BENTHIC NITROGEN CYCLING TRAVERSING THE PERUVIAN OXYGEN MINIMUM ZONE

(revised manuscript, submitted July 18, 2011)


Leibniz Institute of Marine Sciences (IFM–GEOMAR), Wischhofstr. 1 – 3, 24148 Kiel, Germany

* author for correspondence : lbohlen@ifm-geomar.de
ABSTRACT

Benthic nitrogen (N) cycling was investigated at six stations along a transect traversing the Peruvian oxygen minimum zone (OMZ) at 11 °S. An extensive dataset including porewater concentration profiles and in situ benthic fluxes of nitrate (NO$_3^-$), nitrite (NO$_2^-$) and ammonium (NH$_4^+$) was used to constrain a 1-D reaction–transport model designed to simulate and interpret the measured data at each station. Simulated rates of nitrification, denitrification, anammox and dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA) by filamentous large sulfur bacteria (e.g. *Beggiatoa* and *Thioploca*) were highly variable throughout the OMZ yet clear trends were discernible. On the shelf and upper slope (80 – 260 m water depth) where extensive areas of bacterial mats were present, DNRA dominated total N turnover ($\leq$ 2.9 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) and accounted for $\geq$ 65% of NO$_3^-$ + NO$_2^-$ uptake by the sediments from the bottom water. Nonetheless, these sediments did not represent a major sink for dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN = NO$_3^-$ + NO$_2^-$ + NH$_4^+$) since DNRA reduces NO$_3^-$ and, potentially NO$_2^-$, to NH$_4^+$. Consequently, the shelf and upper slope sediments were recycling sites for DIN due to relatively low rates of denitrification and high rates of ammonium release from DNRA and ammonification of organic matter. This finding contrasts with the current opinion that sediments underlying OMZs are a strong sink for DIN. Only at greater water depths (300 – 1000 m) did the sediments become a net sink for DIN. Here, denitrification was the major process ($\leq$ 2 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) and removed 55 – 73% of NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ taken up by the sediments, with DNRA and anammox accounting for the remaining fraction. Anammox was of minor importance on the shelf and upper slope yet contributed up to 62% to total N$_2$ production at the 1000 m station. The results indicate that the partitioning of oxidized N (NO$_3^-$, NO$_2^-$) into DNRA or denitrification is a key factor determining the role of marine sediments as DIN sinks or recycling sites. Consequently, high measured benthic
uptake rates of oxidized N within OMZs do not necessarily indicate a loss of fixed N from the marine environment.
1. INTRODUCTION

As a limiting nutrient for biological productivity, nitrogen (N) occupies a central role in the biogeochemistry of the marine environment and exerts a significant influence on other elemental cycles, in particular carbon (Falkowski, 1997; Gruber, 2004). Bioavailable, or reactive, N in the ocean includes nitrate (NO$_3^-$), nitrite (NO$_2^-$) and ammonium (NH$_4^+$), whereas dinitrogen gas (N$_2$) is only accessible for nitrogen fixing bacteria. For the most part, the oceanic inventory of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN = NO$_3^- + NO_2^- + NH_4^+$) depends on the balance between losses via denitrification (Codispoti et al., 2001; Gruber, 2004) and anammox (Dalsgaard et al., 2003; Kuypers et al., 2003) and gains through N$_2$ fixation.

Denitrification and anammox occur prominently in the water column in oxygen minimum zones (OMZs) and in anoxic marine sediments and together determine the extent of N deficit in these environments (Gruber and Sarmiento, 1997; Codispoti et al., 2001). An imbalance between sources and sinks of DIN may affect the intensity and potential growth of OMZs. For example, a loss of DIN from the water column due to denitrification or anammox may result in lower primary and export production and diminished oxygen (O$_2$) consumption rates in deeper water masses. Such a negative feedback could limit the ongoing spreading of OMZs (Oschlies et al., 2008; Stramma et al., 2008). However, benthic release of DIN potentially stimulates primary production and O$_2$ consumption in the water column, exacerbated by increased phosphorus fluxes from sediments underlying O$_2$-deficient waters (e.g. Ingall and Jahnke, 1994; Wallmann, 2010). This could drive the expansion of OMZs in a similar way to the biogeochemical feedback mechanisms driving Cretaceous ocean anoxic events (Van Cappellen and Ingall, 1994).

On a global scale marine sediments have been identified as fixed N sinks (e.g. Brandes and Devol, 2002), yet their source-sink function on regional scales is currently unclear.
(Fulweiler et al., 2007). Sediments underlying the hypoxic waters of upwelling regions are commonly perceived as sinks for DIN (Middelburg et al., 1996; Gruber and Sarmiento, 1997). Rate measurements are scarce, but those which do exist generally support this idea (Berelson et al., 1987; Devol and Christensen, 1993; Hartnett and Devol, 2003; Glud et al., 2009; Schwartz et al., 2009; Woulds et al., 2009). A recent study along 11 °S within the Peruvian OMZ (Sommer et al., submitted) showed the sediments were a sink for DIN on the continental slope at water depths with low dissolved O$_2$. However, on the shelf and upper slope the opposite was true. Here, mats of large vacuolated sulfur bacteria such as *Thioploca* and *Beggiatoa* (Mosch et al., 2010) were observed. These microorganisms internally store NO$_3^−$ and, potentially NO$_2^−$, from the overlying seawater at millimolar concentrations (Fossing et al., 1995; Zopfi et al., 2001). The NO$_3^−$ is used as an electron acceptor for sulfide oxidation in a process termed dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA), by which the microorganisms gain metabolic energy (e.g. Otte et al., 1999; Jørgensen and Nelson, 2004; Preisler et al., 2007). Large NH$_4^+$ effluxes have been measured on the shelf in these areas (Sommer et al., submitted), and a rudimentary N mass balance by these workers indicates that a major proportion of the total NO$_3^−$ + NO$_2^−$ uptake on the Peruvian shelf is channeled into DNRA rather than denitrification and anammox. DNRA by large sulfur bacteria has been identified as an important process in the N cycle and source of NH$_4^+$ to the porewater in organic matter–rich sediments on the continental shelf (Christensen et al., 2000; Graco et al., 2001; Otte et al., 1999; Dale et al., 2011). Critically, though, DNRA does not result in a net loss of DIN but instead recycles fixed N to the overlying water column in the form of NH$_4^+$. The significance of this process in the marine N budget is unknown.

The aim of this study is to investigate N cycling in the Peruvian OMZ sediments along 11 °S and identify the major benthic N turnover processes under the changing redox conditions. We used a reaction–transport model constrained by measured in situ N fluxes and
porewater geochemical profiles to explain the observed shift of the sediments as recycling sites for DIN on the shelf to DIN sinks down the continental slope. In contrast to previous modeling studies that simulated denitrification as a direct conversion of $\text{NO}_3^-$ to $\text{N}_2$ (e.g. Middelburg et al., 1996; Van Cappellen and Wang, 1996), the role of the intermediate species, $\text{NO}_2^-$, is considered here owing to high concentrations in the water column on the shelf. We also focus on the importance of DNRA to N turnover since previous modeling studies suggest that it may dominate benthic sulfur and nitrogen cycling in suboxic upwelling regions as well as organic–rich coastal sediments where sulfide accumulates in the porewater (e.g. Dale et al., 2009; 2011). Furthermore, because of the widespread occurrence of bacterial mats off southern Peru and Chile we expect this process to be significant (e.g. Gallardo, 1977; Fossing et al., 1995; Thamdrup and Canfield, 1996). To our knowledge this is the first modeling study to combine in situ flux data and numerical modeling to quantify DNRA and anammox along a redox gradient through fully anoxic to hypoxic bottom waters.

2. STUDY AREA

The Peruvian upwelling region forms part of the eastern boundary current system of the Eastern Tropical South Pacific. Alongshore winds engender offshore Ekman transport of surface waters which are replaced by $\text{O}_2$–poor, nutrient–rich equatorial subsurface waters of the Peru–Chile undercurrent (Fiedler and Talley, 2006; Silva et al., 2009). Upwelling stimulates high rates of primary productivity ($1.8 – 3.6 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$, Reimers and Suess, 1983; Pennington et al., 2006; Fernández et al., 2009) and supports the development of an extensive OMZ (Fiedler and Talley, 2006; Silva et al., 2009). The upwelling intensity is seasonally variable and is most intense in austral winter and spring with interannual variability imposed by the El Niño Southern Oscillation (Morales et al., 1999; Kessler, 2006). The vertical extension of the OMZ reaches 700 m water depth off Peru (defined as $\text{O}_2 < 20 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$;
Fuenzalida et al. 2009), with an upper boundary that may be as shallow as 50 m (Morales et al., 1999) and deepen to ca. 200 m (e.g. Levin et al., 2002) during strong El Niño events.

The present study area at 11 °S (Fig. 1) is located within the most intense coastal upwelling region and falls with the region of maximum primary productivity (Krissek et al., 1980; Pennington et al., 2006). This results in the formation of an upper–slope diatomaceous mud lens rich in organic–carbon and poor in carbonate between 10.5 °S and 13.6 °S (Zuta and Guillén, 1970; Krissek et al., 1980; Reimers and Suess, 1983). Preservation and burial of organic matter within the mud lens is supported by high sediment accumulation rates and diminished bottom current velocities (Suess et al., 1987). Sediment accumulates preferentially at water depths between 100 and 450 m and below 2000 m, whereas lower accumulation rates are found in the middle slope due to fluctuations in bottom current velocities (Reimers and Suess, 1983). At the time of sampling, the OMZ (defined here as ≤ 10 µM O₂) extended from a water depth of ca. 50 – 550 m (Fig. 1) and minimum bottom water O₂ concentrations were below the analytical detection limit (2 µM). In these anoxic areas, the surface sediments were characterized by extensive coverage by mats of large vacuolated sulfur bacteria such as *Thioploca* and *Beggiatoa* (Mosch et al., 2010).

### 3. MATERIAL AND METHODS

#### 3.1. Sampling and geochemical analysis

Sediment cores were taken at 6 stations during two expeditions on RV Meteor (M77, leg 1 and 2) from October to December 2008 (late austral spring, high upwelling season) using multi–corers (MUC) and benthic lander deployments (BIGO). The latter were used to determine in situ fluxes of NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻, NO₂⁻ and, at the 2 deepest stations (5 and 6), total
oxygen uptake (TOU). Complete details of the benthic flux measurements are provided by Sommer et al. (submitted). Locations and water depths at the stations are listed in Table 1. With the exception of station 2, sediment samples were taken using both MUC and BIGO technologies. The retrieved cores were immediately transferred to a cool room onboard at 4 °C and processed within a few hours. Two parallel cores were taken for all MUC deployments. The first core was sub-sampled for redox sensitive constituents under anoxic conditions using an argon-filled glove bag. Sediment sections for porewater extraction were transferred into tubes pre-flushed with argon gas and subsequently centrifuged at max. 4500 G for 20 minutes. Prior to analysis, the supernatant porewater was filtered with 0.2 µm cellulose acetate Nuclepore® filters within the glove bag. The centrifugation tubes with the remaining solid phase of the sediment were stored for further analysis onshore. The second core was sub-sampled for porewater (i) without the glove bag by squeezing 1 – 2 cm thick slices using a low pressure squeezer (argon at 2.5 bar) and filtering (0.2 µm) into recipient vessels, or (ii) anaerobically using rhizons®. For the BIGO deployments containing two chambers one core was taken from each. All BIGO cores were processed anaerobically with the glove bag as described above.

Samples for bottom water analysis were taken from the supernatant water of the sediment cores and from syringes attached to the outside of the benthic lander directly above the seabed.

Ammonium (NH₄⁺), nitrite (NO₂⁻), dissolved ferrous iron (Fe²⁺), and total dissolved sulfide (TH₂S ~ H₂S + HS⁻) were measured onboard using standard photometric techniques (Grasshoff et al., 1999). Aliquots of porewater were diluted with O₂-free artificial seawater prior to analysis where necessary. Porewater samples for Fe²⁺ analysis were treated with ascorbic acid directly after filtering (0.2 µm). Detection limits for NH₄⁺, NO₂⁻ and TH₂S were 1 µM. Total alkalinity (TA) was determined onboard by direct titration of 1 ml porewater with
0.02 M HCl according to Ivanenkov and Lyakhin (1978) with an error of 0.05 meq l\(^{-1}\). The titration method was calibrated using IAPSO seawater standard. Ion chromatography was used to determine nitrate (\(\text{NO}_3^–\)) and occasionally sulfate (\(\text{SO}_4^{2–}\)) in the onboard laboratory. Additional \(\text{SO}_4^{2–}\) analysis was performed onshore in porewater samples stored and transported in plastic vials. \(\text{NO}_3^–\) and \(\text{SO}_4^{2–}\) were measured with a detection limit of 1 µM and 10 µM, respectively and a relative error of 5 % and 2 %.

The solid phases were freeze–dried and analyzed for total particulate carbon, particulate organic nitrogen (PON) and total particulate sulfur (TPS) using a Carlo–Erba element analyzer (NA 1500). Particulate organic carbon (POC) content was determined on the residue after acidifying the sample with HCl (detection limit < 0.1 wt–% and relative error of 3%). Inorganic carbon was determined by weight difference. Additional sediment samples were embedded in epoxy resin for determination of gamma–ray excess \(^{210}\text{Pb}\) activities at 46.5 keV on a low–background coaxial Ge(Li) detector.

Porosity was determined from the weight of the freeze–dried sediment and the water content. The volume fraction of the sediment was calculated using a dry sediment density of 2 g cm\(^{-3}\) (Böning et al., 2004). Further analytical details corresponding to the benthic lander deployments are described by Sommer et al. (submitted).

3.2. Numerical modeling

3.2.1. Coupling reaction and transport

A 1–D numerical reaction–transport model was developed to simulate the biogeochemical cycles in the surface sediments at the 6 sampling stations along the 11 °S transect. The length of the modeled domain, L, varied between 20 and 50 cm. In total 10 solutes were considered,
including O$_2$, NO$_3^-$, NO$_2^-$, NH$_4^+$, N$_2$, TH$_2$S, SO$_4^{2-}$, Fe$^{2+}$ as well as NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ stored in large sulfur bacteria (NO$_3^-$$_{bac}$, NO$_2^-$$_{bac}$). Solid species considered were POC, PON, adsorbed NH$_4^+$ (NH$_4^+$$_{ads}$), reactive iron oxide (FeOOH), sulfide–bound iron (FeII), TPS and excess $^{210}$Pb. Solute and solid concentrations were modeled in units of mmol cm$^{-3}$ of porewater and dry weight percent (wt–%), respectively, except for NH$_4^+$$_{ads}$ (mmol g$^{-1}$). The modeled reaction network and rate expressions are described in Table 2 and the corresponding parameters are in Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplementary Material.

Chemical species in the simulated sediment column were transported by advection due to sediment accumulation and compaction, molecular diffusion (for solutes), sediment mixing by fauna (bioturbation), non–local transport of solutes by fauna (bioirrigation) and non–local transport of NO$_3^-$$_{bac}$ and NO$_2^-$$_{bac}$ due to chemotaxis of large sulfur bacteria. Low Peclet numbers ($<< 1$) over the length of the modeled sediment column (50 cm) illustrate that diffusion rather than advection is the dominant transport process for solutes below the irrigation layer (Boudreau, 1997). The following mass conservation equations were used to describe the temporal concentration change of solutes (C$_i$), NO$_3^-$$_{bac}$ and NO$_2^-$$_{bac}$ (C$_b$), and solids (C$_j$), due to transport and reaction:

\[
\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \phi \left( D_s - D_B \right) \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \rho v_i C_i \right) + \phi v_i (C_i(0) - C_i) - \phi \Sigma R_i \tag{1a}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial C_b}{\partial t} = \rho v_d (C_b(0) - C_b) + \rho \Sigma R_b \tag{1b}
\]

\[
(1 - \phi) \frac{\partial C_j}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( (1 - \phi) D_B \frac{\partial C_j}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( (1 - \phi) w C_j \right) + (1 - \phi) \Sigma R_j \tag{1c}
\]
where t (yr) is time, x (cm) is depth below the sediment–water interface, $\varphi$ (dimensionless) is porosity, $v$ (cm yr$^{-1}$) is the burial velocity for solutes, $w$ (cm yr$^{-1}$) is the burial velocity for solids, $D_S$ (cm$^2$ yr$^{-1}$) is the tortuosity corrected molecular diffusion coefficient, $D_B$ (cm$^2$ yr$^{-1}$) is the bioturbation coefficient, $\alpha_i$ (yr$^{-1}$) is the bioirrigation coefficient, $\alpha_b$ (yr$^{-1}$) is the coefficient for non–local NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ transport by bacteria, $C_{i(0)}$ and $C_{b(0)}$ are the concentrations of solutes and NO$_3^-$ or NO$_2^-$ in bacteria at the sediment–water interface, respectively, and $\Sigma R$ is the sum concentration change due to chemical reactions. NO$_3^-$$_{bac}$ and NO$_2^-$$_{bac}$ were assumed to be confined to the vacuoles and thus not transported by diffusion or burial. In these equations $\varphi$, $D_S$, $D_B$, $v$, $w$, $\alpha_i$, $\alpha_b$ are depth–dependent and explained in more detail in the Supplementary Material.

The model was run to steady–state ($\partial C / \partial t = 0$), although we are aware that the shelf is a more transient environment than the deeper slope settings. For example, an increase in POC accumulation rates began around 1820 AD (Gutiérrez et al., 2009) and the shelf bottom waters were renewed and ventilated in 1993 and 1997/98 in response to El Niño events (Gutiérrez et al., 2008). Nonetheless, we argue that (i) the relatively slow change in solid accumulation rates beginning ca. 200 years ago allows the solutes in the upper 50 cm to approach dynamic equilibrium with regard to POM mineralization, and (ii) the 13 year period since the last major oxygenation event on the shelf is sufficiently long for the N fluxes and turnover rates in the surface layers impacted by microbial mats (< 10 cm) also to have reached quasi–steady state conditions. In support of this argument, diffusion time–scales calculated from the modified Einstein–Smoluchowski equation (Jørgensen et al., 2004) for a typical solute are on the order of 10 and 1 yr for the upper 50 and 10 cm of the sediment, respectively.
3.2.2. Reaction network

The biogeochemical reactions considered (Table 2) were driven by the degradation of particulate organic matter (POM), defined chemically as \((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)_{r\text{NC}}\) where \(r_{\text{NC}}\) is the molar ratio of N:C. POM was degraded by aerobic respiration (\(R_1\)), denitrification (\(R_2, R_3\)), iron oxide reduction (\(R_4\)) and sulfate reduction (\(R_5\)). Manganese oxide reduction and methanogenesis were neglected because measured dissolved and solid Mn concentrations were low (< 1 µM and < 0.05 wt-%, respectively) and \(\text{SO}_4^{2-}\) was never exhausted over the modeled sediment layer. The organic nitrogen in POM was liberated as \(\text{NH}_4^+\) during mineralization rather than being directly coupled to nitrification (Van Cappellen and Wang, 1996) since these processes are mediated by different groups of microorganisms. The relative rates of each POM degradation pathway were determined using Michaelis–Menten kinetics (e.g. Boudreau, 1996), where the electron acceptors \(\text{O}_2, \text{NO}_3^-, \text{NO}_2^-, \text{FeOOH}\) and \(\text{SO}_4^{2-}\) were used sequentially in this order until their concentrations decreased to limiting levels defined by different half saturation constants (\(K\)) for each electron acceptor. Bimolecular rate laws were used for all secondary redox reactions (Van Cappellen and Wang, 1996).

\(\text{TA}\) was not modeled explicitly and was calculated from the major ion concentrations at each depth (\(x\)) relative to their concentrations at the sediment–water interface (\(x = 0\)) using the explicit conservative expression for \(\text{TA}\) (Wolf–Gladrow et al., 2007):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TA}(x) &= \text{TA}(0) - (\text{NO}_3^-(x) - \text{NO}_3^-(0)) + (\text{NH}_4^+(x) - \text{NH}_4^+(0)) - 2\times(\text{SO}_4^{2-}(x) - \text{SO}_4^{2-}(0)) \\
&\quad - (\text{NO}_2^-(x) - \text{NO}_2^-(0)) + 2\times(\text{Fe}^{2+}(x) - \text{Fe}^{2+}(0)) \quad (2)
\end{align*}
\]

A schematic overview of the modeled N cycle is shown in Fig. 2A. Organic nitrogen was released as \(\text{NH}_4^+\) during POM mineralization (ammonification, \(R_{\text{AMF}}\)). Canonical
Denitrification was modeled as a two-step process (R_2, R_3) with NO_2^- as an intermediate species. The kinetics of this process was formulated such that POM degradation via NO_3^- was inhibited by the accumulation of NO_2^- (Table 2), i.e. POM was preferentially degraded by NO_2^-.

We took this approach since denitrifying organisms harvest a greater amount of catabolic energy during the reduction of NO_2^- to N_2 compared to NO_3^- reduction to NO_2^- under standard conditions (Thauer et al., 1977; Lam and Kuypers, 2011). Similarly, nitrification, was described as the stepwise oxidation of NH_4^+ to NO_2^- followed by NO_2^- to NO_3^- (R_6, R_7). In our model, therefore, NO_2^- was allowed to accumulate in the porewater, thus permitting competition between denitrification (R_3), nitrification (R_7) and anammox (R_8) for NO_2^-.

The latter process produces N_2 gas from NO_2^- and NH_4^+ (Thamdrup and Dalsgaard, 2002; Dalsgaard et al., 2005) and is an important pathway of nitrogen loss in the marine environment (Thamdrup and Dalsgaard, 2002; Dalsgaard et al., 2005; Hamersley et al., 2007; Lam et al., 2009). Denitrification coupled to Fe^{2+} oxidation (Straub et al., 1996) was also considered to compete with canonical denitrification for NO_3^-.

However, simulations (not shown) revealed that this process was of minor importance (contributing < 0.1 % to total N_2 production) and will thus not be discussed further. In what follows, the term ‘denitrification’ applies to canonical denitrification (i.e. R_2 followed by R_3) rather than anammox (R_8).

At station 1, where bottom water NO_2^- was elevated and NO_3^- concentrations were low (Table 3), DNRA was allowed to proceed using both NO_3^- (R_9) and NO_2^- (R_{10}) as electron acceptors. In support of this assumption, Zopfi et al. (2001) observed positive chemotaxis of *Thioploca* toward NO_2^-, suggesting a direct response of large sulfur bacteria to NO_2^-.

At the other stations where seawater NO_2^- concentrations were < 3 µM (Table 3), NO_3^- was considered to be the only available electron acceptor for DNRA.
NH$_4^+$ was allowed to adsorb onto sediment particles ($R_{11}$). Although this process is more correctly described as a dynamic equilibrium between dissolved and adsorbed NH$_4^+$ defined by an empirical equilibrium constant, $K_{NH4}$ (Morse and Morin, 2005), it was simulated as a kinetic process whose rate is partially determined by the departure from equilibrium (Table 2). The rate constant was set to sufficiently large values to ensure that dynamic equilibrium between dissolved and adsorbed ammonium was always maintained (Wallmann et al., 2008).

Although iron and sulfur cycling were included in the reaction network through their coupling with the nitrogen cycle, only the most relevant reactions were considered. Labile FeOOH can undergo dissimilatory iron reduction ($R_4$) producing Fe$^{2+}$. Subsequently, Fe$^{2+}$ may be either oxidized by O$_2^-$ (Table 2) to FeOOH or be precipitated as sedimentary iron sulfide minerals. Dissolved sulfide may be either oxidized aerobically or anaerobically (i.e. by DNRA) or be precipitated into particulate iron minerals or incorporated in organic matter. The iron and sulfide precipitation reactions are not described by explicit reactions. Instead, the rates of these processes were estimated from fitting appropriate functions to the Fe$^{2+}$ and TH$_2$S profiles. This procedure is described in the Supplementary Material.

3.2.3. Constraints on the rates of N cycling

Rates of benthic N turnover processes at each station were not measured directly using, for example, $^{15}$N labeling studies but were instead indirectly estimated by applying the numerical model to the measured porewater profiles and benthic fluxes. The procedure is outlined graphically in Fig. 2B and described below.

An initial guess for the rate of POM degradation at each station was made from the measured NH$_4^+$ profiles. At steady state, Eq. (1a) shows that the net accumulation of NH$_4^+$ at
each depth will be zero due to a balancing of the transport and reaction terms. In this case, the sum of reactions involving NH$_4^+$, $\Sigma R_{NH4(x)}$, can be expressed as:

$$\Sigma R_{NH4(x)} = R_{AMF(x)} - R_6(x) - R_8(x) + R_9(x) + (4/3 \times R_{10(x)}) - R_{11(x)} \quad (3)$$

where $R_{AMF(x)}$ is the rate of NH$_4^+$ production during organic matter degradation and the other reactions are listed in Table 2. Typically, the NH$_4^+$ data would be simulated by adjusting the rate constants in the individual reactions expression in the above equation. In our approach, however, a continuous function was fit through the measured NH$_4^+$ concentrations to obtain a profile of observed NH$_4^+$ ($NH_4^{+}_{OBS(x)}$). The following fitting function was then used to describe $\Sigma R_{NH4(x)}$:

$$\Sigma R_{NH4(x)} = k_{fit} \times (NH_4^{+}_{OBS(x)} - NH_4^{+}(x)) \quad (4)$$

where NH$_4^+(x)$ is the modeled NH$_4^+$ profile and $k_{fit}$ (yr$^{-1}$) is a kinetic constant. $k_{fit}$ was prescribed a high value to ensure that the modeled concentrations were maintained close to the measured values. With this approach, the observed NH$_4^+$ concentrations constitute an external forcing to the model which allows $\Sigma R_{NH4(x)}$ to be quantified without explicitly specifying a kinetic rate expression for ammonium production during organic matter degradation. The rate of ammonification was then determined from Eq. (3) and (4):

$$R_{AMF(x)} = k_{fit} \times (NH_4^{+}_{OBS(x)} - NH_4^{+}(x)) + R_6(x) + R_8(x) - R_9(x) - (4/3 \times R_{10(x)}) + R_{11(x)} \quad (5)$$

Consequently, the rate of POC mineralization ($R_{POC}$) was estimated from $R_{AMF(x)}$ by the following expression:
\[ R_{POC}(x) = R_{AMF}(x) / r_{NC}. \]  

The determination of \( R_{AMF}(x) \) thus required knowledge of the rates of nitrification (\( R_6 \)), anammox (\( R_8 \)), DNRA (\( R_9, R_{10} \)) and \( NH_4^+ \) adsorption (\( R_{11} \)). The rates of nitrification and \( NH_4^+ \) adsorption were parameterized using constants whose values were invariable across the transect (Table S1 in the Supplementary Material). The rate constants for anammox and DNRA (Table S2) were variable and adjusted to fit the measured fluxes. To begin with, the rates of anammox and DNRA were initially set to zero which means that ammonification is the only unknown process affecting \( NH_4^+ \) concentrations. If this were correct, the modeled \( NH_4^+ \), TA and \( SO_4^{2-} \) profiles and DIN fluxes would be consistent with the measured data (Fig. 2B, step #1). However, this was not the case for any station, which indicates the occurrence of DNRA and/or anammox (Fig. 2B, steps #2 and 3). Furthermore, the flux of \( NO_3^- \) and/or \( NO_2^- \) into the sediment was underestimated at all stations when anammox and DNRA were not considered. This deficit must then be due to one or both of these processes since the rate of denitrification (\( R_2, R_3 \)) is indirectly imposed by \( R_{POC} \) (Eq. 6).

Rates of DNRA and anammox at the individual stations were constrained according to three criteria. Firstly, where the initial model simulation underestimated both \( NO_3^- \) and/or \( NO_2^- \) uptake into the sediment and POM degradation (indicated by too low TA and too high \( SO_4^{2-} \) concentrations), anammox was assumed to take place (Fig. 2B, step #2). Anammox consumes \( NO_2^- \) and \( NH_4^+ \), thus leading to higher rates of POM degradation in order to maintain the fit to the observed \( NH_4^+ \) data and, consequently, enhanced accumulation of TA and consumption of \( SO_4^{2-} \) (Eq. 5). If the measured benthic fluxes and concentrations profiles could be simulated by only considering anammox, DNRA was assumed not to occur. Note that for the above criteria, increasing the rate of DNRA instead of anammox would slow
down, rather than enhance, the rate of POM degradation since more NH$_4^+$ would be produced, ultimately leading to a greater misfit with the TA and SO$_4^{2-}$ data.

Secondly, where the initial model simulation underestimated NO$_3^-$ and/or NO$_2^-$ uptake and overestimated POM mineralization (indicated by too high TA and too low SO$_4^{2-}$ concentrations), DNRA was assumed to take place (Fig. 2B, step #3). As mentioned, DNRA enhances NO$_3^-$ (and NO$_2^-$) uptake into the sediment and produces NH$_4^+$, leading to a decrease of POM degradation and TA concentrations through Eq. 5. If the model adequately simulated the measured benthic N fluxes and the porewater profiles with DNRA only, anammox was assumed not to occur.

Finally, if the uptake of NO$_3^-$ and/or NO$_2^-$ into the sediment was underestimated in the model even after DNRA was considered, the remaining NO$_3^-$ and/or NO$_2^-$ uptake was attributed to anammox. This systematic approach, therefore, allows for the occurrence of only DNRA and anammox or, if necessary, both processes together to explain the benthic fluxes.

3.2.4. Boundary conditions and model solution

Boundary conditions for each species at the top and the bottom of the modeled sediment layer were required to solve the differential equations (Eq. 1). At the sediment–water interface fixed concentrations were imposed for solutes (Dirichlet type) and fixed fluxes for solids (Robin type). Solute concentrations were assigned measured bottom water values where available (Table 3). Concentrations of NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ in large sulfur bacteria were not measured but were estimated from the porewater NO$_3^-$ concentrations in squeezed sediment samples in the uppermost sediment layer which yielded higher NO$_3^-$ concentrations compared to centrifuged samples or rhizon extractions (see section 4.1). This assumes that squeezing destroyed the bacterial cells and released the nitrate stored in their vacuoles (Thamdrup and Canfield, 1996).
The imposed upper boundary for NO$\textsubscript{3}^-_{\text{bac}}$ and NO$\textsubscript{2}^-_{\text{bac}}$ should be regarded as minimum estimates since repeated freezing and thawing the sediment is required to fully destroy the cells and liberate the intracellular fluid (Dale et al., 2009).

POC fluxes to the sediment–water interface were constrained from a simple mass balance of the sediment at each station developed by Sommer et al. (submitted). The range of the organic carbon flux used in this model (6 $-$ 14 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, Table 3) compares very well to the TOC flux off Callao at 12 °S ($\sim$ 3 - 14 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$; Sifeddine et al., 2008) and the organic carbon flux reported by Henrichs and Farrington (1984) at 15 °S (9 $-$ 16 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$). PON fluxes were calculated using the measured C:N ratio in the top layer of sediment and the POC flux. Reactive FeOOH flux was calculated from the Al deposition rate (derived from the $^{210}$Pb measurements) and the Fe/Al ratio of 0.47 in andesitic volcanic rocks (Sarbas and Nohl, 2009) forming the local drainage area. Moreover, we assumed that only 50 % of the total iron reaching the seafloor was reactive in the surface layers (Poulton and Raiswell, 2002). Particulate sulfur fluxes at the top boundary were set to zero. The upper boundary for NH$^+_{\text{ads}}$ was implicitly given by the upper boundary concentration of NH$^+_{\text{ads}}$ and the apparent equilibrium coefficient for adsorption.

Solid species were prescribed zero–gradient (Neumann type) conditions at the lower boundary ($x = L$ cm) at all stations. A similar condition was also prescribed for solutes at stations 5 and 6 because the concentrations were invariable at the depth of the lower model boundary. At stations 1 to 4 distinct concentrations changes at the bottom boundary were observed, and here a constant gradient condition was imposed:

$$\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=L/2} = 0.95 \times \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=L}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)
where \( n \) refers to a layer (0 to 100) in the discretized grid space. This gradient resembles the near–linear measured concentration profiles of TA and \( \text{SO}_4^{2-} \) close to the bottom boundary. For \( \text{NH}_4^+ \), whose concentration was fit to the observed data, the gradient was set to that of the fitting function at the bottom boundary.

Finite differences and the method of lines were used to solve the set of coupled partial differential equations (Boudreau, 1996). A central differences scheme was applied over an uneven grid for diffusion, bioturbation, and advection in the bioturbated layer whereas upward differences were used for advective transport below the bioturbated zone. Depth intervals increased with sediment depth to a maximum resolution of 1 cm. The set of coupled ordinary differential equations was solved using the numerical solver NDSolve in Mathematica 7.0. Mass conservation of the model was \( > 99 \% \) and a typical steady–state simulation was completed within 5 minutes on a personal computer (Intel Core 2 Duo processor).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Sediment geochemistry and POM degradation

Porewater \( \text{NH}_4^+ \), \( \text{NO}_3^- \), \( \text{TH}_2\text{S} \), \( \text{SO}_4^{2-} \) and TA profiles for all stations are shown in Fig. 3. Maximum TA and \( \text{NH}_4^+ \) concentrations of 14 meq l\(^{-1}\) and 1.2 mM, respectively, were observed at the base of the core at the shallowest site (station 1). Steep \( \text{NH}_4^+ \) and TA concentration gradients at the sediment–water interface and a strong convex curvature of the profiles indicate high rates of POM mineralization in the surface layers on the shelf. For the Peru upwelling region at 12 °S (183 m water depth), higher concentrations of about 25 meq l\(^{-1}\) TA and 2.8 mM \( \text{NH}_4^+ \) have been reported (Froelich et al., 1988). Further south at 15 °S,
NH$_4^+$ concentrations > 3 mM at 60 cm were measured at a site at 245 m water depth (Rowe and Howarth, 1985). The rates of POM mineralization on the shelf at 11 °S are thus on the low side of previous reports. However, the NH$_4^+$ concentrations were elevated compared to other high productivity OMZ regions such as offshore central Chile (< 0.8 mM; Thamdrup and Canfield, 1996) and the Pakistan margin (< 0.3 mM; Woulds et al., 2009). The decrease in NH$_4^+$ and TA concentration gradients from station 1 to station 6 (Fig. 3) allude to a decrease in POM degradation rates with increasing water depth. This is confirmed by the SO$_4^{2-}$ concentration data which is progressively less depleted down slope.

These qualitative trends were supported by quantitative modeling of POC degradation rates (Table 4). Total mineralization rates decreased from 8.23 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ on the shelf to 1.74 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ at station 5 on the slope. At stations 1 and 2 sulfate reduction was by far the dominant POC degradation pathway (up to 80 % of total) and became relatively less important with increasing water depth. Empirical data sets predict that sulfate reduction accounts for ca. 70 % of organic carbon mineralization on the shelf (0 – 200 m) whereas aerobic respiration contributes only 10 % (Burdige, 2006). Based on these data, it can be inferred that sulfate reduction consumes the fraction of POM normally respired aerobically. Nonetheless, the modeled sulfate reduction rates (< 6.6 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) were a factor of 7 to 20 lower than measured rates from studies on the shelf off Peru and Chile (Fossing, 1990; Ferdelman et al., 1997), yet our derived total POC degradation rates were too low to support such high sulfate reduction rates except at station 1. Böning et al. (2004) reported sulfate reduction rates for 14 stations on the Peruvian shelf of which only two were > 3.9 mmol S m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ or twice this value for in terms of carbon mineralization. Furthermore, sulfate reduction rates equivalent to ca 2.4 and 1.2 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ were reported for 36 °S and 23 °S, respectively (Niggemann et al., 2007). Clearly, there is pronounced spatial heterogeneity in the total organic matter degradation rate in the OMZ off Peru and Chile.
The low total mineralization rates at the deep stations 5 and 6 are markedly higher than the measured TOU of ca. 0.5 and 1.5 mmol O$_2$ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, respectively (Fig. 4). This indicates that a large fraction of the reduced metabolites (e.g. NH$_4^+$, TH$_2$S) escape oxidation and are either buried or transported to the water column. The model underestimates the TOU by up to a factor of 2 and 3 at station 5 and 6, respectively. The reason for this discrepancy is not clear, but may be due to respiration by fauna or oxidation of reduced species in the chamber water rather than the sediments (Sommer et al., 2010).

Iron reduction contributed only marginally to the overall POM degradation inside the OMZ (< 1%) but accounted for 7% at the lower edge. Metal oxide reduction may account for up to 10 – 20% in highly bioturbated shelf sediments (Burdige, 2006), otherwise only 1% or less may be expected based on globally averaged studies (Thullner et al., 2009). The relatively high contribution from iron within the OMZ thus indicates that reactive iron fluxes are elevated in the area, perhaps by benthic release of ferrous on the shelf and oxidation to particulate ferric iron at the edges of the OMZ.

Porewater NO$_3^-$ concentrations were depleted below the uppermost centimeter(s) at stations 2 to 5 (Fig. 3). Similarly, NO$_2^-$ was generally < 1 µM below the uppermost centimeter(s) (data not shown), yet was elevated at station 1 where measured bottom water concentrations were 11.5 µM (Table 3). However, at station 1 and 6, NO$_3^-$ accumulated up to 10 µM below the surface layers. The reason for these anomalies is currently unclear, but may be due to deep bioirrigation at station 6 or experimental artifacts caused by ammonium oxidation as suggested by Woulds et al. (2009) who reported similar observations in the Pakistan margin OMZ. On the shelf there are further potential artifacts from the NO$_3^-$ stored within vacuolated sulfur bacteria. At stations 1 and 3, surface NO$_3^-$ concentrations in samples obtained using the porewater squeezing method exceeded 90 – 100 µM, whereas those using the centrifugation method or rhizons yielded much lower concentrations (< 30 µM). Such
elevated porewater NO$_3^-$ concentrations have already been observed in *Thioploca* inhabited sediments off central Chile (Thamdrup and Canfield, 1996). A comparison of the different porewater extraction techniques indicates that the porewater squeezing and, to some extent also the centrifugation method, led to elevated NO$_3^-$ concentrations by disrupting cells, whereas the use of rhizons appeared to be free of extraction artifacts (Fig. 3). Consequently, the elevated NO$_3^-$ values at depths < 10 cm were attributed to NO$_3^-$ released from large sulfur bacteria and thus not representative of true porewater concentrations. Porewater squeezing was not used at station 2 and the significance of intracellular NO$_3^-$ here is uncertain. In the absence of in situ NO$_3^-$ data obtained from microbiosensors, we are cautious to draw any firm conclusions from our measured NO$_3^-$ concentrations and these are not discussed further.

Nonetheless, the NO$_3^-$ cycling is constrained using the benthic fluxes and we are confident that the modeled rates of denitrification are realistic. At the intermediate water depths (stations 3 and 4), NO$_3^-$ (R$_2$) and NO$_2^-$ (R$_3$) reduction accounted for 40 – 50 % of POC degradation (Table 4), which is much higher than values of < 10 % predicted for the same water depth in normoxic settings (Thullner et al., 2009). In the absence of an upper oxic layer where aerobic respiration would inhibit denitrification, the denitrification layer would be located at the sediment–water interface. The rate of denitrification would then be much less limited by diffusion of NO$_3^-$ into the sediment since NO$_3^-$ no longer has to traverse the aerobic zone. We hypothesize that this explains why up to half of POM is mineralized through this pathway. Despite anoxic bottom waters on the shelf, denitrification accounts for a lower, yet significant, fraction of carbon degradation (15 – 20 %). We envisage that sediment clogging by microbial mats creates a barrier to NO$_3^-$ diffusion and limits the efficiency of denitrifying bacteria at these depths.

**4.2 Nitrogen turnover processes along the transect and their regulation**
The fluxes of DIN species (NO$_3^-$, NO$_2^-$, NH$_4^+$) measured in the benthic landers were well reproduced by the model (Fig. 4). The overall magnitude of the fluxes decreased with increasing water depth which reflects lower organic matter reactivity and degradation rates. Accordingly, NH$_4^+$ effluxes were highest at the shallowest station 1 and decreased monotonously to almost zero at station 5 and 6. Nitrate fluxes were always directed into the sediment with the maximum uptake rate at station 2, whereas station 1 showed elevated nitrite uptake. This can be attributed to relatively low bottom water NO$_3^-$ concentrations and high NO$_2^-$ concentrations (Table 3). With regards to the net flux of DIN, the stations can be distinguished by region, that is, those where DIN was recycled in the sediments (fluxes of NO$_3^-$ + NO$_2^-$ ≈ NH$_4^+$, stations 1 and 2) and those where the sediments were a sink for DIN (fluxes of NO$_3^-$ + NO$_2^-$ > NH$_4^+$, station 3 – 6). These trends are discussed in more detail by Sommer et al. (submitted).

The relative contributions of the various N turnover reactions to the measured fluxes along the 11 °S transect are listed in Table 5 and an overview of the major pathways along the transect is shown in Fig. 5. In agreement with the trend for POM degradation and the benthic NH$_4^+$ effluxes, ammonification was highest at the shallowest station 1 and decreased with increasing water depth. Rates of POM degradation via nitrate and nitrite (R$_2$ and R$_3$, respectively) exhibited a peak at station 3 and 4 (Fig. 5) where the relative contribution of these mineralization pathways was also highest (Table 4). The relatively lower rates of denitrification at stations 1 and 2, despite higher total POM degradation and the lack of O$_2$ have been explained as diffusion limitation of NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ from the bottom water. The predicted range of denitrification rates (R$_2$, R$_3$) was 0.2 – 2 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ and is consistent with rates measured at other low oxygen environments, for example, Concepción Bay (0.18 –
2.9 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\); Graco et al., 2001; Fariñas et al., 2004) and the Pakistan margin (0.07 – 3.68 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\); Schwartz et al., 2009).

In general, nitrification rates were low and could potentially supply < 1.5 % of \(\text{NO}_3^-\) or \(\text{NO}_2^-\) requirements for nitrate and nitrite reduction (Table 5). The major \(\text{NO}_3^-\) source for denitrification was thus identified as bottom water \(\text{NO}_3^-\). The availability of \(\text{NO}_3^-\) may limit denitrification at the shallower stations 1 – 4 where bottom water \(\text{NO}_3^-\) concentrations were lower than those down slope (Table 3). In fact, nitrate reduction (\(R_2\)) was positively correlated with bottom water \(\text{NO}_3^-\) concentration at stations 1 – 4, but not at stations 5 and 6 where low rates were associated with high \(\text{NO}_3^-\) availability (Fig. 6). It is likely that aerobic respiration outcompetes denitrification for labile organic carbon here, thus limiting the amount of substrate which can be degraded by denitrification (Dale et al., 2011). The model by Middelburg et al. (1996) predicts similar tendencies for high–nutrient low–oxygen bottom waters.

Total DNRA exhibited highest rates at stations 1 and 2 (ca. 2.8 mmol m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) where DIN was recycled in the sediments leading to high release rates of \(\text{NH}_4^+\) to the overlying water column (Table 5). With increasing water depth, DNRA rates decreased to zero. About 60 % of total DNRA at station 1 occurred with \(\text{NO}_2^-\) (\(R_{10}\)). Simulated DNRA rates are consistent with minimum estimates from a simple mass balance for the upper 10 cm of the sediment column by Sommer et al. (submitted), who calculated rates of 2.1 to 3.2 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\) for station 1 and 2.9 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\) for station 2. Within the OMZ, our DNRA rates (0.48 – 2.93 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) were in the same range as found for Concepción Bay in summer (2.7 – 5 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\), Graco et al., 2001) and Laguna Madre/Baffin Bay (0.6 – 1.9 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\), An and Gardner, 2002) yet far lower than on the highly sulfidic sediments on the Namibian shelf colonized by \textit{Thiomargarita} spp. (17 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\); Dale et al., 2009). A
porewater sulfide budget (Supplementary Material) revealed that DNRA removed 50 – 95 % of the available free sulfide at stations 1 – 4 where bacterial mats were observed.

Large sulfur bacteria compete with denitrifying bacteria for oxidized N. However, the sulfur bacteria may have a competitive edge in organic rich sediments where sulfide accumulates in the porewater. The balance between DNRA (favored at high TH$_2$S concentrations) and denitrification (favored at low TH$_2$S concentrations) may thus depend on the rate of sulfide sources (sulfate reduction) and sinks (oxidation and mineral sequestration) (An and Gardner, 2002; Dale et al., 2011). A positive linear correlation between the fraction of total NO$_3^-$ consumed by DNRA and the modeled depth–integrated rate of sulfate reduction (Fig. 7) supports this idea. Moreover, Thioploca and Beggiatoa may move through the sediments at a rate of 10 cm per day (Jørgensen and Gallardo, 1999) which makes them more versatile to seek out NO$_3^-$ than non–motile denitrifiers. They can also access bottom water NO$_3^-$ and/or NO$_2^-$ directly with their filaments and hence do not depend on NO$_3^-$ supply by diffusion. Intracellular storage of NO$_3^-$ (and potentially NO$_2^-$) within their vacuoles further allows them to thrive in areas of lower NO$_3^-$ availability (Schulz and Jørgensen, 2001). Hence, because of these physiological adaptations, it is to be expected that DNRA accounts for the majority of the total NO$_3^-$ uptake at the organic–rich shallower stations where bottom water NO$_3^-$ availability was limited.

The data indicate that anammox only occurred at stations 4 – 6, with highest rates at station 4 (Fig. 5, Table 5). Modeled depth–integrated anammox rates (0 – 0.43 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) were consistent with measurements in sediments of the Skagerrak (0 – 0.6 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ from 0 to 1.5 cm; Dalsgaard and Thamdrup, 2002), the Washington margin (0.03 – 0.08 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, Engström et al., 2009) and the North Atlantic (2.6 × 10$^{-3}$ – 0.06 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$; Trimmer and Nicholls, 2009). The regulation of anammox is ultimately dependent on the supply of NH$_4^+$ and NO$_2^-$ . Despite the high rates of ammonification on the shelf, the absence
of anammox at stations 1 – 3 likely results from the high demand for NO$_2^-$ by denitrifiers which outcompete ammonium oxidizers for NO$_2^-$ (cf. Dalsgaard et al., 2005; Risgaard–Petersen et al., 2005). At the deeper stations, NO$_2^-$ supply directly from the water column was insufficient to support the simulated anammox rates. Furthermore, due to the low availability of O$_2$, only a small fraction of total NO$_2^-$ turnover by anammox can be coupled to nitrification. In situ NO$_3^-$ reduction to NO$_2^-$ within the sediment via heterotrophic denitrification thus was the principal NO$_2^-$ supply pathway for anammox. This pattern agrees with the analysis by Dale et al. (2011) who showed that anammox is most likely to be coupled to denitrification in sediments which are poorly ventilated and/or highly reactive and to nitrification in well ventilated sediments with lower fluxes of labile organic material. Other factors not considered here which are also potentially important with regards to anammox are inhibition of anammox by O$_2$ (Dalsgaard et al., 2005) and reduction of NO$_3^-$ to NO$_2^-$ by *Thioploca* (Prokopenko et al., 2006). Our model is able to explain the benthic fluxes without invoking these additional mechanisms.

### 4.3 Relative importance of denitrification, DNRA, and anammox in N cycling

Since DNRA retains DIN in the ecosystem while denitrification and anammox remove DIN, the channeling of oxidized N (NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$) into canonical denitrification and anammox versus DNRA determines the role of sediments as a recycling site or sink for DIN. The main sink for NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ in the sediments along the 11 °S transect switched from DNRA ($\geq$ 65 % of total uptake at stations 1 and 2) to coupled denitrification–anammox at stations 5 and 6 (Fig. 8) where microbial mats and DNRA were absent. Nitrification was negligible throughout (Table 5). For comparison, DNRA was responsible for 40 % and 94 % of total NO$_3^-$ reduction in Concepción Bay sediments in spring and summer, respectively (Graco et
al., 2001), and 70 % at Boknis Eck (southwestern Baltic; Dale et al., 2011). Percentages in excess of 80 % were observed in estuarine environments that receive high loads of nutrients (Jørgensen and Sørensen, 1985; Gilbert et al., 1997; Kim et al., 1997). Thus, at least at locations where large sulfur bacteria are present, NO$_3^-$ uptake tends to be recycled to NH$_4^+$ at the expense of denitrifying processes. At stations 1 and 2, where DNRA governed both total N turnover (Fig. 5) and NO$_3^- +$ NO$_2^-$ uptake (Fig. 8), DIN was recycled and large amounts of NH$_4^+$ were released by diffusion across the sediment–water interface (Fig. 4). The fate of NH$_4^+$ after being released from the Peruvian sediments is unknown, yet it may reach the euphotic zone and enhance primary production and the spread of the OMZ. This positive effect may be further exacerbated by the simultaneous release of excess phosphate and iron from the sediments that was also measured at the time of sampling (Noffke et al., 2010). At intermediate water depths (stations 3 – 6), where NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ uptake was mainly attributed to denitrification (Fig. 8) the sediments were a net sink for DIN (Fig. 4).

Anammox accounted for up to 62 % of N$_2$ production at the deepest station (Table 5), which is comparable to coastal sediments with oxic bottom waters in the Skaggerak (4 – 79 %; Thamdrup and Dalsgaard, 2002; Engström et al., 2005) and coastal Greenland (1 – 35 %; Rysgaard et al., 2004). Similar data for sediments underlying oxygen deficient environments are scarce, yet Glud et al. (2009) reported that anammox contributed 37 % to the total N$_2$ production in the hypoxic Sagami Bay in Japan (55 – 60 µM O$_2$). In contrast to the absolute anammox rates, the relative importance of anammox in N$_2$ production increased with water depth from station 4 to 6 (Table 5). This negative relationship has been reported for a wide range of marine sediments (Trimmer and Nicholls, 2009; Thamdrup and Dalsgaard, 2002; Dalsgaard et al., 2005) and has been explained as increased coupling between anammox and nitrification because NO$_2^-$ production by denitrification tends to decrease with increase water depth (Dale et al., 2011). In support of this thesis, the relative importance of anammox to total
Nitrogen production was highest at stations 5 and 6 which had the lowest rates of denitrification and highest rates of nitrification (Table 5). Possible inhibition of anammox and denitrification on the shelf by sulfide (Dalsgaard et al., 2003; Joye, 2002) was not considered in our model since no free sulfide was observed in the upper sediment layers where anammox and denitrification take place (Fig. 3). The dominance of denitrification as the major sink in sediments underlying the OMZ is in contrast to water column studies on the Peru margin which observed that N cycling was dominated by anammox (Hamersley et al., 2007; Lam et al., 2009).

### 4.4 Potential importance of anammox on the shelf

The data analysis has shown that, under the assumptions imposed by the model, anammox was absent at stations 1 – 3 within the OMZ. However, despite the multiple constraints on the modeled turnover rates, this result remains to be corroborated with experimental evidence. The largest potential uncertainties in the anammox rate are introduced through the rate constant ($k_8$). The transport and physical parameters are reasonably well known and a realistic variability in their parameterization is likely to have less impact on anammox than the reaction kinetics. Thus, anammox may be occurring to some extent on the shelf, particularly at station 3 on the transition between the sediments dominated by DNRA and denitrification.

To test the potential importance of anammox at this station, we carried out a simple sensitivity analysis which consisted of re-running the baseline model using the lowest ($3 \times 10^9$ M$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$) and highest ($1.6 \times 10^{10}$ M$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$) values of the anammox rate constant derived from the stations 4 – 6 where anammox was predicted. The lower values resulted in a rate of 1.0 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ (Table 6) which is about twice as high as simulated for station 4 (Table 5). The higher rate constant increases anammox to 2.0 mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$. However, due to the
highly coupled nature of the N cycle, increased anammox also enhances NO$_3^-$ uptake, by 24 and 58 % for the low and high rate constants, respectively. Furthermore, because anammox consumes NH$_4^+$, the higher rates lead to 2 – 3 fold increase in sulfate reduction (Table 6). This is a result of the procedure used to fit the modeled NH$_4^+$ values with the measured NH$_4^+$ pore water data (Eq. 5, Fig. 2B). Böning et al. (2004) reported a sulfate reduction rate of 1.9 mmol S m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ for a site in close proximity to station 3. Although we recognize that spatial heterogeneity could account for a 2 – 3 fold increase in depth-integrated sulfate reduction rates, the close similarity of our modeled rate with those measured by Böning et al. (2004) plus the additional constraint of the measured NO$_3^-$ flux indicates that the absence of anammox in the baseline simulation at station 3 is realistic.

Finally, it is worth noting that the sensitivity of NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ fluxes to anammox in Table 6 is much larger than the standard deviation of the measured fluxes (Fig. 4). Similar results were for the other N cycling reactions. This strongly restricts the leverage with which to vary the biogeochemical rates constant independently of one another. Furthermore, the measured fluxes must be consistent with the porewater profiles of TA, NH$_4^+$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ which are a robust proxy for POM mineralization. Accordingly, and notwithstanding the usual inconvenience of local heterogeneity issues, the uncertainty in the modeled rates is determined by the uncertainty in the measured data (primarily the fluxes). At station 1 where the highest NH$_4^+$ release rates were measured, the precision in fluxes is around 20 % (Fig. 4). Since NH$_4^+$ fluxes are the major constraint on the model (Eq. 5), this value can be assumed to be reasonable estimate for the uncertainty in the simulated rates.

5. CONCLUSIONS
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The dominant pathways and rates of benthic N cycling change dramatically through the Peruvian oxygen minimum zone (OMZ) at 11 °S. DNRA governed total N turnover on the shelf and the upper slope (80 – 260 m water depth) where organic matter mineralization rates were high and bottom waters were depleted in O$_2$, NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$. These sediments represented a DIN recycling site, releasing large amounts of NH$_4^+$ by diffusion across the sediment–water interface. This may create a positive feedback with primary production and oxygen draw-down within the Peruvian OMZ. At greater water depths (> 300 m), where organic carbon degradation decreased and bottom water NO$_3^-$ concentrations increased, denitrification was the dominant pathway in the benthic N cycle and the sediments here were a net sink for DIN. Anammox was of minor importance on the shelf and upper slope but gained importance at water depths > 400 m where it contributed up to 62 % to total N$_2$ production at the deepest station.

Sediments underlying the oxygen deficient water of upwelling regions are commonly considered as sinks for DIN associated with high benthic NO$_3^-$ uptake. However, this study shows that high benthic NO$_3^-$ uptake rates in these environments are not always due to high rates of denitrification but may also result from DNRA. Consequently, the role of sediments underlying low oxygen waters as sinks for DIN should be revised and, furthermore, DNRA should be considered when interpreting benthic NO$_3^-$ uptake in such settings. Models predict that OMZs are expanding due to climate change (Oschlies et al., 2008; Shaffer et al., 2009). Due consideration of DNRA versus denitrification with regards to the balance between net removal and recycling of DIN and the potential feedback on primary production is required to accurately predict the rate of spreading of OMZs.

Numerical transport–reaction modeling is an appropriate tool for the identification of pathways and quantification of rates of DIN turnover in marine surface sediments. The strength of the model developed here rests with the multiple constraints on N turnover, which
include in situ benthic fluxes in addition to a suite of porewater data which allow the organic
matter mineralization rates to be quantified. Both of these different sets of data must be
coherent and consistent with one another when coupled to a set of reactions describing the
major processes on N cycling on the Peruvian shelf. Our model parameterizations could be
further verified using fluxes of stable N isotopes at sites both inside and outside the OMZ.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station no.</th>
<th>Core identifier</th>
<th>Date (2008)</th>
<th>Latitude (S)</th>
<th>Longitude (W)</th>
<th>Water depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M77–1 568 BIGO 5</td>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>11°00.02'</td>
<td>77°47.72'</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M77–1 543 MUC 52</td>
<td>Nov. 12</td>
<td>10°59.99'</td>
<td>77°47.40'</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M77–2 016 BIGO T6</td>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>10°59.80'</td>
<td>78°05.91'</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M77–1 464 BIGO 1</td>
<td>Nov. 5</td>
<td>11°00.00'</td>
<td>78°09.92'</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M77–1 449 MUC 19</td>
<td>Nov. 3</td>
<td>11°00.01'</td>
<td>78°09.97'</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M77–1 626 BIGO 3</td>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>11°00.02'</td>
<td>78°15.27'</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M77–1 481 MUC 33</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>11°00.00'</td>
<td>78°14.19'</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M77–1 474 BIGO 2</td>
<td>Nov. 5</td>
<td>11°00.01'</td>
<td>78°25.55'</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M77–1 459 MUC 25</td>
<td>Nov. 4</td>
<td>11°00.03'</td>
<td>78°25.60'</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M77–2 013 BIGO 6</td>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>10°59.82'</td>
<td>78°31.05'</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M77–1 549 MUC 53</td>
<td>Nov. 13</td>
<td>10°59.81'</td>
<td>78°31.27'</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Reaction network used in the model. Model parameters are listed in Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplementary Material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Stoichiometry</th>
<th>Rate expression (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₁</td>
<td>((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)\text{NO}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow ) ((1 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{CO}_2 + (\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_7)\text{HCO}_3\text{O}^- + \text{NH}_3\text{H}_2\text{O}^- + (1 - \text{NH}_3)\text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(R_{900} \times \frac{[\text{O}_2]}{[\text{O}_2]} \times K_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₂</td>
<td>((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)\text{NO}_2 + 1 \text{NO}_3^- \rightarrow ) (2 \text{NO}_3^- + (1 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{CO}_2 + (\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_7)\text{HCO}_3\text{O}^- + \text{NH}_3\text{H}_2\text{O}^- + (1 - \text{NH}_3)\text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(R_{900} \times \frac{[\text{NO}_3^-]}{[\text{NO}_3^-]} \times \frac{K_2}{K_2} \times \frac{K_3}{K_3} \times \frac{K_4}{K_4} \times \frac{[\text{O}_2]}{[\text{O}_2]} \times K_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₃</td>
<td>((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)\text{NO}_2 + 4/3 \text{NO}_3^- + (1/3 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 2/3 \text{N}_2 + (4/3 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{HCO}_3\text{O}^- + (1/3 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(R_{900} \times \frac{[\text{NO}_3^-]}{[\text{NO}_3^-]} \times K_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₄</td>
<td>((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)\text{NO}_2 + 4 \text{FeOOH} + (7 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{CO}_2 + (1 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 4 \text{Fe}^{2+} + (8 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{HCO}_3\text{O}^- - 1/2 \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(R_{900} \times \frac{[\text{FeOOH}]}{[\text{FeOOH}]} \times K_2 \times \frac{K_3}{K_3} \times \frac{K_4}{K_4} \times \frac{K_5}{K_5} \times \frac{[\text{O}_2]}{[\text{O}_2]} \times K_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₅</td>
<td>((\text{CH}_2\text{O})(\text{NH}_3)\text{NO}_2 + 0.5 \text{SO}_4^{2-} + (1/2 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{CO}_2 + (1 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 0.5 \text{H}_2\text{S} + (1 - 1/\text{NH}_3)\text{HCO}_3\text{O}^- - 1/2 \text{NH}_3\text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(R_{900} \times \frac{[\text{FeOOH}]}{[\text{FeOOH}]} \times K_2 \times \frac{K_3}{K_3} \times \frac{K_4}{K_4} \times \frac{K_5}{K_5} \times \frac{[\text{O}_2]}{[\text{O}_2]} \times K_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₆</td>
<td>\text{NH}_4^+ + 3/2 \text{O}_2 + 2 \text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{NO}_2^- + 3 \text{H}_2\text{O} + 2 \text{CO}_2</td>
<td>k_6 \times [\text{O}_2] \times [\text{NH}_4^+]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₇</td>
<td>\text{NO}_2^- + 1/2 \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}_3^-</td>
<td>k_7 \times [\text{O}_2] \times [\text{NO}_2^-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₈</td>
<td>\text{NH}_4^+ + \text{NO}_3^- \rightarrow 2 \text{N}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O}</td>
<td>k_8 \times [\text{NO}_3^-] \times [\text{NH}_4^+]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₉</td>
<td>\text{HS}^- + \text{NO}_3^- + \text{CO}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{2-} + \text{NH}_4^+ + \text{HCO}_3^-</td>
<td>k_9 \times [\text{NO}_3^-] \times [\text{TH}_3\text{S}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₀</td>
<td>\text{HS}^- + 4/3 \text{NO}_2^- + 5/3 \text{CO}_2 + 9/3 \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{2-} + 4/3 \text{NH}_4^+ + 5/3 \text{HCO}_3^-</td>
<td>k_{10} \times [\text{NO}_3^-] \times [\text{TH}_3\text{S}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₁</td>
<td>\text{NH}_4^+ \leftrightarrow \text{NH}<em>4^+</em>{\text{ads}}</td>
<td>k_{11} \times (1 - [\text{NH}<em>4^+]</em>{\text{ads}})/([\text{NH}<em>4^+] \times K</em>{\text{NHa}})^{b}\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₂</td>
<td>\text{Fe}^{2+} + 1/4 \text{O}_2 + 2 \text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{FeOOH} + 2 \text{CO}_2 + 1/2 \text{H}_2\text{O}</td>
<td>k_{12} \times [\text{O}_2] \times [\text{Fe}^{2+}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₃</td>
<td>\text{HS}^- + 2 \text{O}_2 + \text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{2-} + \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}</td>
<td>k_{13} \times [\text{O}_2] \times [\text{TH}_3\text{S}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₄</td>
<td>\text{Fe}^{2+} + 1/5 \text{NO}_3^- + 9/5 \text{HCO}_3^- \rightarrow \text{FeOOH} + 1/10 \text{N}_2 + 9/5 \text{CO}_2 + 2/5 \text{H}_2\text{O}</td>
<td>k_{14} \times [\text{NO}_3^-] \times [\text{Fe}^{2+}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The factor \(\psi = \phi/(1 - \phi) \times M_i/(10 \times ds)\) where \(M_i\) is the molecular mass of species \(i\) (g mol\(^{-1}\)), was used to convert between dissolved species in units of mmol cm\(^{-3}\) of porewater and solid phase species in dry weight percent (wt-%).

(b) The factor \((1 - \phi) \times ds\) was used to convert between dissolved and adsorbed \(\text{NH}_4^+\) (mmol g\(^{-1}\)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>station 1</th>
<th>station 2</th>
<th>station 3</th>
<th>station 4</th>
<th>station 5</th>
<th>station 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O\textsubscript{2} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO\textsubscript{3} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO\textsubscript{2} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{2–} [mM]</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH\textsubscript{2}S [µM]</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fe\textsuperscript{2+} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA [mM]</strong></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N\textsubscript{2} [µM]\textsuperscript{b}</strong></td>
<td>489</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO\textsubscript{3}\textsubscript{bac} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>119\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>100\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>102\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>33\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO\textsubscript{2}\textsubscript{bac} [µM]</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POC (mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1})\textsuperscript{e}</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PON (mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1})\textsuperscript{f}</strong></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPS (mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1})</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FeOOH (mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1})</strong></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) below analytical detection limit (< 2 µM)
(b) calculated according to Hamme and Emerson (2004) using site-specific temperature (Table S2) and a salinity of 35
(c) estimated from porewater NO\textsubscript{3}– concentrations after sediment squeezing
(d) estimated from values at stations 1 and 3
(e) determined from the mass balance for upper 10 cm (Sommer et al., submitted)
(f) calculated from the POC flux applying measured N:C values (r\textsubscript{NC}, Table S2)
Table 4: POC degradation rates (mmol C m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) across the transect rounded to two decimal places. Percentages of the total POC degradation rate used by each electron acceptor rounded to the nearest integer are given in parenthesis. A 20% uncertainty is assigned to the rates (see Section 4.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Station 1</th>
<th>Station 2</th>
<th>Station 3</th>
<th>Station 4</th>
<th>Station 5</th>
<th>Station 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R(_1) (O(_2))</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.23 (14)</td>
<td>0.59 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_2) (NO(_3^-))</td>
<td>0.17 (2)</td>
<td>0.65 (8)</td>
<td>0.95 (16)</td>
<td>0.91 (23)</td>
<td>0.28 (16)</td>
<td>0.18 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_3) (NO(_2^-))</td>
<td>1.08 (13)</td>
<td>0.87 (11)</td>
<td>1.51 (26)</td>
<td>1.15 (29)</td>
<td>0.29 (17)</td>
<td>0.15 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_2) + R(_3)</td>
<td>1.25 (15)</td>
<td>1.52 (20)</td>
<td>2.46 (42)</td>
<td>2.06 (52)</td>
<td>0.57 (33)</td>
<td>0.33 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_4) (FeIII)</td>
<td>0.43 (5)</td>
<td>0.03 (&lt;1)</td>
<td>0.03 (&lt;1)</td>
<td>0.04 (&lt;1)</td>
<td>0.12 (7)</td>
<td>0.12 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_5) (SO(_4^{2-}))</td>
<td>6.55 (80)</td>
<td>6.19 (80)</td>
<td>3.40 (58)</td>
<td>1.91 (48)</td>
<td>0.82 (47)</td>
<td>1.10 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: N turnover rates (mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) across the transect. A 20 % uncertainty is assigned to the rates (see Section 4.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Station 1</th>
<th>Station 2</th>
<th>Station 3</th>
<th>Station 4</th>
<th>Station 5</th>
<th>Station 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R(_{AMF}) ammonification</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_2) (NO(_3^-) → NO(_2^-))</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_3) (NO(_2^-) → N(_2))</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_6) nitrification (NH(_4^+) → NO(_2^-))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>2.2×10(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_7) nitrification (NO(_2^-) → NO(_3^-))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>5.6×10(^{-4})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_{11}) NH(_4^+) adsorption</td>
<td>6.9×10(^{-3})</td>
<td>5.8×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>8.5×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>3.6×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>7.2×10(^{-4})</td>
<td>1.1×10(^{-4})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_9) DNRA (NO(_3^-) → NH(_4^+))</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_{10}) DNRA (NO(_2^-) → NH(_4^+))</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣDNRA</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(_8) anammox (NH(_4^+) + NO(_2^-) → N(_2))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% N(_2) production by anammox</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Sensitivity study for station 3 to estimate the potential impact of anammox on NO$_3^-$, NO$_2^-$ and N$_2$ fluxes across the sediment water interface and the depth integrated sulfate reduction rate. The standard run ($k_8 = 0$) is given in the first line of the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_8$ (M$^{-1}$ yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Anammox (R$_8$) (mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$%$ N$_2$ production by anammox</th>
<th>NO$_3^-$ flux</th>
<th>NO$_2^-$ flux</th>
<th>N$_2$ flux (% change from standard run)</th>
<th>Sulfate reduction (R$_4$) (mmol SO$_4^{2-}$ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+ 24</td>
<td>+ 92</td>
<td>+ 68</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+ 58</td>
<td>+ 224</td>
<td>+ 156</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1: Cross-section of oxygen concentrations (µM) on the shelf and slope of the Peruvian OMZ at 11 °S. The vertical lines denote the CTD casts where O₂ measurements were made on cruise M77 leg 1. Station locations 1 to 6 for benthic studies are indicated. Note concentrations were ca. 45 µM at 10 m depth on the shelf, and that higher concentrations in the surface layers are not visible on this scale.

Fig. 2: A) The N cycle considered in the model. Circles and squares denote porewater and solid species, respectively, and the ellipses denote filamentous sulfur bacteria. Reactions simulated with the model are shown with black arrows and the fluxes across the sediment–water interface are shown by dashed arrows. The stoichiometry of the reactions is listed in Table 2. B) Procedure used to constrain the rates of POM degradation, DNRA and anammox described in the text (steps #1 to 3). Rectangles denote measured data and ellipses denote biogeochemical processes. Black arrows show constraints described in the text and the dashed arrows denote sources and sinks of NH₄⁺. The rate constants for NH₄⁺ oxidation and adsorption were fixed and these processes are not shown.

Fig. 3: Modeled (lines) and measured (symbols) porewater concentration profiles of NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻, TH₂S, SO₄²⁻ and TA at stations 1 to 6. Symbols denote the following porewater subsampling methods: circles = MUC, glove–bag; squares = MUC, porewater squeezer; diamonds = MUC, rhizons; triangles = BIGO, glove–bag. NH₄⁺ concentrations were fitted using the procedure described in the text. Note the different concentration scales for NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ between stations.
Fig. 4: Measured (empty columns) and modeled (filled columns) fluxes of DIN (mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) species and O$_2$ (mmol O$_2$ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) across the sediment–water interface at each station. Error bars correspond to the measured minimum and maximum fluxes (at station 2 only one chamber was deployed). O$_2$ fluxes at stations 5 and 6 show the measured total oxygen uptake (TOU) in benthic chambers (Sommer et al., submitted). N fluxes are from Sommer et al. (submitted).

Fig. 5: Model–predicted depth–integrated rates of nitrogen turnover along the 11°S transect. Station numbers are indicated by the arrows at the top. The bottom arrow denotes the occurrence of bacterial mats (Mosch et al., 2010).

Fig. 6: Nitrate reduction ($R_2$) as a function of bottom water NO$_3^-$ concentration for each station. The linear regression applies to stations 1 – 4 only.

Fig. 7: Fraction of total benthic NO$_3^-$ uptake by DNRA (%) as a function of the sulfate reduction rates. The solid denotes the linear fit to the data. Station numbers are indicated.

Fig. 8: Total model–predicted uptake of NO$_3^-$ + NO$_2^-$ across the sediment–water interface (mmol N m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$). The partitioning of the flux into DNRA (white), denitrification (black), and anammox (hashed) is given as percentage of the total flux.
The scatter plot illustrates the correlation between 

\[
\text{NO}_2^- \text{ (mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1})
\]

and 

\[
\text{NO}_3^- \text{ [\mu M]}
\]

with the regression line and an 

\[r^2 = 0.85\]

indicating a strong positive correlation.
The figure shows a linear relationship between the fraction of total \( \text{NO}_3^- \) uptake by DNRA (%) and sulfate reduction (mmol C m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)). The correlation coefficient \( r^2 = 0.98 \) indicates a strong positive correlation.