

Aberystwyth University

Biogeochemical Connectivity Between Freshwater Ecosystems beneath the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and the Sub-Ice Marine Environment

Vick-Majors, Trista J.; Michaud, Alexander B.; Skidmore, Mark L.; Turetta, Clara; Barbante, Carlo; Christner, Brent C.; Dore, John E.; Christianson, Knut; Mitchell, Andrew C.; Achberger, Amanda M.; Mikucki, Jill A.; Priscu, John C.

Published in:

Global Biogeochemical Cycles

DOI:

[10.1029/2019GB006446](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GB006446)

Publication date:

2020

Citation for published version (APA):

Vick-Majors, T. J., Michaud, A. B., Skidmore, M. L., Turetta, C., Barbante, C., Christner, B. C., Dore, J. E., Christianson, K., Mitchell, A. C., Achberger, A. M., Mikucki, J. A., & Priscu, J. C. (2020). Biogeochemical Connectivity Between Freshwater Ecosystems beneath the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and the Sub-Ice Marine Environment. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 34(3), Article e2019GB006446. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GB006446>

Document License

CC BY

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400

email: is@aber.ac.uk

Biogeochemical connectivity between freshwater ecosystems beneath the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and the sub-ice marine coastal environment

Trista J. Vick-Majors¹, Alexander B. Michaud^{1†}, Mark L. Skidmore², Clara Turetta^{3§}, Carlo Barbante^{3,4}, Brent C. Christner^{5,6}, John E. Dore¹, Knut Christianson⁷, Andrew C. Mitchell⁸, Amanda M. Achberger^{5§}, Jill A. Mikucki⁹, and John C. Priscu¹,

¹ Michigan Technological University, Department of Biological Sciences, Houghton, MI, 49931, USA

² Department of Earth Sciences, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, 59717, USA

³Institute for the Dynamics of Environmental Processes – CNR, Venice 30123, Italy

⁴Department of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics, Ca'Foscari University of Venice, Venice 30123, Italy

⁵ Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, 70803, USA

⁶ Department of Microbiology and Cell Science, Biodiversity Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA

⁷ Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195, USA

⁸ Department of Geography and Earth Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DB, UK

⁹ Department of Microbiology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 37996, USA

[†] Present Address: Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences, East Boothbay, ME, 04544

[§]Present Address: Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 77843-3146, USA

[§] Present Address: Institute of Polar Sciences, CNR, Venice 30123, Italy

Contents of this file

Text
Figures S1 to S4
Table S1

Additional Supporting Information (Files uploaded separately)

Captions for Datasets S1 to S2

Introduction

This file contains supplementary information regarding the analysis of dissolved organic matter fluorescence data and a table containing information about the parameters sampled at different depths of the sediment porewater profile.

S1. DOM fluorescence

Our 4-component parallel factor analysis (PARAFAC) model (Supplementary Figures 1 & 2) explained 99.7% of the variability in the sediment porewater EEMS dataset and had a core consistency of 58.3%. Our relatively small number of available samples (19, of which 7 water column samples were excluded from the model as outliers) may have limited our ability to validate models with more components, however, the low residuals (99.7% variability explained), along with manual analysis of the corrected EEMS profiles indicated that 4 fluorescent components is reasonable. The four component model also minimized the sum of squares error ($SSE=0.15$) and converged after 62 iterations with random starts and non-negativity constraints. The model was successfully split-half validated using alternating splits of 6 samples per split. We were unable to include water column samples in our model, as their fluorescence characteristics made them outliers relative to the porewaters (determined through visual examination of the spectra and preprocessing with the drEEM toolbox) and the small number of water column samples precluded the construction of a water column only PARAFAC

model. However, manual “peak picking” (i.e. Coble 1996) revealed the presence of a single peak, indicative of protein-like fluorescence (ex/em 240/310; Supplementary Figure 3).




Figure S1. Fluorescence matrices for sediment porewater samples. The EEMS matrix (corrected as described in Methods), the modeled matrix (PARAFAC) and the residuals from the PARAFAC model are shown from left to right. Randomly distributed residuals, in combination with a high proportion of variability explained (99.7%) indicated a good model fit. The color scale in the lower right corner indicates the intensity of relative fluorescence units. The white band results from the removal of Rayleigh scatter. Samples are labeled by 2 to 4 cm increments, beginning at the sediment-water interface.




Figure S2. PARAFAC fingerprints and excitation and emission spectra. Comp 1, 2, 3, and 4 are C1, 2, 3, and 4 in the main text. Red indicates higher signal intensity of relative fluorescence units, while blue indicates lower intensity.




Figure S3. Representative water column EEM showing the maximum ex/em at 240/310. The color bar indicates intensity in relative fluorescence units.




Figure S4. Relationship between the quantity of leucine incorporated and incubation time. Rate of incorporation was linear beyond the course of the experiment (117 h) used to determine rates at the GZ. Error bars show standard deviation of three replicates, except for the time point at 25 h, which is based on two replicates.

Sediment depth horizon (cm)	Analyte				
	DOC/FDOM	DON	NH ₄ ⁺	NO ₃ ⁻	PO ₄ ³⁻
0-2	X	X	X	X	X
2-4	X			X	X
4-6				X	X
6-8	X	X	X	X	X
8-10	X			X	X
10-12				X	X
12-14				X	X
14-16				X	X
16-18	X	X	X	X	X
18-20				X	X
20-22	X	X	X	X	X
22-24		X	X	X	X
24-26	X	X	X	X	X
26-28	X	N.D.	X	X	X
28-30	X			X	X
30-32				X	X
32-34	X			X	X
34-36	X	X	X	X	X
36-38	X			X	X

Table S1. Sediment porewater sampling increments. X's indicate analysis was completed and results are reported in the main manuscript. Grey boxes indicate depths where an analysis was not conducted. "N.D." indicates analyte was not detected. DOC = dissolved organic carbon and FDOM. DON = dissolved organic nitrogen.