Fingerprinting the Spatial Sources of Fine-grained Sediment Deposited in the Bed of the Mehran River Draining into the Northern Coast of the Persian Gulf using Elemental Geochemistry

Atefe Fatahi

University of Hormozgan

Hamid Gholami (✉ hgholami@hormozgan.ac.ir)

University of Hormozgan

Yahya Esmaeilpour

University of Hormozgan

Aboalhasan Fathabadi

Gonbad Kavous University

Research Article

Keywords: Sediment source fingerprinting, statistical tests, generalized likelihood uncertainty estimation, virtual sediment mixtures

Posted Date: October 28th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1012154/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Fingerprinting the spatial sources of fine-grained sediment deposited in the bed of the Mehran River draining into the northern coast of the Persian Gulf using elemental geochemistry

Atefe Fatahi^{1a} Hamid Gholami^{1*a} Yahya Esmailpour¹ Aboalhasan Fathabadi²

1. Department of Natural Resources Engineering, University of Hormozgan, Bandar-Abbas, Hormozgan, Iran.

2. Department of Range and Watershed Management, Gonbad Kavous University, Gonbad Kavous, Golestan Province, Iran.

* Corresponding authors: Hamid Gholami, Email: hgholami@hormozgan.ac.ir; and Yahya Esmailpour, Email: y.esmailpour@hormozgan.ac.ir.

a: These authors contributed equally to this study.

Abstract

Accurate information on the sources of suspended sediment in riverine systems is essential to target mitigation. Accordingly, we applied a generalized likelihood uncertainty estimation (GLUE) framework for quantifying contributions from three sub-basin spatial sediment sources in the Mehran River catchment draining into the Persian Gulf, Hormozgan province, southern Iran. A total of 28 sediment samples were collected from the three sub-basin sources and six from the overall outlet. 43 geochemical elements (e.g., major, trace and rare earth elements) were measured in the samples. Four different combinations of statistical tests comprising: 1) traditional range test (TRT), Kruskal-Wallis (KW) H-test and stepwise discriminant function analysis (DFA) (TRT+KW+DFA); 2) traditional range test using mean values (RTM) and two additional tests (RTM+KW+DFA); 3) TRT+KW+PCA (principle component analysis), and; 4) RTM+KW+PCA, were used to the spatial sediment source discrimination. Tracer bi-plots were

used as an additional step to assess the tracers selected in the different final composite signatures for source discrimination. The predictions of spatial source contributions generated by GLUE were assessed using statistical tests and virtual sample mixtures. On this basis, TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA yielded the best source discrimination and the tracers in these composite signatures were shown by the biplots to be broadly conservative during transportation from source to sink. Using these final two composite signatures, the estimated mean contributions for the western, central and eastern sub-basins, respectively, ranged between 10-60% (overall mean contribution 36%), 0.3-16% (overall mean contribution 6%) and 38-77% (overall mean contribution 58%). In comparison, the final tracers selected using TRT+KW+PCA generated respective corresponding contributions of 1-42% (overall mean 20%), 0.5-30% (overall mean 12%) and 55-84% (overall mean 68%) compared with 17-69% (overall mean 41%), 0.2-12% (overall mean 5%) and 29-76% (overall mean 54%) using the final tracers selected by RTM+KW+PCA. Based on the mean absolute fit (MAF; $\geq 95\%$ for all target sediment samples) and goodness-of-fit (GOF; $\geq 99\%$ for all samples), GLUE with the final tracers selected using TRT+KW+PCA performed slightly better than GLUE with the final signatures selected by the three other combinations of statistical tests. Based on the virtual mixture tests, however, predictions provided by GLUE with the final tracers selected using TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA (mean MAE = 11% and mean RMSE = 13%) performed marginally better than GLUE with RTM+KW+PCA (mean MAE = 14% and mean RMSE = 16%) and GLUE with TRT+KW+PCA (mean MAE = 17% and mean RMSE = 19%). The estimated source proportions can help watershed engineers plan the targeting of conservation programmes for soil and water resources.

Key words: Sediment source fingerprinting, statistical tests, generalized likelihood uncertainty estimation, virtual sediment mixtures

1. Introduction

Accelerated soil erosion by water is an environmental threat on different continents including Asia (e.g. Iran, China, India), North America (e.g., Canada), Europe (especially the Mediterranean regions) and Africa (Koiter et al., 2013; Mararakanye and Sumner, 2017; Mohammadifar et al., 2021; Marzloff et al., 2011). Elevated suspended sediment loads in riverine systems resulting from the accelerated erosion due to human activities are a serious threat to the sustainable management of watersheds and ecosystem services therein worldwide (Collins et al., 2020). Consequently, identifying the sources of suspended sediment in a watershed is essential to target mitigation and to help remedy problems such as eutrophication, and siltation of reservoirs. In particular, well-designed policies and control measures for protecting finite soil and water resources are dependent on reliable and scale-appropriate information on the key sources of the sediment problem which in manifested in the form of both on-site and off-site impacts (Collins et al., 2020).

Today, sediment source fingerprinting (SSF) is increasingly applied to document sediment sources at multiple scales in differing environments. For example, SSF has been applied to quantify the provenance of riverine suspended sediment (Collins et al., 1997; Walling, 2013; Dutton et al., 2013; Collins and Walling, 2002), aeolian sands (Liu et al., 2016; Gholami et al., 2017; Nosrati et al., 2021; Gholami et al., 2019b; Niu et al., 2020; Telfer et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2020;2021), atmospheric dust (Nosrati et al., 2020; Gholami et al., 2020; Behrooz et al., 2019)

and loess deposits (Li et al., 2019; 2020). SSF is founded on measuring the different properties of watershed source material and target sediment samples and their comparison. To date, the different properties used in SSF include colour, mineralogy, geochemical elements (e.g., major, trace and rare earth (REE) elements), isotopic signatures and ratios (e.g., $^{87}\text{Sr}/^{86}\text{Sr}$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$), REE indices, weathering indices, fallout radionuclides (FRNs) and absolute particle size (Habibi et al., 2019; Walling et al., 2005; Collins et al., 1998; LeGall et al., 2016; Laceby et al., 2015a; Pulley and Collins, 2019).

In the last two decades, efforts exploring the uncertainties associated with both aeolian and fluvial SSF results has attracted increasing attention (Walling, 2013; Collins et al., 2017, 2020). The frameworks used to quantify uncertainty associated with SSF estimates can be divided into three groups comprising Monte Carlo simulation - the most commonly applied framework (Collins et al., 2012; Pulley et al., 2020; Koiter et al., 2013), Bayesian approaches (Massoudieh et al., 2013; Cooper et al., 2014; Li et al., 2020; Gholami et al., 2017) and generalized likelihood uncertainty estimation (GLUE; Rowan et al., 2000). Among these three frameworks, the GLUE model has been used far less frequently and, in many cases, has been applied in conjunction with quantifying the provenance of aeolian, rather than fluvial, sediments (Behrooz et al., 2019; Telfer et al., 2020; Gholami et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020). To the best of our knowledge, GLUE has not been used to quantify uncertainty associated with estimating the spatial sources of fluvial suspended sediment in river catchments. Despite this less frequent application of GLUE, it is useful to bear in mind that Bayesian modelling, as an alternative to GLUE, is more sophisticated but equally more demanding, since it uses different distributions and transformations (e.g., posterior and prior, Dirichlet), centered log ratio (CLR; Semmens et al., 2009), additive log-ratio

(ALR; Brewer et al., 2005) and iso-metric log ratio (ILR; Egozcue et al., 2003)) in the data structure. Regardless of the approach used to estimate uncertainties associated with predicted sediment source proportions, the uncertainties associated with the SSF approach may originate from a variety of sources, including within-source group tracer variability, tracer selection, limited numbers of source material or target sediment samples, laboratory analyses, and source group classification (Pulley et al., 2015; Pulley and Collins, 2019; Collins et al., 2020).

Given the above background, the primary goal of this study was to apply geochemical SSF within GLUE framework in the estimation of sub-basin spatial sediment source contributions in the arid Mehran River catchment in southern Iran, which drains into the Persian Gulf. The accuracy of GLUE predictions generated using four different sets of statistical tests for discriminating three sub-basin spatial sources was evaluated using 10 virtual sediment (VS) samples with known source contributions using the root mean square error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE).

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study area

The Mehran River catchment (2142 km²) is located in the western part of Hormozgan province, southern Iran (26° 42' to 27° 16' N, and 54° 30' to 55° 26' ") (Fig.1). The study area is surrounded by Bandar-e-Khamir and Bandar-e-Langeh on the eastern and western sides, respectively. It can be divided into three sub-basins comprising a western sub-basin (1611 km²), a central sub-basin (106 km²) and an eastern sub-basin (425 km²). The river is 86 km long. Elevation ranges between -44 m in the eastern part of the study area in the vicinity of the

catchment outlet to 1857 m in the northwestern part. Slopes range between 0 to 79%. Due to existing mangrove forests in the vicinity of the outlet located on the northern coast of the Persian Gulf, the study catchment is earmarked as being important environmentally. Geologically, the study area is underlain by diverse geological units including Asmari-Jahrom, Jahrom, Tuffaceous shale, Bangestan group, Gachsaran, Mishan, Aghajari, Razak, Bakhtyari, Quaternary fan terraces and the Hormoz series with high salt content. The main channel of the Mehran River is established on Quaternary fans and terraces.

Figure 1: Location of the sub-basin and catchment outlet sediment sampling sites in the study area in Hormozgan province, Iran. The red and yellow shading in the bottom map indicate the study catchment and Hormozgan province, respectively.

2.2 Sampling, sample preparation and laboratory analysis

Based on the sub-basin map (Fig. 1), potential spatial sediment sources in the Mehran River catchment were classified as the western, central and eastern sub-basins. A total of 28 surficial samples were collected from the fine-grained materials deposited in the bed of the main channel of the sub-basin spatial sources, comprising eight for the western, eight for the central and 12 for the eastern sub-basin, respectively (Fig. 2a,b,c). A total of six target sediment samples were collected from the fine-grained sediments deposited in the bed of the Mehran River main stem in the vicinity of the overall outlet (Fig. 2d). Samples were air dried and sieved to separate the <63 μm fraction. The results of the granulometry analysis for the source and target sediment samples are presented in Table 1. The conventional <63 μm fraction was selected as this is the most geochemically active (Horowitz, 1991). Aqua regia was used to digest the sieved samples and then the solutions were analysed for tracer pseudo-content using inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES) in the Central Laboratory of the University of Hormozgan. In total, 43 geochemical elements (Al, As, Ba, Be, Bi, Cu, Ce, Co, Cr, Cs, Er, Fe, K, Li, Mo, Ga, Gd, Hf, Ho, In, Mg, Mn, Na, Nb, Ni, Te, Zn, P, Pb, S, Sc, Sm, Sn, Ta, Tb, V, W, Ag, Zr, Ca, Eu and La) were measured in the 34 source material and target sediment samples.

Table 1: The results of granulometry analysis for source and target sediment samples using dry sieving.

Sample no		Particle size class (% by mass)							
		> 4.75	4.75	3.35	0.85 mm	0.355	0.180 mm	0.125	0.063
		mm	mm	mm		mm		mm	mm
		Fine gravel	Very fine gravel	Very coarse sand	Coarse sand	Medium sand	Fine sand	Very fine sand	Silt and clay
Western sub-basin	SS1	4.78	12.97	11.17	36.76	17.73	6.56	5.37	4.65
	SS2	4.71	4.27	3.52	28.51	29.74	16.22	9.04	3.98
	SS3	17.16	13.91	4.26	19.31	32.36	5.08	4.07	3.85
	SS4	52.45	16.42	2.19	3.48	11.94	6.72	4.7	2.1
	SS5	32.88	29.09	4.08	10.04	15.35	3.92	2.05	2.6
	SS6	50.01	26.69	2.67	3.19	4.68	4.01	2.57	6.18
	SS7	5.08	8.6	8.04	57.45	8.27	5.33	3.01	4.21
	SS8	31.78	40.54	6.25	10.2	5.23	2.79	1.44	1.76
Central sub-basin	SS1	11.41	31.94	12.07	31.3	7.53	2.32	1.59	1.85
	SS2	4.82	18.31	7.54	25.67	31.79	5.99	2.75	3.12
	SS3	27.07	16.66	3.66	8.51	12.68	14.57	4.58	12.27
	SS4	14.53	21.04	10.24	37.46	10.57	2.42	1.66	2.09
	SS5	24.37	14.31	7.9	10.32	7.03	7.9	16.86	11.3
	SS6	11.41	28.87	7.3	11.48	17.79	9.91	11.33	1.9
	SS7	12.11	47.03	16.09	13.12	2.85	3.03	3	2.77
	SS8	35.38	34.51	6.77	11.86	3.44	1.95	1.97	4.12
Eastern sub-basin	SS1	11.25	30.8	14.72	34.39	2.94	1.77	1.84	2.3
	SS2	7.79	20.44	13.1	42.51	8.83	2.6	1.75	2.97
	SS3	28.74	45.38	7.9	10.08	2.83	1.86	1.51	1.7
	SS4	20.35	30.35	11.42	24.14	6.43	2.59	2.33	2.39
	SS5	23.81	47.19	7.76	11.65	3.69	1.79	2.03	2.09
	SS6	13.02	41.28	9.81	20.11	8.36	2.73	2.23	2.47
	SS7	21.41	44.34	7.13	10.36	7.31	2.91	4.14	2.4
	SS8	20.17	39.66	8.98	18.99	5.98	2.11	2.02	2.1

	SS9	9.91	17.81	6.18	31.98	27.03	3.66	2.67	0.76
	SS10	3.58	34.1	14.34	35.7	7.75	1.53	1.47	1.52
	SS11	3.2	16.97	19.36	48.83	6.58	1.95	1.43	1.67
	SS12	5.64	16.29	10.5	46.95	13.86	2.46	2.46	1.85
Target sediment	S1	7.97	11.68	5	55.93	13.52	2.36	1.91	1.64
	S2	0	2.3	2.31	33.12	50.19	4.77	3.78	3.54
	S3	15.73	16.21	5.88	10.71	22.47	12.66	9.21	7.13
	S4	9.14	11.79	4.2	23.26	37.15	7.14	3.17	4.16
	S5	2.42	6.28	2.79	39.58	36.41	3.76	2.8	5.96
	S6	4.5	10.7	3.98	41.84	28.97	5.59	2.53	1.89

Figure 2: Photographs showing the sediment deposits where the samples were collected from: a) western sub-basin; b) central sub-basin; c) eastern sub-basin, and; d) the main channel of the Mehran River in the vicinity of the overall catchment outlet.

2.3 Discriminating the spatial sources of the target sediment samples

A wide range of methods including individual statistical tests such as the Kruskal-Wallis H test, stepwise discriminant function analysis, principle component analysis, or combined statistical procedures, are used to discriminate the potential sources of target sediment samples (Collins et al., 2017). Here, we used four combinations of statistical procedures. The first comprised a TRT (based on the minimum and maximum ranges of tracer concentrations in the source and target sediment samples) for tracer conservation plus the (KW test for individual tracer discriminatory power and DFA for composite signature discriminatory power. The second comprised a RTM (range test using mean tracer values in source and target sediment samples) in combination with KW and DFA. The third combination of tests comprised TRT, KW and PCA. The fourth combination combined RTM, KW and PCA. Tracer bi-plots was used for further assessment of source discrimination provided by each final composite signature and of tracer conservation.

2.4 Generalised Likelihood Uncertainty Estimation (GLUE)

GLUE was first applied to uncertainty modelling and sensitivity analysis for hydrological models by Beven and Binley (1992). In more recent years (2019 to present) GLUE modelling has been applied to quantify uncertainty associated with source contributions to sampled loess deposits, and aeolian dust and sands in Central Asia, Iran and Australia (Li et al., 2020; Behrooz et al., 2019; Gholami et al., 2020; Telfer et al., 2020). Based on GLUE, we can quantify the uncertainties associated with SSF results via the following five key steps:

173 Step 1: application of LHS (Latin Hypercube Sampling) for the random sampling of tracer
174 parameter sets (10,000 iterations). At this stage, two boundary constraints ($0 \leq x_j \leq 1$; and $\sum x_j =$
175 1) must be satisfied (Collins et al., 2012);

176 Step 2: use of the Nash–Sutcliffe coefficient (NSC) as the likelihood function (Behrooz et al.,
177 2019):

$$178 \quad NSC = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_o - a_s)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_o - am_o)^2} \quad (\text{eq. 1})$$

179 where a_s and a_o indicate the simulated i th final tracer concentration and the measured i th final
180 tracer concentration, respectively. am_o represents the mean value of the i th measured tracer
181 concentration in the target sediment sample;

182 Step 3: application of an un-mixing model as follows:

$$183 \quad A_{ts} = B_s \times C \quad (\text{eq. 2})$$

184 where C is an m dimensional column vector of the spatial source contributions, A_{ts} indicates an
185 n -dimensional column vector of tracer concentrations in the target sediment sample, and B_s
186 represents an $n \times m$ dimensional matrix representing the mean tracer concentrations in the spatial
187 sub-basin sources;

188 Step 4: division of the tracer parameter sets into behavioural and non-behavioural types (Zhou
189 et al, 2016), and;

190 Step 5: re-scaling of the likelihood weights for the behavioural parameter sets.

191 More details for GLUE modelling can be found in Telfer et al. (2020) and Behrooz et al. (2019).

192 *2.5 Assessment of GLUE performance*

Two statistical measures (mean absolute fit - MAF and goodness-of-fit - GOF) (Motha et al., 2003; Laceby and Olley, 2014; Collins et al., 2010; Gholami et al., 2020) were applied to assess the performance of GLUE in estimating the measured tracer concentrations in the target sediment samples collected from the outlet of the Mehran River catchment, viz.:

$$MAF = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j a_{j,i}}{b_i} \right| \right) \quad (eq. 5)$$

$$GOF = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \times \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \left(\frac{|b_i - \sum_{j=1}^m x_j a_{j,i}|}{b_i} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (eq. 6)$$

where n and m are the number of tracers in the final composite signature and number of sub-basin spatial sources (m=3), respectively. b_i is the concentration of the final tracer (i) measured in the target sediment sample, x_j indicates the relative contribution of source (j) to the target sediment sample, and $a_{j,i}$ represents the mean concentration of the final tracer (i) in the sub-basin spatial source (j).

The accuracy of the GLUE predictions of spatial source contributions was assessed using 10 VS mixtures (Pulley et al., 2020; Gholami et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020). Here, the root mean square error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) were used to compare the GLUE predictions with known source contributions from the three sub-basin spatial sources, viz.:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_K - X_P)^2}{n}} \quad (Eq. 7)$$

$$MAE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |X_K - X_P|}{n} \quad (Eq. 8)$$

213

214 where, X_K and X_P indicate the known contribution from the sub-basin spatial sources in the VS
 215 and the corresponding contribution predicted by the GLUE model, respectively. n is the number
 216 ($n = 3$) of sub-basin spatial sources.

217 A methodological flowchart is presented in Figure 3.

218

219 Figure 3: Flowchart for the GLUE methodology applied for source fingerprinting of the target sediment
 220 samples collected from the Mehran River.

221

222 3. Results and discussion

223 3.1 Discriminating conservative from non-conservative tracers

The selection of a combination of final geochemical tracers in a so-called composite signature for source apportionment is one of the key stages in successful SSF (Walling et al., 1993; Collins et al., 2017; Gellis and Walling, 2011). Based on TRT, 11 geochemical tracers (Be, Bi, Cs, Er, Fe, K, Li, Mo, Te, Zn and Cu) were identified as non-conservative, meaning that 33 geochemical elements (Al, As, Ba, Ce, Co, Cr, Ga, Gd, Hf, Ho, Mg, Mn, Na, Nb, Ni, P, Pb, Pr, Rb, S, Sc, Sm, Sn, Ta, Tb, V, W, Ag, Zr, Ca, Eu and La) were conservative. By comparison, using RTM, 18 geochemical tracers (Al, As, Ba, Be, Co, Cr, Fe, Ga, K, Mo, Na, Pb, Sm, Sn, Ta, Tb, Te and Zn) failed the test. Logically, the results for TRT and TRM make sense since TRM is a stricter test meaning that more tracers typically fail this mathematical test for conservative behaviour. Due to immobility and low solubility, rare earth elements (REEs) (e.g., Ce, Gd, Ho, Sc, Sm, Tb, Eu and La) may be useful tracers for identifying the provenance of sediments and the formation mechanism of rocks (Taylor and McLennan, 1985; Habibi et al., 2019). Tracers failing either range test were excluded from further statistical analysis.

3.2 Spatial sediment source discrimination

3.2.1 Stepwise DFA

The results of KW suggested that, among the 32 geochemical tracers passing the TRT, 12 (Al, Ce, Hf, Mn, Nb, P, Rb, Sc, Zr, Ca, Eu and La) were significant ($p \leq 0.05$), whilst 20 geochemical elements (As, Ba, Co, Cr, Ga, Gd, Ho, Mg, Na, Ni, Pb, Pr, S, Sm, Sn, Ta, Tb, V, W and Ag) were not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$). The 12 statistically significant tracers were used in stepwise DFA for identifying the final composite signature for discriminating the sub-basin spatial sources of the target sediment samples. Based on the stepwise DFA (Table 2), three geochemical tracers (Zr,

Mn and P) were selected. The final tracers were selected based on minimizing the Wilks' Lambda values. The values of Wilks' Lambda ranged between 13.9 (for the first step with Zr as the first tracer entered into the model) and 11.3 (for the third step with P as the third tracer entered into the model).

Among the 25 geochemical tracers (Bi, Ce, Cs, Er, Gd, Hf, Ho, Li, Mg, Mn, Nb, Ni, P, Pr, Rb, S, Sc, V, W, Ag, Zr, Ca, Cu, Eu and La) passing RTM, 12 geochemical proprieties (Bi, Cs, Er, Gd, Ho, Mg, Ni, Pr, S, V, W, and Ag) were not statistically significant (with $p \geq 0.05$) according to KW, whereas 13 (Ce, Hf, Li, Mn, Nb, P, Rb, Sc, Zr, Ca, Cu, Eu and La) were significant ($p \leq 0.05$). Overall, the results of stepwise DFA for tracers passing RTM+KW were the same as those identified using TRT+KW+DFA (Table 2, Fig. 4).

Table 2: The final composite signature selected by both TRT+KW+DFA and TRM+KW+DFA for discriminating the three sub-basin spatial sources of the six target sediment samples collected at the outlet of the study area.

Step	Final tracers	Wilks' Lambda	
		Statistic	Sig.
1	Zr	13.9	0.000
2	Mn	11.7	0.000
3	P	11.3	0.000

Figure 4: Two-dimensional scatterplot constructed based on the first and second functions of the stepwise DFA for the tracers selected using either TRT+KW+DFA or TRM+KW+DFA.

The results of the stepwise DFA are summarised in Figure 4 and Table 3. Based on these results, a combination of Zr, Mn and P were able to correctly classify 89.3% of the sub-basin spatial source sediment samples (Fig. 4).

Table 3: Classification results for the three sub-basin spatial sediment sources using stepwise DFA.

No		Predicted group membership			Total
		Western sub-basin	Central sub-basin	Eastern sub-basin	
Count	Western sub-basin	6	2	0	8
	Central sub-basin	1	7	0	8
	Eastern sub-basin	0	0	12	12
Percent	Western sub-basin	75	25	0	100
	Central sub-basin	12.5	87.5	0	100
	Eastern sub-basin	0	0	100	100

267

268 *3.2.2 Principle component analysis (PCA)*

269 12 (Al, Ce, Hf, Mn, Nb, P, Rb, Sc, Zr, Ca, Eu and La) and 13 (Ce, Hf, Li, Mn, Nb, P, Rb, Sc, Zr,
 270 Ca, Cu, Eu and La) geochemical tracers passing TRT+KW and RTM+KW (Table 4), respectively,
 271 were entered into the PCA. Based on Table 4 and Figure 5, the first three PC yielded the most
 272 interpretable factor pattern. The initial eigenvalues for components 1 to 3 ranged between 5.6
 273 to 1.26 (Fig. 5a). The percentage of the variance explained by these components was calculated
 274 as 30.7%, 25.9% and 25.6%, respectively. Based on Figure 5c, the variance of PC1, PC2and PC3
 275 was 29.3%, 26.6% and 23.9%, respectively, whereas the initial eigenvalue for these components
 276 was estimated to be 5.63, 3.46 and 1.28, respectively. Based on Figures 5b and 5d, projection of
 277 the sample cases on the PC plane using PCA indicates that the final set of tracers, selected using
 278 a combination of either TRT+KW+PCA or TRM+KW+PCA, provided relatively good discrimination
 279 between the three sub-basin spatial sediment sources.

280 Table 4: Results of PCA based on tracers passing TRT+KW and RTM+KW.

TRT+KW+PCA			
Tracer	PC1	PC2	PC3
Al	0.058	-0.017	0.97
Ce	0.94	0.26	0.029
Hf	0.23	0.75	0.008
Mn	0.059	0.11	0.84
Nb	0.29	0.71	0.30
P	0.74	0.46	0.05
Rb	-0.165	-0.515	0.73
Sc	0.118	0.376	0.86
Zr	0.26	0.86	0.125
Ca	0.48	0.69	-0.189
Eu	0.91	0.28	0.12
La	0.954	0.208	0.014
RTM+KW+PCA			
Tracer	PC1	PC2	PC3

Ce	0.94	-0.003	0.26
Hf	0.23	-0.04	0.76
Li	-0.275	0.883	-0.07
Mn	0.108	0.87	0.151
Nb	0.275	0.194	0.758
P	0.73	-0.025	0.467
Rb	-0.214	0.721	-0.402
Sc	0.131	0.816	0.447
Zr	0.257	0.025	0.88
Ca	0.531	-0.221	0.63
Cu	0.155	0.795	-0.049
Eu	0.925	0.096	0.27
La	0.94	-0.013	0.21

281

282

283

284

285

Figure 5 : a) Scree plot output from the PCA for the spatial sediment source discrimination based on geochemical tracers selected by TRT+KW, b) projection of the cases on the principal component plane using PCA based on geochemical tracers selected by TRT+KW, c) Scree plot output from the PCA for the spatial sediment source discrimination based on geochemical tracers selected by RTM+KW, and; d) projection of the cases on the principal component plane using PCA based on geochemical tracers selected by RTM+KW. S1, S2 and S3 indicate samples collected from the spatial sources represented by the western, central and eastern sub-basins, respectively.

3.3 Bi-plots as a further test for identify conservative tracers

Bi-plots of the 14 geochemical tracers (Al, Ce, Hf, Li, Nb, Rb, Sc, Ca, Cu, Eu, La, Zr, Mn and P) comprising the final composite signatures selected using TRT+KW+DFA, RTM+KW+DFA, TRT+KW+PCA and RTM+KW+PCA were constructed as a further test for geochemical tracer conservation (Fig.6). These bi-plots confirmed the conservative behaviour of the final geochemical tracers during sediment mobilization and delivery to the sampling points at the outlet of the study catchment since the sub-basin spatial source and target sediment samples plotted in the same space on each plot. Plots wherein the samples do not fall in the same space indicate non-conservative behaviour of the geochemical tracers in question. Several studies have reported the inclusion of bi-plots for identifying conservative tracers in SSF (e.g., Pulley and Collins, 2018; Owens et al., 2012; Smith and Blake, 2014; Martínez-Carreras et al., 2010).

305

306

307

308

309

310

311 Figure 6: The bi-plots of the geochemical tracers comprising the final composite signatures selected using
 312 TRT+KW+DFA, RTM+KW+DFA, TRT+DFA+PCA and RTM+DFA+PCA for discriminating the three sub-basin
 313 spatial sediment sources. The blue, orange, grey and gold points indicate the samples collected from the
 314 western, central and eastern sub-basins and the target sediment samples, respectively.

315

3.4 The uncertainty ranges of the source contributions and their cumulative distributions estimated by GLUE

The uncertainty ranges (with 95% confidence limits) of the estimated source contributions and their cumulative distributions for the six target sediment samples collected from the outlet of the Mehran River estimated by GLUE using the signatures selected by the different combinations of the statistical tests are presented in Figure 7. Using the final composite signature selected by TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA (Fig. 7a), the contributions from the western sub-basin to target sediment sample S1 were predicted to dominate and ranged between 42% and 72%, compared with 1 to 27% from the central sub-basin, and 19 to 35% from the eastern sub-basin. For target sediment sample S2, the corresponding respective contributions, using the same final composite signature, ranged between 1-51%, 0.2-21% and 48-90%. The western sub-basin contributed 1-40% for S3, whereas the central and eastern sub-basins contributed 0.5 to 30%, and 57 to 90%, respectively. The ranges of the contributions from the western, central and eastern sub-basins spatial sources to S4 ranged between 0.9 to 41%, 5 to 30%, and 57 to 91%, respectively. The predicted contributions from the western sub-basin to S5, ranged between 0.6-33%, whereas the corresponding contributions from the central and eastern sub-basins ranged between 0.7-37% and 59-90%, respectively. The predicted contributions from the western sub-basin to S6 ranged between 26 to 51%, whereas the contributions from the central and eastern sub-basins ranged between 26 to 49%, and 19 to 28%, respectively.

The results for the predicted spatial source contributions using GLUE and the final composite signature selected by TRT+KW+PCA (Fig. 7b) suggested that the ranges of the

338 contributions from the western, central and eastern sub-basins spatial sources to S1 were 38 to
339 76%, 1 to 30%, and 20 to 37%, respectively. The western sub-basin contributed 1-52% of S2,
340 whereas the central and eastern sub-basins contributed 0.2 to 20%, and 46 to 91%, respectively.
341 The corresponding respective contributions to S3 ranged between 1-41%, 0.5-39% and 57%-91%.
342 For target sediment sample S4, the contribution from the western sub-basin ranged between
343 0.8-41%, whereas the corresponding contributions from the central and eastern sub-basins
344 ranged between 0.5-30% and 57-91%, respectively. The ranges of the contributions from the
345 western, central and eastern sub-basins spatial sources to S5 were 0.8 to 40%, 5 to 30%, and 57
346 to 91%, respectively. The predicted contributions from the western, central and eastern sub-
347 basins to S6, ranged between 40-81%, 1-35% and 14-31%, respectively.

348 Finally, the results for the predicted spatial source apportionment using GLUE and the
349 final composite signature selected by RTM+KW+PCA (Fig. 7c), indicated that the contribution of
350 the western sub-basin to target sediment sample S1, ranged between 53-91%, whereas the
351 corresponding contributions from the central and eastern sub-basins range between 0.6-22% and
352 1-37%, respectively. The contributions from the western sub-basin to target sediment sample S2
353 were predicted to dominate and ranged between 51% and 90%, compared with 0.3 to 23% from
354 the central sub-basin, and 15 to 47% from the eastern sub-basin. The eastern sub-basin was
355 predicted to be the dominant source of target sediment samples S3 (42-91%), S4 (48-90%) and
356 S5 (57-91%), whereas the corresponding predicted contributions from the western and central
357 spatial sub-basins ranged between 2-56%, 2-49% and 1-40%, and 0.3-17%, 3-19% and 0.4-30%,
358 respectively. The ranges of the contributions from the western, central and eastern sub-basins
359 spatial sources to S6 were 53 to 90%, 7 to 25%, and 2 to 32%, respectively.

Figure 7: The cumulative distributions for the predicted contributions from the three sub-basin spatial sources (western sub-basin - blue line; central sub-basin - red line, and; eastern sub-basin - black line) modelled using GLUE based on the final composite signatures selected using the four different combinations of statistical tests.

3.5 Assessment of the GLUE predictions using MAF and GOF estimators

The contributions from the three sub-basins estimated by GLUE (with 95% confidence limits) using the four different statistical combinations (TRT+KW+DFA, RTM+KW+DFA, TRT+KW+PCA and RTM+KW+PCA) including their overall means and the corresponding estimates of MAF and GOF are presented in Figure 8 and Table 5. The results of apportionment by GLUE using TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA shows that the overall mean contributions from the western, central and eastern sub-basins ranged between 10-60%, 0.3 to 16% and 38% to 77%, respectively (Fig. 8a), and the overall respective mean contributions were estimated at 36%, 6% and 58% (Table 5). Based on the MAF ($\geq 80\%$, exception MAF=78.3% for target sediment sample S2) and GOF ($\geq 95\%$) results, the GLUE procedure was able to predict the measured concentrations in the target sediment samples of the tracers comprising these two final composite signatures. Based on the final composite signature selected using TRT+KW+PCA, the range of the overall mean contributions of the western sub-basin was predicted to be 1-42% (with an overall mean of 20%), whereas the corresponding contributions of the central and western sub-basin spatial sources ranged between 0.5-30% (overall mean 14%) and 55-84% (overall mean 68%), respectively (Fig. 8b). Based on MAF ($> 84\%$) and GOF ($\geq 97\%$), the predicted tracer values using GLUE in combination with the final composite signature selected by TRT+KW+PCA were more accurate than the predictions provided by GLUE with TRT+KW+DFA, RTM+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+PCA. The overall mean contributions, provided by GLUE in combination with the final composite signature selected using RTM+KW+PCA, from the western, central and eastern sub-basin spatial sources ranged between 17-69% (overall mean 41%), 0.2-12% (overall mean 5%) and 29-76% (overall mean 54%), respectively (Fig. 8c). Among the four

387 different statistical combinations, predictions provided by GLUE with RTM+KW+PCA, with a MAF
388 = 89.3% and a GOF = 98.6%, had the lowest accuracy with respect to predicting the measured
389 tracer concentrations in the target sediment samples.

390

391

Figure 8: The cumulative distributions for the overall mean contributions of the three sub-basin spatial sediment sources (western sub-basin - blue line, central sub-basin - red line and eastern sub-basin - black line) modelled using GLUE with the different combinations of the statistical tests.

Table 5: The contributions of the three sub-basin spatial sources estimated by GLUE and the final composite signatures selected using different statistical tests and the corresponding values of MAF and GOF for predicting the measured geochemical tracer concentrations in the six target sediment samples (S1-S6).

Statistical tests combinations	Target sediment sample	Western sub-basin	Central sub-basin	Eastern sub-basin	MAF (%)	GOF (%)
TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA	S1	56	16	28	95.3	99.6
	S2	25	8	68	78.3	95.2
	S3	18	12	70	88.4	97.9
	S4	18	12	70	92.1	99.1
	S5	14	16	70	80.5	95.6
	S6	37	39	24	93.4	98.8
	Overall mean	36	6	58	93.8	99.6
TRT+KW+PCA	S1	55	15	30	90.4	97.3
	S2	27	7	66	84.2	97.1
	S3	18	12	70	88	97.6
	S4	18	12	70	91.8	99.1
	S5	18	12	70	87.8	96.9
	S6	57	19	24	97.7	99.9
	Overall mean	20	12	68	95.4	99.6
RTM+KW+PCA	S1	68	11	21	78.5	90.6
	S2	68	9	23	76.2	92.3
	S3	30	6	64	83.7	96.5
	S4	27	7	66	88.9	98.4
	S5	18	12	70	84.4	96.5
	S6	68	14	18	96.3	99.8
	Overall mean	41	5	54	89.3	98.6

3.6 Testing the predicted source proportions with virtual sediment (VS) mixtures

The ten VS samples with different known mixtures presented in Table 6 were used to evaluate the accuracy of the GLUE models using final composite signatures selected by different combinations of the statistical tests for discriminating the three sub-basin spatial sources. The values of the MAE for the GLUE with TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA ranged between 30% for VS7 to 2% for VS9 and VS10, whereas the corresponding values of the RMSE ranged between 2%

for VS9 and 36% for VS7. The highest values for MAE and RMSE, or the lowest accuracy, was estimated for VS7 with known contributions of 60% (western sub-basin), 20% (central sub-basin) and 20% (eastern sub-basin), compared with predicted corresponding contributions of 16% (western sub-basin), 61% (central sub-basin) and 23% (eastern sub-basin). Among the VS mixtures, the highest accuracy was returned for VS9 with known contributions of 20% (western sub-basin), 20% (central sub-basin) and 60% (eastern sub-basin), and predicted contributions of 20% (western sub-basin), 17% (central sub-basin) and 63% (eastern sub-basin). The values of the MAE and RMSE were estimated to be less than 20% for eight VS mixtures (VS2, VS3, VS4, VS5, VS6, VS8, VS9 and VS10) but $\geq 28\%$ for VS1 and VS7.

Overall, based on the estimates of MAE and RMSE ($<20\%$ for the majority of VS mixtures), GLUE provided accurate predictions of the spatial source contributions in the study area. Equally successful applications of GLUE for source fingerprinting aeolian sands and atmospheric dust, in Australia and Iran respectively, have been reported by Telfer et al., (2020) and Behrooz et al., (2019). The GLUE framework can therefore return acceptable accurate estimates of source contributions in different environmental settings and for different types of target sediment.

Table 6: Comparison of the modelled and known contributions from the three spatial sub-basin sources to the target sediment samples (VS1-VS10) using GLUE and virtual sediment (VS) mixtures.

Statistical tests combinations	VS sample no	VS mixture known source proportions			GLUE predicted source proportions			MAE	RMSE
		Western sub-basin	Central sub-basin	Eastern sub-basin	Western sub-basin	Central sub-basin	Eastern sub-basin		
TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA	VS1	80	10	10	43	52	5	28	33
	VS2	10	80	10	33	60	7	16	18
	VS3	10	10	80	13	17	70	6	8
	VS4	40	30	30	51	27	22	7	8
	VS5	30	40	30	32	43	25	4	4
	VS6	30	30	40	20	48	32	12	13
	VS7	60	20	20	16	61	23	30	36
	VS8	20	60	20	26	51	23	6	7
	VS9	20	20	60	20	17	63	2	2
	VS10	33.3	33.3	33.3	32	31	37	2	3
TRT+KW+PCA	VS1	80	10	10	30	66	4	38	44
	VS2	10	80	10	39	47	14	22	26
	VS3	10	10	80	14	11	75	4	5
	VS4	40	30	30	20	71	9	28	29
	VS5	30	40	30	29	21	50	14	17
	VS6	30	30	40	7	44	49	15	17
	VS7	60	20	20	62	11	27	6	7
	VS8	20	60	20	25	69	6	9	10
	VS9	20	20	60	5	40	55	13	15
	VS10	33.3	33.3	33.3	26	11	63	20	22
RTM+KW+PCA	VS1	80	10	10	46	50	4	26	30
	VS2	10	80	10	17	70	13	7	8
	VS3	10	10	80	13	17	70	7	8
	VS4	40	30	30	42	35	23	5	5
	VS5	30	40	30	68	16	16	25	27
	VS6	30	30	40	9	59	32	19	21
	VS7	60	20	20	14	68	18	32	38
	VS8	20	60	20	17	50	33	9	9
	VS9	20	20	60	15	21	64	3	4
	VS10	33.3	33.3	33.3	17	46	37	11	12

4. Study limitations

Any SSF study necessarily has inherent limitations and uncertainties. Available resources and in many cases, the nature of the landscape in question, inevitably serve to constrain field access and effort and sampling campaigns. In this study, a conventional confluence-based

approach to estimating sub-basin spatial sediment source contributions (e.g., Collins et al., 1996; Vale et al., 2016) was implemented using limited sampling of the spatial sources and downstream target sediment and the single campaign nature of these samples should be borne in mind when interpreting the results. The river bed sediment samples used to represent the spatial sources and the downstream target sediment were not age-dated (e.g., Matisoff et al., 2005; Gellis et al., 2016, 2019) and so it is not possible to confirm the time period represented by the source apportionment estimates. Although a combination of two range tests and tracer biplots was used to help evidence tracer conservatism, it remains widely reported that these approaches fail to attest to the complete absence of transformation during sediment mobilization and routing. With regards the constituent tracers selected in the final composite signatures used in our work, Ca, Mn and P have been reported as being susceptible to phase changes, whereas in comparison, Al, Ce, Eu, La and Sc have been reported as being far less susceptible to mobility between phases (Meybeck and Helmer, 1989). The composite signatures selected in this study are essentially statistical solutions generated by different combinations of tests and here it is informative to bear in mind that some studies have attempted to focus on knowledge-based pre-selection of tracers (e.g., Laceby et al., 2015b; Batista et al., 2019). Finally, VS mixtures were used as a convenient and widely adopted (e.g., Palazon et al., 2015; Sherriff et al., 2015) means to assess the accuracy of the predicted spatial source proportions, since independent monitoring data for the sediment loads emitted from the tributary sub-catchments was not available. The lack of independent evidence to validate SSF results is common to almost all existing published studies, although a few exceptions exist (e.g., Collins et al., 1998; Stone et al., 2014).

5. Conclusions

The novel contribution of this study is quantification of the uncertainty and accuracy of the spatial source contributions from three sub-basins of a large arid catchment in southern Iran using SSF within a GLUE framework. Based on MAF and GOF, all four tracer models performed well, but GLUE with the final composite signature selected by the more traditional statistical procedures (TRT+KW+DFA and RTM+KW+DFA) for source discrimination performed slightly better than the two other models (GLUE with TRT+KW+PCA, and GLUE with RTM+KW+PCA). Our results for sediment source apportionment can help managers target spatial priorities for interventions to help decrease sediment loads and mitigate their negative effects in the Mehran study catchment. On the basis of our experience with this study, we recommend applying the SSF approach within a GLUE framework with the traditional statistical tests for quantifying source contributions. To confirm the wider applicability of our case study findings, our analyses herein should be replicated for estimating the sources of aeolian and fluvial sediments and the associated uncertainties and accuracies in catchments and landscapes located in different regions around the world experiencing severe soil erosion and sediment delivery by either water or wind.

Acknowledgements

This paper was written based on the results from Atefeh Fatthahi's PhD dissertation. The authors would like to thank the Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Hormozgan, Iran, for supporting this joint research project.

References

477 Batista, P. V., Laceby, J. P., Silva, M. L., Tassinari, D., Bispo, D. F., Curi, N., ... & Quinton, J.
 478 N. (2019). Using pedological knowledge to improve sediment source apportionment in tropical
 479 environments. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 19(9), 3274-3289.

480 Behrooz, R. D., Gholami, H., Telfer, M. W., Jansen, J. D., & Fathabadi, A. (2019). Using
 481 GLUE to pull apart the provenance of atmospheric dust. *Aeolian Research*, 37, 1-13.

482 Beven, K., & Binley, A. (1992). The future of distributed models: model calibration and
 483 uncertainty prediction. *Hydrological processes*, 6(3), 279-298.

484 Brewer, M. J., Filipe, J. A., Elston, D. A., Dawson, L. A., Mayes, R. W., Soulsby, C., & Dunn,
 485 S. M. (2005). A hierarchical model for compositional data analysis. *Journal of agricultural,*
 486 *biological, and environmental statistics*, 10(1), 19-34.

487 Collins, A. L., Blackwell, M., Boeckx, P., Chivers, C. A., Emelko, M., Evrard, O., ... & Harris,
 488 P. (2020). Sediment source fingerprinting: benchmarking recent outputs, remaining challenges
 489 and emerging themes. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 20(12), 4160-4193.

490 Collins, A. L., Pulley, S., Foster, I. D., Gellis, A., Porto, P., & Horowitz, A. J. (2017). Sediment
 491 source fingerprinting as an aid to catchment management: a review of the current state of
 492 knowledge and a methodological decision-tree for end-users. *Journal of Environmental*
 493 *Management*, 194, 86-108.

494 Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E., & Leeks, G. J. L. (1998). Use of composite fingerprints to
 495 determine the provenance of the contemporary suspended sediment load transported by
 496 rivers. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms: The Journal of the British Geomorphological*
 497 *Group*, 23(1), 31-52.

498 Collins, A. L., & Walling, D. E. (2002). Selecting fingerprint properties for discriminating
 499 potential suspended sediment sources in river basins. *Journal of hydrology*, 261(1-4), 218-244.

500 Collins, A., Walling, D., & Leeks, G. J. L. (1996). Composite fingerprinting of the spatial
 501 source of fluvial suspended sediment: a case study of the Exe and Severn River basins, United
 502 Kingdom. *Géomorphologie: relief, processus, environnement*, 2(2), 41-53.

503 Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E., & Leeks, G. J. (1997). Fingerprinting the origin of fluvial
 504 suspended sediment in larger river basins: combining assessment of spatial provenance and
 505 source type. *Geografiska Annaler: Series A, Physical Geography*, 79(4), 239-254.

Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E., & Leeks, G. J. L. (1998). Use of composite fingerprints to determine the provenance of the contemporary suspended sediment load transported by rivers. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms: The Journal of the British Geomorphological Group*, 23(1), 31-52.

Collins, A. L., Zhang, Y., Walling, D. E., Grenfell, S. E., & Smith, P. (2010). Tracing sediment loss from eroding farm tracks using a geochemical fingerprinting procedure combining local and genetic algorithm optimisation. *Science of the total environment*, 408(22), 5461-5471.

Collins, A. L., Zhang, Y., Walling, D. E., Grenfell, S. E., Smith, P., Grischkeff, J., ... & Brogden, D. (2012). Quantifying fine-grained sediment sources in the River Axe catchment, southwest England: Application of a Monte Carlo numerical modelling framework incorporating local and genetic algorithm optimisation. *Hydrological Processes*, 26(13), 1962-1983.

Cooper, R. J., Krueger, T., Hiscock, K. M., & Rawlins, B. G. (2014). Sensitivity of fluvial sediment source apportionment to mixing model assumptions: AB ayesian model comparison. *Water Resources Research*, 50(11), 9031-9047.

Dutton, C., Anisfeld, S. C., & Ernstberger, H. (2013). A novel sediment fingerprinting method using filtration: Application to the Mara River, East Africa. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 13(10), 1708-1723.

Egozcue, J. J., Pawlowsky-Glahn, V., Mateu-Figueras, G., & Barcelo-Vidal, C. (2003). Isometric logratio transformations for compositional data analysis. *Mathematical Geology*, 35(3), 279-300.

Gellis, A. C., & Walling, D. E. (2011). Sediment source fingerprinting (tracing) and sediment budgets as tools in targeting river and watershed restoration programs. *Stream restoration in dynamic fluvial systems: scientific approaches, analyses, and tools*, 194, 263-291.

Gellis, A. C., Fitzpatrick, F. A., & Schubauer-Berigan, J. (2016). *A manual to identify sources of fluvial sediment* (No. EPA/600/R-16/210). US Environmental Protection Agency.

Gellis, A. C., Fuller, C. C., Van Metre, P., Filstrup, C. T., Tomer, M. D., Cole, K. J., & Sabitov, T. Y. (2019). Combining sediment fingerprinting with age-dating sediment using fallout radionuclides for an agricultural stream, Walnut Creek, Iowa, USA. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 19(9), 3374-3396.

Gholami, H., Rahimi, S., Fathabadi, A., Habibi, S., & Collins, A. L. (2020). Mapping the spatial sources of atmospheric dust using GLUE and Monte Carlo simulation. *Science of The Total Environment*, 138090.

Gholami, H., Telfer, M. W., Blake, W. H., & Fathabadi, A. (2017). Aeolian sediment fingerprinting using a Bayesian mixing model. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 42(14), 2365-2376.

Gong, Y., Shen, Z., Hong, Q., Liu, R., & Liao, Q. (2011). Parameter uncertainty analysis in watershed total phosphorus modeling using the GLUE methodology. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 142(3-4), 246-255.

Habibi, S., Gholami, H., Fathabadi, A., & Jansen, J. D. (2019). Fingerprinting sources of reservoir sediment via two modelling approaches. *Science of the Total Environment*, 663, 78-96.

Horowitz, A. J. (1991). *A primer on sediment-trace element chemistry* (Vol. 2). Chelsea: Lewis Publishers.

Koiter, A. J., Lobb, D. A., Owens, P. N., Petticrew, E. L., Tiessen, K. H., & Li, S. (2013). Investigating the role of connectivity and scale in assessing the sources of sediment in an agricultural watershed in the Canadian prairies using sediment source fingerprinting. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 13(10), 1676-1691.

Laceby, J. P., & Olley, J. (2015). An examination of geochemical modelling approaches to tracing sediment sources incorporating distribution mixing and elemental correlations. *Hydrological processes*, 29(6), 1669-1685.

Laceby, J. P., Olley, J., Pietsch, T. J., Sheldon, F., & Bunn, S. E. (2015). Identifying subsoil sediment sources with carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios. *Hydrological processes*, 29(8), 1956-1971.

Laceby, J. P., McMahon, J., Evrard, O., & Olley, J. (2015). A comparison of geological and statistical approaches to element selection for sediment fingerprinting. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 15(10), 2117-2131.

Le Gall, M., Evrard, O., Foucher, A., Laceby, J. P., Salvador-Blanes, S., Thil, F., ... & Ayrault, S. (2016). Quantifying sediment sources in a lowland agricultural catchment pond using

563 137Cs activities and radiogenic 87Sr/86Sr ratios. *Science of the Total Environment*, 566, 968-
564 980.

565 Li, Y., Gholami, H., Song, Y., Fathabadi, A., Malakooti, H., & Collins, A. L. (2020). Source
566 fingerprinting loess deposits in Central Asia using elemental geochemistry with Bayesian and
567 GLUE models. *Catena*, 194, 104808.

568 Liu, B., Niu, Q., Qu, J., & Zu, R. (2016). Quantifying the provenance of aeolian sediments
569 using multiple composite fingerprints. *Aeolian research*, 22, 117-122.

570 Mararakanye, N., & Sumner, P. D. (2017). Gully erosion: A comparison of contributing
571 factors in two catchments in South Africa. *Geomorphology*, 288, 99-110.

572 Martínez-Carreras, N., Krein, A., Gallart, F., Iffly, J. F., Pfister, L., Hoffmann, L., & Owens,
573 P. N. (2010). Assessment of different colour parameters for discriminating potential suspended
574 sediment sources and provenance: a multi-scale study in Luxembourg. *Geomorphology*, 118(1-
575 2), 118-129.

576 Marzolf, I., Ries, J. B., & Poesen, J. (2011). Short-term versus medium-term monitoring
577 for detecting gully-erosion variability in a Mediterranean environment. *Earth Surface Processes
578 and Landforms*, 36(12), 1604-1623.

579 Massoudieh, A., Gellis, A., Banks, W. S., & Wieczorek, M. E. (2013). Suspended sediment
580 source apportionment in Chesapeake Bay watershed using Bayesian chemical mass balance
581 receptor modeling. *Hydrological Processes*, 27(24), 3363-3374.

582 Matisoff, G., Wilson, C. G., & Whiting, P. J. (2005). The 7Be/210Pbxs ratio as an indicator
583 of suspended sediment age or fraction new sediment in suspension. *Earth Surface Processes and
584 Landforms: The Journal of the British Geomorphological Research Group*, 30(9), 1191-1201.

585 Meybeck, M., & Helmer, R. (1989). The quality of rivers: from pristine stage to global
586 pollution. *Global and Planetary Change*, 1(4), 283-309.

587 Mohammadifar, A., Gholami, H., Comino, J. R., & Collins, A. L. (2021). Assessment of the
588 interpretability of data mining for the spatial modelling of water erosion using game theory.
589 *Catena*, 200, 105178.

590 Motha, J. A., Wallbrink, P. J., Hairsine, P. B., & Grayson, R. B. (2003). Determining the
591 sources of suspended sediment in a forested catchment in southeastern Australia. *Water*
592 *resources research*, 39(3).

593 Niu, B., Tan, L., Zhang, X. J., Qu, J., An, Z., Wang, J., ... & Li, K. (2020). Targeted control of
594 sand hazards for a railway in extremely arid regions using fingerprinting approaches.
595 *Geomorphology*, 361, 107189.

596 Nosrati, K., Akbari-Mahdiabad, M., Ayoubi, S., & Collins, A. L. (2021). An exploratory
597 study on the use of different composite magnetic and colour fingerprints in aeolian sediment
598 provenance fingerprinting. *CATENA*, 200, 105182.

599 Nosrati, K., Akbari-Mahdiabad, M., Ayoubi, S., Degos, E., Koubansky, A., Coquatrix, Q., ...
600 & Collins, A. L. (2020). Storm dust source fingerprinting for different particle size fractions using
601 colour and magnetic susceptibility and a Bayesian un-mixing model. *Environmental Science and*
602 *Pollution Research*, 27(25), 31578-31594.

603 Nosrati, K., & Collins, A. L. (2019). Fingerprinting the contribution of quarrying to fine-
604 grained bed sediment in a mountainous catchment, Iran. *River Research and Applications*,
605 35(3), 290-300.

606 Owens, P. N., Blake, W. H., Giles, T. R., & Williams, N. D. (2012). Determining the effects
607 of wildfire on sediment sources using ¹³⁷Cs and unsupported ²¹⁰Pb: the role of landscape
608 disturbances and driving forces. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 12(6), 982-994.

609 Palazón, L., Latorre, B., Gaspar, L., Blake, W. H., Smith, H. G., & Navas, A. (2015).
610 Comparing catchment sediment fingerprinting procedures using an auto-evaluation approach
611 with virtual sample mixtures. *Science of the Total Environment*, 532, 456-466.

612 Pulley, S., & Collins, A. L. (2018). Tracing catchment fine sediment sources using the new
613 SIFT (Sediment Fingerprinting Tool) open source software. *Science of the Total Environment*, 635,
614 838-858.

615 Pulley, S., Collins, A. L., & Laceby, J. P. (2020). The representation of sediment source
616 group tracer distributions in Monte Carlo uncertainty routines for fingerprinting: An analysis of
617 accuracy and precision using data for four contrasting catchments. *Hydrological processes*,
618 34(11), 2381-2400.

Pulley, S., Foster, I., & Antunes, P. (2015). The uncertainties associated with sediment fingerprinting suspended and recently deposited fluvial sediment in the Nene river basin. *Geomorphology*, 228, 303-319.

Rowan, J. S., Goodwill, P., & Franks, S. W. (2000). Uncertainty estimation in fingerprinting suspended sediment sources. In *Tracers in geomorphology* (pp. 279-290).

Semmens, B. X., Moore, J. W., & Ward, E. J. (2009). Improving Bayesian isotope mixing models: a response to Jackson et al.(2009). *Ecology Letters*, 12(3), E6-E8.

Smith, H. G., & Blake, W. H. (2014). Sediment fingerprinting in agricultural catchments: a critical re-examination of source discrimination and data corrections. *Geomorphology*, 204, 177-191.

Sherriff, S. C., Franks, S. W., Rowan, J. S., Fenton, O., & Ó'hUallacháin, D. (2015). Uncertainty-based assessment of tracer selection, tracer non-conservativeness and multiple solutions in sediment fingerprinting using synthetic and field data. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 15(10), 2101-2116.

Stone, M., Collins, A. L., Silins, U., Emelko, M. B., & Zhang, Y. S. (2014). The use of composite fingerprints to quantify sediment sources in a wildfire impacted landscape, Alberta, Canada. *Science of the total environment*, 473, 642-650.

Telfer, M. W., Gholami, H., Hesse, P. P., Fisher, A., & Hartley, R. (2020). Testing models of linear dune formation by provenance analysis with composite sediment fingerprints. *Geomorphology*, 364, 107208.

Taylor, S. R., & McLennan, S. M. (1985). The continental crust: its composition and evolution.

Vale, S. S., Fuller, I. C., Procter, J. N., Basher, L. R., & Smith, I. E. (2016). Characterization and quantification of suspended sediment sources to the Manawatu River, New Zealand. *Science of the Total Environment*, 543, 171-186.

Walling, D. E. (2005). Tracing suspended sediment sources in catchments and river systems. *Science of the total environment*, 344(1-3), 159-184.

Walling, D. E. (2013). The evolution of sediment source fingerprinting investigations in fluvial systems. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, 13(10), 1658-1675.

Walling, D. E., Woodward, J. C., & Nicholas, A. P. (1993). A multi-parameter approach to fingerprinting suspended-sediment sources. *IAHS publication*, (215), 329-338.

Zhang, X. J., & Liu, B. L. (2016). Using multiple composite fingerprints to quantify fine sediment source contributions: a new direction. *Geoderma*, 268, 108-118.

Zhao, Y., Gao, G. L., Zhang, Y., Ding, G. D., Zhou, J. X., Chen, Y. X., & Zhou, Q. Z. (2020). Aeolian sediment fingerprinting in the Cuona Lake Section along the Qinghai-Tibetan Railway. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 261, 121233.

Zhao, Y., Zhou, Q., Gao, G., Ding, G., Zhang, Y., & Zhou, J. (2021). A new methodological framework coupling computational fluid dynamics and fingerprinting for assessment of aeolian sediment transport processes. *CATENA*, 204, 105372.