Paris, France., 2001.

Gehrels, J. C., Peeters, J. E. M., de Vries, J. J. and Dekkers, M.: The mechanism of soil water movement as inferred from ^{18}O stable isotope studies, Hydrol. Sci. J., 43(4), 579–594, doi:10.1080/02626669809492154, 1998.

Genereux, D. P. and Hooper, R. P.: Oxygen and Hydrogen Isotopes in Rainfall-Runoff Studies, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 319–346, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.

Gomez, J. D. and Wilson, J. L.: Age distributions and dynamically changing hydrologic systems: Exploring topography-driven flow, Water Resour. Res., 49(3), 1503–1522, doi:10.1002/wrcr.20127, 2013.

Gonfiantini, R., Fröhlich, K., Araguás-Araguás, L. and Rozanski, K.: Isotopes in Groundwater Hydrology, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 203–246, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.

Gordon, L. J., Finlayson, C. M. and Falkenmark, M.: Managing water in agriculture for food production and other ecosystem services, Agric. Water Manag., 97(4), 512–519, doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2009.03.017, 2010.

Harman, C. J.: Time-variable transit time distributions and transport: Theory and application to storage-dependent transport of chloride in a watershed, Water Resour. Res., 51(1), 1–30, doi:10.1002/2014WR015707, 2015.

Heidbüchel, I., Troch, P. A., Lyon, S. W. and Weiler, M.: The master transit time distribution of variable flow systems, Water Resour. Res., 48(6), W06520, doi:10.1029/2011WR011293, 2012.

Hindmarsh, A. C., Brown, P. N., Grant, K. E., Lee, S. L., Serban, R., Shumaker, D. E. and Woodward, C. S.: SUNDIALS: Suite of Nonlinear and Differential/Algebraic Equation Solvers, ACM Trans. Math. Softw., 31(3), 363–396, doi:10.1145/1089014.1089020, 2005.

Hollander, M., Wolfe, D. A. and Chicken, E.: Nonparametric Statistical Methods, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA., 2013.

Hrachowitz, M., Benettin, P., van Breukelen, B. M., Fovet, O., Howden, N. J. K., Ruiz, L., van der Velde, Y. and Wade, A. J.: Transit times—the link between hydrology and water quality at the catchment scale, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water, doi:10.1002/wat2.1155, 2016.

IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency: Water Resources Programme – Global Network of Isotopes in Precipitation, [online] Available from: http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/ih/IHS_resources_gnip.html (Accessed 11 August 2014), 2014.

Jin, L., Siegel, D. I., Lautz, L. K., Mitchell, M. J., Dahms, D. E. and Mayer, B.: Calcite precipitation driven by the common ion effect during groundwater–surface-water mixing: A potentially common process in streams with geologic settings containing gypsum, Geol. Soc. Am. Bull., 122(7/8), B30011.1, doi:10.1130/B30011.1, 2010.

Jin, L., Siegel, D. I., Lautz, L. K. and Lu, Z.: Identifying streamflow sources during spring snowmelt using water chemistry and isotopic composition in semi-arid mountain streams, J. Hydrol., 470–471, 289–301, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.09.009, 2012.

Jouzel, J., Alley, R. B., Cuffey, K. M., Dansgaard, W., Grootes, P., Hoffmann, G., Johnsen, S. J., Koster, R. D., Peel, D., Shuman, C. A., Stievenard, M., Stuiver, M. and White, J.: Validity of the temperature reconstruction from water isotopes in ice cores, J. Geophys. Res., 102, 26471–26487, doi:10.1029/97JC01283, 1997.

Kendall, C. and Caldwell, E. A.: Fundamentals of Isotope Geochemistry, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 51–86, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.

Kirchner, J. W.: A double paradox in catchment hydrology and geochemistry, Hydrol. Process., 17(4), 871–874, doi:10.1002/hyp.5108, 2003.

Klaus, J., McDonnell, J. J., Jackson, C. R., Du, E. and Griffiths, N. A.: Where does streamwater come from in low-relief forested watersheds? A dual-isotope approach, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19(1), 125–135, 2015.

Koeniger, P., Leibundgut, C. and Stichler, W.: Spatial and temporal characterisation of stable isotopes in river water as indicators of groundwater contribution and confirmation of modelling results; a study of the Weser river, Germany, Isotopes Environ. Health Stud., 45(4), 289–302, doi:10.1080/10256010903356953, 2009.

Kolaczyk, E. D.: Statistical Analysis of Network Data with R, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, NY, USA., 2014.

Kortelainen, N. M. and Karhu, J. A.: Regional and seasonal trends in the oxygen and hydrogen isotope ratios of Finnish groundwaters: a key for mean annual precipitation, J. Hydrol., 285(1–4), 143–157, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.08.014, 2004.

Kraft, P., Vaché, K. B., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: CMF: A Hydrological Programming Language Extension For Integrated Catchment Models, Environ. Model. Softw., 26(6), 828–830, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.12.009, 2011.

Lai, C.-T. and Ehleringer, J. R.: Deuterium excess reveals diurnal sources of water vapor in forest air, Oecologia, 165(1), 213–223, doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1721-2, 2011.

Lauer, F., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Uncertainty assessment of quantifying spatially concentrated groundwater discharge to small streams by distributed temperature sensing, Water Resour. Res., 49(1), 400–407, doi:10.1029/2012WR012537, 2013.

LGR: Los Gatos Research, Greenhouse Gas, isotope and trace gas analyzers, [online] Available from: http://www.lgrinc.com/ (Accessed 5 February 2013), 2013.

Li, F., Song, X., Tang, C., Liu, C., Yu, J. and Zhang, W.: Tracing infiltration and recharge using stable isotope in Taihang Mt., North China, Environ. Geol., 53(3), 687–696, doi:10.1007/s00254-007-0683-0, 2007.

Maloszewski, P. and Zuber, A.: Manual on lumped parameter models used for the interpretation of environmental tracer data in groundwaters, in Use of isotopes for analyses of flow and transport dynamics in groundwater systems, p. 50, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 2002.

McConville, C., Kalin, R. m., Johnston, H. and McNeill, G. w.: Evaluation of Recharge in a Small Temperate Catchment Using Natural and Applied $\delta^{18}O$ Profiles in the Unsaturated Zone, Ground Water, 39(4), 616–623, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2001.tb02349.x, 2001.

McDonnell, J. J. and Beven, K.: Debates—The future of hydrological sciences: A (common) path forward? A call to action aimed at understanding velocities, celerities and residence time distributions of the headwater hydrograph, Water Resour. Res., 50(6), 5342–5350, doi:10.1002/2013WR015141, 2014.

McDonnell, J. J., Sivapalan, M., Vaché, K., Dunn, S., Grant, G., Haggerty, R., Hinz, C., Hooper, R., Kirchner, J., Roderick, M. L. and others: Moving beyond heterogeneity and process complexity: a new vision for watershed hydrology, Water Resour. Res., 43(7), W07301, 2007.

McDonnell, J. J., McGuire, K., Aggarwal, P., Beven, K. J., Biondi, D., Destouni, G., Dunn, S., James, A., Kirchner, J., Kraft, P., Lyon, S., Maloszewski, P., Newman, B., Pfister, L., Rinaldo, A., Rodhe, A., Sayama, T., Seibert, J., Solomon, K., Soulsby, C., Stewart, M., Tetzlaff, D., Tobin, C., Troch, P., Weiler, M., Western, A., Worman, A. and Wrede, S.: How old is streamwater? Open questions in catchment transit time conceptualization, modelling and analysis, Hydrol. Process., 24(12), 1745–1754, 2010.

McGuire, K. J. and McDonnell, J. J.: A review and evaluation of catchment transit time modeling, J. Hydrol., 330(3), 543–563, 2006.

Michel, R. L.: Residence times in river basins as determined by analysis of long-term tritium records, J. Hydrol., 130(1), 367–378, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(92)90117-E, 1992.

Mook, W. G., Groeneveld, D. J., Brouwn, A. E. and Ganswijk, A. J. van: Analysis of a run-off hydrograph by means of natural ^{18}O, in Isotope techniques in groundwater hydrology, vol. 1, pp. 159–169, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1974.

Neal, C. and Rosier, P. T. W.: Chemical studies of chloride and stable oxygen isotopes in two conifer afforested and moorland sites in the British uplands, J. Hydrol., 115(1–4), 269–283, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(90)90209-G, 1990.

O'Driscoll, M. A., DeWalle, D. R., McGuire, K. J. and Gburek, W. J.: Seasonal ^{18}O variations and groundwater recharge for three landscape types in central Pennsylvania, USA, J. Hydrol., 303(1–4), 108–124, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.08.020, 2005.

Orlowski, N., Frede, H.-G., Brüggemann, N. and Breuer, L.: Validation and application of a cryogenic vacuum extraction system for soil and plant water extraction for isotope analysis, J. Sens. Sens. Syst., 2(2), 179–193, doi:10.5194/jsss-2-179-2013, 2013.

Orlowski, N., Lauer, F., Kraft, P., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Linking Spatial Patterns of Groundwater Table Dynamics and Streamflow Generation Processes in a Small Developed Catchment, Water, 6(10), 3085–3117, doi:10.3390/w6103085, 2014.

Penna, D., Ahmad, M., Birks, S. J., Bouchaou, L., Brenčič, M., Butt, S., Holko, L., Jeelani, G., Martínez, D. E., Melikadze, G., Shanley, J. B., Sokratov, S. A., Stadnyk, T., Sugimoto, A. and Vreča, P.: A new method of snowmelt sampling for water stable isotopes, Hydrol. Process., 28(22), 5637–5644, doi:10.1002/hyp.10273, 2014.

Perry, C. and Taylor, K.: Environmental Sedimentology, p. 36, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, OX, UK, 2009.

Pierce, S. C., Kröger, R. and Pezeshki, R.: Managing Artificially Drained Low-Gradient Agricultural Headwaters for Enhanced Ecosystem Functions, Biology, 1(3), 794–856, doi:10.3390/biology1030794, 2012.

Qu, Y. and Duffy, C. J.: A semidiscrete finite volume formulation for multiprocess watershed simulation, Water Resour. Res., 43(8), W08419, doi:10.1029/2006WR005752, 2007.

Rinaldo, A., Benettin, P., Harman, C. J., Hrachowitz, M., McGuire, K. J., van der Velde, Y., Bertuzzo, E. and Botter, G.: Storage selection functions: A coherent framework for quantifying how catchments store and release water and solutes, Water Resour. Res., 51(6), 4840–4847, doi:10.1002/2015WR017273, 2015.

Rohde, A.: Snowmelt-Dominated Systems, in Isotope Tracers in Catchment Hydrology, edited by C. Kendall and J. J. McDonnell, pp. 391–433, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1998.

Rozanski, K., Sonntag, C. and Münnich, K. O.: Factors controlling stable isotope composition of European precipitation, Tellus, 34(2), 142–150, doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1982.tb01801.x, 1982.

Rozanski, K., Froehlich, K. and Mook, W. G.: in Environmental isotopes in the hydrological cycle: Principles and Applications, vol. 3, International Hydrological Programme; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Atomic Energy Agency, Paris, Vienna., 2001.

Schultz, N. M., Griffis, T. J., Lee, X. and Baker, J. M.: Identification and correction of spectral contamination in ^{2}H/^{1}H and ^{18}O/^{16}O measured in leaf, stem, and soil water, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 25(21), 3360–3368, doi:10.1002/rcm.5236, 2011.

Shuttleworth, W. J. and Wallace, J. S.: Evaporation from sparse crops-an energy combination theory, Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 111(469), 839–855, doi:10.1002/qj.49711146910, 1985.

Sklash, M. G.: Environmental isotope studies of storm and snowmelt runoff generation, in Process studies in hillslope hydrology, edited by M. G. Anderson, pp. 410–435, Wiley, New York, NY, USA., 1990.

Sklash, M. G. and Farvolden, R. N.: The Role Of Groundwater In Storm Runoff, in Developments in Water Science, vol. 12, edited by W. B. and D. A. Stephenson, pp. 45–65, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands., 1979.

Song, X., Wang, P., Yu, J., Liu, X., Liu, J. and Yuan, R.: Relationships between precipitation, soil water and groundwater at Chongling catchment with the typical vegetation cover in the Taihang mountainous region, China, Environ. Earth Sci., 62(4), 787–796, doi:10.1007/s12665-010-0566-7, 2011.

Stewart, M. K., Morgenstern, U. and McDonnell, J. J.: Truncation of stream residence time: how the use of stable isotopes has skewed our concept of streamwater age and origin, Hydrol. Process., 24(12), 1646–1659, doi:10.1002/hyp.7576, 2010.

Stumpp, C., Klaus, J. and Stichler, W.: Analysis of long-term stable isotopic composition in German precipitation, J. Hydrol., 517, 351–361, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.05.034, 2014.

Tang, K. and Feng, X.: The effect of soil hydrology on the oxygen and hydrogen isotopic compositions of plants' source water, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 185(3–4), 355–367, 2001.

Taylor, S., Feng, X., Kirchner, J. W., Osterhuber, R., Klaue, B. and Renshaw, C. E.: Isotopic evolution of a seasonal snowpack and its melt, Water Resour. Res., 37(3), 759–769, doi:10.1029/2000WR900341, 2001.

Thomas, E. M., Lin, H., Duffy, C. J., Sullivan, P. L., Holmes, G. H., Brantley, S. L. and Jin, L.: Spatiotemporal Patterns of Water Stable Isotope Compositions at the Shale Hills Critical Zone Observatory: Linkages to Subsurface Hydrologic Processes, Vadose Zone J., 12(4), 0, doi:10.2136/vzj2013.01.0029, 2013.

Timbe, E., Windhorst, D., Crespo, P., Frede, H.-G., Feyen, J. and Breuer, L.: Understanding uncertainties when inferring mean transit times of water trough tracer-based lumped-parameter models in Andean tropical montane cloud forest catchments, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(4), 1503–1523, doi:10.5194/hess-18-1503-2014, 2014.

van der Velde, Y., Torfs, P. J. J. F., van der Zee, S. E. a. T. M. and Uijlenhoet, R.: Quantifying catchment-scale mixing and its effect on time-varying travel time distributions, Water Resour. Res., 48(6), W06536, doi:10.1029/2011WR011310, 2012.

Wang, X. F. and Yakir, D.: Using stable isotopes of water in evapotranspiration studies, Hydrol. Process., 14(8), 1407–1421, doi:10.1002/1099-1085(20000615)14:8<1407::AID-HYP992>3.0.CO;2-K, 2000.

Windhorst, D., Waltz, T., Timbe, E., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Impact of elevation and weather patterns on the isotopic composition of precipitation in a tropical montane rainforest, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17(1), 409–419, doi:10.5194/hess-17-409-2013, 2013.

Windhorst, D., Kraft, P., Timbe, E., Frede, H.-G. and Breuer, L.: Stable water isotope tracing through hydrological models for disentangling runoff generation processes at the hillslope scale, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(10), 4113–4127, doi:10.5194/hess-18-4113-2014, 2014.

Woolfenden, L. R. and Ginn, T. R.: Modeled Ground Water Age Distributions, Ground Water, 47(4), 547–557, doi:10.1111/j.1745-6584.2008.00550.x, 2009.

Wu, J., Ding, Y., Ye, B., Yang, Q., Hou, D. and Xue, L.: Stable isotopes in precipitation in Xilin River Basin, northern China and their implications, Chin. Geogr. Sci., 22(5), 531–540, doi:10.1007/s11769-012-0543-z, 2012.

Xia, Y.: Optimization and uncertainty estimates of WMO regression models for the systematic bias adjustment of NLDAS precipitation in the United States, J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres, 111(D8), D08102, doi:10.1029/2005JD006188, 2006.

Yurtsever, Y.: Worldwide survey of stable isotopes in precipitation, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria., 1975.

Zhao, L., Xiao, H., Zhou, J., Wang, L., Cheng, G., Zhou, M., Yin, L. and McCabe, M. F.: Detailed assessment of isotope ratio infrared spectroscopy and isotope ratio mass spectrometry for the stable isotope analysis of plant and soil waters, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 25(20), 3071–3082, doi:10.1002/rcm.5204, 2011.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of δ^2H, δ^{18}O, and d-excess values for precipitation, stream, and groundwater over the two-year observation period including all sampling points.

Sample type	Mean±SD		Min		Max		D-excess mean±SD	N
	δ^2H [‰]	δ^{18}O [‰]	δ^2H [‰]	δ^{18}O [‰]	δ^2H [‰]	δ^{18}O [‰]		
Precipitation	−43.9±23.4	−6.2±3.1	−167.6	−22.4	−8.3	−1.2	5.9±5.7	592
Vollnkirchener Bach	−58.0±2.8	−8.4±0.4	−66.3	−10.0	−26.9	−6.7	9.0±2.3	332
Schwingbach	−58.2±4.3	−8.4±0.6	−139.7	−18.3	−47.2	−5.9	9.0±2.2	463
Groundwater meadow	−57.6±1.6	−8.2±0.4	−64.9	−9.2	−50.8	−5.7	7.9±5.5	375
Groundwater arable land	−56.2±3.7	−8.0±0.5	−91.6	−12.3	−49.5	−6.8	1.7±5.0	338
Groundwater along stream	−59.9±6.8	−8.5±0.9	−94.5	−13.0	−49.5	−7.0	8.2±1.5	108

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation for isotopic signatures and soil physical properties in 0.2 m and 0.5 m soil depth (N~~ = ~~=52 per depth).

	δ^2H [‰]		δ^{18}O [‰]		water content [% w/w]		pH		bulk density [g cm^{-3}]	
	0.2 m	0.5 m	0.2 m	0.5 m	0.2 m	0.5 m	0.2 m	0.5 m	0.2 m	0.5 m
Mean±SD	−46.9±8.4	−58.5±8.3	−6.6±1.2	−8.2±1.2	16.8±7.2	16.1±8.3	5.0±1.0	5.3±1.0	1.3±0.2	1.3±0.2



Figure 1. Maps show (a) the location of the Schwingbach catchment in Germany, (b) the main monitoring area, (c) the land use, elevation, and instrumentation, (d) the locations of the

snapshot as well as the seasonal soil samplings, (e) soil types, and (f) geology of the Schwingbach catchment including the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment boudaries.



Figure 2. Temporal variation of precipitation amount, isotopic signatures (δ^2H and δ^{18}O) including snow samples (grey striped box), and d-excess values for the study area compared to monthly d-excess values (July 2011 to July 2013) of GNIP station Koblenz with reference d-excess of GMWL (d~~ = ~~=10; solid black line).



Figure 3. Local Meteoric Water Line for the Schwingbach catchment (LMWL) in comparison to GMWL, including comparisons between precipitation, stream water, groundwater, and soil water isotopic signatures and the respective EWLs.



Figure 4. Boxplots of δ^2H values comparing precipitation, stream, groundwater, and soil isotopic composition in 0.2 m and 0.5 m depth (N~~ = ~~=52 per depth). Different letters indicate significant differences (p~~ ≤ ~~≤0.05).



Figure 5. Dual isotope plot of soil water isotopic signatures in 0.2 m and 0.5 m depth compared by land use including precipitation isotope data from 19, 21, and 28 October 2011. Insets: Boxplots comparing δ^{2}H isotopic signatures between different land use units and precipitation (small letters) in top and subsoil (capital letters). Different letters indicate significant differences (p~~<~~≤0.05).



Figure 6. Seasonal δ^2H profiles of soil water (upper panels) and water content (lower panels) for winter (28 March 2013), summer (28 August 2011), and spring (24 April 2013). Error bars represent the natural isotopic variation of the replicates taken during each sampling campaign. For reference, mean groundwater (grey shaded) and mean seasonal precipitation δ^2H values are shown (coloured arrows at the top).



Figure 7. Mean daily discharge at the Vollnkirchener Bach (13, 18) and Schwingbach (site 11, 19, and 64) with automatically recorded data (solid lines) and manual discharge measurements (asterisks), temporal variation of δ^{2}H of stream water in the Schwingbach (site 11, 19, and 64) and Vollnkirchener Bach (site 13, 18, and 94) including moving averages (MA) for streamflow isotopes.



Figure 8. Temporal variation of discharge at the Vollnkirchener Bach with automatically recorded data (solid line) and manual discharge measurements (asterisks) (site 18), groundwater

head levels, and δ^2H values (coloured dots) for selected piezometers under meadow (site 3 and 21), arable land (site 26, 27, and 28), and beside the Vollnkirchener Bach (site 24 and 32) including moving averages for groundwater isotopes.



Figure 9. Network map of δ^{18}O relationships between surface water (SW) and groundwater (GW) sampling points. Yellow circles represent groundwater sampling points on the arable field, light green circles are piezometers located on the grassland close to the conjunction of the Schwingbach with the Vollnkirchener Bach, and dark green circles represent piezometers along the Vollnkirchener Bach. Light blue circles stand for Schwingbach and darker blue circles for Vollnkirchener Bach surface water sampling points. See Figure 1 for an overview of all sampling points. Only statistically significant connections between δ^{18}O time series ($p<0.05$) are shown in the network diagram.



Figure 10. Maps of modelled groundwater ages (colour scheme) and flow directions (white arrows) of (a) the Vollnkirchner Bach subcatchment and (b) detail view of the northern part of the subcatchment. The intensity of flow is depicted by the length of the white arrows.

Appendix I

Mean transit time estimation

We applied a set of five different models to estimate the MTT using the FlowPC software (Maloszewski and Zuber, 2002): dispersion model (with different dispersion parameters D_p=0.05, 0.4, and 0.8), exponential model, exponential-piston-flow model, linear model, and linear-piston-flow model. We evaluated these results using two goodness of fit criteria, i.e. sigma (σ) and model efficiency (ME) following Maloszewski and Zuber (2002):

$$\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{\sum(c_{mi} - c_{oi})^2}}{m} \quad (1)$$

$$ME = 1 - \frac{\sum(c_{mi} - c_{oi})^2}{\sum(c_{oi} - \bar{c_o})^2} \quad (2)$$

Where:

- c_{mi}: The i-th model result
- c_{oi}: The i-th observed result
- $\bar{c_o}$: The arithmetic mean of all observations

A model efficiency ME=1 indicates an ideal fit of the model to the concentrations observed, while ME=0 indicates that the model fits the data no better than a horizontal line through the mean observed concentration (Maloszewski and Zuber, 2002). The same is true for sigma. For calculations with FlowPC, weekly averages of precipitation and stream water isotopic signatures are calculated. We firstly calculated the MTT from precipitation to the streams for three sampling points in the Vollnkirchener Bach (sites 13, 18 and 94) and three points in the Schwingbach (sites 11, 19 and 64). For the second set of simulations, the mean residence time from precipitation to groundwater comprising thirteen groundwater sampling points was determined. We also bias-corrected the precipitation input data with two different approaches: the mean precipitation value is subtracted from every single precipitation value and then divided by the standard deviation of precipitation isotopic signatures. Afterwards, this value is subtracted from the weekly precipitation values (bias1). For the second approach, the difference of the mean stream water isotopic value and the mean precipitation value is calculated and also subtracted from the weekly precipitation values (bias2).

Appendix II

Model-based groundwater age dynamics

Objective:

Stable water isotopes are only a tool to determine the residence time for a few years (McDonnell et al., 2010). In cases of longer residence times and a strong mixing effect, seasonal variation of isotopes vanishes and results in stable flat lines of the isotopic signal. To get a rough estimate of residence times greater than the limit of stable water isotopes (>5 years), we split the water flow path in our catchment in two parts: the flow from precipitation to groundwater, which was calculated via FlowPC and the longer groundwater transport. The simplest method to estimate the residence time of groundwater transport is via the storage-to-input-relation, with the storage as the aquifer size and the input as the groundwater recharge time. However, this method ignores the topographic setting, and water input heterogeneity. In our study we used a simplified groundwater flow model with tracer transport to calculate the groundwater age dynamics. The numerical output of water ages cannot be validated with the given isotope data, since the model is used to fill a residence time gap, where stable water isotopes are not feasible to apply. The model is falsified however, if the residence time is short enough (<5 years) to be calculable via FlowPC. Hence, the results of the groundwater age model should be handled with care and only seen as the order of magnitude of flow time scales.

Model setup:

We set up a tailored hydrological model for the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment using the *Catchment Modelling Framework* (CMF) by Kraft et al. (2011). CMF is a modular framework for hydrological modelling based on the concept of finite volume method by Qu and Duffy (2007). CMF is applicable for simulating one- to three-dimensional water fluxes but also advective transport of stable water isotopes (^{18}O and ^{2}H). Thus, it is especially suitable for our tracer study and can be used to study the origin (Windhorst et al., 2014) and age of water. The generated model is a highly simplified representation of the Vollnkirchener Bach subcatchment's groundwater body. The subcatchment is divided into 353 polygonal-shaped cells ranging from 100–40'000 m² in size based on land use, soil type, and topography. The model is vertically divided in two compartments, the upper soft rock aquifer, and the lower bed rock aquifer, referred to as upper and lower layer from now onwards.

The layers of each cell are connected using a mass conservative Darcy approach with a finite volume discretization. The water storage dynamic of one layer in one cell *i* of the groundwater model is given as:

$$\frac{dV_{i,s}}{dt} = R_i - S_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \left(K_s \frac{\Psi_{i,s} - \Psi_{j,s}}{d_{ij}} A_{ij,s} \right) \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{dV_{i,b}}{dt} = S_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} \left(K_b \frac{\Psi_{i,b} - \Psi_{j,b}}{d_{ij}} A_{ij,b} \right)$$

Where:

- V_i: The water volume stored by the layer in m³ in cell *I* for soft rock (*s*) and bedrock (*b*), respectively
- R_i: The groundwater recharge rate in $m^3 \cdot d^{-1}$
- S_i: the percolation from the soft rock to the bedrock aquifer, calculated by the gradient and geometric mean conductivity between the layers: $S_i = \sqrt{K_s K_b} \frac{\Psi_{i,s} - \Psi_{i,b}}{d_{sb}} A_i$, where d_{sb} is the distance between the layers and A_i is the cell area
- N_i: Number of adjacent cells to cell *i*
- *K:* Saturated hydraulic conductivity in $m \cdot d^{-1}$ for soft rock (*s*) and bedrock (b), respectively
- *Ψ:* Water head in the current cell *i* and the neighbour cell *j* in m for soft rock (*s*) and bedrock (*b*), respectively
- d_{ij}: The distance between the current cell *i* and the neighbour cell *j* in m
- $A_{i,j,x}$: The wetted area of the joint layer boundary in m² between cells *i* and *j* in layer *x*

The volume head relation is linearized as $\Psi = \phi \frac{V}{A}$, with ϕ being the fillable porosity and *A* the cell area. The resulting ordinary differential equation system is integrated using the CVODE solver by Hindmarsh et al. (2005), an error controlled Krylov-Newton multistep implicit solver with an adaptive order of 1–5 according to stability constraints.

Boundary conditions:

The upper boundary condition of the groundwater system – the mean groundwater recharge – is modelled applying a Richard’s equation based model using measured rainfall data (2011–2013) and calculated evapotranspiration with the Shuttleworth-Wallace method (Shuttleworth and Wallace, 1985) including land cover and climate data. To retrieve long-term steady state conditions, the groundwater recharge is averaged and used as constant flow Neumann boundary condition. The total outflow is calibrated against measured outflow data; hence, the unsaturated model’s role is mainly to account for spatial heterogeneity of groundwater recharge. As an additional input, a combined sewer overflow (site 38, Fig. 1b) is considered based on findings of Orlowski et al. (2014). Moreover, there are two water outlets in the two lowest cells for efficient draining, reflecting measured groundwater flow directions throughout most of the year at piezometers 1–6 (Fig. 1b). Both cells are located in the very north of the subcatchment and their outlets are modelled as constant head Dirichlet boundary condition.

Parameters:

The saturated hydraulic conductivity of the groundwater body is set to 0.1007 m d^{-1}, as measured in the study area. For the lower bedrock compartment there is no data available. However, expecting a high rate of joints, preliminary testing revealed that a saturated hydraulic conductivity of 0.25 m d^{-1} seemed to be a realistic estimation (based on field measurements).

Water Age:

To calculate the water age in each cell, a virtual tracer flows through the system using advective transport. To calculate the water age from the tracer that enters the system with a unity concentration by groundwater recharge, a linear decay is used to reduce the tracer concentration with time:

$$\frac{dX_{i,s}}{dt} = 1\frac{u}{m^3} R_i - S_i[X]_{i,s} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_i}\left([X]_{i,s}\, K_s \frac{\Psi_{i,s} - \Psi_{j,s}}{d_{ij}} A_{ij,s}\right) - r\, X_{i,s} \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{dX_{i,b}}{dt} = S_i[X]_{i,s} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_i}\left([X]_{i,b}\, K_b \frac{\Psi_{i,b} - \Psi_{j,b}}{d_{ij}} A_{ij,b}\right) - \mathrm{r}X_{i,b}$$

$$t_{ix} = \frac{\ln[X]_{ix}}{r}$$

Where:

- $X_{i,x}$: Amount of virtual tracer in layer x in cell i in virtual unit u
- $1\frac{u}{m^3}R_i$: Tracer input with groundwater recharge R with unity concentration
- $[X]_{i,x}$: Concentration of tracer in layer x of cell i in $u\ m^{-3}$
- r: Arbitrary chosen decay constant, for water age calculation in d^{-1}. Rounding errors occur due to low concentrations when r is set to a high value. We found a good numerical performance with values between 10^{-6}–$10^{-9}\ d^{-1}$
- t_{ix}: Water age in days in layer x in cell i

To ensure long term steady state conditions, the model is run for 2000 years. However, after 300 years of model run time, steady state is reached.