

1 **Organic carbon causes interference with nitrate and nitrite measurements by UV/Vis spectrometers: The**  
2 **importance of local calibration**

3  
4 Uusheimo, Sari<sup>1</sup>  
5 sari.uusheimo@helsinki.fi  
6 Phone: +358 50 4620555  
7

8 Tulonen, Tiina<sup>1</sup>  
9

10 Arvola, Lauri<sup>1</sup>  
11

12 Arola, Hanna<sup>2</sup>  
13

14 Linjama, Jarmo<sup>3</sup>  
15

16 Huttula, Timo<sup>2</sup>  
17  
18

19 <sup>1</sup> Lammi Biological Station, University of Helsinki, Pääjärventie 320, FI-16900 Lammi, Finland  
20

21 <sup>2</sup> Finnish Environment Institute, Freshwater Center, Survontie 9 A, FI-40500, Jyväskylä, Finland  
22

23 <sup>3</sup> Finnish Environment Institute, P.O. Box 141, FI-00251 Helsinki, Finland  
24  
25  
26

27 **Abstract**  
28

29 Compared with sporadic conventional water sampling, continuous water-quality monitoring with optical sensors has  
30 improved our understanding of freshwater dynamics. The basic principle in photometric measurements is the incident  
31 light at a given wavelength that is either reflected, scattered, or transmitted in the body of water. Here, we discuss the  
32 transmittance measurements. The amount of transmittance is inversely proportional to the concentration of the  
33 substance measured. However, the transmittance is subject to interference, because it can be affected by factors other  
34 than the substance targeted in the water. In this study, interference with the UV/Vis sensor nitrate plus nitrite  
35 measurements caused by organic carbon was evaluated. Total or dissolved organic carbon as well as nitrate plus nitrite  
36 concentrations were measured in various boreal waters with two UV/Vis sensors (5-mm and 35-mm pathlengths), using  
37 conventional laboratory analysis results as references. Organic carbon increased the sensor nitrate plus nitrite results,  
38 not only in waters with high organic carbon concentrations, but also at the lower concentrations ( $< 10 \text{ mg C L}^{-1}$ ) typical  
39 of boreal stream, river, and lake waters. Our results demonstrated that local calibration with multiple linear regression,  
40 including both nitrate plus nitrite and dissolved organic carbon, can correct the error caused by organic carbon.  
41 However, high-frequency optical sensors continue to be excellent tools for environmental monitoring when they are  
42 properly calibrated for the local water matrix.

43  
44 **Keywords**

45 Boreal water monitoring, calibration, nitrate, high-frequency sensor, optical measurement, organic carbon  
46

47 **Introduction**

48  
49 Excess nitrogen (N) has become one of the world's main environmental challenges during recent decades (Rockström et  
50 al. 2009). Humans have doubled the amount of reactive nitrogen (Nr) on Earth mainly due to food production,  
51 wastewater, and fossil-fuel combustion (Gruber and Galloway 2008; Fowler et al. 2013), resulting in increased  
52 eutrophication and greenhouse-gas emissions, acid rain, smog, and stratospheric ozone depletion (Galloway et al.  
53 2013). In agricultural watersheds and other nonpoint Nr sources, continuous monitoring of Nr is crucial to measuring N  
54 loading more accurately in dynamic water systems. Nutrient loading calculations based on traditional sporadic sampling  
55 generate uncertainty and may lead to under- or overestimations, especially in small lotic systems where spatiotemporal  
56 variation in water quality can be significant (e.g. Linjama et al. 2009; Koskiaho et al. 2010). Thus, high-frequency  
57 measurements are needed to better understand the relationships between land use, weather, and water chemistry in  
58 aquatic systems, especially in changing climates.

59  
60 Optical sensors have a history spanning several decades in oceanographic and coastal studies, but their use in freshwater  
61 systems has increased only during the last decade (Pellerin and Bergamaschi 2014). One of the *in-situ* photometric  
62 sensors used is the ultraviolet/visible light (UV/Vis) scanning spectrometer manufactured by Messtechnik GmbH  
63 (Klagenfurt am Wörthersee, Austria). It is a multiparameter instrument that records the complete absorbance spectrum  
64 at wavelengths between 220 nm and 720 nm and is able to measure nitrate plus nitrite N (referred together as NO<sub>x</sub>-N),  
65 dissolved organic carbon (DOC), total organic carbon (TOC), and turbidity. Sensors with distinct measuring  
66 pathlengths perform differently, because their precision and detection limits vary (spectrometer probe manual at  
67 www.s-can.at). Increased use of optical *in-situ* sensors has raised questions about their reliability, compared with the  
68 data obtained with conventional laboratory analyses.

69  
70 For optical sensors with large absorbance spectra, it is not possible to differentiate the amounts of nitrate and nitrite, so  
71 they indicate the sum by the use of NO<sub>x</sub>-N. The absorbance range of NO<sub>x</sub>-N and organic carbon (OC) partly overlap,  
72 since they both absorb UV radiation, mainly at wavelengths between 200 nm and 250 nm (Van den Broeke et al. 2006).  
73 For the NO<sub>x</sub>-N results, the interference likely comes from elements that have absorbance properties similar to those of  
74 OC, such as humic or fulvic acids, or inorganic elements such as bromide and hydrogen sulfide (Pellerin et al. 2013).  
75 Turbidity influences the entire absorption spectrum by shading and scattering light from suspended particles (Huber and  
76 Frost 1998). The effect of these substances can decrease the transmittance of light in the sample and result in  
77 overestimation of the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentration.

78  
79 Manufacturers of optical sensors may offer various calibration options, depending on the application, without the  
80 absolute need for local calibration. The main purpose of these calibration options is to separate the NO<sub>x</sub>-N signal from  
81 that of the interfering substances that typically occur in the types of waters studied (Pellerin et al. 2013). However, if  
82 differences with the reference method are observed, manufacturers recommend that local calibration be applied to  
83 enhance the reliability of the sensor results. One of the methods most used in calibration is simple linear regression  
84 (SLR); the results obtained from this reference method, usually in the laboratory, are plotted against the sensor results,  
85 and the linear function obtained is then applied to correct the sensor results (Huotari and Ketola 2014).

86

87 In this study, OC interference with the NO<sub>x</sub>-N results was investigated with UV/Vis scanning spectrolyzer sensors having  
88 two different optical measuring pathlengths (35 mm and 5 mm). The TOC, DOC, and NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations were  
89 analyzed with both sensors, as well as with laboratory methods for reference. To obtain a thorough water matrix for  
90 testing the performance of the sensors, we analyzed freshwaters ranging from spring water to a bog outlet and streams  
91 draining from agriculturally influenced catchments. We also spiked the spring and bog water samples with potassium  
92 nitrate (KNO<sub>3</sub>) to obtain high NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations. Finally, we applied the 5-mm pathlength sensor in an agricultural  
93 stream for 6 months to compare with the weekly collected samples analyzed in the laboratory. This information was  
94 used to consider the importance of OC in the local calibration method. This study provided much needed information  
95 regarding the local calibration of the UV/Vis sensor used in the NO<sub>x</sub>-N measurements in freshwaters with high OC  
96 concentrations.

97

## 98 **Materials and Methods**

99

### 100 Experimental design

101

102 Various surface waters were collected from eight sites located in southern Finland for the two experiments. Samples for  
103 Experiment I were collected in 2009 (DOC analysis) and 2011 (TOC analysis). For Experiment II, the waters were  
104 collected in 2009. The water samples were kept in the dark and cold (+4 °C) until determined within a few hours of  
105 sampling by standard analytical methods and by the UV/Vis optical sensors. The laboratory and sensor measurements  
106 were performed simultaneously. To obtain a wide variety of combinations of NO<sub>x</sub>-N and OC concentrations, the waters  
107 were mixed and/or diluted with deionized water (MQ) (Millipore; EMD Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA). Before the  
108 experiments, the accuracy of the OC measurements by the sensors was evaluated with laboratory TOC and DOC as  
109 references.

110

111 Measurements done in the laboratory with standard analytical methods conducted at Lammi Biological Station,  
112 University of Helsinki (see Arvola et al. 2015) were used as references for the sensor results. In this study, both TOC  
113 and DOC were considered as corresponding to OC. TOC was measured from unfiltered and DOC from filtered (< 0.2  
114 μm, Nuclepore; Whatman GE Healthcare, Chicago, IL, USA) sample water, using a high-temperature combustion  
115 method with a TOC-5000 A analyzer (Shimadzu Corp., Kyoto, Japan). The detection limit of the TOC and DOC  
116 analyses varied between 0.2 and 1.0 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, depending on the type of sample (e.g. turbidity). NO<sub>x</sub>-N was analyzed from  
117 filtrates (< 0.2 μm, Nuclepore) with an automated flow-injection analyzer (Lachat QuikChem 8000 FIA; Lachat  
118 Instruments, Hach Company, Loveland, CO, USA), using a nitrate-reducing method with a cadmium column. The  
119 detection limit for the NO<sub>x</sub>-N analysis was 0.01 mg L<sup>-1</sup>.

120

121 The sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N measurements in the experiments were done with UV/Vis scanning spectrolyzers (Messtechnik) with  
122 35-mm and 5-mm measuring pathlengths. The specifications state that the 35-mm pathlength sensor is capable of  
123 measuring NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations < 10.0 mg L<sup>-1</sup>. For TOC and DOC, the measurement ranges are below 25 and 12 mg  
124 C L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. At higher concentrations, the 5-mm pathlength sensor was more applicable, with measuring ranges  
125 for NO<sub>x</sub>-N < 70 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, for TOC < 150 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>, and for DOC < 90 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> (specifications at [www.s-can.at](http://www.s-can.at)). A  
126 specific cuvette designed for the sensors was mounted, and the sample was poured into the cuvette. Four to five

127 sequential readings were recorded for each sample. The cuvette was rinsed with MQ and sample water between  
 128 measurements.

129

130 **Table 1.** Sampling sites, coordinates, water type, and mean NO<sub>x</sub>-N, DOC, and TOC concentrations measured in the  
 131 laboratory. The standard deviations are shown in parentheses if available. Not determined = *nd*.

132

Site	Coordinates	Type	NO <sub>x</sub> -N mg L <sup>-1</sup>	DOC mg L <sup>-1</sup>	TOC mg L <sup>-1</sup>
Laavionsuonoja Brook	61°2'N, 24°59'S	small peatland stream, high organic matter content	0.040 (±0.010, n=6)	74.0 (±0.38, n=2)	53.0 (±0.61, n=3)
Lake Ormajärvi	61°5'N, 24°57'S	medium-sized clear-water lake, mesotrophic	0.35 (±0.010, n=3)	<i>nd</i>	7.8 (±0.030, n=3)
Löytynlähde Spring	61°2'N, 24°58'S	spring, oligotrophic	0.41 (±0.010, n=4)	1.2 (±0.29, n=2)	2.3 (±0.060, n=3)
Luhtaanmäenjoki River	60°20'N, 24°47'S	small river, high turbidity, clay soils, agriculture	0.57	7.6 (±0.037, n=2)	<i>nd</i>
Lake Pääjärvi	61°5'N, 25°5'S	medium-sized humic lake, meso-oligotrophic	0.85	10.0 (±0.038, n=2)	<i>nd</i>
Teuronjoki River	61°5'N, 24°50'S	outflow river of Lake Pääjärvi	1.2	8.1 (±0.033, n=2)	<i>nd</i>
Vantaanjoki River	60°40'N, 24°56'S	small river, high turbidity, clay soils, agriculture	1.3 (±0.012, n=3)	<i>nd</i>	10.0 (±0.24, n=3)
Letkunoja Brook	61°3'N, 25°5'S	small stream, mineral soils, agriculture	2.5	7.9 (±0.028, n=2)	<i>nd</i>
Koiransuolenoja Brook	61°3'N, 25°4'S	small stream, mineral soils, agriculture	2.4 (±0.37, n=25)	10.6 (±4.5, n=25)	<i>nd</i>

133

134 *Experiment I:* In the first part of the experiment in 2009, water samples were collected from six sites (Laavionsuonoja,  
 135 Löytynlähde, Teuronjoki, Letkunoja, Luhtaanmäenjoki, and Pääjärvi (Table 1). In addition, one mixed sample (1:1) of  
 136 two streams (Laavionsuonoja : Luhtaanmäenjoki) was prepared. After analyzing the samples in the laboratory for NO<sub>x</sub>-  
 137 N and DOC, dilutions with these seven samples and MQ were done at ratios of 1:1, 1:3, 1:9, and 3:1. The diluted  
 138 concentrations were calculated based on the laboratory-analyzed initial concentrations and compared with the sensor  
 139 results. In the second part of the experiment, water samples were collected in 2011. Three to six replicate water samples  
 140 from each of four sites (Laavionsuonoja, Löytynlähde, Ormajärvi, and Vantaanjoki) were analyzed in the laboratory for  
 141 NO<sub>x</sub>-N and TOC before making the dilutions and mixtures presented in Table 2. The concentrations were analyzed in  
 142 the laboratory and compared with the sensor results.

143

144 **Table 2.** Mixtures of the waters examined in Exp. I from the 2011 samples (only TOC analyzed). MQ = deionized  
145 water.

Sample	Mixing Ratios
Laavionsuonoja: Vantaanjoki	1:1
Löytynlähde: Vantaanjoki	2:1
Laavionsuonoja: Löytynlähde	1:2, 1:4
Vantaanjoki: Ormajärvi	1:1, 1:2
Ormajärvi: MQ	1:1, 1:2, 1:3, 1:4
Löytynlähde: MQ	1:1
Löytynlähde: Ormajärvi: MQ	1:1:1

146  
147

148 *Experiment II* (only the 5-mm pathlength sensor): In this experiment, KNO<sub>3</sub> was added to waters collected from  
149 Laavionsuonoja and Löytynlähde, to determine the lower and upper detection limits for NO<sub>x</sub>-N in the presence of high  
150 and low OC concentrations. First, the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations were analyzed in the laboratory from the original samples.  
151 The sample waters were spiked with KNO<sub>3</sub> (1000 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>), and the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations were: Laavionsuonoja 0.53,  
152 2.03, 8.03, 16.0, and 32.0, and Löytynlähde 1.6, 2.6, 8.6, 16.6, and 32.6 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>. Based on the known initial NO<sub>x</sub>-N  
153 concentrations, the calculated values of NO<sub>x</sub>-N were compared with the corresponding sensor results.

154

155 *Experiment III:* The 5-mm pathlength sensor measured NO<sub>x</sub>-N and DOC in Koiransuolenoja for 6 months from early  
156 May to late November in 2013. These data were compared with weekly collected samples analyzed in the laboratory.  
157 The sensor data were calibrated in two different ways: simple linear regression (SLR) and multiple linear regression  
158 (MLR). In SLR, the calibration was based on the regression function between the laboratory and sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N. In  
159 MLR, the data calibration was based on the sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N and sensor DOC results in relation to the laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N  
160 results, and the sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N data were corrected, based on the resulting regression function. This information was  
161 used to demonstrate the impact of OC on the local calibration procedure.

162

163 Data analysis

164

165 SLR was applied to compare the laboratory (x-axis) and sensor results (y-axis). The accuracy of the sensor results was  
166 evaluated by the correlation coefficient (R<sup>2</sup>) of the regression function. Due to the rather small sample sizes and the  
167 skewness of the data, statistical differences between the sensor and laboratory results were investigated with the  
168 nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-ranks test. The level of statistical significance was 0.05. The data were analyzed in  
169 their original form to maintain the relationship between the laboratory and sensor data. The effect of the increasing  
170 DOC concentration on the NO<sub>x</sub>-N sensor results was evaluated by the proportional difference between the laboratory  
171 and sensor results (referred to as the NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio). If the DOC concentration had not affected the NO<sub>x</sub>-N results  
172 by the sensor, the error ratio would have been steady. In Experiment III, we applied two different local calibration  
173 methods: SLR and MLR, and analyzed their accuracy by comparing the laboratory results with the corrected sensor data  
174 in linear regression and nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-ranks test. Data analyses were performed, using Microsoft

175 Excel for Mac (15.33; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA) and IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh version 24.0  
176 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

177

## 178 **Results**

179

180 The water quality varied between the sampling sites (Table 1.). The lowest NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentration was detected in the  
181 bog outlet (Laavionsuonoja) and the highest were found in the brook and river waters draining from the agriculturally  
182 influenced catchments. Respectively, the lowest concentration of OC was measured in Löytynlähde and the highest in  
183 Laavionsuonoja.

184

185 The laboratory-measured TOC and DOC concentrations in the experimental waters varied between 1.3-53.0 and 0.12-  
186 74.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>. Two TOC concentrations (31.0 and 53.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>) and seven DOC concentrations (19-74.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>)  
187 were out of the measurement range of the 35-mm pathlength sensor (TOC < 25 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> and DOC < 12 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>), and  
188 these were omitted from the analysis. Additionally, the 35-mm pathlength sensor was unable to measure the TOC in one  
189 sample from Laavionsuonoja, whereas the laboratory-analyzed TOC was 19.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>. The one outlier seen in Fig. 1a  
190 was a sample from Laavionsuonoja. All the DOC/TOC concentrations were within the measuring range of the 5-mm  
191 pathlength sensor. A strong linear relationship ( $p < 0.001$ ) was found between both sensors and the laboratory OC  
192 results, but the sensor values were significantly (22-29%) higher than the laboratory results (**Fig. 1**) (35-mm:  $Z = -$   
193  $3.269$ , sig. = 0.001; 5-mm:  $Z = -4.462$ , sig. = 0.000).

194

195 **Fig. 1a, b** Laboratory TOC/DOC concentrations in relation to measured concentration by a) 35-mm pathlength sensor  
196 and b) 5-mm pathlength sensor

197

### 198 Experiment I

199

200 The laboratory-analyzed and -calculated NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations varied between 0.010 and 3.8 mg N L<sup>-1</sup> ( $n = 63$ ). Thus,  
201 the concentrations settled within the measurement range for both of the sensors given by the manufacturer in the  
202 specifications.

203

204 For the 35-mm pathlength sensor, a strong linear correlation ( $R^2 = 0.88$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $n = 40$ ) was evident between the  
205 sensor and laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N results in samples with OC concentrations of 1.3-10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> (TOC) and 0.12-10.0 mg  
206 C L<sup>-1</sup> (DOC). The linear relationship strengthened when the bog water samples ( $n = 3$ ) were removed from the  
207 regression analysis ( $R^2 = 0.93$ ) (**Fig. 2a**). However, the sensor indicated 26% higher NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations than did the  
208 laboratory results with statistical significance ( $Z = -1.989$ , sig. = 0.047). The sensor was not able to measure NO<sub>x</sub>-N in  
209 two bog water samples and gave 'NaN' (Not a Number) indications. The NO<sub>x</sub>-N and TOC concentrations in these  
210 samples were 0.23, 0.28 mg N L<sup>-1</sup> and 19.0, 13.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.

211

212 For the 5-mm pathlength sensor, the OC concentration in all the samples ( $n = 51$ ) fell inside the measurement range of  
213 the sensor (TOC < 150 and DOC < 90 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>.) However, the linear dependency between the NO<sub>x</sub>-N sensor and  
214 laboratory results was weak ( $R^2 = 0.024$ ,  $p < 0.28$ ). Use of the sensor resulted in significant overestimation, compared

215 with the laboratory results ( $Z = -2.925$ , sig. = 0.003), due to the bog outlet waters from Laavionsuonoja having high OC  
216 concentrations (TOC 13.0-53.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>, DOC 4.0-74.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>) and low NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations. Omission of these  
217 bog water samples from the analysis significantly increased the linear dependency ( $R^2 = 0.96$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $n = 37$ ). Yet,  
218 the sensor resulted in overestimation of the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentration by 32% compared with the laboratory results, but the  
219 difference was not verified statistically ( $Z = -0.228$ , sig. = 0.820).

220

221 **Fig. 2a, b** Relationships of NO<sub>x</sub>-N between the sensor results and laboratory measurements at DOC/TOC ranges of  
222 0.12-10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>. The bog outlet waters from Laavionsuonoja (marked with empty circles) were excluded from the  
223 regression lines. The detection limit for the laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N was 0.010 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>  
224

225 Low NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations

226

227 The results showed that both sensors experienced difficulty when samples contained low levels of NO<sub>x</sub>-N (0.010-0.43  
228 mg NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup>). As shown in **Fig. 3a**, the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations in samples containing Laavionsuonoja water ( $n = 3$ ,  
229 DOC 4.03-10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>) were highly overestimated (10-50 times higher than the laboratory result), using the 35-mm  
230 pathlength sensor. No strong linear dependency between the sensor and laboratory results could be observed ( $R^2 = 0.59$ ,  
231  $p = 0.000$ ). In addition, eight samples with NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations between 0.056 and 0.28 mg N L<sup>-1</sup> resulted in readings  
232 of zero by the sensor. The OC concentrations in these samples were low (TOC 1.8-2.1 and DOC 0.12-0.99 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>).  
233 However, the inability to measure NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations  $< 0.28$  mg N L<sup>-1</sup> was not consistent, since the sensor was able  
234 to measure 10 other samples  $< 0.28$  mg N L<sup>-1</sup> (TOC 1.3-4.0, DOC 0.79-7.4 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>).

235

236 The 5-mm pathlength sensor showed a higher measurement range for OC. Thus, it was able to measure more samples  
237 containing bog water within the range 0.010-0.43 mg NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup> (**Fig. 3b**). However, the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations  
238 measured by the sensor were overestimated by a greater extent (5-130 times higher than the laboratory result). No  
239 strong linear dependency could be observed between the laboratory and sensor results, even without the bog water  
240 samples ( $R^2 = 0.55$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Similarly, difficulty in measuring low NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations was observed, since the  
241 sensor recorded no results in 12 samples with NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations of 0.056-0.28 mg L<sup>-1</sup>. The OC concentrations in  
242 these samples were 1.3-2.7 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> as TOC and 0.12-1.9 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> as DOC. Yet, the sensor was able to measure 16  
243 other samples with NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations  $< 0.28$  mg L<sup>-1</sup>, of which 13 were bog water samples (TOC 3.3-53.0, DOC  
244 2.5-74.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>).

245

246 **Fig. 3a, b** Relationship for the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations 0.010 – 0.43 mg L<sup>-1</sup> by the sensors, compared with the laboratory  
247 results: a) 35-mm pathlength sensor, b) 5-mm pathlength sensor. The bog outlet waters from Laavionsuonoja (empty  
248 circles) are omitted from the regression lines. The detection limit (0.010 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>) of the laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N is indicated  
249 by the dashed line. Note the different scales

250

251 Experiment II

252

253 The initial laboratory-analyzed NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations in Laavionsuonoja and Löytynlähde were 0.031 and 0.56 mg  
254 NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. The DOC concentration in Löytynlähde was 0.12 mg C L<sup>-1</sup> and in the bog outlet water of  
255 Laavionsuonoja 74.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>. All the concentrations were within the measurement range given by the manufacturer of  
256 the 5-mm pathlength sensor (NO<sub>x</sub>-N  $< 70.0$  mg N L<sup>-1</sup> and for DOC  $< 90.0$  mg C L<sup>-1</sup>).

257

258 The 5-mm pathlength sensor failed to measure NO<sub>x</sub>-N in the two highest concentrations, 16.0 and 32.0 mg NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup>  
259 (**Fig. 4**) and gave 'NaN' indications in the high-OC waters of Laavionsuonoja. As a result, the measurement range  
260 observed was 0.031-8.03 mg NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup>, having a strong linear correlation ( $R^2 = 0.99$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). In the spring water  
261 with low OC, the sensor measured all the samples accurately ( $R^2 = 1.0$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) within the concentration range 0.56-  
262 33.0 mg NO<sub>x</sub>-N L<sup>-1</sup>.

263

264 **Fig. 4** NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations of Laavionsuonoja (empty circles) and Löytynlähde (filled circles) measured with the 5-  
265 mm pathlength sensor, compared with the laboratory results. The detection limit for the laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N was 0.010  
266 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>

267

268 NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio

269

270 The proportional difference between the laboratory and sensor results is referred to as the NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio. This ratio  
271 was plotted against the corresponding DOC concentration to demonstrate the effects of OC on the NO<sub>x</sub>-N results by the  
272 sensors. Only study sites with at least four data points were included. Based on the results, the NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio for the  
273 35-mm pathlength sensor mostly increased along with the corresponding DOC concentration (DOC < 10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>),  
274 yet remained below 2.0 (**Fig. 5**). The OC strongly influenced the NO<sub>x</sub>-N results by the 5-mm pathlength sensor in the  
275 bog waters, resulting in error ratios of 40.0-66.0 and 3.7-15.0 (**Fig. 6a**). The first data points in these lines (error ratios  
276 40.0 and 3.7) were observed in DOC concentrations of 7.4 and 4.03 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>. In samples with no bog waters (DOC  
277 below 10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>), the NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio remained under 2.0 (**Fig. 6b**).

278

279 **Fig. 5** NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratios for the 35-mm pathlength sensor with corresponding DOC concentrations (< 10.0 mg C L<sup>-1</sup>)  
280 in Letkunoja, Teuronjoki, Pääjärvi, and Luhtaanmäenjoki

281

282 **Fig. 6a, b** NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratios for the 5-mm pathlength sensor with corresponding DOC concentrations, including a) bog  
283 outlet waters with high levels of OC (Laavionsuonoja and mixture of Laavionsuonoja and Luhtaanmäenjoki) and b)  
284 Letkunoja, Teuronjoki, and Pääjärvi. Note the different scales

285

286 Experiment III

287

288 Sensor data collected from Koiransuolenoja was corrected with two different methods. In SLR, the correlation  
289 coefficient of the regression function between the sensor and laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N was weak ( $R^2 = 0.32$ ,  $n = 25$ ). In MLR,  
290 the sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N data were corrected, based on the resulting regression function (laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N = 781.087 -  
291 (74.994 \* scan-DOC) + (0.935 \* scan-NO<sub>x</sub>-N), and the model was significant ( $R^2 = 0.92$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Yet, both sensor  
292 results showed the dynamic nature of the NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentration in the agriculturally influenced stream. As can be seen  
293 in **Fig. 7a** and **b**, the sensor data corrected by MLR were more accurate ( $R^2 = 0.93$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) than the sensor data with  
294 higher variability corrected by SLR ( $R^2 = 0.33$ ,  $p < 0.010$ ). The mean NO<sub>x</sub>-N concentrations were similar with both  
295 correction methods (2.4 mg L<sup>-1</sup>), and no statistical differences were found in the medians with the Wilcoxon signed-  
296 ranks test.

297



298 **Fig. 7a, b** Laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N results indicated with circles (n = 25) in relation to the continuous 5-mm pathlength  
299 sensor results from Koiransuolenoja Brook on 3 May to 22 November 2013 corrected by a) simple linear regression  
300 (laboratory NO<sub>x</sub>-N result as the only explanatory variable) and b) multiple linear regression (explanatory variables scan-  
301 DOC, scan-NO<sub>x</sub>-N) (unpublished data, Uusheimo et al.)  
302

### 303 **Discussion**

304

305 Originally, optical nitrate sensors were developed for ocean environments with low turbidity and color (Pellerin et al.  
306 2013). Thus, their use in various aquatic environments, such as rivers and lakes with high turbidity and color, calls for  
307 careful planning in application procedure. Use of these sensors resulted in increasing overestimation of the NO<sub>x</sub>-N  
308 concentrations under ascending OC, which was not a result of inaccurate measurement of OC, but rather due to the  
309 partial absorption of light at the same wavelengths. The 35-mm pathlength sensor, recommended for lower NO<sub>x</sub>-N and  
310 OC concentrations, performed according to the manufacturer's specifications, excluding the samples of bog outlet  
311 waters, in which the TOC concentrations fell within the measuring range given by the manufacturer. This result is in  
312 agreement with the findings of Drolc and Vrtovšek (2010), who observed that the NO<sub>x</sub>-N values obtained from the  
313 sensor were higher than those from the reference method, due to interference from other substances in the local water  
314 matrix. Additional support for cross-sensitivity between OC and NO<sub>x</sub>-N was found in the KNO<sub>3</sub> amendment  
315 experiment, in which the measuring range of NO<sub>x</sub>-N by the 5-mm pathlength sensor was clearly decreased under the  
316 influence of the high OC levels in the bog outlet water. However, a matter of OC quality was also seemingly involved,  
317 because the NO<sub>x</sub>-N error ratio was higher in the bog outlet waters than in the river, stream, or lake water. It should be  
318 noted that the error ratio was not linear. In addition, both sensors were unreliable at measuring low NO<sub>x</sub>-N  
319 concentrations (< 0.28 mg N L<sup>-1</sup>) often resulting in readings of zero in the spring, lake and stream waters. This should  
320 be considered, especially in working with waters typically low in nitrates, such as forest areas, oligotrophic lakes,  
321 headwaters, and other more pristine areas.  
322

323 As the manufacturer states, the accuracy of the measurements can be improved by local calibration, i.e. correcting the  
324 sensor results with sufficient manual sampling. Caradot et al. (2015) suggested that calibration should be based on at  
325 least 15-20 samples, covering for the most part the variation in concentration of the substance measured. There are  
326 several procedures for calibration; Lepot et al. (2016) used SLR, which has proven a robust and applicable tool. Our  
327 results show that if sufficient accuracy in sensor NO<sub>x</sub>-N results is not achieved by simple correction, an MLR including  
328 OC data can be applied to achieve a more accurate correction.

329

330 Based on the results of this study, local calibration in NO<sub>x</sub>-N measurements with optical sensors should always be  
331 carried out in dealing with waters containing some organic matter. Streams, lakes, and other natural boreal waters can  
332 contain high amounts of OC. In Finland, due to the large areas of coniferous forest and marshland, the average TOC of  
333 surface waters ranges from 0.50 to 47.0 mg L<sup>-1</sup> (median 12.0 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) (Kortelainen 1999). In boreal latitudes, seasonality  
334 may also result in changes in freshwater OC quantity and quality (e.g. Erlandsson et al. 2012). Interference of organic  
335 matter in NO<sub>x</sub>-N measurements with optical sensors may become even more relevant, due to future changes in climate  
336 and their effects on OC.

337

338 In conclusion, neither sporadic manual sampling nor continuous sensor monitoring can ensure excellent data quality  
339 alone. Our results demonstrate that sensor data need to be verified with samples analyzed in the laboratory. When the  
340 data quality of photometric sensors has been assured with care, high-frequency measurements by sensors can provide  
341 extremely useful data and improve our knowledge of water quality and nutrient loading, especially in highly dynamic  
342 aquatic environments.

343

#### 344 **Acknowledgements**

345

346 This study was funded by the M. and T. Nessling Foundation. We thank the laboratory staff of Lammi Biological  
347 Station for conducting the laboratory work. This study was conducted under projects: ERDF-funded New Solutions for  
348 Environmental Monitoring (YMLI, YMPANA), Profitability and Added-Value for Agriculture from Automatic, Real-  
349 Time Monitoring of Environment and the Extension Services (EnviSense), Measurement, Monitoring and  
350 Environmental Assessment (MMEA), Processes Controlling DOC-Fluxes in Boreal Catchments (PRO-DOC), and N-  
351 Sink (LIFE12 ENV/FI/597).

352

#### 353 **References**

354

355 Arvola, L., Einola, E. & Järvinen, M. (2015). Landscape properties and precipitation as determinants for high summer  
356 nitrogen load from boreal catchments. *Landscape Ecology*. 30:429-442.

357

358 Caradot, N., Sonnenberg, H., Roualt, P., Gruber, G., Hofer, T., Torres, A., Pesci, M. & Bertrand-Krajewski, J-L. (2015).  
359 Influence of local calibration on the quality of online wet weather discharge monitoring: feedback from five  
360 international case studies. *Water Science & Technology* Vol 71(1), pp 45-51. IWA Publishing.

361

362 Drolc, A. & Vrtovšek, J. (2010). Case study: Nitrate and nitrite nitrogen determination in waste water using on-line UV  
363 spectrometric method. *Bioresource Technology*. 101:4228-4233.

364

365 Erlandsson, M., Futter, M.N., Kothawala, D.N. & Köhler, S.J. (2012). Variability in spectral absorbance metrics across  
366 boreal lake waters. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 14, 2643, doi:10.1039/c2em30266g

367

368 Fowler, D., Coyle, M., Skiba, U., Sutton, M., Cape, N., Reis, S., Sheppard, L. J., Jenkins, A., Grizzetti, B., Galloway, J.  
369 N., Vitousek, P., Leach, A., Bouwman, A. F., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Dentener, F., Stevenson, D., Amann, M. & Voss, M.  
370 (2013). The global nitrogen cycle in the twenty-first century. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:  
371 Biological Sciences* 368:20130164.

372

373 Galloway, JN, Leach, AM, Bleeker, A, Erisman, JW. (2013). A chronology of human understanding of the nitrogen  
374 cycle. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0120

375

376 Gruber, N. & Galloway, J. N. (2008). An earth-system perspective of the global nitrogen cycle. *Nature*. Vol 451:293-  
377 296.

378 Huber, E. & Frost, M. (1998). Light scattering by small particles. *Aqua*, 47: 87–94. doi:10.1046/j.1365-  
379 2087.1998.00086

380 Huotari, J. & Ketola, M. (2014). Jatkuvatoinen levämäärien mittaust. Hyvät mittauskäytännöt ja aineiston käsittely.  
381 *Ympäristöhallinnon ohjeita* 5/2014.

382 Kortelainen, P. (1999). Occurrence of humic waters. Temporal and spatial variability. In: J. Kesitalo, & P. Eloranta,  
383 (eds.). *Limnology of Humic Waters*. (pp. 46-55). Leiden, Backhuys Publishers.

384 Koskiaho, J., Lepistö, A., & Tattari, S. (2010): On-line measurements provide more accurate estimates of nutrient  
385 loading: a case of the Yläneenjoki river basin, southwest Finland. *Water Science & Technology*. Vol 62 No 1 pp 115–  
386 122 IWA Publishing.

387

388 Lepot, M., Torres, A., Hofer, T., Caradot, N., Grubber, G., Aubin, J-B & Bertrand-Krajewski J-L. (2016). Calibration of  
389 UV/Vis spectrophotometers: A review and comparison of different methods to estimate TSS and total and dissolved

390 COD concentrations in sewers, WWTPs and rivers. *Water Research* 101:519-534.  
391  
392 Linjama, J., Puustinen, M., Koskiahho, J., Tattari, S., Kotilainen, H. & Granlund, K. (2009). Implementation of  
393 automatic sensors for continuous monitoring of runoff quantity and quality in small catchments. *Agricultural and Food*  
394 *Sciences*. Vol 18:417-427.  
395  
396 Pellerin, B.A., Bergamaschi, B.A., Downing, B.D., Saraceno, J., Garret, J.D. & Olsen, L.D. (2013). Optical techniques  
397 for the determination of nitrate in environmental waters: Guidelines for instrument selection, operation, deployment,  
398 maintenance, quality assurance, and data reporting. *USGS Techniques and Methods Report 1-D5*, 37 pp.  
399  
399 Pellerin, B.A.& Bergamaschi, B.A. (2014). Optical Sensors for Water Quality. *Lakeline*. Spring 2014.  
400  
400 Rockstrom, J., W. Steffen, K. Noone, A. Persson, F. S. Chapin, III, E. Lambin, T. M. Lenton, M. Scheffer, C. Folke, H.  
401 Schellnhuber, B. Nykvist, C. A. De Wit, T. Hughes, S. van der Leeuw, H. Rodhe, S. Sorlin, P. K. Snyder, R. Costanza,  
402 U. Svedin, M. Falkenmark, L. Karlberg, R. W. Corell, V. J. Fabry, J. Hansen, B. Walker, D. Liverman, K. Richardson,  
403 P. Crutzen, and J. Foley. (2009). Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and*  
404 *Society* 14(2): 32. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art32/>.  
405  
405 Van den Broeke, J., Langergraber, G. & Weingartner, A. 2006. On-line and in-situ UV/vis spectroscopy for multi-  
406 parameter measurements: a brief review. *Spectroscopy Europe*. Vol 18:1-4.