

# OMEN-SED 1.0: A new, numerically efficient sediment module for the coupling to Earth System Models

Dominik Hülse<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Arndt<sup>1</sup>, Stuart Daines<sup>2</sup>, and Andy Ridgwell<sup>1, 3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1SS, UK

<sup>2</sup>Earth System Science, University of Exeter, North Park Road, Exeter EX4 4QE, UK

<sup>3</sup>Department of Earth Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

*Correspondence to:* Sandra Arndt (s.arndt@bristol.ac.uk)

**Abstract.** Here we describe the first version of the Organic Matter ENabled SEDiment model (OMEN-SED 1.0).

## 1 Introduction

**DH:** How to include comments.

### Role of marine sediments for climate and global biogeochemical cycles:

- 5 Marine surface sediments are key components in the Earth system. They host the largest carbon reservoir within the surficial Earth system, provide the only long term sink for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, recycle nutrients and represent the most important geochemical archive used for deciphering past changes in biogeochemical cycles and climate. Physical and chemical processes in sediments (i.e. diagenetic processes) depend on the water column and vice versa: Diagenesis is mainly donor controlled, as it is fuelled by the external supply of solid material (e.g. organic matter, calcium carbonate, opal) from the water column and is affected by overlying bottom water concentrations of solutes. At the same time, diagenesis in the sediments transforms the deposited material and returns some of the resulting products (e.g. nutrients, DIC) to the water column. This so-called benthic-pelagic coupling is essential for understanding global biogeochemical cycles and climate (e.g. Archer and  
10 Maier-Reimer, 1994; Soetaert et al., 2000; Archer et al., 2000; Mackenzie, 2005).  
15

Biological primary production of organic matter (OM, CH<sub>2</sub>O in equation R1) and the reverse process of degradation can be written in a greatly simplified reaction as:



- On geological timescales production of OM is generally greater than degradation which results in  
20 some organic matter being buried in marine sediments and oxygen accumulating in the atmosphere.

Thus burial of OM leads to net oxygen input to, and CO<sub>2</sub> removal from the atmosphere (Berner, 2004). On shorter timescales, the upper few meters of the sediments (i.e. early diagenesis) are specifically important as it is decided here if a substance is recycled to the water column or buried for a longer period of time in the deeper sediments (Hensen et al., 2006). Most biogeochemical cycles  
25 and reactions in this part of marine sediments can be related either directly or indirectly to the degradation of organic matter (e.g Boudreau and Ruddick, 1991; Arndt et al., 2013). Organic matter degradation releases metabolic CO<sub>2</sub> to the pore water, causing it to have a lower pH and provoking the dissolution of CaCO<sub>3</sub> (Emerson and Bender, 1981). Oxygen and nitrate for instance, the most powerful electron acceptors, are consumed in the course of the degradation of organic matter, resulting  
30 in the release of ammonium and phosphate to the pore water. As such, changes in the degradation rate of OM can profoundly affect the oxygen and nutrient inventory of the ocean and thus primary productivity (Van Cappellen and Ingall, 1994; Lenton and Watson, 2000).

**TODO:** Something on: Role of marine sediments for another time period , e.g. glacial/interglacial atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> cycles

35 Nutrient recycling from the sediments has been invoked by modelling and data studies to explain the occurrence of extreme events in Earth history, for instance Oceanic Anoxic Events (OAEs) (e.g. Mort et al., 2007; Tsandev and Slomp, 2009). OAEs represent severe disturbances of the global carbon, oxygen and nutrient cycles of the ocean and are usually characterized by widespread bottom water anoxia and photic zone euxinia (Jenkyns, 2010). One way to explain the genesis and retention  
40 of OAEs is increased oxygen demand due to enhanced primary productivity (PP). Increased nutrient inputs to fuel PP may have come from marine sediments as the burial efficiency of phosphorus declines when bottom waters become anoxic (Ingall and Jahnke, 1994; Van Cappellen and Ingall, 1994). The recovery from OAE like conditions is thought to involve the permanent removal of excess CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere and ocean by burying carbon in the form of organic matter in marine  
45 sediments (e.g. Arthur et al., 1988; Jarvis et al., 2011), which is consistent with the geological record of widespread black shale formation (Stein et al., 1986). However, the overall amount, exact timing and the rate of organic matter burial remain a topic of an ongoing debate.

#### **Diagenetic Models:**

Therefore, globally quantifying the burial and degradation of organic matter in marine sediments and  
50 related biogeochemical dynamics is important for understanding climate and the cycling of many chemical elements on various timescales. Such studies and quantifications are possible through the application of idealised mathematical representations of diagenesis, or so-called diagenetic models (e.g. Berner, 1980; Boudreau, 1997). The number of research questions that can be addressed with diagenetic models is infinite and a plethora of different approaches have been developed, mainly  
55 following two distinct directions (Arndt et al., 2013). First, state-of-the art vertically resolved diagenetic models simulating all of the essential coupled redox and equilibrium reactions within marine sediments that control carbon burial and benthic recycling fluxes (e.g. BRNS, Aguilera et al., 2005;

MEDIA, Meysman et al., 2003; OMEXDIA, Soetaert et al., 1996b). These “complete”, non-steady-state models generally use a so-called multi-G approach, thus dividing the bulk organic carbon pool  
60 into a number of compound classes that are characterised by different degradabilities  $k_i$ . Combining such a complex diagenetic model with an ocean biogeochemical model results in the most realistic benthic-pelagic coupling. However, the global applicability of this set-up is limited by the high computation cost of simulating all biogeochemical reactions in the sediments. The second group of models is less sophisticated and comprehensive than the “complete”, non-steady-state diagenetic  
65 models and is used for the coupling to global Earth System Models (e.g. DCESS, Shaffer et al., 2008; MEDUSA, Munhoven, 2007 or the model of Heinze et al. (1999)). In particular, these analytic models consider fewer biogeochemical reactions and assume that the sedimentary organic matter pool is composed of just a single or two discrete compound classes (1G or 2G approach respectively).

## 70 How are sediments resolved in Earth System models:

Even though there is potential to use more appropriate global sediment representations, in most current Earth System models sediment-water exchange of OM and chemical elements is either neglected or treated in a very simplistic way (Soetaert et al., 2000; Hülse et al., 2016). Most Earth system Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICs) and also some of the higher resolution global carbon  
75 cycle models represent the sediment-water interface either as a reflective or a conservative/semi-reflective boundary (Hülse et al., 2016). Thus, all particulate material deposited on the seafloor is either instantaneously consumed (reflective boundary), or a fixed fraction is buried in the sediments (conservative/semi-reflective boundary). Both highly simplified approaches furthermore completely neglect the exchange of solute species through the sediment-water interface and, therefore, can-  
80 not resolve the complex benthic-pelagic coupling. However, due to their computational efficiency, both representations are often used in global biogeochemical models (e.g. Najjar et al., 2007; Ridgwell et al., 2007; Goosse et al., 2010). A superior approach is the vertically integrated dynamic model, which represents the whole sediment column as a single box (Hülse et al., 2016). Here, OM deposited on the seafloor is added to the sediment box where it gets degraded and dissolved  
85 species diffuse through the sediment-water interface in accordance with these transformations. This approach thus ignores the vertical extent of the sediments and the temporary storage of dissolved species (Soetaert et al., 2000). Yet, it is computationally efficient and also allows differentiating between various fractions of organic matter. Most EMICs incorporate a vertically integrated dynamic model for particulate inorganic carbon only (i.e. mainly  $\text{CaCO}_3$ ) and just a few are considering oxic-  
90 only sediment degradation of organic matter (Hülse et al., 2016). The most complex description of marine sediments in Earth System models are vertically resolved diagenetic models, solving the one-dimensional, fully coupled reaction-transport equation for multiple solid and dissolved species (e.g. Berner, 1980; Boudreau, 1997). These models account for important transport processes (e.g. bioturbation, molecular diffusion and bioirrigation), resolve the coupled biogeochemical dynamics

95 of dissolved species and usually at least a part of the resulting characteristic redox-zonation of marine sediments (Soetaert et al., 2000; Hülse et al., 2016). Examples of global carbon cycle models employing a vertically resolved diagenetic model are PISCES (Gehlen et al., 2006) and CLIMBER 3 $\alpha$  (Ilyina et al., 2013), both using a version of Heinze et al. (1999), however, just utilizing a 1G approach with a constant degradation rate constant. None of the EMICs reviewed by Hülse et al.  
100 (2016) use such a sediment representation.

**Problem with that:**

Obviously, such simplifications can neither account for the observed vast structural complexity in natural organic matter and its resulting different degradation rates nor for the rapid decrease in OM degradability in the uppermost centimeters of the sediments (Arndt et al., 2013). At least a 3G  
105 approach is necessary to accurately represent organic matter dynamics in this part of the sediments where most OM is degraded (e.g. Soetaert et al., 1996b). **TODO: Go on from here!**

A further problem of both approaches (and models in general) are model parameters which implicitly account for processes not explicitly described. These parameters are either derived through profile fitting for a specific site or follow different global relationships with a related, readily available  
110 sediment characteristic, such as water depth (Middelburg et al., 1997) or sedimentation rate (Tromp et al., 1995). However, also these relationships are mostly based on simple fitting exercises to limited data sets and cannot replace a mechanistic representation of the underlying processes, especially when applying the model for different geological timescales.

Start with OM is composed of loads of different compound classes. 1G approach can't account  
115 for that. Need at least 3 different fractions. Then problem of defining degradation rate constants especially on a global scale. Say how diverse the OM stuff is and how variable it is spatially (move stuff from above down here). Need actually at least 3G approach... Vertically integrated and resolved sediment models of organic matter degradation need to be properly initialise (i.e. get realistic POC degradation rates, from (Soetaert et al., 2000)) **TODO: How they usually quantify the rate of OM**  
120 degradation (see Stolpovsky et al. 2015 or/and (Soetaert et al., 2000; Mackenzie et al., 2004)).

The spatial variability in e.g. benthic particulate organic carbon (POC) mineralization kinetics throughout the ocean is currently unknown. This creates considerable uncertainties when diagenetic models are used to couple benthic and pelagic biogeochemical cycles in global models. see: <https://goldschmidtabstracts.info/2013/2270.pdf>

**Alternative Model approaches e.g. from coastal research**

125

**Solution presented here:** Here, we present the OrganicMatter ENabled SEDiment model (OMEN-SED 1.0), a new, one-dimensional, numerically efficient reactive transport model (RTM) that describes OM cycling as well as the associated dynamics of the most important terminal electron acceptors ( $O_2$ ,  $NO_3^-$ ,  $SO_4^{2-}$ ,  $CH_4$ ), related reduced substances ( $NH_4^+$ ,  $H_2S$ ) and macronutrients ( $PO_4^{3-}$ ).  
130

OMEN-SEDs computational efficiency allows its coupling to Earth System Models and therefore the investigation of coupled global biogeochemical dynamics over geological timescales. Also mention here presented as a 3G-Model (including one “refractory” OM pool, whose degradability is not relevant for the timescales considered), however OMEN-SED can easily be extended to a Multi-G approach.

135

See Van Cappellen and Wang (1996): “Metal cycling in surface sediments: Modeling the interplay or transport and reaction” for some good basic info!

## 2 Model Description

140 The following section provides a detailed description of the new model. Table 1 summarizes the biogeochemical reaction network and a glossary of parameters along with their respective units is provided in Tables 7 and 8.

### 2.1 General Model Approach


The calculation of benthic return/uptake and burial fluxes is based on the vertically resolved con-  
145 servation equation for solid and dissolved species in porous media is given by (e.g. Berner, 1980; Boudreau, 1997):

$$\frac{\partial \xi C_i}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial z} + \xi \sum_j R_i^j \quad (1)$$

where  $C_i$  is the concentration of the biogeochemical species  $i$ ,  $\xi$  equals the porosity  $\phi$  for solute  
150 species and  $(1 - \phi)$  for solid species, hence represents the partitioning of species  $i$  into the solute and dissolved phase. The term  $z$  is the sediment depth,  $t$  denotes the time,  $F$  summarises the trans-  
port fluxes and  $\sum_j R_i^j$  represents the sum of production/consumption rates  $j$  that affect species  $i$ . The reaction network has to account for the most important primary and secondary redox reactions,  
equilibrium reactions, mineral dissolution and precipitation, as well as adsorption and desorption  
155 processes that affect the explicitly resolved chemical species.

State-of-the-art reaction-transport models generally solve the ordinary differential equation (ODE)  
(eq. 1) numerically and thus allow to account for transient dynamics, depth-varying parameters or a high degree of coupling between different chemical species. Yet, numerical models are computational expensive, thus rendering their application in an Earth System Model framework prohibitive.  
160 An analytical solution of equation (1) provides an alternative and computational more efficient approach. Analytical models enjoyed great popularity in the early days of diagenetic modelling and computer technology due to their low computational demands. However, early analytical models were often very problem-specific and only considered one or two coupled species (e.g. Lehrman,

Berner) ?? which pubs?. Over the next decades, a number of more complex analytical models describing the coupled dynamics of ....were developed (e.g. Billen, 1982; Goloway and Bender, 1982; Jahnke et al., 1982), before the boost in computing power enabled the development of fully-coupled, multi-species, numerical models (e.g. Van Cappellen and Wang, 1995; Soetaert et al., 1996b).



**Figure 1.** Schematic of the different modelled species and layers in our sediment model. Here showing the case  $z_{\text{ox}} < z_{\text{bio}} < z_{\text{NO}_3} < z_{\text{SO}_4}$ .

Finding an analytical solution to Eq. (1), especially when complex reaction networks are to be considered, is not straightforward and generally requires the assumption of steady state. In addition, 170 the complexity of the reaction network can be reduced by dividing the sediment into distinct zones and accounting for the most pertinent biogeochemical processes within each zone, thus increasing the likelihood of finding an analytical solution to Eq. (1).

Therefore, OMEN-SED assumes that benthic dynamics can be represented by a series of steady-states. Because the Earth system model relevant variability in boundary conditions and fluxes is 175 generally longer than the characteristic timescales of the reaction-transport processes, the sediment can be described by a series of pseudo steady-states. In addition, it divides the sediment into a bioturbated and a non-bioturbated zone defined by the constant bioturbation depth  $z_{\text{bio}}$  (see Fig. 1). Furthermore, it accounts for the dynamic redox zonation of marine sediments by dividing the sediment into: 2) an oxic zone delineated by the oxygen penetration depth  $z_{\text{ox}}$ , 3) a denitrification zone 180 situated between  $z_{\text{ox}}$  and the nitrate penetration depth  $z_{\text{NO}_3}$ , 4) a sulfate reduction zone situated be-

tween  $z_{\text{NO}_3}$  and the sulfate penetration depth  $z_{\text{SO}_4}$  and 5) a methanogenic zone situated below  $z_{\text{SO}_4}$  (Fig. 1). All penetration depths are dynamically calculated by the model. Each zone is characterised by a set of diagenetic equations that encapsulate the most pertinent reaction and transport processes in this zone (see section 2.2 and 2.3 for more details).

185 OMEN calculates and feeds back to the Earth System model the fraction of POC preserved in the sediments and the sediment-water interface fluxes of the dissolved species  $C_i$ :

$$\text{Flux\_SWI}(C_i) = \phi \cdot \left( D_i \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} + w C_i(0) \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $w$  is the deposition rate,  $D_i$  is the diffusion coefficient and  $C_i(0)$  the sediment-water concentration of species  $i$ .

190 **2.2 Transport**

The model accounts for both the advective, as well as the diffusive transport of dissolved and solid species, assuming that sediment compaction is negligible (i.e.  $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = 0$ ). The molecular diffusion of dissolved species is described via a species-specific apparent diffusion coefficient,  $D_{\text{mol},i}$ . In addition, the activity of infaunal organisms in the bioturbated zone of the sediment ( $z < z_{\text{bio}}$ ) that causes random displacements of sediments and porewaters is simulated using a diffusive term (e.g. Boudreau, 1986), with a constant bioturbation coefficient  $D_{\text{bio}}$  in the bioturbated zone. The pumping activity by burrow-dwelling animals and the resulting ventilation of tubes, the so-called bioirrigation, is encapsulated in a factor,  $f_{ir}$  that enhances the molecular diffusion coefficient ( hence,  $D_{i,0} = D_{\text{mol},i} \cdot f_{ir}$ , Soetaert et al., 1996a). The flux divergence can thus be formulated as:

$$200 \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( -\xi D_i \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} + \xi w C_i \right) \quad (3)$$

where  $D_i$  is the diffusion coefficient of species  $i$  ( $D_i = D_{i,0} + D_{\text{bio}} = D_{\text{mol},i} \cdot f_{ir} + D_{\text{bio}}$  for dissolved species and  $D_i = D_{\text{bio}}$  for solid species) and  $w$  is the deposition rate. The bioturbation coefficient  $D_{\text{bio}}$  is set to zero below  $z_{\text{bio}}$ . In addition, infaunal activity ceases ( $D_{\text{bio}} = 0$ ) once bottom waters become anoxic ( $\text{O}_2 < ??? \text{ mol cm}^{-3}$ ). **check for good value + add if-query in code!!**

205 **2.3 Reaction Network**

Earth System models generally track the biogeochemical dynamics of organic and inorganic carbon, essential nutrients (nitrogen, phosphorus) and oxygen with the aim of investigating the evolution of the ocean's redox structure and carbonate system and its feedbacks on global climate. This general aim thus defines a minimum set of state variables and reaction processes that need to be resolved 210 for an efficient representation of the benthic-pelagic coupling in Earth system models. A suitable sediment model must provide a robust quantification of organic (and inorganic) carbon burial fluxes, as well as the benthic return fluxes of growth-limiting nutrients, equilibrium invariant and reduced species, and oxygen uptake fluxes. As a consequence, the reaction network must account for the

**Table 1.** Reactions and variables implemented in the Reaction Network of OMEN-SED (1.0). The primary and secondary redox reactions are listed in the sequence they occur with increasing sediment depth.

Description	
Primary redox reactions	Degradation of organic matter via aerobic respiration, denitrification, sulfate reduction, methanogenesis (implicit)
Secondary redox reactions	Oxidation of ammonium and sulfide by oxygen, anaerobic oxidation of methane by sulfate
Adsorption/Desorption	Ad-/Desorption of P on/from Fe(OH) <sub>3</sub> , NH <sub>4</sub> adsorption, PO <sub>4</sub> adsorption
Mineral precipitation	Formation of authigenic P
Variables	Organic matter, oxygen, nitrate, ammonium, sulfate, sulfide (hydrogen sulfide), phosphate, Fe-bound P, DIC, ALK

most important primary and secondary redox reactions, equilibrium reactions, mineral precipitation/dissolution and adsorption/desorption, resulting in a complex set of coupled reaction-transport equations. The following subsections provide a short discussion of the reaction processes included in the model and give an overview of the vertically resolved conservation equations and boundary conditions for solid and dissolved species in each layer. Table 1 provides a summary of the reactions and variables considered in the reaction network. Table 10 summarises their reaction stoichiometry and Table ?? provides an overview of their description in the model.

### 2.3.1 Organic matter

In marine sediments, organic matter (OM) is degraded by heterotrophic activity coupled to the sequential utilisation of terminal electron acceptors (TEAs), typically in the order of O<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, Mn(VI), Fe(III) and SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> followed by methanogenesis and/or fermentation. Here, organic matter degradation is described via a multi-G model approach (Arndt et al., 2013, and references therein), assuming that the bulk OM consists of a number of discrete compound classes  $C_i$  characterised by specific degradation rate constants  $k_i$ . Such a multi-G approach allows for selective preservation of compound classes according to their reactivity,  $k_i$  and, thus, accounts for the change in organic matter reactivity during burial. Each compound class is degraded according to first-order kinetics. The conservation equation for organic matter dynamics is thus given by:

$$\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{C_i} \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} - k_i \cdot C_i \quad (4)$$

The analytical solution of Eq. (4) (see section ?? for details) requires the definition of a set of boundary conditions (Table 2). The model assumes a known concentration/flux at the sediment-water interface and continuity across the bottom of the bioturbated zone,  $z_{\text{bio}}$ .

**Table 2.** Boundary conditions for organic matter and oxygen. For the boundaries we define:  $z_-^- := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (z_- - h)$  and  $z_+^+ := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (z_- + h)$ .

Boundary	Condition	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $C_i(0) = C_{i0}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $C_i(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = C_i(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$ 3) $-D_{\text{bio}} \cdot \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = 0$
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $O_2(0) = O_{20}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $O_2(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = O_2(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$ 3) $-(D_{O_2,0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial O_2}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{O_2,0} \cdot \frac{\partial O_2}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	$O_2$ consumption ( $z_{\text{ox}} = z_\infty$ )	4) <b>IF</b> ( $O_2(z_\infty) > 0$ ) $\frac{\partial O_2}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}} = 0$ <b>ELSE</b> $O_2(z_{\text{ox}}) = 0$ and $-D_{O_2} \cdot \frac{\partial O_2}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}} = F_{\text{red}}(z_{\text{ox}})$
	( $z_{\text{ox}} < z_\infty$ ) with flux from below	$F_{\text{red}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{ox}}}^\infty \sum_i (2\gamma_{\text{NH}_4} \text{NC}_i + \gamma_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \text{SO}_4 \text{C}) k_i C_i dz$

### 2.3.2 Oxygen

In marine sediments, oxygen is consumed through the aerobic degradation of organic matter and a number of secondary redox reactions. In the oxic layer ( $z < z_{\text{ox}}$ ), the model explicitly accounts for the aerobic degradation of OM, which consumes oxygen with a fixed O:C ratio (OC, Tab. 8) and 240 produces ammonium, which is partially nitrified to nitrate ( $\gamma_{\text{NH}_4}$ ). In addition, the oxygen consumption through the oxidation of reduced species ( $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Mn}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{NH}_4$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ ) produced in the suboxic and anoxic layers of the sediment is implicitly taken into account through the flux boundary condition at the dynamic oxygen penetration depth  $z_{\text{ox}}$ . This simplification can be justified as it has been shown that these secondary redox reactions mainly occur at the oxic/suboxic interface (Soetaert 245 et al., 1996b). The factor  $\frac{1-\phi}{\phi}$  accounts for the volume conversion from the solid to the dissolved phase. Oxygen dynamics are thus described by:

$$\frac{\partial O_2}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{O_2} \frac{\partial^2 O_2}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial O_2}{\partial z} - \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \sum_i k_i \cdot [OC + 2\gamma_{\text{NH}_4} \text{NC}_i] \cdot C_i(z) \quad (5)$$

The analytical solution of Eq. (5) (see section ??) requires the definition of boundary conditions 250 (Table 2). The model assumes a known bottom water concentration and the complete consumption of oxygen at the oxygen penetration depth (or zero flux if  $z_{\text{ox}} = z_\infty$ ). It considers equal oxygen concentration and diffusive flux above ( $z_{\text{bio}}^-$ ) and below ( $z_{\text{bio}}^+$ ) the bioturbation boundary. In addition, the model imposes a flux of reduced species through the bottom of the oxic zone that is calculated as the reduced substances produced through anoxic mineralization of organic matter below  $z_{\text{ox}}$ . 255 Thus, assuming that fractions ( $\gamma_{\text{NH}_4}$  and  $\delta$ ) of these reduced species are oxidised at the oxic/suboxic interface.

### 2.3.3 Nitrate and Ammonium

To model nitrate and ammonium dynamics the sediment is partitioned into two geochemical layers (oxic and suboxic), where different equations describe the biogeochemical processes. Above the  
260 oxygen penetration depth organic matter mineralization produces ammonium, which is partly nitrified to nitrate (the fraction  $\gamma_{\text{NH}_4}$ ). In the suboxic zone ( $z > z_{\text{ox}}$ ), oxygen concentration is zero and nitrate serves as the electron acceptor to respire organic matter, thus nitrate is consumed by denitrification and ammonium is produced. Below the nitrate penetration depth  $z_{\text{NO}_3}$ , ammonium is still produced through OM mineralization. Therefore the diagenetic equations for nitrate and ammonium  
265 are given by:

1. Layer ( $z \leq z_{\text{ox}}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{NO}_3^I}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{NO}_3} \frac{\partial^2 \text{NO}_3^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{NO}_3^I}{\partial z} + \gamma_{\text{NH}_4} \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{NC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (6)$$

$$270 \quad \frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^I}{\partial t} = 0 = \frac{D_{\text{NH}_4}}{1+K_{\text{NH}_4}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{NH}_4^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^I}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\gamma_{\text{NH}_4}}{1+K_{\text{NH}_4}} \cdot \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{NC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (7)$$

2. Layer ( $z_{\text{ox}} < z \leq z_{\text{NO}_3}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{NO}_3^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{NO}_3} \frac{\partial^2 \text{NO}_3^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{NO}_3^{II}}{\partial z} - \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \text{NO}_3 C \cdot \sum_i k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = \frac{D_{\text{NH}_4}}{1+K_{\text{NH}_4}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{NH}_4^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^{II}}{\partial z} \quad (9)$$

275 3. Layer ( $z_{\text{NO}_3} < z \leq z_{\infty}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^{III}}{\partial t} = 0 = \frac{D_{\text{NH}_4}}{1+K_{\text{NH}_4}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{NH}_4^{III}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{NH}_4^{III}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{1+K_{\text{NH}_4}} \cdot \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{NC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (10)$$

The boundary conditions to solve Equations 6 - 10 are summarized in Table 3. The model assumes known bottom water concentrations for both species, the complete consumption of nitrate at the  
280 nitrate penetration depth (or zero flux if  $z_{\text{NO}_3} = z_{\infty}$ ) and no change in ammonium flux at  $z_{\infty}$ . It considers equal concentrations and diffusive fluxes at  $z_{\text{bio}}$  and  $z_{\text{ox}}$ . In addition, the re-oxidation of upward-diffusing reduced ammonium is considered in the oxic-suboxic boundary condition for nitrate and ammonium.

### 2.3.4 Sulfate and Sulfide

285 When nitrate is depleted, sulfate reduction is the pathway to mineralize organic matter, thus consuming sulfate ( $\text{SO}_4$ ) and producing hydrogen sulfide ( $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ ) until the sulfate penetration depth ( $z_{\text{SO}_4}$ ). Sulfate and sulfide dynamics are thus described by:

**Table 3.** Boundary conditions for nitrate and ammonium.

Boundary	Condition	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $NO_3(0) = NO_{30}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $NO_3(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = NO_3(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$ 3) $-(D_{NO_3,0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial NO_3}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{NO_3,0} \cdot \frac{\partial NO_3}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $NO_3(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = NO_3(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$ 5) $-D_{NO_3} \cdot \frac{\partial NO_3}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} + \gamma_{NH_4} \cdot F_{NH_4}(z_{\text{ox}}) = -D_{NO_3} \cdot \frac{\partial NO_3}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$ $F_{NH_4}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{NO_3}}^{\infty} \sum_i k_i \cdot NC_i \cdot C_i dz$
$z = z_{NO_3}$	NO <sub>3</sub> consumption ( $z_{NO_3} = z_\infty$ )	6) <b>IF</b> ( $NO_3(z_\infty) > 0$ ) $\frac{\partial NO_3}{\partial z}  _{z_{NO_3}} = 0$ <b>ELSE</b> $NO_3(z_{NO_3}) = 0$
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $NH_4(0) = NH_{40}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $NH_4(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = NH_4(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$ 3) $-\frac{D_{NH_4,0} + D_{\text{bio}}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -\frac{D_{NH_4,0}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $NH_4(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = NH_4(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$ 5) $-\frac{D_{NH_4}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} - \gamma_{NH_4} \cdot F_{NH_4}(z_{\text{ox}}) = -\frac{D_{NH_4}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$ $F_{NH_4}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{NO_3}}^{\infty} \sum_i k_i \cdot NC_i \cdot C_i dz$
$z = z_{NO_3}$	continuity flux	6) $NH_4(z_{NO_3}^-) = NH_4(z_{NO_3}^+)$ 7) $-\frac{D_{NH_4}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{NO_3}^-} = -\frac{D_{NH_4}}{1+K_{NH_4}} \cdot \frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{NO_3}^+}$
$z = z_\infty$	zero NH <sub>4</sub> flux	8) $\frac{\partial NH_4}{\partial z}  _{z_\infty} = 0$

1. Layer ( $z \leq z_{NO_3}$ )

$$290 \quad \frac{\partial SO_4^{I}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{SO_4} \frac{\partial^2 SO_4^{I}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial SO_4^{I}}{\partial z} \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\partial H_2S^{I}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{H_2S} \frac{\partial^2 H_2S^{I}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial H_2S^{I}}{\partial z} \quad (12)$$

2. Layer ( $z_{NO_3} < z \leq z_{SO_4}$ )

$$\frac{\partial SO_4^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{SO_4} \frac{\partial^2 SO_4^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial SO_4^{II}}{\partial z} - \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i SO_4C \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (13)$$

$$295 \quad \frac{\partial H_2S^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{H_2S} \frac{\partial^2 H_2S^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial H_2S^{II}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i SO_4C \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (14)$$

3. Layer ( $z_{SO_4} < z \leq z_\infty$ )

$$\frac{\partial H_2S^{III}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{H_2S} \frac{\partial^2 H_2S^{III}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial H_2S^{III}}{\partial z} \quad (15)$$


300 To solve equations 11 - 15 the model assumes known concentrations at the sediment-water interface and continuity across the bioturbation depth and the nitrate penetration depth (see Table 4).

**Table 4.** Boundary conditions for sulfate and sulfide.

Boundary	Condition	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $\text{SO}_4(0) = \text{SO}_{40}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $\text{SO}_4(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = \text{SO}_4(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $-(D_{\text{SO}_4,0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{\text{SO}_4,0} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $\text{SO}_4(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = \text{SO}_4(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$
	flux	5) $-D_{\text{SO}_4} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} + \gamma_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot F_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = -D_{\text{SO}_4} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$
	where:	$F_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \left( \int_{z_{\text{NO}_3}}^{\text{SO}_4} \sum_i \text{SO}_4 \cdot C_i \cdot C_i dz + \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz \right)$
$z = z_{\text{NO}_3}$	continuity	6) $\text{SO}_4(z_{\text{NO}_3}^-) = \text{SO}_4(z_{\text{NO}_3}^+)$
	flux	7) $-D_{\text{SO}_4} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^-} = -D_{\text{SO}_4} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{SO}_4}$	$\text{SO}_4$ consumption ( $z_{\text{SO}_4} = z_\infty$ )	8) <b>IF</b> ( $\text{SO}_4(z_\infty) > 0$ ) $\frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{SO}_4}} = 0$ <b>ELSE</b> $\text{SO}_4(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = 0$ and $-D_{\text{SO}_4} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{SO}_4}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{SO}_4}} = \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4})$ $F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz$
	$(z_{\text{SO}_4} < z_\infty)$ with flux from below:	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $\text{H}_2\text{S}(0) = \text{H}_2\text{S}_0$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $\text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = \text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $-(D_{\text{H}_2\text{S},0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{\text{H}_2\text{S},0} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $\text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = \text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$
	flux	5) $-D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} - \gamma_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} F_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = -D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$
	where:	$F_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \left( \int_{z_{\text{NO}_3}}^{\text{SO}_4} \sum_i \text{SO}_4 \cdot C_i \cdot C_i dz + \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz \right)$
$z = z_{\text{NO}_3}$	continuity	6) $\text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{NO}_3}^-) = \text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{NO}_3}^+)$
	flux	7) $-D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^-} = -D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{SO}_4}$	continuity flux (with AOM)	8) $\text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^-) = \text{H}_2\text{S}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^+)$
	where:	9) $-D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^-} + \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = -D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^+}$ $F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz$
$z = z_\infty$	zero $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ flux	10) $\frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{S}}{\partial z}  _{z_\infty} = 0$

The re-oxidation of reduced  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  to  $\text{SO}_4$  is considered in the oxic-suboxic boundary condition for both species, here including the methanic zone, as  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  is also produced during anaerobic oxidation of methane (AOM). Furthermore, sulfate is used at  $z_{\text{SO}_4}$  to oxidize methane from below and thus producing  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ . In case  $z_{\text{SO}_4} < z_\infty$ , sulfate concentration is zero at  $z_{\text{SO}_4}$  and its diffusive flux must equal the amount of methane produced below; or, in case  $z_{\text{SO}_4} = z_\infty$ , a zero flux condition for sulfate is considered. At lower boundary ( $z_\infty$ ) zero flux of  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  is considered. **correct??**

### 2.3.5 Phosphate



**Figure 2.** A schematic of the sedimentary P cycle in OMEN-SED (1.0). Red numbers represent kinetic rate constants for phosphorus dynamics (compare Table 8;  $p_i$  represents uptake rate of  $\text{PO}_4$  via primary production in shallow environments). Adapted from Slomp et al. (1996).

310 To model phosphorus (P) in the sediments the model takes into account the change with depth of  
 phosphorus ( $\text{PO}_4$ ) and iron-bound P, thereby mainly following the description of Slomp et al. (1996)  
 and Gypens et al. (2008). Throughout the sediment column organic matter is mineralized resulting  
 in a release of phosphate to the pore water. In the oxic part of the sediment, this  $\text{PO}_4$  either diffuses  
 upward to the water column or is adsorbed to Fe oxides forming Fe-bound P (or M)(Slomp et al.,  
 315 1998). In the suboxic/anoxic zone,  $\text{PO}_4$  is not only produced through organic matter degradation  
 but is also released from the Fe-bound P pool due to the reduction of Fe oxides. Furthermore, phos-  
 phate concentrations can become high enough in this layer for authigenic mineral formation to occur  
 (Cappellen and Berner, 1988). This phosphorus bound in authigenic minerals represents a perma-  
 nent sink for reactive phosphorus (Slomp et al., 1996). See Figure 2 for a schematic overview of the  
 320 sedimentary P cycle. Therefore the diagenetic equations for phosphorus are written:

**Table 5.** Boundary conditions for phosphate and Fe-bound P (M).

Boundary	Condition	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $\text{PO}_4(0) = \text{PO}_{40}$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $\text{PO}_4(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = \text{PO}_4(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $(D_{\text{PO}_4,0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = D_{\text{PO}_4,0} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $\text{PO}_4(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = \text{PO}_4(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$
	flux	5) $-\frac{D_{\text{PO}_4}}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^I} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} = -\frac{D_{\text{PO}_4}}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^{II}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$
$z = z_{\infty}$	flux	10) $\frac{\partial \text{PO}_4}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\infty}} = 0$
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $M(0) = M_0$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $M(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = M(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $\frac{\partial M}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = \frac{\partial M}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $M(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = M(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$
	flux	5) $\frac{\partial M}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} = \frac{\partial M}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$
$z = z_{\infty}$	assymptotic concentration	10) $M(z_{\infty}) = M_{\infty}$

1. Layer ( $z \leq z_{\text{ox}}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{PO}_4^I}{\partial t} = \frac{D_{\text{PO}_4}}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^I} \frac{\partial^2 \text{PO}_4^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4^I}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \frac{1}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^I} \sum_i (\text{PC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z)) - \frac{k_s}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^I} (\text{PO}_4^I - \text{PO}_4^s) \quad (16)$$

$$325 \quad \frac{\partial M^I}{\partial t} = D_M \frac{\partial^2 M^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial M^I}{\partial z} + \frac{\phi}{1-\phi} k_s (\text{PO}_4^I - \text{PO}_4^s) \quad (17)$$

2. Layer ( $z_{\text{ox}} < z$ )

$$\frac{\partial M^{II}}{\partial t} = D_M \frac{\partial^2 M^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial M^{II}}{\partial z} - k_m (M^{II} - M^{\infty}) \quad (18)$$

$$330 \quad \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4^{II}}{\partial t} = \frac{D_{\text{PO}_4}}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^{II}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{PO}_4^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{PO}_4^{II}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \frac{1}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^{II}} \sum_i (\text{PC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z)) - \frac{k_a}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^{II}} (\text{PO}_4^{II} - \text{PO}_4^a) + \frac{(1-\phi)}{\phi} \frac{k_m}{1+K_{\text{PO}_4}^{II}} (M^{II} - M^{\infty}) \quad (19) \\ (20)$$

The boundary conditions to solve Equations 16 - 19 are summarized in Table 5. The model assumes known bottom water concentrations and equal concentrations and diffusive fluxes at  $z_{\text{bio}}$  and  $z_{\text{ox}}$  for 335 both species. Additionally it considers no change in phosphate flux and an assymptotic Fe-bound P concentration at  $z_{\infty}$ .

@ Sandra: SWI Flux for M does not exist, right???

**Table 6.** Boundary conditions for DIC and alkalinity.

Boundary	Condition	
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $\text{DIC}(0) = \text{DIC}_0$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $\text{DIC}(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = \text{DIC}(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $-(D_{\text{DIC},0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \text{DIC}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{\text{DIC},0} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{DIC}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{SO}_4}$	continuity	8) $\text{DIC}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^-) = \text{DIC}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^+)$
	flux (with AOM)	9) $-D_{\text{DIC}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{DIC}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^-} + \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = -D_{\text{DIC}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{DIC}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^+}$
	where:	$F_{\text{CH}_4}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz$
$z = z_{\infty}$	zero DIC flux	10) $\frac{\partial \text{DIC}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\infty}} = 0$
$z = 0$	known concentration	1) $\text{ALK}(0) = \text{ALK}_0$
$z = z_{\text{bio}}$	continuity	2) $\text{ALK}(z_{\text{bio}}^-) = \text{ALK}(z_{\text{bio}}^+)$
	flux	3) $-(D_{\text{ALK},0} + D_{\text{bio}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^-} = -D_{\text{ALK},0} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{bio}}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{ox}}$	continuity	4) $\text{ALK}(z_{\text{ox}}^-) = \text{ALK}(z_{\text{ox}}^+)$
	flux	5) $-D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^-} + F_{\text{ALK}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = -D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{ox}}^+}$
	where:	$F_{\text{ALK}}(z_{\text{ox}}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \left( \text{ALK}^{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \gamma_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} \int_{z_{\text{NO}_3}}^{z_{\text{SO}_4}} \sum_i \text{SO}_4 \text{C} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz \right) + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \left( \text{ALK}^{\text{NIT}} \frac{\gamma_{\text{NH}_4}}{1+k_{\text{NH}_4}} \int_{z_{\text{NO}_3}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{NC}_i \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz \right)$
$z = z_{\text{NO}_3}$	continuity	6) $\text{ALK}(z_{\text{NO}_3}^-) = \text{ALK}(z_{\text{NO}_3}^+)$
	flux	7) $-D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^-} = -D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{NO}_3}^+}$
$z = z_{\text{SO}_4}$	continuity	8) $\text{ALK}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^-) = \text{ALK}(z_{\text{SO}_4}^+)$
	flux (with AOM)	9) $-D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^-} + F_{\text{ALK}}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = -D_{\text{ALK}} \cdot \frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\text{SO}_4}^+}$
	where:	$F_{\text{ALK}}(z_{\text{SO}_4}) = \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \left( \text{ALK}^{\text{AOM}} \gamma_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot \int_{z_{\text{SO}_4}}^{\infty} \sum_i \text{MC} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i dz \right)$
$z = z_{\infty}$	zero ALK flux	10) $\frac{\partial \text{ALK}}{\partial z} \Big _{z_{\infty}} = 0$

### 2.3.6 Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC)

- 340 Dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) is produced by when organic matter is degraded. Explain different ratios for the two layers.

1. Layer ( $z \leq z_{\text{SO}_4}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{DIC}^I}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{DIC}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{DIC}^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{DIC}^I}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{DICC}^I \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (21)$$

345

2. Layer ( $z_{\text{SO}_4} < z \leq z_{\infty}$ )

$$\frac{\partial \text{DIC}^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{DIC}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{DIC}^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{DIC}^{II}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{DICC}^{II} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (22)$$

To solve equations 21 and 22 the model assumes the boundary conditions summarised in Table 6.

350 **2.3.7 Alkalinity**

Alkalinity is produced and consumed by when organic matter is degraded. Explain why it is produced/consumed, where and how in the different layers  $j \in \{I, II, III, IV\}$  and talk earlier on in the model description why it matters.

355 **1. Layer ( $z \leq z_{\text{ox}}$ )**

$$\frac{\partial \text{ALK}^I}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{ALK}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{ALK}^I}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^I}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i (\gamma_{\text{NH}_4} \text{NC}_i \text{ALK}^{\text{NIT}} + \text{ALK}^{\text{OX}}) \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (23)$$

**2. Layer ( $z_{\text{ox}} < z \leq z_{\text{NO}_3}$ )**

$$360 \quad \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{II}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{ALK}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{ALK}^{II}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{II}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{ALK}^{\text{DEN}} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (24)$$

**3. Layer ( $z_{\text{NO}_3} < z \leq z_{\text{SO}_4}$ )**

$$\frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{III}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{ALK}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{ALK}^{III}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{III}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{ALK}^{\text{SUL}} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (25)$$

**4. Layer ( $z_{\text{SO}_4} < z \leq z_{\infty}$ )**

$$365 \quad \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{IV}}{\partial t} = 0 = D_{\text{ALK}} \frac{\partial^2 \text{ALK}^{IV}}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial \text{ALK}^{IV}}{\partial z} + \frac{1-\phi}{\phi} \cdot \sum_i \text{ALK}^{\text{MET}} \cdot k_i \cdot C_i(z) \quad (26)$$

To solve equations 23 and 26 the model assumes the boundary conditions summarised in Table 6.

## 2.4 Model Parameters

This section describes the parameters used in OMEN-SED (1.0) to describe sediment transport and 370 biogeochemical reactions related to the burial and mineralization of organic matter under a wide range of environmental conditions. Table 7 states the parameters for sediment characteristics and Table 8 summarizes the stoichiometric factors and secondary reaction parameters used in the model.

### 2.4.1 Transport Parameters

Advection is the bulk flow of sediments and can be directly related to the accumulation of new 375 material on the seafloor (i.e. sedimentation, Burdige, 2006). This results in a downward flux of older sediment material and porewater in relation to the sediment-water interface. OMEN-SED (1.0) uses the empirical global relationship between sediment accumulation rate ( $\text{cm yr}^{-1}$ ) and seafloor depth (m) of Middelburg et al. (1997):

$$w = 3.3 \cdot 10^{-0.87478367 - 0.00043512 \cdot \text{depth}} \quad (27)$$

380 As discussed before (Sec. 2.2), the diffusion coefficient of species  $i$  is calculated as  $D_i = D_{i,0} + D_{\text{bio}} = D_{\text{mol},i} \cdot f_{ir} + D_{\text{bio}}$  for dissolved species and  $D_i = D_{\text{bio}}$  for solid species. The bioturbation coefficient  $D_{\text{bio}}$  ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) is constant in the bioturbated zone and also follows the empirical relationship by Middelburg et al. (1997):

$$D_{\text{bio}} = 5.2 \cdot 10^{0.76241122 - 0.00039724 \cdot \text{depth}} \quad (28)$$

385 Studies showed that bioturbational effects on a global scale are largely restricted to the upper 10 cm of the sediments and are only marginally related to seafloor depth (e.g. Boudreau, 1998; Teal et al., 2010). Therefore, OMEN-SED (1.0) imposes a globally invariant bioturbation depth of 10 cm. Bioirrigation can enhance the molecular diffusion coefficient  $D_{i,0} = D_{\text{mol},i} \cdot f_{ir}$  (Soetaert et al., 1996a). However, here we do not consider this effect and set  $f_{ir}$  to a constant value of 1. The  
390 specific molecular diffusion coefficients  $D_{\text{mol},i}$  are corrected for sediment porosity  $\phi$ , tortuosity  $F$  and are linearly interpolated for an ambient temperature  $T$  using zero-degree coefficients  $D_i^0$  and temperature dependent diffusion coefficients  $D_i^T$  (compare Gypens et al., 2008):

$$D_{\text{mol},i} = (D_i^0 + D_i^T \cdot T) \cdot \frac{1}{\phi \cdot F}$$

395 Tortuosity can be expressed in terms of porosity as  $F = \frac{1}{\phi^m}$  (Ullman and Aller, 1982) with the exponent  $m$  varying according to the type of sediment (here we use  $m=3$ ). Values for  $D_i^T$  and  $D_i^0$  are summarized in Table 7 and are adapted from Li and Gregory (1974) and Gypens et al. (2008).

## 2.4.2 Reaction Parameters

The applied multi-G approach for organic matter degradation considers specific degradation rate constants  $k_i$  ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) for each compound class. The degradation constants are generally taken from  
400 the coupled Earth System model and are assumed invariant along the sediment column, therefore independent of the nature of the terminal electron acceptor. The stoichiometry of organic matter is represented by the factors  $\text{NC}_i$  and  $\text{PC}_i$  denoting the molecular nitrogen to carbon and phosphorus to carbon ratio. In the sulfidic and methanic zone the reduction of 1 mol organic matter additionally produces 0.5 mol of hydrogen sulfide ( $\text{SO}_4\text{C}$ ) and 0.5 mol of methane ( $\text{MC}$ ). In the total sediment  
405 column organic matter mineralization consumes the specific terminal electron acceptor with a fixed ratio ( $\text{OC}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3\text{C}$  and  $\text{SO}_4\text{C}$  respectively). See Table 8 for a complete summary of the parameters and their values.

## 2.5 Module Structure

**TODO:** An analytical steady-state solution is found for the reaction-transport equation of each  
410 chemical species in each layer. At each boundary (i.e.  $z_{\text{ox}}$ ,  $z_{\text{bio}}$ ,  $z_{\text{NO}_3}$  and  $z_{\text{SO}_4}$ ) the model has to match continuity and flux for different ODE solutions of the layer above and below the specific boundary. In particular the bioturbation boundary is problematic as it can theoretically occur in any

**Table 7.** Fixed sediment characteristics and transport parameters. **TODO:** Update table!

Parameter	Unit	Value	Description/Source
$\rho_{\text{sed}}$	$\text{g cm}^{-3}$	2.5	Sediment density
$w$	$\text{cm yr}^{-1}$	Fct. of seafloor depth	Advection/Sediment accumulation rate Middelburg et al. (1997)
$z_{\text{bio}}$	cm	10	Bioturbation depth Boudreau (1998); Teal et al. (2010)
$D_{\text{bio}}$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	Fct. of seafloor depth	Bioturbation coefficient Middelburg et al. (1997)
$\phi$	-	0.8	Porosity
$F$	-	$\frac{1}{\phi^m}$	Tortuosity, here $m=3$
$f_i r$	-	1	Irrigation factor
$\text{PO}_4^s$	$\text{mol cm}^{-3}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-9}$	equilibrium conc. for P sorption Slomp et al. (1996)
$\text{PO}_4^a$	$\text{mol cm}^{-3}$	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$	equilibrium conc. for authigenic P precipitation Slomp et al. (1996)
$M^\infty$	$\text{mol cm}^{-3}$	$1.99 \cdot 10^{-9}$	asymptotic concentration for Fe-bound P Slomp et al. (1996)
<b>Diffusion coefficients</b> (Li and Gregory, 1974; Gypens et al., 2008)			
$D_{\text{O}_2}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	348.62172	Molecular diffusion coefficient of oxygen at 0°C
$D_{\text{O}_2}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	14.08608	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of oxygen
$D_{\text{NO}_3}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	308.42208	Molecular diffusion coefficient of nitrate at 0°C
$D_{\text{NO}_3}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	12.2640	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of nitrate
$D_{\text{NH}_4}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	308.42208	Molecular diffusion coefficient of ammonium at 0°C
$D_{\text{NH}_4}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	12.2640	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of ammonium
$D_{\text{SO}_4}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	157.68	Molecular diffusion coefficient of sulfate at 0°C
$D_{\text{SO}_4}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	7.884	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of sulfate
$D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	307.476	Molecular diffusion coefficient of sulfide at 0°C
$D_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	9.636	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of sulfide
$D_{\text{PO}_4}^0$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$	112.90764	Molecular diffusion coefficient of phosphate at 0°C
$D_{\text{PO}_4}^T$	$\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1} \text{°C}^{-1}$	5.586252	Diffusion coefficient for linear temp. dependence of phosphate

**Table 8.** Values for biogeochemical parameters used in OMEN-SED (1.0).

Parameter/Variable	Unit	Value	Description
<b>Stoichiometric factors and molecular ratios</b>			
NC <sub>1</sub>	mol/mol	0.1509	nitrogen to carbon ratio  refractory fraction, two different ones? why these values?
NC <sub>2</sub>	mol/mol	0.13333	nitrogen to carbon ratio  labile fraction
PC <sub>i</sub>	mol/mol	0.0094	phosphorus to carbon ratio
MC	mol/mol	0.5	methane to carbon ratio  produced during methanogenesis
OC	mol/mol	1.0	oxygen to carbon ratio
NO <sub>3</sub> C	mol/mol	94.4/106	nitrate to carbon ratio
SO <sub>4</sub> C	mol/mol	0.5	sulfate to carbon ratio
ALK <sup>OX</sup>	mol/mol	15/106	ALK from aerobic degradation
ALK <sup>NIT</sup>	mol/mol	-2	ALK from nitrification
ALK <sup>DEN</sup>	mol/mol	93.4/106	ALK from denitrification
ALK <sup>SUL</sup>	mol/mol	15/106	ALK from sulfate reduction
ALK <sup>MET</sup>	mol/mol	14/106	ALK from methanogenesis
ALK <sup>H2S</sup>	mol/mol	-1	ALK from H <sub>2</sub> S oxidation CORRECT???
ALK <sup>AOM</sup>	mol/mol	2	ALK from methanogenesis
<b>Secondary reaction parameters</b>			
γ <sub>NH<sub>4</sub></sub>	-	0.8	fraction of NH <sub>4</sub> that is oxidised in oxic layer
γ <sub>H<sub>2</sub>S</sub>	-	0.95	fraction of H <sub>2</sub> S that is oxidised in oxic layer
γ <sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub>	-	1.0	fraction of CH <sub>4</sub> that is oxidised at z <sub>SO<sub>4</sub></sub>
<b>Rate constants</b>			
k <sub>i</sub>	yr <sup>-1</sup>	from Earth System Model	OM degradation rate constants
k <sub>s</sub>	yr <sup>-1</sup>	???	rate constant for P sorption
k <sub>m</sub>	yr <sup>-1</sup>	???	rate constant for Fe-bound P release
k <sub>a</sub>	yr <sup>-1</sup>	???	rate constant for authigenic P formation

geochemical layer. In order to simplify this recurring boundary matching problem it is implemented in an independent algorithm which is described in Section 2.5.1. Instructions and requirements for  
415 coupling OMEN-SED (1.0) to a global Earth System Model are given in Section 2.5.2.

### 2.5.1 Generic boundary condition matching (GBCM)

A general steady-state advection-diffusion-reaction (ADR) diagenetic equation looks like:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = 0 = D \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} - w \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} - \sum_i \alpha_i \exp(-\beta_i z) - k \cdot C + Q. \quad (29)$$

420 where  $z$  is the sediment depth,  $t$  the time,  $D$  is the diffusion coefficient and  $w$  is the advection rate.

The ODE solution is of the general form:

$$C(z) = A \exp(az) + B \exp(bz) + \sum_i \frac{\alpha_i}{D\beta_i^2 - w\beta_i - k} \cdot \exp(-\beta_i z) + \frac{Q}{k} \quad (30)$$

and can therefore be expressed as:

$$425 \quad C(z) = A \cdot E(z) + B \cdot F(z) + G(z) \quad (31)$$

where  $E(z)$ ,  $F(z)$  are the homogeneous solutions of the ODE,  $G(z)$  the particular integral, and  $A$ ,  $B$  are the integration constants.

Each boundary matching problem involves matching continuity and flux for the two solutions  $C_U(z)$   
430 (= 'upper') and  $C_L(z)$  (= 'lower') across a boundary at  $z = z_b$ . Therefore, we get two ODE solutions of the genral form:

$$C_U(z) = A_U \cdot E_U(z) + B_U \cdot F_U(z) + G_U(z) \quad (32)$$

$$C_L(z) = A_L \cdot E_L(z) + B_L \cdot F_L(z) + G_L(z). \quad (33)$$

435 The two boundary conditions are: for continuity (where for generality we allow a discontinuity  $V_b$ )

$$C_U(z_b) = C_L(z_b) + V_b \quad (34)$$

and for flux

$$440 \quad D_U C'_U(z_b) + w C_U(z_b) = D_L C'_L(z_b) + w C_L(z_b) + F_b \quad (35)$$

where  $w$  is advection,  $D$  are the diffusion coefficients and  $F_b$  is any flux discontinuity.

In terms of the ODE solutions (32), (33), the boundary conditions represent two equations connecting the four integration constants:

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_U & F_U \\ D_U E'_U & D_U F'_U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_U \\ B_U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E_L & F_L \\ D_L E'_L & D_L F'_L \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_L \\ B_L \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} G_L - G_U + V_b \\ D_L G'_L - D_U G'_U + F_b - wV_b \end{pmatrix}$$

where the ODE solutions  $E$ ,  $F$ ,  $G$  are all evaluated at  $z_b$ .

Equation (36) can be solved to give  $A_U$  and  $B_U$  as a function of the integration constants from the layer below ( $A_L$  and  $B_L$ ), thereby constructing a piecewise solution for the whole region, with now just two integration constants  $A_L$  and  $B_L$ .

- 450 In the code the function **benthic\_utils.matchsoln** provides this solution in the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_U \\ B_U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & c_2 \\ c_3 & c_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_L \\ B_L \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} d_1 \\ d_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

Using (37) we can now rewrite  $C_U(z)$  in (32) as a function of  $A_L$  and  $B_L$ :

$$C_U(z) = (c_1 A_L + c_2 B_L + d_1) \cdot E_U(z) + (c_3 A_L + c_4 B_L + d_2) \cdot F_U(z) + G_U(z)$$

and hence define the “transformed” basis functions  $E_U^*(z)$ ,  $F_U^*(z)$ ,  $G_U^*(z)$  such that:

- 455  $C_U(z) = A_L \cdot E_U^*(z) + B_L \cdot F_U^*(z) + G_U^*(z) \quad (38)$

where

$$E_U^*(z) = c_1 E_U(z) + c_3 F_U(z)$$

$$F_U^*(z) = c_2 E_U(z) + c_4 F_U(z) \quad (39)$$

- 460  $G_U^*(z) = G_U(z) + d_1 E_U(z) + d_2 F_U(z)$

(in the code this is done by **benthic\_utils.xformsoln**).

### Solving the sediment layer stack

- Equations (37), (38) and (39) can now be applied for each layer boundary, working up from the bottom of the sediments. The net result is to construct a piecewise solution with just two integration constants (coming from the lowest layer), which can then be solved for by applying one boundary condition for the sediment-water interface and one for the bottom of the sediments (e.g. a concentration condition at the bottom of the sediments, and a flux condition at the SWI).

**TODO: Add figure, illustrating this e.g. for nitrate...**

### Abstracting out the bioturbation boundary

- 470 The bioturbation boundary affects the diffusion coefficient of the modelled solutes and the conservation equation of organic matter which is available for mineralization. The boundary is particularly inconvenient as it can in principle occur in the middle of any “geochemical” layer and therefore generates multiple cases. To simplify this for solutes, the “piecewise solution construction” above is

**Table 9.** Model boundary conditions for the sampling stations in Figure 3.


<b>Sediment characteristics:</b>							
Depth (m)	Temp. (°C)	$z_{\text{bio}}$ (cm)	$D_{\text{bio}}$ ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{yr}^{-1}$ )	TOC <sub>1</sub> (wt%)	TOC <sub>2</sub> (wt%)	$k_1$ ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ )	$k_2$ ( $\text{yr}^{-1}$ )
108	12.5	1.0	0.02	2.64	1.8	0.65	$1.0e^{-5}$
585	5.85	0.01	0.02	2.0	3.5	0.1	$1.0e^{-3}$
2213	3.2	10.0	0.17	0.45	0.6	0.15	$9.0e^4$
4298	2.5	4.2	0.18	1.0	1.2	0.055	$1e^{-5}$

<b>Bottom water concentrations of solutes</b> (all in $\mu\text{mol cm}^{-3}$ ):							
Depth	O <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>3</sub>	SO <sub>4</sub>	NH <sub>4</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> O	PO <sub>4</sub>	PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>a</sup>
108	210.0	9.6	28,000	0.4	0.0	0.0	15.0
585	10.0	25.0	28,000	0.0	0.0	50.0	90.0
2213	250	25	28,000	0.6	0.0	0.0	5.0
4298	243	30.1	28,000	0.22	0.0 0.0	5.0	

used to abstract out the bioturbation boundary. An initial test for each layer is made to identify its  
475 “bioturbation-status” (fully bioturbated, fully non-bioturbated or crossing the bioturbation boundary) and (if needed) a piecewise solution is constructed by matching boundary conditions across the bioturbation boundary. The “outside” code therefore never needs to know whether it is dealing with a piecewise solution (i.e. matched across a bioturbation boundary) or a “simple” solution (i.e. the layer is fully bioturbated or fully non-bioturbated).

480 In the code, this is performed by **zTOC.prepfg\_l12** which hands back a structure ls containing the “bioturbation-status” for each layer and (if needed) the description of the piecewise solution (coefficients  $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, d_1, d_2$  as above). So e.g. for sulfate, **zTOC.prepfg\_l12** is called three times at the beginning of **zSO4.calcbc** (one for each “geochemical” layer: oxic, suboxic, sulfidic) handing back three structures ls describing the layer’s “bioturbation-status”, abstracting away the bioturbation boundary and all associated conditional logic. When calculating the solutions for the different layers, the pre-calculated structure ls is passed to the function **zTOC.calcfg\_l12** which sorts out the correct solution type to use.  
485



**Figure 3.** Modelled (curves) and measured (filled dots) dissolved and solid phase pore water profiles for four different sediment cores. Note that different scales are used for different stations. The blue TOC curve represents the sum of the refractory (green) and labile (red) TOC fraction.

## 2.5.2 Coupling to an Earth System Model

### 3 Test Cases

#### 490 3.1 Sediment profiles

#### 3.2 Sensitivity Analysis

#### 3.3 Benthic fluxes on a global scale


Application to Seitert, 2004 OM, burwiczk see rate data and evaluation based on global data (Archer)

#### 3.4 GENIE-Cretaceous test?

#### 495 4 Scope of applicability and model limitations

### 5 Conclusions

TEXT



**Figure 4.** Pattern plot, showing the output sensitivity for each SWI flux (i.e. the chemical compounds on the horizontal axis) and each input factor (i.e. the model parameters on the vertical axis) for two hypothetical sediment cores.

## 6 Code Availability


### Appendix A: Reaction Network

500 **A1**

*Acknowledgements.* TEXT

**Table 10.** Primary pathways of organic matter degradation, secondary redox reactions and stoichiometries implemented in the reaction network.

Pathway	Stoichiometry
Primary Redox Reactions	
Aerobic degradation	$(\text{CH}_2\text{O})_x(\text{NH}_3)_y(\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4)_z + (\text{x} + 2\text{y})\text{O}_2 + (\text{y} + 2\text{z})\text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow (\text{x} + \text{y} + 2\text{z})\text{CO}_2 + \text{yNO}_3^- + \text{zHPO}_4^{2-} + (\text{x} + 2\text{y} + 2\text{z})\text{H}_2\text{O}$
Denitrification	$5(\text{CH}_2\text{O})_x(\text{NH}_3)_y(\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4)_z + (\text{4x} + 3\text{y})\text{NO}_3^- \rightarrow (\text{2x} + 4\text{y})\text{N}_2 + (\text{x} - 3\text{y} + 10\text{z})\text{CO}_2 + (\text{4x} + 3\text{y} - 10\text{z})\text{HCO}_3^- + 5\text{zHPO}_4^{2-} + (\text{3x} + 6\text{y} + 10\text{z})\text{H}_2\text{O}$
Sulfate reduction	$2(\text{CH}_2\text{O})_x(\text{NH}_3)_y(\text{H}_3\text{PO}_4)_z + \text{xSO}_4^{2-} + 2(\text{y} - 2\text{z})\text{CO}_2 + 2(\text{y} - 2\text{z})\text{H}_2\text{S} \rightarrow \text{xH}_2\text{O} + 2(\text{x} + \text{y} - 2\text{z})\text{HCO}_3^- + 2\text{yNH}_4^+ + 2\text{zHPO}_4^{2-}$
Methanogenesis	—
Secondary Redox Reactions	
Nitrification	$\text{NH}_4^+ + 2\text{O}_2 + 2\text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{NO}_3^- + 2\text{CO}_2 + 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$
Sulfide oxidation	$\text{H}_2\text{S} + 2\text{O}_2 + 2\text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{2-} + 2\text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$
AOM	$\text{CH}_4 + \text{SO}_4^{2-} \rightarrow \text{HCO}_3^- + \text{HS}^- + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ <b>how get <math>\text{H}_2\text{S}</math>?</b> $\rightarrow \text{CO}_3^{2-} + \text{H}_2\text{S} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$



**Figure 5.**

## References

- Aguilera, D. R., Jourabchi, P., Spiteri, C., and Regnier, P. (2005). A knowledge-based reactive transport approach for the simulation of biogeochemical dynamics in Earth systems. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, 6(7):Q07012. 00046.
- Archer, D. and Maier-Reimer, E. (1994). Effect of Deep-Sea Sedimentary Calcite Preservation on Atmospheric Co<sub>2</sub> Concentration. *Nature*, 367(6460):260–263. 00506 WOS:A1994MR49400052.
- Archer, D., Winguth, A., Lea, D., and Mahowald, N. (2000). What caused the glacial/interglacial atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> cycles? *Reviews of Geophysics*, 38(2):159–189. 00414.
- Arndt, S., Jørgensen, B., LaRowe, D., Middelburg, J., Pancost, R., and Regnier, P. (2013). Quantifying the degradation of organic matter in marine sediments: A review and synthesis. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 123:53–86.
- Arthur, M. A., Dean, W. E., and Pratt, L. M. (1988). Geochemical and climatic effects of increased marine organic carbon burial at the Cenomanian/Turonian boundary. *Nature*, 335(6192):714–717.
- Berner, R. A. (1980). *Early Diagenesis: A Theoretical Approach*. Princeton University Press.
- Berner, R. A. (2004). *The Phanerozoic Carbon Cycle: CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub>*. Oxford University Press. 00000.

- Billen, G. (1982). Modelling the processes of organic matter degradation and nutrients recycling in sedimentary systems. *Sediment microbiology*, pages 15–52.
- Boudreau, B. P. (1997). *Diagenetic models and their implementation*, volume 505. Springer Berlin.
- 520 Boudreau, B. P. (1998). Mean mixed depth of sediments: The wherefore and the why. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 43(3):524–526.
- Boudreau, B. P. and Ruddick, B. R. (1991). On a reactive continuum representation of organic matter diagenesis. *American Journal of Science*, 291(5):507–538. 00187.
- Burdige, D. J. (2006). *Geochemistry of marine sediments*, volume 398. Princeton University Press Princeton.
- 525 Cappellen, P. V. and Berner, R. A. (1988). A mathematical model for the early diagenesis of phosphorus and fluorine in marine sediments; apatite precipitation. *American Journal of Science*, 288(4):289–333.
- Emerson, S. and Bender, M. L. (1981). Carbon fluxes at the sediment-water interface of the deep-sea: calcium carbonate preservation. *Journal of Marine Research*, 39:139–162.
- Gehlen, M., Bopp, L., Emprin, N., Aumont, O., Heinze, C., and Ragueneau, O. (2006). Reconciling surface 530 ocean productivity, export fluxes and sediment composition in a global biogeochemical ocean model. *Bio-geosciences*, 3(4):521–537.
- Goloway, F. and Bender, M. (1982). Diagenetic models of interstitial nitrate profiles in deep sea suboxic sediments. *Limnol. Oceanogr*, 27(4):624–638.
- Goosse, H., Brovkin, V., Fichefet, T., Haarsma, R., Huybrechts, P., Jongma, J., Mouchet, A., Selten, F., 535 Barriat, P.-Y., Campin, J.-M., Deleersnijder, E., Driesschaert, E., Goelzer, H., Janssens, I., Loutre, M.-F., Morales Maqueda, M. A., Opsteegh, T., Mathieu, P.-P., Munhoven, G., Pettersson, E. J., Renssen, H., Roche, D. M., Schaeffer, M., Tartinville, B., Timmermann, A., and Weber, S. L. (2010). Description of the earth system model of intermediate complexity LOVECLIM version 1.2. *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3(2):603–633.
- Gypens, N., Lancelot, C., and Soetaert, K. (2008). Simple parameterisations for describing n and p diagenetic 540 processes: Application in the north sea. *Progress in Oceanography*, 76(1):89–110.
- Heinze, C., Maier-Reimer, E., Winguth, A. M. E., and Archer, D. (1999). A global oceanic sediment model for long-term climate studies. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 13(1):221–250.
- Hensen, C., Zabel, M., and Schulz, H. N. (2006). Benthic Cycling of Oxygen, Nitrogen and Phosphorus. In Schulz, P. D. H. D. and Zabel, D. M., editors, *Marine Geochemistry*, pages 207–240. Springer Berlin 545 Heidelberg.
- Hülse, D., Arndt, S., Wilson, J., Munhoven, G., and Ridgwell, A. (2016). Understanding the ocean's biological carbon pump in the past: Do we have the right tools? *Earth-Science Reviews*, –:in review.
- Ilyina, T., Six, K. D., Segschneider, J., Maier-Reimer, E., Li, H., and Núñez-Riboni, I. (2013). Global ocean 550 biogeochemistry model HAMOCC: Model architecture and performance as component of the MPI-Earth system model in different CMIP5 experimental realizations. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 5(2):287–315.
- Ingall, E. and Jahnke, R. (1994). Evidence for enhanced phosphorus regeneration from marine sediments overlain by oxygen depleted waters. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 58(11):2571–2575. 00302.
- Jahnke, R. A., Emerson, S. R., and Murray, J. W. (1982). A model of oxygen reduction, denitrification, and 555 organic matter mineralization in marine sediments. *Limnol. Oceanogr*, 27(4):6–10.

- Jarvis, I., Lignum, J. S., Gröcke, D. R., Jenkyns, H. C., and Pearce, M. A. (2011). Black shale deposition, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> drawdown, and cooling during the Cenomanian-Turonian Oceanic Anoxic Event. *Paleoceanography*, 26(3):n/a–n/a.
- Jenkyns, H. C. (2010). Geochemistry of oceanic anoxic events. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, 11(3).
- 560 Lenton, T. M. and Watson, A. J. (2000). Redfield revisited: 1. Regulation of nitrate, phosphate, and oxygen in the ocean. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 14(1):225–248.
- Li, Y.-H. and Gregory, S. (1974). Diffusion of ions in sea water and in deep-sea sediments. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 38(5):703–714.
- Mackenzie, F. T. (2005). *Sediments, Diagenesis, and Sedimentary Rocks: Treatise on Geochemistry, Second Edition*. Elsevier. 00000.
- 565 Mackenzie, F. T., Lerman, A., and Andersson, A. J. (2004). Past and present of sediment and carbon biogeochemical cycling models. *Biogeosciences*, 1(1):11–32.
- Meysman, F. J. R., Middelburg, J. J., Herman, P. M. J., and Heip, C. H. R. (2003). Reactive transport in surface sediments. II. Media: an object-oriented problem-solving environment for early diagenesis. *Computers & Geosciences*, 29(3):301–318. 00067.
- 570 Middelburg, J. J., Soetaert, K., and Herman, P. M. (1997). Empirical relationships for use in global diagenetic models. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 44(2):327–344.
- Mort, H. P., Adatte, T., Föllmi, K. B., Keller, G., Steinmann, P., Matera, V., Berner, Z., and Stüben, D. (2007). Phosphorus and the roles of productivity and nutrient recycling during oceanic anoxic event 2. *Geology*, 35(6):483–486. 00135.
- 575 Munhoven, G. (2007). Glacial–interglacial rain ratio changes: Implications for atmospheric and ocean–sediment interaction. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 54(5–7):722–746.
- Najjar, R. G., Jin, X., Louanchi, F., Aumont, O., Caldeira, K., Doney, S. C., Dutay, J.-C., Follows, M., Gruber, N., Joos, F., Lindsay, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R. J., Matsumoto, K., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Orr, J. C., Plattner, G.-K., Sarmiento, J. L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R. D., Weirig, M.-F., Yamanaka, Y., and Yool, A. (2007). Impact of circulation on export production, dissolved organic matter, and dissolved oxygen in the ocean: Results from Phase II of the Ocean Carbon-cycle Model Intercomparison Project (OCMIP-2). *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 21(3):GB3007.
- 580 Ridgwell, A., Hargreaves, J. C., Edwards, N. R., Annan, J. D., Lenton, T. M., Marsh, R., Yool, A., and Watson, A. (2007). Marine geochemical data assimilation in an efficient Earth System Model of global biogeochemical cycling. *Biogeosciences*, 4(1):87–104. 00090.
- Shaffer, G., Malskær Olsen, S., and Pepke Pedersen, J. O. (2008). Presentation, calibration and validation of the low-order, DCESS Earth System Model (Version 1). *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 1(1):17–51. 00007.
- 590 Slomp, C., Malschaert, J., and Van Raaphorst, W. (1998). The role of adsorption in sediment-water exchange of phosphate in north sea continental margin sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 43(5):832–846.
- Slomp, C. P., Epping, E. H., Helder, W., and Van Raaphorst, W. (1996). A key role for iron-bound phosphorus in authigenic apatite formation in north atlantic continental platform sediments. *Journal of Marine Research*, 54(6):1179–1205.

- 595 Soetaert, K., Herman, P. M., and Middelburg, J. J. (1996a). Dynamic response of deep-sea sediments to seasonal variations: a model. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 41(8):1651–1668.
- Soetaert, K., Herman, P. M. J., and Middelburg, J. J. (1996b). A model of early diagenetic processes from the shelf to abyssal depths. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 60(6):1019–1040.
- Soetaert, K., Middelburg, J. J., Herman, P. M. J., and Buis, K. (2000). On the coupling of benthic and pelagic  
600 biogeochemical models. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 51(1–4):173–201.
- Stein, R., Rullkötter, J., and Welte, D. H. (1986). Accumulation of organic-carbon-rich sediments in the Late Jurassic and Cretaceous Atlantic Ocean — A synthesis. *Chemical Geology*, 56(1–2):1–32.
- Teal, L., Bulling, M., Parker, E., and Solan, M. (2010). Global patterns of bioturbation intensity and mixed depth of marine soft sediments. *Aquatic Biology*, 2(3):207–218.
- 605 Tromp, T. K., Van Cappellen, P., and Key, R. M. (1995). A global model for the early diagenesis of organic carbon and organic phosphorus in marine sediments. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 59(7):1259–1284. 00164.
- Tsandev, I. and Slomp, C. (2009). Modeling phosphorus cycling and carbon burial during Cretaceous Oceanic Anoxic Events. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 286(1–2):71–79. Cited by 0024.
- 610 Ullman, W. J. and Aller, R. C. (1982). Diffusion coefficients in nearshore marine sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 27(3):552–556.
- Van Cappellen, P. and Ingall, E. D. (1994). Benthic phosphorus regeneration, net primary production, and ocean anoxia: A model of the coupled marine biogeochemical cycles of carbon and phosphorus. *Paleoceanography*, 9(5):677–692.
- 615 Van Cappellen, P. and Wang, Y. (1995). Metal cycling in surface sediments: modeling the interplay of transport and reaction. *Metal contaminated aquatic sediments*, pages 21–64.