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Abstract

To trace NO$_3^-$ sources and assess NO$_3^-$ dynamics in the salinized rivers and estuaries, three rivers (HH River, CB River and JY River) and two estuaries (HH Estuary and CJ Estuary) along the Bohai Bay (China) have been selected to determine DIN and $\delta^{15}$N- and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$. Upstream of the HH River NO$_3^-$ was removed 30.9±22.1% by denitrification, resulting from effects of the floodgate: limiting water exchange with downstream and prolonging water residence time to remove NO$_3^-$. Downstream of the HH River NO$_3^-$ was removed 2.5±13.3% by NO$_3^-^*$ turnover processes. Conversely, NO$_3^-$ was increased 36.6±25.2% by external N source addition in the CB River and 34.6±35.1% by in-stream nitrification in the JY River, respectively. The HH and CY Estuaries behaved mostly conservative excluding the sewage input in the CJ Estuary. Hydrodynamic in estuaries has changed by the ongoing reclamation projects, aggravating the estuary losing the attenuation function of NO$_3^-$.
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1. Introduction

Increasing population, extensive agricultural activities and rapid development of urbanization in coastal areas have dramatically increased N loading to rivers and coastal waters (Seitzinger and Kroeze 1998; Jennerjahn et al., 2004; Umezawa et al., 2008). Estuaries play a prominent role for delivery of terrestrially derived N to coastal water through physical, chemical, and biological processes (Mulholland 1992; Bernhardt et al. 2003; Sebilo et al. 2006; Hartzell and Jordan, 2012).

Many estuarine studies have focused on tracing N sources and assessing N dynamics in large estuarine systems, such as the Elbe Estuary (Dähnke et al., 2008) and the Atlantic coast (Middelburg and Herman, 2007) in Europe, the San Francisco Bay Estuary (Wankel et al., 2006), the Mississippi River Estuary (Rabalais et al., 1996), and the Mid-Atlantic coast (Dafner et al., 2007) in the United States, and the Yangtze River Estuary (Chai et al., 2009) and Pearl River Estuary (Dai et al., 2008) in China. Compared to these large estuarine systems with high discharge of freshwater, the levels of freshwater discharge are relatively low in the small estuaries, which are characterized by salinization from sea-water intrusion for rather long distances upstream (Graas and Savenije, 2008). How do these salinized estuaries respond to increased N loading? How do physical and biological processes control DIN (NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$ and NO$_3^-$) concentration variations?

To answer these questions, an intensive study was conducted in three rivers and the corresponding estuaries characterized by different levels of salinization in a coastal municipality (Tianjin) along the Bohai Bay (China). Two investigated rivers with mean salinities around 0.5 and 0.7 flow through a rural area and converge before entering into the estuary. The third one with mean salinity around 2.2 flows through Tianjin municipality and is separated into three parts by two floodgates crossing the
river, for providing water supply for the residents living along the river bank. Since the rapid urbanization and population growth in Tianjin municipality, NO$_3^-$ loading progressively increased in rivers and estuaries associated with human activities, such as agricultural runoff, untreated domestic and industrial wastewater (Gao et al., 2011). Furthermore, port constructions and reclamation projects along the coastline of the municipality even aggravate NO$_3^-$ pollution (Zhang et al., 2004). Thus, tracing NO$_3^-$ sources and assessing NO$_3^-$ dynamics in the salinized rivers and estuaries represent fundamental goals in this study.

More than concentration data alone, the combined use of N ($\delta^{15}$N) and O ($\delta^{18}$O) isotopes of NO$_3^-$ has provided a powerful tool to investigate NO$_3^-$ dynamics and identify NO$_3^-$ sources in estuaries (Middelburg and Nieuwenhuize 2001; Sebilo et al. 2006; Wankel et al. 2006; Dähnke et al., 2008; Miyajima et al., 2009). Therefore, in the present study, a combined approach based on the mixing curves of DIN concentration versus salinity and $\delta^{15}$N- and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ is applied to (1) identify potential dominant NO$_3^-$ sources responsible for NO$_3^-$ contamination; and (2) elucidate possible NO$_3^-$ dynamics in the different salinized rivers and the estuaries.

2. Material and method

2.1 Study area

The investigated three rivers are located in a coastal municipality, Tianjin, China (Fig. 1). The study region is influenced by the warm temperate semi-humid monsoon climate with an average annual temperature of 11.4–12.9°C. The annual precipitation is 520–660 mm, with 75% of the total precipitation occurring in June, July and August (yue et al., 2010). The population of Tianjin municipality is ca.16 million and the density is 1100 inhabitants km$^{-2}$. The survey took place in the dry season for three
rivers along a salinity gradient, the Haihe River (HH River) on 7 Nov. 2012, the Chaobaixin River (CB River) on 9 Nov. 2012 and the Jiyun River (JY River) on 10 Nov. 2012 (Fig.1). Water samples were also taken along the estuary of the HH River (HH Estuary) and the mixing estuary of the CB River and the JY River (CJ Estuary) on 16 Nov. 2012 to study reactive N transformation processes from the river to the estuary (Fig.1). The HH River is characterized by 72km in length, ca. 100m in width, 3-5m in depth, and a watershed area of 2066 km² (Liu et al., 2001). Since the separation by the floodgate F1, the upstream part of the HH River serves as a river-type reservoir for the purpose of supplying water to the residents living along the river bank. The other floodgate F2 is located at the end of the HH River serves as flood discharging, tidal blocking and ship traffic. Although there were eight sewage outlets along the HH River, they were all forbidden to discharge. The average runoff of the HH River is $12.36 \times 10^8$ m³/a; the average tidal amplitude is 2.43 m; and the average flow velocity is 0.3-0.4 m/S in 2000-2004 (Wen and Xing, 2004). The CB River flows through a rural area and is characterized by 81km in length, ca. 700 m in width, 5-7m in depth, and a watershed area of 1387 km² (Gburek and Sharpley, 1998). Animal manure could be a potential dominant NO₃⁻ source in the CB River as this watershed has important livestock breeding base for the municipality (Shao et al., 2010). The JY River flows through agricultural area and is considered as a significant water source for agricultural and domestic use. The JY River is characterized by 144km in length, ca. 300 m in width, less than 7 m in depth, and a watershed area of 2146 km²(Chen et al., 2000). The average runoff of the converged river mouth of the CB River and the JY River is $16.03 \times 10^8$ m³/a; the average tidal amplitude is 2.45m; and the average flow velocity is 0.5-0.7 m/S in 1990-1997(Liang and Xing,1999). Unfortunately, we have no hydrological data for these rivers during the study period.
2.2 Sampling and analysis

Water samples were taken on a bridge using a bucket serially from upstream downwards for the rivers and on a ship for estuarine water. The bucket was put into the river/estuary water until it reached ~0.5m below the surface to sample water. Water samples were stored frozen in 1L HDPE (High Density Polyethylene) bottles for determination of physico-chemical properties and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$- and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$-$\text{NO}_3^{-}$. Salinity, temperature (T), pH and dissolved oxygen (DO) were measured by a portable water quality probe (Thermo Orion, USA). Laboratory analyses included $\text{NO}_3^{-}$, $\text{NO}_2^{-}$ and $\text{NH}_4^{+}$. All samples were filtered through 0.45 µm membrane filters and stored at 4°C until analysis. Nitrate ($\text{NO}_3^{-}$), $\text{NO}_2^{-}$ and $\text{NH}_4^{+}$ concentrations were analyzed on a continuous flow analyzer (Auto Analyzer 3, Seal, Germany).

The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$- and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$-$\text{NO}_3^{-}$ values were determined by the “Bacterial denitrification method” (Sigman et al., 2001; Casciotti et al., 2002; Xue et al., 2010) in the UC Davis Stable Isotope Facility of California University, which allows for the simultaneous determination of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ produced from the conversion of $\text{NO}_3^{-}$ by denitrifying bacteria, which naturally lack $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ - reductase activity. Isotope ratios of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ are measured using a Thermo Finnigan GasBench + PreCon trace gas concentration system interfaced to a Thermo Scientific Delta V Plus isotope-ratio mass spectrometer (Bremen, Germany). The $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ sample is purged from vials through a double-needle sampler into a helium carrier stream (25 mL/min) and $\text{CO}_2$ is removed using scrubber (Ascarite). By cryogenic trapping and focusing, the $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ is compressed onto an Agilent GS-Q capillary column (30m x 0.32 mm, 40°C, 1.0 mL/min) and subsequently analyzed by IRMS.

Stable isotope data were expressed in delta ($\delta$) units in per mil (‰) relative to the respective international standards:
where \( R_{\text{sample}} \) and \( R_{\text{standard}} \) are the \(^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N} \) or \(^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O} \) ratio of the sample and standard for \( \delta^{15}\text{N} \) and \( \delta^{18}\text{O} \), respectively. Values of \( \delta^{15}\text{N} \) are reported relative to atmospheric air (AIR) and \( \delta^{18}\text{O} \) values are reported relative to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (VSMOW 2). The calibration standards are the nitrates USGS 32, USGS 34, and USGS 35, and are supplied by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD).

2.3 Mixing model

The concentration of a mixture can be calculated via a basic mixing model (Liss, 1976):

\[
C_{\text{MIX}} = f \times C_R + (1 - f) C_M \tag{2}
\]

where \( C \) represents concentration, the subscripts \( R \) and \( M \) represent riverine and marine end-members, respectively; \( f \) represents the fraction of freshwater in each sample calculated from salinity (Dähnke et al., 2008):

\[
f = (\text{salinity}_{\text{MAX}} - \text{salinity}_{\text{MEA}}) / \text{salinity}_{\text{MAX}} \tag{3}
\]

where MAX is taken as the maximum measured salinity of marine end-member for coastal water and MEA is taken as the measured salinity of the mixture.

Isotopic values of mixed estuarine samples (\( \delta_{\text{MIX}} \)) were calculated using concentration-weighted isotopic values for riverine and marine end-members, respectively (Fry 2002; Dähnke, 2008):

\[
\delta_{\text{MIX}} = [f \times C_R \times \delta_R + (1 - f) C_M \times \delta_M] / C_{\text{MIX}} \tag{4}
\]

where \( C \) represents concentration, \( \delta \) represents isotopic value, the subscripts \( R \) and \( M \) represent riverine and marine end-members, respectively; and \( f \) represents the fraction of freshwater in each sample. The salinity-based isotopic mixing does not follow
linear conservative mixing but show curvilinear mixing that reflects concentration-based weighting of end-member isotopic contributions. When a conservative mixing appeared between the riverine and marine end-members, DIN distribution is expected to fall on the linear mixing line. When an enriched external source or biological transformation (e.g. mineralization, nitrification, etc.) contributes into the river, DIN distribution is expected to fall above the mixing line. In turn, when a depleted external source or the internal removal processes (e.g., denitrification, assimilation, etc.) appears in the river, DIN distribution is expected to fall below the mixing line (Wankel et al., 2006). The curvilinear mixing curves of determined $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{18}O$ of NO$_3^-$ provide better information for transformation processes: an isotopic enriched NO$_3^-$ source or internal removal processes (e.g. denitrification, assimilation, etc.) will result in a distribution of $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{18}O$ falling above the mixing lines, while an isotopic depleted nitrate source or internal nitrification will result in a distribution of $\delta^{15}N$ and/or $\delta^{18}O$ falling below the mixing line.

2.4 Nitrate removal efficiency

Variation percentages of the measured NO$_3^-$ concentrations compared to that of the calculated mixing lines were computed to assess the NO$_3^-$ removal efficiency for the rivers and estuaries as follows:

$$\text{Variation} \ (%) = \frac{C_{\text{measured}} - C_{\text{theoretical}}}{C_{\text{theoretical}}} \times 100\%$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $C_{\text{measured}}$ represents the measured NO$_3^-$ concentration; and $C_{\text{theoretical}}$ represents the theoretical NO$_3^-$ concentration calculated based on the mixing line. A variation percentage $> 0$ represents a source; a variation percentage $< 0$ represents a sink; and a variation percentage equal to 0 represents a mixing.
3. Results

3.1 Physicochemical properties

Table 1 summarizes the data of physicochemical properties collected in this study in the rivers and estuaries. Obviously, the salinities of the HH River (ranging from 0.7 to 4.9 with a mean value of 2.2) and its estuary (ranging from 18.6 to 24.1 with a mean value of 21.2) is higher than the rivers of CB (ranging from 0.5 to 0.6 with a mean value of 0.5) and JY (ranging from 0.6 to 0.8 with a mean value of 0.7) and the corresponding estuary (ranging from 2.0 to 20.0 with a mean value of 7.7), respectively. The municipality had been suffering multiple seawater intrusion and regression, which results in the salinization of the rivers and soil (Wang, 2004), while the greater salinization level of the HH River is also related to seawater intrusion over the floodgate until upstream of the HH River in a relatively long distance. The rivers and the estuaries showed similar pH values between 7.5 and 8.6. The temperature of HH River varied around 12.3°C slightly higher than the CB River (mean is 10.9°C) and the JY River (11.5°C). The mean temperature of the HH Estuary (9.7) is also higher than that of the CJ Estuary (6.7). Dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations were relatively enriched in this study (higher than 7.2 mg L\(^{-1}\)), excluding the DO depleted area in the upstream of the HH River (lower than 5.0 mg L\(^{-1}\)).

3.2 DIN species

Wide concentration variations were noticeable for DIN (\(\text{NH}_4^+\), \(\text{NO}_2^-\) and \(\text{NO}_3^-\)) species in Table 1. In the HH River, the \(\text{NH}_4^+\) concentrations varied from 124.1 to 332.6 µmol L\(^{-1}\), the \(\text{NO}_3^-\) concentrations varied from 62.5 to 219.0µmol L\(^{-1}\) and the \(\text{NO}_2^-\) concentrations varied from 7.2 to 20.8µmol L\(^{-1}\). The DIN concentrations of the
HH Estuary varied smoothly (5.6-6.7 µmol L\(^{-1}\) for NO\(_2^-\), 7.1-25.7 µmol L\(^{-1}\) for NO\(_3^-\), and 65.7-88.1 µmol L\(^{-1}\) for NH\(_4^+\)) and were quite low compared to the HH River. Nitrate concentrations in the CB river were relatively elevated (120.0 – 171.5 µmol L\(^{-1}\)) with a continuous accumulation along the entire salinity gradient, while NO\(_2^-\) concentrations decreased from 12.0 to 6.0 µmol L\(^{-1}\). Ammonium concentrations in the CB River varied from 143.9 to 380.0 µmol L\(^{-1}\). The JY River also showed NO\(_3^-\) accumulation (increased from 40.0 to 83.3 µmol L\(^{-1}\)) along the entire salinity gradient, while a decreasing trend was observed for both NO\(_2^-\) (decreased from 7.0 to 2.1 µmol L\(^{-1}\)) and NH\(_4^+\) (decreased from 72.8 to 11.1 µmol L\(^{-1}\)) concentrations. The CJ Estuary displayed a sea-ward decreasing trend with relatively elevated concentrations in NH\(_4^+\) (328.4-43.2 µmol L\(^{-1}\)), NO\(_2^-\) (7.8-3.4 µmol L\(^{-1}\)) and NO\(_3^-\) (153.4-6.1 µmol L\(^{-1}\)). Compared to the other river and estuaries, DIN results of this study are similar to that in the Pearl River Estuary (Dai et al., 2008) in South China Sea, but higher than that in the Elbe Estuary (Dähnke et al., 2008) in Europe and the San Francisco Bay Estuary (Wankel et al., 2006) in the United States. The specific reasons to cause such variations could be potentially linking to internal/external N source contributions and different N dynamics in the rivers and the estuaries.

3.3 Isotopic composition of NO\(_3^-\)

The isotopic composition of NO\(_3^-\) varied spatially among the rivers and the estuaries (Table 1). The δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_3^-\) values in the HH River varied from -0.2 to 8.4‰ and the δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_3^-\) values varied from -0.5 to 1.5‰. The isotopic composition of NO\(_3^-\) in the HH Estuary remained stable around 8.1‰ for δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_3^-\) and 5.6‰ for the δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_3^-\).

In the CB River, the δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_3^-\) values were enriched with a mean of 13.6‰, and the δ\(^{18}\)O-NO\(_3^-\) values were in a range between 3.9 and 5.6‰. A decrease in δ\(^{15}\)N-NO\(_3^-\)
(from 6.5 to 4.4‰) and an increase in $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ (from 0.8 to 5.3‰) values along the salinity were observed in the JY River. The CY Estuary demonstrated a wide range of $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ (from 7.1 to 15.0‰), while a narrow range of $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ (from 5.9 to 6.9‰).

4. Discussion

4.1 Potential dominant NO$_3^-$ sources

To derive qualitative information on the predominant NO$_3^-$ sources in the rivers and the corresponding estuaries, a classical dual isotope approach ($\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ vs. $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$) has been applied (Figure 2). It is clear that the isotope signatures of all the sampling locations showed in a scattered distribution, indicating different NO$_3^-$ source influence in the rivers and the estuaries. Upstream of the HH River at a salinity of 1.0, a floodgate F1 separates the river into two parts; and at the end of the river at the salinity of 4.9, the other floodgate F2 controls the connection of the river to the HH Estuary. Hence, the $\delta^{15}$N- and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values of the HH River behaved quite differently, which moved from the overlapping area of the “NH$_4^+$ fertilizer” and “soil N” source boxes for the majority of the upstream sampling locations, to the overlapping area of the “soil N” and “manure and sewage” source boxes at the end of the river. In this study, the majority of the sampling locations were potentially influenced by the source of “soil N” or “sewage” not the “mineral fertilizer”, as the HH River flows through the municipality without agricultural activities. In addition, it can no be excluded the influence from salt water intrusion from the estuary, which showed similar isotopic values to that at the end of the HH River. The distribution of the HH Estuary does not show a landward trend due to the floodgate F2 at the end of the HH River, but falls into the range of marine NO$_3^-$ reported by Kendall et al.
Animal manure could be a potential dominant NO$_3^-$ source in the CB River as this watershed plays the role of important livestock breeding base for the municipality (Shao et al., 2010). Furthermore, the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ values were enriched and varied around 14‰, indicating anthropogenic NO$_3^-$ derived from manure (Kendall et al., 2007; Xue et al., 2009). The isotope signatures of the JY River were mainly concentrated in the “soil N” source box. The $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values of the CJ Estuary suggested an influence of the CB River. In addition, quite high DIN concentrations (Table 1) appeared in this estuary, due to sewage discharge of mooring ships in the vicinity of the sampling area. Thus, the influence of sewage and the CB River was considered as the dominant NO$_3^-$ source.

4.2 Nitrate dynamics in the salinized rivers and the corresponding estuaries

4.2.1 Nitrate dynamics in the HH River and its estuary

A mixing line (HH1-E) was setup between the most upstream sampling location in the HH River and the most downstream sampling location in the HH Estuary (Fig. 3). After the separation of the floodgate F1, the upstream of the HH River serves as a river-type reservoir. Thus, a new mixing line (HH2-E mixing line) was re-calculated between the sampling location after the floodgate and estuarine water (Fig. 3). The salinity gradient sampled in the HH River and its estuary showed a seaward decreasing trend in DIN (NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$ and NO$_3^-$) concentrations and an increasing trend in $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values throughout the entire salinity gradient (Fig. 3). However, the DIN and isotopic trends did not behave conservatively, as most of the measured data deviated from the calculated mixing lines.

It is clear that in the upstream part of the HH River before the floodgate F1, NO$_2^-$ and
NH$_4^+$ were above (a source) while NO$_3^-$ was below (a sink) the HH1-E mixing line. Normally, the reductive removal of NO$_3^-$ due to denitrification and assimilation is accompanied with N and O isotope fractionations. The kinetic isotope effects are responsible for preferentially utilizing the lighter isotopes $^{14}$N and $^{16}$O, causing an enrichment of the heavy isotopes in the remaining NO$_3^-$ (Mariotti et al., 1981; Mayer et al., 2002; Fukada et al., 2003). Some studies reported that a linear relationship indicating an enrichment of $^{15}$N relative to $^{18}$O by a factor between 0.8 and 2.0 gives evidence for denitrification (Aravenaand and Robertson, 1998; Fukada et al., 2003; Xue et al., 2009) and 1.0 for assimilation (Granger et al. 2004). In our study, the ratio of N and O isotopic enrichment is 0.8, apparently implying that the removal process of NO$_3^-$ in this river was predominated by denitrification rather than assimilation. From another aspect, elevated NH$_4^+$ compared to NO$_3^-$ will inhibit NO$_3^-$ assimilation by phytoplankton (Dugdale and Hopkins, 1978; Dugdale and MacIsaac, 1971; Dugdale et al., 2006), thus assimilation process is unlikely significant. The linear relation between the isotopic values and the logarithm of residual NO$_3^-$ indicated that denitrification with constant enrichment factors ($\varepsilon = -1.8\%$ for $\delta^{15}$N and $\varepsilon = -1.4\%$ for $\delta^{18}$O) was responsible for the increases in $\delta^{18}$O and $\delta^{15}$N as well. The relatively small enrichment factors were potentially linked to sedimentary denitrification, as diffusion limits the effects of fractionations in the sediments on the $\delta^{15}$N- and $\delta^{18}$O NO$_3^-$ in the overlying water column (Sebilo et al., 2003, Lehmann et al., 2004; Sigman et al., 2005). The NH$_4^+$ species was accumulated as a source, potentially originating from organic matter decomposition not sewage discharge, as the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ values (-0.2-1.1%) were out of the sewage range. Denitrification could also be the potential process for NO$_2^-$ accumulation in the upstream part of the HH River. However, nitrification can not be excluded, especially at relatively low DO levels which may
favor ammonium oxidizers ($\text{NH}_4^+ \rightarrow \text{NO}_2^-$) rather than nitrite oxidizers ($\text{NO}_2^- \rightarrow \text{NO}_3^-$), promoting $\text{NO}_2^-$ accumulation (Helder and De Vries, 1998).

For the HH2-E mixing line after the floodgate F1 (Fig. 3), salinity gradient sampled in the downstream of the HH River illustrated $\text{NO}_3^-$ turned from a source (above the HH2-E mixing line) to a sink (below the HH2-E mixing line), while $\text{NO}_2^-$ and $\text{NH}_4^+$ turned from a sink (below the HH2-E mixing line) to a source (above the HH2-E mixing line) at the end of the river. Nitrate accumulation may be linked to an in-stream nitrification process, in which $\text{NO}_2^-$ and $\text{NH}_4^+$ were consumed to produce $\text{NO}_3^-$. In nitrification, the conversion of $\text{NH}_4^+$ to $\text{NO}_2^-$ and $\text{NO}_3^-$ is accompanied by marked N isotope fractionation effects, resulting in $^{15}\text{N}$ depleted $\text{NO}_3^-$ (Delwiche and Steyn, 1970; Mariotti et al., 1981; Macko and Ostrom, 1994). For $\delta^{18}\text{O}$-$\text{NO}_3^-$ values, NO$_3^-$ produced by nitrification in aquatic environments usually takes similar $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values to the ambient water (Casciotti et al. 2002; Sigman et al.2005). There is evidence that O can exchange between H$_2$O and intermediate compounds of nitrification (Andersson et al., 1982; DiSpirito and Hooper, 1986; Kool et al., 2007).

Since the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of estuarine water is expected to be higher than that of river water (Miyajima et al., 2009), $\delta^{18}\text{O}$-$\text{NO}_3^-$ should increase along the salinity gradient when in situ nitrification is occurring. Thus, a decrease in $\delta^{15}\text{N}$- (4.6-3.9‰) and an increase in $\delta^{18}\text{O}$-$\text{NO}_3^-$ (0.6-1.2‰) occurred downstream of the HH River and confirmed the in-stream nitrification process as a $\text{NO}_3^-$ source. The $\text{NH}_4^+$ concentrations increased at the end of the HH River (a maximum turbidity zone), probably from the release of particle-bound $\text{NH}_4^+$ (Seitzinger et al., 1991; Schlarbaum et al., 2010). Results (Kranck, 1984; Eisma, 1986; Schlarbaum et al., 2010) have been reported that this $\text{NH}_4^+$ could originate from the mineralization of $^{15}\text{N}$-enriched DON adsorbed onto the particles and was released with the estuarine turbidity maximum. The $^{15}\text{N}$-enriched
NH$_4^+$ was further converted to $^{15}$N-enriched NO$_3^-$. Thus, the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ increased sharply from 3.9 to 8.4‰ while the $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ only increased slightly from 1.2 to 1.5‰, resulting from taking similar $\delta^{18}$O values to the ambient water. Another candidate reason to cause a sharp increase in NH$_4^+$ concentration could be sewage discharge. Sewage is enriched in $^{15}$N relative to other N sources, as ammonia volatilization causes a large enrichment of $^{15}$N in the residual NH$_4^+$. This NH$_4^+$ is subsequently converted into $^{15}$N-enriched NO$_3^-$. When salinity achieves 5, nitrifying bacterial was potentially inhibited and reduced the conversion rate from NO$_2^-$ to NO$_3^-$(Pollice et al., 2002). Hence, the NO$_2^-$ was accumulated and NO$_3^-$ was declined in this zone.

The DIN concentrations and $\delta^{15}$N- and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ in the coastal water behaved conservatively of a mixing. Since the separation of the floodgate F2 at the end of the HH River, the salinity demonstrated a sudden increase from 4.9 (before the floodgate) to 18.6 (after the floodgate) in 1 km, potentially indicate that the HH river discharge was limited due to the floodgate F2. As the $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ value of the last sampling location in the HH River was close to that of the estuarine water, hence $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ values remained stable at ~8.0‰. The $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values increase sea-ward because of the high percentage of coastal water.

4.3 Nitrate dynamics in the CB River and JY River and their estuary

Compared to the HH River, the salinity of the CB and JY rivers varied in a relatively small range, from 0.5 to 0.6 for the CB River and from 0.6 to 0.8 for the JY River. Mixing lines were calculated between the CB and JY rivers and the estuarine water, respectively (Fig. 4). Both CB and JY rivers demonstrated a NO$_3^-$ source along the salinity gradient, indicating a NO$_3^-$ input from either in-stream nitrification or external
Nitrate concentrations in the CB River were elevated with a continuous accumulation along the river. The CB River flows through a rural area with intensive livestock production, likely resulting in NO$_3^-$ contamination in the CB River (Shao et al., 2010). Furthermore, a regular source-sink pattern was observed for NH$_4^+$ concentrations while a decrease for NO$_2^-$. The sharp increase in NH$_4^+$ concentrations was probably linked to manure discharge in the rural area. The added NH$_4^+$ was then rapidly oxidized to NO$_2^-$ and NO$_3^-$ during nitrification. Hence, $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ values were enriched and varied around 13.6‰, indicating NO$_3^-$ derived from manure (Kendall et al., 2007; Xue et al., 2009). As NO$_3^-$ from these origins is produced via nitrification, its $\delta^{18}$O values would not be very different from ambient water. Thus, the gradual increase in $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values along the salinity gradient above the respected mixing line confirmed the in situ nitrification (see the discussion above). Thus, in the CB River, the NO$_3^-$ turnover is mainly regulated by nitrification from external livestock N loadings.

The JY River became a significant source for NO$_3^-$ in concert with a sink for NO$_2^-$ and NH$_4^+$ species. The accumulation of NO$_3^-$ was linked to the in-stream nitrification, resulting from the consumption of NO$_2^-$ and NH$_4^+$. Evidence for this may be indicated by decreasing $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ and increasing $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values along the river. The salinity gradient sampled in the corresponding estuary showed a sea-ward decreasing trend in NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$ and NO$_3^-$ concentrations. The measured data in the CJ Estuary were expected to fall between the two calculated mixing lines generated from the rivers of CB and JY, because they both discharge into the same estuary. A major DIN source (above the two calculated mixing lines) appeared in the salinity zone between 2.0 and 4.2. This was probably from sewage discharge of mooring ships in
the vicinity of the sampling area. The typically high $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ (13.6 to 15.0‰) values confirmed NO$_3^-$ derivation from sewage. This point-source contamination was diluted by the estuarine water when salinity higher than 4.2, where the DIN concentrations and $\delta^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ values fall between the two mixing lines. The $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values of the estuarine water were quite close to the $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ derived from the nitrification of sewage, thus $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values were expected to retain stable.

4.4 Nitrate removal efficiency in the rivers and the estuaries

In this study, most of the measured data deviated from the calculated mixing lines, indicating rivers and estuaries becoming either a source or a sink. Thus, variation percentages of the measured data compared to the calculated mixing lines were computed to assess the NO$_3^-$ removal efficiency for the rivers and estuaries (Fig. 5). Interestingly, in the upstream part of the HH River before the floodgate F1, NO$_3^-$ was removed 30.9±22.1% compared to the calculated mixing line. Denitrification could be the dominant NO$_3^-$ removal process. This potentially results from the separation of the floodgate F1 which limited water exchange with downstream water enriched in DO. Furthermore, the floodgate F1 might prolong water residence time in the upstream part to remove a significant part of riverine N loading. The downstream part of the HH River between floodgate F1 and floodgate F2 showed an extremely weak NO$_3^-$ removal tendency (remove 2.5±13.3% of NO$_3^-$) from active NO$_3^-$ turnover processes and the HH Estuary demonstrated a conservative behavior with respect to NO$_3^-$. In contrast, a significant source of NO$_3^-$ is present in the CB (36.6±25.2%) and JY (34.6±35.1%) rivers compared to the calculated mixing line, explained by external N source addition and in-stream nitrification, respectively. Moreover, the CJ Estuary demonstrated higher NO$_3^-$ accumulation efficiency (82.1±78.8%) as a result of an
external N source input. Great variation percentages were observed between the sampling points from the same river or estuary, possibly resulting from different N dynamics and/or external source input.

Estuaries of rivers are considered as active sites of massive NO$_3^-$ losses (Brion et al., 2004; Seitzinger et al., 2006), removing up to 50% of NO$_3^-$ (OsparCom, 2000). However, our data do not support this view as in the HH and the CJ Estuary. First, DO concentrations were higher than 10 mgL$^{-1}$ not favorable for water column NO$_3^-$ removal processes. Second, dredging and diking work to deepen the ship channel decreased the sediment area (where denitrification mainly occurred) that is in contact with the overlying water column in the rivers (Dähnke et al., 2008), thus the NO$_3^-$ removal ability was reduced. Third, water residence time is not long enough to remove N loads in the estuaries by NO$_3^-$ removing processes as reclamation projects for the regional and national economy leading to the hydrodynamics of circulation in Tianjin section disappearance (Qin et al., 2012). This phenomenon could reduce water residence time and force NO$_3^-$ pollutants moving to the northern part of Bohai Bay, aggravating NO$_3^-$ contamination. Furthermore, this wintertime situation, with water temperature around 10˚C, ruled out most biological activity, and conservative mixing behavior in the HH River Estuary was not overly surprising. However, the CJ Estuary became a NO$_3^-$ source, linking to sewage discharge of mooring ships.

5. Conclusions

The combined use of salinity, DIN concentrations and NO$_3^-$ isotopic composition revealed NO$_3^-$ sources and dynamics in the salinized rivers of HH, CB and JY and elucidated mixing patterns of NO$_3^-$ in the corresponding estuarine system. The HH River demonstrated a significant NO$_3^-$ sink appeared in the upstream part of the HH
River by denitrification process. This potentially results from the separation of the floodgate F1 which limited water exchange with downstream water enriched in DO and prolong water residence time in the upstream to remove a significant part of riverine N loading. The downstream of the HH River showed an extremely weak NO$_3^-$ removal tendency from active NO$_3^-$ turnover processes. In contrast, a significant source of NO$_3^-$ is present in the rivers of CB and JY, linking to external N source addition and in-stream nitrification, respectively. We found that the estuarine mixing behavior is mostly conservative excluding the point source input appeared in the CJ estuary. Data indicate that the rivers and their corresponding estuaries have lost their natural capacity of NO$_3^-$ removal but turned into a significant source of NO$_3^-$ for the adjacent Bohai Bay.
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Table 1. Physicochemical properties and isotopic composition of $\text{NO}_3^-$ for the three investigated rivers and the corresponding estuaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Salinity (‰)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>$T$ (˚C)</th>
<th>DO (mg L$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\text{NO}_2^-$</th>
<th>$\text{NO}_3^-$</th>
<th>$\text{NH}_4^+$</th>
<th>$\delta^{15}$N-$\text{NO}_3^-$</th>
<th>$\delta^{18}$O-$\text{NO}_3^-$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>221.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>332.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>311.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>326.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>157.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>127.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.2±1.7</td>
<td>8.1±0.3</td>
<td>12.3±0.6</td>
<td>7.5±3.1</td>
<td>13.9±4.8</td>
<td>110.4±45.9</td>
<td>203.5±87.5</td>
<td>3.5±3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH*</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>21.2±2.3</td>
<td>8.2±0.1</td>
<td>9.7±0.6</td>
<td>10.7±0.0</td>
<td>6.2±0.5</td>
<td>16.4±7.7</td>
<td>77.7±9.3</td>
<td>8.1±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>333.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>380.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>367.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>210.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.5±0.1</td>
<td>8.4±0.3</td>
<td>10.9±0.3</td>
<td>9.8±0.7</td>
<td>9.0±2.3</td>
<td>151.2±20.6</td>
<td>266.9±105.4</td>
<td>13.6±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JY*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.7±0.1</td>
<td>8.3±0.2</td>
<td>11.5±0.8</td>
<td>8.9±1.1</td>
<td>4.4±1.8</td>
<td>61.4±19.9</td>
<td>41.0±23.4</td>
<td>5.6±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ&amp;</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>153.4</td>
<td>328.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>283.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>286.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.7±6.9</td>
<td>8.3±0.1</td>
<td>6.7±1.2</td>
<td>11.2±0.3</td>
<td>6.3±1.7</td>
<td>82.9±58.8</td>
<td>221.0±108.0</td>
<td>12.2±3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* represents river; & represents estuary.
Figure Captions:

Fig. 1 Sampling locations for the three investigated rivers.

Fig. 2 $\delta^{15}$N and $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ of the salinized rivers and estuaries. Ranges of isotopic composition for five potential NO$_3^-$ sources are adapted from Kendall et al., (2007) and Xue et al. (2009) and indicated by boxes: NO$_3^-$ in precipitation (NP), NO$_3^-$ fertilizer (NF), NH$_4^+$ in fertilizer and rain (NFR), soil N (Soil) and manure and sewage (M&S). To provide a range of $\delta^{18}$O-NO$_3^-$ values more wide and clear, the upper limit of NP reaches 50‰.

Fig. 3 DIN (NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$, NO$_3^-$) concentrations and isotopic composition of NO$_3^-$ versus salinity in the HH River and the HH Estuary. HH1-E represented the calculated mixing line between the initial upstream and the estuary; HH2-E represented the calculated mixing line between the floodgate F1 and the estuary; F represents floodgate.

Fig. 4 DIN (NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$, NO$_3^-$) concentrations and isotopic composition of NO$_3^-$ versus salinity in the CB River and the JY River and the CJ Estuary. CB9E represented the calculated mixing line between the CB River and the CJ Estuary; JY9E represented the calculated mixing line between the JY River and the CJ Estuary.

Fig. 5 Variation percentage compared to the calculated mixing lines for the HH River, CB River, JY River and their corresponding estuaries of HH and CJ. When the percentage $>0$ representing a source; when the percentage $<0$ representing a sink; when the percentage equal to 0 representing a mixing; * represents a river.
Figure 1  Xue et al.
Figure 3 Xue et al.
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