

Radiocarbon in atmospheric CH₄ and CO₂ at Jungfraujoch in 2019-2024: influence of regional nuclear emissions and current global atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ signal

Thomas Laemmel^{1,2}, Dylan Geissbühler^{1,2§}, Stephan Henne³, Ryo Fujita⁴, Heather Graven⁵, Christophe Espic^{1,2*}, Matthias Bantle¹, Negar Haghipour⁶, Franz Conen⁷, Dominik Brunner³, Martin Steinbacher³, Giulia Zazzeri⁸, Samuel Hammer⁹, Markus Leuenberger^{2,10}, Sönke Szidat^{1,2}

¹Department of Chemistry, Biochemistry and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

²Oeschger Centre for Climate Change Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

³Empa, Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology, Dübendorf, Switzerland

⁴Meteorological Research Institute, Japan Meteorological Agency, Tsukuba, Japan

⁵Department of Physics, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

⁶Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences and Laboratory of Ion Beam Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁷Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

⁸Ricerca sul Sistema Energetico – RSE S.p.A., Milan, Italy

⁹Institute of Environmental Physics, Heidelberg University, ICOS-CRL, Heidelberg, Germany

¹⁰Climate and Environmental Physics, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

[§]now: Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^{*}now: MIRO Analytical AG, Wallisellen, Switzerland

Correspondence to: Thomas Laemmel (tlaemmel@gmail.com)

Abstract. Radiocarbon (^{14}C) is a valuable tracer to determine the relative fossil fractions of emitted carbonaceous greenhouse gases, such as CO_2 and CH_4 . While atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements have been conducted at multiple sites for several decades, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements remain more limited, mainly due to measurement challenges. In addition, nuclear power plant $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions can complicate data interpretation. In this study, fortnightly $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements at the Swiss High-Altitude Research Station Jungfraujoch (JFJ, about 3500 m a.s.l.) between 2019 and 2024 are presented. Over this period, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values showed an increase from $350 \pm 19 \text{ ‰}$ to $381 \pm 13 \text{ ‰}$, while $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values decreased from $-2.0 \pm 3.8 \text{ ‰}$ to $-12.7 \pm 2.0 \text{ ‰}$, respectively. The former is related to the slight increase of $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions from the nuclear industry over the last years, while the latter is linked to the continued dilution of the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ signal due to the release of ^{14}C -devoid CO_2 from combustion of fossil fuels. Despite its high elevation, JFJ is still influenced by nuclear power plants (NPPs) operating in Europe. To assess the nuclear ^{14}C contribution to our individual measurements, we use a combination of in situ ^{222}Rn measurements and Lagrangian particle dispersion model convolved with bottom-up inventory of ^{14}C emissions from nuclear power plants.. Furthermore, our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements reasonably agree with simulated atmospheric values of $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ estimated by a global atmospheric one-box model and an estimation of global nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions.

1. Introduction

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) are the two main anthropogenic greenhouse gases (GHGs) responsible for global climate change (IPCC, 2023; WMO, 2025). Since the Industrial Revolution around 1850, their global atmospheric concentrations have been multiplied by about 1.5 and 2.7, respectively, from around 285 to 422.8 ppm in 2024 for CO₂ (Etheridge et al., 1996; Lan et al., 2025b) and from around 800 to 1930 ppb in 2024 for CH₄ (Lan et al., 2025a; MacFarling Meure et al., 2006). Anthropogenic emissions of CO₂ and CH₄ (mainly from the energy sector for fossil CO₂ and CH₄, and agriculture and waste management for biogenic CH₄) are responsible for this rise in concentrations and resulting climate change. In the period 2010-2019, CO₂ and CH₄ were responsible for a global warming of around 0.8°C and 0.5°C, respectively, relative to the period 1850-1900 (IPCC, 2023). To implement effective mitigation measures, the main emission sources of both GHGs have to be better quantified and monitored.

Radiocarbon (¹⁴C), a radioactive isotope of carbon with a half-life of 5700 ± 30 years (Kutschera, 2013; Roberts and Southon, 2007), is a valuable tracer to distinguish fossil from modern carbon sources. Naturally produced in the upper atmosphere through the interaction of thermal neutrons with nitrogen, ¹⁴C is finally oxidized to ¹⁴CO₂, which can be integrated into the biosphere via photosynthesis and into the hydrosphere via gas exchange at the water-atmosphere interface (Graven et al., 2020). On the one hand, fossil fuels (*e.g.* coal, oil, natural gas) that were formed millions of years ago are now devoid of ¹⁴C because of its short half-life compared to geological time scales. On the other hand, CO₂ and CH₄ derived from fresh organic matter contain ¹⁴C/¹²C ratios close to the current atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ signature. Atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ and ¹⁴CH₄ measurements are thus valuable proxies to study the different sources of CO₂ and CH₄ released to the atmosphere.

Atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ measurements have a long history. Since the first measurements focused on the documentation of the atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ bomb peak in the 1950s-1960s associated with nuclear bomb tests (Levin et al., 1985; Manning et al., 1990; Nydal and Lövseth, 1983; Rafter and Fergusson, 1957), there are now international monitoring programs following the long-term evolution of atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ at background sites (*e.g.*, Hammer et al., 2017; Turnbull et al., 2007). Observations at the High-Altitude Research Station Jungfraujoch (JFJ) in Switzerland have been conducted since 1986; there, two-weeks integrated CO₂ samples have been collected and further purified and analyzed at the Heidelberg laboratory (Germany) (Levin et al., 2013, 2023). On a more local scale, atmospheric ¹⁴CO₂ measurements have been used to study CO₂ emissions from urban areas to entire countries (Basu et al., 2020; Graven et al., 2018; Levin et al., 2003). Since the bomb peak in the middle of the last century, Δ¹⁴CO₂ values have been declining by the dilution of the enriched atmospheric ¹⁴C signal in both land and ocean carbon sinks and by the emissions of ¹⁴C-free fossil fuel CO₂, which depletes the atmospheric Δ¹⁴CO₂ signal (Graven et al., 2024; Oeschger et al., 1975).

Atmospheric measurements of ¹⁴CH₄ have been more limited than ¹⁴CO₂ so far. One reason for this is related to the about 200-times lower atmospheric CH₄ concentration compared to CO₂: while 2-5 liters of air are sufficient to analyze ¹⁴CO₂ (*e.g.* yielding about 1 mgC from 5 L air at 420 ppm CO₂), several tens of liters are required for ¹⁴CH₄ analysis (*e.g.* yielding about 50 μgC from 50 L air at 2 ppm CH₄). The sampling and analysis of ¹⁴CH₄ is therefore difficult, and prone to CO₂ contamination. Besides this technical consideration, the interpretation of atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ measurements may be complicated at study sites that are influenced by nuclear power plants (NPPs) (Eisma et al., 1994, 1995; Levin et al., 1992). Pressurized water reactors (PWRs), which are currently the most widely operated plants (IAEA PRIS, 2025), emit ¹⁴C mainly as ¹⁴CH₄, whereas other reactor types emit ¹⁴C mainly as ¹⁴CO₂ (Vance et al., 1995; Zazzeri et al., 2018). The annual global nuclear ¹⁴C emission rate for 2016 has been estimated to about 105 TBq for ¹⁴CO₂ and about 45 TBq for ¹⁴CH₄ (Zazzeri et al., 2018). Although ¹⁴CO₂ emissions are larger, the influence of nuclear ¹⁴CH₄ emissions on atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ is stronger due to the much lower atmospheric CH₄ concentration compared to CO₂. This also explains why current atmospheric ¹⁴C/¹²C ratios are about 35% higher for ¹⁴CH₄ than ¹⁴CO₂ (Emmenegger et al., 2025a; Gonzalez Moguel et al., 2022).

Despite these challenges, several analysis setups and atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ datasets have been reported from ice cores and atmospheric samples. Pioneering atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ measurements were reported by Lowe et al. (1988) and Wahlen et al. (1989). In the 1990s, Levin et al. (1992) reported the first sporadic ¹⁴CH₄ measurements between 1988 and 1991 at JFJ. Eisma et al. (1994, 1995) measured atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ values from a tall tower in the Netherlands and highlighted the challenge to interpret ¹⁴CH₄ measurements, even when using an atmospheric transport model to evaluate the nuclear influence on the measurements. Lassey et al. (2007a, b) compiled more than 200 individual atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ measurements from the Northern and Southern Hemispheres between 1986 and 2000 and deduced that about 30% of the global CH₄ source for this period had a fossil origin. Hmiel et al. (2020) used ¹⁴CH₄ measurements from ice cores to better constrain natural geological (*i.e.*, fossil) CH₄ emissions

during the preindustrial era. By synthesizing atmospheric CH₄ concentration and its major isotopologues (¹³CH₄, CH₃D and ¹⁴CH₄) for 1750-2015, Fujita et al. (2025) estimated 30 % lower global CH₄ emissions from the fossil-fuel industry compared to previous isotope-based studies relying mostly on CH₄ and ¹³CH₄ without ¹⁴C consideration. Another output of their work was an updated inventory of the nuclear ¹⁴CH₄ emissions between 1960 and 2015 based on nuclear electricity production data.

In recent years, several novel analysis systems and studies for ¹⁴CH₄ have been reported (Espic et al., 2019; Gonzalez Moguel et al., 2022; Zazzeri et al., 2021, 2023) increasing the analysis capabilities, even in a more field-compatible way (Zazzeri et al., 2025). Despite these new studies, recent background atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ values are still missing. At the Laboratory for the Analysis of Radiocarbon with AMS (LARA, University of Bern) (Szidat, 2020), a system exists since 2019 to analyze ¹⁴CH₄ and ¹⁴CO₂ from a single atmospheric sample (Espic et al., 2019) and was already used in several studies (Espic et al., 2025; Etiope et al., 2024; Zazzeri et al., 2025). Here, we present atmospheric ¹⁴CH₄ and ¹⁴CO₂ measurements conducted at the High-Altitude Research Station Jungfraujoch between 2019 and 2024, discuss their representativeness regarding the nuclear influence in Europe and show their relevance as worldwide background values.

2. Material & Methods

2.1. Jungfraujoch Site and Sampling Strategy

The High-Altitude Research Station Jungfraujoch (stretching from 3455 to 3585 m a.s.l., 46°32'51"N, 7°59'7"E, JFJ), established in 1931, is located on a mountain ridge in the Swiss Alps. Among others, this station is part of the Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) network as well as of the Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Composition Change (NDACC). Furthermore, JFJ is labelled as an Class 1 Station of the European-wide Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) Research Infrastructure (Heiskanen et al., 2022) since May 2018 (Yver-Kwok et al., 2021). Because of its high elevation, JFJ is a well-recognized international background station (Leuenberger and Flückiger, 2008). However, it is also intermittently impacted by direct transport from the polluted planetary boundary layer, most frequently during daytime from April to September (Henne et al., 2010).

A fortnightly air sampling program measuring ¹⁴CH₄ and ¹⁴CO₂ at JFJ every two weeks started in January 2019. Until March 2023, two morning grab air samples were taken using a membrane pump (N022AN.18, KNF Neuberger AG, Germany) that directly pumped air from the Sphinx terrasse (3580 m a.s.l.) at JFJ into two PE-Al-PE 120 L bags (Tecobag, Tesseraux Spezialverpackungen GmbH, Germany) through a dedicated sampling line (Synflex Decabon 1300 Tubing, OD = 6 mm). The sampled air was dried with a magnesium perchlorate dryer (Mg(ClO₄)₂, ACS reagent, ThermoFisher, USA) to avoid condensation and further reactions between water vapor and other sampled gas species. The sampling duration per bag was commonly between 20 and 55 min depending on the ambient pressure, temperature and the flow resistance during sampling due to the dryer and the long length and small diameter of the sampling line. The morning grab samplings were performed manually and as early as possible in the morning to avoid the influence of the daytime planetary boundary layer; in practice, it commonly occurred between 7:00 and 10:00 UTC (i.e., 08:00 and 12:00 local time, UTC+1/UTC+2), depending on the seasonal train schedule ensuring the public transport up to JFJ.

To increase the reproducibility of the air sampling procedure and its representativeness as a background measurement, an automated air sampling system was developed replacing the manual sampling from April 18th 2023 onwards (Fig. 1). Its development was guided by two principles: (1) air sampling should be restricted to nighttime when the station mostly resides within the free troposphere, allowing for the collection of temporally integrated samples over multiple days; and (2) air sampling should occur as far as possible passively, i.e., without any mechanical pumps in contact with the sampled air, thereby minimizing the risk of contamination from membrane outgassing. The novel *Jungfraujoch Air Sampling System (JASS)* consisted of a custom-made electropolished steel sampling tank (260 L, L = 140 cm, OD = 51 cm, Bechtiger Edelstahl AG, Switzerland) coupled to a sampling box containing a series of valves, all controlled by a home-made control unit including a Raspberry Pi 4B module (Raspberry Pi Ltd, United Kingdom) (Fig. 1). The whole system was installed under the roof of the research station at JFJ, at about 3462 m a.s.l. (Fig. S1). Its design allows a routine integrated nighttime air sampling procedure lasting 6 hours every night (between 00:00 and 06:00 UTC) over 14 days, so integrating 84 hours in total. Compared to the initial fortnightly morning grab sampling strategy, integrated sampling gives a more representative air mixture for every two-week period of interest (Fig. S2).




Figure 1: Jungfrauoch Air Sampling System (JASS) used for integrated nighttime air sampling over 14 days since April 18th 2023.

The inlet of the sampling line (Synflex Decabon 1300 Tubing, OD = 12 mm, L~10 m) was protected by a dust filter (Fig. 1). A flushing membrane pump (N022AN.18, KNF Neuberger AG, Germany) continuously conveyed outside air through this sampling line and a water separator to the sampling box. Through two T-pieces (SS-12M0-3, Swagelok, USA) integrated in this sampling line, part of the sampled air could be further directed into the sampling box, either automatically using line (1), or manually using line (2) (Fig. 1). At the beginning of a sampling period, the tank was evacuated using a vacuum pump (MV 2 NT, Vacuubrand GmbH + Co KG, Germany); the end pressure was ≤ 0.7 mbar. During automatic air sampling, the sampling line (1) was open and worked as follows: both 2/2-way solenoid valves A1 and A2 (0330-A-02, Bürkert, Germany) were open and the 3/2-way solenoid valve B (0330-F-02, Bürkert, Germany) was in the position connecting this line with the tank (blue connection, Fig. 1); the mass-flow controller (MFC, F-201DV, Bronkhorst, The Netherlands) between A1 and A2 ensured a controlled air flow into the system and the increasing pressure in the tank was monitored by a pressure gauge (RPT 200 AR, Pfeiffer Vacuum, Germany); in front of the MFC, a $\text{Mg}(\text{ClO}_4)_2$ dryer dried the sampled air and a $0.5 \mu\text{m}$ filter (SS-4FWS-05, Swagelok, USA) protected the MFC from particulate matter. After 6 hours of sampling, both A1 and A2 valves were closed. This sampling procedure was repeated every night. After 14 nighttime samplings, the pressure in the tank reached 600-650 mbar. The mean ambient atmospheric pressure at JFJ was 656 mbar over the period 2019-2024 (Emmenegger et al., 2025d); we configured our passive sampling system in a way where the tank pressure was always lower than ambient pressure, otherwise the passive sampling based on the pressure difference between the tank and the ambient pressure would not work. On-site, the transfer of the sampled air from the tank into a new bag was prepared in this manner: a dedicated transfer pump (N922SPE, KNF Neuberger AG, Germany) was turned on and the manual 3/2-way valve D2 was turned to the left (Fig. 1); the position of the 3/2-way valve D1 stayed by default turned to the left. The Python script running on the Raspberry Pi was then restarted to turn on the vacuum pump and switch the 3/2-way solenoid valve B in the position connecting the tank with the pump line (red connection, Fig. 1). At this stage, the transfer pump was evacuating the tank and after ~30 s of line flushing, a bag was connected to the line for the transfer of the sampled air. After about one hour, enough air was transferred to the bag for further ^{14}C analyses. It was then closed and disconnected from the transfer pump (tank pressure at around 70-90 mbar). To accelerate the evacuation of the tank and condition it again for the next sampling, the valve D2 was then turned to the right, and the vacuum pump was evacuating the tank. The system was left like this for the rest of the day and, at 23:59 UTC, valve B switched automatically back to its sampling position (blue connection, Fig. 1) (final tank pressure ≤ 0.7 mbar), the vacuum pump turned off and the whole system was ready to start the next sampling period. The whole sampling system was validated to be leak-tight in our laboratory in Bern before being transferred to JFJ. The low pressure achieved in the tank before each new sampling every two weeks regularly validated the tightness of the sampling system.

2.2. Sample preparation and measurements of $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$

For both morning grab and integrated nighttime sampling strategies, the air collected in bags was transferred to the LARA laboratory at the University of Bern (Szidat, 2020), where a dedicated extraction line for $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ analysis was available (see Espic et al., 2019 for details). The extraction was generally done within one

week after sampling and most of the time the day after. The typical air volume for one analysis was 60 L. During a preconcentration step, this air was pumped successively through three traps filled either with fiber glass or activated charcoal and cooled down with liquid nitrogen; this allowed us to preserve the whole amount of CH₄ contained in the initial 60 L of air by trapping or pumping away the main other gas species, especially nitrogen and oxygen. CO₂ was quantitatively trapped in the first trap and could be collected separately (see below). After that, the gas sample volume was about 10 mL, small enough to be run through a gas chromatograph (GC, 7890B, Agilent, USA; ShinCarbon ST 80/100 packed column; thermal conductivity detector, He as carrier gas) to purify the sample. CH₄ was isolated quantitatively from the remaining CO and CO₂ present in trace quantities due to different elution times in the GC (CO: ~2 min; CH₄: ~8 min; CO₂: ~13 min). Downstream of the GC, the extracted pure CH₄ was converted into CO₂ by combustion in a flow oven at 950°C using copper oxide wires as a catalyst. The CH₄-derived CO₂ (~60 to 70 µg of carbon, µgC) was transferred into glass ampoules (OD = 4 mm) and sealed for gas radiocarbon measurements. After the CH₄ extraction procedure, the CO₂ of the sample held in the first trap was recovered by cryogenic transfer into a ~55 mL glass flask. The carbon mass of the recovered CO₂ was typically greater than 1 mgC, which was transformed into graphite using an automated graphitization equipment (AGE) (Němec et al., 2010). Concerning the quality control of the ¹⁴CH₄ extraction system, Espic et al. (2019) reported a cross-contamination of 0.4 ± 0.2 % (n = 2) from the previous sample and an extraction yield of 101.2 ± 1.4 (n = 13).

Radiocarbon analyses of the gaseous CH₄-derived CO₂ samples and the graphite CO₂ samples were performed either at LARA or at the Laboratory of Ion Beam Physics, ETH Zürich, Switzerland, using the same type of AMS (MIni CARbon DAtIng System, MICADAS), equipped with a gas ion source (Ruff et al., 2007; Synal et al., 2007). Glass ampoules were cracked in a dedicated gas inlet system (Wacker et al., 2013) and the CH₄-derived CO₂ was diluted with He to ~5%, transferred into a syringe, and then fed into the ion source using a constant gas flow. Graphite samples were introduced directly to the MICADAS source. For both types of samples, raw ¹⁴C/¹²C as well as ¹³C/¹²C ratios were converted into F¹⁴C and δ¹³C values, respectively, by performing a blank subtraction as well as a standard normalization and correction for isotope fractionation (only for F¹⁴C) using ¹⁴C-free CO₂ (Blank) (F¹⁴C = 0) and CO₂ produced from the primary NIST standard oxalic acid II (OX-II) (SRM 4990C) (F¹⁴C = 1.34066, δ¹³C = -17.8 ‰), respectively. For the gas measurements, standards came from two gas bottles directly attached to the gas inlet system; both mixtures consisted of 5% CO₂ with the F¹⁴C value of interest and 95% He. For the graphite measurements, both standards underwent the same sample preparation as the CO₂ samples and were measured with them in the same magazine. Gas samples were commonly measured starting with 2-4 OX-II and 2 Blank standards, then with the samples in chronological sampling order and finishing with 2-4 OX-II and 2 Blank to account for potential drifts. The dataset presented here was built over 40 measurement days in 6 years. Per measurement day, about 24-32 standards and samples, including about 5-8 from JFJ, were measured; the remaining samples coming from other sampling sites or further projects. The average standard deviation of all the OX-II standard used for normalization within a single measurement day was ±0.007 (in F¹⁴C) whereas the average single OX-II precision derived from counting statistics was ±0.010 (n = 204). Graphite samples were generally measured in a 39-position magazine containing 3-4 OX-II and 3 Blank samples. The dataset presented here was built over 35 magazines. The average standard deviation of all the OX-II standard used for normalization within a single measurement day was ±0.0018 (in F¹⁴C) whereas the average single OX-II precision derived from counting statistics was ±0.0025 (n = 117). The final data evaluation was done using the BATS tool (Wacker et al., 2010). The typical measurement precision is 8 ‰ for ¹⁴CH₄ and 1.5 ‰ for ¹⁴CO₂ (see below). Throughout the current work, ¹⁴C results are reported using the notation Δ¹⁴C, and calculated with age correction as the parameter Δ in Stuiver and Polach (1977).

2.3. Ancillary measurements and datasets

At JFJ, in the framework of the ICOS measurement program, CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations are measured continuously using cavity ringdown spectroscopy; corresponding hourly average values were used in the present study (Emmenegger et al., 2025b, c). These values were used, among other purposes, to determine the stability of CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations in the transfer bags between sampling and extraction. CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations were measured in the remaining sampled air after extraction with a cavity ringdown spectrometer (Picarro G2401, Picarro Inc., USA) calibrated with three gas bottles with known CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations (1861.2, 1955.9, and 2206.7 ppb for CH₄; 379.21, 418.38, and 458.62 ppm for CO₂) (Carbagas, Switzerland). Mean differences between concentrations measured after extraction and measured in situ were 1.3 ± 2.8 ppb and 0.7 ± 1 ppm, for CH₄ and CO₂, respectively (n = 13, between January and July 2024).

Furthermore, integrated samples have been collected at JFJ since 1986 to analyze atmospheric Δ¹⁴CO₂, first started by the University of Heidelberg, now run as part of the ICOS Research Infrastructure (Emmenegger et al., 2025a; Hammer et al., 2017; Levin and Kromer, 2004). The dedicated setup draws ambient air throughout 14 days through

a sodium hydroxide solution, in which CO_2 is chemically absorbed. We chose the same 14-day schedule for our nighttime sampling as the ICOS schedule to enable a comparison between both datasets. ICOS $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values are also reported as Δ values according to Stuiver and Polach (1977). Furthermore, atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values from the Mace Head Atmospheric Research Station (MHD, Ireland) are used here for comparison (Hammer and Levin, 2023); due to its location exposed to westerly winds from the North Atlantic Ocean, MHD is often used as European background station.

We also made use of continuous ^{222}Rn (in the following referred as Rn) measurements at JFJ with a two-filter dual loop alpha particle detector, operated by the University of Basel since 2009 (Griffiths et al., 2014) and which is meanwhile part of ICOS (Fig. S1). Rn is emitted from land surfaces into the atmosphere and because of its half-life of 3.8 days, it is a potential tracer of recent land contact. In this study, Rn was used as a proxy to distinguish free tropospheric samples from those originating from the planetary boundary layer (i.e., with recent land contact). To account for variations in ambient temperature and pressure, the raw hourly Rn concentrations (Conen, 2025) were converted into Rn values at STP conditions (i.e., $T = 0^\circ\text{C}$, $P = 101\,325\text{ Pa}$).

To evaluate the accuracy and stability of our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements over time, regular measurements of a pressurized air bottle (PAB) (Carbagas, Switzerland) considered as an internal standard have been performed since March 2022 in parallel to the measurements of the JFJ samples; this air strictly underwent the same extraction and measurement procedures as the JFJ samples, commonly just before them. A first bottle was measured until end of July 2023 ($\text{CH}_4 = 1997 \pm 2\text{ ppb}$, and $\text{CO}_2 = 434.5 \pm 0.1\text{ ppm}$), replaced by a second one in August 2023 ($\text{CH}_4 = 2178 \pm 2\text{ ppb}$, and $\text{CO}_2 = 455.8 \pm 0.1\text{ ppm}$). It should be noted that the $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values of both bottles were *a priori* unknown and that we used them to evaluate the stability of the values derived from our measurement procedure.

2.4. Atmospheric modeling of nuclear ^{14}C influence at JFJ

One goal of the present study was to evaluate the influence of nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions on our atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements at JFJ. For this purpose, the amount and transport of $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ molecules from nuclear emissions were simulated using the Lagrangian particle dispersion model FLEXible PARTicle (FLEXPART) (Pisso et al., 2019) in the version adopted for inputs from the numerical weather prediction model COSMO (Henne et al., 2016). Here, we use the COSMO analysis product of the Swiss Federal Office of Meteorology and Climatology (MeteoSwiss), based on high spatial resolution ($1\text{ km} \times 1\text{ km}$) model simulations and using a local ensemble transform Kalman filter (LETKF) meteorological data assimilation system (Schraff et al., 2016). Meteorological analysis fields from this product were available at 1 hour temporal resolution for the Alpine domain (approximately $0\text{--}17^\circ\text{E}$, $42\text{--}50^\circ\text{N}$). The FLEXPART-COSMO model was used in previous atmospheric studies including the verification of the Swiss CH_4 emission inventory (Henne et al., 2016), the influence of nuclear $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions on $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ at a Swiss tall tower (Berhanu et al., 2017), the analysis of CO_2 and $\delta^{13}\text{CO}_2$ at JFJ (Pieber et al., 2022), and for inverse modeling of halocarbon emissions over Switzerland (Katharopoulos et al., 2023). Here, the model was operated in the same way as in Katharopoulos et al. (2023). In short, 50'000 model particles were released continuously from JFJ for every 3-hour interval and traced backwards in time for 4 days or until they reached the domain boundaries. Afterwards, the integration of the particles' path was continued for up to 10 days in a European scale FLEXPART-IFS simulation driven by hourly inputs from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) HRES operational forecast/analysis product available at $0.1^\circ \times 0.1^\circ$ resolution. The residence time of particles below a height of 50 m above model ground is then estimated in 3-hourly intervals and divided by air density provides so called source sensitivities (or concentration footprints).

Nuclear ^{14}C emissions between 2019 and 2023 from the nuclear power plants (NPPs) located in the modeling area (Fig. S3) were mostly estimated using the compilation of nuclear ^{14}C emissions of Laemmel et al. (2025). The atmospheric transport modeling was performed only for the period 2019-2023, as the input parameters for 2024 were not yet fully available. For most countries (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom) only annual total ^{14}C emissions for the NPPs were available. For some countries, more detailed information could be used including quarterly ^{14}C emissions from NPPs in France and Germany and monthly emissions for the Swiss NPPs Leibstadt and Gösgen, the Swedish NPPs Forsmark, Oskarshamn, and Ringhals, some NPPs in the United Kingdom and the French nuclear fuel reprocessing plant (NFRP) La Hague. Monthly inorganic and organic ^{14}C emissions from the Hungarian NPP Paks were also available for 2019 in this dataset. In addition to these published values, monthly inorganic and organic ^{14}C emissions for 2020-2023 were kindly made available by the operating company of the NPP Paks for this simulation. Reported

emissions from the NPPs located in Belarus, Belgium, Russia, and Ukraine were not available; we estimated the annual ^{14}C emissions for each of these plants by multiplying the annual electricity production (Laemmel and Szidat, 2025) by reactor-specific emission factors (EF) of 0.19, 0.41, and 1.3 TBq/GWa (GWa = gigawatt x 1 year) for PWR, VVER (water-cooled water-moderated energy reactor), and LWGR (light water graphite reactor), respectively. EF values for PWR and VVER were derived from the work of Fujita et al. (2025) and EF value for LWGR from the work of Zazzeri et al. (2018).

In a further step, $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions per NPP were derived, as the reported values were mainly for total ^{14}C . We used data for inorganic and organic ^{14}C emissions that were reported in some countries (*e.g.* for NPPs in Germany, Hungary, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland). For other countries we assumed that PWRs and VVERs emit 75 % of the total ^{14}C amount in organic form (so 25 % in inorganic form) and that all the other reactors (*e.g.* boiling water reactor (BWR), LWGR, and pressurized heavy water reactor (PHWR)) emit ^{14}C entirely in inorganic form, as also was assumed by Fujita et al. (2025). Furthermore, we assumed that the inorganic ^{14}C form is entirely composed of $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and that $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ represents 72.5 % of the organic ^{14}C form; this last value was derived from the study of Kunz (1985) who analysed the composition of hydrocarbons of gaseous effluents at two PWRs in the USA. They reported values of 68 and 77 % at the PWR Ginna and PWR Indian Point, respectively. Finally, the annual, quarterly or monthly emission amount of $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ available for each plant was equally divided into three-hour intervals to compute an emission rate per output step of the FLEXPART transport simulation. FLEXPART-derived source sensitivities, convolved with these emission rates yield ^{14}C mole fractions at the sampling site and a final nuclear correction $\Delta^{14}\text{C}^{\text{Nuc}}$ can be calculated assuming a mass balance model for C and ^{14}C (Graven et al., 2019) (See detailed equations in supplementary material). Background atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ modeling.

Another goal of the present study was to evaluate the representativeness of our atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at JFJ on a global level. For this goal, we compared our data with calculated atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values from a one-box model developed by Fujita et al. (2025). In this study, we extended their simulation until 2024 (Fig. S4) by updating their posterior CH_4 emission scenarios since 2013 (*i.e.*, average of posterior CEDS, EDGARv5, and EDGARv6 scenarios; see Fujita et al. (2025)). The anthropogenic CH_4 emissions for 2013-2022 were extended by using EDGARv8 (European Commission. Joint Research Centre., 2023). To match the consistency with the posterior anthropogenic biogenic (BIO) and fossil fuel (FF) emissions in Fujita et al. (2025), the mean differences between EDGARv8 and Fujita et al. (2025) were calculated for 2008-2012 (BIO: 2.1 Tg/yr, FF: 9.8 Tg/yr) and then added to the values of EDGARv8 after 2013, respectively. For 2023-2024, the emissions of the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) were used. Here, we adopted SSP5-8.5 scenario in 2030 (Gidden et al., 2019) and linearly interpolated it between the EDGARv8 2022 emissions and the 2030 scenario emissions to the years 2023 and 2024. Natural biogenic CH_4 emissions were optimized based on the CH_4 mass balance equation to keep the consistency between our simulations and observed global mean CH_4 mole fractions by NOAA/GML (Lan et al., 2025a). To evaluate the ^{14}C signature of the biospheric CH_4 sources, $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values for the time period 2013-2024 were derived from the SSP5-8.5 scenario (Graven et al., 2020). To extend the nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions beyond 2013, we considered the posterior annual nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions derived by Fujita et al. (2025). Assuming that only PWRs and VVERs are emitting $^{14}\text{CH}_4$, a mean annual emission factor Φ (GBq/GWa) was computed by dividing these emissions by the annual total electricity production by PWRs and VVERs derived from the data compilation by Laemmel and Szidat (2025). Considering the years 2008-2012, the mean Φ value was 250 GBq/GWa, the min Φ value was 243 GBq/GWa, and the max Φ value was 259 GBq/GWa. Considering these three Φ values and the annual total electricity production by PWRs and VVERs in 2013-2024 (the value for 2024 was chosen equal to 2023 as the real value was not yet available), three projections of annual nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions were computed and used as variable input parameter in three different simulations of global atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values (Fig. S4g). Posterior geologic emissions, biospheric turnover time, total CH_4 lifetime, carbon and hydrogen kinetic isotope effects, and carbon and hydrogen CH_4 isotopic signatures for respective sources in Fujita et al. (2025) were repeated by the values in 2012 over 2013-2024.

The simulated $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values were compared to our annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values at JFJ for 2019-2024 and previously reported measurements from samples (ice cores and/or firn air) of Greenland and Antarctica (Hmiel et al., 2020) and from atmospheric samples (Gonzalez Moguel et al., 2022; Lassey et al., 2007b; Levin et al., 1992; Quay et al., 1999; Sparrow et al., 2018; Townsend-Small et al., 2012; Wahlen et al., 1989). Note that the data in Hmiel et al. (2020) was used in Fujita et al. (2025) as observational constraints. Several other studies were found but not used here because of the large scatter in the reported data (Lowe et al., 1988; Manning et al., 1990) or difficulties in the unit conversion into current radiocarbon parameters (Ehhalt, 1974).

3. Results

3.1. $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at Jungfraujoch

$\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values at JFJ between 2019 and 2024 were between 322 and 767 ‰ and showed a slightly increasing trend over the last six years (Fig. 2a,b). Some exceptionally high $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values were measured (*i.e.*, on June 13th and July 25th 2019; May 13th, June 10th and June 24th 2020; May 12th 2021) and were attributed to local and strong nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ releases. Rn values were lower than 5 Bq m⁻³ over 2019–2024 with generally lower values during winter months compared to summer months (Fig. 2c), which is consistent with a potentially stronger influence of the planetary boundary layer in summer. Annual mean CH_4 concentrations increased from 1930 ppb in 2019 to 1996 ppb in 2024 (Fig. 2d). Rn and CH_4 concentration data shown here represent the corresponding average values during the sampling intervals.

Reduced scatter in $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values since the installation of the JASS in April 2023 is visible (Fig. 2a,b). Also, hourly Rn and CH_4 concentrations averaged over the JASS sampling periods show less amplitude variation after this date. For both parameters, corresponding values are closer to the monthly means measured *in situ* by the ICOS instruments (blue curves in Fig. 2c,d). The temporal stability of our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements from March 2022 onwards is evaluated using the regular $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements of our two internal standard PAB bottles. The standard deviation of the $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ value for all 40 CH_4 measurements over 15 months for each PAB bottle (so about 80 CH_4 measurements in total) is 8 ‰ (Fig. S5a,b), which is lower than the instrumental uncertainty of a single $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurement (12 ‰) indicating the satisfactory long-term reproducibility of our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements.




Figure 2: (a) All $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values (black points) measured at JFJ since 2019; (b) same $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values excluding the points showing a clear nuclear influence (black points, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420$ ‰). (c) Rn and (d) CH_4 concentrations corresponding to the sampling periods of the $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements. In subplot (b), black error bars show the statistical uncertainty of the individual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements. The vertical black dashed line in all the four subplots on April 18th, 2023 represents the beginning of air sampling using the new JASS system. The horizontal dashed line in (a) and (b) is shown for $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 = 420$ ‰, *i.e.*, the chosen threshold for a clear influence of nuclear contamination. The horizontal red dotted line in (c) is shown at 1.5 Bq m⁻³ Rn, the chosen threshold between free-troposphere conditions and conditions influenced by the planetary boundary layer at JFJ. Red points in all the subplots represent $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$, Rn, and CH_4 values where corresponding Rn values are lower than 1.5 Bq m⁻³. Blue lines in (c) and (d) correspond to the monthly means measured *in situ*.

For 2019–2024, mean annual atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values can be deduced from our fortnightly air sampling program in different ways (Table 1). Firstly, all $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements clearly influenced by nuclear contamination were excluded. Choosing a threshold of 420 ‰ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420\text{‰}$, Fig. 2b and 3) 129 of the 137 measurements initially available are retained (94 %). Over the six years, a slightly increasing $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420\text{‰}$ tendency rising from $350 \pm 19\text{‰}$ in 2019 to $381 \pm 13\text{‰}$ in 2024 (*i.e.*, by a rate of $\sim +6\text{‰/yr}$) is observed (Table 1, Fig. 3).

Secondly, only $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements whose corresponding Rn values are lower than $1.5\text{ Bq m}^{-3}\text{ STP}$ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$) were retained; analyzing the probability density function of more than five years of Rn values at JFJ (November 2015 to December 2020), Conen and Zimmermann (2020) found that air masses with corresponding Rn values below $1.5\text{ Bq m}^{-3}\text{ STP}$ belong mostly to the free troposphere (with 77% confidence). Compared to the first set of mean annual values ($n = 129$), mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values are 1–7 ‰ lower and the total number of points used for these mean values is almost halved ($n = 71$) (Table 1, Fig. 3). During the period of integrated sampling the observations removed with the Rn threshold are mainly from the summer.

The third processing step additionally corrects for the influence of NPPs by subtracting the nuclear $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ signal simulated with FLEXPART-COSMO from the $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at JFJ. Figure 3 shows for each $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$ value (red point) the corresponding value corrected for the nuclear influence ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$) (blue point). Overall, the mean nuclear $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ influence is $7 \pm 9\text{‰}$ (min = 0, max = 58 ‰, $n = 60$).

Table 1: Mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values with standard deviations derived from our fortnightly $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at JFJ between 2019 and 2024 with four different computations. The first column of mean values considers all $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements; the second column only considers $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements $\leq 420\text{‰}$ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420\text{‰}$). The third column considers only $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values whose corresponding Rn values are lower than $1.5\text{ Bq m}^{-3}\text{ STP}$ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$). The fourth column subtracts from each $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$ value the modelled nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ influence ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$). The numbers in brackets in columns 2–5 represent the number of values per year considered for the annual mean calculation. For 2023, the last sampling period finished early 2024 when no modelled nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ influence was yet available so that the corresponding $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ value was not considered.

Year	Mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$	Mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420\text{‰}$	Mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$	Mean annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$
	All $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$	$\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \leq 420\text{‰}$	$\text{Rn} \leq 1.5\text{ Bq m}^{-3}$	$\text{Rn} \leq 1.5\text{ Bq m}^{-3} \& \Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 \text{ nuclear-corrected}$
2019	363 ± 48 (22)	350 ± 19 (20)	344 ± 17 (12)	338 ± 19 (12)
2020	395 ± 78 (17)	367 ± 16 (14)	364 ± 12 (9)	361 ± 13 (9)
2021	386 ± 85 (23)	369 ± 20 (22)	362 ± 21 (12)	355 ± 19 (12)
2022	372 ± 20 (24)	367 ± 11 (22)	366 ± 12 (15)	357 ± 11 (15)
2023	377 ± 17 (25)	377 ± 17 (25)	374 ± 17 (13)	366 ± 17 (12)
2024	381 ± 13 (26)	381 ± 13 (26)	374 ± 13 (10)	-
n	137	129	71	60




Figure 3: Nuclear influence on background $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at JFJ with values ≤ 420 ‰ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\leq 420\text{‰}}$) (black points). Red symbols denote points where Rn is lower than $1.5 \text{ Bq m}^{-3} \text{ STP}$ ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$) (same as in Fig. 2a,b). Black error bars show the statistical uncertainty of the individual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements. Blue points correspond to the red points after subtraction of the simulated nuclear influence ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$). Blue error bars represent the standard deviation of the nuclear influence. Horizontal black, red and blue lines show the annual mean values derived from the black (Table 1, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\leq 420\text{‰}}$), red (Table 1, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$) and blue points (Table 1, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$), respectively. $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$ values were not available for 2024 due to missing input parameters for the nuclear simulation for this year.

3.2. Comparison with previous observations and simulated global $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ signal


Our annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values at JFJ are similar to previous observations in the Northern Hemisphere from 2005-2020 (Fig. 4). Direct observations from Los Angeles, Canada and Alaska showed values of 340-350 ‰, comparable to our JFJ data of 338-366 ‰ for $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$ from 2019-2023 (Fig. 4, Table 1). Firm air observations from Greenland for 2005-2013 were slightly higher, 350-380 ‰, but still consistent with our data.

A rather stable global background $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ is simulated for the period 2005-2024, supporting the consistency between the observations over this period. This stable period followed an increase from ~ 140 ‰ in 1980 to ~ 350 ‰ in 2005 (see Fig. 4 and Fujita et al. 2025), mainly driven by increasing nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions since 1970 (Fig. S4h).

All the Northern Hemisphere measurement data is higher than the simulated $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ (Fig. 4), which reflects global atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ accounting for contributions from both hemispheres (Fujita et al. 2025). Due to a lack of data, the current difference between the hemispheres is presently not well-known, but previous data indicate an excess $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ in the Northern Hemisphere, which is consistent with stronger nuclear power plant emissions there (Fig. 4). The observational targets from Fujita et al. (2025) were constructed to allow for this hemispheric difference and for uncertainty due to lack of data. The mean offset between the observations in Greenland for 2005-2013 and the simulated global $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ value is 22 ± 9 ‰, comparable to the offset between our JFJ observations for 2019-2024 and the global simulation of 0 to 33 ‰.

The three simulated $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ trends from 2013 to 2024 (blue lines in Fig. 4) based on three different emission factors Φ (Section 2.5 and Fig. S4g) show a decrease followed by a stabilization (for $\Phi = 243 \text{ GBq/GWa}$), or a slight increase (for $\Phi \geq 250 \text{ GBq/GWa}$). The initial decrease was caused by a decrease in nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions following the Fukushima accident in 2011 (Fig. S4h). Afterwards, the stabilization or slight increase has arisen from nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions that have increased again in particular after 2017 (Fig. S4h). Our measurement data show a slight positive trend that is reduced after accounting for regional influences from nuclear power plant emissions (Fig. 4, Section 3.1). The simulations seem to be more consistent with this slight positive trend from our measurement data using the higher emission factors than the lowest emission factor, where a slight decrease in $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ is simulated.

We can also compare with observations at JFJ in 1988-1991 by Levin et al. (1992) (Fig. 4). A large spread in individual measurements of 210-255 ‰ was found at that time. We also found a large scatter in samples collected in the morning before the installation of integrated nighttime sampling (Fig. 2, Section 3.1). The number of operating PWRs worldwide passed from about 240 in 1991 to about 310 in 2024 (Laemmel and Szidat, 2025), suggesting that the influence of nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions has increased. Overall, the increase from ~ 230 ‰ in the 1980s to 360 ‰ in the early 2020s is consistent with other data and with the simulated change (Fig. 4).




449

450 **Figure 4: Simulated global atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ signal based on the one-box model of Fujita et al. (2025) extended until**
 451 **2024 (see section 2.6) with observations from JFJ and other studies, for 1980-2024. The solid black line is the global**
 452 **$\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ posterior until 2013 from Fujita et al. (2025). The grey area surrounding the line shows a 68% confidence**
 453 **interval. The dotted black lines denote the global observational target ranges, corresponding to a 99% confidence**
 454 **interval of the global averages, defined by Fujita et al. (2025). The three blue lines represent the extrapolated global**
 455 **atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ based on the three emission factor values Φ (see text). Individual points represent atmospheric**
 456 **$\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values from atmospheric or ice-core samples. Our annual mean JFJ values between 2019 and 2024 are shown**
 457 **as black diamonds ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\leq 420\text{‰}}$), purple squares ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt}}$), and blue circles ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4^{\text{Rn-filt} + \text{Nuc-corr}}$).**

458

3.3. $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements at Jungfraujoch

459 Between 2019 and 2024, $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values measured at JFJ ranged from +3 to -17 ‰, following a decreasing trend
 460 over these six years; this trend is mostly due to the emissions of ^{14}C -free fossil fuel CO_2 which depletes the global
 461 atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ signal. (Fig. 5a). Annual mean CO_2 concentrations increased from 411.9 ppm in 2019 to
 462 424.7 ppm in 2024 (Fig. 5b). The standard deviation of the $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ value for all 40 CO_2 measurements over 15
 463 months for each PAB bottle (so about 80 CO_2 measurements in total) is 1.5 ‰ (Fig. S5c,d), which is lower than
 464 the instrumental uncertainty of a single $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurement (2 ‰) indicating the satisfactory long-term
 465 reproducibility of our $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements.



467

468

469

470

471

472

Figure 5: (a) in black, $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values measured at JFJ since 2019 and in blue, $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values reported by ICOS. (b) In black, CO_2 values related to the sampling periods of our $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements and in blue, mean monthly CO_2 values measured continuously in situ. The vertical black dashed line in both subplots on April 18th, 2023 represents the change in the sampling method, passing from fortnightly morning grab air samples to 14-days nighttime integrated samples with the JASS system.

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

We compare our annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and individual $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ observations with measurements from ICOS at JFJ (Emmenegger et al., 2025a) in Figures 5a and 6 and in Table 2. The average trend in $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is similar in both datasets: $-2.1 \pm 1.9 \text{ ‰/yr}$ for our data and $-2.8 \pm 1.9 \text{ ‰/yr}$ for ICOS data. Annual mean values differ by less than 1.5 ‰ except for 2019, when our annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ value was 3.6 ‰ lower than the ICOS annual mean. Larger individual differences are visible especially in the first half of 2019 (Fig. 5a). Both annual mean ICOS $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values for 2019 and 2020 at JFJ are consistent with the equivalent means at the MHD station (Table 2), indicating that the offset in 2019 between our values and the ICOS ones was probably due to a small fossil contamination in our early $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements that was remediated during the year.

481

482

483

484

Table 2: Annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ (in units of ‰) with standard deviations at JFJ from this study and from ICOS (Emmenegger et al., 2025a). The third line of the table gives the annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ at Mace Head Atmospheric Research Station (MHD, Ireland). The numbers in brackets represent the number of values per year considered for the annual mean.

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
JFJ (This study)	-2.0 ± 3.8 (n = 17)	-1.7 ± 2.3 (n = 15)	-3.6 ± 2.6 (n = 25)	-4.8 ± 2.1 (n = 22)	-8.0 ± 2.3 (n = 21)	-12.6 ± 2.0 (n = 21)
JFJ (ICOS)	1.6 ± 2.2 (n = 15)	-0.7 ± 3.4 (n = 14)	-5.0 ± 2.5 (n = 21)	-5.0 ± 2.5 (n = 19)	-7.5 ± 2.1 (n = 18)	-12.2 ± 3.0 (n = 14)
MHD	2.5 ± 2.2 (n = 18)	-0.4 ± 2.3 (n = 15)	-3.5 ± 2.4 (n = 9)	-5.0 ± 3.4 (n = 10)	/	/

485

486

487

488

489

After the JASS installation in 2023, a more detailed comparison of $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ with ICOS became possible, as we use the same 14-day sampling as the ICOS integrated sodium hydroxide solution sampling (Fig. 6). Over about 20 months the mean difference was $-0.04 \pm 1.74 \text{ ‰}$ (n = 20) with (insignificantly) lower values in our data. A few large differences up to $\pm 4 \text{ ‰}$ were observed. We emphasize that even though the fortnightly periods are the same,

our JASS sampler integrates only nighttime hours whereas the ICOS sampler integrates all day; moreover, the air inlet of our system is situated about 3 m higher than the one from the ICOS sampler. Therefore, the measurements are not conducted on the exact same air. However, the insignificant mean difference suggests that the different sampling conditions affect the measured $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ only marginally.




Figure 6: (a) comparison between nighttime-integrated $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values from our LARA program (black points) and all-day-integrated $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values from the ICOS program (blue lines). (b) Difference between LARA and ICOS $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values for simultaneous samples (i.e., $\Delta\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$). The solid black line represents the zero line and the typical $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurement uncertainty of ± 2 ‰ are shown as dotted black lines. The red line shows the mean difference between both datasets of -0.04 ± 1.74 ‰ ($n = 20$).

Similar to the correction we made using the simulated $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ nuclear influence on $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements, we also make a correction using the simulated $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ nuclear influence on $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements (Fig. 7). The mean nuclear $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ influence is 0.2 ± 0.4 ‰ (min = 0, max = 2.3 ‰). The overall effect of nuclear ^{14}C emissions on atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is less than for $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$, i.e., 0.2 ± 0.4 ‰ compared to 7 ± 9 ‰, respectively. Moreover, nuclear $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions (from BWRs and NFRP) are known to be less sporadic than $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions from PWR reactors (Stenström et al., 1995b), so our atmospheric model based on monthly nuclear ^{14}C releases simulates better nuclear $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ contributions than $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ contributions.




Figure 7: Raw $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values measured at JFJ (black points) and corresponding nuclear-corrected $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2^{\text{Nuc-corr}}$ values from which the mean nuclear influence was subtracted (blue points). The vertical blue bar around each blue point corresponds to the standard deviation of the nuclear influence over the sampling period. Annual horizontal black lines correspond to the annual mean raw $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ value derived from the black points. Annual horizontal blue lines correspond to the annual mean $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2^{\text{Nuc-corr}}$ value derived from the blue points. Simulations for 2024 have not been available yet due to missing input parameters for this year.

4. Discussion

Our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ measurements at JFJ represent the first direct multi-annual time-series of atmospheric measurements in the Northern Hemisphere published within the last 25 years. With the introduction of integrated nighttime sampling, the collected air samples are less likely to show elevated $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values due to sporadic NPP emissions. Four sets of annual $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ means for 2019-2024 are reported in Table 1, based on different filtering approaches. The first two columns present annual values based on raw measurements and an upper threshold ($\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4 = 420 \text{ ‰}$) chosen to remove the 6% highest values measured, respectively. The third column uses simultaneous ^{222}Rn measurements and only considers $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values with a corresponding $^{222}\text{Rn} \leq 1.5 \text{ Bq m}^{-3}$. Based on this previous filtered $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ dataset, the fourth column further adds a correction of the regional nuclear influence based on atmospheric modeling. From these four sets, the third one is probably the most representative of a well-mixed mid-latitude background site as ^{222}Rn is a well-known proxy to identify origin of air masses, *e.g.* from the free troposphere. The fourth set, based on ^{14}C nuclear emission inventory, would represent the ideal set but it still so far needs a better knowledge and more high-resolution data of nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions to be validated. As the measurements at JFJ are consistent with previous measurements and global model simulations, continued observations at JFJ will provide an important constraint on the global background $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ trends and the global CH_4 budget (Fujita et al. 2025).

The correction for the NPP influence on $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ that we apply to the measurements may even be improved with more information on regional nuclear ^{14}C emissions. Our current atmospheric simulation uses monthly constant $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emission rates to describe the NPP releases in Switzerland and less frequent data for reactors in other countries. However, it is known that radioactive emissions from PWRs are rather sporadic (Stenström et al., 1995b). Espic et al. (2025) collected 18 grab air samples for atmospheric $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ analyses around the Swiss PWR Gösgen during the first day of its annual revision period in 2019 (sampling duration per bag: 20-75 min) and observed a $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ release event that lasted only a few hours but included $\sim 8\%$ of the total annual $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ emissions of that year. Comparing this former study using grab samples to the present study using integrated samples also illustrates the importance of the choice of sampling duration and setup to gain knowledge about two processes with different timescales. Furthermore, Espic et al. (2025) found that the activities of noble gases measured at a 10-min temporal resolution at the PWR stack may be a valuable proxy to identify sporadic ^{14}C releases. A generalized use of this kind of high-frequency data would be beneficial to refine temporal variation in estimates of ^{14}C emissions from NPPs.

The composition of ^{14}C is another important uncertainty for estimates of ^{14}C emissions from NPPs. Here, only PWRs and VVERs were considered to emit organic ^{14}C (*e.g.*, $^{14}\text{CH}_4$); however, small organic ^{14}C emissions have also been reported for other reactor types: up to 7 % for BWRs (Kunz, 1985; Stenström et al., 1995a), 1-4 to 25-30 % for PHWRs (Bharath et al., 2022; IAEA, 2004; Joshi et al., 1987; Milton et al., 1995), and up to 30 % for LWGRs (Gaiko et al., 1985; Konstantinov et al., 1989). Organic ^{14}C emissions from these reactor types may be significant as about 13 % of the total nuclear electricity is produced by BWRs (which is the third-most important reactor type after PWRs and VVERs based on nuclear electricity) and the emission factors for PHWRs and LWGRs (1.6 and 1.3 TBq/GWa, respectively, Zazzeri et al. (2018)) are even several times higher than for PWRs and VVERs. LWGR emissions are particularly uncertain, and radiocarbon measurements of tree rings around LWGRs suggested emission factors could be two to four times higher than the assumed value of 1.3 TBq/GWa (Juodis et al., 2022; Nazarov et al., 2023). In addition, PWRs themselves exhibit a broad range (*i.e.*, 44-95 %) for the organic ^{14}C fraction at PWRs and VVERs. Furthermore, there are only few 40-year old measurements of the speciation of the individual fractions of the organic ^{14}C emissions that may involve (besides $^{14}\text{CH}_4$) relevant portions of *e.g.* $^{14}\text{C}_2\text{H}_6$, $^{14}\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$ and $^{14}\text{C}_4\text{H}_{10}$ (Kunz, 1985). More recently, Espic et al. (2025) found for the Swiss PWR Gösgen (see above) that the measured ratio between $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions and the reported ratio between organic and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions agreed with each other, implying that almost all the organic emissions are in form of $^{14}\text{CH}_4$. More measurements focusing on the hydrocarbon composition of the organic ^{14}C fraction are needed at PWRs, VVERs and LWGRs.

This work demonstrates that our measurements of $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ at JFJ are generally consistent with concurrent measurements from the ICOS program. The installation of the JASS system in 2023 furthermore constitutes an improvement of the long-running ICOS $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements at JFJ, since it integrates nighttime periods which mostly are dominated by air from the free troposphere, whereas the ICOS measurements rely on all-day air sampling. Even though the insignificantly low mean difference between ICOS sodium hydroxide-based integrated sampling vs. our JASS system suggests that the different sampling conditions affect the measured $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ only marginally (Fig. 6), this observation requires a longer duration for the comparison of both datasets to prove their consistency.

5. Conclusions

We conducted fortnightly atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements at the Swiss High-Altitude Research Station Jungfraujoch (about 3500 m a.s.l.) between 2019 and 2024. Initially based on 20-60-minute air samples commonly collected in the early morning, a novel air sampling setup automatically collecting ambient air during nighttime was installed in April 2023. Over the six years 2019-2024, $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ values at JFJ have shown a slight increase from $350 \pm 19 \text{ ‰}$ to $381 \pm 13 \text{ ‰}$ (*i.e.*, by a rate of $\sim +6 \text{ ‰/yr}$) while $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values decreased from $-2.0 \pm 3.8 \text{ ‰}$ to $-12.6 \pm 2.0 \text{ ‰}$ (*i.e.*, by a rate of $\sim -2 \text{ ‰/yr}$). Our $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values generally agree well with the integrated $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements from the ICOS program. Accounting for nuclear $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ emissions on the European scale within the atmospheric transport model FLEXPART-COSMO, we simulate the nuclear signal on our individual measurements at JFJ and estimate an average nuclear influence of $7 \pm 9 \text{ ‰}$ and $0.2 \pm 0.4 \text{ ‰}$ for ^{222}Rn -filtered $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and raw $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ values, respectively, which we use to correct the observed data. Our $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ data are consistent with an atmospheric one-box model for $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ that simulates slightly increasing or decreasing $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ over 2013-2024, depending on the strength of nuclear power plant emissions. Our new observations at JFJ will help to refine the global background $\Delta^{14}\text{CH}_4$ and $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and to constrain CH_4 and CO_2 sources and sinks.

Data availability

All raw values presented in this work will be made available after publication on Zenodo.

Author contributions

TL: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing. **DG:** Data curation, Investigation Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing. **SH:** Investigation Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing. **RF:** Investigation Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing. **HG:** Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing. **CE:** Data curation, Writing – review and editing. **MB:** Data curation, Writing – review and editing. **NH:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **FC:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **DB:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **MS:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **GZ:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **SH:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **ML:** Investigation, Writing – review and editing. **SS:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing – review and editing.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the funding of the SNSF Sinergia funding n°193770 (Radiocarbon Inventories of Switzerland – RICH: integrated approach to understand the changing carbon cycle) as well as the Dr. Alfred Bretscher Scholarship. We thank Gary Salazar, Franziska Lechleitner and Tiberiu Sava for their assistance during ^{14}C

measurements at LARA. We further thank the operating company of the Paks nuclear power plant (MVM Paks Nuclear Power Plant Ltd.) for sharing the corresponding ^{14}C emission values and Mihály Molnár for ensuring the communication with it. We are grateful to the team of the DCBP workshop (especially Sandra Hostettler and Thomas Hübscher) as well as René Schraner for their assistance in designing and building the JASS. We also thank the International Foundation High-Altitude Research Stations Jungfrauoch and Gornergrat for access to Jungfrauoch facilities and the Jungfrauoch's custodians (Joan & Martin Fischer, Christine & Ruedi Käser, Daniela Bissig & Erich Furrer, and Sonja Stöckli & Thomas Furter) for their support on site. We also thank Céline Pascale and Tobias Bühlmann at METAS (Swiss Federal Institute of Metrology) for the use of the Picarro analyzer at METAS. We are grateful to Scott Chambers and his colleagues at Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) for the ongoing collaboration and support in maintaining the radon detection system. The radon and greenhouse gas concentration observations were financially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF, 20FI20_173691, 20FI20_198227, 20FI-0_229655) as a contribution to the pan-European Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) Research Infrastructure. We thank ICOS for making available a large number of parameters continuously measured at JFJ. We thank the Global Monitoring Laboratory (GML) of the US National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for making available global CH_4 and CO_2 atmospheric levels. We thank Lukas Bani, René Bleisch and Rolf Bütikofer for their assistance in configuring the remote access of the JASS. We finally thank an anonymous reviewer and Vasilii Petrenko for their comments that helped improving this manuscript.

624 References

- 625 Basu, S., Lehman, S. J., Miller, J. B., Andrews, A. E., Sweeney, C., Gurney, K. R., Xu, X., Southon, J., and
626 Tans, P. P.: Estimating US fossil fuel CO₂ emissions from measurements of ¹⁴C in atmospheric CO₂,
627 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 117, 13300–13307, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1919032117>, 2020.
- 628 Berhanu, T. A., Szidat, S., Brunner, D., Satar, E., Schanda, R., Nyfeler, P., Battaglia, M., Steinbacher, M.,
629 Hammer, S., and Leuenberger, M.: Estimation of the fossil fuel component in atmospheric CO₂ based
630 on radiocarbon measurements at the Beromünster tall tower, Switzerland, Atmospheric Chemistry
631 and Physics, 17, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-10753-2017>, 2017.
- 632 Bharath, Arya Krishnan, K., D’Souza, R. S., Rashmi Nayak, S., Dileep, B. N., Ravi, P. M., Mangavi, S. S.,
633 Salunke, G. S., Veerendra, D., and Karunakara, N.: Carbon-14 emission from the pressurized heavy
634 water reactor nuclear power plant at Kaiga, India, Journal of Environmental Radioactivity, 255,
635 107006, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2022.107006>, 2022.
- 636 Conen, F.: Radon Monitors JungfrauJoch & Uni Bern Near Realtime Data -
637 <https://sievju.org/pl/radon.pl>, 2025.
- 638 Conen, F. and Zimmermann, L.: Separating “free tropospheric conditions” from those “influenced by
639 the planetary boundary layer” -
640 https://www.hfsjg.ch/reports/2020/pdf/120_UniBasel_Conen_radon_cf.pdf, International
641 Foundation HFSJG, 2020.
- 642 Ehhalt, D. H.: The atmospheric cycle of methane, Tellus, 26, 58–70, [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2153-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2153-3490.1974.tb01952.x)
643 3490.1974.tb01952.x, 1974.
- 644 Eisma, R., Borg, K. van der Jong, A. F. M. de, Kieskamp, W. M., and Veltkamp, A. C.: Measurements of
645 the ¹⁴C content of atmospheric methane in The Netherlands to determine the regional emissions of
646 ¹⁴CH₄, Nuclear Inst. and Methods in Physics Research, B, 92, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-583X(94)96044-5)
647 583X(94)96044-5, 1994.
- 648 Eisma, R., Vermeulen, A. T., and Borg, K. V. D.: ¹⁴CH₄ emissions from nuclear power plants in
649 northwestern Europe, Radiocarbon, 37, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200030952>, 1995.
- 650 Emmenegger, L., Leuenberger, M., and Steinbacher, M.: ICOS ATC ¹⁴C Release analysed by ICOS CRL
651 from JungfrauJoch (6.0 m), 2015-09-21–2024-11-25, ICOS RI,
652 <https://hdl.handle.net/11676/AtmTz0jbjTlwKST7jLLrHSHh>, 2025a.
- 653 Emmenegger, L., Harris, E., Leuenberger, M., and Steinbacher, M.: ICOS ATC CH₄ Release from
654 JungfrauJoch (13.9 m), 2016-12-12–2025-03-31, ICOS RI,
655 https://hdl.handle.net/11676/_qRWgJ01HGlxRzpTZjGCWWJF, 2025b.
- 656 Emmenegger, L., Harris, E., Leuenberger, M., and Steinbacher, M.: ICOS ATC CO₂ Release from
657 JungfrauJoch (13.9 m), 2016-12-12–2025-03-31, ICOS RI, [https://hdl.handle.net/11676/4ba-](https://hdl.handle.net/11676/4ba-uo4FsoZbxFyfjOS6CaUQ)
658 uo4FsoZbxFyfjOS6CaUQ, 2025c.
- 659 Emmenegger, L., Harris, E., Leuenberger, M., Steinbacher, M., and Roulet, Y.-A.: ICOS ATC Meteo
660 Release from JungfrauJoch (1.0 m), 2016-12-12–2025-03-31, ICOS RI,
661 <https://hdl.handle.net/11676/6XYAZIL0CPWhQmPTAY-Swghh>, 2025d.
- 662 Espic, C., Liechti, M., Battaglia, M., Paul, D., Röckmann, T., and Szidat, S.: Compound-Specific
663 Radiocarbon Analysis of Atmospheric Methane: A New Preconcentration and Purification Setup,
664 Radiocarbon, 61, 1461–1476, <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2019.76>, 2019.

665 Espic, C., Laemmel, T., Henne, S., Purtschert, R., and Szidat, S.: Atmospheric $^{14}\text{CH}_4$, $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and ^{37}Ar
666 measurements around a Swiss pressurized water reactor during an annual revision period, *Journal of*
667 *Environmental Radioactivity*, 281, 107576, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2024.107576>, 2025.

668 Etheridge, D. M., Steele, L. P., Langenfelds, R. L., Francey, R. J., Barnola, J. -M., and Morgan, V. I.:
669 Natural and anthropogenic changes in atmospheric CO_2 over the last 1000 years from air in Antarctic
670 ice and firn, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 4115–4128, <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JD03410>, 1996.

671 Etiope, G., Ciotoli, G., Benà, E., Mazzoli, C., Röckmann, T., Sivan, M., Squartini, A., Laemmel, T., Szidat,
672 S., Haghipour, N., and Sassi, R.: Surprising concentrations of hydrogen and non-geological methane
673 and carbon dioxide in the soil, *Science of The Total Environment*, 948, 174890,
674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.174890>, 2024.

675 European Commission. Joint Research Centre.: GHG emissions of all world countries: 2023.,
676 Publications Office, LU, 2023.

677 Fujita, R., Graven, H., Zazzeri, G., Hmiel, B., Petrenko, V. V., Smith, A. M., Michel, S. E., and Morimoto,
678 S.: Global fossil methane emissions constrained by multi-isotopic atmospheric methane histories,
679 *JGR-Atmospheres*, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JD041266>, 2025.

680 Gaiko, V. B., Korablev, N. A., Solov'ev, E. N., Trosheva, T. I., Shamov, V. P., Umanets, M. P., and
681 Shcherbina, V. G.: Discharge of ^{14}C by nuclear power stations with RBMK-1000 reactors, *At Energy*, 59,
682 703–705, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01122497>, 1985.

683 Gidden, M. J., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Fujimori, S., Luderer, G., Kriegler, E., Van Vuuren, D. P., Van Den
684 Berg, M., Feng, L., Klein, D., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Frank, S., Fricko, O., Harmsen, M., Hasegawa, T.,
685 Havlik, P., Hilaire, J., Hoesly, R., Horing, J., Popp, A., Stehfest, E., and Takahashi, K.: Global emissions
686 pathways under different socioeconomic scenarios for use in CMIP6: a dataset of harmonized
687 emissions trajectories through the end of the century, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 12, 1443–1475,
688 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1443-2019>, 2019.

689 Gonzalez Moguel, R., Vogel, F., Ars, S., Schaefer, H., Turnbull, J. C., and Douglas, P. M. J.: Using carbon-
690 14 and carbon-13 measurements for source attribution of atmospheric methane in the Athabasca oil
691 sands region, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 22, 2121–2133, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-2121-2022>, 2022.

692 Graven, H., Fischer, M. L., Lueker, T., Jeong, S., Guilderson, T. P., Keeling, R. F., Bambha, R., Brophy, K.,
693 Callahan, W., Cui, X., Frankenberg, C., Gurney, K. R., LaFranchi, B. W., Lehman, S. J., Michelsen, H.,
694 Miller, J. B., Newman, S., Paplawsky, W., Parazoo, N. C., Sloop, C., and Walker, S. J.: Assessing fossil
695 fuel CO_2 emissions in California using atmospheric observations and models, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 13,
696 065007, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabd43>, 2018.

697 Graven, H., Hocking, T., and Zazzeri, G.: Detection of Fossil and Biogenic Methane at Regional Scales
698 Using Atmospheric Radiocarbon, *Earth's Future*, 7, 283–299, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF001064>,
699 2019.

700 Graven, H., Keeling, R. F., and Rogelj, J.: Changes to Carbon Isotopes in Atmospheric CO_2 Over the
701 Industrial Era and Into the Future, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 34, e2019GB006170,
702 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GB006170>, 2020.

703 Graven, H. D., Warren, H., Gibbs, H. K., Khatiwala, S., Koven, C., Lester, J., Levin, I., Spawn-Lee, S. A.,
704 and Wieder, W.: Bomb radiocarbon evidence for strong global carbon uptake and turnover in
705 terrestrial vegetation, *Science*, 384, 1335–1339, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adl4443>, 2024.

706 Griffiths, A. D., Conen, F., Weingartner, E., Zimmermann, L., Chambers, S. D., Williams, A. G., and
707 Steinbacher, M.: Surface-to-mountaintop transport characterised by radon observations at the
708 Jungfrauoch, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 12763–12779, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-12763-2014>,
709 2014.

710 Hammer, S. and Levin, I.: CORSO Deliverable 3.1 - Database of existing $\Delta^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurements,
711 <https://hdl.handle.net/11676/HnpyYFcQlQ-SJer66F-hr-b>, 2023.

712 Hammer, S., Friedrich, R., Kromer, B., Cherkinsky, A., Lehman, S. J., Meijer, H. A. J., Nakamura, T.,
713 Palonen, V., Reimer, R. W., Smith, A. M., Southon, J. R., Szidat, S., Turnbull, J., and Uchida, M.:
714 Compatibility of Atmospheric $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ Measurements: Comparing the Heidelberg Low-Level Counting
715 Facility to International Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (AMS) Laboratories, *Radiocarbon*, 59, 875–
716 883, <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2016.62>, 2017.

717 Heiskanen, J., Brümmer, C., Buchmann, N., Calfapietra, C., Chen, H., Gielen, B., Gkritzalis, T., Hammer,
718 S., Hartman, S., Herbst, M., Janssens, I. A., Jordan, A., Juurola, E., Karstens, U., Kasurinen, V., Kruijt, B.,
719 Lankreijer, H., Levin, I., Linderson, M.-L., Loustau, D., Merbold, L., Myhre, C. L., Papale, D., Pavelka, M.,
720 Pilegaard, K., Ramonet, M., Rebmann, C., Rinne, J., Rivier, L., Saltikoff, E., Sanders, R., Steinbacher, M.,
721 Steinhoff, T., Watson, A., Vermeulen, A. T., Vesala, T., Vítková, G., and Kutsch, W.: The Integrated
722 Carbon Observation System in Europe, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 103, E855–
723 E872, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0364.1>, 2022.

724 Henne, S., Brunner, D., Folini, D., Solberg, S., Klausen, J., and Buchmann, B.: Assessment of
725 parameters describing representativeness of air quality in-situ measurement sites, *Atmos. Chem.*
726 *Phys.*, 10, 3561–3581, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-3561-2010>, 2010.

727 Henne, S., Brunner, D., Oney, B., Leuenberger, M., Eugster, W., Bamberger, I., Meinhardt, F.,
728 Steinbacher, M., and Emmenegger, L.: Validation of the Swiss methane emission inventory by
729 atmospheric observations and inverse modelling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 3683–3710,
730 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-3683-2016>, 2016.

731 Hmiel, B., Petrenko, V. V., Dyonisius, M. N., Buizert, C., Smith, A. M., Place, P. F., Harth, C., Beaudette,
732 R., Hua, Q., Yang, B., Vimont, I., Michel, S. E., Severinghaus, J. P., Etheridge, D., Bromley, T., Schmitt, J.,
733 Faïn, X., Weiss, R. F., and Dlugokencky, E.: Preindustrial $^{14}\text{CH}_4$ indicates greater anthropogenic fossil
734 CH_4 emissions, *Nature*, 578, 409–412, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-1991-8>, 2020.

735 IAEA: Management of Waste Containing Tritium and Carbon-14, Technical Reports Series, 421, 2004.

736 IAEA PRIS: World Statistics,
737 <https://pris.iaea.org/PRIS/WorldStatistics/OperationalReactorsByType.aspx>, 2025.

738 IPCC: Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Sixth
739 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 1st ed., Cambridge University
740 Press, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896>, 2023.

741 Joshi, M. L., Ramamirtham, B., and Soman, S. D.: Measurement of ^{14}C Emission Rates From a
742 Pressurised Heavy Water Reactor, *Health Physics*, 52, 787–791, <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004032-198706000-00009>, 1987.

744 Juodis, L., Maceika, E., Barisevičiūtė, R., Pabedinskas, A., Ežerinskis, Ž., Šapolaitė, J., Plukis, A., and
745 Remeikis, V.: Radiocarbon generation and atmospheric release assessment from nuclear power plant
746 with RBMK type reactors, *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, 394, 111822,
747 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nucengdes.2022.111822>, 2022.

748 Katharopoulos, I., Rust, D., Vollmer, M. K., Brunner, D., Reimann, S., O'Doherty, S. J., Young, D.,
 749 Stanley, K. M., Schuck, T., Arduini, J., Emmenegger, L., and Henne, S.: Impact of transport model
 750 resolution and a priori assumptions on inverse modeling of Swiss F-gas emissions, *Atmos. Chem.*
 751 *Phys.*, 23, 14159–14186, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-14159-2023>, 2023.

752 Konstantinov, E. A., Korablev, N. A., Solov'ev, E. N., Shamov, V. P., Fedorov, V. L., and Litvinov, A. M.:
 753 ^{14}C emission from RBMK-1500 reactors and features determining it, *At Energy*, 66, 77–79,
 754 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01121081>, 1989.

755 Kunz, C.: Carbon-14 Discharge at Three Light-water Reactors, *Health Physics*, 49, 25–35,
 756 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004032-198507000-00002>, 1985.

757 Kutschera, W.: Applications of accelerator mass spectrometry, *International Journal of Mass*
 758 *Spectrometry*, 349–350, 203–218, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijms.2013.05.023>, 2013.

759 Laemmel, T. and Szidat, S.: Compilation of annual nuclear electricity production per reactor from
 760 1954 to 2023, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.14535156>, 2025.

761 Laemmel, T., Knaack, T., Heckel, A., Wenger, A., and Szidat, S.: Compilation of nuclear industry's
 762 gaseous radiocarbon emissions from 1950 to 2023, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15034662>,
 763 2025.

764 Lan, X., Thoning, K., and Dlugokencky, E.: Trends in globally-averaged CH_4 , N_2O , and SF_6 determined
 765 from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory measurements. Version 2025-08 (2025-08),
 766 <https://doi.org/10.15138/P8XG-AA10>, 2025a.

767 Lan, X., Tans, P., and Thoning, K.: Trends in globally-averaged CO_2 determined from NOAA Global
 768 Monitoring Laboratory measurements. Version 2025-08 (2025-08), [https://doi.org/10.15138/9N0H-](https://doi.org/10.15138/9N0H-ZH07)
 769 [ZH07](https://doi.org/10.15138/9N0H-ZH07), 2025b.

770 Lassey, K. R., Etheridge, D. M., Lowe, D. C., Smith, A. M., and Ferretti, D. F.: Centennial evolution of the
 771 atmospheric methane budget: what do the carbon isotopes tell us?, *Atmospheric Chemistry and*
 772 *Physics*, 7, 2119–2139, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-2119-2007>, 2007a.

773 Lassey, K. R., Lowe, D. C., and Smith, A. M.: The atmospheric cycling of radiomethane and the “fossil
 774 fraction” of the methane source, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 7, 2141–2149,
 775 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-2141-2007>, 2007b.

776 Leuenberger, M. and Flückiger, E.: Research at Jungfraujoch, *Science of The Total Environment*, 391,
 777 169–176, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.10.044>, 2008.

778 Levin, I. and Kromer, B.: The Tropospheric $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ Level in Mid-Latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere
 779 (1959–2003), *Radiocarbon*, 46, 1261–1272, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200033130>, 2004.

780 Levin, I., Kromer, B., Schoch-Fischer, H., Bruns, M., Münnich, M., Berdau, D., Vogel, J. C., and Münnich,
 781 K. O.: 25 Years of Tropospheric ^{14}C Observations in Central Europe, *Radiocarbon*, 27, 1–19,
 782 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200006895>, 1985.

783 Levin, I., Bössinger, R., Bonani, G., Francey, R. J., Kromer, B., Münnich, K. O., Suter, M., Trivett, N. B. A.,
 784 and Wölfli, W.: Radiocarbon in Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide and Methane: Global Distribution and
 785 Trends, in: *Radiocarbon After Four Decades*, edited by: Taylor, R. E., Long, A., and Kra, R. S., Springer
 786 New York, New York, NY, 503–518, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4249-7_31, 1992.

787 Levin, I., Kromer, B., Schmidt, M., and Sartorius, H.: A novel approach for independent budgeting of
788 fossil fuel CO₂ over Europe by ¹⁴CO₂ observations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 30, 2003GL018477,
789 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL018477>, 2003.

790 Levin, I., Kromer, B., and Hammer, S.: Atmospheric Δ¹⁴CO₂ trend in Western European background air
791 from 2000 to 2012, *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 65, 20092,
792 <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.20092>, 2013.

793 Levin, I., Preunkert, S., Graven, H., Lewis, C., Miller, J. B., Turnbull, J. C., Xu, X., and Hammer, S.:
794 Database of existing 14CO₂ measurements - CO2MVS Research on Supplementary Observations
795 (CORSO), European Union, 2023.

796 Lowe, D. C., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Manning, M. R., Sparks, R., and Wallace, G.: Radiocarbon
797 determination of atmospheric methane at Baring Head, New Zealand, *Nature*, 332, 522–525,
798 <https://doi.org/10.1038/332522a0>, 1988.

799 MacFarling Meure, C., Etheridge, D., Trudinger, C., Steele, P., Langenfelds, R., Van Ommen, T., Smith,
800 A., and Elkins, J.: Law Dome CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O ice core records extended to 2000 years BP,
801 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33, 2006GL026152, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026152>, 2006.

802 Manning, M. R., Lowe, D. C., Melhuish, W. H., Sparks, R. J., Wallace, G., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., and
803 McGill, R. C.: The Use of Radiocarbon Measurements in Atmospheric Studies, *Radiocarbon*, 32, 37–
804 58, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200039941>, 1990.

805 Milton, G. M., Kramer, S. J., Brown, R. M., Repta, C. J. W., King, K. J., and Rao, R. R.: Radiocarbon
806 Dispersion around Canadian Nuclear Facilities, *Radiocarbon*, 37, 485–496,
807 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200030964>, 1995.

808 Nazarov, E. I., Kruzhalov, A. V., Vasyanovich, M. E., Ekidin, A. A., Pyshkina, M. D., Kukarskikh, V. V., and
809 Parkhomchuk, E. V.: ¹⁴C in tree rings in the vicinity of the RBMK reactor nuclear power plant,
810 *Radiocarbon*, 65, 1343–1350, <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2023.125>, 2023.

811 Němec, M., Wacker, L., and Gaggeler, H.: Optimization of the Graphitization Process at Age-1,
812 *Radiocarbon*, 52, 1380–1393, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200046464>, 2010.

813 Nydal, R. and Lövseth, K.: Tracing bomb ¹⁴C in the atmosphere 1962–1980, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88,
814 3621–3642, <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC088iC06p03621>, 1983.

815 Oeschger, H., Siegenthaler, U., Schotterer, U., and Gugelmann, A.: A box diffusion model to study the
816 carbon dioxide exchange in nature, *Tellus*, 27, 168–192, [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2153-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2153-3490.1975.tb01671.x)
817 3490.1975.tb01671.x, 1975.

818 Pieber, S. M., Tuzson, B., Henne, S., Karstens, U., Gerbig, C., Koch, F.-T., Brunner, D., Steinbacher, M.,
819 and Emmenegger, L.: Analysis of regional CO₂ contributions at the high Alpine observatory
820 Jungfraujoch by means of atmospheric transport simulations and δ¹³C, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 22,
821 10721–10749, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-10721-2022>, 2022.

822 Pisso, I., Sollum, E., Grythe, H., Kristiansen, N. I., Cassiani, M., Eckhardt, S., Arnold, D., Morton, D.,
823 Thompson, R. L., Groot Zwaartink, C. D., Evangeliou, N., Sodemann, H., Haimberger, L., Henne, S.,
824 Brunner, D., Burkhardt, J. F., Fouilloux, A., Brioude, J., Philipp, A., Seibert, P., and Stohl, A.: The
825 Lagrangian particle dispersion model FLEXPART version 10.4, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 12, 4955–4997,
826 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-4955-2019>, 2019.

- Quay, P., Stutsman, J., Wilbur, D., Snover, A., Dlugokencky, E., and Brown, T.: The isotopic composition of atmospheric methane, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 13, 445–461, <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998GB900006>, 1999.
- Rafter, T. A. and Fergusson, G. J.: “Atom Bomb Effect”—Recent Increase of Carbon-14 Content of the Atmosphere and Biosphere, *Science*, 126, 557–558, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.126.3273.557>, 1957.
- Roberts, M. L. and Southon, J. R.: A Preliminary Determination of the Absolute $^{14}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ Ratio of OX-I, *Radiocarbon*, 49, 441–445, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200042363>, 2007.
- Ruff, M., Wacker, L., Gaggeler, H. W., Suter, M., Synal, H.-A., and Szidat, S.: A Gas Ion Source for Radiocarbon Measurements at 200 kV, *Radiocarbon*, 49, 307–314, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200042235>, 2007.
- Schraff, C., Reich, H., Rhodin, A., Schomburg, A., Stephan, K., Perriñez, A., and Potthast, R.: Kilometre-scale ensemble data assimilation for the COSMO model (KENDA), *Quart J Royal Meteor Soc*, 142, 1453–1472, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2748>, 2016.
- Sparrow, K. J., Kessler, J. D., Southon, J. R., Garcia-Tigreros, F., Schreiner, K. M., Ruppel, C. D., Miller, J. B., Lehman, S. J., and Xu, X.: Limited contribution of ancient methane to surface waters of the U.S. Beaufort Sea shelf, *Sci. Adv.*, 4, eaao4842, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao4842>, 2018.
- Stenström, K., Erlandsson, B., Hellborg, R., Wiebert, A., and Skog, G.: $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ and total airborne ^{14}C releases from a PWR and a BWR at Ringhals nuclear power plant measured with accelerator mass spectrometry, 1995a.
- Stenström, K., Erlandsson, B., Hellborg, R., Wiebert, A., Skog, S., Vesanen, R., Alpsten, M., and Bjurman, B.: A one-year study of the total air-borne ^{14}C effluents from two Swedish light-water reactors, one boiling water- and one pressurized water reactor, *Journal of Radioanalytical and Nuclear Chemistry Articles*, 198, 203–213, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02038258>, 1995b.
- Stuiver, M. and Polach, H. A.: Discussion Reporting of ^{14}C Data, *Radiocarbon*, 19, 355–363, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200003672>, 1977.
- Synal, H.-A., Stocker, M., and Suter, M.: MICADAS: A new compact radiocarbon AMS system, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 259, 7–13, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2007.01.138>, 2007.
- Szidat, S.: ^{14}C Research at the Laboratory for the Analysis of Radiocarbon with AMS (LARA), *University of Bern, Chimia*, 74, 1010, <https://doi.org/10.2533/chimia.2020.1010>, 2020.
- Townsend-Small, A., Tyler, S. C., Pataki, D. E., Xu, X., and Christensen, L. E.: Isotopic measurements of atmospheric methane in Los Angeles, California, USA: Influence of “fugitive” fossil fuel emissions, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 117, n/a-n/a, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016826>, 2012.
- Turnbull, J. C., Lehman, S. J., Miller, J. B., Sparks, R. J., Southon, J. R., and Tans, P. P.: A new high precision $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ time series for North American continental air, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, 2006JD008184, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD008184>, 2007.
- Vance, J. N., Cline, J. E., and Robertson, D. E.: Characterization of Carbon-14 generated by the Nuclear Power industry, EPRI, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, California, 1995.

867 Wacker, L., Christl, M., and Synal, H.-A.: Bats: A new tool for AMS data reduction, *Nuclear Instruments*
868 *and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 268, 976–
869 979, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2009.10.078>, 2010.

870 Wacker, L., Fahrni, S. M., Hajdas, I., Molnar, M., Synal, H.-A., Szidat, S., and Zhang, Y. L.: A versatile gas
871 interface for routine radiocarbon analysis with a gas ion source, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in*
872 *Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 294, 315–319,
873 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2012.02.009>, 2013.

874 Wahlen, M., Tanaka, N., Henry, R., Deck, B., Zeglen, J., Vogel, J. S., Southon, J., Shemesh, A., Fairbanks,
875 R., and Broecker, W.: Carbon-14 in Methane Sources and in Atmospheric Methane: The Contribution
876 from Fossil Carbon, *Science*, 245, 286–290, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.245.4915.286>, 1989.

877 WMO: The State of Greenhouse Gases in the Atmosphere Based on Global Observations through
878 2024, WMO, Geneva, 2025.

879 Yver-Kwok, C., Philippon, C., Bergamaschi, P., Biermann, T., Calzolari, F., Chen, H., Conil, S.,
880 Cristofanelli, P., Delmotte, M., Hatakka, J., Heliasz, M., Hermansen, O., Komínková, K., Kubistin, D.,
881 Kumps, N., Laurent, O., Laurila, T., Lehner, I., Levula, J., Lindauer, M., Lopez, M., Mammarella, I.,
882 Manca, G., Marklund, P., Metzger, J.-M., Mölder, M., Platt, S. M., Ramonet, M., Rivier, L., Scheeren, B.,
883 Sha, M. K., Smith, P., Steinbacher, M., Vítková, G., and Wyss, S.: Evaluation and optimization of ICOS
884 atmosphere station data as part of the labeling process, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 14, 89–116,
885 <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-14-89-2021>, 2021.

886 Zazzeri, G., Yeomans, E. A., and Graven, H. D.: Global and Regional Emissions of Radiocarbon from
887 Nuclear Power Plants from 1972 to 2016, *Radiocarbon*, 60, 1067–1081,
888 <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2018.42>, 2018.

889 Zazzeri, G., Xu, X., and Graven, H.: Efficient Sampling of Atmospheric Methane for Radiocarbon
890 Analysis and Quantification of Fossil Methane, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 55, 8535–8541,
891 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c03300>, 2021.

892 Zazzeri, G., Graven, H., Xu, X., Saboya, E., Blyth, L., Manning, A. J., Chawner, H., Wu, D., and Hammer,
893 S.: Radiocarbon Measurements Reveal Underestimated Fossil CH₄ and CO₂ Emissions in London,
894 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL103834, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL103834>, 2023.

895 Zazzeri, G., Wacker, L., Haghipour, N., Gautschi, P., Laemmel, T., Szidat, S., and Graven, H.: A new
896 portable sampler of atmospheric methane for radiocarbon measurements, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 18,
897 319–325, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-18-319-2025>, 2025.

898