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Abstract

The anaerobic oxidation of methane (AOM) is a crucial component of the methane cycle, but quantifying its role in situ under dynamic environmental conditions remains challenging. We use sediment samples collected during IODP Expedition 347 to the Baltic Sea to show that relative abundances of $^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2$ and $^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}$ in methane remaining after microbial oxidation are in internal, thermodynamic isotopic equilibrium, and we attribute this phenomenon to the reversibility of the initial step of AOM. These data suggest that $^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2$ and $^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}$ together can identify the influence of anaerobic methanotrophy in environments where conventional bulk isotope ratios are ambiguous, and these findings may lead to new insights regarding the global significance of enzymatic back reaction in the methane cycle.
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Quantifying the subsurface carbon cycle by linking biogeochemistry to deep biosphere metabolisms remains a long-standing challenge compounded by slow rates of reaction (Edwards et al., 2012; Marlow et al., 2017). Even in well-characterised environments, determining how methanogens and anaerobic methanotrophs influence organic matter degradation can be challenging (Regnier et al., 2011; Beulig et al., 2018). These challenges are due in part to how methane produced by methanogens inherits characteristics from its substrates (both a range of organic and inorganic carbon) (Conrad, 2005), and they are further complicated when methane is itself the substrate during anaerobic methane oxidation (AOM) (Whiticar, 1999). Our understanding of how anaerobic methanotrophs respond to varying environmental conditions (Holler et al., 2009, 2011; Yoshinaga et al., 2014) and how they might contribute to “cryptic cycles” (the rapid production and consumption of reactive intermediates) in the marine subsurface is constantly evolving (Egger et al., 2018).

AOM is thought to be carried out by a consortium of methane oxidising archaea and sulphate reducing bacteria performing the net reaction $\text{CH}_4+\text{SO}_4^{2-}\rightarrow \text{HCO}_3^-+\text{HS}^-+\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (Boetius et al., 2000). Evidence suggests that these processes can be decoupled (Milucka et al., 2012; Scheller et al., 2016) and metal oxides may also act as terminal electron acceptors (Beal et al., 2009; Cai et al., 2018). In all cases, the first step of AOM involves C-H bond activation by a modified methyl-coenzyme M reductase (Mcr), the terminal enzyme in methanogenesis (Scheller et al., 2010). Anaerobic methanotrophs use enzymes homologous to those used by methanogens (Krüger et al., 2003; Shima et al., 2012), prompting questions regarding the directionality of these metabolisms (Lloyd et al., 2011; Beulig et al., 2019).

Coupling exploration of methane enzymatic chemistry with isotope geochemistry can provide powerful insights. Here, we interrogate subsurface methane metabolisms by precisely determining concentrations of molecules containing two heavy isotopes, referred to as “clumped” isotopologues (Eiler, 2007). The relative proportions of $^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}$ and $^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2$ (reported as $\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}$ and $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2$ values relative to a random distribution of isotopes among all CH$_4$ isotopologues; see Supplementary Information) have known temperature sensitive equilibrium concentrations and thus are sensitive indicators of reversibility in reactions (Piasecki et al., 2016). For instance, axenic cultures of methanogens produce methane...
with depletions in clumped isotopes relative to the random distribution that reflect kinetic processes (Stolper et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015; Douglas et al., 2016; Young et al., 2017; Gruen et al., 2018). In some cases, the clumped isotope composition of environmental microbial methane is consistent with the axenic cultures, but in others it displays a clumped isotope composition reflective of equilibration within the environment of formation (Wang et al., 2015; Young et al., 2017). This span in clumped isotope distributions suggests that enzymatic reactions associated with methanogenesis and methanotrophy are capable of ranging from reversible to kinetic. Previous work using one rare isotopologue ($\Delta^{13}$CH$_3$D) suggests that the rate of methanogenesis controls the degree of molecular isotopic equilibrium (Stolper et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015). However, the inability to produce equilibrated methane from axenic cultures has led to speculation that AOM may be responsible for equilibrated environmental methane (Stolper et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Young et al., 2017; Gruen et al., 2018). The use

Figure 1  Geochemical profiles (±2 σ) from Bornholm Basin from 3-35 MCD. Horizontal grey bar denotes sediments deposited during lacustrine conditions overlain with sediments deposited during brackish marine conditions. Samples were not recovered above the shallow SMTZ. Pink dashed lines denote a shallow (3.3 MCD) and deep (19.8 MCD) SMTZ; only the shallow SMTZ is shown in the bottom panel for clarity. Dark grey vertical bars in e and f denote equilibrium isotopologue compositions for the subsurface temperature of 7.8 ± 0.6 °C. Modelled CH$_4$ production, Fe-AOM and SO$_4$-AOM rates are shown in panel d (Dijkstra et al., 2018). CH$_4$ production (purple) and SO$_4$-AOM (gold) rates correspond with the upper x axis and Fe-AOM rates (brown) correspond with the lower x axis. SO$_4$-AOM rates above the upper SMTZ are calculated using bottom water SO$_4$ concentrations of 15.0 mM. Additional porewater data shown in Supplementary Information.
of a second rare isotopologue, $^{13}$CH$_2$D$_2$, aids in interpreting the causes of intra-methane disequilibrium and suggests that microbial methanogenesis does not lead to isotopologue equilibrium among methane molecules.

Here, we examine microbial methane from the Bornholm Basin (Baltic Sea; see Supplementary Information) to test the hypothesis that methane remaining after anaerobic oxidation is in thermodynamic equilibrium due to reversibility of the initial step of AOM. We compare methane clumped isotope composition to geochemical profiles (Andrén et al., 2015; Egger et al., 2017) and present day rates of methanogenesis and methanotrophy calculated with a multicomponent diagenetic model (Dijkstra et al., 2018) to determine parameters controlling the isotopic composition of methane (Fig. 1a-d). Methane $^{13}$C and $^{18}$O, $^{13}$C/C$_{DIC}$, $^{15}$N/C$_{TOC}$ and $^{37}$Ar vary non-monotonically over 30 metres below seafloor (Fig. 1g,h; Fig. S-1) while $^{13}$CH$_2$D and $^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ values increase with depth (Fig. 1e,f).

Comparisons of the bulk isotopic composition of methane to carbon and hydrogen reservoirs at this location are complicated by the change from limnic to marine deposition (Egger et al., 2017). For instance, the hydrogen isotopes in methane are seemingly not equilibrated with porewater that changes by >100 ‰ in this interval (Fig. S-1), obscuring the history of this reservoir. Instead, we will focus on the intra-molecular isotopic equilibrium of the methane itself using clumped isotopes, thus sidestepping the complications in bulk isotope ratios. We introduce $\xi_{^{12}CH_2D_2}$, a parameter that quantifies the degree of thermodynamic disequilibrium for a methane system. $\xi_{^{12}CH_2D_2}$ is analogous to the symbol for the reaction progress variable ($\xi_{^{12}CH_2D_2} = ^{12}CH_2D_2$ measured - $^{12}CH_2D_2$ equilibrium, see Supplementary Information). Values for $\xi_{^{12}CH_2D_2}$ in upper sediments as low as -7.5 ‰ are significantly different (>6 $\sigma$) from 0 ‰ (i.e. thermodynamic equilibrium) which is approached with depth (Fig. 2). In order to determine how methanogenesis and methanotrophy influence this transition, we consider evidence for and against reversibility in each metabolism.

Methanogenesis in intra-molecular isotopic thermodynamic equilibrium requires reversibility at the final hydrogen addition step. Trace methane oxidation (TMO) does occur during methanogenesis, but altering the concentration of H$_2$ or terminal electron acceptors necessary for oxidising methane does not increase TMO and has never been shown to consume greater than ~3 ‰ of the CH$_4$ produced (Moran et al., 2005; Moran et al., 2007). Although some of the first steps of methanogenesis may be reversible (Valentine et al., 2004), the final transfer of the methyl group to coenzyme M and the subsequent final hydrogen addition are believed to be irreversible (Gärtner et al., 1994; Thauer, 2011). Work on determining the biochemical pathways of Fe(III) reducing ANME (Thauer, 2011) suggests the first step of anaerobic methanotrophy is partially reversible, providing a potential mechanism for equilibrating methane isotopologues with environmental temperatures. This back reaction is sensitive to concentrations of the terminal electron acceptor SO$_4^{2-}$ (Holler et al., 2011; Yoshinaga et al., 2014). At high concentrations of SO$_4^{2-}$, the back reaction produces 3-7 ‰ of the CH$_4$ consumed by AOM, and at low concentrations of SO$_4^{2-}$ (below 0.5 mM), back reaction can produce as much as 78 ‰ of the CH$_4$ consumed by AOM (Yoshinaga et al., 2014; Timmers et al., 2017). Intra-cellular exposure of methane to Mcr can lead to isotopexchange catalysis during bond rupture and reformation (Marlow et al., 2017), and methane that diffuses back out of the cell could move an environmental reservoir of methane towards thermodynamic equilibrium. Using estimates of AOM rates from Dijkstra et al. (2018), we calculate the timescale of this equilibration (see Supplementary Information) to be on the order of 10$^3$-10$^4$ years, consistent with the estimated age of methane at 20 MCD of <~8000 years (Figs. S-1, S-2). Such timescales would vary in environments with differing rates of AOM.

Our findings suggest that when terminal electron acceptors are limiting, equilibrium bond ordering may be used to identify AOM activity even when the bulk isotopic composition of reservoir material is changing and ambiguous. Methane from Kidd Creek Mine (Ontario, Canada) also shows methane isotopologues transitioning with time from non-equilibrated to equilibrated (Fig. 3). This suggests that as energy-rich fractures open, Mcr exposure during the initial step of AOM catalytically exchanges isotopes leaving behind a reservoir that moves closer to thermodynamic equilibrium (Young et al., 2017).
Figure 3  \( \Delta^{12} \text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \) is plotted versus \( \Delta^{13} \text{CH}_3\text{D} \). The solid black line represents theoretical thermodynamic equilibrium abundances (with dots representing 100 °C increments from 0-1000 °C). Methane produced by thermogenesis, high temperature abiotic reactions, microbial methanogenesis and low temperature abiotic reactions inhabit unique zones in double isotopologue space. AOM, equilibrating through exchange catalysis during enzymatic back reaction, also inhibits a unique zone: low temperature intra-species thermodynamic equilibrium. Bornholm Basin data (magenta diamonds) span between the methanogenesis and AOM zones, while data from Kidd Creek Mine (black to white symbols) (Young et al., 2017) span from the abiotic to AOM zone. See Supplementary Information for additional sample description.

Methane remaining after AOM is in low temperature equilibrium due to exchange catalysis by Mcr. Therefore, it has distinct \( \Delta^{13} \text{CH}_3\text{D} \) and \( \Delta^{12} \text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \) concentrations when compared to methane produced through other known mechanisms (thermogenesis, microbial methanogenesis and abiotic methanogenesis) (Fig. 3). AOM metabolisms have been shown to be active from -1 °C to 70 °C (Niemann et al., 2006; Holler et al., 2011), a range of temperatures that is unique and distinguishable from equilibrated thermogenic methane forming in the 100 °C to 250 °C gas window. Abiotic methane may also form at low temperatures, yet even when it is apparently equilibrated in \( \Delta^{13} \text{CH}_3\text{D} \), it may exhibit large depletions in \( \Delta^{12} \text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \) that distinguish it from methane that has undergone exchange catalysis during AOM. We suggest that when combined (as in the \( \xi_{\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2} \) parameter), \( \Delta^{12} \text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \) and \( \Delta^{13} \text{CH}_3\text{D} \) values are sensitive indicators of the degree of thermodynamic equilibrium that may be useful in determining the role of enzymatic back reaction during AOM in the global methane cycle.
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Materials and Methods

Samples

Thermogenic Methane. Gases previously measured from the Marcellus and Utica Shales in the Appalachian Basin of the eastern USA are used as representative thermogenic gases in this study (Young et al., 2017). The Marcellus formation consists of black, carbonaceous shale of Middle Devonian age, and the Utica formation (ranging from hundreds of meters to 2 km below the Marcellus) is an organic-rich, black calcareous shale of Middle Ordovician age. These samples originate from a well operated by Shell Oil Company in western Pennsylvania. Modern temperatures in the Marcellus and Utica Shales are 60 °C and 90 °C respectively (Rowan and Geological Survey (U.S.), 2006).

Methanogenesis cultures. Previously published clumped isotope data for axenic methanogen cultures are used as a reference in this study (Young et al., 2017). The cultures were grown in crimp-top serum bottles at the University of Southern California. *Methanosarcina barkeri* and *Methanosarcina acetivorans* were grown at 30 °C with methanol. *Methanothermococcus thermolithotrophicus* was grown at 60 °C with CO$_2$ and H$_2$.

Baltic Sea. Baltic Sea methane samples analysed here were collected in October 2013 as part of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program Expedition 347 (Baltic Sea Paleoenvironment). Sediment cores were drilled in Bornholm Basin (Site M0065; 55°28.034’N, 15°28.680’E). Sediment-associated methane was collected by plunging a cut-off, sterile syringe into a freshly exposed core end. Sediment samples of 5 cubic centimetres were extruded into 10 mL syringes pre-poisoned with 5 mL 1M NaOH and crimp sealed under atmosphere. Samples were agitated to break up sediment and stored upside down at 4 °C until analysis. Methane concentration and other key geochemical parameters were analysed as described in detail in (Egger et al., 2017). Methane $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta$D, $\delta^{13}$C$_{\text{DIC}}$, $\delta^{13}$C$_{\text{TOC}}$ and $\delta$D$_{\text{H}_2}O$ are shown in Figure S-1.
Abiotic methane synthesis. Methane samples produced through silane decomposition and the Sabatier reaction are representative of abiotically synthesised methane in this study. Details of these experiments are outlined in Young et al. (2017).

Kidd Creek Mine. Kidd Creek Mine extends to 3 km depth in the subsurface and the deepest waters sampled have billion-year residence times. Samples reported on within originate from two locations with depths of 7850 and 9500 feet and were collected from 2013-2015 (Young et al., 2017). Temperatures range from 23-26 °C at the 7850 site and 29-32 °C at the 9500 site. Abiotic synthesis has been suggested to be the mechanism producing methane at a depth of 6800 feet (Sherwood Lollar et al., 2002).

Stable and Clumped Isotope Notation

Stable isotope data is reported in delta notation where delta refers to a difference in rare isotope ratio from a standard. The standards include Pee Dee Belemnite (PDB) for carbon and Standard Mean Ocean Water (SMOW) for hydrogen. For example,

\[ \delta^{13}C = \left( \frac{R_{\text{sample}}}{R_{\text{standard}}} - 1 \right) \cdot 1000 , \]

(Eq. S-1)

where \( R \) refers to the ratio \(^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}\) and the difference is in per mil (‰). Similarly, for \( D/H \),

\[ \delta D = \left( \frac{2R_{\text{sample}}}{2R_{\text{standard}}} - 1 \right) \cdot 1000 . \]

(Eq. S-2)

Abundances of rare isotopologues are reported relative to the stochastic distribution of isotopic bond pairings in which the relative abundances of rare isotopologues are those predicted by chance for a given bulk isotopic composition. For example, the fraction of carbon that is the rare isotope, \(^{13}\text{C}\), is

\[ X(^{13}\text{C}) = \frac{^{13}\text{C}}{^{13}\text{C}+^{12}\text{C}} , \]

(Eq. S-3)

and the fraction of the hydrogen isotopes that is deuterium, \( D \), is

\[ X(D) = \frac{D}{D+H} . \]

(Eq. S-4)

In order to arrive at the stochastic distribution of isotopologues, the fractional abundances are equated with probabilities, yielding

\[ X(^{12}\text{CH}_4) = X(^{12}\text{C})(X(H))^4 , \]

(Eq. S-5)

\[ X(^{13}\text{CH}_4) = X(^{13}\text{C})(X(H))^4 \]

(Eq. S-6)

and

\[ X(^{12}\text{CH}_3D) = 4X(^{12}\text{C})(X(H))^4(X(D)) , \]

(Eq. S-7)

where the coefficient “4” in Equation S-7 accounts for the four equivalent isotopomers created by varying configurations of \( D \) within molecules. This stochastic distribution of isotopes applies for systems in thermodynamic equilibrium at high temperatures.
(>1000 K). At lower temperatures, thermodynamic equilibrium predicts excesses of the multiply-substituted species relative to stochastic.

As an example, consider the following intra-species isotope-exchange reaction:

\[ ^{13}\text{CH}_4 + ^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D} \rightleftharpoons ^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D} + ^{12}\text{CH}_4 \]  

(Eq. S-8)

The equilibrium constant for this reaction is

\[ K_{\text{Eq}} = \frac{[^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}][^{12}\text{CH}_4]}{[^{13}\text{CH}_4][^{12}\text{CH}_3\text{D}]} \]  

(Eq. S-9)

where the brackets indicate molecular concentrations. The equilibrium constant at infinite temperature is evaluated by substituting the fractional abundances from Equation S-7 into Equation S-9 for the concentrations such that

\[ K_{\text{Eq}} = \frac{4X(^{13}\text{C})(X(H))^3 X(D)X(^{12}\text{C})(X(H))^4}{4X(^{12}\text{C})(X(H))^3 X(D)X(^{13}\text{C})(X(H))^4} = 1 \]  

(Eq. S-10)

At temperatures lower than infinity, the equilibrium constant in Equation S-10 is >1. Values less than unity are indicative of kinetics, mixing, or some other process that shifts the abundances of isotopologues from their equilibrium values.

Per mil differences between the apparent intra-species equilibrium constant (concentration quotient) and the stochastic equilibrium constant are expressed using the capital delta notation such that

\[ \Delta^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D} = 10^3 \ln \left( \frac{K_{\text{Eq}}}{K_{\text{Eq,Stochastic}}} \right) - 10^3 \left( \frac{X(^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D})}{X(^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D,Stochastic})} - 1 \right) \approx 10^3 \left( \frac{^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D} R}{^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D,Stochastic} R} - 1 \right) \]  

(Eq. S-11)

The equivalent expression for \(^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2\) is

\[ \Delta^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 = 10^3 \ln \left( \frac{K_{\text{Eq}}}{K_{\text{Eq,Stochastic}}} \right) - 10^3 \left( \frac{X(^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2)}{X(^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{Stochastic})} - 1 \right) \approx 10^3 \left( \frac{^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 R}{^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{Stochastic} R} - 1 \right) \]  

(Eq. S-12)

### Sample Purification and Analysis

Gas samples were purified on a vacuum line with inline gas chromatography using methods described previously (Young et al., 2017). Mass spectrometric methods are similar to those previously described excepting the use of a small-volume cold finger during introduction to the bellows of the mass spectrometer inlet (Young et al., 2016, 2017). In this modified method, samples are frozen onto a silica gel cold finger cooled by liquid nitrogen directly adjacent to the bellows housing for 5 minutes. The sample bellows and the cold finger are subsequently isolated from the rest of the dual inlet and warmed to room temperature. The variable volume bellows is cycled during warming to promote thorough mixing of gas. Between analyses, the cold finger is heated to 40 °C and pumped at high vacuum prior to introduction of new samples.

Baltic Sea samples for this study were analysed in July/August of 2016. A list of measured values for this study can be found in Table S-1. A tank methane gas (UCLA-2) was used as the reference internal standard. The composition of this gas was determined by comparing to gases of known bulk isotopic compositions and to gases heated to >800 °C. Aliquots of 30 to 60 μmol of UCLA-2 were repeatedly analysed during this session to assess external precision during measurement of Baltic Sea samples that were of comparable size. The average internal precisions (reported as 1σ) for δ\(^{13}\text{C}\), δD, \(\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}\) and \(\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2\) measurements are 0.004 ‰, 0.03 ‰, 0.32 ‰ and 0.85 ‰, respectively. External 1SD precisions for δ\(^{13}\text{C}\), δD, \(\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_3\text{D}\) and \(\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2\) values are 0.02 ‰, 0.05 ‰, 0.31 ‰ and 0.32 ‰ (n = 5).
To arrive at the total internal precision uncertainties listed above, the following error propagation was used. From Equation S-12, $\Delta^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ values are dependent on the measured $^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$/CH$_4$ ratios and on the D/H ratios from the measured CH$_3$D/CH$_4$ ratios because

$$^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R} = 6 \left(\frac{D}{R}\right)^2.$$  

(Eq. S-13)

Therefore, the total uncertainty in $\Delta^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ is

$$\sigma^2_{\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2} = \left(\frac{\partial \Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{\delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2} + \left(\frac{\partial \Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{\delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$$  

(Eq. S-14)

where the partial derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial \Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}} = \frac{10^3}{^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}}$$  

(Eq. S-15)

and

$$\frac{\partial \Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}} = - \frac{10^{3}^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 R}{(^{11}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R})^2}.$$  

(Eq. S-16)

Standard errors in isotopologue ratios are derived from standard errors in the associated δ-values so that for the measured $^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio,

$$\sigma^2_{^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R}{R}} = \left(\frac{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R}{R}}{\partial \delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{\delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2} = \left(\frac{^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Reference gas}}}{R}}{10^3}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{\delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$$  

(Eq. S-17)

where the partial derivative comes from the definition of the δ values. Likewise,

$$\sigma^2_{^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}} = \left(\frac{\partial^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2 \frac{R_{\text{Stochastic}}}{R}}{\partial D/R}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{D/R} = \left(D/R\right)^2 \left(\frac{^{12}R_{\text{Reference gas}}}{10^3}\right)^2 \sigma^2_{D/R}$$  

(Eq. S-18)

where Equations S-13 and S-2 are used to evaluate the partial derivative in Equation S-18. Finally, Equations S-15 through S-18 are substituted into Equation S-14. An analogous procedure applies to determine internal precision for $\Delta^{13}$CH$_3$D.

**Methanogenesis rate measurements**

At Cardiff University, samples for prokaryotic activity measurements were taken from the centre of whole-round cores with sterile 5 ml syringes (luer end removed) under anaerobic and aseptic handling conditions (Parkes et al., 1995) and sealed with Suba-Seals (Sigma). All syringe mini-core samples were then equilibrated under anoxic conditions (under nitrogen in sealed gas-tight
aluminium bags) at 10 °C for approximately 12 h prior to further processing. Microbial activity was measured by injecting the syringe mini-core samples, along the central line of the syringe, individually with \(^{13}\)C-acetate (7.5 µl, 81.3 kBq), \(^{14}\)C-bicarbonate (7.5 µl, 106.2 kBq) or \(^{14}\)C-dimethylamine (7.5 µl, 30.5 kBq) for estimating acetoclastic, hydrogenotrophic, and methylotrophic methanogenesis, respectively. All injected isotopes were in aqueous solution. Injected samples were then incubated at 10 °C under anoxic conditions for a further 3, 7 and 16 h (\(^{13}\)C-acetate, -dimethylamine, or 7, 16 and 24 h (\(^{14}\)C-bicarbonate). Ten syringe mini-cores were used at each depth for each isotope with one frozen immediately after injection as a control. Incubations were terminated by individually transferring the syringe contents into 30 ml glass vials containing 7 ml of 2 M NaOH, sealed, mixed thoroughly and stored inverted until processing. Radio-labelled methane was determined by purging the headspace (35 ml min^{-1} for 20 minutes) with a mixture of nitrogen and oxygen (95:5) as a carrier gas over copper oxide in a furnace (Carbolite, UK) at 900 °C and then into a CO, absorber.

Potential rates of methanogenesis for each substrate were determined by applying the label turnover rates to the pool size of total acetate, (DIONEX 2 x 50 mm guard column AG15 and 2 x 250 mm analytical column AS15 using KOH as eluent at a flow rate of 0.35 ml/min for 53 minutes with a conductivity detector and AERS-2 mm suppressor), dimethylamine (DIONEX 3 x 50 mm guard column CG16 and 3 x 250 mm analytical column CS16 using methanesulfonic acid as eluent at a flow rate of 0.36 ml/min for 80 minutes with a conductivity detector and CERS-2 mm suppressor), and CO\(_2\) [calculated from IODP Expedition 347 pH and alkalinity data; (Andrén et al., 2015)].

Sources of error for these measurements are principally that activity measurements were made in vitro after a period of sample storage, during which time super-saturated concentrations of methane in the core samples would have dissipated. Additionally, incubations were carried out at 10 °C under 1 atm pressure rather than in situ conditions. Measurements such as these are referred to as potential activity rates, and values are listed in Table S-2.

**Modelling the timescale of equilibration**

In order to assess the plausibility of equilibrating methane by methanotrophy in the Baltic Sea sediments, we determine the timescale necessary to equilibrate a hypothetical reservoir of methane with an initial clumped isotope composition of err...
or

2. The model $R_{\text{net AOM}}$ rates are underestimated.

Disentangling the contributions of the two potential sources of error to the calculated timescale is not possible a priori. However, modelled rates (i.e. net rates) are known to underestimate the actual turnover rates based on isotopic incubation studies (i.e. gross rates). Tripling $R_{\text{net AOM}}$ and using the higher value of 0.78 for $(R/R)_{\text{AOM}}$ decreases the calculated timescale of equilibration to $7.4 \times 10^3$ years, near to the estimated maximum age of the methane gas. Furthermore, these rates are unlikely to have been constant through time, and the present-day rates potentially overestimate rates of Fe-AOM and underestimate rates of SO$_2$-AOM through time (Dijkstra et al., 2018).

In keeping with the implied uncertainties, we utilise a $\tau$ value of $10^4$ years in the rate model used here for illustration purposes. The rate constant for enzymatic back reaction ($K_{\text{AOM}}$) is obtained by treating the timescale of equilibration as an e-fold time:

$$K_{\text{AOM}} = e^\frac{\Delta G}{RT}.$$  
(Eq. S-21)

We utilise this $K_{\text{AOM}}$ in a simple model that describes the equilibration from a disequilibrium methanogenic end member to thermodynamic equilibrium at the average temperature of 7.75 °C estimated from shipboard core temperature measurements. We describe the rate of equilibration system using

$$\frac{d\Delta_i}{dt} = K_{\text{AOM}}(\Delta_{eq} - \Delta_i),$$  
(Eq. S-22)

where $\Delta_{eq}$ is the clumped isotope composition at equilibrium and $\Delta_i$ is the clumped isotope composition at a given time step. In essence, this formulation treats the rate of reaction as one driven by the reaction affinity (e.g., De Donder, 1927; Prigogine et al., 1954).

The methanogenesis endmember defines $\Delta_{\text{AOM}}$ and $\Delta_{\text{AOM}}$ is defined by thermodynamic equilibrium at 7.75 °C. The curves in Figure S-2 illustrate the timescales of equilibration for the two mass-18 isotopologues of methane. Figure S-3 shows the evolution of microbial methane progressively equilibrated over this timescale to the low-temperature AOM endmember in double isotopologue space under two treatments. The first assumes that $K_{\text{AOM}}$ is equal for both the $^{13}$CH$_2$D and $^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ isotopologues, and the trajectory is a straight line between the two endmembers. The second assumes that $K_{\text{AOM}}$ for $^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ is half of that for $^{13}$CH$_2$D to account for the higher energy barrier of bonding two deuteriums within a methane molecule.

Calculating $\xi_{12\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$

The parameter $\xi_{12\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$ quantifies the difference between $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{measured}$ and $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{equilibrium}$. $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{equilibrium}$ is calculated by assuming that for each datum, $\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_{\text{measured}}$ is in equilibrium and that all methane isotopologues are in intra-species thermodynamic equilibrium. A $\xi_{12\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$ value of zero implies that $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{measured}$ is in intra-species thermodynamic equilibrium with all methane isotopologues, and a positive or negative $\xi_{12\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$ value implies that $\Delta^{12}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2,\text{measured}$ is not in intra-species thermodynamic equilibrium with the corresponding $\Delta^{13}\text{CH}_2\text{D}_{\text{measured}}$. In Bornholm Basin, the shallowest samples display the most negative values of $\xi_{12\text{CH}_2\text{D}_2}$ and the deepest samples approach zero (Fig. 2).

Calculating AG of methane consumption

Here, both Fe-AOM and SO$_2$-AOM are potential methane consumption pathways. Evidence for enzymatic back-reaction during AOM with iron as the terminal electron acceptor has yet to be shown, but it has been suggested that the Gibbs free energies of reaction at standard conditions (AG$^{\circ} = 16.3$ kJ mol$^{-1}$ for SO$_2$-AOM and AG$^{\circ} = 571.2$ kJ mol$^{-1}$ for Fe-AOM) imply that Fe-AOM would be less reversible than SO$_2$-AOM, and therefore a weaker mechanism for equilibrating methane (Timmers et al., 2017). However,
standard-state free energies of reaction are not the relevant indicators of reversibility. We calculate the Gibbs free energies of reaction (ΔG = ΔG° + RTlnQ where Q is the activity quotient for the reaction) for in-situ concentrations in the equilibrated methane zone (20 MCD) in Bornholm Basin and obtain values of -33.8 kJ mol⁻¹ for SO₄-AOM and -93.4 kJ mol⁻¹ for Fe-AOM (Table S2). Although these estimates for ΔG values are still far from equilibrium, they are sufficiently close to one another to suggest that the likelihood of reversibility in SO₄-AOM and Fe-AOM are similar. Furthermore, it has been previously suggested that actual free energy dissipation during such reactions is less negative than suggested by calculations based on in-situ concentrations due to coupling to energy conservation (Holler et al., 2011). This implies that enzymatic back-reaction may be possible in both Fe-AOM and SO₄-AOM even at these calculated Gibbs free energies.

We note that non-zero Gibbs free energies calculated from environmental conditions are related to the amount of energy available for microbial purposes (LaRowe and Amend, 2016) and can drive rates of reactions through reaction affinity in irreversible thermodynamics. However, they do not include the catalysing effects of the enzymes in the reaction. For instance, if one considers only Gibbs free energy as an indicator of reversibility, then the degree of reversibility of methanogenesis appears to be to that for anaerobic methanotrophy, implying back reaction is equally likely during both processes. However, this is contradictory to experiments that suggest the forward reaction is far more strongly favoured during methanogenesis (Moran et al., 2005; Moran et al., 2007), and the substantial clumped isotope evidence of disequilibrated methane produced by methanogens supports this conclusion (Stolper et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015; Douglas et al., 2016; Young et al., 2017; Gruen et al., 2018). In light of this, we infer that back reaction during methanogenesis (i.e. methane consumption) does not seem to be an important process in the subsurface for equilibrating methane isotope signatures, and exploration of the intracellular metabolites that drive bi-bi reaction mechanisms at enzymes (Wongnate and Ragsdale, 2015) warrants further study.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1 Potential activity measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (MCD)</th>
<th>Acetoclastic methanogenesis activity pmol cm⁻³ d⁻¹</th>
<th>Hydrogenotrophic methanogenesis activity pmol cm⁻³ d⁻¹</th>
<th>Methylotrophic methanogenesis activity pmol cm⁻³ d⁻¹</th>
<th>Total methanogenesis activity pmol cm⁻³ d⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.88</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2 Species concentrations for ΔG calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₄ + SO₄²⁻ ➔ HCO₃⁻ + HS⁻ + H₂Oₐ₀</td>
<td>SO₄²⁻</td>
<td>0.16 mM</td>
<td>Andrén et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H⁻</td>
<td>0.001 mM</td>
<td>Egger et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCO₃⁻</td>
<td>4.7 mM⁴</td>
<td>Egger et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>5.36 mM</td>
<td>Andrén et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄ + 8Fe(OH)₃ irresponsible + 16H⁺ ➔ CO₂ + 8Fe³⁺ + 22H₂Oₐ₀</td>
<td>Fe³⁺</td>
<td>277.2 μM</td>
<td>Andrén et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>5.36 mM</td>
<td>Andrén et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H⁺</td>
<td>10⁻³⁰ M*</td>
<td>Andrén et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>0.293 mM⁴</td>
<td>Egger et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Below detection
§ Calculated from DIC concentration
¥ Calculated from shipboard pH measurements
Table S-3  Methane geochemistry of Bornholm Basin, Baltic Sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (MCD)</th>
<th>$\delta^{13}$C‰ ± 2SE</th>
<th>$\delta D$‰ ± 2SE</th>
<th>$\Delta^{13}$CH$_3$D ± 2SE</th>
<th>$\Delta^{12}$CH$_2$D$_2$ ± 2SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-76.16 ± 0.006</td>
<td>-244.03 ± 0.05</td>
<td>4.76 ± 0.43</td>
<td>7.88 ± 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>-74.06 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-242.45 ± 0.05</td>
<td>5.10 ± 0.69</td>
<td>8.52 ± 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>-72.54 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-239.91 ± 0.05</td>
<td>4.99 ± 0.66</td>
<td>11.79 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>-71.81 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-238.60 ± 0.07</td>
<td>5.35 ± 0.67</td>
<td>11.42 ± 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>-71.87 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-239.34 ± 0.04</td>
<td>5.74 ± 0.59</td>
<td>15.13 ± 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>-72.11 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-239.95 ± 0.06</td>
<td>5.05 ± 0.56</td>
<td>14.48 ± 2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>-72.33 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-239.21 ± 0.06</td>
<td>5.36 ± 0.61</td>
<td>16.70 ± 2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>-72.89 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-238.91 ± 0.07</td>
<td>5.90 ± 0.68</td>
<td>17.43 ± 2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>-74.03 ± 0.008</td>
<td>-238.37 ± 0.05</td>
<td>5.04 ± 0.46</td>
<td>16.21 ± 1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>-74.63 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-238.28 ± 0.06</td>
<td>5.86 ± 0.55</td>
<td>16.72 ± 1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>-75.59 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-238.20 ± 0.08</td>
<td>6.17 ± 0.61</td>
<td>20.54 ± 2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplementary Figures

Figure 5-1  Isotopes of methane, carbon and hydrogen reservoirs from Bornholm Basin, Baltic Sea are shown versus depth. Round symbols were measured in this study, diamond symbols are from previously published work (Egger et al., 2017).
Figure S-2  $\Delta^{13}CH_3D$ and $\Delta^{12}CH_2D_2$ equilibrate within ~10,000 years. Equilibrium values for both species are shown as dashed lines.

Figure S-3  $\Delta^{12}CH_2D_2$ is plotted versus $\Delta^{13}CH_3D$. Solid black line represents theoretical thermodynamic equilibrium in 100 °C increments marked by black circles. Baltic Sea methane data are shown as open circles shaded from white (shallowest sample) to black (deepest sample). Green symbols represent axenic cultures of methanogens as labeled. Purple lines represent equilibration pathways under two treatments as described in the text.
Supplementary Information References


