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ABSTRACT

Radiolysis of water may provide a continuous flux of an electron donor (molecular hydrogen) to subsurface microbial communities. We assessed the significance of this process in anoxic marine sediments by comparing calculated radiolytic H₂ production rates to estimates of net (organic-fueled) respiration at several Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) Leg 201 sites. Radiolytic H₂ yield calculations are based on abundances of radioactive elements (uranium, thorium, and potassium), porosity, grain density, and a model of water radiolysis. Net respiration estimates are based on fluxes of dissolved electron acceptors and their products. Comparison of radiolytic H₂ yields and respiration at multiple sites suggests that radiolysis gains importance as an electron donor source as net respiration and organic carbon content decrease. Our results suggest that radiolytic production of H₂ may fuel 10% of the metabolic respiration at the Leg 201 site where organic-fueled respiration is lowest (ODP Site 1231). In sediments with even lower rates of organic-fueled respiration, water radiolysis may be the principal source of electron donors. Marine sedimentary ecosystems may be useful models for non-photosynthetic ecosystems on early Earth and on other planets and moons, such as Mars and Europa. Key Words: Radiolysis—Hydrogen—Subsurface—Biosphere—Sediment—Microbe-mineral interaction—Radiation. Astrobiology 7, 951–970.

INTRODUCTION

Several studies have proposed that deep subsurface microbial communities may rely on molecular hydrogen (H₂) generated abiotically by water-rock interactions as their primary electron donor (e.g., Pedersen, 1993; Stevens and McKinley, 1995; Chapelle et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005). Such communities can serve as models for potential ecosystems on other worlds, such as Mars and Europa (e.g., Boston et al., 1992; Fisk and Giovannoni, 1999). Proposed abiotic sources of hydrogen include tectonic activity (Chapelle et al., 2002), serpentinization (Mével, 2003; Kelley et al., 2005), and water radiolysis (Pedersen, 1997). Pedersen (1997) and Lin et al. (2005) noted that molecular hydrogen and oxidants produced by the radiolysis of water potentially provide a continuous source of energy to subsurface microbial communities. It is to this hydrogen source that we have directed our focus.

In water-rock systems such as water-saturated
sediments, alpha, beta, and gamma radiation released by the decay of radioactive elements dissociates water molecules. Uranium (238U), thorium (232Th), and potassium (40K) are the primary sources of naturally occurring radiation in sediments. Transfer of energy from the alpha, beta, or gamma radiation to water molecules along the radiation track excites and ionizes the water molecules. Short-lived reactive species formed through interactions of the water molecules and found after ∼10^{-11} s are aqueous electrons (e^{-aq}), protons (H^+), hydrogen radicals (H•), and hydroxyl radicals (OH•), the so-called “primary products of water radiolysis” (Draganic and Draganic, 1971). Molecular hydrogen is formed by subsequent reactions on timescales of ∼10^{-12} to ∼10^{-9} seconds (Harris and Pimblott, 2002). After ∼10^{-9} s, the major products of water radiolysis present are: e^{-aq}, H^+, H•, OH•, hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂), and molecular hydrogen (H₂).

Marine sediments, especially those comprised mostly of clay, are a particularly interesting environment for the study of this process. While U, Th, and K concentrations in these sediments are expected to be similar to those in igneous continental crust (Taylor and McLennan, 1985), the grain size of sediments is much smaller, porosity is orders of magnitude higher, and water is distributed throughout the sediment. Therefore, it can be reasonably expected that rates of water radiolysis per volume of bulk material will be much higher in these sediments than in continental crust.

The primary objectives of this study were to determine (1) whether radiolysis of water may be a significant source of biologically accessible energy in anoxic subseafloor sediments [collected during Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) Leg 201] and (2) whether the potential significance of radiolysis in anoxic sediments varies predictably from one subseafloor environment to another (e.g., as a function of lithology, organic flux to the sediment, or rates of microbial activities).

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

H₂ production by radiolysis of pore water in deep subseafloor sediments was estimated using U, Th, and K abundances, shipboard measurements of porosity and density, and a model of water radiolysis. To assess geographic variation in the potential rates of radiolytic H₂ production, we compared estimates of radiolytic H₂ yield at equatorial Pacific sites (ODP Sites 1225 and 1226), continental shelf sites (ODP Sites 1228 and 1229), a continental slope site (ODP Site 1230), and an open ocean (Peru Basin) site (ODP Site 1231).

The potential importance of water radiolysis as an energy source was assessed by comparing calculated radiolytic H₂ production rates to estimates of organic-fueled respiration (as net potential carbon oxidation) from D’Hondt et al. (2004) at sites with low (Site 1231), intermediate (Sites 1225 and 1226), and high (Site 1230) organic carbon content and microbial activity.

Because grain size affects the extent to which radioactive elements in sediments interact with water, the applicability of this model to deep-sea sediments was assessed by characterizing the grain size distribution at Site 1231.

**Site and sample selection**

The sites selected for this study were cored during Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) Leg 201 (D’Hondt et al., 2003) (Fig. 1). Sites 1225 and 1226 are located in the eastern equatorial Pacific beneath the relatively high-productivity equatorial ocean at depths of 3760 m and 3297 m, respectively (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003a, 2003b). Sites 1227, 1228, and 1229 are located on the Peru Shelf beneath the high-productivity Peru upwelling system at water depths of 427 m, 252 m, and 150 m, respectively (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e). Site 1230 is located on the lower continental slope in the accretionary wedge of the Peru Trench at a water depth of 5086 m (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003f). Site 1231 is located in the Peru Basin at a water depth of 4827 m (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003g).

Radiolytic hydrogen production rates were calculated for Sites 1225, 1226, 1228, 1229, and 1230 using estimates of 238U, 232Th, and 40K concentrations derived from natural gamma radiation (NGR) spectra (NGR and concentration data from Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003a, 2003b, 2003d, 2003e, 2003f). At these sites, downhole logs of NGR were measured using a Hostile Environment Natural Gamma Ray Sonde (HNGS), which collects 256-channel spectral data; U, Th, and K concentrations are estimated from the HNGS data by proprietary software of Schlumberger (the HNGS manufacturer) (D’Hondt et al., 2003).

Such calculations cannot be made for Sites 1227 and 1231 because downhole logs of NGR were
not collected at those sites. Although NGR spectral data were measured from the sediment cores of all Leg 201 sites on the ODP multi-sensor track (MST) apparatus (D’Hondt et al., 2003), the MST NGR apparatus was not calibrated appropriately for precisely quantifying U, Th, and K concentrations. For Site 1231, we resolved this issue by making direct measurements of $^{238}$U, $^{232}$Th, and $^{40}$K concentrations using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). For this purpose, thirty-two 10 cm$^3$ samples were taken from the archived sediment cores of Hole 1231B. The depths from which the 32 samples were collected range from near the sediment surface to a depth of about 114 meters below seafloor (mbsf). Regions that appeared to be more lithologically variable, based on core photos and core logs of NGR (data from Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003g), were sampled more heavily than those that were apparently more homogeneous.

The number of samples chosen for the Site 1231 analyses was determined by: (1) dividing the sediment column into NGR subunits (based on NGR core logs from Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003g), (2) treating the data within each subunit as a normal population, and (3) using the Standard Normal Distribution Function (Hogg and Ledolter, 1992) to determine the number of samples from each subunit necessary to have a >90% chance that their mean NGR value was within 1 standard deviation of the mean of the population.

Model of water radiolysis

The production of hydrogen by radiolysis of water in a porous medium was calculated using the following equations. The variables and units used are described in Table 1.

Hydrogen production by water radiolysis is due to alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, and can be written as:

$$P_{H_2,\text{sed}} = P_{H_2,\alpha} + P_{H_2,\beta} + P_{H_2,\gamma} = (G_{H_2,\alpha}D_{\alpha}) + (G_{H_2,\beta}D_{\beta}) + (G_{H_2,\gamma}D_{\gamma})$$ (1)

where $G_{H_2,\alpha}$, $G_{H_2,\beta}$, and $G_{H_2,\gamma}$ are the radiolytic $H_2$ yields per unit of energy produced in pure water by radiolysis and $D_{\alpha}$, $D_{\beta}$, and $D_{\gamma}$ are respectively the alpha, beta and gamma radiation doses absorbed by water in the bulk sediment. $G_{H_2}$ values of $1.57 \times 10^4$, $5.3 \times 10^5$, and $4.5 \times 10^3$ $H_2$ molecules/MeV were used for alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, respectively, and were calculated from Spinks and Woods (1990). [These
impede the H₂-limiting reaction where OH⁻ diffusion is due to contributions from the decay series of 238U, 235U, 232Th, and 40K [a Becquerel (Bq) is a unit of radioactive decay equal to 1 decay/s].

1. \( \rho_t \) grain density (g/cm³) 2. \( \Lambda_x \) activity of nuclide x (Bq/kg dry sediment), where x is 238U, 235U, 232Th, or 40K [a Becquerel (Bq) is a unit of radioactive decay equal to 1 decay/s] 3. \( \Sigma E_i x \) sum of radiation energy (\( i = \alpha, \beta, \), or \( \gamma \)) associated with the decay of nuclide x and its daughters (which are assumed to be in secular equilibrium) (MeV) 4. \( \phi \) porosity (fraction of void space in bulk sediment) 5. \( S_i \) ratio of radiation stopping power of water to quartz for radiation type i (\( i = \alpha, \beta, \), or \( \gamma \)) 6. \( D_{i,x} \) dose of radiation of type i (\( i = \alpha, \beta, \), or \( \gamma \)) absorbed by water in a volume of bulk sediment (MeV/s/cm³)

The radiation doses can be expressed using measurable quantities:

\[
D_{i,238U} = \frac{\rho_t A_{238U} \Sigma E_{i,238U}}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S_i \phi} \]  
\[
D_{i,235U} = \frac{\rho_t A_{235U} \Sigma E_{i,235U}}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S_i \phi} \]  
\[
D_{i,232U} = \frac{\rho_t A_{232U} \Sigma E_{i,232U}}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S_i \phi} \]  
\[
D_{i,40K} = \frac{\rho_t A_{40K} \Sigma E_{i,40K}}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S_i \phi} \]  

where \( i \) is alpha, beta, or gamma radiation, \( \rho_t \) is grain density (average density of dry sediment grains), \( A_{238U}, A_{235U}, A_{232Th}, \) and \( A_{40K} \) are the activities of 238U, 235U, 232Th, and 40K, respectively, \( \Sigma E_i \) is the energy sum of the decay series of the parent nuclide specified, \( \phi \) is porosity (the fraction of the bulk volume taken up by water), and \( S_i \) is the relative stopping power ratio.

Secular equilibrium is assumed for our calculations because the half-lives of the daughters of 238U, 235U, 232Th, and 40K are short compared to the age of all but the shallowest sediments at the Leg 201 sites. Note that the radiation dose reaches a maximum when porosity is 50% and goes to zero as porosity approaches either 0 or 100%. To convert the dose absorbed by the bulk sediment to the dose absorbed by water, multiply equations 4a–4d by \( 1/\phi \). Grain density and porosity data are from D’Hondt et al. (2003). Activities were calculated using 238U, 232Th, and 40K concentrations determined by ICP-MS or derived from downhole logs of NGR (data from D’Hondt et al., 2003). Uranium-235 concentrations were calculated from 238U concentrations using a constant isotopic abundance value of 0.725%. Decay values differ from the G\(_{H_2,\alpha}\), G\(_{H_2,\beta}\), and G\(_{H_2,\gamma}\) values of \( 9.6 \times 10^3\), \( 6 \times 10^3\), and \( 4 \times 10^3\) H\(_2\) molecules/MeV, respectively, used by Lin et al. (2005), who determined G\(_{H_2,\gamma}\) experimentally and appear to have taken G\(_{H_2,\beta}\) from Harris and Pimblott (2002).] These values are the greatest source of uncertainty in our calculations because they were not measured at \textit{in situ} conditions. However, they are affected very little by changes in temperature and pressure, and they change very little over a wide range of pH (Draganic and Draganic, 1971). They are enhanced to some extent by salinity because some inorganic solutes, such as Cl⁻ and CO₃²⁻, react with OH⁻ and thereby impede the H₂-limiting reaction where OH⁻ combines with H₂ to form H₂O and H⁺ (Spinks and Woods, 1990; Lin et al., 2005). For example, Lin et al. (2005) reported ∼20% higher H₂ yields in anaerobic water at pH 7 with 0.5 M NaCl than in pure anaerobic water at pH 7. However, H₂ is generally unreactive once it is formed because of its low solubility in water and its high bond dissociation energy (Spinks and Woods, 1990).

The radiation dose for a given type of radiation is due to contributions from the decay series of 238U, 235U, 232Th, and 40K:

\[
D_{\alpha} = D_{\alpha,238U} + D_{\alpha,235U} + D_{\alpha,232Th} \]  
\[
D_{\beta} = D_{\beta,238U} + D_{\beta,235U} + D_{\beta,232Th} + D_{\beta,40K} \]  
\[
D_{\gamma} = D_{\gamma,238U} + D_{\gamma,235U} + D_{\gamma,232Th} + D_{\gamma,40K} \]

Note that the alpha radiation dose does not include a contribution from 40K because this isotope does not undergo alpha decay. Using Equations 2a–2c, Equation 1 can be rewritten as:

\[
P_{H_2,\text{sed}} = [G_{H_2,\alpha}(D_{\alpha,238U} + D_{\alpha,235U} + D_{\alpha,232Th})]
+ [G_{H_2,\beta}(D_{\beta,238U} + D_{\beta,235U} + D_{\beta,232Th} + D_{\beta,40K})]
+ [G_{H_2,\gamma}(D_{\gamma,238U} + D_{\gamma,235U} + D_{\gamma,232Th} + D_{\gamma,40K})] \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Variables and Units Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. ( \rho_t ) grain density (g/cm³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. ( \Lambda_x ) activity of nuclide x (Bq/kg dry sediment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. ( \Sigma E_i x ) sum of radiation energy (( i = \alpha, \beta, \gamma ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. ( \phi ) porosity (fraction of void space in bulk sediment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. ( S_i ) ratio of radiation stopping power of water to quartz for radiation type i (( i = \alpha, \beta, \gamma ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. ( D_{i,x} ) dose of radiation of type i (( i = \alpha, \beta, \gamma )) absorbed by water in a volume of bulk sediment (MeV/s/cm³)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
series energy sums were calculated using the World Wide Web Table of Radioactive Isotopes (Ekström and Firestone, 1999). $S_i$ values of 1.5, 1.25, and 1.14 were used for alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, respectively, and were taken from Aitken (1985).

ICP-MS analyses of Site 1231 samples

Sediment samples were taken from the working half of Site 1231 cores using plastic mini-corers and stored in sealed plastic bags. The samples were digested for analysis by using a modification of the procedure used by Balzer (1999) and Kelley et al. (2003). Subsamples of the sediments were rinsed with deionized water, homogenized, and dried in an oven prior to digestion. Approximately 50 mg of sample were digested for each Site 1231 sample, each calibration standard reference material (SRM), and the quality assurance / quality control (QA/QC) SRM. The Site 1231 samples and the SRMs were digested in parallel. Each sample was digested by adding a 3:1 mixture of 8N HNO3 and concentrated HF to the sample, heating the mixture on a hot plate at 120°C, and then drying it down. A small amount of water and 3 mL of hydrogen peroxide were subsequently added to each sample to eliminate organic carbon. The samples were re-dissolved with a mixture of 3 mL 8N HNO3 and 3 mL deionized water, transferred to high-density polyethylene bottles, and then brought to their final dilution factor ($\times 1000$) via the addition of deionized water. The bottles and their contents were sonicated to dissolve any remaining precipitates prior to ICP-MS analysis. A small, known mass of an internal standard (a “spike”) that contained 0.393 ppm bismuth (Bi) and 79.72 ppm indium (In) in 2% HNO3 was added to a split of each sample to achieve concentrations of $\sim 10$ ppb Bi and $\sim 2$ ppm In.

The spiked solutions were analyzed for $^{238}$U, $^{232}$Th, and $^{39}$K content using a Finnigan MAT ELEMENT High Resolution ICP-MS. All 3 isotopes were measured simultaneously on the single sample dilutions. $^{39}$K and $^{40}$K concentrations were interconverted using an isotopic abundance value for $^{40}$K of $1.17 \times 10^{-4}$. Uranium-238 and $^{232}$Th were measured using the low-resolution mode of the ELEMENT ($\sim 300 \text{ M} / \Delta \text{M}$), while $^{39}$K was measured using the high-resolution mode ($\sim 8000 \text{ M} / \Delta \text{M}$) in order to separate the $^{39}$K signal from the nearby $^{40}$Ar signal and from the significant polyatomic interferences of $^{38}$Ar$^1$H and $^{23}$Na$^{16}$O. Each analytical run consisted of 2 blanks, an external drift correcting solution, 5 calibration SRMs, the QA/QC SRM, and several unknowns. To obtain $^{238}$U, $^{232}$Th, and $^{39}$K concentrations, raw ICP-MS data were blank-subtracted, corrected for drift, calibrated using the 5 SRMs, and corrected for dilution.

The acid blank contained 2% HNO3 and was prepared using the same nitric acid and water used during sediment digestion. It was not spiked with the internal standard. The procedural blank contained 2% HNO3 and resulted from treating an empty beaker identically to the beakers that contained the SRMs and the Site 1231 samples (i.e., the blank was “digested,” dried down, redissolved, and spiked with internal standard).

The long-term decrease in instrument sensitivity during a run was corrected for by normalizing the analyte intensities to the change in intensities of the internal standards of Bi (for low-resolution mode) and In (for high-resolution mode).

The external drift corrector was a solution that contained several Site 1231 samples mixed together to achieve matrix matching. It was analyzed after every third sample to correct for changes in instrument sensitivity for each analyte (see, e.g., Cheatham et al., 1993).

The calibration standard reference materials used in this study were volcanic rock standards with certified concentrations of total U, total Th, and total K (Table 2). Based on the NGR-derived concentration estimates at other Leg 201 sites, we anticipated for Site 1231 $^{238}$U concentrations in the range of 0.05 ppm to 15 ppm, $^{232}$Th concentrations in the range of 1 ppm to 15 ppm, and $^{39}$K concentrations in the range of 0.05% to 3%. The SRMs were chosen based on their U, Th, and K concentrations (which for the most part bracketed the anticipated ranges) and their compatibility with the digestion procedure.

The QA/QC SRM was IAEA-315, a marine sediment with certified concentrations of U, Th, and K similar to those predicted for the unknowns. It was used as a check on the accuracy of the analytical methods and was digested and analyzed as an unknown several times throughout the course of the measurements.

Grain size analysis

Grain size analysis was performed on subsamples of each Site 1231 sample. The sample prepa-
ration methods used here were adapted from Steurer and Underwood (2003). Samples were weighed to ensure that laser obscuration values (laser obscuration is the percentage of light that is attenuated because of scattering or absorption by the particles, or both) would be high enough for particles to be detected but not so high that particle interaction or overlap would become significant (10–20%). They were then dispersed with sodium hexametaphosphate and treated with hydrogen peroxide for approximately 24 hours to digest organic matter. Clay-rich samples were further dispersed by sonicating for approximately 15 minutes; to avoid disintegration of fragile components (e.g., foraminiferal tests), this step was not used for nannofossil-rich samples. The resulting suspensions were diluted with deionized water and vigorously agitated within the sample dispersion unit.

The diluted suspension aliquots were scanned with a Malvern Mastersizer 2000 laser diffraction-based particle size analyzer. The Fraunhofer model of light scattering was used for all measurements. Mean grain size, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis were measured using the Mastersizer 2000 (version 5.22) software.

RESULTS

Relation of calculated radiolytic hydrogen yields to radioactivity and physical properties

We use the Site 1231 data to illustrate relationships between radioactivity, physical properties, and our estimates of radiolytic H₂ yields. Distributions of ²³⁸U, ²³²Th, and ⁴⁰K with depth are similar to the distribution of natural gamma radiation (NGR), because NGR is almost entirely due to the abundance of these isotopes (Figs. 2A–B). Thus, like NGR, ²³⁸U, ²³²Th, and ⁴⁰K concentrations are generally higher in the upper portion of the sediment column (0–55 mbsf) but decrease dramatically at the Unit II/III boundary. Average ⁴⁰K, ²³⁸U, ²³⁵U, and ²³²Th concentrations are 2.7 ± 0.0 ppm, 4.2 ± 0.1 ppm, 30.3 ± 0.9 ppb, and 14.8 ± 0.8 ppm, respectively, in the upper half of the sediment column and 0.4 ± 0.0 ppm, 0.5 ± 0.0 ppm, 3.7 ± 0.1 ppb, and 1.0 ± 0.1 ppm, respectively, in the lower half of the sediment column. Note that, because ²³⁵U concentrations are much smaller than those of ²³⁸U, there is little difference between ²³⁸U content and total uranium content; we will hereafter use “U” to refer to total uranium unless an isotope is specified.

Variations in activities of ⁴⁰K, ²³⁸U, ²³⁵U, and ²³²Th with depth follow similar patterns to those of ⁴⁰K, ²³⁸U, ²³⁵U, and ²³²Th concentrations; however, the relative magnitude of activity is different for each element, because each has a different decay constant (Figs. 2B–C). In any given sample, ⁴⁰K activity is greatest because its concentrations are relatively high and its decay constant is very high. Uranium-238 and ²³²Th activities are generally of the same order of magnitude and similar because, though ²³²Th is usually 3–4 times more abundant, the decay constant of ²³²Th is ~3 times greater. Uranium-235 exhibits relatively high activity, despite its low concentrations, because it has the largest decay constant of these isotopes (approximately twice that of ⁴⁰K).

Our estimates of H₂ yield with depth exhibit similar patterns as the U, Th, and K concentrations but are modulated by the effect of porosity (Figs. 2B, 2D–E). According to our model, radiation doses reach a maximum when porosity is 50% and go to zero as porosity approaches either 0 or 100%. Because porosity is much closer to 50% in the lower portion of the sediment column, the calculated H₂ yields in this interval are enhanced relative to those in the higher porosity, clay-rich portions of the sediment column. For example, average ⁴⁰K, ²³⁸U, and ²³²Th concentrations are respectively ~7, ~8, and ~15 times greater in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRM</th>
<th>[Th] (ppm)</th>
<th>[U] (ppm)</th>
<th>[K] (wt %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USGS BIR-1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS W-2a</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS AGV-2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS RGM-1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS STM-1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF CERTIFIED TOTAL THORIUM (Th), TOTAL URANIUM (U), AND TOTAL POTASSIUM (K) CONCENTRATIONS IN THE CALIBRATION STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIALS (SRMS) USED IN THIS STUDY
upper portion of the sediment column than in the lower portion, but the average H$_2$ yield is only ~4 times greater in the upper part of the column. The calculated average radiolytic H$_2$ yield for the upper half of the sediment column is $1.3 \times 10^{-12}$ moles H$_2$/yr/cm$^3_{sed}$, while that of the lower half of the sediment column is $3.0 \times 10^{-13}$ moles H$_2$/yr/cm$^3_{sed}$.
Our estimates of H₂ yield with depth differ from the pattern of NGR by not exhibiting a strong peak near the top of the sediment column. This is probably because we did not include a contribution from excess ²³⁰Th in our calculations of radiolytic H₂ yield. Although we do not have ²³⁰Th concentration data for Site 1231, we can roughly estimate excess ²³⁰Th concentrations in the upper part of the sediment column (and, therefore, radiolytic H₂ production due to excess ²³⁰Th in the column), by using a calculated ²³⁰Th deposition rate. This calculation is based on the principle that, because ²³⁰Th is produced at a constant rate by the decay of ²³⁸U and has a short residence time in the ocean water column, the flux of ²³⁰Th to the seafloor is mainly a function of the depth of the overlying water column (Bacon, 1984). According to this calculation, radiolysis of water by the decay of excess ²³⁰Th may produce an additional 1.2 × 10⁻¹² moles H₂/yr/cm³ sed in the top 3 or so meters of sediment at Site 1231, which would nearly double the radiolytic H₂ yield in the uppermost portion of the sediment column. However, because the interval over which this process is significant is such a small fraction of the total height of the sediment column, the decay of excess ²³⁰Th does not significantly contribute to total radiolytic H₂ production at this site.

Energy from alpha decay is by far the most important contributor to our calculations of radiolytic H₂ production. It accounts for 88% of the calculated H₂ production, while beta decay energy and gamma radiation account for 10% and 2% of the calculated H₂ production, respectively (Fig. 3A). These proportions are very similar in both the upper and lower halves of the sediment column. Alpha decay is relatively important because alpha radiation is much more energetic and effective at dissociating water molecules than either beta radiation or gamma radiation.

Energy from the decay of ²³⁸U series isotopes is the most important contributor to our estimates of radiolytic H₂ production. It accounts for 49% of the calculated H₂ production by radiolysis, while the decay of ²³²Th, ⁴⁰K, and ²³⁵U series isotopes account for 41%, 8%, and 2% of the calculated radiolytic H₂, respectively (Fig. 3B). The contributions from the ²³⁸U, ²³²Th, ⁴⁰K, and ²³⁵U series are on average 44%, 48%, ~7%, and ~2%, respectively, in the upper half of the sediment column and 56%, 33%, 9%, and 2%, respectively, in the lower half of the column. This modest difference between the upper and lower portions of the column is likely due to greater importance of terrestrial input in the upper half of the column and marine input in the lower half of the column; thorium concentrations that are high relative to ura-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Radiation</th>
<th>% Contribution to Total Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 3. Contributions to radiolytic H₂ production at Site 1231.** (A) Relative contribution of alpha decay energy, beta decay energy, and gamma decay energy to calculated radiolytic H₂ yield at Site 1231. Potassium-40 emits beta and gamma radiation, while ²³²Th, ²³⁵U, and ²³⁸U emit alpha, beta, and gamma radiation. (B) Relative contribution of energy derived from the decay of the potassium (⁴⁰K), thorium (²³²Th), and uranium (²³⁵U + ²³⁸U) series to calculated radiolytic H₂ yield at Site 1231.
nium concentrations are associated with terrestrial input, while uranium concentrations that are high relative to those of thorium are associated with marine input. Calculated H₂ yields due to the decay of ²³⁸U and ²³²Th are much higher than those of ⁴⁰K despite the higher activity of ⁴⁰K (Fig. 2C) because ²³⁸U and ²³²Th undergo alpha decay while ⁴⁰K does not. Although ²³⁵U undergoes alpha decay, estimated H₂ yields due to the decay of ²³⁵U are low because ²³⁵U concentrations are very low. These results imply that a fairly accurate estimate of H₂ production by water radiolysis in fine-grained sediment can be obtained by focusing on the alpha decay of the ²³⁸U and ²³²Th series.

Our model of water radiolysis assumes that sedimentary grains are small enough for radiation from each alpha decay event to escape the grain in which the event originates (diameters <30 μm). However, it is important to note that, once grain size exceeds ~30 μm, H₂ yields must decrease because that grain diameter exceeds the stopping distance of alpha radiation (Aitken 1985), and thus, some of the alpha particles will never come into contact with water. At Site 1231, the overall mean grain size is 6.2 μm (Fig. 2F). Mean grain size is 5.0 μm in Unit I, 9.0 μm in Unit II, and 5.0 μm in Unit III. On average, approximately 92% of the sediment grains are in the medium silt and clay size classes (<31 μm). All the samples are mostly medium silt and clay, and 75% of them are over 90% medium silt and clay. We conclude that our assumption is appropriate for estimating H₂ yields from water radiolysis at this site.

**Geographic variation in radioactivity and estimated radiolytic H₂ yields**

The equatorial Pacific sites (1225 and 1226) had the lowest ²³⁸U, ²³²Th, and ⁴⁰K concentrations of the Leg 201 sites (Figs. 1, 4A, 5). The Peru Margin sites (1228, 1229, 1230) and the Peru Basin site (1231) have concentrations of ²³⁸U, ²³²Th, and ⁴⁰K...
that are higher and somewhat similar to each other. Our estimates of radiolytic H$_2$ yields exhibit similar patterns (Figs. 4B, 6). The average calculated yield was lowest at the equatorial Pacific sites (1225 and 1226) and highest at the Peru Margin sites (1230, 1229, and 1228). Although Site 1231 has the highest average concentrations of $^{232}$Th and $^{40}$K, and fairly high concentrations of
$^{238}\text{U}$, it has a lower average calculated radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ yield than the Peru Margin sites because the latter sites have average $^{238}\text{U}$ concentrations the same as or higher than Site 1231 and much lower average porosities (~65% versus 75% at Site 1231). The calculated average $\text{H}_2$ yields vary by a factor of ~20 between sites.

As at Site 1231, energy from alpha decay is the most important contributor to our calculated radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production at all these sites. It generates ~90% of the $\text{H}_2$ produced, while beta decay energy and gamma radiation generate ~10% and ~2% of all $\text{H}_2$ production, respectively, with little variation between sites (Fig. 7A). Also, as at Site 1231, energy from the decay of $^{238}\text{U}$ is the most important contributor to our estimates of radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production at all these sites, followed by energy from the decay of $^{232}\text{Th}$, $^{40}\text{K}$, and $^{235}\text{U}$ (Fig. 7B). However, the relative contribution of total $\text{U}$ and $^{232}\text{Th}$ to calculated $\text{H}_2$ production varies considerably from site to site. For example, at Site 1226, the decay of total $\text{U}$ and $^{232}\text{Th}$ generates 85% and 12% of the calculated $\text{H}_2$ production, respectively, whereas at Site 1230, the decay of total $\text{U}$ and $^{232}\text{Th}$ generates 60% and 35% of the $\text{H}_2$ produced, respectively. As with the 2 halves of the sediment column at Site 1231, this difference between sites may be due to differences in the proportions of terrestrial and marine input between sites. These results further support our inference that a fairly accurate estimate of radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production in fine-grained sediment can be obtained by focusing on the alpha decay of the $^{238}\text{U}$ and $^{232}\text{Th}$ series.

DISCUSSION

Causes of site-to-site variation in calculated radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production

Lithology controls the rate at which radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ is produced at a given site. In particular, concentrations of radioactive elements, porosity, and grain size are the properties that most strongly influence $\text{H}_2$ production by water radiolysis. Maximum radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production results when

FIG. 6. Calculated radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ yields as functions of depth at five Leg 201 sites. Radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production rates were calculated using estimates of $^{238}\text{U}$, $^{232}\text{Th}$, and $^{40}\text{K}$ concentrations derived from downhole logs of NGR. Calculations were not done for the first 70 meters below seafloor because the drill pipe interfered with measurement of $^{238}\text{U}$, $^{232}\text{Th}$, and $^{40}\text{K}$ concentration data over that interval (Fig. 5).
radioactive element concentrations are high, porosity is 50%, and grain sizes are small. These 3 criteria are rarely simultaneously met in marine sediments; for example, terrigenous sediments deposited along continental margins often have relatively high concentrations of radioactive elements and relatively low porosity, but grain sizes often exceed alpha particle stopping distances [as at the Peru Margin ODP sites (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e)]. On the other hand, abiogenic sediments deposited distant from shore (such as at Peru Basin Site 1231) have high concentrations of radioactive elements and small grain sizes but high porosity (Fig. 2). Sediments that are predominantly biogenic (such as those at equatorial Pacific Sites 1225 and 1226) have relatively low porosity and small grain sizes but relatively low concentrations of radioactive elements. The competing effects of these physical properties cause radiolytic H₂ production in the Leg 201 sediments to vary over a range that is surprisingly narrow, given the wide variety of lithologies present (1 order of magnitude).

The potential importance of radiolysis as a source of electron donors to subseafloor communities

The potential importance of water radiolysis as a source of electron donors can be assessed by comparing the calculated radiolytic hydrogen production of each drilled sediment column to previously calculated rates of organic oxidation in the same sediment column. This comparison provides a measure of the potential importance of in situ water radiolysis for fueling subseafloor respiration, relative to burial of organic matter from the surface photosynthetic world.

The total radiolytic hydrogen production of each drilled sediment column depends on both the H₂ yield (moles/yr/cm³) and the depth to which the sediment was drilled (Table 3). It varies by a factor of ~12 between sites. It is low at the

**FIG. 7. Contributions to radiolytic H₂ production at six Leg 201 sites.** (A) Relative contribution of alpha decay energy, beta decay energy, and gamma decay energy to calculated radiolytic H₂ yield at ODP Sites 1225, 1226, 1228, 1229, 1230, and 1231. (B) Relative contribution of energy from decay of the potassium (⁴⁰K), thorium (²³²Th) series, and uranium (²³⁵U + ²³⁸U) series to calculated radiolytic H₂ yield at the same sites. Note that energy from the decay of the ²³⁵U series consistently contributes 2–3%; its contributions are combined with those of ²³⁸U for the sake of graphical simplicity.
open ocean sites and high at the Peru Margin sites (Table 3).

D’Hondt et al. (2004) estimated rates of organic matter oxidation at Leg 201 sites from fluxes of electron acceptors (SO$_4^{2-}$ and NO$_3^-$) into the sediment column and fluxes of reduced metals (Fe$^{2+}$ and Mn$^{2+}$) within the sediment column reduction at several Leg 201 sites (Table 3). The sum of these processes at each site is approximately equal to the net rate of electron acceptor reduction at that site. Burial rates of organic matter (D’Hondt et al., 2004) and, for Site 1226, mass balance calculations of dissolved carbon fluxes and rates of carbonate mineral precipitation demonstrate that this net rate of electron acceptor reduction is approximately equal to the gross rate of organic carbon oxidation at each site (Wang et al., 2006). Because water radiolysis generates an electron donor and an electron acceptor in stoichiometric balance (e.g., H$_2$ and $\frac{1}{2}$O$_2$), metabolic use of radiolytic products does not contribute to net rates of electron acceptor reduction.

The net rate of electron acceptance (net respiration) varies by a factor of ~100 from one Leg 201 site to another (D’Hondt et al., 2004). It is much lower at the open ocean sites than at the ocean margin sites. It is lowest at Peru Basin Site 1231, intermediate at the equatorial Pacific sites (1225 and 1226), and highest at the Peru Margin sites. This geographic variation in net respiration closely resembles the pattern of geographic variation in sea-surface chlorophyll concentration and in the flux of organic matter to the seafloor (D’Hondt et al., 2004). The similarity of these patterns presumably results from the dependence of net respiration on buried organic matter. The flux of organic matter to the seafloor depends, in large part, on the rate of photosynthetic productivity in the overlying ocean (which in turn depends on concentrations of chlorophyll) and on water depth (the distance over which marine organic matter is degraded as it falls to the seafloor) (e.g., Jahnke, 1996). Consequently, net respiration in subseafloor sediments is highest along ocean margins, where photosynthetic productivity is very high and water depth is very low (e.g., at Peru Margin Sites 1227 and 1230). It is lower in the equatorial region where upwelling sustains lower productivity than along the ocean margins and where water depth is much greater (e.g., at the equatorial Pacific Sites 1225 and 1226). It is still lower in open-ocean regions where photosynthetic productivity is lower than in upwelling regions and where water depth is as great or greater than in the upwelling regions (e.g., Peru Basin Site 1231).

Our calculated ratio of radiolytic H$_2$ production to net respiration (organic oxidation) in each drilled column varies from site to site by a factor of 25 (Table 3). From site to site, this ratio varies inversely with net respiration. It depends more strongly on the rate of net respiration than on the rate of radiolytic H$_2$ production because net respiration varies by 2 orders of magnitude from site to site, whereas the calculated rate of radiolytic H$_2$ production varies by only an order of magnitude from site to site. The ratio is lowest at Peru Margin Site 1230 (0.4%), where net respiration of the drilled column is highest, and highest at Site 1231 (9.8%), where net respiration is lowest.

### Table 3. Site Location, Water Depth, Depth to Which the Sediment Was Drilled, Calculated Radiolytic H$_2$ Production of the Drilled Sediment Column, Net Respiration [Calculated from D’Hondt et al. (2004), Converted to Moles of H$_2$ Equivalents], and the Ratio of H$_2$ Production to Respiration (Presented as a Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Water depth (mbsl)</th>
<th>Depth drilled (mbsf)</th>
<th>Radiolytic H$_2$ production (moles/yr/cm$^2$ sed) in drilled sed. column</th>
<th>Net respiration (moles H$_2$ eq/yr/cm$^2$ sed)</th>
<th>Ratio $\times$ 100 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocean margin sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Shelf Site 1227</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>3.66E-06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Shelf Site 1229</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>194.4</td>
<td>3.77 $\times$ 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Shelf Site 1228</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>200.9</td>
<td>4.74 $\times$ 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Slope Site 1230</td>
<td>5086</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>3.51 $\times$ 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td>1.01E-05</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open ocean sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equat. Pacific Site 1226</td>
<td>3760</td>
<td>420.0</td>
<td>1.31 $\times$ 10$^{-8}$</td>
<td>6.02E-07</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equat. Pacific Site 1225</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>319.6</td>
<td>3.91 $\times$ 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1.14E-07</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Basin Site 1231</td>
<td>4813</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>9.79 $\times$ 10$^{-9}$</td>
<td>1.00E-07</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mbsf, meters below seafloor; mbsl, meters below sea level; n.d., not determinable.
At the open ocean sites (1225, 1226, 1231), these ratios apply to the entire sediment column because those sites were drilled to the basaltic basement. However, this only applies to the upper portion of the sediment column at Peru Margin Site 1230 because only the uppermost portion of the sediment column was drilled at the Peru Margin sites (1227, 1228, 1229, 1230). At these sites, the radiolytic H₂ production of the entire sediment column (drilled and undrilled) is probably much higher than the radiolytic H₂ production of the drilled sediment column that is presented in Table 3.

For two reasons, the ratio of radiolytic H₂ production to net respiration is less well-constrained at Peru Margin site 1230 than at the open ocean sites (1225, 1226, and 1231). First, the radiolytic H₂ yields calculated for the Peru Margin sites may be overestimates because many sediment grains at the Peru Margin sites are larger than the \( \sim 30 \, \mu \text{m} \) length of an alpha track. Sediment grains at these sites range up to gravel in size (\( \sim 2000 \, \mu \text{m} \)) (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003c, 2003d, 2003e). Second, net respiration rates calculated by D’Hondt et al. (2004) for Peru Margin Sites 1227 and 1230 probably underestimate the net respiration in the entire sediment columns of those sites. A recent radiocarbon study demonstrated that sedimentation rates are very high at these sites (Skilbeck and Fink, 2006); consequently, electron donors such as methane and acetate that are abundant deep in the sediment column may be buried faster than they can diffuse up to be oxidized by \( \text{SO}_4^{2-} \) reduction in the shallower sediments. To the extent that radiolytic H₂ production is overestimated and net respiration underestimated for Peru Margin sites, radiolytic H₂ may be an increasingly important source of electron donors with increasing sediment depth and sediment age.

The results of this study provide a basis for predicting the abundance of cells that might occur in a subsurface sedimentary ecosystem where H₂ from water radiolysis is the principal electron donor. At Site 1231, cell abundances averaged \( 10^6 \) cells/cm³ (Shipboard Scientific Party, 2003g). If the number of microbes that rely on radiolytic H₂ is proportional to the fraction of electron donors provided by radiolytic H₂ at Site 1231, our results suggest that \( \sim 10^5 \) cells/cm³ (\( \sim 9.8% \) of the Site 1231 total) are fueled by H₂ from water radiolysis. We infer from this calculation that \( \sim 10^5 \) cells/cm³ may be supported in a marine sedimentary ecosystem where radiolytic H₂ is the principal electron donor.

A similar approach could be used to predict the abundance of cells that could be sustained by radiolytic hydrogen in wet sedimentary environments on early Earth and other planetary bodies, such as subsurface Mars and sub-ice Europa. In this manner, extant subsea floor ecosystems may be useful models for non-photosynthetic ecosystems on early Earth and for sedimentary ecosystems on other planets.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Production of H₂ by water radiolysis in sub-surface environments depends on concentrations of radioactive elements, porosity, and grain size. In the sediments examined for this study, \( \sim 90% \) of the calculated H₂ production results from alpha decay of uranium and thorium. Comparison of calculated radiolytic H₂ yields to net respiration at multiple sites suggests that radiolysis gains importance as an electron donor source as net respiration and organic carbon content decrease. Production of H₂ by water radiolysis may fuel 10% of the metabolic respiration at the Leg 201 site where organic-fueled respiration is lowest (ODP Site 1231). In sedimentary ecosystems with even lower rates of net respiration, such as in a central ocean gyre, water radiolysis may be the principal source of electron donors. This process has the potential to sustain a subsurface
ecosystem in wet sediments of other planetary bodies, such as Mars and Europa.
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APPENDIX 1: DERIVATION OF WATER RADIOLYSIS MODEL

The radiation dose equations assume that within a volume of sediment with dimensions larger than the ranges of the emitted radiations, the rate of energy emission due to radioactive decay is equal to the rate of energy absorption by water and sediment particles because energy is conserved (Aitken, 1985).

The energy emitted during decay can be written as

\[ F_{e,i} = (A_x \sum E_{i,x})(1 - \phi)\rho_t \]

\[ F_{e,i} = \left[ \frac{\text{decays}}{\text{time} \times \text{mass}_{\text{rock}}} \times \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{decay}} \right] \times \left( \frac{V_{\text{rock}}}{V_{\text{sed}}} \right) \times \left( \frac{\text{mass}_{\text{rock}}}{V_{\text{rock}}} \right) \times \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{time} \times V_{\text{sed}}} = \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{time} \times V_{\text{sed}}} \quad \text{(A1.1)} \]

where \( i \) denotes alpha, beta, or gamma radiation, \( x \) denotes a radioactive isotope (e.g. \( ^{238}\text{U} \)), \( A_x \) is the activity of parent nuclide \( x \), \( \Sigma E_{i,x} \) is the alpha, beta, or gamma energy sum of the decay series of parent nuclide \( x \) (assuming secular equilibrium), \( \phi \) is porosity, and \( \rho_t \) is grain density.

The energy absorbed during decay can be written as

\[ F_{a,i} = D_{w,i}\phi + D_{r,i}(1 - \phi) \]

\[ F_{a,i} = \left[ \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{time} \times V_{\text{water}}} \times \frac{V_{\text{water}}}{V_{\text{sed}}} \right] + \left[ \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{time} \times V_{\text{rock}}} \times \frac{V_{\text{rock}}}{V_{\text{sed}}} \right] = \frac{\text{energy}}{\text{time} \times V_{\text{sed}}} \quad \text{(A1.2)} \]

where \( D_{w,i} \) is the radiation dose absorbed by the water and \( D_{r,i} \) is the radiation dose absorbed by the sediment grains. Setting Equations A1.1 and A1.2 equal to one another,

\[ (A_x \sum E_{i,x})(1 - \phi)\rho_t = D_{w,i}\phi + D_{r,i}(1 - \phi) \]

We define the relative stopping power ratio, \( S_i \), as \( S_i = \frac{D_{w,i}}{D_{r,i}} \). This ratio compares the ability of water to stop a given type of radiation \( i \) over the ability of quartz (which is taken to represent the solid phase) to stop the same type of radiation. Substituting this into the above equation,

\[ (A_x \sum E_{i,x})(1 - \phi)\rho_t = D_{w,i}\left( \phi + \frac{D_{r,i}}{D_{w,i}}(1 - \phi) \right) = D_{w,i}\left( \phi + \frac{1}{S_i}(1 - \phi) \right) \quad \text{(A1.3)} \]

Solving for the dose absorbed by the water and simplifying,

\[ D_{w,i} = \frac{(A_x \sum E_{i,x})(1 - \phi)\rho_t}{\phi + \frac{1}{S_i}(1 - \phi)} \quad \text{(A1.4)} \]

\[ D_{w,i} = \frac{(A_x \sum E_{i,x})(1 - \phi)\rho_t}{\phi + \frac{1}{S_i}(1 - \phi)} \times \frac{1/(1 - \phi)}{1/(1 - \phi)} = \frac{(A_x \sum E_{i,x})\rho_t}{\phi/(1 - \phi) + \frac{1}{S_i}} \quad \text{(A1.5)} \]

To convert to the dose absorbed by the bulk sediment, multiply Equation A1.5 by porosity,

\[ D_{i,x} = \frac{(A_x \sum E_{i,x})\rho_t}{(1 - \phi) + \frac{1}{S_i} \phi} = \frac{(A_x \sum E_{i,x})\rho_t}{\phi(1 - \phi) + \frac{1}{S_i} \phi} \quad \text{(A1.6)} \]
To summarize the variables,

i. $F_e$ (MeV/s/cm$^3$) is the energy emitted during radioactive decay.

ii. $F_a$ (MeV/s/cm$^3$) is the energy absorbed during radioactive decay.

iii. $\rho_r$ (g/cm$^3$) is the grain density.

iv. $A_x$ (decays/s/g$_{rock}$) is the activity of parent nuclide $x$.

v. $\Sigma E_{i,x}$ (MeV / decay series) is the alpha, beta, or gamma energy sum of the decay series of parent nuclide $x$.

vi. $\phi$ is the porosity (volume of water / volume of sediment).

vii. $D_w$ (MeV/s/cm$^3$H$_2$O) is the radiation dose absorbed by the water.

viii. $D_r$ (MeV/s/cm$^3$rock) is the radiation dose absorbed by the sediment grains.

ix. $S_i$ is the relative stopping power ratio for alpha, beta, or gamma radiation.

x. $D_{i,x}$ (MeV/s/cm$^3$sed) is the radiation dose absorbed by the bulk sediment due to the alpha, beta, or gamma decay of the parent nuclide $x$ series.

The following assumptions are made when using the above equations:

i. Within a volume of sediment with dimensions larger than the ranges of the emitted radiations, the rate of energy emission due to radioactive decay is equal to the rate of energy absorption by water and sediment particles because energy is conserved (Aitken, 1985).

ii. Porosity is homogeneous.

iii. Grains are small enough for all alpha and beta particles and gamma radiation to escape without significant energy loss.

iv. Radioactive decay is in secular equilibrium.

**APPENDIX 2: RADIOLYTIC H$_2$ YIELD CALCULATIONS**

**Equations**

Hydrogen production by water radiolysis is due to alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, and can be written as

$$P_{H_2\text{sed}} = P_{H_2,\alpha} + P_{H_2,\beta} + P_{H_2,\gamma} = (G_{H_2,\alpha}D_\alpha) + (G_{H_2,\beta}D_\beta) + (G_{H_2,\gamma}D_\gamma) \quad (A2.1)$$

where $G_{H_2,\alpha}$, $G_{H_2,\beta}$, and $G_{H_2,\gamma}$ are the radiation chemical yields of H$_2$ produced in pure water by radiolysis and $D_\alpha$, $D_\beta$, and $D_\gamma$ are the radiation doses absorbed by the bulk sediment due to alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, respectively.

The radiation dose for a given type of radiation is due to contributions from the decay series of $^{238}$U, $^{235}$U, $^{232}$Th, and $^{40}$K:

$$D_\alpha = D_{\alpha,^{238}U} + D_{\alpha,^{235}U} + D_{\alpha,^{232}Th} \quad (A2.2a)$$

$$D_\beta = D_{\beta,^{238}U} + D_{\beta,^{235}U} + D_{\beta,^{232}Th} + D_{\beta,^{40}K} \quad (A2.2b)$$

$$D_\gamma = D_{\gamma,^{238}U} + D_{\gamma,^{235}U} + D_{\gamma,^{232}Th} + D_{\gamma,^{40}K} \quad (A2.2c)$$

Note that the alpha radiation dose does not include a contribution from $^{40}$K because this isotope does not undergo alpha decay. Using Equations A2.2a–2c, Equation A2.1 can be rewritten as

$$P_{H_2\text{sed}} = [G_{H_2,\alpha}(D_{\alpha,^{238}U} + D_{\alpha,^{235}U} + D_{\alpha,^{232}Th})] + [G_{H_2,\beta}(D_{\beta,^{238}U} + D_{\beta,^{235}U} + D_{\beta,^{232}Th} + D_{\beta,^{40}K})]$$

$$+ [G_{H_2,\gamma}(D_{\gamma,^{238}U} + D_{\gamma,^{235}U} + D_{\gamma,^{232}Th} + D_{\gamma,^{40}K})] \quad (A2.3)$$
The radiation doses can be expressed using measurable quantities:

\[ D_{i,238U} = \frac{\rho_r \bar{A}_{238U} \Sigma E_{238U}}{1 - \phi + \frac{1}{S\phi}} \]  

(A2.4a)

\[ D_{i,235U} = \frac{\rho_r \bar{A}_{235U} \Sigma E_{235U}}{1 - \phi + \frac{1}{S\phi}} \]  

(A2.4b)

\[ D_{i,232U} = \frac{\rho_r \bar{A}_{232U} \Sigma E_{232U}}{1 - \phi + \frac{1}{S\phi}} \]  

(A2.4c)

\[ D_{i,40U} = \frac{\rho_r \bar{A}_{40U} \Sigma E_{40U}}{1 - \phi + \frac{1}{S\phi}} \]  

(A2.4d)

Simplifying,

\[ D_\alpha = \frac{\rho_r}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S\phi} \left( \bar{A}_{238U} \Sigma E_{\alpha,238U} + \bar{A}_{235U} \Sigma E_{\alpha,235U} + \bar{A}_{232Th} \Sigma E_{\alpha,232Th} \right) \]  

(A2.5a)

\[ D_\beta = \frac{\rho_r}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S\phi} \left( \bar{A}_{238U} \Sigma E_{\beta,238U} + \bar{A}_{235U} \Sigma E_{\beta,235U} + \bar{A}_{232Th} \Sigma E_{\beta,232Th} + \bar{A}_{40K} \Sigma E_{\beta,40K} \right) \]  

(A2.5b)

\[ D_\gamma = \frac{\rho_r}{1 - \phi} + \frac{1}{S\phi} \left( \bar{A}_{238U} \Sigma E_{\gamma,238U} + \bar{A}_{235U} \Sigma E_{\gamma,235U} + \bar{A}_{232Th} \Sigma E_{\gamma,232Th} + \bar{A}_{40K} \Sigma E_{\gamma,40K} \right) \]  

(A2.5c)

Variables

- \( P_{H_2\text{sed}} \) (molecules/s/cm\(^3\_\text{sed}\)) is the production rate of hydrogen.
- \( G_{H_2,\alpha} = 1.57 \times 10^4 \) H\(_2\) molecules/MeV and is the radiation chemical yield for alpha particles (Spinks and Woods, 1990).
- \( G_{H_2,\beta} = 5.3 \times 10^3 \) H\(_2\) molecules/MeV and is the radiation chemical yield for beta particles (Spinks and Woods, 1990).
- \( G_{H_2,\gamma} = 4.5 \times 10^3 \) H\(_2\) molecules/MeV and is the radiation chemical yield for gamma radiation (Spinks and Woods, 1990).
- \( D_\alpha, D_\beta, D_\gamma \) (MeV/s/cm\(^3\_\text{sed}\)) are the radiation doses absorbed by the bulk sediment due to alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, respectively.
- \( \rho_r \) (g/cm\(^3\)) is the grain density.
- \( \bar{A}_{238U}, \bar{A}_{235U}, \bar{A}_{232Th} \) and \( \bar{A}_{40K} \) (decays/s/g\(_\text{rock}\)) are the activities of \(^{238}\text{U}, ^{235}\text{U}, ^{232}\text{Th}, \) and \(^{40}\text{K}\), respectively.
- \( \Sigma E_{\alpha}, \Sigma E_{\beta}, \Sigma E_{\gamma} \) (MeV / decay series) are the alpha, beta, and gamma decay energy sums, respectively, of the decay series of the parent nuclide specified.
- \( \phi \) is the porosity (volume of water / volume of sediment).
- \( S\alpha, S\beta, S\gamma \) are the relative stopping power ratios for alpha and beta particles and gamma radiation (a ratio of the ability of water to stop a given type of radiation over the ability of quartz to stop the same type of radiation).

Steps to complete these calculations

1. Obtain necessary data
   a. \(^{238}\text{U}, ^{235}\text{U}, ^{232}\text{Th}, \) and \(^{40}\text{K}\) concentrations
      i. use isotopic abundance values to convert \(^{39}\text{K}\) or total K abundance to \(^{40}\text{K}\) abundance (if needed)
      1. \( X_{\omega K} = 1.17 \times 10^{-4} \) (from Wedepohl, 1978)
ii. use isotopic abundance values to convert $^{238}\text{U}$ or total U abundance to $^{235}\text{U}$ abundance (if needed)
1. $X_{^{238}\text{U}} = 0.99275$, $X_{^{239}\text{U}} = 0.00725$ (from Wedepohl, 1978)
iii. $X_{^{232}\text{Th}} = 1.00$ (from Wedepohl, 1978)

b. Porosity
c. Grain density

2. Calculate dose rates
   a. Convert concentrations to activities using Avogadro’s number and each isotope’s decay constant
   b. Calculate decay energy sums ($\Sigma E_\alpha$, $\Sigma E_\beta$, $\Sigma E_\gamma$); in this study they were calculated using the World Wide Web Table of Radioactive Isotopes (Ekström and Firestone, 1999):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isotope</th>
<th>$\alpha$ decay energy sum (MeV/decay)</th>
<th>$\beta$ decay energy sum (MeV/decay)</th>
<th>$\gamma$ decay energy sum (MeV/decay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^{40}\text{K}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1760</td>
<td>0.1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{232}\text{Th}$</td>
<td>35.95</td>
<td>2.8408</td>
<td>2.2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{238}\text{U}$</td>
<td>42.87</td>
<td>6.0935</td>
<td>1.7034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^{235}\text{U}$</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>10.4470</td>
<td>0.5500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. $S_i$ values of 1.5, 1.25, and 1.14 were used for alpha, beta, and gamma radiation, respectively, and were taken from Aitken (1985)

3. Calculate radiolytic $\text{H}_2$ production rates
   a. $G_{\text{H}_2}$ values are from Spinks and Woods (1990), and were converted from $\mu$mol/J to $\text{H}_2$ molecules/MeV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$G_{\text{H}_2}$</th>
<th>$\mu$mol/J</th>
<th>#H$_2$ molecules/MeV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G_{\text{H}_2\alpha}$</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>15719.7852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{\text{H}_2\beta}$</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>4532.6988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_{\text{H}_2\gamma}$</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>5304.2222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. multiply each dose rate by the appropriate $G$ value