# **Supplemental material**

Sources and sinks of methane in sea ice: insights from stable isotopes

Caroline Jacques1\*, Célia J. Sapart1,2, François Fripiat1, Gauthier Carnat1, Jiayun Zhou1,3, Bruno Delille3, Thomas Röckmann2, Carina van der Veen2, Helge Niemann4,5,6, Tim Haskell7 and Jean-Louis Tison1

1 Laboratoire de Glaciologie, Université libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

2 Institute for Marine and Atmospheric research Utrecht (IMAU), Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

3 Unité d’Océanographie Chimique, Université de Liège, Liège, Belgium

4 Department of Marine Microbiology and Biogeochemistry, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), The Netherlands

5 Department of Earth Sciences, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

6 CAGE – Centre for Arctic Gas Hydrate, Environment and Climate, Department of Geosciences, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

7Callaghan Innovation, Wellington, new Zealand

\*corresponding author: Jean-Louis.Tison@ulb.be

Table S1. Summary of the sensitivity parameters tested with the one-box model, considering an initial CH4 concentration in bulk ice of 9.1 nM, characterized by a δ13C value of –68.5 ‰ and a δD value of –239 ‰.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **δ13C-CH4 MOg (‰ vs VPDB)** | **MOg rate/MOx rate** | **εC MOx** | **Figure** |
| –66 | 0.33 | 13 | Fig. S1 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 30 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| –40 | 0.33 | 13 | Fig. S2 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 30 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| **δ13C-CH4 S (‰ vs VPDB)** | **S rate/MOx rate** | **εC MOx** | **Figure** |
| –66 | 0.33 | 13 | Fig. S3 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 30 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| **δD-CH4 MOg (‰ vs VSMOW)** | **MOg rate/MOx rate** | **εD MOx** | **Figure** |
| –239 | 0.33 | 97 | Fig. S4 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 350 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| –100 | 0.33 | 97 | Fig. S5 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 350 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| **δD-CH4 S (‰ vs VSMOW)** | **S rate/MOx rate** | **εD MOx** | **Figure** |
| –250 | 0.33 | 97 | Fig. S6 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |
| 0.33 | 350 |
| 0.66 |
| 1 |




Figure S1. δ13C-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VPDB) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on the April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of in situ CH4 production with a δ13C value of 66 ‰, typical of methanogenesis (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εc = 13 (black) or εc = 30 (grey), with increasing microbial production-to-oxidation ratios (MOg/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).




Figure S2. δ13C-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VPDB) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of in situ CH4 production with an atypically high δ13C value of 40 ‰ (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εc = 13 (black) or εc = 30 (grey), with increasing microbial production-to-oxidation ratios (MOg/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).




Figure S3. δ13C-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VPDB) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of CH4 supply via bubbles or diffusive exchange from underlying seawater with a δ13C value of 66 ‰ (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εc = 13 (black) or εc = 30 (grey), with increasing supply-to-microbial oxidation ratios (S/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).




Figure S4. δ2H-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VSMOW) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of in situ CH4 production with a δ2H value of 239 ‰, typical of methanogenesis (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εH = 97 (black) or εH = 350 (grey), with increasing microbial production-to-oxidation ratios (MOg/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).




Figure S5. δ2H-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VSMOW) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of in situ CH4 production with an atypically high δ2H value of 100 ‰ (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εH = 97 (black) or εH = 350 (grey), with increasing microbial production-to-oxidation ratios (MOg/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).




Figure S6. δ2H-CH4 signatures (‰ vs VSMOW) as a function of ln(f) (where f is the remaining fraction of CH4 ice), measured in Barrow sea-ice cores collected on April 3 (blue), May 8 (orange) and June 5 (red). We tested the impact of CH4 supply via bubbles or diffusive exchange from underlying seawater with a δ2H value of 250 ‰ (dotted lines), on the trend imposed by microbial oxidation (solid lines) with an isotopic fractionation εH = 97 (black) or εH = 350 (grey), with increasing supply-to-microbial oxidation ratios (S/MOx) from the left to the right panel (1/3, 2/3 and 1, respectively).