



Supplement of

Zero to moderate methane emissions in a densely rooted, pristine Patagonian bog – biogeochemical controls as revealed from isotopic evidence

Wiebke Münchberger et al.

Correspondence to: Wiebke Münchberger (wiebke.muenchberger@uni-muenster.de) and Klaus-Holger Knorr (kh.knorr@uni-muenster.de)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure S1. Arrangement of collars at platform 3 in the study site. Boardwalks were not installed between platforms to minimize disturbance of the cushion vegetation surface. Picture taken by Isabella Närdemann. Note the different types of microforms.



Figure S2 a-h CH₄ fluxes measured from individual collars of dominant microforms (*Astelia* lawns (a,e), *Sphagnum* lawns (b,f), pools (c,g) and *Donatia* lawns (d,h)) in a Patagonian cushion bog plotted against water table depth and soil temperature. CH₄ emissions were mostly decoupled from environmental controls probably since CH₄ fluxes were negligible in many cases. Obviously, individual collars of microforms with non-zero emissions released different amounts of CH₄.

Identification of CH₄ production and consumption zones applying PROFILE

Methods

Zones of CH₄ production and consumption in the peat column were quantitatively identified by inverse modelling based on pore water profiles of CH₄ concentrations using the software routine PROFILE (Berg et al., 1998). Steady-state conditions as well as a dominance of diffusive gas 5 transport over ebullient events and aerenchymatic transport would have to be assumed. Given the large root biomass, this may only partly apply to the system under study here. Therefore, the modelling approach provided only rough estimates for production and consumption zones due to the complex diffusivity in the rhizosphere of highly rooted peat. Nevertheless, diffusion coefficients for CH₄ were derived from Lermann (1988) and corrected for mean soil temperatures (of 10°C in February 2015 and 2016 as well as 7°C in April at a depth of 0.5 m) as well as porosity. Porosity ϕ was calculated as (Eq. A1)

10
$$\varphi = 1 - \frac{\rho_{\text{bulk}}}{\rho_{\text{bulk}}}$$

$$\rho_{particle}$$

where ρ bulk is the bulk density (g cm⁻³) and ρ particle the particle density (g cm⁻³). Particle density was assumed to be 1.5 g cm⁻³ (Weiss et al., 1998). Below Astelia lawns, the porous media available for diffusion was reduced by presence of roots and porosity was calculated considering the average root biomass throughout the rhizosphere. The software input requires equal depth zones and thus data were averaged to get a 0.2 m resolution over the whole profile, if necessary. The model results were evaluated at a significance level of 0.05.

Results and discussion 15

The lower rhizosphere of Astelia lawns was the most pronounced sink of CH4, while in the upper rhizosphere production of (small amounts) of CH₄ was balanced by CH₄ oxidation (fig. A3, a-f). Zones of CH₄ consumption below pools (fig. A3, g-l) roughly corresponded to zones of CH₄ consumption of Astelia lawns while near the surface net production also approached zero. These zones of CH₄ consumption in relatively great depths below pools support our assumption of a lateral concentration gradient distributing e.g. CH₄ and O₂ along adjacent microforms. The pool

sediment was identified as a zone of CH₄ production in two cases, possibly due to the availability of degradable organic matter from submerged 20 Sphagnum. The near-zero diffusive CH₄ flux was consistent with low emission measured by chambers. Deep peat layers below those sampled would probably indicate intense CH₄ production.



Figure S3 a-I CH₄ pore water concentration depth profiles obtained from MLPs installed in *Astelia* lawns and pools during two sampling campaigns in austral summer 2015 and 2016. Displayed depths represent the centre of a MLP segment. Note that no data were available for the upper profile of pool 1 and that modelling of production rates did not include all data obtained from pool 2 in 2015 for depth consistency. Concentrations are given per volume of pore water while production rates are given per volume of peat.

References

Berg, P., Risgaard-Petersen, N., and Rysgaard, S.: Interpretation of measured concentration profiles in sediment pore water, Limnol Oceanogr, 43, 1500-1510, 1998.

Lerman, A.: Geochemical processes: water and sediment environments, Wiley, Hoboken, N.J., USA, 492 pp., 1979.

5 Weiss, R., Alm, J., Laiho, R., and Laine, J.: Modeling Moisture Retention in Peat Soils, Soil Sci Soc Am J, 62, 305-313, 1998.