

Stable Carbon Isotope Signature of Methane Released from Phytoplankton

T. Klintzsch^{1,2}, H. Geisinger², A. Wieland², G. Langer³, G. Nehrke⁴, M. Bizic⁵, M. Greule², K. Lenhart⁶, C. Borsch⁷, M. Schroll² and F. Keppler^{2,8}

¹Department for Plant Nutrition, Gießen University, Gießen, Germany.

²Institute of Earth Sciences, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany.

³Institute of Environmental Science and Technology (ICTA), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

⁴Marine Biogeosciences, Alfred Wegener Institut – Helmholtz-Zentrum für Polar- und Meeresforschung, Bremerhaven, Germany.

⁵Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Stechlin, Germany

⁶Professorship of Botany, Limnology and Ecotoxicology, University of Applied Sciences, Bingen.

⁷Institute of Nutritional Science, Gießen University, Gießen, Germany.

⁸Heidelberg Center for the Environment (HCE), Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany.

Corresponding authors: Thomas Klintzsch (thomas.klintzsch@umwelt.uni-giessen.de), Frank Keppler (frank.keppler@geow.uni-heidelberg.de).

Key Points:

- Stable carbon isotope values of methane emitted from six phytoplankton cultures incubated in the laboratory
- Isotope fractionation between methane source signature and biomass of widespread algal and cyanobacterial species
- Isotopic patterns of methane released by phytoplankton may be clearly distinguished from methane formed by methanogenic archaea

Abstract

Aquatic ecosystems play an important role in global methane cycling and many field studies have reported methane supersaturation in the oxic surface mixed layer (SML) of the ocean and in the epilimnion of lakes. The origin of methane formed under oxic condition is hotly debated and several pathways have recently been offered to explain the ‘methane paradox’. In this context, stable isotope measurements have been applied to constrain methane sources in supersaturated oxygenated waters. Here we present stable carbon isotope signatures for six widespread marine phytoplankton species, three haptophyte algae and three cyanobacteria, incubated under laboratory conditions. The observed isotopic patterns implicate that methane formed by phytoplankton might be clearly distinguished from methane produced by methanogenic archaea. Comparing results from phytoplankton experiments with isotopic data from field measurements, suggests that algal and cyanobacterial populations may contribute substantially to methane formation observed in the SML of oceans and lakes.

Plain Language Summary

Methane plays an important role in atmospheric chemistry and physics as it contributes to global warming and to the destruction of ozone in the stratosphere. Knowing the sources and sinks of methane in the environment is a prerequisite for understanding the global atmospheric methane cycle but also to better predict future climate change. Measurements of the stable carbon isotope composition of carbon – the ratio between the heavy and light stable isotope of carbon – help to identify methane sources in the environment and to distinguish them from other formation processes. We identified the carbon isotope fingerprint of methane released from phytoplankton including algal and cyanobacterial species. The observed isotope signature improves our understanding of methane cycling in the surface layers of aquatic environments helping us to better estimate methane emissions to the atmosphere.

1 Introduction

Methane (CH_4) plays an important role in atmospheric chemistry and physics as it contributes to global warming and the destruction of ozone in the stratosphere. Aquatic environments including oceans, lakes, rivers, estuaries, and wetlands have recently been estimated to contribute to around half of annual global CH_4 emissions to the atmosphere (Rosentreter et al., 2021), although a large portion of the CH_4 produced in these individual ecosystems is oxidized by methanotrophic bacteria in the sediment or water column before escaping to the atmosphere (Reeburgh, 2007; Weber et al., 2019). Despite CH_4 losses through oxidation and release at the water surface to the atmosphere, numerous field studies have shown CH_4 supersaturation in the oxic surface mixed layer (SML) of the ocean (e.g. Karl et al., 2008; Kolomijeca et al., 2022; Scranton & Brewer, 1977; Scranton & Farrington, 1977; Sosa et al., 2019; Taenzer et al., 2020; Weber et al., 2019) and in the epilimnion of lakes (e.g. Donis et al., 2017; Grossart et al., 2011; Günthel et al., 2019; Hartmann et al., 2020; Tang et al., 2016; Thottathil et al., 2022). Maintaining the CH_4 supersaturation state requires frequent CH_4 production in the oxygenated water column, though it has been postulated for decades that microbial CH_4 production by methanogenic archaea is prevented by oxygen. Several sources and processes have recently been

proposed to explain the so called “methane paradox” occurring in oxic waters in oceans and lakes which we summarize in the following. (1) Methane might be produced by photochemical degradation of the algal metabolite dimethyl sulfide (DMS) or acetone and chromophore organic matter (Bange & Uher, 2005; Li et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2015). (2) Methane is formed by microbes including (a) methanogenic archaea in anoxic microsites (de Angelis & Lee, 1994; Karl & Tilbrook, 1994; Oremland, 1979; Schmale et al., 2018; Stawiarski et al., 2019; Zindler et al., 2013), (b) bacterial degradation of the algal metabolites dimethylsulfonium propionate (DMSP) and its degradation products dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and DMS (Damm et al., 2010; Damm et al., 2008; Florez-Leiva et al., 2013), (c) N_2 -fixing bacteria, carrying Fe-only nitrogenase (Zheng et al., 2018), (e) bacterial conversion of methylamine (Wang et al., 2021) and (d) bacterial degradation of methyl phosphonates (MPn) via the C-P lyase reaction pathway, with MPn serving as an alternative source of P under phosphate-limiting conditions (del Valle & Karl, 2014; Karl et al., 2008; Metcalf et al., 2012; Repeta et al., 2016; Taenzer et al., 2020). (3) Phytoplankton produces CH_4 *per se* (Bižić et al., 2020a; Ernst et al., 2022; Klintzsch et al., 2019; Klintzsch et al., 2020; Lenhart et al., 2016; McLeod et al., 2021), (4) and specifically for surface waters of lakes physical transport processes from shallow water zones to the open surface waters (Encinas Fernández et al., 2016; Peeters et al., 2019). For a more detailed overview of the different sources and processes please refer to recent review articles (e.g. Bižić et al., 2020b; Bižić, 2021; DelSontro et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2022; Reeburgh, 2007; Tang et al., 2016).

Interestingly, a very recent study (Perez-Coronel & Beman, 2022) that applied freshwater incubation experiments under different treatments suggested multiple sources act simultaneously to explain aerobic CH_4 production in aquatic environments. Several recent studies have applied stable isotope techniques to better constrain the origin and fate of CH_4 in lakes (Einzmann et al., 2022; Hartmann et al., 2020; Taenzer et al., 2020; Thottathil & Prairie, 2021; Thottathil et al., 2022; Tsunogai et al., 2020). The stable carbon isotope ratio ($^{13}C/^{12}C$) of CH_4 (expressed as $\delta^{13}C-CH_4$ values) depends on the production, degradation, and transport processes within the aquatic system. Thus, a comprehensive temporal and spatial $\delta^{13}C-CH_4$ data set of the water column is useful to disentangle sources and sinks. Their inclusion together with CH_4 concentration data allows for improved modelling of the regional and global CH_4 budget (Sherwood et al., 2017). As phytoplankton might contribute to CH_4 production in both oxic marine and freshwater environments, we measured $\delta^{13}C-CH_4$ values from phytoplankton including three widespread marine haptophyte algal, and three cyanobacteria species. The six phytoplankton species were incubated under controlled laboratory conditions and the apparent isotopic fractionation between phytoplanktonic CH_4 and biomass was calculated. The importance of the observed isotopic patterns for our understanding of aquatic CH_4 cycling is discussed in relation to recent results from field experiments and to well-known isotope patterns of biotic and abiotic CH_4 sources.

2 Results and Discussion

2.1 Stable carbon isotope signature and isotopic fractionation of CH_4 emitted from phytoplankton.

Six phytoplankton cultures were cultivated under sterile conditions, including three different marine algal species (haptophytes) and three cyanobacteria species. We determined CH_4 mass and $\delta^{13}C-CH_4$ values in the cultures' headspace at the end of the incubation period. In addition, stable carbon isotope values of particulate organic matter ($\delta^{13}C-POC$) were measured (a detailed

methodical description is given in the Supporting Information Text S1-Text S5 and Figure S1). At the end of the incubation period, the CH₄ mass in the headspace of all studied cultures increased compared to the medium control group. The latter remained at the initial measured atmospheric background CH₄ levels (all culture vessels were closed in atmospheric air and thus contained background CH₄). The amount of CH₄ produced correlated positively with the amount of initial inoculated phytoplankton biomass (Figure S2). Simultaneously, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄ values in five cultures shifted towards to more positive values with increasing CH₄ production when compared to the control group, i.e., atmospheric background values, while a shift towards more negative values was observed for one culture only. To determine the isotopic source signature of CH₄ ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄_{source}) of the phytoplankton cultures the Keeling plot method (Keeling, 1958) was used as described in the Supporting Information (Text S2). Figure 1 shows the Keeling plots for each species in which the intersection of the extrapolated regression between $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄ values and the inverse CH₄ mass yields the CH₄ source signatures. Five cultures produced CH₄ that was clearly enriched in ¹³C relative to the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄ values of atmospheric CH₄ ($\approx -47\text{‰}$) yielding $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄_{source} values ranging between -19‰ and -43‰ (Figure 1, a, b, c, e, f), while a slight depletion in ¹³C relative to atmospheric CH₄ was found only for *Prochlorococcus* strain (-54‰ ; Figure 1, d). Based on the discrepancy between $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄_{source} values (Figure 1) and the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -POC values (Table S1) the apparent stable carbon isotopic fractionation during CH₄ formation ($\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$) was calculated for each phytoplankton species. The corresponding isotopic fractionations are shown for each species in Figure 2. The observed negative values for $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ ranging from $-29.8 \pm 1.7\text{‰}$ to $-1.4 \pm 0.7\text{‰}$ exhibited a ¹³C depletion of released CH₄ when compared to the biomass expressed as POC, with the exception of *Synechococcus* WH8102, where no fractionation occurred ($+0.5 \pm 1.0\text{‰}$). Thus, CH₄ formation by phytoplankton followed the general isotope fractionation rule that in kinetic reactions the lighter isotopes tend to react faster, resulting in a ¹³C-depleted product compared to the substrate (see e.g., Fry, 2006). However, based on the degree of fractionation, the calculated $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values obviously suggest two different CH₄ formation patterns of the phytoplankton species. On the one hand, CH₄ formation by *E. huxleyi*, *P. globosa*, and *Prochlorococcus* resulted in a substantial depletion of ¹³C in the formed CH₄ compared to their $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -POC values, with an average fractionation of $-23 \pm 4\text{‰}$. On the other hand, *Chrysochromulina* sp. and both *Synechococcus* strains showed average $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values of $-1 \pm 1\text{‰}$ (Figure 2). Thus, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of CH₄ emitted by these strains are nearly the same as those measured for POC. Currently, we can only speculate about the reasons of the observed different $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values. It is known that different metabolic pathways are accompanied by specific kinetic isotope fractionation that leads to specific $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of the cellular compounds (e.g., see Hayes, 2001). Thus, the different $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values calculated for the six investigated species may indicate that these organisms used different pathways and/or precursor compounds to produce CH₄. This is well known for CH₄ formation pathways of methanogenic archaea: the CO₂-reducing pathway fractionates significantly stronger against ¹³C than the acetoclastic pathway, with apparent isotopic fractionations of around -49‰ and -19‰ , respectively (see Conrad, 2005 and references therein). Analogously, the CH₄ formation by marine algae, with isotopic fractionations of *P. globosa* and *E. huxleyi* ($-22.6 \pm 0.9\text{‰}$ and $-17.9 \pm 1.2\text{‰}$) distinct from those of *Chrysochromulina* sp. ($-2.1 \pm 2.5\text{‰}$) might be the result of conversion of different CH₄ precursor compounds. This hypothesis is supported by recent studies (Klintzsch et al., 2019; Lenhart et al., 2016), showing that methylated sulfur compounds such as DMS, DMSO, methionine sulfoxide and methionine are potential CH₄ precursor compounds in marine algae. It has been shown that the investigated algal species

produce these compounds in mM cellular concentrations (Liss et al., 1994; Sunda et al., 2002) with the synthesis of these compounds requiring individual enzymatic steps (Bullock et al., 2017; Stefels, 2000). Therefore, a different isotopic composition of the methyl precursors might cause different isotope fractionation in CH_4 produced by phytoplankton as observed in our study (Figure 2). This might also explain the larger differences in isotopic fractionation between phytoplankton cultures even though $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -POC values were similar (Table S1). Please note that within this study it was not possible to extract potential methyl precursor compounds such as DMS or DMSO from the incubation experiments and measure their $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values.




Figure 1. Keeling plots from three haptophytes (a, b, c) and *Cyanobacteria* species (d, e, f). The calculated $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of each species are given by the extrapolated intercept with the y axis CH_4 ($1/[\text{CH}_4] = 0$). The correlation between CH_4 mass (given as reciprocal) and the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values of all incubations is shown in detail for each plot. N refers to the total number of observations from independent incubation experiments.

Cyanobacteria including the investigated genera *Synechococcus* and *Prochlorococcus* have been shown to produce methylated sulfur compounds but in extremely low-intracellular concentrations (Corn et al., 1996; McParland & Levine, 2019). In contrast, MPn associated with esters are common in many bacteria strains (Metcalf et al., 2012). Methylphosphonates can be metabolized by several marine bacteria as an alternative phosphorus source via the C-P lyase

pathway whereby CH₄ is released (del Valle & Karl, 2014; Karl et al., 2008; Repeta et al., 2016; Taenzer et al., 2020). Taenzer et al. (2020) showed that the MPn cleaving by freshwater and marine bacterial strains leads to marginal isotopic fractionation between substrate MPn and produced CH₄ with average ϵ values of 1.3 ‰. Based on the observed isotopic pattern, the research team concluded that MPn is a likely source of CH₄ in the surface waters of the Pacific Ocean (station ALOHA, Taenzer et al., 2020). However, the MPn related CH₄ formation pathway might be less relevant for the experiments conducted in our study because of the following reasons. All of the investigated strains lack the C-P lyase gene (Bižić et al., 2020a) and the phosphate rich conditions of the culture medium would, if present, inhibit C-P lyase gene expression (Bižić et al., 2020a). Although Yao et al. (2022) showed for some freshwater bacterial cultures that C-P lyase gene expression was not completely inhibited by phosphorus, the addition of MPn was mandatory to induce C-P lyase gene expression. In addition, Sosa et al. (2021) showed that *Prochlorococcus* processes MPn to formate rather than to CH₄. Thus, in our experiments the cleavage of MPn is rather unlikely to explain the observed CH₄ formation. Consequently, there must be other mechanisms of CH₄ formation in addition to the C-P lyase pathway. According to Ernst et al. (2022), oxic CH₄ formation might occur in living organisms from all domains of life when sulfur or nitrogen-methylated compounds are converted to CH₄ by a Fenton-type reaction via formation of methyl radicals. This reaction might cause relatively small fractionations between biomass and CH₄, because radical-induced reactions are typically associated with small fractionations between precursors and reaction products (Morasch et al., 2004). Consequently, the ROS-driven pathway suggested by Ernst et al. (2022), might explain the small fractionations observed in our experiments for the three phytoplankton species *Chrysochromulina* sp., *Synechococcus* WH8102 and WH7803 (on average -1 ± 1 ‰, Figure 2). On the other hand, the larger calculated isotopic fractionations of -29.8 ± 1.7 ‰ to -17.9 ± 1.2 ‰ for *Prochlorococcus* MIT 9312, *E. huxleyi* and *P. globosa*, respectively, imply that different methyl precursor substrates and/or pathways were involved in the CH₄ formation by the three phytoplankton species.

Even though the reaction pathways and the specific circumstances leading to the observed fractionation patterns between POC and CH₄ of the six investigated species remain unclear, the results show, for the first time the range of $\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values directly obtained from phytoplankton cultures. The fractionations between POC and CH₄ might help to trace back CH₄ formation in field studies, which will be discussed in greater detail in the section 2.3 below. To accomplish the presented dataset of marine algal and cyanobacteria species we provide further $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of freshwater and terrestrial cyanobacteria which were calculated from culture experiments performed in previous laboratory experiments (Bižić et al., 2020a). The data is provided in the Supporting Information (Figure S3; Text S6) and are considered in the discussion section below.




Figure 2. Apparent isotopic fractionation between phytoplanktonic POC and released CH₄. Values are the mean of replicated culture experiments. Error bars show the standard error.

2.2 The stable carbon isotope pattern of CH₄ released from phytoplankton compared with other well-known CH₄ sources

Global CH₄ monitoring is usually based on measurements of CH₄ mixing ratios, i.e., quantification of CH₄ emissions, while a growing number of studies include measurements of $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values in order to better constrain the strengths of different sources in context of total emissions (e.g., Allen, 2016; Dlugokencky et al., 2011; Fletcher & Schaefer, 2019; Houweling et al., 2017; Menoud et al., 2022; Nisbet & Weiss, 2010). Ranges of measured $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values have been reported for conventional sources which might be classified into thermogenic (from geological processes), pyrogenic (from biomass burning) and biogenic (from methanogenic archaea) origin (Saunois et al., 2020). Recently, $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values from eukaryotic sources including plants, fungi and humans have been reported (Keppler et al., 2006, 2016; Schroll et al., 2020; Vigano et al., 2009) which we categorize as “biogenic non-archaeal” CH₄ formation processes.

In Figure 3, we compare the already known $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ _{source} patterns from various sources with those observed from phytoplanktonic cultures obtained in our study. Pyrogenic CH₄, produced during biomass burning exhibits mean $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values of -26.2 ± 4.8 ‰ and thus is typically highly enriched in ¹³C compared to atmospheric CH₄ (≈ -47 ‰). Thermogenic $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values, produced from buried biomass in the Earth’s crust, shows median $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values of -49.8 ± 11.2 ‰, -42.5 ± 6.7 ‰ and -44.0 ± 10.7 ‰ for coal, shale gas and conventional oil and gas, respectively (Sherwood et al., 2017). These values are very similar to atmospheric values. Both source categories, pyrogenic and thermogenic, are often referred to as abiotic sources because a metabolic activity is not directly involved in their CH₄ formation process – although the

precursor compounds are derived from organic matter (Boros & Keppler, 2018). In contrast, biotic CH₄, including traditional pathways (from methanogens) and novel discovered non-archaeal sources, is directly linked to biological metabolic processes, and released CH₄ tends to be ¹³C-depleted relative to atmospheric values (Figure 3). Biogenic CH₄, produced by methanogenic archaea in anoxic environments, typically ranges from -72 to -47 ‰ (Sherwood et al., 2017), depending on its individual source category. The $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values emitted from biogenic non-archaeal sources such as plants and fungi lie between -70 ‰ and -45 ‰ and thus are almost in the same range as those $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values reported for methanogenic archaea. $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values directly emitted from plants depend on the autotrophic carbon fixation pathway (Keppler et al., 2006; Vigano et al., 2009), as the C₃ and C₄ photosynthetic pathway controls the isotopic composition of biomass, which in turn influences the $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values from plants (see $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values of C₃ and C₄ plants in Figure 3). Similarly, $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values of CH₄ released by fungi is related to the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of the growth substrate (Schroll et al., 2020). In human breath, a $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values ranging from -90 ‰ to -49.3 ‰ were observed (Keppler et al., 2016). Traditionally, human CH₄ production was considered to exclusively arise from methanogenic archaea living in the gastrointestinal tract (Bond et al., 1971). However, recent investigations (Keppler et al., 2016; Polag & Keppler, 2018, 2022) suggest that CH₄ is also formed endogenously in human cells. Thus, $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values measured from human breath might include both pathways which are currently difficult to distinguish. The CH₄ production by marine algae and cyanobacteria investigated in this study is categorized into “biogenic non-archaeal CH₄”, as the CH₄ is formed under oxic conditions by the metabolism of the members from the domain *Eukaryote* and *Prokaryote*. The $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of marine phytoplankton, ranging from -54.5 ‰ to -19.3 ‰, showed mostly less negative $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values (median -33.7 ‰) when compared to both atmospheric values and previously described biogenic non-archaeal CH₄ sources (e.g., plants and fungi). The tendency of less negative values is in line with the $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of the two terrestrial and five limnic cyanobacteria (median -33.8 ‰) ranging between -61.4 ‰ to -5.4 ‰ (Figure S3).

The observed $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values from phytoplankton considerably extend the range of biogenic non-archaeal CH₄ towards less negative $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values of up to -5.4 ‰. Therefore, biotic and abiotic CH₄ source categories are less clearly delimited due to their $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values isotopic signature when taking those of phytoplankton into account. Figure 3 shows that the range of measured $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values for methanogenic archaea has little overlap with $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of phytoplankton. Therefore, phytoplanktonic CH₄ might be clearly distinguished from CH₄ produced by methanogenic archaea based on their $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values. However, at the ecosystem scale, even distinguishing between two different co-occurring methanogenic sources based on their $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values is complex, requiring knowledge of additional parameters as discussed in Conrad (2005). Furthermore, microbial CH₄ oxidation is a widespread feature in oxic and anoxic environments which might change the initial $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ value. The CH₄ oxidation reduces the ¹²C content, resulting in an increase of the ¹³C content in the remaining CH₄ pool (Barker & Fritz, 1981). In recent field studies microbial CH₄ oxidation were considered for calculating $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of oxic CH₄ production by mass balance within the epilimnion of lakes (Hartmann et al., 2020; Thottathil et al., 2022). These researcher hypothesized the occurrence of oxic CH₄ production by phytoplankton because CH₄ formation was spatially associated with phytoplankton blooms and calculated $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ values were less negative than would be expected from methanogenic archaea. In this context, it is important to note that the range of phytoplanktonic $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values obtained in our

laboratory study largely overlaps with $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values previously calculated for aquatic oxic CH_4 production derived from field investigations of several lakes (Hartmann et al., 2020; Sasakawa et al., 2008; Thottathil et al., 2022). Therefore, our isotopic results support the hypothesis that in aquatic environments under certain conditions direct formation of CH_4 by phytoplankton might fully or partly explain the observed elevated CH_4 concentrations in oxic surface layers which often is described as the “methane paradox”. In addition, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of phytoplankton complement our understanding of isotopic carbon source signatures of CH_4 in the environment. In the context of the aquatic CH_4 paradox, the results could help to differentiate between CH_4 produced by methanogenic archaea in anoxic microsites, the intestinal tract of zooplankton or sedimentary sources, and those produced from phytoplankton as for example recently applied by Einzmann et al. (2022) to constrain sources and sinks of CH_4 in a small lake in Southern Germany.




Figure 3. Typical range of $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ values of pyrogenic, fossil, biogenic and eukaryotic CH_4 sources. The box marks the SD and whiskers the min-max value. The mean and median are given by the black and white stripe within the box respectively. $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values of the thermogenic, pyrogenic and biogenic sources represent values from many individual studies summarized by Sherwood et al. (2017) which is currently the most comprehensive data set with respect to CH_4 source signature values. The $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ value of plants were taken from Keppler et al. (2006) and Vigano et al. (2009) and the ones of fungi and humans from Keppler et al. (2016) and Schroll et al. (2020). $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values calculated for aquatic oxic CH_4 production (OMP) derived from lake and ocean field studies are taken from Thottathil et al. (2022), Holmes et al.

(2000) and Sasakawa et al. (2008). The $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4_{\text{source}}$ value of phytoplankton are summarized from both section 2.1 and Figure S3. Detailed information regarding classification of CH_4 can be found in Boros & Keppler (2018), Conrad (2009), Etiope & Sherwood Lollar (2013), Kirschke et al. (2013) and Saunio et al. (2016).

2.3 Potential contribution of phytoplankton to CH_4 supersaturated SML

To assess the potential environmental relevance of the isotope data of phytoplankton obtained by the laboratory experiments, we compiled the available isotope data for POC and $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values of CH_4 supersaturated SMLs reported from field studies of oceans and lakes (e.g., Forster et al., 2009; Grossart et al., 2011; Günthel et al., 2019; Hartmann et al., 2020; Scranton & Brewer, 1977; Weber et al., 2019).

We assume that $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values of phytoplankton depend on the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values according to equation 1

$$\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4 = \delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC} + \Delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}, \quad 1$$

where $\Delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ is the isotopic difference associated with CH_4 release from POC ($\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}} \approx \Delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}} = \delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4 - \delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$). Therefore, $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values and the isotope difference associated with the release of CH_4 from POC are fundamental for the evaluation of laboratory $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values with regard to their environmental relevance. A comprehensive compilation of $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ data of the world ocean has been provided by Goericke and Fry (1994). Most $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values range from -28 ‰ to -18 ‰ with even lower values in the polar regions (see Goericke & Fry, 1994 and references inside). In this study, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values of the investigated phytoplankton species range from ≈ -26 ‰ to -19 ‰ (Table S1) and thus reflect the range of $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values typically found in marine environments. However, it should be noted, that the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values from oceanic POC samples are considered to reflect the carbon of the phytoplankton and are therefore often used as its proxy, but may also contain carbon from heterotrophic organisms or detritus, which may have distinct $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values (Hansman & Sessions, 2016; Marty & Planas, 2008). An alternative biomarker and possibly better proxy for haptophytes in the ocean, are alkenone lipids synthesized by the haptophytes *E. huxleyi* and *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* (e.g., Bidigare et al., 1997; Popp et al., 1989). $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values of haptophytes, estimated from alkenone lipids, globally range from -28.7 ± 1.2 ‰ to -21.5 ± 1.6 ‰ with the Santa Monica Basin and Peru Upwelling Zone showing the lowest and highest values, respectively (Table 3 in Bidigare et al., 1997). The reported range fits well with $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ data of the three haptophyte species investigated in our study (Table S1).

Based on the reported $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values of natural haptophyte populations from the literature and $\Delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values established from our laboratory-grown haptophytes, using equation 1, natural haptophyte populations could generate $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values ranging from -49.2 ‰ to -23.6 ‰ within the SML. Analogously, by using the $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{POC}$ values reported by Goericke & Fry (1994) for cyanobacterial populations and $\Delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values calculated from our experiments lead to $\delta^{13}\text{C}-\text{CH}_4$ values ranging from -56 ‰ to -22 ‰.

The next step is to compare the theoretical calculated data with field observations. Yet, only a few studies reporting $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values of CH_4 dissolved in the SML of seawater are available in the literature (Florez-Leiva et al., 2013; Holmes et al., 2000; Sasakawa et al., 2008; Yoshikawa et al., 2014), showing that the SML seawater is typically supersaturated with ^{13}C -enriched CH_4 , relative to atmospheric values of around -47 ‰. It should be emphasized that $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values measured in the SML do not necessarily reflect their isotopic source value, since microbial CH_4 oxidation, input from lateral or sub-thermocline water masses and atmospheric release potentially modulate $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values (Reeburgh, 2007; Holmes et al., 2000; Sasakawa et al., 2008). For this reason, isotopic CH_4 source values need to be estimated by application of thorough mass balances. In this way, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values maintaining CH_4 supersaturation were estimated to be -42.5 ‰ to -43 ‰ and -33 ‰ within the SML of the tropical and northwestern North Pacific respectively (Holmes et al., 2000; Sasakawa et al., 2008). These values are in good agreement with the above estimated range of $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ source values for the six phytoplankton species investigated in our study. Thus, natural populations of phytoplankton are likely to be responsible for the ^{13}C -enriched CH_4 reported for the SML by Holmes et al. (2000) and Sasakawa et al. (2008).

Similar to the observation of oxic CH_4 production in the surface waters of oceans, there has been a controversial discussion about the occurrence of CH_4 formation in the epilimnion of lakes (Bižić et al., 2020b; Encinas Fernández et al., 2016; Grossart et al., 2011; Günthel et al., 2020; Hartmann et al., 2020; Tang et al., 2014, 2016; Peeters et al., 2019). A comprehensive data set of $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values of lake water has recently been provided for Lake Stechlin in Germany (Hartmann et al., 2020) and five lakes in Canada (Thottathil et al., 2022).

Based on the stable carbon isotope mass balance of CH_4 produced and the correlation between CH_4 and chlorophyll, the research teams suggested phytoplanktonic CH_4 production as the most likely source to explain the CH_4 oversaturation in the epilimnion during spring and summer. This hypothesis has recently been strongly supported by Perez-Coronel & Beman (2022) that associated aerobic CH_4 production with (bacterio)chlorophyll metabolism and photosynthesis. $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values of oxic CH_4 production in surface water were distinct from the much more negative $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values measured in sediment pore water produced by methanogenic archaea (Thottathil et al., 2022; Hartmann et al., 2020). In the epilimnion of Lake Stechlin in Germany $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values from oxic CH_4 formation during spring/summer were found to be less negative than -50 ‰ (Hartmann et al., 2020). A similar isotope pattern, i.e. an enrichment of ^{13}C in CH_4 relative to other sources, was also found by Thottathil et al. (2022). In four out of the five studied Canadian Shield lakes, $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values of oxic CH_4 production, leading to CH_4 oversaturated surface waters during the summer period, ranged from -47 ‰ to -38 ‰. Therefore, a contribution of phytoplankton to the observed $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values in the oversaturated oxic surface waters is greatly supported by our laboratory culture experiments as we found $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values of the thirteen phytoplankton species ranging from -61.4 ‰ to -5.4 ‰ (median value -33.8 ‰). These data include five freshwater phytoplankton species (Figure S3) grown with $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-DIC}$ values \approx -4 ‰ (Text S7), which is within the natural various of $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-DIC}$ values in lakes (Bade et al., 2004). Thus, based on the $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-DIC}$ values, and assuming a dependence between the isotopic composition of the carbon precursor and the $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values as described above, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_{4_source}$ values of laboratory grown freshwater phytoplankton could be ecologically relevant. Although microbial consumption of CH_4 might be also involved in increasing $\delta^{13}\text{C}\text{-CH}_4$ values in the surface waters we strongly suggest that direct

formation of CH₄ by phytoplankton contributes substantially to the oxic CH₄ formation in the epilimnion of lakes during the growth period of these organisms.

5 Conclusions

Further insights into the CH₄ formation by phytoplankton were provided by determining stable carbon isotopic fractionation ($\epsilon_{\text{CH}_4/\text{POC}}$ values) and source signatures of CH₄ emitted by three marine haptophyte algal and three cyanobacterial species. The observed isotopic fractionation suggests that different source substrates of CH₄ and/or pathways were involved in the CH₄ formation by the investigated species. The isotopic patterns suggest that in the absence of abiotic and thermogenic CH₄ sources, CH₄ released by phytoplankton can be clearly distinguished from CH₄ produced by methanogenic archaea, as phytoplankton exhibits significantly less negative $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CH₄ values. Based on the comparison of stable isotope data from phytoplankton experiments with isotope data reported from field measurements in aquatic environments, we conclude that algal and cyanobacterial populations may indeed contribute to the CH₄ observed in the SML of oceans and lakes. However, more isotopic data than currently available is required to better distinguish between different CH₄ sources and sinks in aquatic systems. In this context, future applications of two-dimensional isotope studies including $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^2\text{H}$ values and even clumped isotope techniques but also in combination with metagenomic and metatranscriptomic data might be promising tools to allow for better differentiation between sources and sinks of CH₄.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Acknowledgments

We thank Bernd Knape, Stefan Rheinberger and the ORCAS-Team at Heidelberg University for technical support that helped to produce this dataset. F.K. was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG; Grants KE 884/8-2, KE 884/11-1 and KE 884/16-2).

Open Research

The data of this article will be made available after review but before publication via heiDATA, which is an institutional repository for research data of the Heidelberg University of the UFZ. A doi (digital object identifier) will be assigned and included in the last version of the manuscript.

428 **References**

- 429 Allen, G. (2016). Rebalancing the global methane budget. *Nature*, 538(7623), 46-48.
 430 <https://doi.org/10.1038/538046a>
- 431 Bange, H. W., & Uher, G. (2005). Photochemical production of methane in natural waters: implications for its
 432 present and past oceanic source. *Chemosphere*, 58(2), 177-183.
- 433 Bade, D. L., Carpenter, S. R., Cole, J. J., Hanson, P. C., & Hesslein, R. H. (2004). Controls of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -DIC in lakes:
 434 Geochemistry, lake metabolism, and morphometry. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 49(4), 1160-1172.
 435 <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.4319/lo.2004.49.4.1160>
- 436 Barker, J. F., & Fritz, P. (1981). Carbon isotope fractionation during microbial methane oxidation. *Nature*,
 437 293(5830), 289-291. <https://doi.org/10.1038/293289a0>
- 438 Bidigare, R. R., Fluegge, A., Freeman, K. H., Hanson, K. L., Hayes, J. M., Hollander, D., et al. (1997). Consistent
 439 fractionation of ^{13}C in nature and in the laboratory: Growth-rate effects in some haptophyte algae. *Global*
 440 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 11(2), 279-292.
 441 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/96GB03939>
- 442 Bižić, M., Grossart, H.-P., & Ionescu, D. (2020). Methane Paradox. In *eLS* (pp. 1-11).
- 443 Bižić, M., Klintzsch, T., Ionescu, D., Hindiyeh, M. Y., Günthel, M., Muro-Pastor, A. M., et al. (2020). Aquatic and
 444 terrestrial cyanobacteria produce methane. *Science Advances*, 6(3), eaax5343.
 445 <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/advances/6/3/eaax5343.full.pdf>
- 446 Bizic, M., Phytoplankton photosynthesis: an unexplored source of biogenic methane emission from oxic
 447 environments, *Journal of Plankton Research*, Volume 43, Issue 6, November/December 2021, Pages 822–
 448 830, <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbab069>
- 449 Bond, J. H., Jr., Engel, R. R., & Levitt, M. D. (1971). Factors influencing pulmonary methane excretion in man. An
 450 indirect method of studying the in situ metabolism of the methane-producing colonic bacteria. *J Exp Med*,
 451 133(3), 572-588.
- 452 Boros, M., & Keppler, F. (2018). Chapter 8 Production and Signaling of Methane. In *Gasotransmitters* (pp. 192-
 453 234): The Royal Society of Chemistry.
- 454 Boros, M., & Keppler, F. (2018). Production and Signaling of Methane. *Gasotransmitters*, 12, 192.
- 455 Bullock, H. A., Luo, H., & Whitman, W. B. (2017). Evolution of Dimethylsulfoniopropionate Metabolism in Marine
 456 Phytoplankton and Bacteria. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 8(637). Review.
 457 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00637>
- 458 Conrad, R. (2005). Quantification of methanogenic pathways using stable carbon isotopic signatures: a review and a
 459 proposal. *Organic Geochemistry*, 36(5), 739-752.
 460 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0146638004002566>
- 461 Conrad, R. (2009). The global methane cycle: recent advances in understanding the microbial processes involved.
 462 *Environmental Microbiology Reports*, 1(5), 285-292.
- 463 Corn, M., Belviso, S., Partensky, F., Simon, N., & Christaki, U. (1996). Origin and Importance of Picoplanktonic
 464 DMSP. In R. P. Kiene, P. T. Visscher, M. D. Keller, & G. O. Kirst (Eds.), *Biological and Environmental*
 465 *Chemistry of DMSP and Related Sulfonium Compounds* (pp. 191-201). Boston, MA: Springer US.
- 466 Damm, E., Helmke, E., Thoms, S., Schauer, U., Nöthig, E., Bakker, K., & Kiene, R. P. (2010). Methane production
 467 in aerobic oligotrophic surface water in the central Arctic Ocean. *Biogeosciences*, 7(3), 1099-1108.
 468 <http://www.biogeosciences.net/7/1099/2010/>
- 469 Damm, E., Kiene, R. P., Schwarz, J., Falck, E., & Dieckmann, G. (2008). Methane cycling in Arctic shelf water and
 470 its relationship with phytoplankton biomass and DMSP. *Marine Chemistry*, 109(1-2), 45-59. Article.
- 471 de Angelis, M. A., & Lee, C. (1994). Methane production during zooplankton grazing on marine phytoplankton.
 472 *Limnology and Oceanography*, 39(6), 1298-1308.
- 473 del Valle, D. A., & Karl, D. M. (2014). Aerobic production of methane from dissolved water-column
 474 methylphosphonate and sinking particles in the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. *Aquatic Microbial*
 475 *Ecology*, 73(2), 93-105. <http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/ame/v73/n2/p93-105/>
- 476 DelSontro, T., Beaulieu, J. J., & Downing, J. A. (2018). Greenhouse gas emissions from lakes and impoundments:
 477 Upscaling in the face of global change. *Limnology and Oceanography Letters*, 3(3), 64-75.
 478 <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/lol2.10073>
- 479 Dlugokencky, E. J., Nisbet, E. G., Fisher, R., & Lowry, D. (2011). Global atmospheric methane: budget, changes
 480 and dangers. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering*
 481 *Sciences*, 369(1943), 2058-2072. <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsta.2010.0341> %X

- Donis, D., Flury, S., Stöckli, A., Spangenberg, J. E., Vachon, D., & McGinnis, D. F. (2017). Full-scale evaluation of methane production under oxic conditions in a mesotrophic lake. *Nature communications*, 8(1), 1661.
- Einzmann, T., Schroll, M., Kleint, J. F., Greule, M., & Keppler, F. (2022). Application of concentration and 2-dimensional stable isotope measurements of methane to constrain sources and sinks in a seasonally stratified freshwater lake. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10. Original Research. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fenvs.2022.865862>
- Encinas Fernández, J., Peeters, F., & Hofmann, H. (2016). On the methane paradox: Transport from shallow water zones rather than in situ methanogenesis is the major source of CH₄ in the open surface water of lakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 121(10), 2717-2726. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JG003586>
- Ernst, L., Steinfeld, B., Barayeu, U., Klintzsch, T., Kurth, M., Grimm, D., et al. (2022). Methane formation driven by reactive oxygen species across all living organisms. *Nature*, 603(7901), 482-487. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04511-9>
- Etiopie, G., & Sherwood Lollar, B. (2013). Abiotic methane on Earth. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 51(2), 276-299.
- Fletcher, S. E. M., & Schaefer, H. (2019). Rising methane: A new climate challenge. *Science*, 364(6444), 932-933.
- Florez-Leiva, L., Damm, E., & Fariás, L. (2013). Methane production induced by dimethylsulfide in surface water of an upwelling ecosystem. *Progress in oceanography*, 112, 38-48.
- Forster, G., Upstill-Goddard, R. C., Gist, N., Robinson, C., Uher, G., & Woodward, E. M. S. (2009). Nitrous oxide and methane in the Atlantic Ocean between 50 N and 52 S: latitudinal distribution and sea-to-air flux. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 56(15), 964-976.
- Fry, B. (2006). *Stable isotope ecology* (Vol. 521): Springer.
- Goericke, R., & Fry, B. (1994). Variations of marine plankton $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ with latitude, temperature, and dissolved CO₂ in the world ocean. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 8(1), 85-90. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/93GB03272>
- Grossart, H.-P., Frindte, K., Dziallas, C., Eckert, W., & Tang, K. W. (2011). Microbial methane production in oxygenated water column of an oligotrophic lake. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(49), 19657-19661. <http://www.pnas.org/content/108/49/19657>.
- Günthel, M., Donis, D., Kirillin, G., Ionescu, D., Bizic, M., McGinnis, D. F., et al. (2019). Contribution of oxic methane production to surface methane emission in lakes and its global importance. *Nature communications*, 10(1), 5497. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13320-0>
- Günthel, M., Klawonn, I., Woodhouse, J., Bižić, M., Ionescu, D., Ganzert, L., et al. (2020). Photosynthesis-driven methane production in oxic lake water as an important contributor to methane emission. *Limnology and Oceanography*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11557>. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11557>
- Hansman, R. L., & Sessions, A. L. (2016). Measuring the in situ carbon isotopic composition of distinct marine plankton populations sorted by flow cytometry. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 14(2), 87-99. <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/lom3.10073>
- Hartmann, J. F., Günthel, M., Klitzsch, T., Kirillin, G., Grossart, H.-P., Keppler, F., & Isenbeck-Schröter, M. (2020). High Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Methane Production and Emission in Oxic Surface Water. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(3), 1451-1463. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b03182>
- Hayes, J. M. (2001). Fractionation of Carbon and Hydrogen Isotopes in Biosynthetic Processes*. *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry*, 43(1), 225-277. <https://doi.org/10.2138/gsrmg.43.1.225>
- Holmes, M. E., Sansone, F. J., Rust, T. M., & Popp, B. N. (2000). Methane production, consumption, and air-sea exchange in the open ocean: An Evaluation based on carbon isotopic ratios. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 14(1), 1-10. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/1999GB001209>
- Houweling, S., Bergamaschi, P., Chevallier, F., Heimann, M., Kaminski, T., Krol, M., et al. (2017). Global inverse modeling of CH₄ sources and sinks: an overview of methods. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(1), 235-256. <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/17/235/2017/>
- Karl, D. M., Beversdorf, L., Bjorkman, K. M., Church, M. J., Martinez, A., & DeLong, E. F. (2008). Aerobic production of methane in the sea. *Nature geoscience*, 1(7), 473-478.
- Karl, D. M., & Tilbrook, B. D. (1994). Production and Transport of Methane in Oceanic Particulate Organic-Matter. *Nature*, 368(6473), 732-734.
- Keeling, C. D. (1958). The concentration and isotopic abundances of atmospheric carbon dioxide in rural areas. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 13(4), 322-334. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0016703758900334>
- Keppler, F., Hamilton, J. T., Braß, M., & Röckmann, T. (2006). Methane emissions from terrestrial plants under aerobic conditions. *Nature*, 439(7073), 187.

- 538 Keppler, F., Schiller, A., Eehalt, R., Greule, M., Hartmann, J., & Polag, D. (2016). Stable isotope and high
539 precision concentration measurements confirm that all humans produce and exhale methane. *Journal of*
540 *Breath Research*, 10(1), 016003. <http://stacks.iop.org/1752-7163/10/i=1/a=016003>
- 541 Kirschke, S., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Saunio, M., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., et al. (2013). Three decades
542 of global methane sources and sinks. *Nature geoscience*, 6(10), 813.
- 543 Klintzsch, T., Langer, G., Nehrke, G., Wieland, A., Lenhart, K., & Keppler, F. (2019). Methane production by three
544 widespread marine phytoplankton species: release rates, precursor compounds, and potential relevance for
545 the environment. *Biogeosciences*, 16(20), 4129-4144. <https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/16/4129/2019/>
- 546 Klintzsch, T., Langer, G., Wieland, A., Geisinger, H., Lenhart, K., Nehrke, G., & Keppler, F. (2020). Effects of
547 Temperature and Light on Methane Production of Widespread Marine Phytoplankton. *Journal of*
548 *Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 125(9), e2020JG005793.
549 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020JG005793>
- 550 Kolomijeca, A., Marx, L., Reynolds, S., Cariou, T., Mawji, E., & Boulart, C. (2022). An update on dissolved
551 methane distribution in the subtropical North Atlantic Ocean. *Ocean Sci.*, 18(5), 1377-1388.
552 <https://os.copernicus.org/articles/18/1377/2022/>
- 553 Lenhart, K., Klintzsch, T., Langer, G., Nehrke, G., Bunge, M., Schnell, S., & Keppler, F. (2016). Evidence for
554 methane production by the marine algae *Emiliania huxleyi*. *Biogeosciences*, 13(10), 3163-3174.
555 <http://www.biogeosciences.net/13/3163/2016/>
- 556 Li, Y., Fichot, C. G., Geng, L., Scarratt, M. G., & Xie, H. (2020). The Contribution of Methane Photoproduction to
557 the Oceanic Methane Paradox. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(14), e2020GL088362.
558 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2020GL088362>
- 559 Liss, P., Malin, G., Turner, S., & Holligan, P. (1994). Dimethyl sulphide and Phaeocystis: a review. *Journal of*
560 *Marine Systems*, 5(1), 41-53.
- 561 Liu, L.-Y., Xie, G.-J., Ding, J., Liu, B.-F., Xing, D.-F., Ren, N.-Q., & Wang, Q. (2022). Microbial methane
562 emissions from the non-methanogenesis processes: A critical review. *Science of The Total Environment*,
563 806, 151362. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969721064408>
- 564 Marty, J., & Planas, D. (2008). Comparison of methods to determine algal $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ in freshwater. *Limnology and*
565 *Oceanography: Methods*, 6(1), 51-63.
566 <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.4319/lom.2008.6.51>
- 567 McLeod, A. R., Brand, T., Campbell, C. N., Davidson, K., & Hatton, A. D. (2021). Ultraviolet Radiation Drives
568 Emission of Climate-Relevant Gases From Marine Phytoplankton. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
569 *Biogeosciences*, 126(9), e2021JG006345.
570 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021JG006345>
- 571 McParland, E. L., & Levine, N. M. (2019). The role of differential DMSP production and community composition
572 in predicting variability of global surface DMSP concentrations. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 64(2), 757-
573 773. <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/lno.11076>
- 574 Menoud, M., van der Veen, C., Lowry, D., Fernandez, J. M., Bakkaloglu, S., France, J. L., et al. (2022). New
575 contributions of measurements in Europe to the global inventory of the stable isotopic composition of
576 methane. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 14(9), 4365-4386. <https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/14/4365/2022/>
- 577 Metcalf, W. W., Griffin, B. M., Cicchillo, R. M., Gao, J. T., Janga, S. C., Cooke, H. A., et al. (2012). Synthesis of
578 Methylphosphonic Acid by Marine Microbes: A Source for Methane in the Aerobic Ocean. *Science*,
579 337(6098), 1104-1107.
- 580 Morasch, B., Richnow, H. H., Vieth, A., Schink, B., & Meckenstock, R. U. (2004). Stable Isotope Fractionation
581 Caused by Glycyl Radical Enzymes during Bacterial Degradation of Aromatic Compounds. *Applied and*
582 *environmental microbiology*, 70(5), 2935-2940. [https://journals.asm.org/doi/abs/10.1128/AEM.70.5.2935-](https://journals.asm.org/doi/abs/10.1128/AEM.70.5.2935-2940.2004)
583 [2940.2004](https://journals.asm.org/doi/abs/10.1128/AEM.70.5.2935-2940.2004)
- 584 Nisbet, E., & Weiss, R. (2010). Top-down versus bottom-up. *Science*, 328(5983), 1241-1243.
- 585 Oremland, R. S. (1979). Methanogenic Activity in Plankton Samples and Fish Interstines – Mechanism for Insitu
586 Methanogenesis in Oceanic Surface Waters. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 24(6), 1136-1141.
- 587 Peeters, F., Encinas Fernandez, J., & Hofmann, H. (2019). Sediment fluxes rather than oxic methanogenesis explain
588 diffusive CH₄ emissions from lakes and reservoirs. *scientific reports*, 9(1), 243.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36530-w>
- 590 Perez-Coronel, E., & Beman, J.M. (2022). Multiple sources of aerobic methane production in aquatic ecosystems
591 include bacterial photosynthesis. *Nature communications*, 13(1), 6454. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34105-y)
592 [34105-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34105-y)

- Polag, D., & Keppler, F. (2018). Long-term monitoring of breath methane. *Science of The Total Environment*, 624, 69-77. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969717335246>
- Polag, D., & Keppler, F. (2022). COVID19-vaccination affects breath methane dynamics. *bioRxiv*, 2022.2007.2027.501717. <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2022/07/27/2022.07.27.501717.full.pdf>
- Popp, B. N., Takigiku, R., Hayes, J. M., Louda, J. W., & Baker, E. W. (1989). The post-Paleozoic chronology and mechanism of ^{13}C depletion in primary marine organic matter. *American Journal of Science*, 289(4), 436-454. <https://www.ajsonline.org/content/ajs/289/4/436.full.pdf>
- Reeburgh, W. S. (2007). Oceanic methane biogeochemistry. *Chemical Reviews*, 107(2), 486-513.
- Repeta, D. J., Ferrón, S., Sosa, O. A., Johnson, C. G., Repeta, L. D., Acker, M., et al. (2016). Marine methane paradox explained by bacterial degradation of dissolved organic matter. *Nature geoscience*, 9(12), 884.
- Rosentreter, J. A., Borges, A. V., Deemer, B. R., Holgerson, M. A., Liu, S., Song, C., et al. (2021). Half of global methane emissions come from highly variable aquatic ecosystem sources. *Nature geoscience*, 14(4), 225-230. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00715-2>
- Sasakawa, M., Tsunogai, U., Kameyama, S., Nakagawa, F., Nojiri, Y., & Tsuda, A. (2008). Carbon isotopic characterization for the origin of excess methane in subsurface seawater. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 113(C3). <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2007JC004217>
- Saunois, M., Bousquet, P., Poulter, B., Peregón, A., Ciais, P., Canadell, J. G., et al. (2016). The global methane budget 2000–2012. *Earth System Science Data*, 8(2), 697-751.
- Saunois, M., Stavert, A. R., Poulter, B., Bousquet, P., Canadell, J. G., Jackson, R. B., et al. (2020). The Global Methane Budget 2000–2017. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 12(3), 1561-1623. <https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/12/1561/2020/>
- Schmale, O., Wäge, J., Mohrholz, V., Wasmund, N., Gräwe, U., Rehder, G., et al. (2018). The contribution of zooplankton to methane supersaturation in the oxygenated upper waters of the central Baltic Sea. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 63(1), 412-430.
- Schroll, M., Keppler, F., Greule, M., Eckhardt, C., Zorn, H., & Lenhart, K. (2020). The stable carbon isotope signature of methane produced by saprotrophic fungi. *Biogeosciences*, 17(14), 3891-3901. <https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/17/3891/2020/>
- Scranton, M. I., & Brewer, P. G. (1977). Occurrence of methane in the near-surface waters of the western subtropical North-Atlantic. *Deep Sea Research*, 24(2), 127-138. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0146629177905483>
- Scranton, M. I., & Farrington, J. W. (1977). Methane production in the waters off Walvis Bay. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 82(31), 4947-4953. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/JC082i031p04947>
- Sherwood, O. A., Schwietzke, S., Arling, V. A., & Etiope, G. (2017). Global Inventory of Gas Geochemistry Data from Fossil Fuel, Microbial and Burning Sources, version 2017. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 9(2), 639-656. <https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/9/639/2017/>
- Sosa, O. A., Casey, J. R., & Karl, D. M. (2019). Methylphosphonate Oxidation in *Prochlorococcus* Strain MIT9301 Supports Phosphate Acquisition, Formate Excretion, and Carbon Assimilation into Purines. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, 85(13), e00289-00219. <https://aem.asm.org/content/aem/85/13/e00289-19.full.pdf>
- Stawiarski, B., Otto, S., Thiel, V., Gräwe, U., Loick-Wilde, N., Wittenborn, A. K., et al. (2019). Controls on zooplankton methane production in the central Baltic Sea. *Biogeosciences*, 16(1), 1-16.
- Stefels, J. (2000). Physiological aspects of the production and conversion of DMSP in marine algae and higher plants. *Journal of Sea Research*, 43(3), 183-197. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1385110100000307>
- Sunda, W., Kieber, D. J., Kiene, R. P., & Huntsman, S. (2002). An antioxidant function for DMSP and DMS in marine algae. *Nature*, 418(6895), 317-320. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature00851>
- Taenzer, L., Carini, P. C., Masterson, A. M., Bourque, B., Gaube, J. H., & Leavitt, W. D. (2020). Microbial Methane From Methylphosphonate Isotopically Records Source. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(1), e2019GL085872. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019GL085872>
- Tang, K. W., McGinnis, D. F., Frindte, K., Brüchert, V., & Grossart, H.-P. (2014). Paradox reconsidered: Methane oversaturation in well-oxygenated lake waters. *Limnol. Oceanogr*, 59(1), 275-284.
- Tang, K. W., McGinnis, D. F., Ionescu, D., & Grossart, H.-P. (2016). Methane Production in Oxic Lake Waters Potentially Increases Aquatic Methane Flux to Air. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 3(6), 227-233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00150>

- Thottathil, S. D., & Prairie, Y. T. (2021). Coupling of stable carbon isotopic signature of methane and ebullitive fluxes in northern temperate lakes. *Science of The Total Environment*, 777, 146117. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969721011840>
- Thottathil, S. D., Reis, P. C. J., & Prairie, Y. T. (2022). Magnitude and Drivers of Oxidic Methane Production in Small Temperate Lakes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 56(15), 11041-11050. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c01730>
- Tsunogai, U., Miyoshi, Y., Matsushita, T., Komatsu, D. D., Ito, M., Sukigara, C., et al. (2020). Dual stable isotope characterization of excess methane in oxidic waters of a mesotrophic lake. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 65(12), 2937-2952. <https://aslopubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/lno.11566>
- Vigano, I., Röckmann, T., Holzinger, R., van Dijk, A., Keppler, F., Greule, M., Brand, W.A., Geilmann, H., van Weelden, H. . (2009). The stable isotope signature of methane emitted from plant material under UV irradiation. *Atmospheric Environment*, 43, 5637-5646
- Wang, Q., Alowafeer, A., Kerner, P., Balasubramanian, N., Patterson, A., Christian, W., et al. (2021). Aerobic bacterial methane synthesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 118(27).
- Weber, T., Wiseman, N. A., & Kock, A. (2019). Global ocean methane emissions dominated by shallow coastal waters. *Nature communications*, 10(1), 4584. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12541-7>
- Yao, M., Henny, C., & Maresca, J. A. (2016). Freshwater Bacteria Release Methane as a By-Product of Phosphorus Acquisition. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, 82(23), 6994-7003. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5103098/>
- Yoshikawa, C., Hayashi, E., Yamada, K., Yoshida, O., Toyoda, S., & Yoshida, N. (2014). Methane sources and sinks in the subtropical South Pacific along 17°S as traced by stable isotope ratios. *Chemical Geology*, 382, 24-31. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009254114002721>
- Zhang, Y., Xie, H., & Xie, H. (2015). Photomineralization and photomethanification of dissolved organic matter in Saguenay River surface water.
- Zheng, Y., Harris, D. F., Yu, Z., Fu, Y., Poudel, S., Ledbetter, R. N., et al. (2018). A pathway for biological methane production using bacterial iron-only nitrogenase. *Nature Microbiology*, 3(3), 281-286. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-017-0091-5>
- Zindler, C., Bracher, A., Marandino, C. A., Taylor, B., Torrecilla, E., Kock, A., & Bange, H. W. (2013). Sulphur compounds, methane, and phytoplankton: interactions along a north-south transit in the western Pacific Ocean. *Biogeosciences*, 10(5), 3297-3311.