Methane, ethane, and propane production in Greenland ice core samples and a first isotopic characterization of excess methane
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Abstract. Air trapped in polar ice provides unique records of the past atmospheric composition ranging from key greenhouse gases such as methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) to short-lived trace gases like ethane (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}) and propane (C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}). Recently, the comparison of CH\textsubscript{4} records obtained using different extraction methods revealed disagreements in the CH\textsubscript{4} concentration for the last glacial in Greenland ice. Elevated methane levels were detected in dust-rich ice core sections measured discretely pointing to a process sensitive to the melt extraction technique. To shed light on the underlying mechanism, we performed targeted experiments and analyzed samples for methane and the short-chain alkanes ethane and propane covering the time interval from 12 to 42 kyeears. Here, we report our findings of these elevated alkane concentrations, which scale linearly with the amount of mineral dust within the ice samples. The alkane production happens during the melt extraction step of the classic wet extraction technique and reaches 14 to 91 ppb of CH\textsubscript{4} excess in dusty ice samples. We document for the first time a co-production of excess methane, ethane, and propane with the observed concentrations for ethane and propane exceeding their past atmospheric background at least by a factor of 10. Independent of the produced amounts, excess alkanes were produced in a fixed molar ratio of approximately 14:2:1, indicating a shared origin. The carbon isotopic signature of excess methane is (-47.0 ± 2.9) ‰ and its deuterium isotopic signature is (-326 ± 57) ‰ in the samples analyzed. With the co-production ratios of excess alkanes and the isotopic composition of excess methane we established a fingerprint that allows us to constrain potential formation processes. This fingerprint is not in line with a microbial origin. Moreover, an adsorption-desorption process of thermogenic gas on dust particles transported to Greenland appears not very likely. Rather the alkane pattern appears to be indicative of abiotic decomposition of organic matter as found in soils and plant leaves.

1. Introduction

Atmospheric air entrapped in polar ice represents a unique archive of the past atmospheric composition including the concentration of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}) methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) and nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) but also short-lived trace gases such as ethane (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}) and propane (C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}). The ongoing anthropogenic increase in the atmospheric concentrations of these gases makes a detailed understanding of their preindustrial variations and biogeochemical cycling of paramount importance and only polar ice cores are able to provide this information. However, to interpret reconstructions of the atmospheric composition from polar ice cores requires that archived atmospheric trace gases are not altered within the ice itself. Furthermore, the air must be extracted from the ice sample without altering the original composition. Thus,
the comparison of ice core records obtained using different extraction techniques and from different ice cores requires careful consideration and interpretation.

It is known that not all drill sites or specific time intervals are equally suitable to derive pristine atmospheric trace gas records. For example CO₂ data from Greenland ice are subject to CO₂ in situ production due to impurities in the ice (Anklin et al., 1995; Smith et al., 1997). In situ production is also observed for N₂O, for example in glacial Antarctic ice core samples characterized by higher dust content (Schilt et al., 2010). In contrast, CH₄ in polar ice cores, in the absence of melt layers, was considered to be not affected by such in situ processes. However, more recent results from Greenland showing elevated CH₄ concentrations in glacial dust-rich ice (Lee et al., 2020) and high amplitude CH₄ spikes in Holocene ice (Rhodes et al., 2013, 2016) question this assumption.

This becomes especially worrisome as atmospheric methane shows a significant North-South gradient, reflecting the predominance of Northern Hemisphere sources. Ice cores from Greenland and Antarctica have been used to quantify this Inter-Polar Difference (IPD) in past CH₄ concentrations (Chappellaz et al., 1997; Baumgartner et al., 2012, Beck et al., 2018) with the goal to derive the relative contribution of Northern and Southern hemispheric sources to the overall CH₄ changes. The Holocene IPD is on the order of several tens of ppb, i.e., one order of magnitude smaller than the past atmospheric CH₄ concentration. Thus, any small CH₄ bias on the order of a few ppb to tens of ppb has a strong impact on the conclusions drawn from this IPD, while the influence on the total radiative forcing by such small biases is negligible. In summary, existing results of CH₄ concentrations from Greenland and Antarctic ice cores have to be carefully scrutinized for such effects.

A first step in this direction has been made in previous work by Lee et al. (2020), for example by comparing CH₄ records derived using different measurement techniques. Past CH₄ concentrations ([CH₄]) are retrieved by measurements of Greenland and Antarctic ice cores using traditional discrete and relatively new continuous melt extraction techniques. While discrete ice measurements deliver one single value for each sample, Continuous Flow Analyses (CFA) gradually melt a thin stick of the ice core providing a continuous record for this section. Although in both techniques the ice sample is melted, the CFA technique separates air from the meltwater stream in about 1-2 min providing only a short time for any reaction in the water while for the discrete technique the contact time is typically 15-30 min. Comparing [CH₄]
histories from several Greenland ice cores measured discretely (NGRIP, GISP2, GRIP) with the continuous Greenland NEEM and the continuous Antarctic WAIS records over the last glacial period, higher [CH₄] can be found in the discrete Greenland measurements for specific time intervals (Lee et al., 2020; Fig. 1 therein), where dust concentrations are especially high.

Looking at the NGRIP methane hydrogen isotope (δD-CH₄) record (Bock et al., 2010b), which was also measured with a discrete melt extraction technique (Bock et al., 2010a), it turns out that in the high dust ice sections, the isotopic values are also affected. Several negative hydrogen isotopic excursions with a maximum depletion of 16‰ (permil) prior to the onset of Dansgaard-Oeschger (DO) event 8 were identified (Bock et al., 2010b). At the time of that publication there was no straightforward explanation for these depletions that could lead to “lighter” δD-CH₄ values during times of a relatively stable climate. Using ice from Antarctica much smaller δD-CH₄ variations (3-4‰) during this interval were found in measurements performed at the University of Bern (unpublished data), again questioning the atmospheric origin of these δD-CH₄ depletions prior to the DO onset.

All these variations recorded in Greenland ice give reason to assume that a hitherto unknown process exists that produces or releases additional methane in some time intervals in Greenland ice cores (from here on referred to as “excess methane” or CH₄(xs)). This process is related to the extraction technique (only found in records obtained by discrete melt extractions) and has only been observed in glacial Greenland ice with high mineral dust concentrations.

A first attempt to characterize CH₄(xs) was made by Lee et al. (2020) who analyzed [CH₄] in discrete ice samples with different impurity composition and concentration from several ice cores (GISP2, NEEM, WAIS, SPICE) using a multiple melt-refreeze technique. They were able to quantify CH₄(xs) contributions of up to 30-40 ppb for Greenland samples. Sequential melt-refreeze extractions showed that the process leading to CH₄(xs) is slow and not completed during the first melt-refreeze cycle (i.e., within around 30 min). A special set of samples was analyzed with the admixture of a HgCl₂ solution to suppress microbial activity in the meltwater. No difference in the measured [CH₄] was observed between the poisoned samples and replicates without HgCl₂, excluding a microbial CH₄ production after melting. In addition, Lee et al. (2020) used the NGRIP [CH₄] (Baumgartner et al., 2014) and δD-CH₄ records (Bock et al., 2010b) to estimate the deuterium isotopic signature of the CH₄(xs). Assuming a two-component
mixture of atmospheric methane and excess methane their model led to a best estimate of (-293 ± 31) ‰ for δD- CH₄(xs).

A straightforward explanation for CH₄(xs) may be that CH₄ is either produced in the meltwater, or it was produced beforehand and only released during the melt extraction. With respect to that, Lee et al. (2020) reviewed several mechanisms that could account for the observed variations in Greenland ice core records. None perfectly matched all their observations but lastly, three of the proposed mechanisms were short-listed by Lee et al. (2020): (1) an adsorption process on dust particles prior to the deposition on the ice sheet; (2) an in situ production in the ice; or (3) an abiotic reaction during melt extraction.

Here we resume the work by Lee et al. (2020) and shed more light upon the potential formation processes using a targeted and more comprehensive study to quantify CH₄(xs). We analyzed specific NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples discretely with two different wet extraction systems. With our δ¹³C-CH₄ device we are able to measure [methane], [ethane], [propane], and δ¹³C-CH₄ on a single ice sample in two subsequent extractions. With our second device we add experimental information on δD-CH₄. In Sect. 2 we provide information on our sampling strategy and measurement techniques. With our new experimental results, presented in Sect. 3, we provide quantitative data for CH₄(xs) in NGRIP and GRIP samples and extend our observations to other “excess alkanes” (ethane and propane), which are revealed to be co-produced during the excess CH₄ production. The observed molar ratios between methane, ethane, and propane are evaluated and their relation to the abundance of mineral dust (Ca²⁺) within the ice samples is quantified. A 2nd extraction of the meltwater enables us to estimate the temporal dynamics of excess alkane production. Using a Keeling-plot approach to our isotopic results, we calculate the carbon and deuterium isotopic signature of excess CH₄ (δ¹³C-CH₄(xs) and δD-CH₄(xs)). Based on our new and improved evidence, we finally come back to the discussion of the hypotheses proposed by Lee et al. (2020) in Sect. 4 and offer potential mechanisms that could explain the excess alkanes in ice core samples. For readers not interested in all the experimental details, we recommend to jump straight to Sect. 4 to see the discussion.

2. Ice core samples and measurements

2.1 Ice core samples
Mixing ratios of alkanes (methane, ethane, and propane) and the stable carbon ($\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$) and hydrogen ($\delta$D-CH$_4$) isotope ratios of methane were measured on ice core samples from the North Greenland Ice Core Project (NGRIP) ice core. For this study, a total of 19 NGRIP ice core samples were measured for $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ and alkane concentrations and nine NGRIP ice samples for $\delta$D-CH$_4$ covering the depth between 1795.84 m and 1933.25 m. The NGRIP samples are from the late glacial Marine Isotope Stages (MIS) 3 and 2 (22.6 to 30.6 kyears BP). These time intervals are characterized by sharp atmospheric CH$_4$ increases in parallel to rapid warmings, the so-called Dansgaard-Oeschger events, but we mostly sampled intervals with stable CH$_4$ concentrations. From the same time period, we also investigate measurements of 41 NGRIP and 12 GRIP ice core samples which were carried out in 2011 and 2018, respectively, and which have not previously been published. See Fig. 1 for an overview of all analyzed NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples over time.

We also included 22 ice core samples from the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica (EPICA) ice core from Dome C (MIS 4), which are not affected by a measureable excess CH$_4$ production and which we use as long-term monitoring ice for the system performance and to quantify the blank contribution of the analytical system (see Appendix B). The late glacial time period, which includes the age of most of the measured NGRIP samples, is characterized by an overall high impurity and dust content and low atmospheric methane concentrations. For our analysis, we have selected ice core bags (where for NGRIP and GRIP ice cores, a bag is a 55 cm long ice core section) in which we expect the same atmospheric CH$_4$ concentration but see a high range of mineral dust content (Ca$^{2+}$). In this way we can compare neighbouring samples that have the same low stadial CH$_4$ levels due to stable atmospheric concentrations and temporal smoothing by the slow bubble enclosure process but are expected to vary in measured concentrations due to contributions of excess alkanes. Ca$^{2+}$ content across our NGRIP samples range from 307 ng/g to 1311 ng/g. This sample selection is also critical to quantify the isotopic signature of the CH$_4$(xs) produced using the Keeling-plot approach (Keeling, 1958). The underlying assumptions of this mass balance approach are that (1) there is only a two-component mixture (atmospheric methane and excess methane) and that (2) the isotopic ratio of the mixture changes only by a varying input of the second source (CH$_4$(xs)).

To select the samples, we use high-resolution mineral dust records measured using an Abakus laser attenuation device (Klotz, Germany) for particulate dust (Ruth et al., 2003) as well as Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations (Erhardt et al., 2022) as dissolved mineral dust tracer derived from the Bern
Continuous Flow Analysis System (Kaufmann et al., 2008). In principle, particulate dust and the specific soluble dust tracer Ca$^{2+}$ are strongly correlated. However, depending on acidity of the ice (mainly due to H$_2$SO$_4$ and HNO$_3$), variable amounts of CaCO$_3$ are converted into soluble CaSO$_4$ and Ca(NO$_3$)$_2$ leading to a variable Ca$^{2+}$/dust ratio (Legrand and Delmas, 1988). As an example, Fig. 2 shows the Ca$^{2+}$ and mineral dust concentration of the NGRIP bag 3292 which we used to select the individual samples, and the relevant parameters measured for each sample of this bag. The data overview for all other measured NGRIP bags can be found in the Appendix A.

Figure 1: Overview of the analyzed NGRIP and GRIP samples over time. All analyzed NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples are indicated on the NGRIP depth (m) on the bottom axis. To indicate an absolute age for the gas and ice records both the AICC2012 gas age (kyears BP) and the GICC05 ice age (kyears b2k) scale are provided on the upper axes. Note that for the purpose of describing the excess CH$_4$ production in a certain ice sample the age is irrelevant and we provide all records on depths throughout this manuscript. NGRIP samples measured from the five main bags (3292, 3331 & 3332, 3453, 3515) for the Keeling-plot approach are indicated with vertical lines in pink, NGRIP samples measured in 2011 and individual NGRIP ice core samples measured in 2019-2020 (not included in the Keeling-plot analyses) in turquoise, and GRIP ice core samples in green. (a) [CH$_4$] record measured by wet extraction from NGRIP samples from Baumgartner et al. (2012, 2014). (b) $\delta^{18}$O record from North Greenland Ice Core Project members (2004). (c) Ca$^{2+}$ record from Erhardt et al. (2022).
Figure 2: Detailed data overview for NGRIP bag 3292. Bag-specific overview of several parameters measured for each sample in this bag at a given depth: methane, ethane, propane, Ca\textsuperscript{2+}, mineral dust mass, TAC (Total Air Content), δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4}. At the top the AICC2012 gas age (upper top axis) and the GICC05 ice age (lower top axis) of the respective depth are indicated. The mineral dust record is taken from Ruth et al. (2003), the Ca\textsuperscript{2+} record from Erhardt et al. (2022). The data overview for all further measured NGRIP bags can be found in the Appendix A.

2.2 CH\textsubscript{4}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} and δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} Analysis of Ice Core Samples

The short-chain alkanes and δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} were measured at the University of Bern using the discrete wet extraction technique as described in detail in Schmitt et al. (2014). With this method it is possible to measure mixing ratios of methane, ethane, and propane as well as the methane carbon isotopic signature and other trace gases on a single ice core sample of about 150 g.

Briefly, ice core samples are placed in a glass vessel locked by a stainless-steel flange which is attached to the vacuum line to evacuate laboratory air (see Fig. 3, step a). Before melting the ice sample, the leak tightness of the vacuum extraction line is tested with a so-called He blank. The ice sample is then melted under vacuum with the help of infrared radiation for ~35 min to...
release the enclosed air (step b). The released air is continuously removed from the sample vessel by a pressure gradient towards an adsorbing AirTrap (activated carbon), collecting all relevant air components at -180°C. After melting is completed, the temperature of the meltwater is stabilized close to 0°C, but does not refreeze again. Afterwards, He is sparged with 4 mL/min at standard temperature and pressure (equivalent to 100-400 mL at the varying low pressure in the headspace) through the melt water for ~14 min through a capillary at the bottom of the vessel to transfer any remnant gas species dissolved in the melt water onto the AirTrap (step c). The sample vessel is then sealed by closing inlet and outlet valves (step d). Consecutively, the AirTrap is warmed up in two steps to first remove N₂ and O₂ and in a second step to release the gases of interest which are then sent after a cryofocus step to the gas chromatograph (GC) for separation and quantification using an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Isoprime 100, Elementar).

Precision of this method for CH₄ is about 8 ppb and 0.1 ‰ for δ¹³C-CH₄ based on the reproducibility of the 1st extraction of ice core samples where isotopic data are expressed using the δ notation on the international Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (VPDB) scale. For C₂H₆ the precision is 0.02 ppb or 1 ‰, for C₃H₈ 0.03 ppb or 5 ‰ (whatever is higher) based on the reproducibility of standard air samples which are by definition not subject to excess production (Schmitt et al., 2014). Blank levels for these species based on melted artificial (gas-free) ice samples are 1-2 ppb for CH₄, 0.3 ppb for C₂H₆ and 0.2 ppb for C₃H₈ (Schmitt et al., 2014), which are below the values measured on Antarctic ice, where excess production is minimal compared to glacial Greenland samples (see Appendix B for details).

With their experimental investigations, Lee et al. (2020) were already able to demonstrate that production/ release of CH₄(xs) is time dependent. We therefore conclude that this process does not have to be completed in the time available for the gas extraction described above. We continued the analyses of excess alkane production with an additional extraction step (here referred to as 2nd extraction, steps d-g in Fig. 3) following the normal ice extraction routine. After all sample air is collected in the 1st extraction, the meltwater is left in the isolated sample vessel (the vessel is closed and not connected to the carbon trap) and held at temperatures close to 0°C for ~100 min (step d). After this “waiting time” of ~100 min, He is purged through the meltwater for ~24 min to extract the gases that have been accumulated during this time interval simulating the extraction time of the 1st extraction, followed by another ~14 min of He purging to mimic the last step of the ice extraction when the sample had completely melted (step f). The
gases from this 2nd extraction are collected and measured following the same trapping and separation steps as in the 1st extraction. Note that the procedure of the 2nd extraction can be repeated any number of times (e.g. 3rd extraction).

The amount of gases that we obtain from the 1st extraction comprises the atmospheric amount, a possible contribution by in situ production, and a potential time-dependent production/release in the meltwater (in extractu). The 2nd extraction, however, targets only the in extractu fraction. The system blank for the 2nd extraction was estimated using the 2nd extraction of Antarctic ice (Talos Dome, EDC) and were 2 ppb, 0.3 ppb and 0.3 ppb for CH₄, C₂H₆ and C₃H₈, respectively, assuming an ice core sample air volume of 14 mL at standard temperature and pressure, which is the typical ice sample size of 150 g with a total air content of 0.09 mL/g. For CH₄ this is <1% of the amount of extracted species in the 1st extraction of glacial Greenland ice. Due to the small amount of CH₄ analyzed in this 2nd extraction (about a factor of 20 to 50 less than for an ice core sample) the precision for the δ¹³C analysis is much lower than for the 1st (ice sample) extraction and we estimate the precision of δ¹³C-CH₄ to 2 ‰ and for [CH₄] to be 2 ppb or 10% (based on the reproducibility of 2nd extractions of Antarctic EDC samples). For C₂H₆ and C₃H₈, the precision is comparable to the 1st extraction. Note that throughout the manuscript we do not perform blank corrections (neither for the measured alkane concentrations nor for the isotopic values). The only exception is for the calculation of the temporal dynamics of excess ethane production (see Appendix C) as the blank contribution would otherwise bias the samples with low Ca²⁺ content.

Figure 3: Sequential steps (a-g) happening in the ice core sample vessel during the 1st and the 2nd extraction in the δ¹³C-CH₄ extraction line. Scheme illustrates the subsequent steps as described in detail in the text. Brownish spots indicate dust particles in the ice/meltwater. Green circles indicate gas species (methane, ethane, and propane) in the meltwater or in the headspace of the vessel. Closed valves are indicated in black, open valves in white. Blue arrows indicate the He flow through the inlet capillary into the sample vessel, pink arrows indicate the flow direction from the sample vessel towards the AirTrap.
2.3 δ-D-CH₄ Analysis of Ice Core Samples

All δ-D-CH₄ data presented here were measured at the University of Bern using the discrete wet extraction technique as described in detail in Bock et al. (2010a, 2014). This δ-D-CH₄ device allows to measure the concentration of methane and its deuterium isotopic signature (δ-D-CH₄) on a single ice core sample of about 300 g.

Briefly, ice core samples are melted after evacuation of the headspace using a warm water bath at 40°C for 25-30 min to release the enclosed air into the sample vessel headspace. Once all the ice is melted, the warm water bath is replaced by an ice-water bath to keep the meltwater temperature and water vapor pressure low but without refreezing. Note, in contrast to the δ¹³C-CH₄ method, the inlet and outlet valves are closed during the melting process. The released air leads to an increased pressure in the sample vessel headspace enhancing the solubility of gases in water. After the melting is complete, the inlet and outlet valves are opened and He is purged for ~40 min with a flow of 360 mL/min to transfer the accumulated air in the headspace and bubble He through the meltwater to strip dissolved gases. Just like for the δ¹³C-CH₄ method, the air is collected on an activated carbon trap followed by further purification steps including GC separation. Note that compared to the δ¹³C-CH₄ device, we performed only one extraction with the δ-D-CH₄ device.

For both methods, we assume that the time for an in extractu production during the ice extraction procedure starts with the first presence of meltwater until He purging is stopped. Note that this time is considerably longer for the δ-D-CH₄ analysis (~60 min) compared to the time of the 1st extraction in the δ¹³C-CH₄ analysis (~35 min).

Using this method we can measure [CH₄] and δ-D-CH₄ with a precision of about 15 ppb and 3‰ (based on standard ice sample measurements), where isotopic data are expressed using the δ notation on the international Standard Mean Ocean Water (SMOW) scale.

3. Characterization of excess alkanes in ice cores

3.1 Methane, ethane, propane concentrations

As described in detail in Sect. 2.2 a full ice sample measurement includes the regular ice sample extraction (1st extraction) and, after the waiting time of ~100 min, a 2nd gas extraction in the
meltwater. Gas from the 1st extraction is comprised of atmospheric air, a possible contribution from in situ production, a potential time-dependent contribution by an in extractu process, and any contribution from the device itself (blank). For the gas species discussed here (methane, ethane, propane), these individual fractions are very different in magnitude. For polar ice core samples, the atmospheric air is the major fraction of methane even in dust-rich, glacial ice from Greenland prone to CH$_4$(xs) production (see below). The opposite is expected for ethane and propane, which are dominated by the in extractu component in dust-rich Greenland ice. To establish a better knowledge of alkanes in Greenland ice, we evaluated the measured concentrations of methane, ethane, and propane, their ratios to each other and the relation to the content of mineral dust in the ice for both the 1st and the 2nd extraction.

Note that different units to indicate concentrations of the trace gases of interest are used throughout this study. By using mixing ratios in units of [ppb], as typically used for atmospheric concentrations, the concentration of trace gases is related to the amount of air included in the ice. Ice core samples with a low air content cause higher mixing ratio values for any additional molecules produced in situ or in extractu compared to ice core samples with a high air content and the interpretation might be biased. Alternatively, for any additional molecules produced in situ or in extractu, [mol absolute per sample] denotes the absolute amount of trace gases and is independent of the ice core air content. In the following, both units are used and great care has to be taken to avoid misinterpretation of the results with respect to the different units.

3.1.1 Excess alkanes in the 1st extraction

Figure 4 and 5 show results from the 1st extraction of our NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples. For dust-rich samples, ethane ranges between 2 ppb and 12 ppb, and propane concentrations between 1 ppb and 5 ppb. In contrast, low-dust samples from both GRIP and NGRIP have much lower concentration (ca. 0.5 ppb for ethane, and 0.3 ppb for propane) consistent with estimates of past atmospheric ethane and propane concentrations from the 15th to 19th century of the common era being about 0.4 ppb in Greenland ice (Nicewonger et al., 2016) and lower for propane (Helmig et al., 2013). Emissions of ethane and propane were likely reduced during the glacial (Bock et al., 2017; Nicewonger et al., 2016; Dyonisius et al., 2020) thus, 0.5 ppb appears to be an upper limit of past atmospheric concentrations of ethane and propane. This estimate of past atmospheric ethane concentrations is an order of magnitude smaller than the values we obtained from our dust-rich ice core samples from the 1st extraction, pointing to a strong
additional source of these alkanes for dust-rich samples. Thus, the unusually high mixing ratios indicates that ethane and propane in glacial ice extracted using our melt technique on discrete samples do not represent atmospheric levels.

As illustrated in Fig. 4 (left panel), the ethane and propane concentrations are highly correlated, pointing to a common production of excess ethane and excess propane. The weighted mean ratio and its weighted standard deviation (both weighted according to the number of samples measured per bag) is \((2.25 \pm 0.09)\) ppb ethane/ ppb propane. Note that all regression lines are calculated by following the method of York (1968) and York et al. (2004). York’s analytical solution to the best-fit line accounting for normally distributed errors both in x and y is widely used to determine an isotopic mixing line and has been proven as the least biased method (Wehr and Saleska, 2017; Hoheisel et al., 2019). Throughout the manuscript we use the 1 sigma (1\(\sigma\)) standard deviation to express uncertainties. In Fig. 4, where the individual bags studied are color-coded, we can clearly see that the ratio is essentially the same between the individual bags and that the correlation is also very high within each bag (although we have to consider for the significance of this correlation that the number of samples per bag is very low). This indicates that for NGRIP ice ethane and propane are found in a fixed ratio. Accordingly, excess ethane and propane production can be well represented by the weighted mean ratio and ethane and propane are produced in a ratio of approximately 2:1. Very similar results were also observed in NGRIP samples measured in 2011 and in GRIP samples revealing an ethane to propane ratio of \(2.14 \pm 0.03\) \((r^2 = 0.99)\) and \(2.00 \pm 0.13\) \((r^2 = 0.99)\), respectively (see Fig. 4, left panel).
Methane concentrations range from 407 ppb to 476 ppb and are predominantly of atmospheric origin (see Fig. 5). The amount of CH$_4$(xs) is the difference between the measured methane concentration and the atmospheric background concentration. To quantify CH$_4$(xs) we use the fact that due to the low-pass filtering of the bubble enclosure process all samples within one bag should have the same atmospheric CH$_4$ concentration. This also ensures that any physical processes that potentially influence the atmospheric alkanes in our samples (gravitational enrichment, thermodiffusion, disequilibrium effects on CH$_4$ isotopes) are the same for all samples within one bag. The only difference between these samples is, thus, the degree of CH$_4$(xs) production which can be estimated from the linear fit between the measured CH$_4$ concentration and the concentration of another species (e.g. ethane, propane, mineral dust, or Ca$^{2+}$), which serves as a proxy for CH$_4$(xs) production. The closest relationship was found for [C$_2$H$_6$] and quantifying CH$_4$(xs) was done by extrapolating the linear regression between ethane
and methane to an ethane concentration of 0.39 ppb, the assumed atmospheric $[\text{C}_2\text{H}_6]$. This leads to an estimate of the true atmospheric $[\text{CH}_4]$ value within the respective bag, a value that can then be subtracted from the measured $\text{CH}_4$ concentration to obtain the $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ in each sample. The uncertainty of the calculated $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ is typically 8 ppb.

Using the relation of ethane to methane this approach translates into $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ in the range of 14 ppb to 91 ppb for these five NGRIP bags with a mean excess of 39 ppb. Equivalent calculations can be made using propane, dust, or $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ as proxy for $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ production, however, the relationship between dust parameters and $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ is more variable and does not lead to equally precise values for $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$. Nevertheless, the obtained mean $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ using the relation of mineral dust or $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ to methane is similar in size to the one obtained by ethane.

We find that there exists a constant production ratio between all three excess alkanes for all bags investigated. The weighted mean production ratio and its weighted standard deviation was calculated to be $(6.42 \pm 1.57)$ ppb methane / ppb ethane and $(14.3 \pm 3.7)$ ppb methane/ ppb propane for the samples of the five main NGRIP bags, and $(2.25 \pm 0.09)$ ppb ethane/ ppb propane (also including NGRIP2011 and GRIP here). Note that there is a flagged sample for $\text{CH}_4$ in bag 3453 (yellow asterisk in Fig. 5), where one vent (V6) was unintentionally open during the measurement, which may have compromised the result. We therefore excluded the production ratio determined from bag 3453.

In summary, we can characterize the excess alkane production in our measured NGRIP samples by an overall methane/ethane/propane ratio of approximately 14:2:1. This constant relationship between different alkanes suggests that excess alkanes are produced in a fixed ratio by a common production process.

Another important observation is the close relation between excess alkanes and the content of mineral dust within the ice core samples. Using measurements on GISP2 and NEEM ice core samples, Lee et al. (2020) reported for the first time the close relation of $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$ to chemical impurities with the highest correlation with $\text{Ca}^{2+}$. This is supported by our measurements on NGRIP and GRIP samples revealing an overall increase of $\text{CH}_4^{(xs)}$, ethane, and propane with increasing $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ (see for example the ethane/$\text{Ca}^{2+}$ relationship in Fig. 4, right panel). Although the connection between ethane and $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ is more variable than for ethane and propane between the different bags, the slopes of the linear regressions in Fig. 4 (right panel) are still the same.
within the 2 σ uncertainty and the weighted mean ratio of all NGRIP samples amounts to 
(0.0089 ± 0.0024) ppb ethane/ (ng/g) Ca\(^{2+}\). However, this weighted mean value is likely biased 
low due to the relatively low ethane/ Ca\(^{2+}\) slope of bag 3515. Due to a data gap at 1932.7 m in 
the Ca\(^{2+}\) record, the corresponding Ca\(^{2+}\) concentration for two of the samples of this bag is 
subject to a large interpolation error and overestimated Ca\(^{2+}\) (see Fig. A3).

The results agree with results from GRIP and older NGRIP (2011) samples, revealing an ethane/
Ca\(^{2+}\) ratio of 0.0105 ± 0.0029 (r\(^2\) = 0.76) and 0.0090 ± 0.0006 (r\(^2\) = 0.91), respectively.

Based on the fixed ratio of excess CH\(_4\) and ethane described above this translates into a
weighted mean excess CH\(_4\)/Ca\(^{2+}\) ratio of (0.0529 ± 0.0111) ppb methane per (ng/g) Ca\(^{2+}\).

Figure 5: NGRIP results of methane and ethane from the 1\(^{st}\) extraction. Concentrations of methane (ppb) and
ethane (ppb) and their ratios to each other for NGRIP samples measured in the 1\(^{st}\) extraction of the δ\(^{13}\)C-CH\(_4\)
device. Different colors and symbols indicate the different NGRIP bags used for our analysis. Note that there is a
flagged sample for CH\(_4\) in bag 3453 as indicated with a yellow asterisk, which is not included in the ratio of bag
3453. The grey hatched area indicates past atmospheric ethane concentrations of maximum 0.39 ppb as estimated
by Nicewonger et al. (2016).
3.1.2 Excess alkanes in the 2nd extraction

With the 2nd extraction of the δ\(^{13}\)C-CH\(_4\) analyses we can evaluate the temporal dynamics of excess alkane production, assuming that all alkanes extracted in the 2nd extraction were produced in the time after the 1st extraction was completed.

For our Greenland samples we measured a range of about 0.2 to 2.4 pmol for ethane and a range of 0.1 to 1.2 pmol for propane in the 2nd extraction (Fig. 6, right panel). These values in pmol are equivalent to 0.2 to 4.8 ppb of ethane and 0.2 to 2 ppb of propane assuming that the amount of excess alkanes was added to 14 mL of ice core air (which is the typical ice sample size of 150 g with a total air content of 0.09 mL/g). The measured amount of methane ranges between 3 pmol and 20 pmol (Fig. 6, left panel).

The ratio of the measured amount for the individual species between the 1st and the 2nd extraction amounts to 3.6 ± 0.85 (r\(^2\) = 0.78) for ethane (Fig. 7, right panel), 3.3 ± 0.33 (r\(^2\) = 0.78) for propane (combined data of NGRIP and GRIP) and 3.8 ± 1.62 (r\(^2\) = 0.33) for methane (only NGRIP data), where the uncertainty for CH\(_4\) is again much larger. Thus, we can conclude that the amount of alkanes produced during the waiting time after the 1st extraction until the 2nd extraction was finished, was approximately 30% of the amount produced during the 1st extraction. Results from the 2nd extraction also demonstrate that this process is slow and not completed during the time of the 1st extraction. We can thereby confirm the results of Lee et al. (2020) but we are able to show for the first time that this process leads also to production of excess ethane and propane.

For a better estimate of the temporal reaction kinetics of the underlying process, we can relate the measured amount of the individual species to the time available for a potential reaction in the meltwater during each extraction. For the five GRIP samples that were measured with a 2nd and 3rd extraction (see Sec. 2.2 for details) we take the cumulative production amount (where the first data point is the produced amount in the 1st extraction, the second data point is the sum of the 1st and 2nd extraction, and the third data point is the sum of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd extraction).

In the example shown for ethane (Fig. C1, Appendix C) we can see the assumed first-order reaction kinetics with a saturation of ethane accumulation over time providing a good model for our measurements (details on the calculation can be found in the Appendix C). With that, we can estimate the half-life time (τ) of the production to be approximately 30 min. Note that this long half life has also an implication for a potential excess production of CH\(_4\) in continuous
flow techniques, where the reaction time before the air is separated from the liquid water stream is only 1-2 min. Thus, only 5-10% of the *in situ* production found in our 1st extraction can be expected in such continuous flow measurements, which are difficult to detect.

The goodness of fit of the ratios of the measured concentrations between the 1st and the 2nd extraction is $r^2 = 0.78$ for both ethane and propane, indicating that the production/release in the 1st extraction in relation to the 2nd extraction is well correlated for both species (see Fig. 7b for ethane). Thus, samples that produced higher excess alkanes during the 1st extraction also produced more excess alkanes in the 2nd extraction, suggesting that the production is dependent on the amount of some reactant present in the samples from which excess alkanes are produced. Again, for CH$_4$ this relationship is more variable which is likely related to the higher uncertainty in measuring CH$_4$ for the 2nd extraction.

The ratio of ethane to propane of all measured Greenland samples in the 2nd extraction is $1.98 \pm 0.07$ ($r^2 = 0.99$). The ratio of methane to ethane is $8.17 \pm 1.14$ ($r^2 = 0.86$). Accordingly, the overall relationship between methane, ethane, and propane in the 2nd extraction can be characterized by a ratio of approximately 16:2:1. However, comparing the ratios of ethane/propane and methane/ethane between the 1st and the 2nd extraction, there is no significant difference within the 2σ uncertainties from $2.25 \pm 0.09$ to $1.98 \pm 0.07$, and from $6.42 \pm 1.57$ to $8.17 \pm 1.14$. We can conclude that within the error limits, the production ratios stayed the same, suggesting that the same *in situ* process is at play during both extractions.

In the 2nd extraction, we can again observe the relation between excess alkanes and the amount of mineral dust. Figure 7a shows the correlation of ethane (fmol/g meltwater) to Ca$^{2+}$ (ng/g) in all measured NGRIP and GRIP samples in the 2nd extraction revealing a production of $(0.0085 \pm 0.0011)$ fmol/(g meltwater) ethane per (ng/g) Ca$^{2+}$ with $r^2 = 0.70$. For methane, we observe a production ratio of $(0.0556 \pm 0.01513)$ fmol/(g meltwater) methane per (ng/g) Ca$^{2+}$ with a correlation of $r^2 = 0.47$ (data not shown).

Overall, excess alkane concentrations are increasing with increasing Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations, in both the 1st and the 2nd extraction. The total alkane production/release, however, decreased in the 2nd extraction, suggesting the progressive exhaustion over time of some reactant necessary for the *in situ* process. We propose that this reactant co-varies with Ca$^{2+}$ and particulate
dust, where $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ is of course not a reactant itself and represents only a proxy for higher in extractu production.

**Figure 6:** NGRIP and GRIP results of excess methane, ethane, and propane from the 2nd extraction. (a) Concentrations of methane and ethane and their ratios to each other. (b) Concentrations of propane and ethane and their ratios to each other. Units are given as pmol absolute per sample on the primary axis in black and in ppb assuming an air volume of 14 mL of the ice core sample on the secondary axis in grey. Grey crosses indicate the blank level of the system estimated from 2nd extractions of EDC ice core samples.
Figure 7: GRIP and GRIP results of ethane from the 2nd extraction in relation to the Ca$^{2+}$ concentration and to the 1st extraction. (a) Produced amount of ethane in the meltwater (fmol/g meltwater) in relation to the Ca$^{2+}$ concentration in the ice core samples. The numbered GRIP samples are used in Figure C1 to evaluate the temporal dynamics. Grey crosses indicate the blank level of the system estimated from 2nd extractions of EDC ice core samples. (b) Relation of the amount of ethane (pmol) measured in the 1st and 2nd extraction.

3.2 Isotopic composition of excess methane

In this section we characterize the isotopic signature of excess methane and explore how we can use this parameter to better identify its source or production pathway. The evaluation of the carbon and deuterium isotopic signature of excess methane ($\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs) and $\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs)) is based on the Keeling-plot approach (Keeling, 1958, 1961; Köhler et al., 2006).

3.2.1 $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ isotopic signature of excess methane

Figure 8 (left panel) shows the $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ results of the 1st extraction. The carbon isotopic signature of excess CH$_4$ from the 1st extraction of the ice core sample measurements within one NGRIP bag are obtained from the y-intercept of the Keeling-plot, representing the excess $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ value for this bag. Note that the two NGRIP bags 3331 and 3332 are neighbouring bags and were therefore combined into one Keeling y-intercept. As the individual samples in these two bags span less than 10 years between each other, they are the same within the age distribution, and the assumptions for the Keeling-plot approach (see Sec. 2.1) are met. All bags show agreement in $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ signature (y-intercepts) within 2 $\sigma$ uncertainties. The weighted
mean isotopic signature is \((-47.0 \pm 2.9)\)‰, with weights assigned by the number of samples that constrained each individual Keeling plot regression line.

Figure 8 (right panel) shows the isotopic results in relation to the amount of CH\(_4\) produced during the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction. No atmospheric CH\(_4\) is present during the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction and the individual isotopic values in Fig. 8 (right panel) are the directly measured values of excess CH\(_4\) without applying the Keeling-plot approach. For a better comparison, the produced CH\(_4\) is shown both in pmol (lower axis in Fig. 8, right panel) and in a mixing ratio CH\(_4\) scale (ppb). The Keeling y-intercept values of the 1\(^{st}\) extraction are added in the right panel of Fig. 8.

The \(\delta^{13}C\)-CH\(_4\) values of the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction range between -34 ‰ and -48 ‰ with the mean being (-41.2 \(\pm\) 2.2) ‰. This value appears isotopically somewhat heavier compared to the weighted mean of (-47.0 \(\pm\) 2.9) ‰ inferred from the Keeling analysis, however, is still the same within the 2 \(\sigma\) error limits. We note that the measured peak areas for the 2\(^{nd}\) extractions are very small and lie outside of the typical range of our gas chromatography mass spectrometry analysis for \(\delta^{13}C\)-CH\(_4\) and we cannot exclude some bias in these results. However, we mimicked these small peak areas with injections of small amounts of standard air and observed no significant bias in the measured \(\delta^{13}C\)-CH\(_4\) values given that the precision of such small peaks is around 2 ‰.

Another caveat is the considerable blank contribution for CH\(_4\) that we observe for the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction. Since Antarctic ice cores do not show a sizable \textit{in situ} production (Fig. 7, grey crosses for EDC) we measured EDC samples with the same protocol of a 2\(^{nd}\) extraction as for our Greenland samples to provide an upper boundary of this blank. Hence the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction of the EDC samples are a conservative blank estimate while the true system blank is lower. As can be seen in Fig. 8 (right panel) the amount of CH\(_4\) measured for these EDC samples (grey crosses) is on average about 2 pmol (equivalent to about 3 ppb). For comparison, our ice samples from Greenland show a range of about 5 to 20 pmol, indicating a considerable blank contribution in the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction.

To estimate the influence of the blank on the isotopic signature that occurs during the 2\(^{nd}\) extraction we used the values from our EDC measurements and applied an isotope mass balance approach. The \(\delta^{13}C\)-CH\(_4\) blank signature obtained from these EDC samples is -39.0 ‰, hence a few ‰ heavier than the mean \(\delta^{13}C\)-CH\(_4\) signature of the excess CH\(_4\) from this 2\(^{nd}\) extraction for the Greenland samples. On average, the correction would shift our NGRIP values towards
lighter (more negative) values by 0.31 ‰. This systematic correction is thus small compared to
the typical measurement precision obtained both from the Keeling-plot approach and the direct
measurement of the CH\textsubscript{4}(xs) with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} extraction. As the δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} signature of the blank is
close to the NGRIP values, performing a blank correction has only little leverage. Considering
these analytical limitations of our 2\textsuperscript{nd} extraction for δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4}, these findings suggest that
CH\textsubscript{4}(xs) produced during the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} extraction has the same δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} isotopic signature
within the 2 σ error limits and is likely produced/released by the same process in both
extractions.

Figure 8: NGRIP (and GRIP) δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} results of the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} extraction measured with the δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4}
device. (a) Keeling-plot of δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} for NGRIP samples from the five main bags (3292, 3331 & 3332, 3453,
3515) measured in the 1\textsuperscript{st} extraction. Colors and symbols indicate individual measurements of the respective bags.
Colored lines indicate the corresponding Keeling regression line of each individual bag. (b) δ\textsuperscript{13}C-CH\textsubscript{4} (‰) values in
relation to the amount of methane measured for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} extraction. Units for CH\textsubscript{4} are given as pmol absolute per
sample on the primary axis in black, and in ppb assuming an air volume of 14mL of an ice core sample on the
secondary axis in grey. Colors and symbols indicate individual measurements of the respective bags. Color-coded
lines indicate the corresponding Keeling y-intercept of each individual bag as measured in the 1\textsuperscript{st} extraction. Grey
crosses indicate the blank level of the system estimated from 2\textsuperscript{nd} extractions of EDC ice core samples.

3.2.2 δD-CH\textsubscript{4} isotopic signature of excess methane

Figure 9 shows the isotopic results of the δD-CH\textsubscript{4} analyses. Due to the larger sample size
required for the δD-CH\textsubscript{4} analyses and the sample availability restrictions only two bags could
be studied for δD-CH\textsubscript{4}. The individual isotopic results obtained from the ice core sample
measurements within one NGRIP bag are again combined into one Keeling y-intercept, representing the δD-CH₄ value for this bag. NGRIP bag 3460 (orange) reveals a Keeling y-intercept δD-CH₄ value of (-308 ± 51)‰. The two NGRIP bags 3266 and 3267 (purple) are neighbouring bags and were therefore combined into one Keeling y-intercept revealing a δD-CH₄ value of (341 ± 62)‰. The difference between the two Keeling y-intercepts of the individual bags is within the error limits. Accordingly, we combine the two values to a weighted mean and weighted uncertainty of (-326 ± 57)‰.

Our results are consistent with the findings of Lee et al. (2020), who used the NGRIP δD-CH₄ record of Bock et al. (2010b) and the NGRIP [CH₄] record of Baumgartner et al. (2014) to estimate the δD-CH₄(xs) signature in these samples. Assuming a two-component mixture of atmospheric methane and excess methane in their model led to a best estimate of (-293 ± 31)‰ for δD-CH₄(xs) which is within the error limits of our Keeling-plot results.

Figure 9: NGRIP δD-CH₄ results. Keeling-plot of δD-CH₄ of NGRIP samples measured with the δD-CH₄ device. Colors and symbols indicate individual measurements of the respective bags and colored lines indicate the corresponding regression of each individual bag.

4. Testing the hypotheses explaining excess alkanes

In Sect. 3 several pieces of evidence for the production/release of excess alkanes in Greenland ice core samples were collected:
We can confirm the observations of Lee et al. (2020) on excess methane in different Greenland ice cores and its covariance with the amount of mineral dust in the ice. Despite the different extraction techniques applied (multiple melt-refreeze method in Lee et al. (2020) versus two subsequent wet extractions in our study), we can further corroborate that the temporal dynamics of the production/release is on the order of hours and production/release occurs when liquid water is present during extraction.

We document for the first time a co-production/release of excess methane, ethane, and propane, with the observed values for ethane and propane exceeding by far their estimated past atmospheric background concentrations.

Excess alkanes (methane, ethane, propane) are produced/released in a fixed molar ratio of approximately 14:2:1, indicating a common origin.

We further characterize the isotopic composition of excess CH$_4$ of $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs) and $\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs) to be $(-47.0 \pm 2.9)$ ‰ and $(-326 \pm 57)$ ‰ in NGRIP ice core samples, respectively. Within the error limits, our $\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs) results are consistent with the calculated best estimate of $(-293 \pm 31)$ ‰ by Lee et al. (2020).

In the introduction we presented the hypotheses proposed by Lee et al. (2020) explaining their observations on CH$_4$(xs). Here we resume the discussion of the original hypotheses and refine them in light of our new data from NGRIP and GRIP ice sample measurements. An overview of the different possible sources explaining excess alkanes is illustrated in Fig. 10 and Table 1. We discuss in the following three options for the origin of the observed excess alkanes:

1.) Excess alkanes could be adsorbed on mineral dust particles prior to their deposition on the Greenland ice sheet and released in the laboratory during the prolonged melting process. The adsorption step could happen in the mineral dust source region (East Asian deserts) thereby adsorbing the alkanes from natural gas seeps within the sediment (process marked as A1, see Fig. 10). Alternatively, adsorption of atmospheric alkanes on dust particles can happen anytime starting from the soil surface in the dust source region, during atmospheric transport to the Greenland ice sheet after deflation, or within the firn layer before pores are closed-off (A2). The desorption of the adsorbed alkanes happens during the melting process for both cases.

2.) Excess alkanes could be produced microbially. The production happens either in the ice itself (in situ), the alkanes are adsorbed on dust particles in the ice and then slowly released
during the melting phase in the laboratory (M1). Alternatively, the microbial production happens in the meltwater during the melting process (in extractu) (M2). A microbial in situ production in the ice without an adsorption-desorption process was already deemed unlikely by Lee et al. (2020) since it is not compatible with the lack of excess CH$_4$ in the CFA CH$_4$ concentration records.

3.) Excess alkanes are produced abiotically, e.g. by the decomposition of labile organic compounds. This chemical reaction can happen either in the ice itself (in situ), where excess alkanes are then adsorbed on dust particles and subsequently released during the melting process (C1), or in the meltwater during extraction (in extractu) (C2). An abiotic in situ production in the ice without an adsorption-desorption process can also be ruled out with the CFA evidence.

We now discuss these mechanisms in detail and evaluate the viability of the different hypotheses in the light of our new experimental observations.

Figure 10: Overview of the different possibilities explaining excess alkanes in dust-rich Greenland ice. A depicts an adsorption process of alkanes on mineral particles, either from natural gas seeps within the sediment (A1) or from the atmosphere (A2) prior to their deposition on the Greenland ice sheet. This gas is then desorbed during the melting process in the laboratory. M depicts a microbial production of excess alkanes, either in the ice itself (in situ), followed by adsorption on dust particles in the ice and a subsequent slow desorption process during the melting process (M1), or a microbial production in the meltwater (in extractu) (M2). C depicts the abiotic/chemical production of excess alkanes, either in the ice itself (in situ) followed by adsorption on dust particles after production in the ice and a subsequent slow desorption during the melting process (C1), or abiotic production in the meltwater (in extractu) (C2).
(1) Adsorption/desorption of alkanes on mineral dust particles

Depending on where the adsorption takes place, the mineral particles might adsorb alkanes of different origin and composition. One possibility is that the adsorption already takes place within the sediment or soil of the dust source region, thus before mineral dust deflation (erosion of loose material by winds from flat and dry areas; A1). As proposed by Lee et al. (2020), the major source region of mineral dust arriving in Greenland during the glacial (Taklamakan, Tarim Basin) are also regions where natural gas seeps reach the surface (Etiope and Klusman, 2002; Etiope et al., 2008). In this case the methane should reflect the isotopic composition and alkane composition of the seep. Alternatively, adsorption of atmospheric alkanes on the particles can happen anytime starting from the soil surface, during transport en route to the Greenland ice sheet after deflation and within the firn layer before pores are closed-off (A2). For the scenario A2 the fingerprint (isotopic composition and ratio of alkanes) of the adsorbed alkanes depends on the past atmospheric composition but could be modulated by selective fractionation processes during adsorption and desorption.

To be a viable mechanism for our problem, it requires that the adsorbed alkanes stay strongly bound at the mineral dust particles while desorption is minor both during the atmospheric transport and during the several hundred years the dust particle spends in the porous firn (age of the firn at bubble close-off). During the melting procedure the adsorbed alkanes would then be released from their mineral dust carrier, which in case of Greenland ice from glacial times is predominately consisting of clay minerals from the Taklamakan (and partly also Gobi) desert (Biscaye et al., 1997; Svensson et al., 2000; Ruth et al., 2003). However, other additional dust sources exist with their relative contribution varying with climate conditions (Han et al., 2018; Lupker et al., 2010).

Several experimental studies showed that clay minerals have a high adsorption capacity and retention potential for alkanes (Sugimoto et al., 2003; Cheng and Huang, 2004; Dan et al., 2004; Pires et al., 2008; Ross and Bustin, 2009; Ji et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013; Tian et al., 2017). Influencing parameters for an adsorption-desorption process are mainly pressure, temperature, clay mineral type, micropore size, surface area, organic carbon content, and water/moisture content (Sugimoto et al., 2003; Cheng and Huang, 2004; Dan et al., 2004; Pires et al., 2008; Ross and Bustin, 2009; Ji et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013; Tian et al., 2017). Most interestingly for us, studies by Sugimoto et al. (2003) and Dan et al. (2004) on the adsorption of CH₄ in micropores on the surface of clay minerals in dried and fresh lake sediment showed that dried
sediment still retains \( \text{CH}_4 \) and that dried and degassed sediment re-adsorbs ambient \( \text{CH}_4 \) at standard pressure and room temperature. The amount of \( \text{CH}_4 \) adsorbed in their samples is strongly dependent on pressure and temperature while increasing temperatures and decreasing pressure lead to a stronger desorption. The addition of water/moisture leads to a rapid desorption of already adsorbed gases (Sugimoto et al., 2003; Dan et al., 2004; Pires et al., 2008; Ji et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013).

These results in principle support the possibility of an adsorption-desorption process for our glacial NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples, where alkanes (from fossil seeps or atmosphere) would be adsorbed on dust particles and desorbed during the measurement procedure when liquid water is present. Independent of the origin of the alkanes (A1 or A2) the amount of alkanes deposited onto the Greenland ice sheet by this process would be diminished if mineral dust particles were already in contact with liquid water during the long-range transport which may lead to a loss of previously adsorbed alkanes already in the atmosphere. This water contact could occur for example already at the dust source, as it is known that the deserts in the Tarim basin receive regular input from water from the surrounding mountain regions also providing the minerals to the basin that are blown out of the desert afterwards (Ruth et al., 2007).

To explain the constant ratio of methane, ethane, and propane of 14:2:1 in our samples with an adsorption mechanism, we need to discuss the potential origins of the adsorbed alkanes. First, we find very high relative excess contributions of ethane and propane in our samples, while we see a small excess contribution for methane compared to the atmospheric background. If we assume a comparable adsorption for all three alkanes, this would imply a strong relative enrichment of ethane and propane over methane in the concentration of these gases during adsorption. This is not in line with the past atmospheric \( \text{CH}_4/(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6+\text{C}_3\text{H}_8) \) ratio where past atmospheric ethane concentrations by Nicewonger et al. (2016) are an order of magnitude smaller (and propane concentrations even less) than the measured concentrations in our NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples.

In contrast, the ratio of methane, ethane, and propane for our samples of approximately 14:2:1, translates into a \( \text{CH}_4/(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6+\text{C}_3\text{H}_8) \) ratio of \( \sim 5 \), which is most consistent with a thermogenic origin (see Fig. 11, left panel). However, due to the different adsorption capacity of mineral dust particles, also a fractionation of the three alkanes is to be expected during the adsorption process, which could alter the thermogenic signature.
To further evaluate the adsorption theory in the light of our experimental evidence, we now include the carbon and deuterium isotopic signature of CH₄(xs) in our samples. Our NGRIP samples reveal a δ¹³C-CH₄(xs) value (Keeling y-intercept weighted mean) of (-47.0 ± 2.9) ‰, which is within the error consistent with contemporaneous atmospheric values or with emissions from seeping reservoirs of natural gas. In contrast, our hydrogen isotopic measurements on NGRIP samples reveal a very light δD-CH₄(xs) value (Keeling y-intercept weighted mean) of (-326 ± 57) ‰ and slightly outside of the field of a thermogenic origin (see Fig. 11). The value is similar to the estimate by Lee et al. (2020), which, however, lies inside the field of a thermogenic origin (see Fig. 11). While both the low CH₄/(C₂H₆+C₃H₈) ratio and the δ¹³C-CH₄(xs) could be indicative of a thermogenic source (A1), the light δD-CH₄(xs) signature is far away from the atmospheric δD-CH₄ value and is borderline in line with typical δD-CH₄ values of a thermogenic origin. Hence, our δD-CH₄(xs) values exclude the atmospheric adsorption scenario A2 and put a question mark after the seep adsorption scenario A1.

For the seep adsorption scenario A1 to work the dust particles on which the thermogenic gas adsorbed are not allowed to experience any contact with liquid water prior to the analysis in the lab. In other words, if the particles get in contact with liquid water after the adsorption step, the adsorbed alkanes would desorb from the particles as they do it in the laboratory during melting. Given the occurrence of wet/dry cycles in the source area (Ruth et al., 2007), we question the plausibility of scenario A1. Moreover, we expect the characteristic desorption time to differ between the three alkanes, which would be in contradiction to the observation that the alkane ratios in the 1st and 2nd extraction are the same within the error limits.
Figure 11: Diagrams of genetic fields for natural gas adopted from Milkov and Etiope (2018). (a) Genetic diagram of $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ versus CH$_4$/(C$_2$H$_6$+C$_3$H$_8$). Typical atmospheric values are indicated by a grey-shaded area, NGRIP values obtained from this study with a pink dot. (b) Methane genetic diagram of $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ versus $\delta$D-CH$_4$. Values for cellulose (C), lignin (L) and pectin (P) from Vigano et al. (2009) and mean values for C3 and C4 plants, respectively, from studies by Keppler et al. (2006) and Vigano et al. (2009) are added.

(2) Microbial production
The second process that we take into consideration is the microbial production of excess alkanes through methanogenic microbes. Here we must again differentiate between two scenarios: a microbial production can either take place in the ice sheet itself (in situ) by extremophile microbes. This process requires that in situ produced excess alkanes are then adsorbed onto dust particles in the ice and subsequently slowly desorbed during extraction when in contact with liquid water (M1). Or the production takes place during the melt extraction when methanogenic microbes can metabolize in liquid water (in extractu; M2). Lee et al. (2020) already excluded a “simple” in situ production of excess CH$_4$ (microbial in situ production in the ice without an adsorption-desorption process; M0) and this option will therefore not be further discussed here.
The second part of a potential M1 process, the adsorption of the microbially produced excess alkanes onto dust particles in the ice and the subsequent desorption during extraction, remains difficult to assess. A selective adsorption of the in situ produced alkanes on mineral dust in the ice requires that the in situ production is taking place on the dust particles themselves, which can be questioned but cannot be ruled out. However, our ratios of excess methane/ethane/propane in NGRIP and GRIP samples add another piece of corroborating evidence that excess alkanes are not produced microbially. The main microbial production process of methane, the decomposition of organic precursors in an anaerobic environment by archaea, also co-produces ethane and propane, however only in marginal amounts. The typical methanogenesis yields >200 times more methane than ethane and propane (Bernard et al., 1977; Milkov and Etiope, 2018) while we find a molar ratio of methane to ethane to propane of 14:2:1 in our samples. This renders a microbial production pathway (in situ and in extractu, i.e. M1 and M2) unlikely. Moreover, a microbial production of CH$_4$ is unlikely in view of the $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs) signature which is too heavy for microbial CH$_4$.

Similar to our argument made for the pure desorption hypothesis, the constant excess alkane ratio in the second and first extraction is difficult to reconcile with an expected different desorption lifetime for the three alkanes.

Apart from these quantitative limitations of microbial CH$_4$ in situ production in ice, there is contradicting evidence from the “microbial inhibition experiment” by Lee et al. (2020) also for microbial production of alkanes during extraction. Lee et al. (2020) tested whether biological CH$_4$(xs) production in the meltwater was inhibited when the ice core samples were treated with HgCl$_2$. As CH$_4$(xs) was still observed in the poisoned samples and as it seems quite unlikely that microbes are resistant to HgCl$_2$, this experiment questions the hypothesis of microbially produced CH$_4$(xs) also during extraction (in extractu).

We conclude that regardless of the production pathway, in situ or in extractu, the fingerprint of the produced excess alkanes in our samples (heavy $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs) signature and low CH$_4$/($C_2$H$_6$+$C_3$H$_8$) ratio) essentially rules out a microbial source and another (abiotic?) process for excess alkane production is likely to exist.

(3) Abiotic/ chemical production

In this last section we consider an abiotic or chemical process to be responsible for the observed excess alkanes, where excess alkanes would be produced through the abiotic decomposition of
labile organic compounds in the meltwater (C2). Based on the same arguments presented in the
previous section for a microbial in situ production, we also question an abiotic in situ production
in the ice (C1) as it would require the quantitative adsorption of the in situ produced alkanes
onto mineral dust particles but not the atmospheric CH₄ that is available in the ice otherwise.
However, as the location of an in situ excess CH₄ production in the ice is not the same as the
location of the bubble or clathrates in the ice, this argument is not able to exclude this
hypothesis. However, given the age of the ice that allows for permeation of gases on the grain
scale and the recrystallization of the ice during that time, which both could bring the
atmospheric CH₄ in contact with the dust particles, we feel this process is less plausible than a
potential C2 mechanism. Moreover (as mentioned before), in view of the expected different
desorption characteristics of the three alkanes we would expect different alkane rations in the
1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ extraction, which is not the case. Accordingly, a direct abiotic production during the
melt process appears to be more likely than a desorption process.

Organic precursors for this abiotic production during extraction could be any organic matter
(either microbial or plant-derived). As the amount of excess alkanes is tightly coupled to the
amount of dust, we assume that these organic compounds are attached to dust particles. This
“docking” of the organic precursor onto the mineral dust could happen already in the dust
source region involving organic material available at the surface. Or it could happen by
adhering of volatile organic molecules or secondary organic aerosols from the atmosphere to
the mineral dust aerosol either before deflation at the source region or during transport to
Greenland.

We consider this pathway plausible, as in recent years the prevailing paradigm that methane is
only produced by methanogenic archaea under strictly anaerobic conditions has been
challenged. Several experimental studies demonstrated that methane can also be released from
dried soils (Hurkuck et al., 2012; Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013; Gu et al., 2016), fresh
plant matter and dry leaf litter (Keppler et al., 2006; Vigano et al., 2008, 2009, 2010; Bruhn et
al., 2009; Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011), different kinds of living eukaryotes (plants, animals
and fungi) (Liu et al., 2015), single organic structural components (McLeod et al., 2008;
Messenger et al., 2009; Althoff et al., 2014) and in fact under aerobic conditions. Most of these
studies focused on methane, however, there is also evidence for simultaneous formation of other
short-chain hydrocarbons like ethane and propane (McLeod et al., 2008; Derendorp et al., 2010,
2011). At least three mechanisms have been identified to be relevant: i) photo-degradation, ii)
thermal degradation, or iii) degradation by the reaction with a reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Schade et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2017). Common to all three pathways is a functional group (for example a methyl or ethyl group) that is cleaved from the organic precursor molecule. Key parameters that control the production of abiotic methane are mainly temperature, UV radiation, water/moisture, and the type of organic precursor material (Vigano et al., 2008; Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011; Hurkuck et al., 2012; Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013, 2017).

Recent findings demonstrated the large variety of potential organic precursors for abiotic trace gas formation. For the formation of methane, the plant structural components pectin and lignin have been identified in many studies as a precursor in different plant materials. Pectin and lignin contain methoxyl-groups in two different chemical types, ester methoxyl (present in pectin) and ether methoxyl (present in lignin) (Keppler et al., 2006, 2008; McLeod et al., 2008; Messenger et al., 2009; Bruhn et al., 2009; Vigano et al., 2008; Hurkuck et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017). Ester methyl groups of pectin were also discovered as precursor for ethane formation (McLeod et al., 2008). Overall, pectin makes up a large fraction of the primary cell wall mass of many plants, thus, representing a large reservoir available as organic precursor for abiotic alkane formation (Keppler et al., 2006; Mohnen et al., 2008; Vigano et al., 2008, 2010; McLeod et al., 2008), and may be present in sufficient quantities in our ice core samples attached to mineral dust particles. CH4 production was also detected from cellulose even though it does not contain methoxyl groups suggesting that other carbon moieties of polysaccharides might allow abiotic CH4 formation (Keppler et al., 2006; Vigano et al., 2008). In addition, polyunsaturated fatty acids in plant membranes are suggested to play a key role not only in the formation of methane but also for ethane and propane (John and Curtis, 1977; Dumelin and Tappel, 1977; Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011). Further, sulfur-bound methyl groups of methionine are an important precursor for abiotic CH4 formation in fungi (Althoff et al., 2014).

Considerably different emission rates were found for the same amount but different type of organic substances leading to the conclusion that abiotic emissions are strongly dependent on the type of organic precursor material or single structural components (Keppler et al., 2006; McLeod et al., 2008; Vigano et al., 2008; Messenger et al., 2009; Hurkuck et al., 2012). Other factors such as leaf and cell wall structure (McLeod and Newsham, 2007; Watanabe et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2015) and the organic carbon content (Hurkuck et al., 2012) are suggested to have an important influence on this process, too.
To explain the observed excess alkanes in dust-rich Greenland ice core samples by an abiotic
production through the decomposition of labile organic compounds requires adequate quantities
of organic precursors to be present within the ice core samples. Certainly, such material is
present in Greenland ice, but currently, there is no record on the amount and type of organic
substances in NGRIP and GRIP ice available. We have some limited information from
occasional Greenland ice core samples in which different types of organic substances were
detected (Giorio et al., 2018, and references therein), but it does not allow for an overarching
interpretation for our ice samples. A NGRIP record on formaldehyde and a GRIP record on
acetate and formate exists (Fuhrer et al., 1997), which suggest lower levels during the glacial,
but as we do not know which organic precursors lead to the excess CH₄ productions this
observation is only of limited value.

We may also question whether a perfect record of eligible precursor molecules could exist at
all. As we observe that precursor substances are labile and quickly decompose when in contact
with liquid water, a direct measurement of these substances might not be possible but only for
similar, non-reactive substances, which are then not qualified as precursors for the reaction
observed. The problems of sampling, analysis and interpretation of organic material in polar
ice are well summarized and expounded in Giorio et al. (2018).

In any case, it appears likely that the mineral dust carries along soil organic matter or plant
residues or accumulates organic aerosols as a result of organic aerosol aging during transport.
In our data we see a relationship between the amount of mineral dust within the ice core samples
and the amount of excess alkanes. As the amount of excess alkanes per Ca²⁺ (or mass of dust)
is variable, this suggests that mineral dust is just a carrier for (a variable amount of) organic
substances but does not account for the production of excess alkanes itself. The dust content
within the ice core sample can therefore only serve as a rough estimate of organic precursor
availability and whether an abiotic production from organic precursor substances is likely to
occur during extraction.

Again, our experiments can shed some light on the viability of this pathway for excess alkane
production. If we assume that the dust-related organic matter in the ice represents a reservoir
available for an abiotic production, then the decomposition continues until all functional groups
are cleaved from their organic precursor molecules and released as excess alkanes. Once the
reservoir is emptied excess alkane production ceases (Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011). In line, we
interpret that the decrease in the amount of measured excess alkanes from the 1st to the 2nd extraction may result from an exhaustion of the precursor reservoir. The reaction time is slow enough to allow for the continuing production during the second extraction but too slow for a detectable production during continuous flow analysis of CH₄, where the water phase is present only for less than two minutes before gas extraction. The significantly reduced production during the 2nd extraction in our samples shows that the time scale for this process is hours (see Fig. C1) until the reservoir of functional groups is depleted. We note that this implies that the amount of excess alkanes is strongly dependent on the time span when liquid water is in contact with the dust, which varies among the methods used for CH₄ analyses. Thus, any excess CH₄ in measurements from different labs performed under different conditions may differ.

To explain an abiotic alkane production, certain conducive boundary conditions must be met. The most important parameters that control non-microbial trace gas formation are temperature and UV radiation. This was demonstrated in many field and laboratory experiments (Keppler et al., 2006; McLeod et al., 2008; Vigano et al., 2008, 2009; Messenger et al., 2009; Bruhn et al., 2009; Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011; Hurkuck et al., 2012; Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2017). Generally, increasing temperatures lead to exponentially increasing CH₄ emissions (Vigano et al., 2008; Bruhn et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2015). The same behaviour was observed for ethane and propane with very low emissions at ambient temperatures (20-30°C) and a maximum at 70°C (McLeod et al., 2008; Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011). At constant temperatures emission rates decreased over time, which is at high temperatures on the timescale of hours and at ambient temperatures of months. Even after months, some production was observed, pointing to a slowly depleting reservoir of organic precursors (Derendorp et al., 2010, 2011). Increasing emissions observed at temperatures >40°C were also used as indicator to exclude the possibility of enzymatic activity, as the denaturation of enzymes would lead to rapidly declining emissions at higher temperatures (Keppler et al., 2006; Derendorp et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2015). We note that our sample extraction takes place at 0°C or a few °C above, hence, temperature conditions during the extraction are not conducive of the type of abiotic alkane production as observed in the studies listed above. Whether the cool temperature of the meltwater during extraction inhibits abiotic reaction is difficult to say. Derendorp et al. (2010, 2011) observed a much lower temperature dependency of C2-C5 hydrocarbon emissions from ground leaves than whole leaves, which might also apply to our samples with very fine fragments of organic substances attached to dust particles.
Besides the strong relationship to temperature also UV irradiation seems to have a substantial effect on an abiotic production. Studies on irradiated samples (dry and fresh plant matter, plant structural components) showed a linear increase in methane emissions, while UV-B irradiation seems to have a much stronger effect on the release compared to UV-A (Vigano et al., 2008; McLeod et al., 2008; Bruhn et al., 2009; Jugold et al., 2012). The influence of visible light (400-700 nm), however, seems controversial (Keppler et al., 2006; Bruhn et al., 2009; Austin et al., 2016). Further, samples that were heated and irradiated show a different emission curve than just heated samples, indicating that irradiation changes the temperature dependency, in turn pointing to the fact that different chemical pathways exist (Vigano et al., 2008).

In dark experiments on plant material at different temperatures CH$_4$ emissions were still observed, while again higher temperatures revealed much higher emissions, emphasizing the strong temperature dependency also without UV irradiation (Vigano et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2008; Bruhn et al., 2009). The release of ethane along with methane from pectin was also stimulated under UV radiation (McLeod et al., 2008).

Regarding our measurements, the sample vessel in the $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ device is encased by a UV blocker foil absorbing the shortwave (<600 nm) emissions from the heating bulbs when melting the ice sample, while in the $\delta^{1}$D-CH$_4$ device the sample vessel is completely shielded from light (Sect. 2.2 and 2.3). Two NGRIP ice core samples were measured with the $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ device in the dark (“dark extraction”) showing the same amount of excess alkanes as the regular measurements at day light. This indicates that light >600 nm has no influence on an in extractu reaction during our measurements.

We stress that although we can exclude a direct UV effect during sample extraction, it is possible that UV irradiation during dust aerosol transport to Greenland and within the upper snow layer after deposition until the snow gets buried into deeper layers may precondition organic precursors attached to mineral dust to allow for alkane production to occur during extraction. In particular, the first step of the reaction (excitation of the homolytic bond of a precursor compound) may start already in the atmosphere or in the upper firn layer where energy from UV radiation is available. Within the ice sheet the reaction may be paused (“frozen reaction”) and the total reaction pathway is only completed during the melting process when liquid water is present.

Finally, we consider the role of reactive oxygen species in an abiotic production pathway. ROS are widely produced in metabolic pathways during biological activity but also during
photochemical reactions with mineral oxides (Apel and Hirt, 2004; Messenger et al., 2009; Georgiou et al., 2015). Through their high oxidative potential ROS are capable to cleave functional groups from precursor compounds. Several studies have demonstrated this mechanism for the production of abiotic CH₄ in soils and plant matter (McLeod et al., 2008; Messenger et al., 2009; Althoff et al., 2010, 2014; Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2011, 2013) and for other trace gases such as CO₂, ethane, and ethylene from plant pectins (McLeod et al., 2008). UV radiation or thermal energy has no direct influence on the degradation process by the reaction with ROS, however, it might also be a stimulating factor and evoke further indirect reactions. For instance, UV radiation can lead to changes in plants which in turn lead to ROS generation (Liu et al., 2015). It was demonstrated that UV radiation induces the formation of organic photosensitizers or photo-catalysts which increase CH₄ emissions from pectin (Messenger et al., 2009) and clay minerals. For example, the formation of OH from montmorillonite and other clay minerals upon UV (and visible light) irradiation shows that clays might play a significant role in the oxidation of organic compounds on their surface in different environments (Katagi, 1990; Wu et al., 2008; Kibanova et al., 2011).

It has been proven that the species type and the overall amount of ROS available for, or involved in a reaction, has a significant effect on the amount of emissions through such a process (Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013, 2017). For the production of methane (and ethane), hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) and hydroxyl radicals (OH) have been proven to be the prominent species (Messenger et al., 2009; Althoff et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2011, 2013; Jugold et al., 2012; McLeod et al., 2008). Such ROS could be already present in the snow and ice or being produced in the meltwater. For example, H₂O₂ can be unambiguously detected in Greenland Holocene ice using CFA, however, H₂O₂ in dusty glacial ice is mostly below the detection limit, likely due to oxidation reactions in the ice sheet or during melt extraction.

In summary, we believe that in our case of excess alkane production/release in the meltwater at low temperatures and without any UV irradiation, the ROS-induced mechanism appears possible. In experiments with plant pectin McLeod et al. (2008) observed not only CH₄ but also ethane and found a methane to ethane production ratio of around 5 which is similar to our value of around 7. Accordingly, we see that a ROS-induced production pathway has the potential to explain excess alkanes in our samples, however, little is known about ROS chemistry in ice cores in particular for reactions with organic precursors and more research is needed to understand the role of ROS in organic decomposition in ice. Another alternative to the two-
stage reaction pathway with ROS would be a reaction catalyzed in the meltwater by dust-derived transition metals. This has been observed for example for the oxidation of SO₂ in water-activated aerosol particles (Harris et al., 2013), but to our knowledge it has not been described in the literature for alkane production via organic precursors so far. Accordingly, we can only speculate on this pathway at the moment.

Another key parameter influencing all abiotic pathways might be the presence of liquid water or moisture. In experiments testing the hypothesis of non-microbial CH₄ formation in different soil samples, it was demonstrated that the addition of water/moisture led to an up to eight-fold increase in CH₄ emissions (Hurkuck et al., 2012; Jugold et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013). It is hypothesized that the presence of liquid water or moisture stimulates (in addition to heating or UV radiation) the cleaving process of a functional group from the primary precursor compound and therefore increases the production of CH₄. However, it seems that the stimulating effect by water cannot be generalized, as Wang et al. (2013) emphasized that this process is highly dependent on “water of proper amount”. In their experiments, CH₄ emissions from peat and grassland soil samples treated with a varying amount of water in oxia–anoxia cycles at 70°C were measured. They observed that under both aerobic and anaerobic conditions water does not always stimulate non-microbial CH₄ release and that too much water can also suppress CH₄ emissions. Wang et al. (2013) observed differences between different soil samples in response to a varying water content indicating that the water effect is different for different precursors. With respect to our observations on NGRIP and GRIP samples the presence of water seems to be a fundamental parameter influencing the second step of a “frozen reaction” in extractu process, where the duration of water presence plays an important role.

A final puzzle piece for a possible abiotic methane production comes from our dual isotopic fingerprints of the excess CH₄. As illustrated in Fig. 11 (right panel) our δD-CH₄(nn) signature lies well within the distribution of the hydrogen isotopic composition of CH₄ produced from potential organic precursors. For δ¹³C our values lie outside and on the heavier side of the isotopic carbon signature spectrum.

We conclude that despite our inability to pinpoint the exact organic precursors that lead to abiotic excess alkane production during the melt extraction of our ice samples at this point, both the ratio of the excess alkanes as well as the isotopic signature of excess CH₄ is generally in
line with this pathway. Thus, without further contradicting evidence from targeted studies on organic precursors in ice core samples and their chemical degradation, we believe that the ROS-induced production pathway is to date the most likely explanation for the observed excess alkanes during extraction. However, we cannot completely rule out an adsorption-desorption process of thermogenic gas on dust particles.

Table 1: Overview of the different hypotheses explaining the possible sources for excess alkanes (as illustrated in Figure 10) in relation to our experimental and analytical observations. A green checkmark indicates that the observation is in line with the respective mechanism, a black cross indicates that the observation is in not line with the respective mechanism. A grey shaded area means that this observation does not apply or does not affect the respective mechanism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) ADSORPTION-DESORPTION OF THERMGENIC/ATMOSPHERIC GAS</th>
<th>(2) MICROBIAL PRODUCTION</th>
<th>(3) ABIOTIC/CHEMICAL PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation to Ca$^{2+}$/mineral dust</td>
<td>✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkane pattern</td>
<td>✓  ×  ×  ×  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA evidence</td>
<td>✓  ×  ×  ×  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs)</td>
<td>×  ✓  ×  ×  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs)</td>
<td>✓  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs) estimated by Lee et al. (2020)</td>
<td>✓  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisoning experiment by Lee et al. (2020)</td>
<td>✓  ×  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusions and Outlook

The comparison of methane records from ice cores samples measured with different extraction techniques requires careful consideration and interpretation. Non-atmospheric methane contributions to the total methane concentration were discovered in specific Greenland ice core sections pointing to a process occurring during the wet extraction. To better assess this finding, we measured new records of [methane], [ethane], [propane], $\delta$D-CH$_4$, and $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ on discrete NGRIP and GRIP ice core samples using two different wet extraction systems. With our new
data we confirm the production of CH$_4$ in the meltwater and quantify its dual isotopic signature. With the simultaneous detection of ethane and propane we discovered that these short-chain alkanes are co-produced in a fixed molar ratio pointing to a common production pathway. With our 2nd extraction we constrained the temporal dynamics of this process, which occurs on the timescale of hours.

Based on our new experimental data we provide an improved assessment of several potential mechanisms that could be relevant for the observed variations in NGRIP and GRIP ice samples. A microbial CH$_4$ production represents in principle an obvious candidate but regardless of whether this CH$_4$ is produced in situ or in extractu, several lines of evidence gained from our measurements (low CH$_4$/(C$_2$H$_6$+C$_3$H$_8$) ratio, heavy $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ signature) demonstrate that the fingerprint of the produced excess alkanes is unlikely to have a microbial source. Also an adsorption-desorption process of atmospheric or thermogenic CH$_4$ on dust particles does not match many of our observations and is therefore unlikely. However, with the current knowledge we cannot definitely exclude such an adsorption of thermogenic gas to be responsible for the observed excess alkane levels in our samples.

At present we favor to explain the formation of excess alkanes by abiotic decomposition of organic precursors during prolonged wet extraction. Such an abiotic source for methane and other short-chain alkanes was discovered previously in other studies (Keppler et al., 2006; Vigano et al., 2008, 2009, 2010; Messenger et al., 2009; Hurkuck et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013, and others listed above) using different organic samples, e.g. from plant or soil material, however, this process has not been connected to excess CH$_4$ production during ice core analyses. This process matches many of our observations and such a mechanism can be responsible for excess alkanes in Greenland ice core samples. To better assess a potential abiotic production process in ice analyses the most important questions to solve in the future are: What are the specific precursor substances? Which parameters control an abiotic production during wet extractions? How does the fixed molar ratio between methane, ethane, and propane come about in this process? And finally, in which way is this excess alkane production causally related to the amount of mineral dust within the ice sample?

Identifying a specific reaction pathway that leads to the short-chain alkanes with their observed ratios would certainly benefit from identifying targeted organic precursor substances in the ice. However, detecting these postulated organic precursors in the ice core is inherently difficult as...
these compounds must be very labile in water as our experiments demonstrated that after about 30 min only a fraction of these compounds remains in the meltwater while the majority already reacted to excess alkanes. Future studies may also focus on further isotopic measurements ($\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ and $\delta$D-CH$_4$) including isotope labeling experiments providing an option to unambiguously detect methane produced during the measurement procedure in a commonly used wet extraction technique, and again, to uncover potential reaction mechanisms for CH$_4$(xs) production.

To better assess the viability of the alternative hypothesis of a release of previously adsorbed alkanes from dust particles (scenario A1 and A2) during the extraction, dust particles from the Taklamakan or Gobi desert need to be tested whether they contain relevant amounts of adsorbed alkanes that are released when in contact with liquid water. A second step could be to expose such dust samples to high levels of alkanes to mimic the adsorption process of natural gas seeps. It also needs to be shown that the adsorbed alkanes stay adsorbed on the dust particles for a prolonged time (months, ideally years) after exposing the particles to ambient air and that droplet and ice nucleation during aerosol transport does not lead to a loss of the previously adsorbed CH$_4$. To quantify any isotopic fractionation involved with the ad- and desorption step, $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ and $\delta$D-CH$_4$ analyses will be most valuable.

Finally, our studies clearly show that the published Greenland ice core CH$_4$ record is biased high for selected (glacial, dust-rich) time intervals and needs to be corrected for the excess CH$_4$ contribution. This is particularly important for studies of the IPD in CH$_4$ and stable isotope ratios of methane. Methodological ways to remedy excess methane (and ethane and propane) in future measurements of atmospheric [CH$_4$] from air trapped in ice cores could be to use continuous online CH$_4$ measurements, which apparently avoid sizeable CH$_4$(xs) production. But also dry extraction methods and sublimation techniques for discrete samples, which are expected to avoid in extractu production by evading the melting phase, could be used. Finally, our own $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ device, which allows to measure $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ as well as methane, ethane, and propane concentrations from the same sample, can be used to correct the measured CH$_4$ values making use of the co-production of the other two alkanes.

It is clear that CH$_4$(xs) needs to be corrected for when interpreting the already existing discrete CH$_4$ records and its stable isotopes in dust-rich intervals in Greenland ice core samples. Impact of CH$_4$(xs) on interpreting past atmospheric [CH$_4$] will only slightly affect radiative forcing
reconstructions, however, it will have a significant effect on the assessment of the global CH$_4$

cycle and in particular on the hemispheric CH$_4$ source distribution which is based on the IPD.

We observe that in some intervals CH$_4$(xs) is in the same range as the previously reconstructed
IPD implying that correcting for CH$_4$(xs) will lower the IPD considerably and hence lower also
the relative contribution of northern hemispheric sources at those times. We see that there is the
urgent need to reliably revisit Greenland ice core CH$_4$ records for the excess CH$_4$ contribution
and in future work we aim to establish an applicable correction for excess methane (CH$_4$(xs),
$\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$(xs), $\delta$D-CH$_4$(xs)) in existing records using the co-production ratios of methane, ethane,
and propane, the isotopic mass balance of excess and atmospheric CH$_4$ in ice core samples as
well as the overall correlation of excess CH$_4$ with the mineral dust content in the ice.
Figure A1: Detailed data overview for the neighbouring NGRIP bags 3331 & 3332. Bag-specific overview of several parameters measured for each sample in this bag: methane, ethane, propane, Ca\textsuperscript{2+}, mineral dust mass, TAC (Total Air Content), $\delta^{13}$C-CH\textsubscript{4}, indicated at the NGRIP depth (bottom axis) and the AICC2012 gas age (upper top axis) and the GICC05 ice age (lower top axis). The mineral dust record is taken from Ruth et al. (2003), the Ca\textsuperscript{2+} record from Erhardt et al. (2022).
Figure A2: **Detailed data overview for NGRIP bag #3453.** Bag-specific overview of parameters measured for each sample in this bag: methane, ethane, propane, Ca\(^{2+}\), mineral dust mass, TAC (Total Air Content), \(\delta^{13}\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CH}_4\), indicated at the NGRIP depth (bottom axis) and the AICC2012 gas age (upper top axis) and the GICC05 ice age (lower top axis). The mineral dust record is taken from Ruth et al. (2003), the Ca\(^{2+}\) record from Erhardt et al. (2022).
Figure A3: **Detailed data overview for NGRIP bag 3515.** Bag-specific overview of parameters measured for each sample in this bag: methane, ethane, propane, $\text{Ca}^{2+}$, mineral dust mass, TAC (Total Air Content), $\delta^{13}$C-$\text{CH}_4$, indicated at the NGRIP depth (bottom axis) and the AICC2012 gas age (upper top axis) and the GICC05 ice age (lower top axis). The mineral dust record is taken from Ruth et al. (2003), the $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ record from Erhardt et al. (2022). Note that there is a gap in the $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ record which was corrected by a fill routine for the analysis of the two measured samples at this depth.
In this section we provide background information of how we determined the blank contributions for our alkane measurements for the different measurement modes. Overall, our strategy is similar to the measurements which were published earlier in 2014 (Schmitt et al., 2014). Here we include more measurements performed since then with our $\delta^{13}$C-CH$_4$ device. Following the classic usage, blank contributions are related to the measurement device itself rather than to the sample, thus we report the measured values of the species as absolute amount in pmol with respect to a measurement procedure (sample run). To compare these absolute values with the classic units of species concentration in the air for an ice sample in ppb, Fig. B1 has secondary axes (grey) for the species concentrations in ppb for an assumed sample size of air of 14 mL STP (our typical ice core sample size).

Since our extraction device is at vacuum conditions, a blank contribution from leaks that allow ambient air with relatively high ethane and propane concentrations to be collected together with our sample seems the most straightforward risk. To quantify this leak contribution, we routinely
perform so-called “He over ice” runs where a helium flow is passed over the unmelted ice core sample and the species are trapped on the cold activated carbon trap (see details in Schmitt et al., 2014). The trapping duration is the same as for the 1st extraction, thus this “He over ice” run mimics the contribution for the 1st extraction. As can be seen in Fig. B1, for ethane this “leak contribution” is typically <0.1 ppb, thus small compared to concentrations we see for dust-rich Greenland ice samples with about 6 ppb (see Fig. 5). However, this “He over ice” does not capture the actual melting process of the ice sample and represents the lowest blank boundary for our ice core samples. To mimic the full procedure an ice core samples experiences, we run a limited number of artificial gas-free ice samples (blue circles in Fig. B1). The ethane values obtained for these artificial ice sample is around 0.3 ppb and thus considerably higher than for the procedure without melting. This indicates that the presence of liquid water may lead to a desorption or production of alkanes from the inner walls of our extraction vessel. Alternatively, our artificial ice still contains traces of alkanes. So far, we could not solve this issue and more experiments are needed. A much larger data set on the upper boundary of the extraction blank comes from routine measurements of Antarctic ice core samples with the primary target of stable isotope analyses of CH₄ and N₂O. These Antarctic samples cover glacial and interglacial time intervals and the measured ethane values are typically around 0.55 ppb. Since the reconstructed atmospheric background for ethane in Antarctic ice is lower with values in the range of 0.1 – 0.15 ppb for the late Holocene (Nicewonger et al., 2018), a realistic blank contribution for our 1st extraction is on the order of 0.4 to 0.5 ppb. An additional constraint comes from five stadial GRIP samples from the time interval 28-38 kyears (green circle in Fig. B1) that have very low Ca²⁺ content (< 50 ppb) and thus have likely a negligible contribution from a dust-related in extractu component. The measured ethane concentration from these GRIP samples is very similar to the Antarctic ice core samples. One possible explanation would be that the atmospheric ethane concentration during the glacial was similar and low for both hemispheres. Regardless of the individual contributions, for our considerations of dust-related in extractu production in Greenland ice cores the upper estimate for the sum of atmospheric background and blank contribution is about 0.55 ppb (about 0.35 pmol) for ethane. Since the ethane to propane ratio for these non-dust contributions is about 1.5, the corresponding propane values are lower by that value. Importantly, since the ethane to propane ratio for our dust-related production is with 2.2 rather similar, its impact on the calculated ethane to propane ratio (e.g. Fig. 4) is very minor and small within the error estimate. For that reason, we did not correct our Greenland measurements for any blank contribution and showed the values as measured along with measurements of Antarctic ice cores samples which serve as first-order blank estimates.
Figure C1: **Temporal dynamics of excess ethane production in GRIP ice core samples.** Cumulative ethane amount from the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd extraction in relation to the time available for a potential reaction in the meltwater during each extraction. We assume a first-order reaction kinetic as model for our observations where the mean half-life time ($\tau$) and standard deviations are calculated for each GRIP sample from the compilation of all 1000 iterations of our Monte Carlo approach. The numbered samples can also be found in Fig. 7a.

The general equation to describe a first-order chemical reaction or exponential decay process (e.g. release of adsorbed gas from the adsorbent) is Eqn. (1).

$$N(t) = N_0 \times e(-t/\tau)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

With $N_0$ being the total amount of substance (reactant) at the start of the reaction. $N(t)$ equals the remaining amount of the reactant at time $t$, and $t$ being time of reaction and $\tau$, the mean lifetime of the reaction. In our case, we cannot determine $N(t)$ neither do we know $N_0$ but we experimentally determined the cumulative amount of the product, $P_{\text{cum}(t)}$, at three different times as our observable quantity. Thus, in Eqn. 2 we define $P_{\text{cum}(t)}$ as the difference between $N_0$ and $N(t)$. 
Replacing $N(t)$ in Eqn. 1 with our definition in Eqn. 2 we obtain Eqn. 3, which contains two fit parameters, $N_0$ and $\tau$, as well as our observable parameter $P_{\text{cum}(t)}$, i.e. the cumulative amount of alkane for a certain time step.

$$P_{\text{cum}(t)} = N_0 - N(t)$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$P_{\text{cum}(t)} = N_0 - N_0 \cdot e^{-t/\tau}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

For the five GRIP samples we have three consecutive measurements each, the 1$^{\text{st}}$, 2$^{\text{nd}}$, and 3$^{\text{rd}}$ extraction. The time dependent $P_{\text{cum}(t)}$ values are as follows: $P_{\text{cum}0}$ is defined as 0, representing the state of the unmelted ice sample before liquid water is present. $P_{\text{cum}1}$ is the measured amount from the 1$^{\text{st}}$ extraction (ice extraction) minus the estimated contribution from the atmosphere and minus the blank contribution for the 1$^{\text{st}}$ extraction. $P_{\text{cum}2}$ is the sum of $P_{\text{cum}1}$ and the value from the 2$^{\text{nd}}$ extraction minus the blank contribution of the 2$^{\text{nd}}$ extraction. Similarly, $P_{\text{cum}3}$ is the sum of $P_{\text{cum}2}$ and the value from the 3$^{\text{rd}}$ extraction minus the blank for the 3$^{\text{rd}}$ extraction.

To account for the uncertainties of the involved measurements and corrections, we added normally distributed errors to the following parameters (measured value $\pm$ 5%; blank $\pm$ 20%; atmospheric contribution $\pm$ 50%), and we also assigned an uncertainty of 5 min to the time to account for variations of the melting speed of the ice and delays between the individual measurements (1$^{\text{st}}$, 2$^{\text{nd}}$, 3$^{\text{rd}}$).

For the fitting procedure we used the Matlab built-in nonlinear least-squares solver called ‘lsqcurvefit’ and performed 1000 runs where we varied the above-mentioned input parameters. The output of the function are the two fit parameters, i.e., $N_0$ and $\tau$. From the 1000 runs we calculated the mean and the 1 sigma standard deviation of the lifetime.

Note, this approach can only be suitably applied to ethane and propane as the past atmospheric contribution for these gases in the 1$^{\text{st}}$ extraction is typically small against the excess contribution for dust-rich samples. For our five GRIP samples, where we have three consecutive extractions, four samples are considered “dust-rich” and are suitable to provide robust estimates for $\tau$. In contrast, one sample is from an interstadial period with very low dust content and thus shows negligible production of alkanes in all three extractions. While this sample is not suited to provide robust estimates for $\tau$, this sample allows to assess the first-order plausibility of the blank correction and the assumed atmospheric background for ethane for the 1$^{\text{st}}$ extraction.
(sample number 1, bottom-most sample). For a sample without any *in extractu* production, the cumulative curve should be flat at around 0 which is the case within our error estimates.
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