



Supplement of

Diel and seasonal methane dynamics in the shallow and turbulent Wadden Sea

Tim René de Groot et al.

Correspondence to: Tim René de Groot (tim.de.groot@nioz.nl)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

1 Supplementary materials and methods

2 *Endmember mixing modelling* – Linear mixing of surface waters equilibrated with atmospheric CH₄ and bottom
3 waters with maximum methane concentrations was modelled based on an endmember approach. Equilibrium with
4 atmospheric methane was assumed for surface waters translating to CH₄ concentrations of ~ 3 nM (Wiesenberg
5 and Guinasso, 1979) with a δD-value of ~ -85 ‰ (Whiticar, 1999). The second endmember was water with
6 maximum CH₄ concentration in autumn at 3 m water depth at 0 h (i.e., 35.5 nM, δD-CH₄ = -254 ‰) and in summer
7 at 3 m water depth at 36 h (i.e., 154.9 nM, δD-CH₄ = -250 ‰).


8 *Rayleigh fractionation modelling* - A Rayleigh fractionation model was constructed for hydrogen stable isotope
9 compositions to test whether the enrichment in heavy isotopes (D) at low CH₄ concentrations was related to
10 methane oxidation by methanotrophs (Whiticar, 1999). For this, samples with methane concentrations < 21 nM
11 (δD-CH₄ = ~ -217 ‰) in autumn and < 61 nM (δD-CH₄ = ~ -244 ‰) in summer were defined as the methane
12 source signal and thus the starting point of the Rayleigh fractionation model. These values were chosen because
13 above these concentrations, the isotope effect imposed by MOx is masked by the high background CH₄ and/or is
14 overprinted by methane entering the water column from sediments. The apparent isotope enrichment ε is then
15 calculated according to an open system approach (Mariotti et al., 1981; Jacques et al., 2021):

$$16 \delta_s = \delta_{s,0} + \epsilon_{\text{open}} \ln f \quad (6)$$

17 Where δ_s and δ_{s,0} are the δD values of methane at a given concentration and of the source signal, respectively. *f*
18 denotes the fraction of the remaining methane. Apparent ε-values for δD-CH₄ were -97.26 ‰ in autumn (Fig. S2)
19 and comparable to previous reported fractionation factor (Jacques et al., 2021). Note that for δD-CH₄ in summer,
20 there was no heavy isotope enrichment, precluding to calculate Rayleigh distillation for H/D in a well constrained
21 manner.


22 Supplementary figures and tables

23



24
25


Figure S1. Concentrations of methane in sediments at the time-series station.



26

27 **Figure S2.** Rayleigh fractionation of stable hydrogen isotopes in (A) autumn and (B) summer. Samples with methane
28 concentrations < 21 nM (δD-CH₄ = ~ -217‰) in autumn and < 61 nM (δD-CH₄ = ~ -244‰) in summer were defined as the
29 methane source signal (CH₄₍₀₎, δ₀). The apparent isotope enrichment ε was then calculated according to an open system

30 approach. Note that $\delta D-CH_4$ values did not deviate consistently with methane concentrations <61 nM, precluding to
31 calculate Rayleigh distillation for H/D in a well constrained manner.



32

33 **Figure S3.** Pearson correlation matrix depicting the correlations between variables used in a principal component analysis.

34

35 **Table S1.** Differences in methane concentration, *k*, and MOx between tidal phases. Welch's t-test was applied to methane
 36 concentrations, first order rate constants and MOx at low tide and high tide. p-values marked in grey indicate non-significant
 37 differences ($p > 0.05$).

Season	Variable	LT (n)	HT (n)	Increase at LT vs. HT	Welch's t-test P(T<=t) two-tail
Autumn	CH ₄ conc.	10	8	21%	0.34
Winter	CH ₄ conc.	8	5	3%	0.47
Spring	CH ₄ conc.	8	6	25%	0.13
Summer	CH ₄ conc.	8	8	2%	0.94
Autumn	<i>k</i>	10	8	76%	0.003
Winter	<i>k</i>	8	5	8%	0.83
Spring	<i>k</i>	8	6	259%	5.5×10^{-5}
Summer	<i>k</i>	8	8	30%	0.07
Autumn	MOx	10	8	208%	0.03
Winter	MOx	8	5	9%	0.82
Spring	MOx	8	6	345%	6.4×10^{-6}
Summer	MOx	8	8	24%	0.38

38
 39 **Table S2.** Contribution of individual variables to the principal components. Variables are centred and scaled before running
 40 PCA.

	PC 1	PC 2	PC 3	PC 4	PC 5
CH ₄ conc.	20.1	0.49	40.34	6.57	32.49
<i>k</i>	9.72	32.51	42.77	0.55	14.43
MOx	18.5	14.13	2.41	13.09	15.79
Density	11.38	35.27	10.17	11.82	0.03
Temperature	22.31	0.02	0.72	67.72	0.87
Salinity	17.99	17.57	3.58	0.24	0.39

41
 42 **References**
 43 Jacques, C., Gkritzalis, T., Tison, J.-L., Hartley, T., van der Veen, C., Röckmann, T., Middelburg, J. J.,
 44 Cattrijsse, A., Egger, M., Dehairs, F., and Sapart, C. J.: Carbon and Hydrogen Isotope Signatures of Dissolved
 45 Methane in the Scheldt Estuary, *Estuaries and Coasts*, 44, 137-146, 10.1007/s12237-020-00768-3, 2021.
 46 Mariotti, A., Germon, J. C., Hubert, P., Kaiser, P., Letolle, R., Tardieux, A., and Tardieux, P.: Experimental
 47 determination of nitrogen kinetic isotope fractionation: Some principles; illustration for the denitrification and
 48 nitrification processes, *Plant and Soil*, 62, 413-430, 10.1007/BF02374138, 1981.
 49 Whiticar, M. J.: Carbon and hydrogen isotope systematics of bacterial formation and oxidation of methane,
 50 *Chemical Geology*, 161, 291-314, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541\(99\)00092-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541(99)00092-3), 1999.
 51 Wiesenberg, D. A. and Guinasso, N. L.: Equilibrium Solubilities of Methane, Carbon Monoxide, and Hydrogen
 52 in Water and Sea Water, *Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data*, 24, 356-360, 1979.

53