Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, C4362–C4366, 2013
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/C4362/2013/

Biogeosciences Discussions
Open Access

Interactive comment on "Artificially induced migration of redox layers in a coastal sediment from the Northern Adriatic" *by* E. Metzger et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 August 2013

This manuscript is one of a series of manuscripts derived from a multidisciplinary project in the Northern Adriatic Sea; it reports on a simulation of bottom-water anoxia that used benthic chambers equipped with sensors that measure oxygen and sulfide over time in the enclosed water column. Diffusive Equilibrium in Thin films probes (DET should have been spelled out) were employed to measure the distribution of pore water constitutents in the enclosed sediment at the end of a simulation. The aims of this particular sub-project were to "describe the geochemical evolution of the enclosed bottom water and sediment pore water during three incubations lasting from nine days to ten months; to understand the behavior of the main redox fronts during the onset of anoxia; and provide the geochemical constraints for the studies focusing on the response to anoxia of various studied faunal compartments".

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

The first aim is straight forward, assuming that geochemical evolution means the way the composition of the bottom water changes over time. The second and third aims are not so clear. What precisely is “behavior of the main redox fronts”, and what is meant with “geochemical constraints for the studies of response of various studies faunal compartments”? I can guess that the second aim is related to how the sequential use of terminal electron acceptors during diagenesis (the Froelich paradigm) influences the depth in the sediment that separates the stability fields of reduced and oxidized components of a given redox couple, but I am not sure that this is in fact what the authors had in mind. The third aim is problematic because we are not offered information about the nature of the “faunal compartments”, nor about their responses or how these could be constrained by the results of this study. As it happened, infauna crawled out of the sediment, died, and ultimately decomposed, but it seems doubtful that this is the faunal response intended in the formulation of aim number 3.

The project used three benthic chambers of a design called Experimental Anoxia Generating Unit (EAGU) (this acronym should have been spelled out – I had to look it up in another paper) that were equipped with sensors to measure dissolved oxygen and sulphide in the enclosed water. As I understand it, this chamber was designed primarily for studying the behavior and survival/mortality of benthic infauna according to their tolerance of changing oxygen levels. There is no indications that the chambers are optimal for measuring fluxes of chemical substances, which requires a certain degree of control over the hydrodynamic regime of the enclosed water. For example, there is no indication that the water was stirred. If the absence of stirring was a deliberate choice, the reasons for it should have been given.

There is a large body of literature describing the design and performance of benthic chambers. For example, Hall and co-workers in Sweden used benthic chambers to measure in-situ fluxes of oxygen, nutrients, metals, alkalinity, and transport tracers at the sediment-water interface. (Hall, Per OJ, et al. "Oxygen uptake kinetics in the benthic boundary layer." Limnology and Oceanography 34.4 (1989): 734-746, and sev-

BGD
10, C4362–C4366, 2013

eral other papers). These papers discuss the importance of design variables such as stirring vs. no stirring with respect to the transport of solutes and gases across the sediment-water interface. Another important paper from the Swedish group is Tengberg et al. "Intercalibration of benthic flux chambers I. Accuracy of flux measurements and influence of chamber hydrodynamics." Progress in Oceanography 60.1 (2004): 1-28. I realize that the purpose of the present study was not to measure fluxes, but the authors' apparent unawareness of this body of useful knowledge when they designed their study is surprising. Besides, the boundary layer also affects benthic organisms (e.g. Jørgensen, B.B. (2001). Life in the diffusive boundary layer, in: Boudreau, B.P. et al. (Ed.) (2001). The benthic boundary layer: transport processes and biogeochemistry. pp. 348-373, and many other papers by Jorgensen and co-workers.)

A second question about the design of the benthic chambers is whether they were darkened to avoid the influence of benthic photosynthesis on the oxygen regime at the sediment water interface. There is no mention of it in the paper, so I assume they were not darkened. Not knowing much about the transparency of the water column at the study site, I cannot say if this was important or not. Was the light level at the site measured, and was the apparent decision not to use darkened chambers the result of such measurements? In any event, as revealed in the paper, the sediment surface was covered by microalgae, mostly diatoms, so some degree of oxygen production by photosynthesis certainly seems possible. From "progressive orange coloration of the seabed" it is inferred that reduced iron diffuses to the sediment surface and is oxidized. The coloration suggests that oxygen is present at the sediment surface, which is consistent with benthic photosynthesis and a stagnant boundary layer. (For an example of the importance of this phenomenon, see Jahnke, R. A., et al. "Benthic primary productivity on the Georgia midcontinental shelf: Benthic flux measurements and high-resolution, continuous in situ PAR records." Journal of Geophysical Research 113.C8 (2008): C08022.)

A third aspect of the design is the placement of oxygen and sulfide sensors on the

BGD
10, C4362–C4366, 2013

interior walls. What was the reason for placing them precisely 0.4 cm and 5.0 cm above the sediment water interface? And why were not some of the sensors placed in the sediment instead of in the water column? A time series of oxygen and sulfide in the sediment pore water could have provided valuable information. Incidentally, why are the data from the sulfide sensor not shown?

Now some comments on the results. Looking at the data presented in this manuscript, I was struck by the difference between the two sets of observations from the control site just outside the chambers, what is here called the "normoxic experiment". The distributions of dissolved manganese and iron at this site (fig. 2) reveal an extreme degree of spatial heterogeneity. The upper and lower rows of panels in fig. 2 are replicate observations – two DETs per chamber for Mn and Fe. These data reveal that the distributions of iron and manganese are equally heterogeneous in the porewater of the sediment inside the chambers. The heterogeneity makes it difficult, if not impossible, to draw firm conclusions from the data set presented. The heterogeneity was revealed by the DET, a tool that measures on a much smaller spatial scale than the chamber itself. Had the water in the chamber been stirred, the water column data could have been treated as averages, and could have provided an interesting and useful comparison with the DET data.

A weakness of this study is that it does not provide information on the composition of the solid phase sediment. Yet, as revealed in the paper by Koron et al. (part of the same project), sediment samples were collected and preserved, so it would have been relativly simply to obtain an idea of the vertical distributions of major components such as reducible forms of iron and manganese, and iron sulfides in addition to sediment texture, porosity, and organic carbon. The DET data show high concentrations of ferrous iron in the porewater as well as concentration maxima that indicate the depth where the soluble iron is being produced, but they do not provide information about eventual vertical heterogeneity in the solid phase sediment components. In view of the extreme horizontal differences in sediment properties that was observed, there is

BGD
10, C4362–C4366, 2013

reason to think that the vertical variability may be equally important. Indeed, the sulphate data in fig. 3 reveal that prominent concentration minima developed in the pore water as the experiment progressed. The concentration minimum implies that the rate of sulfate reduction is higher at about 20 cm below the sediment water interface than higher and lower in the sediment column, i.e. the highest rates of sulfate reduction take place within the sediment column and not at the sediment water interface. The reason why sulfide does not appear in high concentrations in the porewater is likely because it is precipitated as a ferrous sulfide by the abundant soluble reduced iron in the porewater – at least until the sediment runs out of reducible iron. I am curious why the sulfate minimum developed at 20 cm depth: could it be that the sediment at that depth was organic rich, i.e. that the sulfate distribution reflects vertical heterogeneity in the solid phase sediment? Are there other ways to understand the development of this minimum? Vertical profiles of sediment properties might have provided some clues.

Overall, other than the local spatial variability in sediment properties, I find little in this paper that could not have been predicted from present understanding of sediment diagenesis and sediment water exchange processes. I refer the authors to Aller's work on the Long Island Sound, an environment where the bottom water fluctuates seasonally between oxic and anoxic. A good example is Aller, Robert C. "The sedimentary Mn cycle in Long Island Sound: Its role as intermediate oxidant and the influence of bioturbation, O2, and Corg flux on diagenetic reaction balances." Journal of Marine Research 52.2 (1994): 259-295. Likewise, the papers by Hall and coworkers mentioned above contain information that could have been used to predict the sequence of events in the Adriatic experiments.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 12029, 2013.