

Environmental Science Processes & Impacts

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



rsc.li/process-impacts

1 The research presented in this paper seeks to characterise dissolved organic matter (DOM) in a tropical
2 catchment in North Borneo that has been affected by significant (and recent), development of oil palm
3 plantations. The paper also examines variations in DOM according to land use (specifically secondary
4 forests, oil palm plantations and coastal swamps), and seasonal variations in DOM (during the inter-
5 monsoonal period, wet and dry seasons). We emphasize, in the paper, the potential of fluorescence
6 spectroscopy to determine the environmental impacts of active land use change including deforestation
7 and commercial agricultural activities on water resources. To-date there has been very little work
8 published on catchments that have been affected in this way and particularly with respect to the
9 application of fluorescence spectroscopy. We hope that the research will be of wider interest, and believe
10 that the research is a precursor to solving problems of ecosystem loss for energy production associated
11 with oil palm plantations in tropical regions.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Spatial and seasonal variations in the composition of dissolved organic matter**
4
5 **in a tropical catchment: the Lower Kinabatangan River, Sabah, Malaysia**
6
7

8
9 Sahana Harun^{1,2*}, Andy Baker³, Chris Bradley⁴, Gilles Pinay⁵
10

11
12 ¹Institute for Tropical Biology and Conservation, Universiti Malaysia Sabah,
13
14 Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia
15
16

17
18
19 ²Water Research Unit, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu,
20
21 Sabah, Malaysia
22
23

24
25 ³Connected Waters Initiative Research Centre,
26
27 UNSW Australia, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia
28
29

30
31 ⁴School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, the University of
32
33 Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom
34
35

36
37 ⁵ECOBIO, OSUR, University of Rennes 1, campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes
38
39 cedex, France
40
41

42
43
44 *Corresponding Author
45

46
47 Email: sahana@ums.edu.my; A.Baker@unsw.edu.au; C.Bradley@bham.ac.uk;
48

49
50 Gilles.Pinay@univ-rennes1.fr
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Dissolved organic matter (DOM) was characterised in waters sampled in the Lower Kinabatangan River Catchment, Sabah, Malaysia between October 2009 and May 2010. The study sought to: i. distinguish between the quality of DOM in waters draining palm oil plantations (OP), secondary forests (SF) and coastal swamps (CS) and, ii. identify the seasonal variability of DOM quantity and quality. Surface waters were sampled during fieldwork campaigns that spanned the wet and dry seasons. DOM was characterised optically by fluorescence Excitation Emission Matrix (EEM), the absorption coefficient at 340 nm and the spectral slope coefficient (S). Parallel Factor Analysis (PARAFAC) was undertaken to assess DOM composition from EEM spectra and five terrestrial derived components were identified: (C1, C2, C3, C4 and C5). Components C1 and C4 contributed most to DOM fluorescence in all study areas during both the wet and dry seasons. The results suggest that component C4 could be a significant (and common) PARAFAC signal found in similar catchments. Peak M (C2 and C3) was dominant in all samples collected in wet and dry seasons, which could be anthropogenic in origin given active land use change in the study area. In conclusion, there were significant seasonal and spatial variations in DOM which demonstrated the effects of land use cover and precipitation amount in the Kinabatangan catchment.

Keyword: Dissolved organic matter, tropical river, Excitation-emission matrix, Kinabatangan, PARAFAC model

Introduction

A recent synthesis and re-evaluation of the global carbon cycle suggested that approximately 3 Pg C per year of CO₂ is outgassed from global inland waters¹, while the estimated global riverine total carbon flux is 0.80-1.33 Pg C per year.² Given that it has been estimated that approximately half of the carbon is consumed within river systems before reaching the ocean³, in-stream and near-stream processing of organic matter is a fundamental component of the carbon cycle. This corroborates a research which found that Amazonian rivers outgassed more than ten times the quantity of carbon exported to the ocean in the form of total organic carbon or dissolved organic carbon (DOC).⁴ Significantly, determination of the carbon isotopic composition of DOC suggests that contemporary organic carbon (i.e. carbon < 5 years in age) was the dominant source of excess CO₂ that drives outgassing in Amazonian first order streams and large rivers.⁵ Together, these results emphasize the importance of land-derived, biologically available carbon, for heterotrophic microbial processes in river systems.

Tropical wetlands provide important ecosystem services including flood mitigation, coastal and wildlife protection, carbon sequestration and respiration.⁶ Tropical wetland ecosystems include a variety of landforms such as lowland floodplains, forested peatlands, swamps and mangroves.⁷ The latter are particularly important carbon sinks which have been reported to store ~49-98% ecosystem carbon in the organic soils.⁸ Tropical wetlands also experience periodic (prolonged) inundation⁹, reflecting marked seasonal variations in precipitation¹⁰, while evapotranspiration rates are high.¹¹ Tropical wetlands have been associated with the release of an estimated ~60% of total (global) water, sediment and organic carbon input to the ocean¹². However, these wetlands are seriously threatened by environmental deterioration as many catchments have experienced rapid conversion of land to agriculture¹³⁻¹⁵ with a concomitant reduction in wetland extent.

1
2
3 Among other agricultural threats, conversion of tropical forest to oil palm
4 (*Elaeis guineensis*) cultivation is a major concern given the recent growth of the palm
5 oil industry.¹⁶ Oil palm plantations are now estimated to extend over >13.5 million ha
6 of the tropics¹⁷ and have contributed to the drainage of floodplain wetlands, and the
7 loss of primary and secondary forest.¹⁸ At present, the majority of oil palm plantations
8 are confined to South East Asia, as Malaysia and Indonesia produce ~80% of the
9 world's palm oil. However, substantial areas of the Congo and Amazon Basin are
10 suitable for oil palm plantation, and further plantation developments are likely in these
11 areas. This situation emphasizes the urgent need to understand the environmental
12 implications of oil palm development. This is particularly important as the full
13 implications of recent and, in some places accelerating, changes in oil palm cover
14 have yet to be considered in detail and these land use changes are likely to affect the
15 quantity and quality of dissolved organic matter (DOM) and DOC.^{19,20}
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Recent advances in fluorescence spectroscopy have considerable potential
31 as we seek to address this research gap, as they have significantly enhanced our
32 ability to characterize DOM.²¹ DOM fractions possess fluorescent properties enabling
33 DOM monitoring in soils²², rivers^{23,24}, lakes²⁵, estuarine and coastal environments.^{26,27}
34 Reassessment of fluorescence excitation emission matrix (EEM) spectra using
35 Parallel Factor Analysis (PARAFAC) has been invaluable in characterising and
36 quantifying changes in DOM fluorescence. By decomposing an EEM dataset into
37 several, mathematically independent components parameterized by concentrations
38 (loadings) and excitation and emission spectra, different DOM fractions have been
39 traced through the natural environment.²⁸ For example, in southern Ontario, Canada,
40 DOM production and transformation processes were successfully studied in areas of
41 different use.²⁴ Specifically in a tropical catchment, DOM export was found to be
42 greater during the April flush (inter-monsoonal period), and it has been suggested
43 that tropical rivers are likely to export more labile DOM during periods of high
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 precipitation.²⁹ This is supported by a study in the sub-tropical Jiulong River
4 catchment, China, where increased DOM concentrations were observed after storms,
5 as a result of terrestrial DOM export to the river; with a decrease in the protein-like
6 fraction of DOM over the same period.³⁰ In sub-tropical Uruguay also, DOM
7 characteristics have been found to vary temporally in catchments with intensive
8 farming practices which was positively related to microbial processing.¹⁹ These
9 results have implications for downstream and marine ecosystems, however, the
10 importance of this research has yet to be more widely established.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The potential utility of fluorescence spectroscopy, specifically in SE Asia, was
21 demonstrated in a preliminary study that sought to characterize spatial trends in
22 DOM in the Lower Kinabatangan River Sabah, Malaysian Borneo.³¹ River flow and
23 photodegradation were found to have a significant effect on DOM properties,
24 however, the extent to which DOM varies seasonally was not considered. This
25 provides the motivation for this paper particularly as, in common with other
26 catchments in this region, there has been a rapid recent increase in the areal extent
27 of oil palm plantations. This, and the conservation of riparian secondary forest and
28 coastal wetlands within the catchment, provides an opportunity to determine the
29 degree to which DOM quantity and quality is affected: first by land-use change, and
30 second by the seasonal flood pulse.³² Accordingly, the objectives of this study were
31 to: i. characterize DOM quality in waters associated with palm oil plantations,
32 secondary forests and coastal wetlands using fluorescence spectroscopy and
33 PARAFAC;^{33,34} and ii. determine the seasonal variability of DOM quantity and quality,
34 and its attribution to each land cover type.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **METHODS AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES**

52
53
54
55 *Study area* - DOM characteristics were determined in selected downstream reaches
56 of the Kinabatangan River and tributaries in Sabah, Malaysia. The Kinabatangan
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 River (560 km in length), is the largest river in Sabah, with a total catchment area of
4
5 16,800 km² (Fig. 1).³⁵ Geologically, the Kinabatangan area is predominantly covered
6
7 by sandstone and shales, with minor occurrence of cherts and limestones, while the
8
9 igneous rocks are mainly basalts, serpentinites, gabbros, volcanic breccias and
10
11 tuffs.³⁶ Four groups of soil parent material were identified by surveys conducted in the
12
13 early 1950s: undifferentiated alluvium, peat, sandstone and mudstone and
14
15 limestone.^{37,38} Recent alluvium, originating mainly from sedimentary rocks, is found
16
17 widely on floodplains and in freshwater swamps.³⁸

18
19 The area has a humid tropical climate with mean daily temperatures ranging
20
21 from 22°C to 32°C and mean annual rainfall of 2,500 - 3,000 mm.^{35,39} Rainfall is
22
23 greatest between November and March particularly during the northeast (NE)
24
25 monsoon, and to a lesser degree during the southwest (SW) monsoon.^{39,40} Transition
26
27 periods, referred to as the 'inter-monsoonal periods', normally occur in April and
28
29 October and generally correspond with the period of lowest rainfall⁴¹ although
30
31 significant precipitation events may still occur at this time.^{40,42} Typically, the floodplain
32
33 and coastal plain are widely inundated during the rainy season but rainfall totals
34
35 exhibit considerable inter-annual variability.

36
37 The lower floodplain of the Kinabatangan is >2,800 km² in area (Fig. 1) with
38
39 two principal land uses: (i) forest (mangroves and peat swamps); (ii) agriculture
40
41 (primarily oil palm plantations and other crops); with relatively little urban
42
43 development and only occasional small water bodies.⁴³ Approximately 74% of the
44
45 Kinabatangan catchment is tropical forest, including floodplains with open reed
46
47 swamp, and lowland dipterocarp forest in areas that are inundated frequently.^{39,43}
48
49 Mean river flow in the upper catchment, recorded at Pagar (PGR) and Balat (BLT)
50
51 (Fig. 2), varied from ~14.0 to 1944 m³/s (26-1944 m³/s) between 1979 to 2013 (peak
52
53 daily discharge was recorded in January 1986 at BLT; the lowest flow was observed
54
55 at PGR in June 1998). Only limited sediment data are available, but a survey at
56
57 Sukau (at points upstream of coastal swamps) (Fig. 1) in 2005 and 2006 indicated
58
59
60

1
2
3 that maximum sediment concentrations were 96 mg/l equating to Class IIB of the
4 Malaysian Interim National Water Quality Standard (INWQS).^{43,44} This appears to
5 reflect commercial logging in the catchment since the 1980s and the development of
6 oil palm plantations which currently extend over ~4,200 km² which represents
7 approximately 25% of the basin.⁴³
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 *Sampling and analyses* – Waters were characterized throughout the lower catchment
16 through the manual collection of 510 water samples during five sampling periods in
17 2009-2010. One period corresponded with the inter-monsoonal period (IM): October
18 2009; three corresponded with the wet season (WS): November, December 2009
19 and February 2010; and one the dry season (DS): May 2010. Fieldwork design was
20 constrained by difficulties of access; however, waters were sampled along a
21 freshwater – estuarine gradient to determine seasonal trends in DOM in the Lower
22 Kinabatangan floodplain including across the freshwater-marine interface between
23 the Kinabatangan River and the Sulu Sea. The nearest gauging station was at Berek
24 Manis (BM), situated ~11km from sample point SF-1, at which point the upstream
25 catchment is 12,300 km² (Fig. 1). Monthly mean discharges during the fieldwork
26 campaign are presented in Table 1.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Waters were sampled from streams or creeks situated entirely within: i. oil
41 palm (*Elaeis guineensis*) plantations: OP-1, OP-2, OP-3 and OP-4 (220 samples); ii.
42 secondary forests: SF-1, SF-2 and SF-3 (139 samples) and iii. coastal swamps of
43 *Nypa fruticans* (nipa palm): CS-1 and CS-2 (151 samples) (Fig. 1). The vegetation
44 characteristics for each land cover type are summarised in Table 2 (after Abram et
45 al.⁴⁵). At each point, a 200 ml water sample was collected from the middle of the river
46 / stream from a boat at three points in the water profile: the surface, the mid-point
47 and near the riverbed using a WaterMark Horizontal Polycarbonate water sampler.
48 Samples were stored in high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottles, pre-washed with
49 hydrochloric acid 10% and deionised water. pH and salinity were determined using a
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hanna Water Quality Multiparameter (Model HI 9828) immediately prior to filtering
4 the water samples (within six hours of sample collection) using 47 mm pre-
5 combusted Whatman glassfiber GF/C filter papers (nominal pore size 1.2 μm).
6
7 Filtered water samples were kept in the dark and stored at 4°C before shipment to
8
9 the UK for laboratory analysis, which occurred within seven days of the end of the
10
11 field-campaign.
12
13
14
15

16
17 *Spectral measurements and DOC* – Fluorescence analyses of samples were
18 performed at the University of Birmingham, UK, using a Varian Cary Eclipse
19 spectrophotometer. Excitation-emission matrices (EEMs) were generated for each
20 sample over excitation wavelengths 250 to 400 nm at 5-nm intervals and emission
21 wavelengths 280 to 500 nm at 5-nm intervals, with 2-nm bandwidths on excitation
22 and emission modes. Spectrophotometer output was monitored by regular
23 determination of the Raman intensity of ultra pure water in a sealed 10 x 10 mm
24 cuvette at 348 nm excitation and 5 nm bandpass. No significant changes were
25 observed in the EEMs, particularly in samples associated with the secondary forest
26 and coastal swamps (the mean salinity for all samples collected was 1.27‰),
27 although Yang & Hur⁴⁶ suggested the potential impact of salinity on fluorescence
28 DOM peaks A and M. An inner-filter effect (IFE) correction was applied to the data
29 set⁴⁷:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

$$I = I_0 (10^{-b(A_{ex}+A_{em})}) \quad (1)$$

44 where I is detected fluorescence intensity; I_0 is fluorescence in the absence
45 of self-absorption; b is the path length for both the excitation and emission beam;
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

955 Absorption coefficients at 340 nm and spectral slope over the interval of 275-
956 295 nm ($S_{275-295}$)⁴⁸ were determined using a Lightwave (WPA) spectrophotometer in a
957
958
959
960

10 mm quartz cuvette. Absorption measurements were corrected against Milli-Q water blanks and the slope of the absorption curve was calculated by linear regression of the log-transformed a spectra.

Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) was determined using a Shimadzu TOC-V-SCH analyser with auto-sampler TOC-ASI-V. Samples were acidified to pH ~2 with HCl and analysed within one month collection. Acidified samples (pH ~2) were sparged for 8 minutes at 75 or 100 ml/min⁻¹ with either ultra-pure oxygen to remove all inorganic carbon from samples prior to measurement.

PARAFAC modelling – Fluorescence excitation emission matrix (EEM) spectra were reassessed using Parallel Factor Analysis (PARAFAC).^{33,34} Fluorescence EEMs were combined into a 3-dimensional data array and decomposed to a set of trilinear terms and a residual array:

$$x_{ijk} = \sum_{f=1}^F a_{if} b_{jf} c_{kf} + e_{ijk} \quad i = 1, \dots, I \quad j = 1, \dots, J \quad k = 1, \dots, K \quad (2)$$

where x_{ijk} is the fluorescence intensity for sample i at emission wavelength j and excitation wavelength k ; a_{if} , b_{jf} and c_{kf} are the loading matrices. F is the number of components in the model, and e_{ijk} is the residual noise (i.e. the variability that is not explained by the model). Despite the use of a 250-395 nm excitation filter, the initial PARAFAC analysis was confounded by scatter in individual EEMs, which occurred within the excitation (emission) wavelength ranges of 250 to 280-nm (280 to 290-nm). In this study, mean suspended sediment concentrations of the Lower Kinabatangan River varied between ~7 and ~9800 mg/l (data not presented). As a result, of filtration the signal / noise ratio for excitation wavelengths <290 nm was not acceptable and consequently the microbial peak, which corresponds to an excitation wavelength of 280 nm excitation, was removed in the PARAFAC analysis.

1
2
3 A PARAFAC model with non-negativity constraint on all modes (samples,
4 emission and excitation) was implemented in MATLAB. The data were split into two
5 random halves each comprising 254 EEMs, representing a calibration data array and
6 a validation array. The appropriate number of components (the model rank) was
7 determined by comparing the excitation and emission spectra of components
8 between the calibration and validation data arrays and from split-half analysis, a total
9 of five components were validated. Two categories of independent data sets were
10 successfully validated: first, an inter-seasonal comparison between the wet and dry
11 season, and second a land use comparison: oil palm plantations (OP), secondary
12 forests (SF) and coastal swamps (CS). This compares with an earlier PARAFAC
13 model for the Kinabatangan catchment which had validated three components.³¹ In
14 the earlier model, however, all sampling stations were situated in the immediate
15 vicinity of oil palm plantations while in the current study, sampling sites distinguished
16 between three land use types (oil palm plantations, secondary forests and coastal
17 swamps). Thus the five components presented in this study could potentially reflect
18 differences in DOM composition according to land use.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The PARAFAC model returns the relative intensities of derived components,
38 and the intensity of the n^{th} component in a given sample remains unknown. Hence I_n
39 was estimated by determining the fluorescence intensity at the peak excitation and
40 emission maximum of the n^{th} component⁴⁹:
41
42
43
44
45
46

$$I_n = \text{Score}_n * Ex_n(\lambda_{max}) * Em_n(\lambda_{max}) \quad (3)$$

47
48 where: Score_n is the relative intensity of the n^{th} component, $Ex_n(\lambda_{max})$ is the
49 maximum excitation loading of the n^{th} component, $Em_n(\lambda_{max})$ is the maximum
50 emission loading of the n^{th} component derived from the model. The total fluorescence
51 intensity (I_{tot}) was calculated as the sum of the components.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Statistical Analysis* – Precipitation data were analysed using a paired-sample t test to
4 determine whether there were significant differences between inter-monsoonal period
5 (IM), wet (WS) and dry seasons (DS). The p -value ($p < 0.05$) for pairs of IM-WS, IM-
6 DS and WS-DS are 0.950, 0.142 and 0.018 respectively. This analysis also sought to
7 verify whether the rainfall data used in the study were free from precipitation
8 anomalies, potentially caused by irregular synoptic forcing associated with the El
9 Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and changes in the seasonality of the monsoon in
10 SE Asia.⁴⁴ Discriminant analysis was applied to characterise DOM according to land
11 use type and seasonal variations. Calculations of the fluorescence intensities (I_n) of
12 the individual components indicated that: $IC_4 > IC_2 > IC_3 > IC_1 > IC_5$, suggesting
13 that the terrestrially derived peak A had the most abundant spectral characteristics,
14 followed by peak M (IC2 and IC3), peak C (IC1) and peak M (IC5). UV absorbance at
15 340 nm and fluorescence DOM (FDOM) were normalized to IC4 and fluorescence
16 indices (FI) (ratios as detailed below) were used to determine the pre-dominance of
17 each parameter in each land use type to gain more insight on DOM characterisation:
18 IC_4/a_{340} (peak A/ a_{340}), IC_2/IC_4 (peak M/peak A), IC_3/IC_4 (peak M/peak A) and
19 IC_5/IC_4 (peak M/peak A). Both paired-sample t test and discriminant analysis were
20 undertaken using SPSS version 21.0.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Results and Discussion**

44
45 The data presented here provide the first evidence of seasonal changes in DOM
46 composition in a catchment affected by the recent development of oil palm
47 plantations. In the following section we compare our results with recent studies of
48 other tropical catchments and consider the wider significance of this work.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Characterisation of PARAFAC Components* – Five fluorescent components were
4 identified by PARAFAC from analysis of the 510 sample dataset (Fig. 3). The
5 excitation and emission pairs of the main peak positions for each component are
6 summarised in Table 3, and individual components are plotted in Fig. 3. Table 3 also
7 compares the results with components identified in selected studies that have
8 modelled DOM in marine, oceanic and estuarine environments.
9
10

11
12
13
14
15
16 Our PARAFAC model identified five terrestrially-derived substances:
17 component 1 (C1) to component 5 (C5). Our terrestrially-derived components (C1
18 and C4) have been observed in other tropical and sub-tropical studies: these are
19 ubiquitous, fulvic-acid representing fluorophores that have the longest excitation (and
20 emission) wavelength and broadest excitation (and emission) band. Our components
21 were found to relate specifically to the Component 1 described by Luciani et al.⁵⁰,
22 Stedmon and Markager⁵¹ and Yamashita et al.⁵²; to the Component 2 of Fellman et
23 al.²¹, Component 3 of Yao et al.⁵³ and to Component 4 of Kowalczyk et al.⁴⁹ Our
24 earlier DOM characterisation study in the Lower Kinabatangan also reported a
25 terrestrial-derived Component 1 (peak A and C).³¹ Our C1 (identified here) is similar
26 to the humic-like fluorophore in the visible region defined by Coble.⁵⁴
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Our components C2, C3 and C5 have been previously reported as peak M;
40 they have shorter emission wavelengths and were initially attributed to a marine
41 source of DOM.^{54,55} Subsequently Stedmon et al.⁵⁶ suggested that this component is
42 found in 'terrestrially dominated end-member samples', and Fellman et al.⁵⁷
43 described this peak as ultraviolet A (UVA), a low molecular weight component related
44 to microbial activities. While peak M is common in marine environments and is
45 apparently related to biological activity, it is also found in wastewater, in wetlands and
46 agricultural environments. Peak M production could be partly due to photobleaching
47 of terrestrial FDOM or autochthonous production from microbial processes.⁵⁸ Our C2
48 resembles Component 3 found by Murphy et al.⁵⁹, and Components 4 and 6 of
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stedmon et al.⁵⁶ and Yamashita et al.⁵². This component was also reported by Zhang
4 et al.⁶⁰: their Component 1; Luciani et al.⁵⁰: their Component 2; Stedmon et al.⁵⁶: their
5 Component 3; Yao et al.⁵³: their Component 3; and Stedmon et al.⁵⁶: their
6 Component 5.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Comparison of the fluorescence intensities, I_n , indicated that terrestrially-
13 derived peak IC4 (peak A) had the most abundant spectral characteristics. The peak
14 component has been described as ubiquitous, photo-labile, terrestrially-derived OM
15 which originates from agricultural activities⁵² but it could also represent a
16 photodegradation processing pathway.⁶¹ Natural forest cover in the Lower
17 Kinabatangan river catchment has declined from ~91% in 1970's to ~47% in 1995⁶²;
18 and at present ~25% of the catchment is largely cultivated with oil palm plantations³⁹,
19 which could explain the spectral characteristics and abundance of component IC4.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The PARAFAC components summarised in this paper are similar to those
31 outlined in other studies of tropical catchments^{31,50,52} indicating that common
32 attributes can be identified. However, the DOM characteristics described in most
33 previous studies, are of DOM that has a very different origin (including subtropical
34 wetlands⁵⁰ and enclosed coastal water bodies⁵²) to that found in our study in NE
35 Sabah³¹. Consequently the results and the implications for both the Kinabatangan
36 catchment, and tropical regions generally, should be interpreted with caution, as
37 there might be site-specific contributions of natural organic matter from other land
38 use and vegetation types might be only applicable in a local context²³. It might also
39 be possible for the fluorescence characteristics to appear 'identical' in different
40 catchments, albeit associated with a different DOM composition.⁶³
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Seasonal and Land Use Variations* – Discriminant analyses of the DOM data-set and
54 land use type yielded two discriminant functions as summarised in Table 4 and Fig. 4.
55 The ratios of i. IC3/IC4 and ii. IC2/IC4 were found to always correlate positively with
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 IC5/IC4. They were classified in discriminant function 1 (DF1) and explained 79.2%
4 of the variance. These results suggest that DF1 corresponds to fluorescence
5 properties arising through photodegradation thus representing a DOM processing
6 signature. Moreover, samples from coastal swamps (CS) were found to comprise
7 DOM which was less processed (i.e. the DOM was fresher or younger), while DOM in
8 waters sampled from the oil palm plantations (OP) showed evidence of greater
9 processing, particularly in those samples collected from canals with stagnant water.
10
11

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Seasonal trends in DOM characteristics were also evident in the discriminant analysis: DF1 suggests that the ratio of IC5/IC4 correlated positively with IC2/IC4 and explained 84.1% of the variance (Table 4). IC4/a₃₄₀ was dominant in waters sampled during the wet season and (Fig. 4), suggesting that DOM was fresher during the wet season (WS) compared with the dry season (DS) when DOM was more processed. While no seasonal variations in EEMs were observed by Baker & Spencer⁶⁴ in their study in a temperate maritime catchment with anthropogenic DOM inputs in the Tyne, UK, other studies highlighted seasonal variability in EEMs. For example, Zhao et al.⁶⁵ observed seasonal variations in EEMs from semi-arid lakes in NE China. Seasonal patterns of DOM distribution also have been found in subtropical Florida Bay, USA where relative abundance of humic-like (Ex/Em=<260, 345/462 and protein-like component (Ex/Em=275/326) were higher during the early wet season (June to August).⁶⁶

The ratios IC2/IC4 and IC5/IC4 were high in samples from the oil palm plantations (OP) during the dry season, suggesting that the DOM was more processed in the OP samples and could have been affected by microbial activities and/or photo-degradation during this period. Preliminary $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and molar C:N values of both DOM and particulate organic matter (POM) in an Australian tropical rainforest catchment suggested that exports of microbially processed organic matter were higher from upper soil horizons during the dry season.⁶⁷ Subsequently, Lee-Cruz et al.⁶⁸ investigated soil bacterial communities in logged forest and oil palm plantations

1
2
3 in Sabah and found a high abundance of *Actinomycetales*, which are dominant in
4 cultivated areas.⁶⁹ Their study indicated that oil palm plantation soils have a higher
5 bacterial diversity and turnover and are more heterogeneous. A study in Jambi,
6 Indonesia revealed a high abundance of the genus *Burkholderia*, *Cupriavidus* and
7 *Acinetobacter* in bacteria isolates from oil palm plantation aquatic sediments.⁷⁰
8 *Burkholderia* and *Cupriavidus* are nitrogen-fixing^{71,72} plant growth promoting
9 bacteria⁷² while *Acinetobacter* has been reported ubiquitous in soil and surface
10 waters⁷³, is a nonmotile, agent for biodegradation, leaching and removal of organic
11 and inorganic waste.⁷⁴ An earlier water quality study in the Sukau area of the
12 Kinabatangan catchment (Fig 1) during a weak La Niña event (2005 to 2006)
13 indicated that the Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) of a stream in an oil palm
14 plantation ranged from 1.3 to 2.1 mg/l.⁴⁴ Dry season water samples from downstream
15 reaches on the Sg. Langat in Selangor, Malaysia, which were also located within oil
16 palm plantations, had mean BOD values ranging from 2.1 to 2.6 mg/l⁷⁵. Therefore,
17 we hypothesize that the peak M we found in the Lower Kinabatangan River
18 catchment, which varied seasonally and according to land use, could be derived from
19 microbial and/or photo-degradation processes.

20
21 The variation in DOM according to season and land cover is illustrated in Fig.
22 5 by plotting DOC against PARAFAC component IC4 for each land use type.
23 Tabulated DOC concentrations varied from 9.88 to 12.85 mg/l (Table 1). Samples
24 from secondary forests (SF) and coastal swamps (CS) showed a strong positive
25 correlation between DOC and PARAFAC component C4 (r^2 of 0.6 and 0.7
26 respectively). It also showed that DOM composition in both SF and CS were
27 moderately constrained by monsoon and flow, compared to samples from the oil
28 palm plantations (OP), which were highly constrained in particular during the inter-
29 monsoonal period and wet season. This is consistent with the discriminant analysis
30 (Fig. 4), which indicated the ratio of IC4 to a_{340} was dominant in samples collected in
31 SF during the wet season, while the spectral slope (275-295 nm) was found to be
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dominant in CS during the inter-monsoonal period (October 2009). There were
4
5 positive correlations between UV absorbance a_{340} nm and PARAFAC component C4
6
7 (peak A) with regression value of 0.5 for all types of land cover (Fig. 6). UV
8
9 absorbance at ~340 nm and spectral slope have been showed to be indicative of
10
11 DOM molecular weight^{48,76}, and to correlate positively with lignin concentration.²⁹
12
13 Lignin concentration in aquatic ecosystems was strongly influenced by seasonal
14
15 hydrology, river catchment discharge, flooding events and types of vegetation and
16
17 land use.⁷⁷ A quantitative aquatic carbon budget for the Langat River in Malaysia
18
19 indicated that although C3 plant-derived matter was the primary source of carbon in
20
21 wetland areas, sewage treatment and landfill sites in the lower catchment provided
22
23 significant additional inputs of organic carbon.⁷⁸ Nedwell et al.⁷⁹ demonstrated that
24
25 carbon mineralisation in a subtropical mangrove swamp in Jamaica was higher
26
27 compared to other areas, indicating abundant OM availability. Mangrove forests also
28
29 typically have rich tannins, which is likely to be the main source of protein-like
30
31 fluorescence.⁸⁰ They are also associated with decreasing bacterial counts⁸¹ and
32
33 hydrophobic acids⁸², which could explain observations of low molecular weight DOM
34
35 in CS samples in the Lower Kinabatangan River catchment during the inter-
36
37 monsoonal period.
38

39
40 Our results indicated that the ratio IC4 (peak A) to a_{340} was high and the
41
42 spectral slope ($S_{275-295}$) was low in waters sampled from secondary forests during the
43
44 wet season. This could be associated with DOM inputs that were fresher and of
45
46 higher molecular weight. There was also evidence of DOM degradation (bio- and
47
48 photo-degradation) in river reaches downstream, including the estuary. The
49
50 consistent high DOC concentrations that we observed in our study are indicative of
51
52 high concentrations of humic material in the waters sampled. Previous work has
53
54 demonstrated that secondary forests have the potential to absorb and store a large
55
56 proportion of the carbon and nutrients lost as a result of changes in land use and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 particularly deforestation.⁸³⁻⁸⁵ Secondary forests can be effective nutrient sinks
4 enabling the rapid accumulation of nutrients over time. With respect to organic matter
5 production, secondary forests can return significant OM in litter fall although they
6 store less nutrients in their litter.^{86,87} This results in high nutrient cycling rates but may
7 also potentially contribute to nutrient loss.⁸⁶
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Conclusion**

17
18
19 We conclude that the characteristics of DOM in the Lower Kinabatangan River,
20 Malaysia are dominated by the fluorescence peaks A (IC4) and M (IC2, IC3 and IC5).
21 These peaks indicate the importance of microbial and photo-degradation processes,
22 particularly during the dry season, which break down the aromatic carbon molecules
23 that account for DOM fluorescence. Discriminant analysis of the PARAFAC data set
24 indicated that OP samples could be distinguished by plotting peak M (IC2, IC3 and
25 IC5) against a_{340} , confirming the importance of microbial activity and photo-
26 degradation processes in streams associated with oil palm plantations. The ratio
27 $IC4/a_{340}$ and spectral slope successfully distinguished secondary forests, followed by
28 oil palm plantations and coastal swamps, suggesting that DOM with higher MW are
29 found in SF. This also suggests variations in the quality of DOC production in
30 different land use types, modified by the monsoonal cycle. This is supported by the
31 PARAFAC model presented here which yielded three peak M components. Hence
32 the paper suggests that analysis of EEMs, supported by PARAFAC, are a useful tool
33 to determine and characterise the humic and fulvic substances in aquatic
34 ecosystems, which correlate strongly with DOC.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Acknowledgements**

53
54
55
56 We thank the Malaysia Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE), Universiti Malaysia
57 Sabah, Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID) Sabah, Malaysian Meteorological
58
59
60

1
2
3 Department, for providing fund, hydrological and meteorological data in this study.
4
5 Thanks are also extended to Sabah Forestry Department and Sabah Wildlife
6
7 Department for permitting this research to be undertaken in Kinabatangan, Sabah,
8
9 Malaysia. We are grateful to: Ms. Anne Ankcorn for drawing Fig. 1; Mr. Zainal Abidin
10
11 Jaafar, Mr. Budin Ransangan and Ms. Asnih Etin, for their great help with the field
12
13 sampling. Finally, we are thankful to the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their
14
15 valuable comments and suggestions.
16
17

18 References

- 19
20
21
22 1 Abril G, Martinez JM, Artigas LF, Moreira-Turcq P, Benedetti MF, Vidal L, Meziane
23 T, Kim JH, Bernardes MC, Savoye N, Deborde J, Souza EL, Alberic P, de
24 Souza MFL, Roland F, *Nature*, 2015, **505**(7483), 395–398.
25
26 2 Huang TH, Fu YH, Pan PY, Arthur Chen CT, *Current Opinion in Environmental*
27 *Sustainability*, 2012, **4**(2), 162–169.
28
29 3 Cole JJ, Prairie YT, Caraco NF, McDowell WH, Tranvik LJ, Striegel RG, Duarte CM,
30 Kortelainen P, Downing JA, Middelburg JJ, Melack J, *Ecosystems*, 2007, **10**:
31 171-84.
32
33 4 Richey JE, Melack JM, Aufdenkampe AK, Ballester VM, Hess LL, *Nature*, 2002,
34 **416**: 617-620.
35
36 5 Mayorga E, Aufdenkampe AK, Masiello CA, Krusche AV, Hedges JI, Quay PD,
37 Richey JE, Brown TA, *Nature*, 2005, **436**: 538-541.
38
39 6 Mitsch WJ, Bernal B, Nahlik AM, Mander Ü, Zhang L, Anderson CJ, Jorgensen SE,
40 Brix H, *Landscape Ecology*, 2013, **28**(4), 583–597.
41
42 7 Aselmann I, Crutzen PJ, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 1989, **8**, 307-358.
43
44 8 Donato DC, Kauffman JB, Murdiyarso D, Kurnianto S, Stidham M, Kanninen M,
45 *Nature Geoscience*, 2011, DOI: 10.1038/ngeo1123
46
47 9 Mayora G, Devercelli M, Giri F, *Hydrobiologia*, 2013, **717**(1), 51–63.
48
49 10 Saigusa N, Yamamoto S, Hirata R, Ohtani Y, Ide R, Asanuma J, Gamo M, Hirano
50 T, Kondo H, Kosugi Y, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 2008, **148**: 700-
51 713.
52
53 11 Ogata Y, Ishigaki T, Ebie Y, Sutthasil N, Chiemchaisri C, Yamada M, *Waste*
54 *Management*, 2015, **44**(C), 164–171.
55
56 12 Alkhatib M, Jennerjahn TC, Samiaji J, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2007, **52**: 2410-2417.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 13 Atapattu S, Kodituwakku D, *Agricultural Water Management*, 2009, **96**(3): 361-
4 373.
5
6 14 Mattsson B, Cederberg C, Blix L, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2000, **8**: 283-292.
7
8 15 Sidle R, Tani M, Ziegler A, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 2006, **224**(1-2): 1–4.
9
10 16 Ji CM, Eong PP, Ti TB, Seng CE, Ling CK, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy*
11 *Reviews*, 2013, **26**(C), 717–726.
12
13 17 Fitzherbert EB, Stuebig MJ, Morel A, Danielsen F, Bruhl CA, Donald PF, Phalan B,
14 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 2008, **23**(10): 538- 545.
15
16 18 Koh LP, Wilcove DS, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 2008, **24**(2): 67-68.
17
18 19 Graeber D, Goyenola G, Meerhoff M, Zwirnmann E, Ovesen NB, Glendell M,
19 Gelbrecht J, Teixeira de Mello F, González-Bergonzoni I, Jeppesen E,
20 Kronvang B, *Hydrology and Earth System Science*, 2015, **19**: 2377-2394.
21
22 20 Lu YH, Bauer JE, Canuel EA, Chambers RM, Yamahita Y, Jaffé R, Barrett A,
23 *Biogeochemistry*, 2014, **119** : 275-292.
24
25 21 Fellman JB, Miller MP, Cory RM, D'Amore DV, White D, *Environmental Science &*
26 *Technology*, 2009, **43**(16): 6228–6234.
27
28 22 Fuentes M, Gonzalezgaitano G, Garchiamina J, *Organic Geochemistry*, 2006,
29 **37**(12): 1949-1959.
30
31 23 Ahmad UK, Ujang Z., Yusop Z, Fong TL, *Water Science and Technology*, 2002,
32 **46**: 117-125.
33
34 24 Williams CJ, Yamashita Y, Wilson HF, Jaffé R, Xenopoulos MA, *Limnol.*
35 *Oceanogr.*, 2010, **55**(3): 1159–1171.
36
37 25 Miller M, McKnight D, Charpra S, Williams M, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2009, **54**: 2213–
38 2227.
39
40 26 Stedmon C, Markager S, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2005, **50**(2): 686–697.
41
42 27 Yamashita Y, Jaffé R, Maie R, Tanque E, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2008, **53**: 1900–
43 1908.
44
45 28 Cory RM, McKnight DM, *Environmental Science & Technology*. 2005, **39**(21):
46 8142-8149.
47
48 29 Spencer R, Hernes P, Rug R, Baker A, Dyda R, Stubbins A, Six J, *Journal of*
49 *Geophysical Research*, 2010, **115**, G03013.
50
51 30 Hong H, Yang L, Guo W, Wang F, Yu X, *Biogeochemistry*, 2012, **109**: 163-174.
52
53 31 Harun S, Baker A, Bradley C, Pinay G, Boomer I, Hamilton RL, *Hydrology*
54 *Research*, 2015, **46**(3), 411-428.
55
56 32 Junk WJ, *Environmental Conservation*, 2002, **29**(4): 414-435.
57
58 33 Bro R, *Chemometrics and intelligent laboratory system*, 1997, **38**: 149-171.
59
60

- 1
2
3 34 Stedmon CA, Markager S, *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 2003, **57**(5-6):
4 973-979.
5
6 35 Josephine R, Alfred RJ, Rajah I, presented in part at *World Water Day*, 2004, 1-10.
7
8 36 Tongkul F, *Journal of Southeast Asian Earth Sciences*, 1991, **6**, 395-405.
9
10 37 Acres BD, Folland CJ, *The Soils of Sabah. Vol. 2: Sandakan and Kinabatangan*
11 *Districts*, Land Resources Division, Ministry of Overseas Development,
12 England, 1975.
13
14 38 Town and Regional Planning Department Sabah, Sabah Coastal Zone Profile. in
15 *The Integrated Coastal Zone Management Unit*, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, 1998.
16
17 39 Boonratana R, *International Journal of Primatology*. 2000, **21**: 497-517.
18
19 40 Gazzaz NM, Yusoff MK, Ramli MF, Aris AZ, Juahir H, *Marine Pollution Bulletin*,
20 2012, **64**(4): 688-698.
21
22 41 Dambul R, Jones P, *Geografia*, 2008, **5**(1): 1–25.
23
24 42 Suhaila J, Deni SM, Wan Zin WW, Jemain AA, *Sains Malaysiana*, 2010, **39**: 533–
25 542.
26
27 43 Department of Environment Malaysia, *Study on pollution and water quality*
28 *improvement for Sg. Kinabatangan Basin. Final Report Volume II: Main Report*
29 *(Part I)*. Unpublished Report, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
30 Malaysia, 2009.
31
32 44 Harun S, Al-Shami S, Dambul R, Mohamed M, Abdullah MH, *Sains Malaysiana*,
33 2015, **44**(4): 545-558.
34
35 45 Abram NK, Xofis P, Tzanopoulos J, MacMillan DC, Ancrenaz M, Chung R, Peter L,
36 Ong R, Lackman I, Goossens B, Ambu L, Knight AT, *PLOS One*, 2014, **9**(6):
37 e95388.
38
39 46 Yang L, Hur J, *Water Research*, 2014, **59**: 80-89.
40
41 47 Ohno T, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2002, **36**(4): 742-746.
42
43 48 Helms JR, Stubbins A, Ritchie J, Minor E, Kieber D, Mopper K, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*,
44 2008, **3**, 955–969.
45
46 49 Kowalczyk P, Durako MJ, Young H, Kahn AE, Cooper WJ, Gonsior M, *Marine*
47 *Chemistry*, 2009, **113**(3-4): 182-196.
48
49 50 Luciani X, Mounier S, Paraquetti H, Redon R, Lucas Y, Bois A, Lacerda L,
50 Raynaud M, Ripert M, *Marine Environmental Research*, 2008, **65**(2): 148-157.
51
52 51 Stedmon C, Markager S, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2005, **50**: 1415–1426.
53
54 52 Yamashita Y, Scinto LJ, Maie N, Jaffé R, *Ecosystems*, 2010, **13**: 1006-1019.
55
56 53 Yao X, Zhang Y, Zhu G, Qin B, Feng L, Cai L, Gao G, *Chemosphere*, 2011, **82**(2):
57 145-155.
58
59 54 Coble P, *Marine Chemistry*, 1996, **51**(4): 325–346.
60

- 1
2
3 55 Parlanti E, Wörz K, Geoffroy L, Lamotte M, *Organic Geochemistry*, 2000, **31**:
4 1765-1781.
5
6 56 Stedmon CA, Markager S, Bro R, *Marine Chemistry*, 2003, **82**: 239–254.
7
8 57 Fellman JB, Hood E, Spencer RGM, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2010, **55**(6): 2452–2462.
9
10 58 Helms JR, Mao J, Stubbins A, Schmidt-Rohr K, Spencer RGM, Hernes PJ,
11 Mopper K, *Aquatic Sciences*, 2014, **76**(3), 353–373.
12
13 59 Murphy KR, Stedmon CA, Waite TD, Ruiz GM, *Marine Chemistry*, 2008, **108**(1-2):
14 40-58.
15
16 60 Zhang Y, van Dijk MA, Liu M, Zhu G, Qin B, *Water Research*, 2009, **43**(18): 4685-
17 4697.
18
19 61 Sharpless CM, Blough NV, *Environmental Science Processes & Impacts*, 2014,
20 **16**, 656-671.
21
22 62 Payne J, *Sabah Biodiversity Conservation Project, Malaysia: Kinabatangan Multi*
23 *Disciplinary Study*. Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Development, Sabah
24 & Danish Co-operation for Environment and Development (DANCED), 1996.
25
26 63 Jaffe R, Cawley KM, Yamashita Y (2014) *Applications of Excitation Emission*
27 *Matrix Fluorescence with Parallel Factor Analysis (EEM-PARAFAC) in*
28 *Assessing Environmental Dynamics of Natural Dissolved Organic Matter*
29 *(DOM) in Aquatic Environments: A Review*. In F. Rosario-Ortiz (Ed.), *Advances*
30 *in the Physicochemical Characterization of Dissolved Organic Matter: Impact*
31 *on Natural and Engineered Systems* (Vol. 1160, pp. 27–73). Washington, DC:
32 American Chemical Society.
33
34
35
36 64 Baker A, Spencer RGM, *Science of the Total Environment*, 2004, **333**: 217-232.
37
38 65 Zhao Y, Song K, Wen Z, Li L, Zang S, Shao T, Li S, Du J, *Biogeosciences*
39 *Discuss*, 2015, **12**: 5725-5756.
40
41 66 Maie N, Yamashita Y, Cory RM, Boyer JN, Jaffe R, *Applied Geochemistry*, 2012,
42 **27**: 917-929.
43
44 67 Bass AM, Bird MI, Liddell MJ, Nelson PN, *Limnol Oceanogr*, 2011, **11**: 399-405.
45
46 68 Lee-Cruz L, Edwards DP, Tripathi BM, Adams JM, *Applied and Environmental*
47 *Microbiology*, 2013, **79**: 7290-7297.
48
49 69 Hill P, Kristufek V, Dijkhuizen L, Boddy C, Kroetsch D, van Elsas JD. *Microb. Ecol.*,
50 2011, **61**: 286-302.
51
52 70 Wijayanti M, Meryandini A, Wahyudi AT, Yuhana M, *Makara J. Sci.*, 2014, **18**, doi:
53 10.7454/mss.v18i3. 3718
54
55 71 Hirsch AM, Fujishige NA (2012) *Molecular Signals and Receptors:*
56 *Communication between Nitrogen-fixing Bacteria and their Plant Hosts*. In:
57 Witzany G and Baluska F (Eds.), *Biocommunication of Plants: Signaling and*
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Communication in Plants, (Vol.14, pp. 255-280. Springer-Verlag Berlin,
4 Heidelberg.
5
6 72 Paganin P, Tabacchioni S, Chiarini L, *Cent. Eur. J. Biol.*, 2011, **6**: 997-1005.
7 73 Howard A, O'Donoghue M, Feeney A, Sleator RD, *Virulence*, 2012, **3**: 243-250.
8 74 Abdel-EI-Haleem D, *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 2003, **2**(4): 71-74.
9 75 Azrina MZ, Yap CK, Rahim Ismail A, Ismil A. Tan SG, *Ecotoxicology and*
10 *Environmental Safety*, 2006, **64**(3), 337–347.
11 76 Baker A, Tipping E, Thacker S, Gondar D, *Chemosphere*, 2008, **73**(11), 1765–
12 1772.
13 77 Jex CN, Pate GH, Blyth AJ, Spencer RGM, Hernes PJ, Khan SJ, Baker A,
14 *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 2014, **87**: 46-59.
15 78 Lee KY, Syakir MI, Clark ID, Veizer J, *Aquat Geochem.*, 2013, **19**(5-6), 443–475.
16 79 Nedwell DB, Blackburn TH, Wiebe WJ, *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 1994,
17 **110**: 223-231.
18 80 Maie N, Scully NM, Pisani O, Jaffe R, *Water Research*, 2007, **41**: 563-570.
19 81 Sahoo K, Dhal NK, *Indian Journal of Marine Sciences*, 2009, **38**: 249–256.
20 82 Aitkenhead-Peterson JA, McDowell WH, Neff JC (2003) *Sources, production, and*
21 *regulation of allochthonous DOM inputs to surface waters*. In: Findlay S. E. G.,
22 Sinsabaugh, R. L. (Eds.), *Aquatic Ecosystems: Interactivity of Dissolved*
23 *Organic Matter*. Elsevier, New York, pp 25–70.
24 83 Hughes RF, Kauffman JB, Jaramillo VJ, *Ecology*, 1999, **80**: 1892–1907.
25 84 Schedlbauer JL, Kavanagh KL, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 2008, **255**:
26 1326–1335.
27 85 van Breugel M, Ransijn J, Craven D, Bongers F, Hall JS, *Forest Ecology and*
28 *Management*, 2011, **262**(8): 1648–1657.
29 86 Brown S, Lugo, AE, *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 1990, **6**: 1–32.
30 87 Silva CEM, Goncalves JFC, Alves EG, *Photosynthetica*, 2011, **49**(2): 246-252.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of environmental conditions, average monthly discharge at BM station and PARAFAC model of selected sampling stations in the Lower Kinabatangan River Catchment.

| | Average of monthly discharge at Barek Manis (BM) (m ³ /s) | Land cover | pH | Salinity | DOC (mg/l) | a ₃₄₀ (/m) | S ₂₇₅₋₂₉₅ (/nm) | IC1 | IC2 | IC3 | IC4 | IC5 | I total | |
|----------------------|--|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Inter-monsoonal (IM) | Oct. 2009 346.6 | OP | Mean | 6.94 | 0.07 | 15.30 | 42.14 | 0.0128 | 8.17 | 10.93 | 13.95 | 8.92 | 5.72 | 47.69 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.52 | 0.03 | 9.50 | 23.25 | 0.0018 | 3.68 | 3.83 | 5.75 | 3.10 | 2.96 | 15.88 |
| | | | Variance | 0.27 | 0.00 | 90.24 | 540.63 | 0.0000 | 13.53 | 14.66 | 33.05 | 9.59 | 8.76 | 252.27 |
| | | SF | Mean | 6.89 | 0.04 | 10.20 | 55.75 | 0.0113 | 8.06 | 9.44 | 13.29 | 7.62 | 3.23 | 41.63 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.25 | 0.01 | 7.64 | 13.17 | 0.0012 | 3.31 | 3.64 | 5.07 | 2.93 | 1.66 | 15.86 |
| | | | Variance | 0.06 | 0.00 | 58.35 | 173.43 | 0.0000 | 10.97 | 13.26 | 25.75 | 8.59 | 2.75 | 251.64 |
| | | CS | Mean | 6.20 | 1.33 | 10.36 | 45.49 | 0.0125 | 8.48 | 10.34 | 14.23 | 8.14 | 2.83 | 44.03 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.76 | 2.15 | 5.03 | 17.49 | 0.0018 | 3.07 | 3.32 | 4.88 | 2.52 | 0.95 | 14.16 |
| | | | Variance | 0.57 | 4.62 | 25.27 | 305.76 | 0.0000 | 9.41 | 11.02 | 23.84 | 6.35 | 0.91 | 200.60 |
| Wet Season (WS) | Nov. 2009 561.4 | OP | Mean | 6.77 | 0.06 | 11.59 | 62.37 | 0.0104 | 10.46 | 14.94 | 11.70 | 25.63 | 3.39 | 66.11 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.66 | 0.02 | 3.58 | 35.46 | 0.0016 | 5.03 | 6.18 | 4.96 | 10.70 | 0.87 | 26.85 |
| | | | Variance | 0.44 | 0.00 | 12.82 | 1257.48 | 0.0000 | 25.28 | 38.24 | 24.64 | 114.55 | 0.75 | 721.17 |
| | SF | Mean | 6.93 | 0.04 | 11.17 | 75.88 | 0.0100 | 9.90 | 13.28 | 10.08 | 23.59 | 2.89 | 59.75 | |
| | | Std. dev. | 0.30 | 0.02 | 5.46 | 65.67 | 0.0019 | 6.55 | 7.69 | 5.95 | 13.77 | 0.75 | 33.96 | |
| | | Variance | 0.09 | 0.00 | 29.79 | 4312.30 | 0.0000 | 42.85 | 59.07 | 35.37 | 189.74 | 0.57 | 1153.60 | |
| | Feb. 2010 404.4 | CS | Mean | 5.95 | 0.08 | 14.70 | 100.49 | 0.0112 | 14.34 | 18.16 | 14.14 | 33.12 | 2.71 | 82.70 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.76 | 0.04 | 4.14 | 62.52 | 0.0023 | 6.15 | 6.50 | 5.45 | 12.16 | 0.85 | 29.65 |
| | | | Variance | 0.57 | 0.00 | 17.15 | 3908.20 | 0.0000 | 37.88 | 42.27 | 29.74 | 147.76 | 0.73 | 879.15 |
| Dry Season (DS) | May 2010 260.5 | OP | Mean | 6.90 | 0.09 | 7.26 | 20.28 | 0.0125 | 7.13 | 11.21 | 9.11 | 17.61 | 6.27 | 51.33 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.75 | 0.03 | 1.61 | 5.80 | 0.0015 | 1.92 | 3.44 | 2.87 | 5.13 | 3.26 | 13.96 |
| | | | Variance | 0.56 | 0.00 | 2.58 | 33.59 | 0.0000 | 3.68 | 11.85 | 8.23 | 26.27 | 10.61 | 194.99 |
| | | SF | Mean | 6.87 | 0.07 | 7.42 | 28.04 | 0.0113 | 7.74 | 11.48 | 8.84 | 18.45 | 4.51 | 51.03 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.24 | 0.04 | 2.40 | 6.40 | 0.0012 | 3.54 | 5.17 | 4.09 | 8.36 | 3.18 | 22.99 |
| | | | Variance | 0.06 | 0.00 | 5.77 | 40.93 | 0.0000 | 12.52 | 26.71 | 16.70 | 69.90 | 10.13 | 528.59 |
| | | CS | Mean | 7.11 | 2.39 | 6.21 | 14.03 | 0.0135 | 6.16 | 10.23 | 7.58 | 16.66 | 5.92 | 46.55 |
| | | | Std. dev. | 0.30 | 2.09 | 0.95 | 4.59 | 0.0019 | 1.47 | 2.57 | 1.84 | 4.65 | 2.58 | 10.66 |
| | | | Variance | 0.09 | 4.38 | 0.91 | 21.02 | 0.0000 | 2.15 | 6.62 | 3.40 | 21.64 | 6.68 | 113.55 |

Table 2 List of sampling stations based on land cover and its vegetation characteristics (after Abram et al.⁴⁵).

| Sampling station | Vegetation characteristics |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Oil palm plantation: | Palm oil classes: |
| Sg. Pin (OP-1) | i. Young mature: Palms were planted from 3-6 years. |
| Sg. Koyah (OP-2) | ii. Prime mature and full stand: Prime yield and planted within the range from 7-24 years. |
| Malbumi Plantation (OP-3) | iii. Underproductive at 75%: Palm capacity is within 51-75% palms per ha. Older palm with natural mortality start to occur. |
| Sg. Resang (OP-4) | iv. Underproductive at 50%: Palm capacity is ranged from 26-50% palms per ha. |
| Secondary forest: | Forest type: |
| ^a Danau Kaboi (SF-1) | i. Lowland dry forest: Secondary forest, preceding dipterocarp forest with species include <i>Nauclea subdita</i> , <i>Neolamarckia cadamba</i> , <i>Glochidion rubrum</i> . |
| ^b Danau Kalinanap (SF-2) | ii. Lowland dry dipterocarp forest: Preceding logged lowland mixed dipterocarp forest, dominated by <i>Dipterocarp sp.</i> |
| Sg. Menanggol (SF-3) | |
| Coastal swamp: | Mangrove forest: |
| Balat Damit (CS-1) | Nipah palm forest: <i>Nypa fruticans</i> are dominant within the mangrove system. Can be found either in mono-stand or coexist with <i>Rhizophora apiculata</i> . |
| Sg. Merah (CS-2) | |

^{a,b} SF-1 and SF-2 are oxbow lakes.

Table 3 Spectral characteristics of excitation and emission maxima of five components identified by PARAFAC modelling for the whole EEMs data set collected in the Lower Kinabatangan River catchment compared to previously identified sources.

| Component in this study | Excitation maximum (nm) | Emission maximum (nm) | Coble et al. ⁵⁴ | Description and probable source |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| C1 | 345 | 466 | Peak C 320-360 / 420-480 | Ubiquitous humic-like substances, widespread Hydrophobic acid fraction (HPOA) Component 1: 350 / 400-450 ⁵⁰ Component 1: 345 / 462 ⁵² Component 4: 350 / 420-480 ⁴⁹ |
| C2 | 305 | 426 | Peak M 290-312 / | Terrestrial humic-like substances, widespread |
| C3 | 325 | 408 | 370-420 | Hydrophobic acid fraction (HPOA), suggested as photo-refractory Component 2: 255 / 380-460 ⁵⁰ Component 3: 255 (330) / 412 ⁶⁰ Component 3: 270 (360) / 478 ⁵⁶ Component 3: 250 (355) / 461 ⁵³ |
| C4 | 290 | 464 | Peak A 260 / 380- 460 | Terrestrial humic-like substances, widespread Hydrophobic acid fraction (HPOA), suggested as photo-refractory Component 1: 270 (365) / 453 ⁶⁰ Component 2: 255 / 380-460 ⁵⁰ Component 3: 270 (360) / 478 ⁵⁶ Component 3: 250 (355) / 461 ⁵³ |
| C5 | 290 | 338 | Peak M 290-312 / 370-420 | Ditto with description for C2. |

Table 4 Factor structure coefficients from the discriminant analysis for both land use and seasonal data sets.

| Fluorescence indices | Discriminant Function (DF) | |
|--|----------------------------|--------|
| Land use: | 1 | 2 |
| IC3/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .913* | -.015 |
| IC2/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .618* | .095 |
| IC5/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .405* | -.054 |
| IC1/IC4 (Peak C/Peak A) | -.285* | -.043 |
| IC4/a ₃₄₀ (Peak A/a ₃₄₀) | -.374 | .746* |
| Spectral slope | .144 | -.626* |
| 45.9% of original group cases correctly classified | | |
| Seasonal: | 1 | 2 |
| IC5/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .678* | .003 |
| IC4/a ₃₄₀ (Peak A/a ₃₄₀) | -.672* | .133 |
| IC2/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .538* | .503 |
| IC3/IC4 (Peak M/Peak A) | .406 | .586* |
| IC1/IC4 (Peak C/Peak A) | -.108 | -.384* |
| Spectral slope | .205 | .253* |
| 63.9% of original group cases correctly classified | | |

List of figure

Fig. 1 Location of sampling stations in the Lower Kinabatangan River catchment.

Fig. 2 Long-term mean monthly flow discharge for three gauging station at Kinabatangan. The catchment area for each station is 9,430 km², 10,800 km² and 12,300 km² respectively. Arrows indicate flow discharges during fieldwork campaign.

Fig. 3 PARAFAC model output showing fluorescence signatures of the five components identified. Contour plots present spectral shapes of excitation and emission of derived components. Line plots to the right of each contour plot present split-half validation results for each identified component. Excitation (dotted line) and emission (solid line) loadings for each component, obtained from two independent PARAFAC models on random halves of the data array.

Fig. 4 Group separation from the discriminant analysis according to: (a) Types of land use; (b) Seasonal variations.

Fig. 5 DOC against PARAFAC component C4 according to different type of land use.

Fig. 6 Correlation between PARAFAC component C4 and UV absorbance at 340 nm according to sampling period: (a) Oil palm plantations (OP); (b) Secondary forests (SF); (c) Coastal swamps (CS).







Fig. 1 Location of sampling stations in the Lower Kinabatangan River catchment.



(a) Pagar (PGR)



(b) Balat (BLT)



(c) Barek Manis (BM)

Fig. 2 Long-term mean monthly flow discharge for three gauging station at Kinabatangan. Box indicates the mean and standard deviation of flow discharge by month. The catchment area for each station is 9,430 km², 10,800 km² and 12,300 km² respectively. Arrows indicate flow discharges during fieldwork campaign.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60






Fig. 3 PARAFAC model output showing fluorescence signatures of five components identified. Contour plots present spectral shapes of excitation and emission of derived components. Line plots at right side of each contour plot present split-half validation results for each identified component. Excitation (dotted line) and emission (solid line) loadings for each component, obtained from two independent PARAFAC models on random halves of the data array.




(a)




(b)

Fig. 4 Group separation from the discriminant analysis according to: (a) Types of land use; (b) Seasonal variations.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




(a) Oil palm plantations (OP)




(b) Secondary forests (SF)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




(c) Costal swamps (CS)

Fig. 5 DOC against PARAFAC component C4 according to different type of land use.




(a)



(b)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



(c)

Fig. 6 Correlation between PARAFAC component C4 and UV absorbance at 340 nm according to sampling period: (a) Oil palm plantations (OP); (b) Secondary forests (SF); (c) Coastal swamps (CS).