

ATMOSPHERE

Sunlight drives the abiotic formation of nitrous oxide in fresh and marine waters

Elizabeth Leon-Palmero^{1,2*}†, Rafael Morales-Baquero¹, Bo Thamdrup², Carolin Löscher², Isabel Reche^{1,3}

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is a potent greenhouse gas and the main stratospheric ozone-depleting agent, yet its sources are not well resolved. In this work, we experimentally show a N₂O production pathway not previously considered in greenhouse gas budgets, which we name photochemodenitrification. Sunlight induces substantial and consistent N₂O production under oxic abiotic conditions in fresh and marine waters. We measured photochemical N₂O production rates using isotope tracers and determined that nitrite is the main substrate and that nitrate can also contribute after being photoreduced to nitrite. Additionally, this N₂O production was strongly correlated to the radiation dose. Photochemodenitrification exceeded biological N₂O production in surface waters. Although previously overlooked, this process may contribute considerably to global N₂O emissions through its occurrence in fresh and marine surface waters.

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is the main stratospheric ozone-depleting agent (1) and one of the strongest greenhouse gases—about 273 times as potent as carbon dioxide (2). Since preindustrial times, the concentration of atmospheric N₂O has risen by 23% (2), in a trend strongly correlated to the higher bioavailability of reactive nitrogen (N) in the environment, largely owing to industrial N fixation by the Haber–Bosch process (3). A considerable portion of the anthropogenic N applied to land as fertilizers enters rivers, estuaries, and continental shelves, which boosts the production and emission of N₂O in these aquatic systems (4–6). These emissions resulting from N inputs—estimated to 0.5 Tg of N year⁻¹ for the 2007 to 2016 period—exceed natural emissions from inland waters, estuaries, and coastal zones [0.3 Tg N year⁻¹ (7)]. The rate of increase in atmospheric N₂O during the past decade was even faster than predicted by the Intergovern-

mental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (8), which emphasizes the need for better identification of the sources of N₂O to reduce uncertainty in climate assessments and optimize mitigation strategies (7).

Ammonia oxidation and denitrification are the microbial processes that are assumed to control the N₂O budget in aquatic ecosystems. Ammonia-oxidizing archaea (AOA) and bacteria (AOB) release N₂O in well-oxygenated waters as a side product during ammonia oxidation to nitrite (NO₂⁻) (9). N₂O is also an intermediate product during denitrification of NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ to N₂O and N₂, a process that is usually coupled to organic matter oxidation and occurs under oxygen-depleted conditions (10). Both microbial processes have been extensively studied in the water column and sediments of aquatic ecosystems. Abiotic processes, such as chemodenitrification, can also contribute to the production of N₂O in soils and marine sediments (11, 12). Dur-

ing chemodenitrification, NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ are abiotically reduced to N₂O coupled to the oxidation of metals, such as Fe (II), or organic matter (11). However, the abiotic production of N₂O within the water column of fresh waters and marine ecosystems remains largely unexplored, particularly in surface waters. Processes occurring in the upper meters of the well-mixed layer hold the potential for a disproportionate contribution to N₂O emissions owing to their closeness to the atmosphere, which may facilitate the air-sea exchange of N₂O when oversaturated. In this work, we describe the discovery of a photochemical source of N₂O, which we named photochemodenitrification. We detected this reaction, mediated by sunlight, that uses NO₂⁻ as substrate in two freshwater reservoirs and two coastal marine systems, demonstrating that it may represent an unrecognized but widespread process relevant to global budgets.

Photochemical formation of N₂O

In a previous study, we found recurrently higher N₂O emissions during the daytime versus during the nighttime during 24-hour flux measurement campaigns over the course of 2 years in two freshwater reservoirs in southeast Spain (Cubillas and Iznájar). Despite differences in magnitude among years and reservoirs, this pattern in N₂O emissions was consistent and significantly correlated to the solar cycle, with daytime emissions up to one order of magnitude greater than nighttime emissions (13). However, that pattern was inconsistent with classical microbial production through ammonia oxidation, which is in-

¹Departamento de Ecología, Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain. ²Nordsee, Department of Biology, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark. ³Research Unit Modeling Nature (MNat), Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain.
*Corresponding author. Email: el23@princeton.edu
†Present address: Department of Geosciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA.




Fig. 1. Effect of sunlight on N₂O production. Dissolved N₂O concentrations over time (i.e., daylight time/total incubation hours) in the incubation experiments 1 to 4. (A) Cubillas in June 2018, unfiltered water. (B) Cubillas in September 2018, unfiltered water. (C) Iznájar in September 2018, unfiltered water. (D) Cubillas in July 2021, filtered water (0.7 μm pore size). HgCl₂ (1 mmol liter⁻¹) was added in all experiments to inhibit biological activity. Bars represent the mean values ± standard

errors over the time course (t₀ to t₃), including dark controls (dark gray bars) and sunlight treatments (yellow bars). Sunlight exposure time/total incubation hours are shown (e.g., 15/24 hours). Note the different scales in the y axes. The significance of the sunlight treatments is included for each experiment: *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001. Rates are presented in table S2. More statistical details are provided in table S3.

hibited by light (14), or through denitrification, which requires oxygen depletion (15, 16). We hypothesized that sunlight may induce the photochemical production of N₂O in surface waters, boosting the fluxes during the daytime. To investigate this hypothesis, we first performed four incubation experiments, exposing surface water from Cubillas and Iznájar reservoirs to natural sunlight with inhibition of biological activity by the addition of HgCl₂ (experiments 1 to 4; table S1). We used ultraviolet (UV)-transparent quartz vials and included dark controls during the incubations. All experiments were conducted under natural, oxic conditions (more details are provided in the materials and methods and fig. S1). The incubation experiments performed during this study and the initial inorganic N pools are listed in table S1.

We detected a significant, consistent, and continuous increase in the N₂O concentration in the sunlight treatments in the four incubation experiments relative to the dark controls (Fig. 1; experiments 1 to 4). Photochemical N₂O production was detected in both the experiments performed using unfiltered (experiments 1 to 3) and filtered water (0.7 μm pore size; experiment 4), with rates varying from 1.01 ± 0.22 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in experiment 4 to 66.6 ± 15.1 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in experiment 2 (table S2). The photochemical N₂O production rate measured in experiment 4 was equivalent to 2.6 × 10⁻⁹ ± 5.5 × 10⁻¹⁰ nmol-N W⁻¹ photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and to 2.3 × 10⁻⁵ ± 4.6 × 10⁻⁶ nmol-N W⁻¹ UVB received. In relation to the in situ N₂O concentration, the daily relative increase varied from 3.8% (initial concentration = 13.4 nmol liter⁻¹) in experiment 4 to 39.3% (initial concentration = 84.6 nmol liter⁻¹) in experiment 2 (table S2), thus contributing substantially to the N₂O pool.

Previous studies in rivers have reported higher N₂O emissions or concentrations during the daytime versus the nighttime (17–20), although the opposite has also been shown (21, 22). These patterns have been attributed to changes in N cycling by biological activity and water temperature (17–21). Liu *et al.* (23) found that the seasonal pattern in N₂O fluxes in Antarctic lakes was positively related to daily radiation, concluding that the increase of daily radiation may favor photosynthesis and thus stimulate N₂O production from the decomposition of the algae. The experiments presented in this work indicate that solar radiation directly drives an abiotic production of N₂O that may represent an important source of N₂O to the atmosphere that has not been reported previously or considered in greenhouse gas budgets. Solar radiation, mostly in the UV band (280 to 400 nm), catalyzes many photochemical reactions in fresh and marine surface waters, including the decomposition of chromophoric and recalcitrant organic molecules (24); the

Table 1. Summary of the rates of photochemodenitrification and biological N₂O production from ammonia oxidation. When derived from ¹⁵N labeling experiments, the total rates of N₂O production were obtained by adding the rates from ¹⁵N-NO₂⁻ and from ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻. The incubation experiments to measure biological N₂O production were performed in darkness, except experiment 7, which included darkness and natural day-night cycle treatments. More details are presented in tables S2, S6, and S8. Dashes indicate not applicable.

Site (experiment)	Total N ₂ O from photochemodenitrification (nmol N-N ₂ O liter ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)		N ₂ O from ammonia oxidation (nmol N-N ₂ O liter ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)	
Cubillas and Iznájar reservoirs (experiments 1 to 4 and 9)	June 2018 (exp. 1, Cubillas)	2.96 (±0.20)	July 2018 (exp. 9)	0.83 (±0.00): Iznájar; 2.08 (±0.15): Cubillas
	September 2018 (exp. 2, Cubillas)	66.56 (±15.11)	September 2018 (exp. 9)	0.06 (±0.00), 0.47 (±0.12): Cubillas; 0.93 (±0.25): Iznájar
	September 2018 (exp. 3, Iznájar)	47.86 (±17.44)		
	July 2021 (exp. 4, Cubillas)	1.01 (±0.22)	–	–
Cubillas reservoir (experiment 5)	July 2021	2.32 (±0.22)	–	–
Motril coast (experiment 6)	July 2021	1.41 (±0.06)	–	–
Boknis Eck (experiment 7)	July 2022	0.03 (±0.00)	July 2022	0.015 (±0.002) (darkness); 0.007 (±0.002) (day-night cycle)

reduction of metals, such as iron (25, 26) or manganese (27); the photochemical production of climate-relevant gases, such as carbon dioxide (28), carbon monoxide (29), and methane (30); and the photolysis of NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ (31–33). The discovery presented in this work indicates that solar radiation can also catalyze the production of N₂O in surface waters, and its importance—not only for daily variability but also as a source of N₂O to the atmosphere—should be addressed.

Nitrite and sunlight explain N₂O photochemodenitrification

We hypothesized that NO₂⁻ may act as a substrate for photochemical N₂O production based on our data from experiments 1 to 4 (fig. S2). A marginally significant relationship between the in situ NO₂⁻ concentrations and the photochemical N₂O production rates was found ($n = 4$ observations, $P < 0.1$; fig. S2A). Additionally, we detected a significant decrease in the NO₂⁻ concentration to below detection (0.5 μmol liter⁻¹) in the sunlight treatments compared with the dark controls during experiment 4 ($P < 0.001$; fig. S2B). We tested our hypothesis by adding ¹⁵N-NO₂⁻ or ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻ to trace the formation of ¹⁵N-N₂O [as ⁴⁵N₂O (¹⁴N¹⁵N¹⁶O) and ⁴⁶N₂O (¹⁵N¹⁵N¹⁶O)]; experiments 5 to 7],

expanding our analysis to include two marine systems at different latitudes (Motril coast and Boknis Eck, experiments 6 and 7, respectively) in addition to a freshwater system (Cubillas reservoir, experiment 5; see table S1 for study site details and fig. S1 for the experimental setup). We included the treatment with ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻ because NO₃⁻ is generally the most abundant form of dissolved inorganic N in these systems, and NO₂⁻ derived from its abiotic photolysis (31) may serve as a substrate for photochemical production of N₂O.

We detected a significant production of ¹⁵N-N₂O from ¹⁵N-NO₂⁻ in the sunlight treatments in the three study systems, with longer sunlight exposure yielding more N₂O (Fig. 2, A to C, and fig. S3). Significant production of ¹⁵N-N₂O from ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻ was also observed in experiments 5 and 6 (Fig. 2, D and E, and fig. S3), although the rate of N₂O production from ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻ was at least one order of magnitude lower than that from ¹⁵N-NO₂⁻. These results support our hypothesis that NO₂⁻ is the direct and main substrate for this reaction. In turn, NO₃⁻ must be photoreduced to NO₂⁻ to later produce N₂O in a second step. On the basis of these findings, we named the reaction photochemodenitrification. The photochemical process generated both single- and double-labeled N₂O (⁴⁵N₂O and




Fig. 2. Photochemical production of $^{15}\text{N}-\text{N}_2\text{O}$ from $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2^-$ and $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_3^-$. (A to F) $^{15}\text{N}-\text{N}_2\text{O}$ excess (in nanomoles of N per liter) calculated with respect to t_0 , over incubation time (sunlight hours/total hours) in the experiments in the Cubillas reservoir (filtered water, 0.7 μm pore size) [(A) and (D)], the Motril coast (filtered water, 0.7 μm pore size) [(B) and (E)], and Boknis Eck (unfiltered water) [(C) and (F)], from $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2^-$ [(A) to (C)] and $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_3^-$ [(D) to (F)]. HgCl_2 (1 mmol liter⁻¹) was added in all experiments to inhibit biological activity.

Bars represent the mean values \pm standard errors over the time course (t_0 to t_2), including dark controls (dark gray bars) and sunlight treatments (yellow bars). Note the different scales in the y axes. The significance of the sunlight treatments is included for each experiment: a indicates $P < 0.1$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$. Photochemical production rates as a function of the bottle area, volume, and radiation doses are presented in table S6, and the statistical details are provided in table S4.

$^{46}\text{N}_2\text{O}$) from both tracers (fig. S3). This is broadly consistent with the isotope pairing expected from the production of N_2O from a mixture of added $^{15}\text{NO}_2^-$ and unlabeled nitrite ($^{14}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2^-$) from either the initial in situ pool or formed, for example, from NO_3^- photolysis (fig. S4). The contribution of other forms of in situ organic or inorganic N compounds as sources of ^{14}N to the formation of $^{46}\text{N}_2\text{O}$ cannot be excluded (see the supplementary text for further explanation).

Photochemodenitrification depended linearly on the sunlight radiation received (Fig. 3 and table S5). We found similar radiation normalized rates (i.e., the slope in the increase in N_2O per radiation dose) across experiments, whether based on UVB or PAR (Fig. 3 and table S5). In experiment 4, in which we did not add any tracer (Fig. 3A), the slopes for PAR ($S_{\text{PAR}} = 5.9 \times 10^{-6} \pm 1.2 \times 10^{-6}$) and UVB


($S_{\text{UVB}} = 0.051 \pm 0.010$) were not significantly different from the slopes calculated for the $^{15}\text{NO}_2^-$ additions in experiments 5 to 7 (Fig. 3B; $S_{\text{PAR}} = 6.3 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2.4 \times 10^{-7}$ and $S_{\text{UVB}} = 0.054 \pm 0.002$). In agreement with our previous results, the slopes were one order of magnitude lower for the $^{15}\text{NO}_3^-$ additions (Fig. 3C).

Rates of photochemical production of $^{15}\text{N}-\text{N}_2\text{O}$ in the $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2^-$ addition experiments varied from 0.03 ± 0.00 nmol-N liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in Boknis Eck (experiment 7) to 2.03 ± 0.18 nmol-N liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in the Cubillas reservoir (experiment 5; table S6). Photochemical production rates from $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_3^-$ were similar in the Motril coast (0.26 ± 0.02 nmol-N liter⁻¹ day⁻¹) and the Cubillas reservoir (0.29 ± 0.04 nmol-N liter⁻¹ day⁻¹) (experiments 5 and 6; table S6). With both $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_2^-$ and $^{15}\text{N}-\text{NO}_3^-$, the photochemical

N_2O production rates measured in the Cubillas reservoir (experiment 5) and the Motril coast (experiment 6) were larger than in Boknis Eck (experiment 7; Fig. 2 and table S6). The higher substrate availability and higher radiation doses in experiments 5 and 6 versus those in experiment 7 could have caused these differences. We used higher concentrations of ^{15}N -labeled tracers in experiments 5 and 6 compared with experiment 7 (i.e., 2 to 5 $\mu\text{mol liter}^{-1}$ versus 0.5 $\mu\text{mol liter}^{-1}$) to reflect the natural differences in NO_3^- and NO_2^- concentrations found in these systems (table S1). In addition, the lower production detected in experiment 7 compared with experiments 5 and 6 may also be related to the lower radiation received in this experiment (Fig. 3), which was incubated in Odense, Denmark ($\sim 55^\circ\text{N}$, 57-m altitude), whereas the others were incubated in Granada,

Fig. 3. Photochemical production of N₂O as function of UVB and PAR dose.

Linear increases in the concentrations of ¹⁵N in the N₂O pool relative to the initial abundance (N₂O excess, in nanomoles of N per liter) in experiments 4 to 7. (A) No tracer addition. (B) ¹⁵NO₂⁻ addition. (C) ¹⁵NO₃⁻ addition. The combined slopes (S_{PAR} and S_{UVB}) are shown in the figure, and the individual slopes for each experiment are provided in table S5. Note the zoom-in plot in (B) and the different scales in the y axes. We did not measure UVB or PAR during experiments 1 to 3.



Spain (~37°N, 738-m altitude). Despite the lower radiation dose received, which determined the lower ¹⁵N-N₂O production, the radiation-normalized rates were similar in the three systems at different latitudes (Fig. 3 and table S5). UV radiation, which may be causing this reaction, tends to increase as we approach the equator and ascend in altitude. Sunlight hours per day also change with the time of the year and latitude, but this variation was accounted for by considering the exact number of sunlight hours in the rate calculations. In addition to the experimental evidence, we also found that the photochemical N₂O production rates were a function of in situ NO₂⁻ concentration ($P < 0.05$), following an exponential fit [N-N₂O production = $0.32e^{0.23(\text{nitrite})}$ (where e is Euler's number), adjusted coefficient of determination (R^2) = 0.65; Fig. 4]. This finding supports the hypothesis that NO₂⁻ plays an active role in the photochemical formation of N₂O.

We performed a final experiment to rule out the potential impact of the biocide HgCl₂ on the photochemical production of N₂O (experiment 8; fig. S5 and table S7). Water was gently prefiltered once (1.0 μm), and sterile filtered twice (0.2 μm) to remove the organisms present in the sample. Then, parallel treatments were

incubated with and without HgCl₂. We detected a significant increase in the ¹⁵N-N₂O concentration after sunlight exposure in both treatments. N₂O production in sunlight conditions was 54% larger ($P < 0.05$) in the treatment without HgCl₂ than in the treatment with HgCl₂, and no production was detected in dark conditions. Although unlikely, we cannot exclude that the difference may be the result of biological reactions by cells smaller than 0.2 μm. However, if that were the case, we would likely have detected production in the dark controls without HgCl₂, but we did not detect any production in those controls. Based on these results, it is very unlikely that HgCl₂ causes the photochemical N₂O production. If anything, HgCl₂ addition may reduce photochemical N₂O production rather than increase it.

Our data show experimental (experiments 1 to 7; Figs. 1 and 2) and in situ evidence (Fig. 4) that NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻ are substrates for the photochemical production of N₂O and that this process significantly depends on sunlight exposure (Fig. 3). NO₂⁻ and especially NO₃⁻ are abundant compounds in eutrophic aquatic systems, such as many freshwater bodies and wetlands, as well as coastal areas and estuaries, which are strongly influenced by N loading from

their watersheds (34, 35) and act as global hotspots for N₂O production (4, 6, 36). For instance, NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻ concentrations reached up to 11 μmol liter⁻¹ and >300 μmol liter⁻¹, respectively, in the surface water column of Mediterranean reservoirs (34) and >2 μmol liter⁻¹ in the surface waters of the Chesapeake Bay estuary (37). In the open ocean, inorganic N concentrations in surface waters vary from region to region. They are typically low in oligotrophic tropical and subtropical regions, where nutrient uptake by phytoplankton is high and upwelling is less common. However, concentrations are higher in upwelling zones and polar regions, where annual average surface values of NO₃⁻ are ~5 to 25 μmol liter⁻¹ (38).

Therefore, photochemical N₂O production rates are expected to be substantial in regions with greater availability of inorganic N and lower in oligotrophic waters, which generally correlates with patterns in N₂O concentration and biological N₂O production (4, 6, 7, 36, 39). We hypothesize that other biological reactions, such as ammonia oxidation, and/or abiotic processes, such as the photodegradation of dissolved organic matter, which release NO₂⁻ and other forms of inorganic N (40), may enhance photochemical N₂O production. If production




Fig. 4. Total N₂O photochemical production rates as a function of the in situ nitrite concentration.

N₂O photochemical production rates (in nanomoles of N per liter per day) ± standard errors are represented. Note the log scale in the y axis. The N₂O photochemical production rate measured in the Cubillas reservoir in June 2018 (sampling performed on 22 June) was related to the nitrite concentration measured in the Cubillas reservoir on 4 July 2018. In experiments 5 to 7, we added the nitrite used as tracer to the in situ nitrite concentration.

and consumption are tightly coupled, they might create a cryptic cycle in which the NO₂⁻ remains undetected. This effect may be particularly important in oligotrophic waters. The contribution of other sources of NO₂⁻ or forms of N may contribute to explain the results found in Boknis Eck (experiment 7), in which a higher production of ⁴⁵N₂O compared with ⁴⁶N₂O was detected, despite in situ NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻ concentrations being below detection levels. This result suggests that other forms or sources of organic or inorganic in situ N compounds may contribute ¹⁴N to the formation of ⁴⁵N₂O (fig. S3 and supplementary text).

The photochemical reduction of NO₂⁻ to N₂O during photochemodenitrification may be coupled to the oxidation of organic matter or metals, such as Fe or Mn, similar to chemodenitrification (11, 12, 41). These metals experience photoreduction in surface waters (25, 27, 42). Alternatively, N₂O may also be produced through UV light-catalyzed photolysis (33, 43, 44). Additional research is needed to elucidate the ultimate mechanism of this process.

Photochemical processes rely mostly on UV radiation, including UVB (280 to 315 nm) and UVA (315 to 400 nm), which is rapidly attenuated in the water column. For instance, NO₃⁻ photolysis occurs in the UVB band, centered at 302 nm, whereas NO₂⁻ photolysis occurs in the UVB and UVA bands, with an absorption maximum at 354 nm (33). Longer wavelengths carry less energy and penetrate deeper into the water column. Vanderploeg *et al.* found that 1% of the UV radiation penetrated from 2 to 4 m for UVB (305 nm) and between 11 and 22 m for UVA (395 nm) in Lake Michigan (45). By contrast, there is still about 10% of the surface radiation at depths between 6 and 31 m (UVB) and between 15 and 104 m (UVA) in the oligotrophic ocean (46). In more eutrophic water bodies, sunlight attenuation is typically high; yet, the likely greater availability of inorganic

N in these systems may compensate for the total depth-integrated photochemical production rates (Fig. 4). Solar radiation also changes with latitude and altitude. Therefore, N₂O production by photochemodenitrification may present a latitudinal pattern in the global ocean and fresh waters related to the differences in solar radiation and influenced by NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻ concentrations around the globe.

Photochemodenitrification versus biological N₂O production

The N₂O production rates from photochemodenitrification exceeded the biological N₂O production from ammonia oxidation, which has been classically considered the key N₂O production process in surface waters (Table 1). Biological production of ¹⁵N-N₂O from ammonia oxidation varied from 0.06 ± 0.00 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in Iznájar to 2.08 ± 0.15 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ in Cubillas (experiment 9; Table 1). These biological rates were determined by incubating the samples in darkness. In Boknis Eck, biological production of ¹⁵N-N₂O reached up to 0.015 ± 0.002 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ when the samples were incubated in darkness and 0.007 ± 0.002 nmol N-N₂O liter⁻¹ day⁻¹ when the samples were incubated in natural day-night conditions (Table 1). We did not find a significant relationship between N₂O production rates by ammonia oxidation and the in situ N₂O concentration in the study reservoirs (fig. S6). However, we found that in situ N₂O concentration was a function of the photochemical N₂O production rates ($n = 5, P < 0.01$; fig. S6). Therefore, the production of N₂O by photochemodenitrification may contribute substantially to sustaining the recurrent surface N₂O supersaturation found in fresh waters (34) and potentially in marine ecosystems, including coastal areas (37) and the open ocean (47), where the production of N₂O from ammonia oxidation in surface waters is typically low.

The rates of N₂O photochemodenitrification detected were higher than the N₂O production by ammonia oxidation in coastal and open ocean regions (37, 47) but lower than those found for N₂O production by denitrification in rivers (48). They were similar to the N₂O production rates by phytoplankton cultures (49). Moreover, ammonia oxidation rates are typically measured in the dark, which eliminates possible contributions with photochemical processes. Because ammonia oxidizers are sensitive to light (14), this may overestimate the biological N₂O production rates in surface waters, as illustrated by our finding of higher rates in darkness compared with natural day-night conditions (experiment 7; Table 1). Still, the photochemical N₂O production rate was at least twice the biological N₂O production in darkness.

N₂O production by photochemodenitrification represents a substantial contribution to the N₂O pool in freshwater reservoirs and may also represent a considerable contribution in coastal marine waters. The fact that N₂O production by photochemodenitrification exhibits its maximum at the very surface of the water, which is in direct contact with the atmosphere, suggests that this reaction may have a disproportionate effect on N₂O fluxes. This is because the newly formed N₂O may diffuse more quickly to the atmosphere when oversaturated compared with the N₂O produced and stored deeper in the water column. Our findings could also imply that the emission of N₂O from surface waters may be larger than previously estimated, particularly by biogeochemical models (36, 50). The recent global synthesis on N₂O fluxes by Resplandy *et al.* (36) showed that global ocean biogeochemical model emission estimates for coastal waters are lower than those based on observations (39). This may indicate that these biogeochemical models underestimate emissions because they do not account for all N₂O sources. We suggest that this underestimation could be, at least partially, related to photochemical N₂O production.

The N₂O production pathway presented in this work (fig. S7) represents a previously unrecognized but potentially relevant source of N₂O for future emission budgets. This reaction may be particularly important for eutrophic freshwater bodies, coastal areas, and upwelling marine regions, which are global N₂O emission hotspots (4, 6, 7, 36). In the coming decades, N₂O emissions may be further amplified by the projected increase in global N export to fresh waters and coastal environments resulting from the growing population (35). This increase may lead to higher rates of photochemical N₂O formation. Therefore, it is crucial to include this pathway in future assessments. This discovery represents a breakthrough in the study of global sources of N₂O, helping to reduce the current uncertainties in the bottom-up estimates highlighted in the last global N₂O inventories (7) and

to explain accelerating emissions, which exceed some of the highest projected scenarios (8).

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. A. R. Ravishankara, J. S. Daniel, R. W. Portmann, *Science* **326**, 123–125 (2009).
2. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2023).
3. N. Gruber, J. N. Galloway, *Nature* **451**, 293–296 (2008).
4. S. P. Seitzinger, C. Kroeze, R. V. Styles, *Chemosphere Glob. Change Sci.* **2**, 267–279 (2000).
5. E. León-Palmero, R. Morales-Baquero, I. Reche, *Environ. Res. Lett.* **15**, 044012 (2020).
6. Y. Li et al., *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 942 (2024).
7. H. Tian et al., *Nature* **586**, 248–256 (2020).
8. R. L. Thompson et al., *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 993–998 (2019).
9. B. B. Ward, "Nitrification" in *Encyclopedia of Ecology*, vol. 2, B. Fath, Ed. (Elsevier, ed. 2, 2013), pp. 351–358.
10. B. B. Ward, *Science* **341**, 352–353 (2013).
11. X. Zhu-Barker, A. R. Cavazos, N. E. Ostrom, W. R. Horwath, J. B. Glass, *Biogeochemistry* **126**, 251–267 (2015).
12. S. D. Wankel et al., *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 15595 (2017).
13. E. León-Palmero, R. Morales-Baquero, I. Reche, *bioRxiv* 2023.10.24.563772 [Preprint] (2023).
14. S. N. Merbt et al., *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **327**, 41–46 (2012).
15. P. Bonin, M. Gilewicz, J. C. Bertrand, *Can. J. Microbiol.* **35**, 1061–1064 (1989).
16. T. Dalsgaard et al., *mBio* **5**, e01966 (2014).
17. J. A. Harrison, P. A. Matson, S. E. Fendorf, *Aquat. Sci.* **67**, 308–315 (2005).
18. T. J. Clough, L. E. Buckthought, F. M. Kelliher, R. R. Sherlock, *Glob. Change Biol.* **13**, 1016–1027 (2007).
19. L. Yang, W. Yan, P. Ma, J. Wang, *J. Geogr. Sci.* **21**, 820–832 (2011).
20. H. M. Baulch et al., *Freshw. Biol.* **57**, 509–525 (2012).
21. M. S. Rosamond, S. J. Thuss, S. L. Schiff, R. J. Elgood, *J. Environ. Qual.* **40**, 256–270 (2011).
22. R. L. Woodrow et al., *Limnol. Oceanogr. Lett.* **9**, 276–285 (2024).
23. Y. Liu et al., *Atmos. Environ.* **45**, 1464–1475 (2011).
24. I. Reche, M. L. Pace, J. J. Cole, *Ecosystems* **3**, 419–432 (2000).
25. L. Emmenegger, R. Schönenberger, L. Sigg, B. Sulzberger, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **46**, 49–61 (2001).
26. K. Barbeau, E. L. Rue, K. W. Bruland, A. Butler, *Nature* **413**, 409–413 (2001).
27. W. G. Sunda, S. A. Huntsman, G. R. Harvey, *Nature* **301**, 234–236 (1983).
28. B. Koehler, T. Landelius, G. A. Weyhenmeyer, N. Machida, L. J. Tranvik, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **28**, 696–711 (2014).
29. L. Conte, S. Szopa, R. Séférian, L. Bopp, *Biogeosciences* **16**, 881–902 (2019).
30. Y. Li, C. G. Fichot, L. Geng, M. G. Scarratt, H. Xie, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **47**, e2020GL088362 (2020).
31. O. C. Zafiriou, M. B. True, *Mar. Chem.* **8**, 33–42 (1979).
32. O. C. Zafiriou, M. B. True, *Mar. Chem.* **8**, 9–32 (1979).
33. J. J. Jankowski, D. J. Kieber, K. Mopper, *Photochem. Photobiol.* **70**, 319–328 (1999).
34. E. León-Palmero, R. Morales-Baquero, I. Reche, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **68**, 1734–1749 (2023).
35. A. H. W. Beusen et al., *Glob. Environ. Change* **72**, 102426 (2022).
36. L. Resplandy et al., *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **38**, e2023GB007803 (2024).
37. W. Tang et al., *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **67**, 2101–2116 (2022).
38. EU Copernicus Marine Service information (CMEMS), "Global Ocean Biogeochemistry Analysis and Forecast" (Marine Data Store, 2025); <https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00015>.
39. S. Yang et al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 11954–11960 (2020).
40. R. J. Kieber, A. Li, P. J. Seaton, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **33**, 993–998 (1999).
41. J. Heil et al., *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **139**, 72–82 (2014).
42. M. J. A. Rijkenberg et al., *Mar. Chem.* **93**, 119–129 (2005).
43. R. G. Zepp, J. Hoigne, H. Bader, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **21**, 443–450 (1987).
44. T. Liu, J. Deng, C. Yang, M. Liu, Y. Liu, *Separ. Purif. Tech.* **304**, 122364 (2023).
45. H. A. Vanderploeg et al., *J. Great Lakes Res.* **50**, 102291 (2024).
46. S. Overmans et al., *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans* **127**, e2021JC017654 (2022).
47. X. S. Wan et al., *Nat. Geosci.* **16**, 29–36 (2022).
48. J. J. Beaulieu et al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 214–219 (2011).
49. A. R. McLeod, T. Brand, C. N. Campbell, K. Davidson, A. D. Hatton, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.* **126**, e2021JG006345 (2021).
50. J. Wang et al., *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **57**, 13506–13519 (2023).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank J. Forja and T. Ortega for helping with gas chromatography analysis at the Department of Physical Chemistry of the University of Cádiz and G. Sánchez and L. Alados-Arboledas from the Applied Physics Department of the Andalusian Inter-University Institute for

Earth System Research (IISTA-CEAMA) for providing the sunlight radiation data during the 2021 experiments. We also thank L. Bristow for measuring samples of experiments 7 and 8 and H. W. Bange for organizing the monthly Boknis Eck sampling campaign and providing the inorganic N measurements. We thank B. B. Ward for hosting E.L.-P. in 2018 and allowing her to use the mass spectrometer for experiment 9 measurements and for insightful comments and support during the review process. We also express our gratitude to the members of the Ward laboratory at Princeton University for their thoughtful comments on this manuscript. **Funding:** This study was supported by MNA - Consejería de Universidad, Investigación e Innovación, Junta de Andalucía, Spain, grant QUAL21-011 (I.R.); Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, grants RTI2018-098849-B-I00 (I.R. and R.M.-B.) and MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 (I.R.); the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), grant PID2022.1378650B.I00 (I.R.); Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, PhD grant FPU014/02917 (E.L.-P.); AEET-SIBECOL project for young researchers, grant PHOTON 2020 (E.L.-P.); Danmarks Frie Forskningsfond, grants 1026-00428B (C.L.) and 1127-00362B (B.T.); Carlsbergfondet, grant CF18-1071 (B.T.); and European Commission, Marie Skłodowska-Curie postdoctoral fellowship HORIZON-MSCA-2021-PF-01, grant 101066750 (E.L.-P.). **Author contributions:** Conceptualization: E.L.-P., I.R., R.M.-B., C.L., B.T.; Funding acquisition: I.R., R.M.-B., C.L., E.L.-P.; Investigation: E.L.-P., I.R., R.M.-B., B.T.; Methodology: E.L.-P., I.R., R.M.-B., B.T., C.L.; Project administration: I.R., E.L.-P., C.L.; Supervision: I.R., R.M.-B., C.L.; Visualization: E.L.-P.; Writing – original draft: E.L.-P.; Writing – review & editing: I.R., R.M.-B., B.T., C.L., E.L.-P. **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests. **Data and materials availability:** All data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials. **License information:** Copyright © 2025 the authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original US government works. <https://www.science.org/about/science-licenses-journal-article-reuse>

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adq0302
Materials and Methods
Supplementary Text
Figs. S1 to S7
Tables S1 to S8
References (51–60)

Submitted 3 May 2024; accepted 4 February 2025
10.1126/science.adq0302