

1 **Supplemental information for neonSoilFlux:**

2 **An R Package for Continuous Sensor-Based**

3 **Estimation of Soil CO₂ Fluxes**

4

5 **1 Assessment of data gaps**

6 For a given half-hourly time period, the `neonSoilFlux` package assigns a QA flag for a
7 measurement if more than one values across all measurement depths uses gap-filled data (Section
8 4.2.1 of the main text). Panel a of Figure S1 reports the proportion of gap-filled data for all
9 input environmental measurements at each site during the period when field measurements
10 were made. Soil fluxes are computed from 4 different types of input measurements (T_S , SWC ,
11 P , and CO_2), any of which could have a QA flag in a half-hourly interval. Panel b of Figure S1
12 displays at each site the distribution of the number of different gap-filled measurements used
13 to compute a half-hourly flux. The largest cause of measurements needing to be gap-filled
14 was missing or flagged soil moisture data. Calculating fluxes for WOOD, WREF, and SJER
15 required using the largest proportion of gap-filled measurements, due to substantially large
16 fractions of flagged or missing SWC and T_S - CO_2 data.




Figure S1: Panel a) Proportion of input gap-filled environmental measurements used to generate F_S from the `neonSoilFlux` package, by study site. Panel b) distribution of the usage of gap-filled measurements at each site.

17 **2 Assessing the signal to noise ratio (SNR) and evaluating
18 estimated uncertainties**

19 Following collection of field measurements and calculation of the soil fluxes from `neonSoilFlux`
20 package, we compared measured F_S based on closed-dynamic chamber measurements with the
21 LI-COR instruments to a given soil flux calculation from `neonSoilFlux` for each site and flux
22 computation method. Beyond the model statistics defined in the main text, we computed the
23 signal to noise ratio (SNR), defined as the ratio of a modeled soil flux (F_{ijk}) from `neonSoilFlux`
24 to its quadrature uncertainty (σ_{ijk}).

25 We observed that the range of values (e.g., e.g., $F_{ijk} \pm \sigma_{ijk}$) was much larger than the measured
26 field flux. We evaluated $|F_S - F_{ijk}| < (1 - \epsilon)\sigma_{ijk}$, where F_S is a measured field soil flux from
27 the LI-COR 6800 (as the LI-COR 870/8250 was used at only three sites in 2024 but the 6800
28 was used at all sites in both years). The parameter ϵ was an uncertainty reduction factor to
29 evaluate how much the quadrature uncertainty could be reduced while maintaining precision
30 between modeled F_{ijk} and measured F_S .

31 The computed signal to noise ratio (SNR) and the proportion of measured field fluxes within
 32 the modeled uncertainty for a given flux computation method F_{ijk} suggest that there was
 33 substantial variability in the agreement between the gradient method and field-measured
 34 observations (Figure S2, [Section 4.3 of the main text](#)). Here, values of SNR greater than
 35 unity ([vertical dashed lines in Figure S2](#)) indicate lower reported uncertainty, as propagated by
 36 quadrature due to a relatively higher precision of measured input variables (CO_2 , T_S , SWC ,
 37 or P).

38 The sensitivity to an uncertainty reduction factor (ϵ , bottom panels in Figure S2) demonstrates
 39 how concordance between measured and modeled fluxes would be affected if environmental
 40 measurement uncertainty σ_{ijk} were to decrease. As ϵ increases from left to right in each figure,
 41 the possible range of values for each predicted flux value decreases and the proportion of
 42 measured fluxes that fall within that range also decreases.




Figure S2: Top panels: distribution of SNR values across each of the different sites for modeled effluxes from the `neonSoilFlux` package, depending on the diffusivity calculation used (Millington-Quirk or Marshall, [Section 4.23.2.2 of the main text](#)). [Dashed lines indicate a signal to noise ratio of 1](#). Bottom panels: Proportion of measured F_S within the modeled range of a flux computation method F_{ijk} given an uncertainty reduction factor ϵ , or $|F_S - F_{ijk}| < (1 - \epsilon)\sigma_{ijk}$.