Version of Record: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771419302343> Manuscript\_11bc34b67d1b2dd17f33d2db07f6b543

# <sup>1</sup> The ebb and flow of protons: A novel approach for

# <sup>2</sup>the assessment of estuarine and coastal acidification

*D.T. Pettay\*†‡, S.F. Gonski§,¶, W.J. Cai§ , C.K. Sommerfield† , W.J. Ullman†* 3

<sup>†</sup> 5chool of Marine Science and Policy, University of Delaware, Lewes, DE, USA

5 ‡Department of Natural Sciences, University of South Carolina Beaufort, Beaufort, SC USA

6 §Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA, USA

<sup>§</sup> 7 <sup>§</sup> School of Marine Science and Policy, University of Delaware Newark, DE, USA

## 8 **ABSTRACT:**

The acidification of coastal waters is a consequence of both natural (e.g., aerobic respiration) and anthropogenic (e.g., combustion of fossil fuels, eutrophication) processes and can negatively impact the surrounding ecosystems. Until recently it was difficult to accurately measure 12 estuarine pH, and thus total proton concentrations ( $[H_T^+]$ ), when salinities vary significantly and rapidly as a consequence of tidal mixing. Proton production and transport are ultimately responsible for acidification in coastal environments, and the uncertainty surrounding proton concentrations measured at high frequency has hindered our understanding of the net impact of global and local processes on estuarine acidification. Here, we quantify the rate of proton exchange between an estuary and bay to assess the extent of acidification by using the novel 18 combination of high frequency  $pH_T$  (total hydrogen ion concentration scale) data from an 19 autonomous SeapHOx<sup>TM</sup> sensor and continuous tidal discharge measurements made between the eutrophic Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay. Proton fluxes reverse with each tide. However,



- *Keywords:* Coastal acidification, Proton concentrations, Fluxes, pH, Continuous monitoring,
- Delaware Bay, Murderkill River

#### **1. INTRODUCTION:**

Acidification of natural waters represents a net increase in hydrogen ion concentration  $(1H<sup>+</sup>)$  or "protons") that is dependent on changes in the magnitude of proton-producing and -consuming processes (Hoffman *et al.* 2009). Open-ocean acidification, due primarily to the 33 dissolution of atmospheric  $CO_2$  into seawater to produce carbonic acid (H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>), progresses at relatively the same rate around the world (-0.001-0.002 pH units/year), while the rates in estuaries and the coastal ocean are consistently estimated to be an order of magnitude higher (Provost *et al.* 2010, Duarte *et al.* 2013, Carstensen and Duarte 2019). In estuarine and coastal waters CO2 dissolution combines with local eutrophication and the aerobic respiration of 38 allochthonous and autochthonous organic matter to enhance acidification (Sunda  $\&$  Cai 2012, Wallace *et al.* 2014). As the delivery of nutrients and organic carbon to estuaries and coastal waters increase, higher rates of local acidification are anticipated (Feely *et al.* 2010, Cai *et al.* 2011, Wallace *et al.* 2014). Conversely, biological processes like primary production and mineral dissolution moderate acidification by consuming CO2 (Borges & Gypens 2010; Aufdenkampe *et al.* 2011, Duarte *et al.* 2013). Due to the large number of competing acid-consuming and - producing processes and environmental proton sources and sinks, it is challenging to determine the net rates of all of processes that contribute to and mitigate the acidification of any particular water body (Hofmann *et al.* 2010 and the references therein).

Proton cycling is the sum of all proton-consuming and -producing processes within a body of water. In an estuary this cycling is influenced by a number of hydrophysical and 49 hydrochemical processes. In general, proton concentrations are elevated (lower pH;  $pH = log[H_T^+]$  in the upper watershed and around marshes due to freshwater inputs, respiration and nitrification. These elevated concentrations flow downstream on the ebb tide and into the

52 nearshore coastal waters where protons are consumed by primary production and  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  degassing and, together with dilution and carbonate buffering, cause proton concentrations in the waters of the returning flood tide to decline (pH increases; Cai *et al.* 2000, Wang & Cai 2004, Hofmann *et al.* 2009).

The imbalance between proton sources and sinks explicitly leads to long-term changes in acidity and is highly variable among coastal systems. This fact is leading to a transition away from a pH-dependent examination of estuarine and ocean acidification, and towards the inclusion and analyses of proton concentrations (Hofmann *et al.* 2010, Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). Therefore, the determination of proton production, consumption, and transport is needed to assess: (1) whether a particular water body will become acidified; (2) the rate and extent of acid production and consumption within the water body; and (3) the rates and direction of proton exchange between adjacent and connected water bodies. Measured proton fluxes can help address this need by quantifying the rates of proton cycling and acidification within coastal waters. Changes in carbonate chemistry (dissolved inorganic carbon; DIC and total alkalinity; TA) are commonly used to calculate pH and to determine the rates of biogeochemical processes leading to the acidification of natural waters, however, this approach is time consuming, tedious, and rarely capable of producing pH measurements over the temporal and spatial scales that approximate the inherent variability of physically and biogeochemically dynamic coastal waters (see Section 3.1 for further discussion; Hofmann *et al.* 2008, Hofmann *et al.* 2010). Recent advances in pH sensor technology bridge this gap and now provide the opportunity to calculate the flux of protons between water bodies, an innovative approach to assess acidification.

To date, we are aware of only one estuarine system for which the notion of proton cycling has been considered, the Scheldt Estuary, where the net consumption of protons 76 (modeled at 20 kmol  $y^{-1}$  for the whole estuary) has already resulted in a gradual increase in estuarine surface pH over time (Borges & Gypens 2010, Hofmann *et al.* 2009). While proton fluxes have been discussed in coral reef systems and analyzed on a global scale relative to changes in *p*CO2 (e.g., Jokiel 2016, Fassbender *et al*. 2017), similar quantification of net proton fluxes within and between estuarine water bodies, as was done in the Scheldt, is not available. However, quantification of these fluxes can help determine the ultimate impact of acidification on ecosystems and ecological processes, and to develop practical and scalable mitigation strategies for acidification-dependent environmental degradation. Here we report measured proton concentrations and calculated fluxes within a dynamic estuarine environment (the confluence of eutrophic Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay, Delaware, USA; Fig. 1). Instantaneous fluxes were determined for the biologically productive Spring and Summer 87 months in 2016, using high frequency pH data from a SeapHOx  $^{TM}$  sensor and discharge measurements at a US Geological Survey (USGS) gaging station. Agricultural runoff and discharge from a wastewater treatment plant significantly influence estuarine water quality within the Murderkill Estuary. As a consequence of these inputs, (1) nutrient concentrations are elevated in the upper Murderkill Estuary; (2) the estuary experiences hypoxia during the summer months; and (3) nitrogen and phosphorus burial rates in the adjacent marsh sediments have increased two-fold since the mid-1970s (Velinsky *et al.* 2010). As such, this eutrophic estuary makes an ideal case study to quantify the influence of proton cycling and exchange on the coastal ocean.

#### **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

#### *2.1 Site Description*

The Murderkill Watershed and Estuary are located in southeastern Kent County, 100 Delaware (Fig 1). The 342 km<sup>2</sup> watershed is predominantly agricultural (56%), with lower fractions of urban (16%), forested (11%), and wetlands (including forested wetlands, 17%) land-uses (Ullman *et al.* 2013). The watershed has well-drained soils, consistent with its coastal plain setting (Andres 2004). Most of the rural development in the watershed disposes of its wastewater through domestic septic and small community systems (DNREC 2006). However, the Kent County Regional Resource Recovery Facility (KCRRRF) that discharges to the upper Murderkill Estuary treats wastewater originating from both within and outside the watershed, including the nearby urban centers of Dover, Smyrna, and Milford, Delaware (Fig. 1). Discharge from the KCRRRF increases the effective anthropogenic pressure on the Estuary and its downstream waters. The Murderkill Estuary has an average width of 50 m and an average channel depth of 4.5 m, and discharges to Delaware Bay at Bowers, Delaware, approximately 39 km upstream of the Delaware Bay mouth, where it supports high and persistent levels of primary production in the Bay margins during the summer months (Wong *et al.* 2009, Voynova *et al.* 2015). The 113 Delaware Bay drains a 36,570 km<sup>2</sup> watershed that encompasses parts of Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York State with the tidal portion extending 215 km into New Jersey and Pennsylvania (Voynova *et al.* 2015). The width of the Bay increases from about 18 km at the mouth to about 44 km upstream and has a mean depth of 6 m (Sharp *et al.* 2009, Wong *et al.* 2009). The Delaware and the Schuylkill Rivers provide more than 70% of the freshwater flow into the Bay, but numerous small tributaries, including the Murderkill River, discharge along the margins of the bay and contribute significant nutrient loads into the Bay (Voynova and Sharp

2012, Voynova *et al.* 2015). Discharge through the River/Bay is typically higher in the Spring 121 than the summer, however, in 2016 the Spring was drier than the Summer by ~30 mm in precipitation for the Murderkill Estuary (data from Kitts Hummock National Estuarine Research 123 Reserve (NERR) station <nerrsdata.org/get/realTime.cfm?stationCode 1/4 DELSJMET>; approximately 5 km northwest of Bowers). Temperature, salinity and pH are temporally and tidally variable in both the Murderkill River and the Delaware Bay, with ranges for the River/Bay system of ~0 - 33°C, 3 - 30 g/kg and 6.5 - 8.3, respectively (Ullman *et al.* 2013, Voynova *et al.* 2015, Gonski *et al.* 2018).

*2.2 Instrumentation*

129 The SeapHOx sensor package is integrated with sensors for temperature, salinity (Sea-Bird Electronics Conductivity-Temperature Sensor – SBE37), pH (Honeywell Durafet), and oxygen (Aanderaa Data Instruments 4835 Optode) deploying in sequence as water is pumped through the sensor flow path by a Sea-Bird Electronics 5M submersible pump (Bresnahan *et al.*, 2014). The SeapHOx was deployed at the confluence of the Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay where it sampled waters discharging from the Estuary to the Bay on falling tides and waters recharging the Estuary from the Bay on rising tides. The SeapHOx was deployed adjacent to the main tidal channel of the Estuary at approximately 1 m above the estuarine floor and 3 m below mean high tide. During the Spring (12 May to 09 June) and Summer (20 July to 24 August) 2016 138 the sensor measured pH<sub>T</sub>, temperature, and salinity every 30 minutes. Due to sedimentation and biofouling, the instrument was cleaned and serviced at intervals of 1-2 weeks and data were not collected during the servicing periods when the instrument was out of the water (described by

Gonski *et al.* 2018). The US Geological Survey operates a tidal gauging station at this site



**Fig. 1.** Map of the Murderkill Watershed and sensor location. Location of the Murderkill

Watershed in the Mid-Atlantic and state of Delaware (A, inset). The Murderkill Watershed

(grey) and the USGS gauging station (DE01484085) in Bowers, Delaware (triangle) at the

confluence of the Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay (B). An autonomous pH sensor was co-

located at the USGS gauging station during the Spring and Summer of 2016.

(USGS 01484085), in cooperation with the Delaware Geological Survey and the State of Delaware. Consistent with the USGS convention, positive discharges and fluxes are directed downstream. Co-located with these instruments was a Seabird Scientific Land Ocean Biogeochemical Observatory that provides additional biogeochemical data (not reported here) for both the Murderkill Estuary and from Delaware Bay depending on the direction of tidal flows (Voynova *et al.*, 2015).

*2.3 SeapHOx Calibration* 

The Honeywell Durafet and its integrated reference electrodes, built into the SeapHOx 157 sensor, calculate and report a pair of pH values on the total scale  $\rm (pH_T): pH^{INT}$  (internal reference, Ag/AgCl reference electrode containing a 4.5 KCl gel liquid junction, FET|INT) and 159 pH<sup>EXT</sup> (external reference, solid-state chloride ion-selective electrode, Cl-ISE, FET|EXT). The SeapHOx was calibrated using an *in situ* or field calibration procedure where discrete bottle samples were collected in the field for laboratory analysis of DIC and TA alongside simultaneous SeapHOx sensor measurements. Duplicate bottle samples were collected for DIC and TA analysis in triple-rinsed 250-mL borosilicate glass bottles by bottom-filling and overflowing following filtration through Whatman 0.45 mm Polyethersulfone (PES) filters (GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences, Pittsburgh, PA, USA). The calibration samples were fixed with 100 μL 166 of saturated mercuric chloride (HgCl<sub>2</sub>), securely closed, and stored on ice and in the dark at  $\sim$ 4 $\degree$ C until returned to the laboratory for analysis (Cai and Wang 1998; Huang *et al*. 2012). Calibration 168 samples for the Spring ( $N = 21$ ) and Summer ( $N = 24$ ) pH time-series were collected every 30 minutes on 01 June 2016 and 02 August 2016, respectively, over full tidal cycles to capture the entire salinity range observed on those days (Gonski *et al.* 2018). DIC was determined in the laboratory, as CO2 gas, using a non-dispersive infrared gas analyzer (AS-C3 Apollo SciTech)

following sample acidification. TA was determined by Gran Titration (Gran 1950, 1952) using a semi-automated open-cell titration system (AS-ALK2 Apollo SciTech) (Cai *et al.* 2010; Huang *et al.* 2012; Wang and Cai, 2004). Both instruments were calibrated using certified reference materials (CRMs), provided by A.G. Dickson (Scripps Institution of Oceanography), yielding 176 results with a precision of  $\pm 2.2$  µmol kg<sup>-1</sup>. A set of reference pH measurements for the calibration samples was calculated on the total scale from measured DIC and TA at *in situ* temperature, salinity, and pressure using the inorganic carbon dissociation constants of Millero *et al.* (2006), the bisulfate ion acidity constant of Dickson (1990), and the boron-to-chlorinity ratio of Lee *et al.* (2010) using the Excel macro CO2SYS (Pierrot *et al.* 2006). The sensor data was 181 then recalibrated to minimize the anomaly between the sensor  $pH_T$  and reference  $pH_T$ determined from the calibration samples by setting the calibration constants specific to each reference electrode to average values based on all valid calibration samples (Bresnahan *et al.* 2014).

Using this rigorous calibration scheme, the sensor pH had root-mean-square errors of 186 0.0275 and 0.0159 pH units for the Spring and Summer periods, respectively, relative to  $\rm{pH}_{T}$ 187 calculated from measured DIC and TA (Gonski *et al.* 2018). The  $pH_T$  and salinity of calibration samples on 1 June 2016 ranged between 7.1 and 8.3 and 8.99 and 22.31, respectively. On 2 189 August 2016,  $pH_T$  and salinity of calibration samples ranged between 7.0 and 7.9 and 21.07 and  $\,$  27.06, respectively. In the present work, the pH<sup>INT</sup> time-series was used for both time periods as pH measured with the internal reference electrode and calibrated using an *in situ* multi-point calibration approach, which provides a more robust measurement over a wide range of time-varying salinities in nearshore estuarine environments (Gonski *et al.* 2018; Miller *et al.* 2018).

For a more thorough discussion of the sampling approach and sensor calibration, the reader is referred to Gonski *et al.* (2018).

No corrections were made for possible "excess" (non-carbonate) alkalinity in the calibration samples. This contribution to alkalinity is not likely to exceed 1-2% of the total alkalinity and therefore should have no significant impact on the SeapHOx calibration (Gonski *et al.* 2018). The present pH data closely approximates the precision recommended by the Global Ocean Acidification Observing Network (GOA-ON) for weather-level pH measurement precision (Newton *et al.*, 2015), and, as such, are sufficient for resolving the directions and magnitudes of proton fluxes between the Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay.

*2.4 Time Series Analysis* 

204 Prior to flux calculations, the half-hourly measured continuous  $pH_T$  data was interpolated linearly to match the six-minute interval of the discharge measurements. Instantaneous proton concentrations on the total hydrogen ion concentration scale were calculated from the measured 207 values of  $pH_T$  and the definition of  $pH_T$ :

208  $[H_T^+] = 10^{\circ}(-pH_T)$ 

The non-tidal component was separated from the instantaneous time series for discharge 210 and  $[H_T^+]$  using a 40-hour low-pass Butterworth filter (Ganju *et al.* 2005, Dzwonkowski et al. 2014). Filtering was performed in R using the 'signal' package (Ligges *et al.* 2013) with a 212 double-pass filter and  $n=3$  (i.e.,  $3<sup>rd</sup>$  order), removing all variation due to tidal harmonics. The 213 filtered non-tidal discharge and  $[H_T^+]$  were used to calculate net non-tidal fluxes for each sampling period. The instantaneous data for salinity was also linearly interpolated and filtered as described above to calculate a salt flux for each period. Salinity represents a conservative

constituent and was used to validate the flux calculations. For the purposes of calculating fluxes, 217 salinity was considered to be in units of  $g \text{ kg}^{-1}$ .

*2.5 Subsampling of Protons* 

High frequency, continuous monitoring reveals patterns in biogeochemical processes that may be missed using less frequent, single time point sampling typical of historical sampling strategies. To further demonstrate this point we randomly subsampled interpolated proton concentrations from the Spring and compared the distribution of the means of these subsamplings to that of the overall mean. Four hypothetical "sampling" strategies were developed and consisted of random pH measurements taken during three-hour windows (similar to recommended by Skeffington *et al.* 2015) either in the morning (9:00 to 11:00) or afternoon (14:00 to 16:00) and sampled every other day starting either on day 1 or day 2 of the Spring 227 dataset. These four subsamplings were therefore named  $day1AM$  or  $day1PM$ , and  $day2AM$  or day2PM. A proton concentration was randomly drawn in the morning or afternoon on every 229 other day and a mean was computed from all of these single daily measurements. Each subsampling was repeated 10,000 times and the frequency distributions of the means were 231 plotted against each other and the overall mean for the Spring 2016.

## *2.6 Flux Calculations*

233 Advective fluxes of dissolved material  $C(J_C)$  can be calculated as the product of 234 concentration (C, mass/m<sup>3</sup>) and discharge (Q, m<sup>3</sup>/time) for any period for which instantaneous or integrated C and Q are both available or can be estimated:

$$
J_c = (C \times Q)
$$

The instantaneous density of seawater, determined using salinity and temperature, was used to 238 . convert kg to  $m^3$ . In this study, net non-tidal fluxes of proton and salt concentrations were calculated using the low-pass filtered data for both C and Q. The mean and standard error of the fluxes (Table 1) were calculated for seasonal discharge measurements and flux calculations.

**3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:** 

#### *3.1 Measuring protons in dynamic saline environments: Why now?*

Previous work has criticized the strong focus on alkalinity changes when characterizing the acid-base chemistry of natural waters (Hofmann *et al.* 2010), while others have further discussed the limitations of using pH to assess acidification, showing proton concentrations to be a more robust indicator (Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). Changes in observed 247 pH actually reflect proton consumption and production by numerous biogeochemical processes, and only indirectly involve alkalinity reactions (Hofmann *et al.* 2010). These processes are seasonal in nature and geographically variable, and using pH to quantify acidification captures 250 only a small portion of this variability when compared to  $[H_T^+]$  (Fassbender *et al.* 2017, Fassbender *et al*. 2018a & b, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). In fact, across most latitudes seasonal pH variability is projected to decrease in the future, while proton variability is predicted to significantly increase (Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). The differences between these two seemly identical measurements are due to the logarithmic nature of the pH scale and the complexity of the carbonate buffering in salt water. These modeling efforts are extremely informative on a global and regional scale, however, they do not explicitly account for or document the high frequency temporal variations that occur within individual coastal systems 258 (Fig. 2). As such, there is a strong need for high frequency, long-term measurements of  $[H_T^+]$ across distinct coastal and estuarine systems to better understand shorter-term variability and

seasonal differences so that this information can be incorporated into predictive models (Fassbender *et al*. 2018).

Cation interferences on the performance of *in situ* glass electrodes, together with their slow response time, previously made continuous measurements of pH in estuaries with rapidly varying salinity highly uncertain. This traditional methodology of using glass electrode potentiometry to yield proton activities is subject to unpredictable and irreproducible liquid junction errors in brackish and saline waters (Bates 1973, Butler *et al.* 1985, Easley & Byrne 2012, Whitfield *et al.* 1985), often making the conversion of proton activity to proton concentration imprecise (Dickson 1984). Accordingly, glass electrode potentiometry is no longer the preferred methodology in contemporary studies of pH in marine and estuarine waters, unless used with alternative methods of calibration (Easley & Byrne 2012; Wootton & Pfister 2012; Martz *et al*. 2015; Gonski *et al.* 2018). In seawater, the determination of proton concentrations 272 on the total hydrogen ion concentration scale  $\rm (pH_T)$  is now preferred (Dickson 1984, 1993).

To overcome the above analytical issues, several autonomous biogeochemical sensors built around a proton-sensitive Ion-Selective Field-Effect Transistor (ISFET) were developed to 275 yield more rapid, precise, accurate, and reproducible  $pH_T$  measurements in natural waters, including seawater (Bresnahan *et al.* 2014; Martz *et al.* 2010). When used with appropriate calibration procedures, these ISFETs are subject to substantially less interference from seawater cations, have smaller "memory" effects, improved long-term stability and responds more rapidly than the glass electrode to changes in ambient proton concentrations in estuarine and marine settings (Martz *et al.* 2010, Bresnahan *et al.* 2014, Takeshita *et al.* 2014, Gonski *et al.* 2018). Using this recent advance in pH sensor technology, together with appropriate sensor deployment 282 and calibration procedures (Bresnahan *et al.* 2014, Gonski *et al.* 2018, Miller *et al.* 2018), [H<sup>+</sup>]





**Fig. 2.** A conceptualization of short-term variability in proton concentrations due to tidal forcing based on data collected in Spring 2016. Proton concentrations (black) for both neap (a) and spring (b) tides. Salinity (grey) is plotted as a surrogate for tidal stage, where salinity maxima occur during flood tides and minima occur during slack ebb tides. Colored points (a & b) are examples of randomly sampled time points for day1AM and day2PM only (see Methods for description of subsampling). These points demonstrate real variability missed when sampling at lower frequencies and how different sampling strategies can lead to differing values of mean proton concentration. Frequency distributions of mean proton concentrations based on four subsampling schemes (c); day1AM (purple), day1PM (light purple), day2AM (light orange), day2PM (orange), and the overall mean for Spring 2016 (dashed line). Day1PM and day2AM distributions overlap each other and the overall mean for the Spring.

296 (nmol kg<sup>-1</sup>) and fluxes (mmol  $h^{-1}$ ) within and between physically dynamic estuarine and marine environments can now be reliably determined with high temporal resolution and in the same manner as the fluxes of other dissolved constituents (for an illustrated demonstration of flux calculation see Fig. 3).

The combination of tidal forcing and biogeochemical processes with respect to sampling 301 date and time can both influence measured  $[H_T^+]$  and our understanding of proton dynamics (Hofmann *et al.* 2009, Ullman *et al.* 2013). A conceptualization of the short-term variability in  $[H_T^+]$  due to tidal forcing and its influence on conclusions drawn from lower frequency sampling is shown in Fig. 2. Proton concentrations from the Spring dataset were randomly sampled, means computed and the frequency distribution of 10,000 iterations plotted against the overall mean for the Spring (see Methods). An example of this random sampling shows that the extent to which 307 [H<sup>+</sup>] variability due to tidal forcing is missed with less frequent samplings (Fig. 2a & b, orange and purple points). The frequency distributions show, even in this simple example, that sampling 309 strategy can significantly affect the mean of measured  $[H_T^+]$  and highlight the need for high frequency monitoring to truly understand acidification in these dynamic systems (Fig. 2c). Similar and more in-depth comparisons of the sample frequency for water quality monitoring show similar patterns (Skeffington *et al.* 2015, Gonski *et al.* 2018, Chappell *et al.* 2017, Miller *et al.* 2018). However, our subsampling does show that prior knowledge of the high frequency 314 dynamics of  $[H_T^+]$  over time might allow for a lower frequency sampling strategy that approximates the means obtained from higher frequency monitoring (Fig. 2c).



**Fig. 3.** Illustration of flux calculations using the product of discharge (Q, red) and proton 318 concentration ( $[H_T^+]$ , blue) to determine instantaneous proton fluxes ( $H^+$  Flux, purple). Positive values for discharge and flux indicate downstream flow, with negative values indicating upstream flow. Note that this illustration depicts an unfiltered flux to demonstrate the influence of tidal harmonics. The seasonal fluxes reported in this paper are filtered to remove these

influences.

#### *3.2 Proton Fluxes through the Murderkill*

Mean non-tidal proton fluxes were calculated for the two seasonal periods using time series of low-pass filtered, instantaneous proton concentration and discharge measured at the mouth of the Murderkill River. We use the term "non-tidal" because filtering removes the influence of tidal variability and represents the net flux of protons upstream or downstream (see 328 Methods). Instantaneous non-tidal proton fluxes ranged from  $-0.71$  to 1.4 mmol  $h^{-1}$  in the Spring, 329 and from -0.57 to 0.6 mmol h<sup>-1</sup> in the Summer (Figs. 4  $\&$  5), where positive flow is downstream. As a result, the Estuary's average upstream proton flux decreased by over 7-fold from the Spring  $(-9.6 \pm 5.5 \text{ mmol h}^{-1})$  to the Summer  $(-1.3 \pm 2.8 \text{ mmol h}^{-1})$ ; Table 1). A portion of this seasonal decrease is likely related to changes in non-tidal discharge during a drier Spring 2016 (total precipitation to the Murderkill was ~30 mm lower, data not shown), leading to less freshwater and proton input into the Estuary and a larger upstream discharge due to tidal forcing (Table 1). In addition to discharge, changes in the magnitude of proton-producing processes like respiration 336 and nitrification, and proton-consuming processes like primary production and  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  degassing will also influence proton cycling and the flux of protons (Cai *et al.* 2000, Wang & Cai 2004, Hofmann *et al.* 2009).

The proton fluxes calculated here correspond surprisingly well with those modeled by Hofmann *et al.* for the Scheldt Estuary (2009). Although the Scheldt is much larger than the Murderkill Estuary and differs in its history and magnitude of human impacts, both systems are temperate, coastal plain estuaries that are turbid and nutrient-rich, and contain extensive salt marshes and mudflats (De Vriend et al. 2001, Ullman *et al.* 2013). While Hofmann and colleagues modeled *in situ* proton production and consumption, as opposed to the proton fluxes,







discharge, (d) proton concentrations and (e) proton fluxes. Both the original data (grey line in c

348 & d) and the non-tidal components (black line in c & d) of the original data, filtered using a low-

pass Butterworth filter, are shown for discharge and protons. Proton fluxes were calculated from the non-tidal component of discharge and protons. Positive discharges and fluxes are directed

- -



**Fig. 5.** Raw and filtered time series data between the Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay at



discharge, (d) proton concentrations and (e) proton fluxes. Both the original data (grey line in c

355 & d) and the non-tidal components (black line in c & d) of the original data, filtered using a low-

pass Butterworth filter, are shown for discharge and protons. Proton fluxes were calculated from

- the non-tidal component of discharge and protons. Positive discharges and fluxes are directed
- 

the results are comparable. Summing the yearly consumption/production rates across their 360 modeled boxes yields a net consumption of protons (increase in  $pH_T$ ) that ranged from -0.03 361 kmol yr<sup>-1</sup> ~100km upstream to -0.40 kmol yr<sup>-1</sup> at the mouth. Extrapolating our hourly fluxes to 362 vearly gives a range of  $-0.08$  kmol yr<sup>-1</sup> to  $-0.01$  kmol yr<sup>-1</sup> using 12 months of either Spring or Summer rates, respectively. This annual flux is only an order of magnitude lower than that calculated for the mouth of the Scheldt Estuary, despite the Murderkill watershed being approximately two orders of magnitude smaller. Additional analyses over an entire year are clearly needed to provide a true annual flux for the Murderkill Estuary; however, it is encouraging that our calculated fluxes align with modeled values for another eutrophic, coastal plain estuary.

Our flux calculations demonstrate that the Murderkill Estuary transports protons downstream and contributes to the acidification of Delaware Bay, but only for short periods of time (hours to days). Over longer periods, the Estuary acts as a sink for protons coming from the Bay and coastal ocean, likely driven by alkalinity generated during anaerobic respiration in 373 marsh sediments (Ullman *et al.* 2013, Wang & Cai 2004). The Murderkill Estuary discharges ~ 39 km upstream of the Bay's mouth and lies within a region where pH is highest for the Bay (Joesoef *et al.* 2017). Nutrient transport down the Murderkill stimulates phytoplankton productivity in the Bay (Voynova *et al.* 2015), thus reducing DIC and elevating pH. Other rivers discharge within this region too (including the St. Jones, Mispillion Rivers and Cedar Creek in Delaware and the Maurice River in New Jersey), and may all contribute to the observed spike in pH. Similar to proton flux, the pH within the Bay shows seasonal variation related to meteorological events and biogeochemical processes within the watershed (Joesoef *et al.* 2017). 381 If freshwater discharge has the largest impact on the long-term trend of  $[H_T^+]$  in the Murderkill

**Table 1:** Summary of mean Spring and Summer fluxes from the Murderkill Estuary to Delaware Bay in 2016 (± standard error).



383 \* Positive fluxes are directed downstream towards the Bay.

(e.g., Hofmann *et al.* 2009), it will be interesting to see how proton fluxes change over the course of a year and if the Estuary is truly a net sink for protons. These analyses will reveal the buffering effect of the Murderkill Estuary, along with other nearby estuaries, on Delaware Bay and the coastal ocean.

#### *3.3 Tidal and Seasonal Changes in Proton Concentrations*

Daily and seasonal variations in the pH of estuaries, bays and coastal oceans have been fairly well documented (e.g., Wang & Cai 2004, Hofmann *et al.* 2011, Kline *et al.* 2015, Rivest & Gouhier 2015, Takeshita *et al.* 2015, Wang *et al.* 2016), including the Delaware Bay (Joesoef *et al.* 2017, Gonski *et al.* 2018). Proton concentrations at the mouth of the Murderkill River tracks tidal advection and, therefore, is inversely related to tidal cycle and salinity (Fig. 2a & b). 394 The lowest  $[H_T^+]$  (highest  $pH_T$ ) occur during flood tides when saline Delaware Bay water flows 395 into the lower Murderkill Estuary. As the tide ebbs,  $[H_T^+]$  increases (pH<sub>T</sub> decreases) and reaches a maximum during the slack-low tide. In contrast to the flood tide, which produces a prolonged 397 minimum in  $[H_T^+]$ , concentrations peak for only a short period of time (typically less than an hour) at slack ebb tide.

Respiration (a proton source) and primary production (a proton sink) are tidally coupled between the Murderkill Estuary and Delaware Bay, and contribute to the patterns described above (Voynova *et al.* 2015). Nutrients and DIC are transferred downstream and fuel primary productivity, the products of which (reactive organic matter) are subsequently transferred back upstream and fuel respiration (Wang & Cai 2004, Voynova *et al.* 2015). Therefore, lower salinity waters discharging from the Murderkill Watershed (and to a lesser extent the wastewater 405 treatment plant) are characterized by higher turbidity, undersaturated levels of dissolved  $O_2$  and elevated DIC associated with net respiration and the production of protons (Ullman *et al.* 2013,

407 Voynova *et al.* 2015). In contrast, higher salinity waters have elevated chlorophyll and O<sub>2</sub> concentrations (often supersaturated) associated with net primary production and the consumption of protons, typically occurring at the mouth of the Estuary and the margins of the 410 Bay (Voynova *et al.* 2015). In other salt marsh ecosystems, additional processes like CO<sub>2</sub> degassing and nitrification also play a large role in proton cycling, but the rates of these processes remain uncharacterized in this system (Jiang *et al.* 2008, Hofmann *et al.* 2009).

The respiration of organic matter produces both TA and DIC, and directly impacts the buffering capacity of natural waters (Wang & Cai 2004). As DIC approaches equality with TA, buffering is reduced and waters are more susceptible to large changes in pH (Cai *et al*. 2001). 416 While mean  $[H_T^+]$  were similar in the Spring (24.6 nmol kg<sup>-1</sup>  $\pm$  0.2 S.E.) and Summer (22.8 nmol  $\text{kg}^{-1} \pm 0.2 \text{ S.E.}$ ), a sampling of TA and DIC over a Spring and Summer tidal cycle shows the processes controlling proton cycling differ between the seasons (Fig. 6). The elevated concentrations of TA and DIC during the Summer ebb tide, relative to the Spring, are consistent with the export of both constituents from the surrounding salt marshes due to the respiration of accumulated organic matter. Salt marshes surrounding the lower Murderkill are a sink for organic matter and, as such, these marshes contribute both TA and DIC to the Estuary that vary seasonally and affect the waters' buffering capacity (Wang & Cai 2004, Sharp 2011, Ullman *et al.* 2013, Wang *et al.* 2016). The reactive organic matter that likely drives proton production and cycling in the Murderkill River is a mixture of marine and freshwater (upper watershed cyanobacterial blooms) phytoplankton, vascular plant detritus, and suspended sedimentary particles (Ullman *et al.* 2013, Andres *et al.* 2019). Variations in these sources over time 428 ultimately influence net watershed respiration, and thus  $[H_T^+]$ , beyond that of non-tidal mean





respect to salinity (grey) for a Spring (a, b) and Summer (c, d) sampling of a full tidal cycle.

432 Discreet samples were taken half-hour for DIC and TA, while salinity and  $[H_T^+]$  were measured

by the SeapHOx sensor at the same interval.

discharge alone (Voynova *et al.* 2015). More research is underway to better understand the magnitude of organic matter respiration, along with other biogeochemical processes and meteorological phenomenon, on proton production and transport within the Murderkill Estuary.

*3.4 Strengths and Limitations of the Proton Flux Method* 

The proton flux method is not mutually exclusive of other, more established methods for characterizing the acidification of estuaries and coastal waters. But rather, is another tool in the toolbox to disentangle the complexities of acidification that include processes like the absorption of anthropogenic carbon, net community production and calcification, and air-sea gas exchange, among numerous other factors. The present methodology provides a novel way of using physical forcing (discharge) to scale down from regional to local influences (and vice versa), assess the magnitude of proton dynamics in smaller systems and resolve how these dynamics may buffer or further acidify larger systems. The present case study clearly demonstrates that further acidification or buffering can occur as a result of inter-system interactions and exchange within the freshwater-influenced Delaware Bay-Murderkill Estuary system; dynamics that existing methods for the study and modeling of estuarine and coastal ocean acidification may fail to accurately estimate or include (Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). Models are only as good as the data that feeds them. If the models only capture constant and idealized variability in tidal signals and exchange, then past approaches to the study of coastal and estuarine acidification may result in substantial and/or disproportionate error in extrapolating from present to future acidification trends and dynamics.

The proton flux method ultimately captures and integrates the real, *in situ* variability representative of estuarine processes. In addition to the astronomical variability in tidal cycles over time (e.g., neap vs. spring tides), the balance between freshwater discharge and tidal forcing

changes over time. The proton flux method allows researchers to integrate natural, asymmetric variability into their methods and analyses. This variability affects the carbonate system by altering rates of dilution and buffering capacity. Variability also influences calculated metrics like the Revell Factor which describes the dynamic ability of the global oceans to absorb 462 atmospheric  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and remains a key characteristic for estimating acidification based on the oceanic uptake of anthropogenic carbon (Carter *et al*. 2019, Egleston *et al*. 2010). The method as shown here incorporates both high temporal variability and, indirectly, spatial variability by sampling the waters from two different end-members over the course of a tidal cycle. The proton flux method provides advantages over other approaches, but it is not without its limitations. The method reveals the net result of proton cycling and the upstream or downstream proton sources and sinks, but it does not identify the specific processes (e.g., primary production or anaerobic respiration) that produce and consume protons. Additional sampling of other parameters is needed to define and quantify the rates of these component 471 processes. Similarly, there is still a need to calibrate the pH sensors by measuring marine  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ system parameters (DIC and TA in this study) in the field, so the method is not exclusive of other methods that examine acidification. Discharge measurements are also needed, which may limit the use of this method in some locations. The mouth of the Murderkill Estuary is a well-mixed system, so the data presented here represents the entire water column. Using the proton flux method in stratified water columns would require additional resources, but is still feasible. For example, additional monitoring that included depth profiling or the use of multiple sensors could account for differential proton cycling occurring in the various, vertically stratified water masses.

#### **4. Conclusions and the Future of Proton Fluxes**

482 The present work demonstrates the tidal and non-tidal dynamics of  $[H_T^+]$  in an estuarine ecosystem. Using continuous, high frequency monitoring to track proton concentrations, together with discharge measurements, we can now precisely quantify the upstream and downstream fluxes of protons and the net direction of coastal acidification (i.e., sources vs. sinks). The Murderkill Estuary was used as a case study to demonstrate this novel way of characterizing acidification of coastal waters, and show temporal changes, from minutes to months, in the magnitude and direction of acidification. Together, a complementary approach that combines proton modeling and advanced time series analyses with measured concentrations using high-frequency autonomous sensors as model inputs and validation can provide a powerful technique to resolve current estuarine acidification mechanisms and trends (Hofmann *et al*. 2009, Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Feely *et al*. 2018, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018, Miller *et al*. 2018, Pacella *et al*. 2018). With the appropriate sensors, similar monitoring and analyses can be performed in any free-flowing freshwater, estuarine or marine system and provides one more tool to identify those 495 water bodies that are receiving elevated  $[H_T^+]$ , and may be more vulnerable to future acidification.

Proton concentration, or pH, is known as a "master" variable of aquatic biogeochemistry because it is both affected by and governs so many processes (Stumm & Morgan 1996). As such, proton cycling is a more appropriate way to view and quantify estuarine and coastal acidification (Hofmann *et al.* 2010, Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). Proton concentrations are a more robust environmental indicator of acidification than pH because changes in pH are related not only to proton concentration, but also the initial pH of the water body and its temperature- and salinity-dependent buffer capacity (Fassbender *et al*. 2017). The present work

is meant to stimulate additional discussion already occurring in the literature on the way researchers measure and characterize the acidification of natural waters by moving towards the direct measurement, reporting and analysis of proton concentrations, in addition to pH and other marine CO2 system parameters (e.g., Hofmann *et al.* 2010, Fassbender *et al*. 2017, Kwiatkowski & Orr 2018). The precise controls of proton production and consumption are not, as yet, known for the Murderkill Estuary. However, the tools presented here will provide the basis for further studies to improve our mechanistic understanding of the processes that drive proton production, consumption, and transport within this and other systems and when used in conjunction with other established methods will provide a better understanding of the sensitivity of estuaries to current and future acidification.

#### **AUTHOR INFORMATION:**

#### **Corresponding Author**

\*email: dpettay@uscb.edu

### **Author Contributions**

The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given approval

to the final version of the manuscript.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

- We thank the Kent County Board of Public Works (Diana Golt, Director, and Hans Medlarz, and
- Andrew Jackubowitch, former directors), the Kent County Levy Court, the Watershed









- Gran, G. (1950). Determination of the equivalence point in potentiometric titrations. *Acta Chemica Scandinavica,* 4: 559-577.
- Gran, G. (1952). Determination of the equivalence point in potentiometric titrations–Part II. *The Analyst,* 77(920): 661-671.
- Hofmann, A.F., Meysman, F.J.R., Soetaert, K. and Middelburg, J.J. (2008). A step-by-step
- procedure for pH model construction in aquatic systems. *Biogeosciences* 5: 227-251.
- Hofmann, A.F., Middelburg, J.J., Soetaert, K. and Meysman, F.J.R. (2009). pH modelling in
- aquatic systems with time-variable acid-base dissociation constants applied to the turbid,
- tidal Scheldt estuary. *Biogeosciences* 6: 1539-1561.
- Hofmann, A.F., J.J. Middelburg, K. Soetaert, D.A. Wolf-Gladrow, and F.J.R. Meysman (2010). Proton Cycling, buffering, and reaction stoichiometry in natural waters. *Marine Chemistry*, 121: 246-255.
- Hofmann, G.E., Smith, J.E., Johnson, K.S., Send, U., Levin, L.A., Micheli, F., Paytan, A., Price,
- N.N., Peterson, B., Takeshita, Y., Matson, P.G., Derse-Crook, E., Kroeker, K.J., Gambi,
- M., Rivest, E. B., Frieder, C.A., Yu, P.C., and Martz, T.R. (2011). High-frequency
- dynamics of ocean pH: a multi-ecosystem comparison. *PLoS One*, 6*(12)*.
- Huang, W.-J., Wang, Y., and Cai, W.-J. (2012). Assessment of sample storage techniques for total alkalinity and dissolved inorganic carbon in seawater*. Limnology and Oceanography: Methods,* 10(9): 711-717.
- Joesoef, A., Kirchman, D. L., Sommerfield, C. K. and Cai, W.-J. (2017). Seasonal variability of the inorganic carbon system in a large coastal plain estuary. *Biogeosciences* 14: 4949- 4963.









*Oceanography* 49: 314-354.

Wang, Z. A., Kroeger, K. D., Ganju, N. K., Gonneea, M. E., Chu, S. N. (2016). Intertidal salt

marshes as an important source of inorganic carbon to the coastal ocean. *Limnology and Oceanography* 61: 1916-1931.

Whitfield, M., Bulter, R. A., and Covington, A. K. (1985). The determination of pH in estuarine waters. I: Definitions of pH scales and selection of buffers. *Oceanol. Acta, 8*(4): 423-432.

Wong, K.-C., Dzwonkowski, B., Ullman, W.J. (2009). Temporal and spatial variability of sea level and volume flux in the Murderkill Estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 84: 440-446.

