Supplemental Information

Molecular characterization of organic matter mobilized from Bangladeshi aquifer sediment: tracking carbon compositional change during microbial utilization

Lara E. Pracht¹, Malak M. Tfaily², Robert J. Ardissono¹, Rebecca B. Neumann¹

¹Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, 8195, USA ²Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, 99354, USA

Correspondence to: Rebecca B. Neumann (rbneum@uw.edu)

Contents:

- Section 1: Calculation of organic carbon in sediment
- Table S1:
 Dissolved organic carbon concentrations in initial waters
- Table S2:
 Dissolved organic carbon concentrations in incubation waters
- Table S3: Methane concentrations in incubation bottles
- Table S4: Compound Class Assignment

Figures S1 - S6

References

Section 1: Calculation of organic carbon in sediment

Sediment Porewater Organic Carbon (DOC) = 0.33 ± 0.06 mg OC g-1 sediment Sediment Organic Matter (LOI) = 6.5 ± 1.5 mg/g

Using van Bemmelan factor (Burt, 2011) (58% OM = OC) to estimate sediment OC: 6.5 mg/g * 0.58 = 3.77 mg OC/g sed

DOC in sediment porewater as percent of sediment OC: 0.33/3.77 * 100 = 8.75 %

Error for the above calculation:

Err,gy= 0.06/3.77=0.0159Err,gt= $0.33/(3.77^2)*(0.58*1.5)=0.0202$ Err = sqrt[$(0.06/3.77)^2+(0.33/(3.77^2)*(0.58*1.5))^2$] = 0.0257 mg OC/g sed 0.0257/3.77*100=0.68%

DOC in sediment porewater represented 8.8 ± 0.7 % of OC in sediment.

| Initial Waters | Pond Recharge | Rice Field Recharge | Sediment Porewater |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Rep 1 | 27.0 | 12.3 | 856 |
| Rep 2 | 29.0 | 25.3 | 1103 |
| Rep 3 | 33.1 | | 1219 |

Table S1. Dissolved organic carbon concentrations in initial waters (mg-C L⁻¹)*

* Samples combined together during processing of FT-ICR-MS data are grouped together with thick lines.

| | | 1.5 days | 17 days | 18 days | 19 days | 20 days | 80 days | 81 days | 91 days | 184 days |
|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Pond Recharge, Sterilized Sediment | Rep 1 | 212.9 | 219.30 | duys | 254.6 | duys | uuys | 253.4 | 184.7 | 222.9 |
| | Rep 2 | 202.7 | 230.68 | | 238.4 | | | 240.5 | | |
| | Avg. (stdev) | 207.8 (7.2) | 235.8 (14.8) | | | 226.2 (36.5) | | | | |
| Rice | Rep 1 | 226.0 | 213.48 | | | 264.9 | | 230.7 | 201.8 | 247.4 |
| Recharge, | Rep 2 | 369.3 | 220.73 | | | 216.0 | | 245.5 | | |
| Sediment | Avg. (stdev) | 297.7 (101.4) | 228.8 (24.3) | | | 226.0 (22.2) | | | | |
| Pond Recharge, Native Sediment | Rep 1 | 145.0 | | 162.9 | 153.8 | | 50.9 | | 40.0 | |
| | Rep 2 | 147.0 | | 161.6 | 155.6 | | | | | |
| | Avg. (stdev) | 146.0 (1.4) | 158.5 (4.5) | | | 45.5 (7.7) | | | | |
| Rice Recharge, Native Sediment | Rep 1 | 135.5 | | 145.0 | | 148.6 | 37.3 | | 26.67 | 20.75 |
| | Rep 2 | 142.6 | | 174.2 | | 140.8 | 31.5 | | | |
| | Avg. (stdev) | 139.1 (5.0) | 152.1 (15.1) | | | 31.77 (5.3) | | | Ī | |

Table S2. Dissolved organic carbon concentrations in incubation waters (mg-C L⁻¹)*

* Samples combined together during processing of FT-ICR-MS data are grouped together with thick lines.

| Table S3 | . Methane | concentrations | in in | cubation | bottles | (mg-C L | - ¹) |
|----------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------|---------|---------|------------------|
|----------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------|---------|---------|------------------|

| | 18 days | 273 days |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Pond Recharge, Sterilized Sediment | Below detection | Below detection |
| Rice Recharge, Sterilized Sediment | Below detection | Below detection |
| Pond Recharge, Native Sediment | Below detection | 198 ±46 |
| Rice Recharge, Native Sediment | Below detection | 368 ±45 |

| Compound Class | H-to-C ratio range | O-to-C ratio range | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Lipid-like | 1.5 – 2.3 | 0-0.2 | | |
| Protein-like | 1.5 - 2.2 | 0.2 - 0.5 | | |
| Amino sugar-like | 1.5 - 2.2 | 0.5 - 0.7 | | |
| Carbohydrate-like | 1.5 - 2.3 | 0.7 – 1.1 | | |
| Lignin-like | 0.8 - 1.5 | 0.25 - 0.67 | | |
| Tannin-like | 0.6 - 1.2 | 0.67 - 0.95 | | |
| Condensed hydrosorhen like | 0.8 - 1.2 | 0 - 0.25 | | |
| Condensed hydrocarbon-like | 0 - 0.8 | 0 - 0.5 | | |

Table S4. Compound Class Assignment

• Based on D'Andrilli et al. (2015).

• Compounds falling outside of designated ratios ranges were classified as 'other'



Chemical characteristics of (red) mobilized SOC, DOC in (black) pond and (grey) rice field recharge water, and (blues) DOC in incubation waters from day 1.5. PA = abiotic pond incubation; RA = abiotic rice field incubation; PB = biotic pond incubation; RB = biotic rice field incubation. (a) Percent of identified compounds in heteroatom groups. Proportional distributions of (b) H-to-C ratios, (c) O-to-C ratios, (d) peak mass, (e) double bond equivalents, and (f) nominal oxidation states of carbon. Percent of identified compounds in groupings based on (g) AI (alkanes, AI=0; olefinics, $0 < AI \le 0.5$; aromatics, AI ≥ 0.67) and (h) compound classifications (Table S4).

Figure S2



Chemical characteristics of (red) mobilized SOC, (dashed blues, squares) DOC in incubation waters from day 1.5, and (solid blues, circles) newly detected compounds on incubation day 18 that were not detected on incubation day 1.5. PA = abiotic pond incubation; RA = abiotic rice field incubation; PB = biotic pond incubation; RB = biotic rice field incubation. Panels as identified in Figure S1.





Relative change in chemical indices between day 1.5 and day 18 for pond recharge water incubated with native sediment and sterilized sediment. The cumulative fraction of compounds that were (black) identified at both time points, i.e., common, (dark grey) identified at the second time point but not at the first, i.e., newly detected, and (light grey) identified at the first time point but not at the second, i.e., lost, were separated by heteroatom groups (CHO and CHO+S are shown) and characterized based on H-to-C ratio, O-to-C ratio, S-to-C ratio, nominal oxidation state of carbon (NOSC), peak mass, and aromaticity index (alkanes, AI=0; olefinics, $0 < AI \le 0.5$; aromatics, AI > 0.5; condensed aromatics, $AI \ge 0.67$).

Figure S4



Relative change in peak mass between day 1.5 and day 18 for both rice field recharge water (top row) and pond recharge water (bottom row) incubated with (a) native sediment and (b) sterilized sediment. The cumulative fraction of compounds that were (black) identified at both time points, i.e., common, (dark grey) identified at the second time point but not at the first, i.e., newly detected, and (light grey) identified at the first time point but not at the second, i.e., lost, were separated by heteroatom groups.





Relative change in chemical indices between day 18 and day 85 for pond recharge water incubated with native sediment and sterilized sediment. The cumulative fraction of compounds that were (black) identified at both time points, i.e., common, (dark grey) identified at the second time point but not at the first, i.e., newly detected, and (light grey) identified at the first time point but not at the second, i.e., lost, were separated by heteroatom groups (CHO and CHO+S are shown) and characterized based on H-to-C ratio, O-to-C ratio, S-to-C ratio, nominal oxidation state of carbon (NOSC), peak mass, and aromaticity index (alkanes, AI=0; olefinics, $0 < AI \le 0.5$; aromatics, AI>0.5; condensed aromatics, AI>0.67).

Figure S6



Relative change in peak mass between day 18 and day 85 for both rice field recharge water (top row) and pond recharge water (bottom row) incubated with (a) native sediment and (b) sterilized sediment. The cumulative fraction of compounds that were (black) identified at both time points, i.e., common, (dark grey) identified at the second time point but not at the first, i.e., newly detected, and (light grey) identified at the first time point but not at the second, i.e., lost, were separated by heteroatom groups.

REFERENCES

Burt, R., Series Ed. *Soil Survey Laboratory Information Manual*; Soil Survey Investigations; 45, Version 2.0; United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service: National Soil Survey Center, Lincoln, Nebraska, 2011.

D'Andrilli, J., Cooper, W. T., Foreman, C. M. and Marshall, A. G.: An ultrahigh-resolution mass spectrometry index to estimate natural organic matter lability, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom., 29(24), 2385–2401, doi:10.1002/rcm.7400, 2015.