1	Evaluating the influence of lake morphology, trophic status and diagenesis
2	on geochemical profiles in lake sediments
3	
4	Dennis Trolle <sup>1,2*</sup> , David P. Hamilton <sup>1</sup> and Conrad Pilditch <sup>1</sup>
5	
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, 3240
8	Hamilton, New Zealand
9	<sup>2</sup> Department of Freshwater Ecology, National Environmental Research Institute, University
10	of Aarhus, Vejlsøvej 25, PO Box 314, 8600 Silkeborg, Denmark
11	
12	* Corresponding author: Dennis Trolle (dtr@dmu.dk)
13	

## 14 Abstract

15 Recent geochemical studies provide evidence that changes in vertical distributions of 16 nutrients in lake sediments are driven by anthropogenic activities, based primarily on trends 17 of increasing concentrations in upper sediment layers. However, we show that vertical concentration profiles of carbon (C), nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) in lake sediments can 18 19 be higher in the upper, most recently deposited sediment strata, driven largely by natural 20 diagenetic processes and not eutrophication alone. We examined sediment cores from 14 21 different lakes in New Zealand and China ranging from oligotrophic to highly eutrophic and 22 shallow to deep, and found that the shape of vertical profiles of total P, a key nutrient for lake 23 productivity, can be similar in sediments across gradients of widely differing trophic status. 24 We derived and applied empirical and mechanistic diagenesis steady state profile models to 25 describe the vertical distribution of C, N and P in the sediments. These models, which focus 26 on large scale temporal (decades) and spatial (up to 35 cm in the vertical) processes, revealed 27 that density-differentiated burial and biodiffusive mixing, were strongly correlated with 28 vertical concentration gradients of sediment C, N and P content, whereas lake trophic status 29 was not. A sensitivity analysis of parameters included in the diagenetic model further showed 30 that the processes including flux of organic matter to the sediment-water interface, burial (net 31 sedimentation), breakdown of organic matter and biodiffusion all significantly can influence 32 the vertical distribution of sediment P content. We conclude that geochemical studies 33 attempting to evaluate drivers of the vertical distribution of sediment C, N, and P content in 34 lake sediments should also account for the natural diagenetic drivers of vertical concentration 35 gradients, assisted with application of similar models to those presented in this study. This 36 would include quantification of key sediment diagenesis model parameters to separate out the 37 influence of anthropogenic activities.

### 38 Introduction

Internal nutrient loading can directly affect lake trophic status and substantially delay lake
ecosystem responses to reduced external loading (Marsden, 1989; Søndergaard et al., 2003;
Jeppesen et al., 2005). The size and availability of the nutrient pool in the bottom sediments
are therefore of critical importance in understanding how lake ecosystems will respond to
changes in external loading (Nürnberg, 1984; Van der Molen et al., 1998; Spears et al., 2007)
or changes in climate (Jeppesen et al., 2007).

45

46 Recognizing that lake sediments can provide information about historical changes in lakes, 47 the vertical distribution of nutrients in lake sediments is often used to describe how lake 48 trophic state may have changed through geological time and from recent human activities 49 (Selig et al., 2007; Xu and Jaffé, 2009). Hence, several studies have used observed profiles of 50 phosphorus and organic nitrogen and carbon to quantify temporal variations in sediment 51 nutrient accumulation rates, and infer changes in lake trophic status (Schelske and Hodell, 52 1995; Hambright et al., 2004; Smoak and Swarzenski, 2004). Only a few studies, however, 53 have compared sediment geochemical profiles collected from a range of lakes of different 54 trophic states (Bortleson and Lee, 1974; Søndergaard et al., 1996). These studies focused only 55 on shallow lakes and did not examine relationships between vertical geochemical profiles and 56 lake trophic state. Concurrently, both laboratory and field studies have indicated that various 57 phosphorus species may migrate vertically through the sediments (Carignan and Flett, 1981; 58 Søndergaard et al., 1996). It is also well known that organic species of phosphorus, nitrogen 59 and carbon will undergo a natural decay with time (Reitzel et al., 2007), thereby generating naturally lower concentrations in the deeper and older sediments. Although often assumed 60 61 negligible (e.g., Smoak and Swarzenski, 2004), these natural processes may be similarly

62 important compared to changes in the flux of nutrients to the sediment-water interface 63 resulting from changes in lake trophic state, in terms of their effect in creating vertical concentration gradients of sediment nutrient content. We therefore hypothesise that natural 64 65 processes should be accounted for in relationships between nutrient concentration profiles in the sediments and historical changes in lake trophic state. In addition, several studies have 66 67 shown that that the surficial sediment concentrations of both phosphorus and nitrogen cannot readily be related to lake trophic state (McColl, 1977; Håkanson, 1984; Trolle et al., 2008). 68 69 Consequently, there is a large degree of uncertainty as to whether, or how strongly, specific 70 profile properties (e.g., the shape of the vertical concentration profiles) are related to lake trophic state. 71

72

73 Diagenetic models that describe the vertical distribution of various geochemical elements may 74 help to quantify the importance of factors such as trophic state, lake morphology and various 75 diagenetic processes. Both two-layer oxic/anoxic sediment diagenesis models (e.g. Wang et 76 al., 2003a, b) as well as more complex one-dimensional, multi-layer, sediment diagenesis models (e.g. Jørgensen et al., 1982; Boudreau, 1996) have been used to describe the vertical 77 78 distribution of nutrients in sediments as well as the fluxes from the sediments to the water 79 column, which may strongly influence lake water quality. However, due to the complex 80 nature of these models, they are typically only applied to sediment cores collected from a 81 single lake (e.g. Van Rees et al., 1996; Schauser et al., 2004).

82

The main objective of the present study was to quantify the influence of lake trophic state and
morphology, and natural diagenetic processes, on vertical profiles of total phosphorus (TP),
total nitrogen (TN) and total carbon (TC) in sediments of a wide variety of lakes, by

concurrently applying an empirical and a simple, mechanistic diagenesis model. We collected sediment cores from 14 different lakes (Table 1) in New Zealand and China, ranging from shallow to deep, and from oligotrophic to highly eutrophic, and derived both an empirical and a mechanistic model to describe the vertical TP, TN and TC concentration profiles observed in these cores. Parameter values, obtained by fitting the empirical and mechanistic models to observed vertical profiles of TP, TN and TC, could then be examined for correlations with trophic status attributes, lake morphology and a range of diagenetic parameters.

93

#### 94 Methods

## 95 Sampling sites

96 Two intact sediment cores were collected from the deep basins in each of the 14 lakes. 97 targeting areas conforming to accumulation bottoms (c.f. Håkanson and Jansson, 1983). The 98 two cores were collected at similar depths, but at two different sites within the deep basin of 99 each lake, in order to capture some of the natural spatial variability within the deep basins. 100 Twelve of the lakes are deep ( $z_{max} > 13.5 - 125m$ ) and lie within the Bay of Plenty Region 101 (known as the Rotorua lakes), North Island of New Zealand. Two shallow lakes were 102 selected, including Lake Te Waihora (Lake Ellesmere) in the Canterbury Region, South 103 Island of New Zealand, and Lake Taihu in the Jaingsu Province, China. Attributes of trophic 104 status were available for each of the lakes.

105

106 Sampling methods

Sampling was conducted in all 14 lakes during the period March 2006 to January 2007. The
sediment cores were collected using a cylindrical gravity or piston corer, which was designed

109 to leave cores intact. The surface sediment was visually inspected in each core, and if there 110 was any evidence of disturbance at the sediment-water interface or in the core profile, the core 111 was discarded and another one taken. Samples of the sediment were collected from each core 112 at intervals of 2 cm to a vertical depth that varied from 8 to 38 cm, using a custom-made 113 slicing chamber, which was designed to minimize the exposure of potentially anoxic sediment 114 to the atmosphere. Each sample was transferred to 50 mL Vulcan<sup>™</sup> centrifuge tubes, which 115 were sealed and placed on ice until return to the laboratory, where pore-waters were 116 immediately separated by centrifugation at 4000 rpm for 40 min. For Lake Taihu, samples 117 were collected in air-tight Zip-lock plastic bags, and pore-waters were not separated from the 118 solid material. The resulting sub-samples of pore-waters and sediment solids from each lake 119 were stored frozen (-18 °C) before further analysis.

120

## 121 Analytical methods

122 Sediment dry weight fraction was determined by weighing solid samples before and after

123 drying at 105 °C for 24 h, and also taking into account pore-water mass. Subsequently,

sediment wet weight was determined as the difference between the bulk weight (total weight

125 including both solids and pore-water) and the sediment dry weight.

126

Total phosphorus (TP), iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) content in the dry sediment was determined after the solids had been ground with mortar and pestle, and approximately 0.5 g of each sample had been digested with Aqua Regia (3:1 v:v of 1:5 conc. hydrochloric acid solution and 1:2 conc. nitric acid solution), based on a modified standard procedure (Martin et al., 1994). Liquid from the digested solid samples and from pore-water samples acidified with

132 two drops of conc. hydrochloric acid, were then analyzed for TP, Fe and Mn on an ICP-MS133 (model ELAN DRC II).

134

135	Total carbon (TC) and nitrogen (TN) content in sediment solids was determined by sub-
136	sampling approximately 0.25 g of the dry sediment solids and analyzing by combustion
137	(LECO TruSpec model CN Determinator). Most of our study lakes have non-calcareous
138	sediments with total carbon content closely related to the sediment organic content (McColl,
139	1977). Concentrations of TC and TN were determined for every second vertical sub-sample in
140	20 out of the 28 cores; for the remaining cores only the surficial sediments were analyzed.

141

Total nitrogen in pore-waters was analyzed spectrophotometrically with a Lachat Instruments
flow injection analyzer (model QuikChem 8000 FIA+) following persulphate digestion (Ebina
et al., 1983).

145

# 146 Mathematical and statistical methods

147 The concentration of TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn in the dried sediment was calculated for each 2 cm interval in each individual core. The pore-water fraction was excluded from further 148 149 statistical analysis as we found this fraction to be negligible relative to the total mass of 150 elements in the sediments (i.e., pore-waters accounted for an < 1% of the average TP 151 concentration across all samples collected), and the mechanistic diagenesis model used to 152 describe vertical profiles is only valid for either the solid or the solute fraction. Most vertical profiles of the measured elements in the solid sediments showed an appearance of 153 154 exponentially decreasing concentrations with depth in the sediments (as demonstrated by TP

155 concentration profiles in Fig. 1). We therefore set up an empirical exponential model to 156 reproduce the vertical distribution of TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn in (mg kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt), and to 157 quantify three characteristic profile parameters: the profile surface concentration ( $\beta + \gamma$ ) at the 158 sediment-water interface, the background concentration ( $\gamma$ ) and the vertical decay coefficient 159  $\alpha$  (cm<sup>-1</sup>):

160

161 
$$C_i(z) = \gamma + \beta \cdot \exp(-\alpha \cdot z)$$
 (1)

162

163 where Ci(z) is the concentration of TP, TN, TC, Fe or Mn at vertical depth z (cm) in the sediment (mg kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt). Values of  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  were calculated for each individual sediment 164 core and for each element (TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn) using Eq. (1) to fit the observed 165 166 geochemical profiles. Goodness of fit of models was tested using Root-Mean-Square-Error (RMSE) values and Pearson correlation coefficients (r). The RMSE value for each profile 167 168 model was minimized by calibrating  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  using Solver in Microsoft Excel, after which 169 Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. Solver uses a generalized reduced gradient 170 non-linear optimization code to minimize model error, thereby searching for and converging 171 on a minimum in the RMSE value space. In order to evaluate the influence of sediment compaction on vertical profiles of TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn,  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  values were also 172 173 calculated for wet weight profiles. Each of these three empirical parameters could then be 174 examined for correlations with trophic status attributes, including water column 175 concentrations of TP, TN, chlorophyll a (Chl a) and Secchi depth, lake morphology and a 176 range of diagenetic parameters.

To interpret the three parameters given by the empirical exponential model from a diagenetic
perspective, and to quantify the influence of a range of diagenetic processes on these
parameters, we first consider the general diagenetic advection-diffusion-reaction (ADR)
equation (Berner, 1980; Boudreau, 1997) for the mass balance of solid organic matter (OM),
where burial and biodiffusive mixing are the transport processes, and OM decays with a first
order kinetic rate:

184

185 
$$\frac{\partial C_{OM}}{\partial t} = D_b \cdot \frac{\partial^2 C_{OM}}{\partial z^2} - w \cdot \frac{\partial C_{OM}}{\partial z} + k \cdot C_{OM}$$
(2)

186

187 where  $C_{OM}$  is the concentration of organic matter in mg kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt,  $D_b$  is the biodiffusion 188 coefficient in cm<sup>2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, w is the advective velocity for solids (also referred to as a burial rate 189 and assumed to be equal to the net sedimentation rate or sediment accumulation rate) in cm 190 yr<sup>-1</sup> and k is a first order kinetic rate coefficient in yr<sup>-1</sup> for the breakdown of OM. If we 191 assume steady state mass-conservation, Eq. (2) simplifies to:

192

193 
$$D_b \cdot \frac{\partial^2 C_{OM}}{\partial z^2} - w \cdot \frac{\partial C_{OM}}{\partial z} + k \cdot C_{OM} = 0$$
(3)

194

We can solve Eq. (3) as a second order ordinary differential equation (Boudreau, 1997;
DiToro, 2001; Meysman et al., 2005a), given a constant flux boundary at the sediment-water
interface:

199 
$$F_{OM}^{0} = \rho \cdot (1 - \phi) \cdot \left[ -D_b \cdot \frac{\partial C_{OM}}{\partial z} + w \cdot C_{OM} \right]_{z=0}$$
(4)

200

where  $F_{OM}^0$  is the constant flux of OM to the sediment-water interface in µg cm<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>,  $\rho$  is the solid sediment density in g cm<sup>-3</sup> and  $\phi$  the porosity; and a zero-gradient boundary in the deep sediments:

204

$$205 \qquad \left[\frac{\partial C_{OM}}{\partial z}\right]_{z \to \infty} = 0 \tag{5}$$

206

207 The analytical solution to Eq. (3) then becomes:

208

$$209 \qquad C_{OM}(z) = \frac{1}{\rho \cdot (1-\phi)} \cdot \frac{2 \cdot F_{OM}^0}{\left[w + \sqrt{w^2 + 4 \cdot D_b \cdot k}\right]} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{w - \sqrt{w^2 + 4 \cdot D_b \cdot k}}{2 \cdot D_b} \cdot z\right)$$
(6)

210

Finally, if we assume that OM can be divided into a labile and a refractory fraction, the latter implicitly also accounting for inorganic matter (where  $k \sim 0$  for refractory OM) the steady state concentration profile becomes:

214

215 
$$C_{OM,total}(z) = \frac{1}{\rho \cdot (1-\phi)} \cdot \left[ \frac{F_R}{w} + \frac{2 \cdot F_L}{\left[ w + \sqrt{w^2 + 4 \cdot D_b \cdot k} \right]} \cdot \exp\left( \frac{w - \sqrt{w^2 + 4 \cdot D_b \cdot k}}{2 \cdot D_b} \cdot z \right) \right]$$
(7)

216

where  $F_R$  and  $F_L$  are a constant flux of refractory and labile OM to the sediment-water interface, respectively. We can now see that Eq. (7) is equivalent to the empirical expression in Eq. (1).

220

221 To determine how the diagenetic parameters of Eq. (7) influence the vertical concentration profiles of TP, TN and TC, and how they may be related to environmental variables (water 222 223 quality, lake depth, etc.), we applied Eq. (7) to the observed concentration profiles of TP, TN 224 and TC. When calibrating the diagenetic parameters we assumed constant porosity in each 225 individual sediment core ( $\phi$ , estimated to range 0.46-0.92 across sediment cores from all lakes) and a constant sediment solids density ( $\rho$ ) of 2.5 g cm<sup>-3</sup>. To estimate burial rates (w) we 226 recorded the depth to a tephra layer, which was present at a depth between 7 and 31 cm below 227 228 the sediment-water interface in most sediment cores collected from the Rotorua Lakes, New 229 Zealand. The tephra is comprised of ash and mud which were dispersed over an area > 200km<sup>2</sup> over North Island of New Zealand during the volcanic eruption of Mount Tarawera in 230 231 1886 (White et al. 1997). For sediment cores where no tephra was present, we used net 232 sedimentation data from Trolle et al. (2008) for Rotorua lakes and from Wang et al. (2001) for 233 Lake Taihu. As no burial rate data were available for Lake Te Waihora, we initially assumed 234 that this large and shallow eutrophic lake had a burial rate similar to that of Lake Taihu. The parameters  $F_R$  and  $F_L$  were initially fitted by assuming a constant mid-range biodiffusion 235 coefficient  $(D_b)$  of 0.5 cm<sup>2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Meysman et al., 2003) and a first order kinetic rate coefficient 236 (k) for moderately labile organic matter of 0.4 yr<sup>-1</sup> (Luff et al., 2000). Goodness of fit of 237 238 models was again tested using RMSE values and Pearson correlation coefficients. From Eq. 239 (7) it is evident that the value of  $F_R$  during initial model calibration (converging on a

240 minimum of the RMSE value space) will be adjusted relative to the observed background 241 concentrations. Following the initial calibration step, we performed a second calibration of 242 parameters  $F_R$ ,  $F_L$ ,  $D_b$  and k. For the second calibration-step of the diagenetic parameters for 243 the Lake Te Waihora profiles we also included the burial rate (*w*).

244

245 The three parameters given by the empirical model (Eq. 1) were then examined for 246 statistically significant linear relationships with the diagenetic parameters given by the 247 mechanistic model (Eq. 7), and subsequently all parameters from the two models were used to 248 test for relationships with lake trophic state (represented by biological and chemical water 249 column attributes) and a selection of morphological variables across all the lakes. The current 250 trophic state was estimated from annual average (based on years 2005-2006) concentrations 251 of TP, TN and Chl a and Secchi depths for the water column of each lake from monthly 252 samples.

253

### 254 **Results**

255 Observed geochemical profiles of TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn

The concentration profiles of TP (Fig. 1), TN, TC, Fe and Mn, derived from each of two sediment cores collected from within the deep basin of each lake, generally showed a similar pattern in the deep lakes. The variability between the two cores collected from within the same basin was, however, typically quite high for the shallower lakes (e.g. Rerewhakaaitu, Rotoehu, Rotorua, Taihu and Te Waihora, Table 1), even though sampling site depths differed by <1 m within these lakes. The surficial sediment concentrations, represented by the first discrete horizontal sediment sample slice (0-2 cm) from each sediment core, ranged between

400 and 4,300 mg P kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for TP; 1,400 and 19,900 mg N kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for TN; 7,000 and 263 136,400 mg C kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for TC; 7,000 and 57,600 mg Fe kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for Fe and 140 and 264 28,800 mg Mn kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for Mn. For most of these elements the concentration decreased 265 266 exponentially with sediment depth, until it became near uniform, typically around 15 cm into 267 the sediments. The depth at which TP concentrations reached this background level tended to 268 be deeper into the sediments for some of the deep oligo-mesotrophic lakes, e.g., Lake 269 Okareka at 15-17 cm compared with deep eutrophic Lake Rotoiti (7-9 cm). The range in 270 background concentrations was generally smaller than that observed in surface sediment samples, and was between 200 and 1,300 mg P kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for TP; 800 and 9,200 mg N kg<sup>-1</sup> 271 dry wt for TN; 4,400 and 80,600 mg C kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for TC; 7,500 and 37,700 mg Fe kg<sup>-1</sup> dry 272 wt for Fe and 180 and 9,100 mg Mn kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt for Mn. 273

274

The tephra layers appeared to influence the various geochemical profiles; dry matter content increased in the tephra, while TN and TC concentrations decreased. The TP, Fe and Mn concentrations in the tephra layers were, however, generally similar to those found in the overlying lacustrine sediment.

279

In examining the concentration profiles of TP (Fig. 1), there was no clear separation between oligotrophic and eutrophic lakes. For example, the TP profiles in sediment cores collected from deep, oligotrophic Lake Okataina, where anthropogenic impacts are still negligible, showed a similar vertical distribution to TP profiles from sediments in deep, eutrophic Lake Rotoiti, which has undergone a period of severe eutrophication during the 1970s (Vincent et al., 1984) and has since remained eutrophic (Hamilton et al., 2006).

286

# 287 Model predictions of sediment geochemical profiles

288 The empirical model used to describe the vertical decay of TP, TN, TC, Fe, Mn and wet 289 weight with sediment depth, as well as the diagenetic model for profiles of TP, TN and TC, 290 generally produced close fits to observed geochemical profiles across the 14 lakes (Table 2). 291 Visual comparison of a subset of the sediment geochemical profiles in cores from lakes 292 representing eutrophic, mesotrophic and oligotrophic states (Fig. 2) showed irregular 293 concentration profiles of various elements (e.g., oligotrophic Lake Tarawera; Fig. 2). In 294 sediment cores that extended into the Tarawera tephra, the tephra values were omitted from 295 the model fit. As the empirical and the mechanistic models were both based on an exponential 296 decrease of elemental concentrations with sediment depth, these models explained the same 297 relative amount of variability in the concentration profiles of TP, TN and TC (Table 2). The 298 models explained between 51 and 100% of the variability in the vertical profiles of TP, TN 299 and TC across the 14 lakes. Concentration profiles which were relatively uniformly or linearly 300 distributed through the sediments (mostly for Fe and Mn) were also reproduced satisfactorily 301 by the empirical model, with the vertical decay coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) for these profiles equal to zero 302 (Table 2).

303

### 304 Geochemical profiles related to diagenetic parameters

305 We found a strong and significant correlation between the sediment background

306 concentrations ( $\gamma$ ) and the flux of refractory matter ( $F_R$ ) of TP, TN and TC (Table 3), whereas

- 307 the surface concentrations  $(\gamma + \beta)$  of TP, TN and TC were more closely related to the flux of
- 308 labile matter ( $F_L$ ). The vertical decay coefficients ( $\alpha$ ) for TP, TN and TC profiles were most

309 strongly related to the biodiffusion coefficients  $(D_b)$ , while the vertical decay coefficients for 310 TN and TC profiles, but not TP profiles, were also significantly and inversely correlated with 311 the burial rates (w). The vertical decay coefficients for TP were also significantly, though weakly, related to the vertical decay coefficients for Fe (r = 0.47, p < 0.05, n = 28), Mn (r =312 313 0.46, p < 0.05, n = 28) and wet weight (r = 0.50, p < 0.01, n = 28). However, the correlation 314 between the vertical decay coefficients for TP and the Fe and Mn profiles cannot be justified 315 as causation, as the vertical decay coefficients for the Fe and Mn profiles were also strongly 316 inter-correlated with the vertical decay coefficients for wet weight profiles (p < 0.001). 317 Vertical decay coefficients for wet weight profiles were also strongly correlated with the 318 vertical decay coefficients for TN and TC profiles. The first order kinetic rate coefficients (k) 319 were not significantly correlated with any of the parameters given by the empirical model for 320 TN and TC profiles, but were significantly related to both the surface concentrations and the 321 vertical decay coefficients for the TP profiles (Table 3).

322

# 323 Geochemical profiles related to morphological, chemical and biological variables

324 We generally found no, or only weak, correlation between the parameters given by the two 325 models and lake water quality data, represented by annual mean TP, TN, Chl a concentrations 326 and Secchi depth (Table 3). The biodiffusion coefficients and vertical decay coefficients of 327 TN profiles were, for example, significantly correlated with water column TN concentrations. 328 The coring site depth, lake mean depth, surface area and catchment area were generally not 329 significantly correlated with any of the parameters given by the two models (p > 0.05). 330 However, the coring site depth to lake mean depth ratio was significantly correlated with the 331 burial rates and the flux of refractory TC (Table 3), and also inversely correlated with the 332 vertical decay coefficients for wet weight profiles. The vertical decay coefficients for wet

333 weight profiles were also significantly related to annual mean TP, TN and Chl *a* 

concentrations in the water column. However, this correlation can also be induced by the
coring site to lake mean depth ratio, which was also significantly correlated with these water
quality attributes.

337

### 338 Discussion

## 339 Model applications and constraints

340 While the calibration routine for the empirical model always converged on distinct model parameter values in a global minimum of the RMSE value space, the mechanistic model, 341 342 which contains five parameters, was equifinal (Beven and Freer, 2001) and could reproduce 343 the same vertical profiles based on different parameter value combinations. Therefore, an 344 initial estimation of a subset of the included model parameters is essential for generating 345 representative values of other unknown model parameters through a model fit. We were able 346 to accurately estimate and fix the burial rates (w) in the mechanistic model, but had to fit the 347 parameters  $F_R$ ,  $F_L$ ,  $D_b$  and k by initially assuming fixed midrange values for  $D_b$  and k, so that 348  $F_R$  and  $F_L$  were close to the background and surface concentrations, respectively. The 349 biodiffusion coefficients can be estimated more accurately based on the vertical distribution 350 of tracer elements (e.g., caesium-137 and lead-210) that decay with known first order kinetic 351 rate coefficients (Mulsow et al., 1998; Henderson et al., 1999; Meysman et al., 2005b), which 352 could also lead to more accurate estimates of the first order kinetic rate coefficients for the 353 decay of organic matter. Tracer data was not available for the 14 lakes in this study, however, 354 and the parameter fit procedure was used as an alternative approach to estimate the diagenetic 355 parameters.

356

357 The empirical model, which was readily calibrated, may also be used as a tool in comparative 358 studies where the discrete sectioning depth differs. For example, Bortleson and Lee (1970) 359 described the vertical distribution of TP in sediments of six Wisconsin lakes, which ranged 360 from oligotrophic to eutrophic. They sectioned sediment cores into 5 cm vertical intervals, 361 however, and the concentrations in their surface samples are thus not directly comparable to 362 the 2 cm vertical intervals used in our study. An empirical model fit to the TP profiles found in their six lakes, using Eq. (1), would provide estimates of the surficial sediment 363 364 concentrations for each of their study lakes. Caution should be exercised, however, when 365 evaluating modelled sediment nutrient concentrations close to the upper boundary condition 366 (the sediment-water interface). This particularly applies for sediment TP concentrations, 367 where redox conditions in the uppermost millimetres may provide the basis for considerably 368 increased TP concentrations due to adsorption of inorganic P; an effect that is not accounted 369 for in the two models presented in our study.

370

## 371 *Vertical irregular profiles driven by redox-processes and variability in timescales*

372 Most vertical profiles of TP, TN, TC, Fe, Mn and wet weight, showed high concentrations near the sediment-water interface and a relatively smooth trend of exponential decrease with 373 374 sediment depth. Some geochemical profiles, however, especially from the deep oligotrophic 375 lakes (e.g. Rotoma, Okataina and Tarawera), had irregular vertical concentration distributions, 376 especially for TP, Fe and Mn. The vertical profiles of TP tended to follow a Gaussian shape 377 (c.f. Davison, 1993) in these lakes, where a subsurface maximum of sediment TP 378 concentrations appears at a depth of approximately 5-13 cm in the sediments. This sub-379 surface peak of TP generally coincides with the location of peaks in Fe and Mn (e.g. Fig. 2,

380 Lake Tarawera). The Gaussian-shaped profiles have previously been described for sediments 381 in the deep, oligotrophic, Lake Baikal in Russia (Müller et al., 2002), which has long 382 hydraulic retention time (~19 years) and low sedimentation rates (Edgington et al., 1991), and 383 where oxygen is known to penetrate more than 2 cm into the sediments (Martin et al., 1993) 384 as opposed to more eutrophic lakes, where oxygen penetrates no further than a few mm into 385 the sediments (Sweerts et al., 1991). The penetration of oxygen is strongly related to the 386 organic content of the sediments (House, 2003), and in deep oligotrophic lakes, with a 387 relatively low organic content in the sediments, oxygen can penetrate deep into the sediments 388 thereby extending the redox boundary where iron and manganese precipitate and where 389 phosphorus species are adsorbed, deeper into the sediments, and thus creating these Gaussian 390 shaped profiles with sub-surface peaks of TP, Fe and Mn (Davison, 1985). The relatively 391 simple empirical and mechanistic models presented in this study are generally less successful 392 at reproducing the vertical concentration profiles of TP in these deep oligotrophic lakes. 393 Nevertheless, the models still captured between 61 and 89% of the variation of TP in the sediments of lakes Rotoma, Okataina and Tarawera. 394

395

In applying steady state models to sediment profiles, we had to assume that the vertical concentration profiles (and model parameters) were at equilibrium with the given boundary conditions. However, the models were set up based on data from sediment deposited during the past 120 years, and only some of the lakes have remained relatively undisturbed during this period, and several of the lakes have become increasingly eutrophic, driven mostly by anthropogenic activities (Hamilton et al., 2006). Consequently, sediment profiles from some of the lakes may not yet be at equilibrium with the current external nutrient load. This may

render the correlations between current lake water quality data across all 14 lakes and theobserved vertical sediment profiles less significant.

405

## 406 Understanding the vertical distribution of TP, TN and TC in lake sediments

407 The results presented in this study attest that the appearance of vertical sediment profiles of 408 TP, TN and TC concentrations is not attributable to lake trophic status (or eutrophication) 409 alone. Thus, studies that use these vertical geochemical profiles in lake sediments as evidence 410 of anthropogenic effects (e.g., Smoak and Swarzenski, 2004; Vreca and Muri, 2006) may not 411 have fully accounted for the natural drivers of these vertical gradients. The correlation 412 analysis revealed that the fluxes of refractory and labile organic matter and the biodiffusive 413 mixing may have a strong influence on the vertical distributions of TP, TN and TC across the 414 14 lakes. A sensitivity analysis of the model parameters included in Eq. (7) showed that the 415 flux of labile TP, for example, had the greatest influence on the surface TP concentration (Fig. 416 3a), while the flux of refractory TP (Fig. 3b) and the burial rate (Fig. 3c) had the greatest 417 influence on the background TP concentration. We might expect that the flux of labile TP 418 would be related to lake productivity (and therefore trophic state) and depth, and Trolle et al. 419 (2008) also showed that across twelve relatively deep New Zealand lakes there is a significant 420 correlation between lake trophic state and sedimentation, and therefore the net flux to the 421 bottom sediments. However, across all the 14 lakes in this study we found no significant 422 correlation between the model-predicted flux of labile TP and any of the water quality 423 attributes (annual average TP, TN and Chl a concentrations). When accounting for between-424 lake differences in sediment focusing patterns, by normalizing the water quality attributes by 425 the relative area of sediment accumulation to the total lake surface area, as described by Blais

426 and Kalff (1995), we also found no significant correlations between the model-predicted flux
427 of labile TP and normalized water quality attributes.

428

429 The biodiffusive mixing generally showed a higher sensitivity towards the vertical decay of 430 TP than the kinetic rate coefficient (Fig. 3d, Fig. 3e). In this context it should be noted that the biodiffusion coefficients for TP profiles were generally higher than those derived from TN 431 432 and TC profiles. This may reflect the influence of the inorganic fraction of TP that can be 433 strongly linked to the mineral composition of the sediments (e.g. Fe concentrations), causing 434 some phosphorus species to be adsorbed to, for example, iron-oxyhydroxide complexes above 435 certain redox boundaries in the sediments, enhancing vertical gradients of TP. Consequently, 436 transport of soluble phosphate from the anoxic deeper sediments to the surficial oxic sediment 437 (often only a few mm deep from the sediment-water interface), may enhance the vertical 438 concentration gradients of TP profiles in the sediment solids fraction. As the mechanistic 439 model used in this study did not distinguish between organic and inorganic phosphorus 440 species (and did not include any adsorption processes), the assigned biodiffusion coefficients 441 for TP will compensate for this, causing the modelled  $D_b$  to increase in order to reproduce the 442 observed profiles. By contrast, the biodiffusion coefficients derived from the TN and TC 443 profiles can be expected to better represent the actual biodiffusive mixing in the sediments, as 444 there is not the same confounding effect by inorganic material. The difference between 445 biodiffusion coefficients (and to some extent also the kinetic rate coefficients for breakdown of organic matter) for TP and TN (or TC) profiles could thus be interpreted as the net effect of 446 447 redox driven gradients.

448

Our correlation analysis indicates that biodiffusion may strongly influence vertical sediment 449 450 nutrient concentration profiles (Table 3). Bioturbators, predominantly benthic 451 macroinvertebrates, may strongly influence biodiffusion but densities were not quantified in 452 our study. Macroinvertebrate density and burrowing depth are highly seasonal (Charbonneau 453 and Hare, 1998) but our study included samples taken only at one time in each lake. A study 454 by Forsyth (1976), however, showed that macroinvertebrates are present in all the New 455 Zealand lakes studied, and that Chironomid larvae can attain high densities (> 1000 456 individuals per  $m^2$  in some of the eutrophic lakes). Some of the observed species are known to 457 be able to burrow >5 cm deep and in some cases (e.g. Chironomus plumosus) up to 50 cm 458 (Hilsenhoff, 1966). Thus there is anecdotal evidence that biodiffusive processes may be 459 enhanced by benthic macroinvertebrates in our study lakes and that seasonally based sampling 460 with detailed observations of densities and burrowing depths could lead to a more complete 461 understanding of the way in which macroinvertebrates contribute to biodiffusion in the lakes.

462

463 When considering the transport process and the reactions described by the mechanistic 464 diagenetic model in Eq. (7), it appears that physical compaction alone cannot be responsible 465 for generating vertical concentration gradients in sediments, as sediment solid density and 466 porosity are assumed constant with depth in this model. Nevertheless, the vertical decay 467 coefficient for the wet weight profiles derived by the empirical Eq. (1), which effectively 468 represented compaction, was the only single parameter that was significantly correlated with 469 all other vertical decay coefficients (including those for TP, TN, TN, Fe and Mn). It is 470 important to acknowledge that lake sediments are not, as we assumed in the mechanistic 471 model, a homogenous mass of constant porosity and density. If one instead assumes that the 472 sediments are comprised of high density material with low TP content (e.g., inorganic

473 material) and low density material with high TP content (e.g., organic material), a density 474 differentiated compaction may cause denser material (with low TP content) to sink faster and 475 deeper into the sediments relative to lighter material, as observed in tephra studies where 476 relatively dense tephra sink several centimetres into lighter organic lake sediments (Beierle 477 and Bond, 2002). The correlation analysis suggests that this density driven compaction may 478 be at least partly responsible for creating vertical concentration gradients in natural lake 479 sediments. The correlation analysis also revealed that the vertical decay coefficients for wet 480 weight profiles were inversely correlated with site to mean depth ratios, which essentially 481 demonstrates that the vertical profiles of sediment density are more uniformly distributed in 482 shallower lakes/regions, presumably caused by resuspension that may intermittently mix and 483 rework the surficial sediments in these lakes/regions (Håkanson and Jansson, 1983).

484

485 In summary, our study shows that the drivers of vertical gradients in sediment geochemical 486 profiles are multiple and complex but suggest that the flux of refractory and labile matter, and 487 biodiffusive mixing, may be the most important parameters influencing variations in between 488 observed geochemical gradients of TP, TN and TC in lake sediments. Physical compaction of 489 the sediments may also be partly responsible for creating these gradients, presumably by 490 causing denser material (with lower TP, TN and TC concentrations relative to lighter organic 491 material) to sink faster into the sediments. Therefore, when evaluating the effects of 492 anthropogenic activities on, for example, vertical profiles of sediment TP concentrations one 493 must consider natural drivers of these vertical profiles, which can readily be done by applying 494 the models presented in this study.

495

### 496 Acknowledgements

497 The first author was funded with a Ph.D. scholarship within the Lake Biodiversity Restoration 498 program funded by the N.Z. Foundation of Research, Science and Technology (Contract 499 UOWX0505). We acknowledge Environment Bay of Plenty for providing additional funding 500 and water quality data. We thank Bob Spigel (NIWA), N.Z., for field assistance and 501 Environment Canterbury for providing water quality data for Lake Te Waihora. Funding was 502 also provided by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC-40730529, 503 40501078) and the International Science and Technology Programme of the Royal Society of 504 New Zealand for field work on Lake Taihu, and we acknowledge the Taihu Laboratory for 505 Lake Ecosystem Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, for providing field work facilities 506 and water quality data. We also thank John Whiteman, Hills Laboratories, for guidance on 507 analytical digestion procedures for sediments, and Lisa Pearson and Olivia Motion, who 508 provided sediment data from Lake Rotorua. We are grateful to Steve Cameron, the 509 Department of Chemistry at the University of Waikato, for conducting ICP-MS analysis. We 510 also acknowledge Filip Meysman, Department of Analytical and Environmental Chemistry, 511 the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium, who provided a very thorough review, and we thank 512 Filip Meysman and also Bernard P. Boudreau, Department of Oceanography, Dalhousie 513 University, Canada, for providing valuable suggestions relating to derivation as well as 514 application of the steady state diagenetic model. Raw data for sediment geochemistry, as 515 presented in figures and used in statistical analysis in this study, are available upon request. 516

### 517 **References**

- 518 Beierle, B., Bond, J., 2002. Density-induced settling of tephra through organic lake sediments.
  519 J. Paleolimnol. 28, 433-440.
- 520 Berner, R. A., 1980. Early Diagenesis: A Theoretical Approach. Princeton Univ. Press, p 241.
- 521 Beven, K., Freer, J., 2001. Equifinality, data assimilation, and uncertainty estimation in
- 522 mechanistic modelling of complex environmental systems using the GLUE methodology, J.
- 523 Hydrol. 249, 11-29.
- 524 Blais, J. M., Kalff, J., 1995. The influence of lake morphometry on sediment focusing.
- 525 Limnol. Oceanogr. 40, 582-588.
- 526 Bortleson, G. C., Lee, G. F., 1974. Phosphorus, iron, and manganese distribution in sediment
- 527 cores of six Wisconsin Lakes. Limnol. Oceanogr. 19, 794-801.
- 528 Boudreau, B. P., 1996. A method-of-lines code for carbon and nutrient diagenesis in aquatic
- sediments. Comput. Geosci. 22, 479-496.
- 530 Boudreau, B. P., 1997. Diagenetic models and their implementation: Modelling transport and
- 531 reactions in aquatic sediments. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p 414.
- 532 Carignan, R., Flett, R. J., 1981. Postdepositional mobility of phosphorus in lake sediments.
- 533 Limnol. Oceanogr. 26, 361-366.
- 534 Charbonneau, P., Hare, L., 1998. Burrowing behavior and biogenic structures of mud-
- 535 dwelling insects. J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc. 17, 239-249.
- 536 Davison, W., 1985. Conceptual models for transport at a redox boundary. In: Chemical
- 537 processes in lakes, pp. 31-53. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- 538 Davison, W. 1993. Iron and manganese in lakes. Earth Sci. Rev. 34, 119-163.

- 539 DiToro, D. M., 2001. Sediment flux modelling. Wiley-Interscience, New York, p 624.
- 540 Ebina, J., Tsutsui, T., Shirai, T., 1983. Simultaneous determination of total nitrogen and total
- 541 phosphorus in water using peroxodisulfate oxidation. Water Res. 17, 1721-1726.
- 542 Edgington, D. N., Klump, J. V., Robbins, J. A., Kusner, Y. S., Pampura, V. D., Sandimirov, I.
- 543 V., 1991. Sedimentation rates, residence times and radionuclide inventories in Lake Baikal
- from 137 Cs and 210 Pb in sediment cores. Nature 350, 601-604.
- 545 Forsyth, D.J., 1976. Insects and Aquatic Ecosystems. The N. Z. Entomologist 6, 132-137.
- 546 Hambright, K. D., Eckert, W., Leavitt, P. R., Schelske, C. L. 2004. Effects of historical lake
- 547 level and land use on sediment and phosphorus accumulation rates in Lake Kinneret. Environ.
- 548 Sci. Technol. 38, 6460-6467.
- Hamilton, D. P., Mitchell, S., 1997. Wave-induced shear stresses, plant nutrients and
  chlorophyll in seven shallow lakes. Freshw. Biol. 38, 159-168.
- Hamilton, D. P., Hawes, I., Gibbs, M. M., 2006. Climatic shifts and water quality response in
  North Island lakes, New Zealand. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 29, 1821-1824.
- 553 Henderson, G. M., Lindsay, F. N., Slowey, N. C., 1999. Variation in bioturbation with water
- depth on marine slopes: a study on the Little Bahamas Bank. Mar. Geol., 160, 105-118.
- 555 Hilsenhoff, W. L., 1966. The biology of *Chironomus plumosus* (Diptera: Chironomidae) in
- Lake Winnebago, Wisconsin. Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am. 59, 465-473.
- 557 House, W. A., 2003. Factors influencing the extent and development of the oxic zone in
- sediments. Biogeochemistry 63, 317-334.
- 559 Håkanson, L., Jansson, M., 1983. Principles of lake sedimentology. Springer-Verlag, p 316.

- 560 Håkanson, L., 1984. Relationship between lake trophic level and lake sediments. Water Res.
  561 18, 303-314.
- 562 Jeppesen, E., Søndergaard, M., Jensen, J. P., Havens, K. E., Anneville, O., Carvalho, L.,
- 563 Coveney, M. F., Deneke, R., Dokulil, M. T., Foy, B., 2005. Lake responses to reduced
- nutrient loading- an analysis of contemporary long-term data from 35 case studies, Freshw.
- 565 Biol. 50, 1747-1771.
- 566 Jeppesen, E., Meerhoff, M., Jacobsen, B. A., Hansen, R. S., Søndergaard, M., Jensen, J. P.,
- 567 Lauridsen, T. L., Mazzeo, N., Branco, C. W. C., 2007. Restoration of shallow lakes by
- 568 nutrient control and biomanipulation the successful strategy varies with lake size and
- climate, Hydrobiologia 581, 269-285.
- Jørgensen, S. E., Kamp-Nielsen, L., Mejer, H. F., 1982. Comparison of a simple and a
  complex sediment phosphorus model. Ecol. Model. 16, 99-124.
- 572 Luff, R., Wallmann, K., Grandel, S., Schlüter, M., 2000. Numerical modeling of benthic
- 573 processes in the deep Arabian Sea. Deep-Sea Research Part II 47, 3039-3072.
- 574 Marsden, M. W., 1989. Lake Restoration by reducing external phosphorus loading: The
- 575 influence of sediment phosphorus release. Freshw. Biol. 21, 139-162.
- 576 Martin, T. D., Creed, J. T., Brockhoof, C. A., 1994. Method 200.2 (Revision 2.8): Sample
- 577 preparation procedure for spectrochemical determination of total recoverable elements. In:
- 578 Methods for the Determination of Metals in Environmental Samples. USEPA, Cincinnati,
- 579 OH.
- 580 Martin, P., Goddeeris, B., Martens, K., 1993. Oxygen concentration profiles in soft sediment
- 581 of Lake Baikal (Russia) near the Selenga delta. Freshw. Biol. 29, 343-349.

- 582 McColl, R. H. S., 1977. Chemistry of sediments in relation to trophic conditions in eight
- 583 Rotorua Lakes. New Zeal. J. Mar. Fresh. 11, 509-523.
- 584 Meysman, F. J. R., Boudreau, B. P., Middelburg, J. J., 2003. Relations between local,
- nonlocal, discrete and continuous models of bioturbation. J. Mar. Res. 61, 391-410.
- 586 Meysman, F. J. R., Galaktionov, O. S., Madani, S., Middelburg, J. J., 2005a. In: Interactions
- 587 between Macro- and Microorganisms in Marine Sediments. Modelling biological interactions
- in aquatic sediments as coupled reactive transport, American Geophysical Union, p 359-388.
- 589 Meysman, F. J. R., Boudreau, B. P., Middelburg, J. J., 2005b. Modeling reactive transport in
- sediments subject to bioturbation and compaction. Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 69, 3601-3617.
- Mulsow, S., Boudreau, B. P., Smith, J. N., 1998. Bioturbation and porosity gradients. Limnol.
  Oceanogr. 43, 1-9.
- 593 Müller, B., Granina, L., Schaller, T., Ulrich, A., Wehrli, B. P., 2002. As, Sb, Mo, and other
- elements in sedimentary Fe/Mn layers of Lake Baikal. Environ. Sci. Technol. 36, 411-420.
- 595 Nürnberg, G. K., 1984. The prediction of internal phosphorus load in lakes with anoxic
- 596 hypolimnia. Limnol. Oceanogr. 29, 111-124.
- 597 Reitzel, K., Ahlgren, J., DeBrabandere, H., Waldebäck, M., Gogoll, A., Tranvik, L., Rydin,
- 598 E., 2007. Degradation rates of organic phosphorus in lake sediment. Biogeochemistry 82, 15-599 28.
- 600 Schauser, I., Hupfer, M., Brüggemann, R., 2004. SPIEL a model for phosphorus diagenesis
- and its application to lake restoration. Ecol. Model. 176, 389-407.

- 602 Schelske, C. L., Hodell, D. A., 1995. Using carbon isotopes of bulk sedimentary organic
- matter to reconstruct the history of nutrient loading and eutrophication in Lake Erie. Limnol.Oceanogr. 40, 918-929.
- 605 Selig, U., Leipe, T., Dörfler, W., 2007. Paleolimnological records of nutrient and metal
- 606 profiles in prehistoric, historic and modern sediments of three lakes in north-eastern Germany.
- 607 Water Air Soil Pollut. 184, 183-194.
- 608 Smoak, J. M., Swarzenski, P. W., 2004. Recent increases in sediment and nutrient
- accumulation in Bear Lake, Utah/Idaho, USA. Hydrobiologia 525, 175-184.
- 610 Spears, B. M., Carvalho, L., Perkins, R., Kirika, A., Paterson, D. M., 2007. Sediment
- 611 phosphorus cycling in a large shallow lake: spatio-temporal variation in phosphorus pools and
- 612 release. Hydrobiologia 584, 37-48.
- 613 Sweerts, J., Baer-Gilissen, M. J., Cornelese, A. A., Cappenberg, T. E., 1991. Oxygen-
- 614 consuming processes at the profundal and littoral sediment-water interface of a small meso-
- 615 eutrophic lake (Lake Vechten, The Netherlands). Limnol. Oceanogr. 36, 1124-1133.
- 616 Søndergaard, M., Windolf, J., Jeppesen, E., 1996. Phosphorus fractions and profiles in the
- 617 sediment of shallow Danish lakes as related to phosphorus load, sediment composition and
- 618 lake chemistry. Water Res. 30, 992-1002.
- 619 Søndergaard, M., Jensen, J. P., Jeppesen, E., 2003. Role of sediment and internal loading of
- 620 phosphorus in shallow lakes. Hydrobiologia 506, 135-145.
- 621 Taylor, K. J. W., Glennie, J. M., Mason, C. R., Larsen, S. H., Weeber, J. H., Reid, R. E.,
- 622 Holmes, R. G., Moore, C. R., Crawford, S. J., Griffiths, G. A., Horrell, J. H., Ward, J. C.,
- 623 Fietje, L., Freeman, M. C., Hawes, I., Smith, V. R., Goddall, A., Borrie, D. N. H., Davis, S.
- 624 F., Blackford, C. J., Glennie, G. T., Glova, K. F. D., Hughey, T. R., Partridge, T. R., Main, M.

- R., Law, E., 1996. The natural resources of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) and its catchment,
  Canterbury Regional Council Report 96.
- 627 Trolle, D., Hamilton, D. P., Hendy, C., Pilditch, C., 2008. Sediment and nutrient
- 628 accumulation rates in sediments of twelve New Zealand lakes: Influence of lake morphology,
- 629 catchment characteristics and trophic state. Mar. Freshwater Res. 59, 1067-1078.
- Trolle, D., Zhu, G., Hamilton, D. P., Lou, L., McBride, C., Zhang, L., 2009. The influence of
- 631 water quality and sediment geochemistry on the horizontal and vertical distribution of
- 632 phosphorus and nitrogen in sediments of a large, shallow lake. Hydrobiologia 627, 31-44.
- 633 Van der Molen, D. T., Portielje, R., Boers, P. C. M., Lijklema, L., 1998. Changes in sediment
- 634 phosphorus as a result of eutrophication and oligotrophication in Lake Veluwe, The
- 635 Netherlands. Water Res. 32, 3281-3288.
- 636 Van Rees, K. C. J., Reddy, K. R., Rao, P. S. C., 1996. Influence of benthic organisms on
- 637 solute transport in lake sediments. Hydrobiologia 317, 31-40.
- 638 Vincent, W. F., Gibbs, M. M., Dryden, S. J., 1984. Accelerated eutrophication in a New
- 639 Zealand lake: Lake Rotoiti, central North Island. New Zeal. J. Mar. Fresh. 18, 431-440.
- 640 Vreca, P., Muri, G., 2006. Changes in accumulation of organic matter and stable carbon and
- 641 nitrogen isotopes in sediments of two Slovenian mountain lakes (Lake Ledvica and Lake
- 642 Planina), induced by eutrophication changes. Limnol. Oceanogr. 51, 781-790.
- 643 Wang, H., Appan, A., Gulliver, J. S., 2003a. Modeling of phosphorus dynamics in aquatic
- 644 sediments: I model development. Water Res. 37, 3928-3938.
- 645 Wang, H., Appan, A., Gulliver, J. S., 2003b. Modeling of phosphorus dynamics in aquatic
- 646 sediments: II examination of model performance. Water Res. 37, 3939-3953.

647	Wang, J., C	Chen, X.,	Zhu, X.,	Liu, J.,	Chang,	W. Y. E	<b>B</b> ., 2001.	Taihu Lake,	lower Y	langtze
	$\mathcal{O}$	, , ,	, , ,	. , ,	<i>U</i>		,	,		<u> </u>

- drainage basin: evolution, sedimentation rate and the sea level. Geomorphology 41, 183-193.
- 649 White, J. D. L, Houghton, B. F., Hodgson, K. A., Wilson, C. J. N., 1997. Delayed
- 650 sedimentary response to the AD 1886 eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand. Geology 25, 459-
- 651 462.
- 652 Xu, Y., Jaffé, R., 2009. Geochemical record of anthropogenic impacts on Lake Valencia,
- 653 Venezuela. Appl. Geochem. 24, 411-418.

### 655 Figure captions

656 Figure 1. Sediment concentration profiles of TP in 14 different lakes. Two cores (marked  $\times$  and  $\bullet$ ) were collected from each of the 14 lakes. Plots are arranged from oligotrophic to 657 658 eutrophic lakes (from left to right and top to bottom). If present in the vertical cores collected 659 from the New Zealand lakes, the start of the Tarawera tephra layer, a layer of ash deposited during a volcanic eruption in 1886, has been highlighted (marked with --- for sites 660 661 represented by  $\bullet$ ,  $\bullet$  -  $\bullet$  for sites represented by  $\times$ , and  $\bullet$  -  $\bullet$  where the tephra layer was present 662 at the same vertical sediment depth at both sites). The y-axis represents depth below the sediment-water interface (cm) and the x-axis represents the TP concentration (mg P kg<sup>-1</sup> dry 663 664 wt); note different scales for x axis.

665

Figure 2. Examples of vertical profiles of TP, TN, TC, Fe and Mn concentrations and wet
weight in lakes Rotoiti, Okareka and Tarawera. Two cores (marked with × and • respectively)
were collected from eutrophic Lake Rotoiti (left), mesotrophic Lake Okareka (middle) and
oligotrophic Lake Tarawera (right). If present in the vertical cores, the start of the Tarawera
tephra layer has been highlighted (marked with — for sites represented by • and - - for
sites represented by ×). Lines represent modelled profiles (the empirical model plot is
equivalent to the mechanistic model plot for TP, TN and TC profiles).

673

Figure 3. Application of the steady state diagenetic model to a sediment core from Lake
Rotoiti. The influence/sensitivity of the flux of (a) labile and (b) refractory TP, (c) burial rate,
(d) biodiffusion coefficient and (e) first order kinetic rate coefficient on the vertical steady
state distribution of TP concentrations.

678

Table 1. Morphological properties and trophic status of the 14 study lakes (after Taylor et al.

	Mean depth (m)	Max depth (m)	Lake area (ha)	Catchment area (ha)	Lake trophic status
Te Waihora (Ellesmere)	1.3	2.5	18,200	256,000	Highly eutrophic
Taihu	1.9	3.0	233,800	3,690,000	Highly eutrophic
Okaro	12.5	18.0	32	407	Highly eutrophic
Rotorua	11.0	44.8	8,079	52,346	Eutrophic
Rotoehu	8.2	13.5	795	5,673	Eutrophic
Rotoiti	31.5	124.0	3,460	12,462	Eutrophic
Rotomahana	60.0	125.0	897	7,994	Mesotrophic
Rerewhakaaitu	7.0	15.8	579	3,816	Mesotrophic
Okareka	20.0	33.5	342	1,958	Mesotrophic
Rotokakahi	17.5	32.0	452	1,872	Mesotrophic
Tikitapu	18.0	27.5	146	567	Oligotrophic
Okataina	39.4	78.5	1,104	5,676	Oligotrophic
Tarawera	50.0	87.5	4,165	14,494	Oligotrophic
Rotoma	36.9	83.0	1,104	2,914	Oligotrophic

680 1996; Hamilton and Mitchell 1997; Trolle et al. 2008; Trolle et al. 2009).

Table 2. Average background concentration ( $\gamma$ ) in mg kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt, surface concentration ( $\gamma + \beta$ ) in mg kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt and exponential vertical decay coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) in cm<sup>-1</sup> as determined by the empirical expression (Eq. 1), with variation explained denoted by  $r_{exp}^2$ , and average flux of refractory ( $F_R$ ) and labile ( $F_L$ ) organic matter in  $\mu$ g (TP, TN or TC) cm<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, burial rates (w) in cm yr<sup>-1</sup>, biodiffusion coefficients ( $D_b$ ) in cm<sup>2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and first order kinetic rate coefficients (k) in yr<sup>-1</sup> as determined by the diagenetic steady state equation (Eq. 7), with variation explained denoted by  $r_{mech}^2$ ; average values based on model fits to two cores collected from the deep basin in each of the 14 study lakes. \*\*\* = significant at p < 0.001, \*\* = significant at p < 0.01 and \* = significant at p < 0.05.

Rotoma								Okatai	na					Tara	wera					Tik	itapu						
	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt			
γ	392	373	0	0	0	80	869	939	0	6716	1326	84	641	0	0	13688	6351	53	0	2746	28523	3648	98	0			
γ+β	13084	8570	57963	28541	8140	97	4398	7580	50622	30127	2747	95	3929	6594	47683	27354	40830	93	573	5489	57042	7289	188	92			
α	1.45	0.056	0.053	0.018	0.043	0.25	0.26	0.076	0.061	0.012	0.34	0.40	0.074	0.037	0.041	0.001	0.77	0.009	0.12	0.18	0.26	0	0	0.034			
$r^2_{exp}$	0.71**	1**	0.97*	0.21	0.22	0.87***	0.89***	0.84*	0.90*	0.30	0.34	0.79**	0.61**	0.84**	0.86**	0.001	0.76**	0.65**	0.82	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.98*			
FR	11.8	13.8	0				46.2	49.0	0				74.4	0	0				0	110.4	948.5						
FL	890	581	3681				663	1004	6824				786	1298	9582				149	789	9520						
W	0.16	0.18	0.14				0.14	0.14	0.14				0.22	0.23	0.23				0.058	0.058	0.058						
$D_b$	15.1	0.35	0.34				0.76	0.28	0.27				0.28	0.24	0.25				0.37	0.50	0.50						
k	0.055	0.15	0.14				0.26	0.39	0.30				0.45	0.25	0.26				0.31	0.40	0.40						
r <sup>2</sup> mech	0.71**	1**	0.97*				0.89***	0.84*	0.90*				0.61**	0.84**	0.86**				0.82	N/A	N/A						
			Okare	eka					Rotokak	ahi					Rerewh	nakaaitu					Rotor	nahana					
	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt	TP	TN	TC	Fe	Mn	Wet wt			
γ	372	699	0	4961	505	37	157	2116	6439	8774	378	77	54	8595	78710	16280	296	31	342	0	29042	8684	254	15			
γ+β	1541	7621	60179	14469	1143	92	2646	16185	108195	17530	742	100	1388	11907	91178	48684	966	97	2288	8422	59423	17356	8196	96			
α	0.12	0.10	0.098	0.29	0.35	0.084	0.14	0.20	0.16	0	0	0.17	0.057	0.21	0.30	0.28	0.57	0.014	0.63	0.031	0.91	0	0.62	0.012			
r <sup>2</sup> <sub>exp</sub>	0.95***	0.98**	0.975*	0.84**	0.97***	0.94***	0.85**	1***	1***	N/A	N/A	0.97***	0.94***	1***	0.82	0.95***	0.88***	0.95***	0.97**	0.77	1***	N/A	0.99***	0.60			
F <sub>R</sub>	25.0	45.6	0				12.4	143.3	435.9				3.6	441.9	4046.9				8.1	0	522.1						
$F_L$	277	1530	13426				628	3537	24726				191	580	2134				136	324	2371						
W	0.14	0.14	0.14				0.14	0.14	0.14				0.16	0.16	0.16				0.084	0.092	0.092						
$D_b$	0.34	0.32	0.31				0.38	0.53	0.44				0.21	0.54	0.82				3.35	0.30	2.97						
k	0.50	0.44	0.45				0.47	0.38	0.42				0.52	0.38	0.23				0.15	0.07	0.04						
-															0.00				0.0744	0 77	4 she she she						
r <sup>2</sup> mech	0.95***	0.98**	0.975*				0.85**	1***	1***				0.94***	1***	0.82				0.9/**	0.77	1***						
r <sup>2</sup> mech	0.95***	0.98**	0.975* Roto	iti			0.85**	1***	1*** Rotoel	1u			0.94***	1***	0.82 Rote	orua			0.9/**	0.77	O	karo					
r <sup>2</sup> mech	0.95*** TP	0.98** TN	0.975* Roto TC	iti Fe	Mn	Wet wt	0.85** TP	1*** TN	1*** Rotoel TC	nu Fe	Mn	Wet wt	0.94*** TP	1*** TN	0.82 	orua Fe	Mn	Wet wt	0.9/** TP	0.77 TN	01 TC	karo Fe	Mn	Wet wt			
$\frac{r^2_{mech}}{\gamma}$	0.95*** TP 604	0.98** TN 7247	0.975* Roto TC 41195	iti Fe 4662	Mn 359	Wet wt 85	0.85** TP 779	1*** TN 3991	1*** Rotoel TC 9200	nu Fe 4583	Mn 371	Wet wt 40	0.94*** TP 344	1*** TN 0	0.82 Rote TC 0	orua Fe 6832	Mn 174	Wet wt 57	0.9/** TP 809	0.77 TN 3534	OI TC 25829	caro Fe 9381	Mn 243	Wet wt 31			
$\frac{r^2_{mech}}{\gamma}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656	0.98** TN 7247 23757	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230	iti Fe 4662 9302	Mn 359 1045	Wet wt 85 97	0.85** TP 779 4115	1*** TN 3991 14182	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195	nu Fe 4583 30293	Mn 371 3842	Wet wt 40 98	0.94*** TP 344 2127	1*** TN 0 7559	0.82 Rote TC 0 49517	orua Fe 6832 10282	Mn 174 544	Wet wt 57 96	TP           809           2165	0.77 TN 3534 16575	OI TC 25829 130542	karo Fe 9381 18738	Mn 243 461	Wet wt 31 99			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31	iti Fe 4662 9302 0	Mn 359 1045 0.36	Wet wt 85 97 0.081	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15	Mn 371 3842 0.007	Wet wt 40 98 0.045	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10	TN 0 7559 0.008	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10	Mn 174 544 0.023	Wet wt 57 96 0.01	TP           809           2165           0.12	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079	OI TC 25829 130542 0.050	karo Fe 9381 18738 0	Mn 243 461 0	Wet wt 31 99 0.01			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\gamma + \beta$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1***	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99***	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99***	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53*	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90***	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93***	ru Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94***	1*** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70***	0.82 Rote TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79***	Fe           6832           10282           0.10           0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62*	TN           3534           16575           0.079           0.91**	OI TC 25829 130542 0.050 0.81**	karo Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\gamma + \beta$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2	TN           3991           14182           0.095           0.90***           612.7	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9	ru Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2	TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0	0.82 Rote TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0	Fe           6832           10282           0.10           0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4	OI TC 25829 130542 0.050 0.81** 821.2	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 5114	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 742	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 612.7	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0	0.82 Rote TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7           154	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 202	OI TC 25829 130542 0.050 0.81** 821.2 9108	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $P$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 2.20	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.12	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.22	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 577	1***           TN           3991           14182           0.095           0.90***           612.7           2988           0.26	1***           Rotoel           TC           9200           79195           0.049           0.93***           1662.9           16760           0.26	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.26	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.27	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	<u>Mn</u> 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7           154           0.20	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.20	OI TC 25829 130542 0.050 0.81** 821.2 9108 0.20	karo Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\gamma+\beta$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}exp$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.22	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15	1***           TN           3991           14182           0.095           0.90***           612.7           2988           0.26           0.30           0.62	1***           Rotoel           TC           9200           79195           0.049           0.93***           1662.9           16760           0.26           0.23           0.12	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.22	0.82 Rote TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.22	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7           154           0.20           0.37           246	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40	I****           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\gamma + \beta$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $2$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1***	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.02***	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.05***	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.52*	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.62	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.43	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	<u>Mn</u> 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.25	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.75***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.21**	I****           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81**	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$ \begin{array}{c} \underline{r^2_{mech}} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \gamma \\ \gamma + \beta \\ \alpha \\ r^2_{exp} \\ F_R \\ F_L \\ W \\ D_b \\ k \\ r^2_{mech} \end{array} $	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1***	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99***	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99**** Taib	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53*	1**** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Ta	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.43 0.93***	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	Fe           6832           10282           0.10           0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.9/**           TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7           154           0.20           0.37           0.46           0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{r^{2}_{exp}}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k}$ $r^{2}_{mech}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TD	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih Taih	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TD	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** The The	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97**           TP           809           2165           0.12           0.62*           32.7           154           0.20           0.37           0.46           0.62*	0.77           TN           3534           16575           0.079           0.91***           112.4           1331           0.20           0.29           0.40           0.91**	I***           Ol           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7271	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A u Fe 5706	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 742 0.53*	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1288	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 Ellesmere) Fe 20106	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 210	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94***	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           Ol           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma}$ $\gamma = 0$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A <u>w</u> Fe 5796	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 02	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2282	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 Ellesmere) Fe 20196	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2528	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           Ol           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 14	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.99	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A N/A <u>w</u> Fe 5796 27646	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 1308	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.00	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.90	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 (Illesmere) Fe 20196 133799	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.72	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{2}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.04	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.93***	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.30	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A N/A W Fe 5796 27646 0.01 0.25	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.0689	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.97***	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.049 0.026 0.026 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.05 0.049 0.026 0.026 0.025 0.043 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.026 0.026 0.025 0.043 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.026 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 (illesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.02	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	xaro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $r^{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $r^{exp}$ $F_{c}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.88*** 1.59	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.83*** 10.8	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.39 225	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A N/A W Fe 5796 27646 0.01 0.35	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.96***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69 0.95***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.87*** 5.02	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56 6 7 8	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25 0.88*** 20.1	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 (Illesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59 0.88	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.92*	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81 0.63	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.9/** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{R}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.88*** 1.58 209	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.83*** 10.8 774	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.39 22.5 4647	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A N/A W Fe 5796 27646 0.01 0.35	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.96***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69 0.95***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.87*** 5.02 280	1**** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56 6.78 224	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25 0.88*** 30.1 2700	IU           Fe           4583           30293           0.15           0.42   Ellesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59 0.88	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.92*	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81 0.63	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua           Fe           6832           10282           0.10           0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.9/** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha$ $r^{2}_{exp}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.88*** 1.58 398 0.01	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.83*** 10.8 774 0.83***	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.39 22.5 4047 0.01	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.96***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69 0.95***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.87*** 5.02 389 0.055	1**** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56 6.78 324 0.05	1***           Rotoel           TC           9200           79195           0.049           0.93***           1662.9           16760           0.26           0.23           0.43           0.93***           Waihora (E           TC           6150           12504           0.25           0.88***           30.1           2709           0.05	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 (Illesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59 0.88	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.92*	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81 0.63	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua         Fe           6832         10282           0.10         0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.9/** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{r^{2}_{exp}}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{r^{2}_{exp}}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.88*** 1.58 398 0.01 0.33	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.83*** 10.8 774 0.01 10.7	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.39 22.5 4047 0.01 0.83	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A W Fe 5796 27646 0.01 0.35	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.96***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69 0.95***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.87*** 5.02 389 0.005 5.62	1**** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56 6.78 324 0.005 3.98	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25 0.88*** 30.1 2709 0.005 0.59	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 Ellesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59 0.88	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.92*	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81 0.63	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			
$\frac{r^{2}_{mech}}{\gamma}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $r^{2}_{mech}$ $\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}$ $\alpha}{\gamma}$ $F_{R}$ $F_{L}$ $W$ $D_{b}$ $k$ $k$	0.95*** TP 604 5656 0.59 1*** 67.6 1171 0.17 3.29 0.02 1*** TP 182 1151 0.14 0.88*** 1.58 398 0.01 0.33 0.62	0.98** TN 7247 23757 0.35 0.99*** 812.8 5114 0.17 1.19 0.12 0.99*** TN 1182 7504 1.17 0.83*** 10.8 774 0.01 10.7 0.33	0.975* Roto TC 41195 123230 0.31 0.99*** 4620.2 26465 0.17 0.98 0.16 0.99*** Taih TC 7371 24171 0.89 0.39 22.5 4047 0.01 0.83 0.13	iti Fe 4662 9302 0 N/A W W Fe 5796 27646 0.01 0.35	Mn 359 1045 0.36 0.98*** Mn 250 1308 0.089 0.96***	Wet wt 85 97 0.081 0.97*** Wet wt 39 92 0.69 0.95***	0.85** TP 779 4115 0.41 0.53* 124.2 742 0.26 5.77 0.15 0.53* TP 867 2283 1.05 0.87*** 5.02 389 0.005 5.62 0.52	1*** TN 3991 14182 0.095 0.90*** 612.7 2988 0.26 0.30 0.62 0.90*** Te TN 1388 2841 0.89 0.56 6.78 324 0.005 3.98 0.013	1*** Rotoel TC 9200 79195 0.049 0.93*** 1662.9 16760 0.26 0.23 0.43 0.93*** Waihora (E TC 6150 12504 0.25 0.88*** 30.1 2709 0.005 0.59 0.32	nu Fe 4583 30293 0.15 0.42 Ellesmere) Fe 20196 133799 1.59 0.88	Mn 371 3842 0.007 0.02 Mn 319 2538 1.73 0.92*	Wet wt 40 98 0.045 0.94*** Wet wt 37 100 1.81 0.63	0.94*** TP 344 2127 0.10 0.94*** 24.2 240 0.3 0.42 0.25 0.94***	1**** TN 0 7559 0.008 0.70*** 0 457 0.3 0.36 0.02 0.70***	0.82 Rot TC 0 49517 0.013 0.79*** 0 3120 0.3 0.37 0.03 0.79***	orua Fe 6832 10282 0.10 0.13	Mn 174 544 0.023 0.60*	Wet wt 57 96 0.01 0.82**	0.97** TP 809 2165 0.12 0.62* 32.7 154 0.20 0.37 0.46 0.62*	0.77 TN 3534 16575 0.079 0.91** 112.4 1331 0.20 0.29 0.40 0.91**	I***           OI           TC           25829           130542           0.050           0.81**           821.2           9108           0.20           0.28           0.24           0.81*	caro Fe 9381 18738 0 N/A	Mn 243 461 0 N/A	Wet wt 31 99 0.01 0.88***			

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients between model-predicted parameters for TP, TN, TC and wet weight profiles,  $(\gamma + \beta)$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $F_R$ ,  $F_L$ ,  $D_b$ , k, w and a range of morphological, chemical and biological variables (n = 26-28). \*\*\* = significant at p < 0.001, \*\* = significant at p < 0.01 and \* = significant at p < 0.05.

	F <sub>R(TP)</sub>	F <sub>L(TP)</sub>	D <sub>b(TP)</sub>	k <sub>(TP)</sub>	w	$(\gamma + \beta)_{TP}$	$(\gamma)_{TP}$	$(\alpha)_{TP}$	$(\gamma + \beta)_{Wet}$	$(\gamma)_{Wet}$	$(\alpha)_{Wet}$	site/mean depth ratio	[TP] water	[TN] water	[Chl a] water	Secchi depth
F <sub>R(TP)</sub>	-	0.57**	0.19	-0.16	0.45*	0.26	0.70***	0.08	0.16	0.32	-0.15	0.06	-0.15	-0.21	-0.12	0.06
F <sub>L(TP)</sub>		-	0.66***	-0.31	0.15	0.78***	0.44*	0.58**	0.28	0.58**	0.13	0.00	-0.14	-0.14	-0.13	0.28
D <sub>b(TP)</sub>			-	-0.46*	-0.04	0.91***	0.32	0.94***	0.17	0.21	0.28	-0.38*	0.04	-0.06	0.07	0.20
$k_{(TP)}$				-	-0.23	-0.38*	-0.02	-0.50**	-0.43*	-0.29	-0.13	-0.20	0.26	0.37	0.19	-0.24
w					-	0.12	0.12	-0.19	0.44*	0.25	-0.46*	0.49**	-0.44*	-0.54**	-0.26	0.20
$(\gamma + \beta)_{TP}$						-	0.37	0.81***	0.18	0.40*	0.03	-0.14	-0.161	-0.20	-0.13	0.40*
(γ)τρ							-	0.32	-0.10	0.29	0.13	-0.31	0.29	0.01	0.32	-0.04
$(\alpha)_{TP}$								-	0.20	0.15	0.50**	-0.46*	0.18	0.01	0.22	0.11
	F <sub>R(TN)</sub>	F <sub>L(TN)</sub>	D <sub>b(TN)</sub>	$k_{(TN)}$	w	$(\gamma + \beta)_{TN}$	$(\gamma)_{TN}$	$(\alpha)_{TN}$	$(\gamma + \beta)_{Wet}$	$(\gamma)_{Wet}$	$(\alpha)_{Wet}$	site/mean depth ratio	[TP] water	[TN] water	[Chl a] water	Secchi depth
F <sub>R(TN)</sub>	-	0.79***	-0.14	0.13	0.31	0.69**	0.82***	-0.06	0.27	0.48*	-0.23	0.36	-0.20	-0.26	-0.16	-0.10
F <sub>L(TN)</sub>		-	-0.09	0.05	0.31	0.82***	0.53*	-0.02	0.36	0.37	-0.16	0.44	-0.27	-0.30	-0.24	-0.03
D <sub>b(TN)</sub>			-	-0.42	-0.45*	0.04	-0.02	0.97***	0.04	-0.08	0.91***	-0.34	0.40	0.66**	0.15	-0.37
$k_{(TN)}$				-	0.20	-0.06	0.14	-0.45	-0.02	-0.12	-0.34	-0.03	-0.22	-0.04	-0.33	-0.02
w					-	0.36	0.11	-0.56**	0.44*	0.25	-0.46*	0.49**	-0.44*	-0.54**	-0.26	0.20
$(\gamma + \beta)_{TN}$						-	0.67**	0.06	0.63*	0.27	-0.11	0.33	-0.21	-0.26	-0.25	-0.10
$(\gamma)_{TN}$							-	-0.01	0.22	0.43	-0.19	0.34	-0.07	-0.13	-0.08	-0.14
$(\alpha)_{TN}$								-	-0.08	-0.01	0.89***	-0.33	0.49*	0.67**	0.27	-0.43
	F <sub>R(TC)</sub>	F <sub>L(TC)</sub>	D <sub>b(TC)</sub>	k <sub>(TC)</sub>	w	$(\gamma + \beta)_{TC}$	$(\gamma)_{TC}$	$(\alpha)_{TC}$	$(\gamma + \beta)_{Wet}$	$(\gamma)_{Wet}$	$(\alpha)_{Wet}$	site/mean depth ratio	[TP] water	[TN] water	[Chl a] water	Secchi depth
F <sub>R(TC)</sub>	-	0.52*	0.17	0.02	0.18	0.56*	0.81***	0.01	0.24	0.46	-0.25	0.49*	-0.19	-0.24	-0.15	-0.05
F <sub>L(TC)</sub>		-	-0.16	0.39	0.33	0.62**	0.07	-0.23	0.33	0.32	-0.23	0.45	-0.32	-0.36	-0.26	0.04
D <sub>b(TC)</sub>			-	-0.52*	-0.29	-0.08	0.33	0.52*	-0.16	-0.29	-0.15	-0.09	0.09	0.12	0.00	-0.20
$k_{(TC)}$				-	0.10	0.07	-0.12	-0.39	-0.02	0.12	-0.06	0.05	-0.14	-0.25	-0.02	0.10
w					-	0.50*	-0.04	-0.65**	0.44*	0.25	-0.46*	0.49**	-0.44*	-0.54**	-0.26	0.20
$(\gamma + \beta)_{TC}$						-	0.49*	-0.29	0.62**	0.15	-0.43	0.37	-0.28	-0.45	-0.27	0.04
(γ) <sub>TC</sub>							-	0.18	0.20	0.21	-0.21	0.33	-0.07	-0.11	-0.10	-0.11
$(\alpha)_{TC}$								-	-0.01	-0.24	0.66**	-0.25	0.27	0.59*	-0.04	-0.38
$(\gamma + \beta)_{Wet}$									-	0.15	0.13	0.20	-0.40*	-0.41*	-0.36	0.20
(γ) <sub>Wet</sub>										-	-0.01	0.39*	-0.16	-0.16	-0.10	0.33
$(\alpha)_{Wet}$											-	-0.52**	0.63***	0.47*	0.62***	-0.29
site/mean depth ra	ntio											-	-0.72***	-0.62***	-0.56**	0.58**
[TP] water													-	0.76***	0.91***	-0.73***
[TN] water														-	0.48*	-0.69***
[Chl a] water															-	-0.61**
Secchi depth																-



#### Phosphorus concentration (mg P kg<sup>-1</sup> dry wt)

Figure 1





Figure 3