Fluxes of fluid and heat from the oceanic crustal reservoir
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Abstract

Recent discoveries define a global scale fluid reservoir residing within the uppermost igneous oceanic crust, a region of seafloor that is both warm and may harbor a substantial biosphere. This hydrothermal fluid reservoir formed initially within volcanic rocks newly erupted at mid-ocean ridges, but extends to the vastly larger and older ridge flanks. Upper oceanic crust is porous and permeable due to the presence of lava drainbacks, fissuring, and inter-unit voids, and this porosity and permeability allows active fluid circulation to advect measurable quantities of lithospheric heat from the crust to an average age of 65 Myr. A compilation of crustal porosities shows that this fluid reservoir contains nearly 2% of the total volume of global seawater. Heat flow and sediment thickness data allow calculation of reservoir temperatures, predicting 40°C mean temperatures in Cretaceous crust. Utilizing these temperature estimates, heat flow measurements and models for the thermal structure and evolution of the oceanic lithosphere, we have computed mean hydrothermal fluxes into the deep ocean as a function of plate age. The total hydrothermal volume flux into the oceans approaches 20% of the total riverine input and may contribute to the global seawater mass balance.
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1. The oceanic crustal reservoir

Porosities of upper oceanic crust can be derived from seafloor gravity measurement [1], the down-hole logging of drill holes [2-5], and geological studies of terrestrially exposed ophiolites [6]. Crustal porosities younger than 10 Myr [1] and published values for older crust are compiled in Table 1 and shown in Fig. 1, demonstrating the non-uniform age distribution of these data. Crustal porosity values within the neo-volcanic zone can approach 34% soon after formation, decreasing to 15% in less than 1 Myr [1]. Although older seafloor measurements are sparse, no strong age-dependent decrease in crustal porosity after 10 Myr is apparent in the data. If this interpretation of very limited data is globally representative, average porosity for the entire upper crust can be obtained by integrating over the amount of seafloor present for each age interval, giving an average for oceanic upper crustal porosity of 12%. While this is a surprisingly large volume, solid mini-cores of intact rock taken from DSDP/ODP drill holes have a measured, and therefore connected, porosity in excess of 6% for crust of
Since recovered DSDP/ODP drill cores represent only the most continuous and robust portions of the solid matrix of upper oceanic crust, an additional 6% porosity present as larger-scale voids, drainbacks, breccia zones and inter-flow cavities, which are not recovered during drilling, is plausible.

Calculation of reservoir volume also requires estimates of the vertical dimension. Accepting the equivalence between high porosity upper crust and seismic layer 2A [8,9] could both provide this estimate and extend the limited number of direct measurements of upper crustal thickness globally [2-5,10,11]. Seismic models give two bounding models for upper crustal thickness: (a) 600 m of constant porosity [9] and (b) an upper 300 m of constant porosity, plus a linearly decreasing porosity for the lower 300 m [10]. These bounds give estimates for the total free water within upper oceanic crustal rocks of: (a) $26 \times 10^6$ km$^3$ and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>$\rho_c$</th>
<th>$\pm$</th>
<th>$\phi_m$</th>
<th>$\pm$</th>
<th>$\phi_e$</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorda</td>
<td>42°41'</td>
<td>-126°47'</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°32'</td>
<td>-126°35'</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°32'</td>
<td>-126°34'</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°19'</td>
<td>-129°43'</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°32'</td>
<td>-129°36'</td>
<td>2810</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°30'</td>
<td>-129°36'</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°29'</td>
<td>-129°36'</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoAxial</td>
<td>46°19'</td>
<td>-129°42'</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>47°57'</td>
<td>-129°6'</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>21°00'</td>
<td>-109°</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>47°58'</td>
<td>-129°05'</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>[33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>9°50'</td>
<td>-104°14'</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMARK</td>
<td>23°50'</td>
<td>-46°18'</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>45°58'</td>
<td>-130°02'</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>9°31'</td>
<td>-104°17'</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Valley</td>
<td>49°27'</td>
<td>-128°42'</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>26°08'</td>
<td>-44°49'</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>[36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>48°00'</td>
<td>-129°11'</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>9°48'</td>
<td>-104°12'</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>48°00'</td>
<td>-129°16'</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>48°00'</td>
<td>-129°19'</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>44°52'</td>
<td>-130°15'</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endeavour</td>
<td>48°03'</td>
<td>-129°22'</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco</td>
<td>44°25'</td>
<td>-130°10'</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMARK</td>
<td>23°56'</td>
<td>-46°02'</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504B</td>
<td>1°14'</td>
<td>-83°44'</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395A</td>
<td>22°45'</td>
<td>-46°05'</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396B</td>
<td>22°59'</td>
<td>-43°31'</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[39,46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troodos</td>
<td>35°20'</td>
<td>33°25'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erimo Smt</td>
<td>41°00'</td>
<td>145°00'</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84A</td>
<td>19°21'</td>
<td>-159°06'</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417D</td>
<td>25°07'</td>
<td>-68°03'</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418A</td>
<td>25°02'</td>
<td>-68°03'</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801C</td>
<td>18°39'</td>
<td>156°22'</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho_c$ = measured crustal density from ocean bottom gravity measurements or gamma density in case of borehole data.

$\phi_m$ = measured porosity of site (when grain density determined from local rock samples).

$\phi_e$ = estimated porosity assuming grain density of 2930 kg/m$^3$ and water density of 1030 kg/m$^3$.

a This value is from a drill hole and not obtained from ocean bottom gravity measurements.

b This value is from a geological study of an ophiolite.

ridge flank ages [7]. Since recovered DSDP/ODP drill cores represent only the most continuous and robust portions of the solid matrix of upper oceanic crust, an additional 6% porosity present as larger-scale voids, drainbacks, breccia zones and inter-flow cavities, which are not recovered during drilling, is plausible.

Calculation of reservoir volume also requires estimates of the vertical dimension. Accepting the equivalence between high porosity upper crust and seismic layer 2A [8,9] could both provide this estimate and extend the limited number of direct measurements of upper crustal thickness globally [2-5,10,11]. Seismic models give two bounding models for upper crustal thickness: (a) 600 m of constant porosity [9] and (b) an upper 300 m of constant porosity, plus a linearly decreasing porosity for the lower 300 m [10]. These bounds give estimates for the total free water within upper oceanic crustal rocks of: (a) $26 \times 10^6$ km$^3$ and
The high variability in young crust is due to structural differences between low density pillowd units with abundant voids and high density massive flows. This variability decreases with age, with the collapse of large voids and the fracturing of massive units as crust is transported out of the neo-volcanic zone. Open circles, ocean bottom gravity measurements. Filled triangles, downhole logging of drill holes. Filled diamond is an ophiolite study [6].

(b) $19 \times 10^6$ km$^3$, with the larger value being supported by seafloor gravity studies [12] and used in our calculations. Error estimates for reservoir volume represent $\pm 150$ m uncertainty in the 600 m layer thickness and the computed uncertainty in porosity (Table 2). Low values for uncertainty in porosity of older crust are likely due to the under-sampling of these regions.

### 2. Properties of the crustal reservoir

Average thermal characteristics of the global crustal reservoir can be estimated by merging heat flow and sediment thickness data determined over wide geographical areas into a single ‘box’ model of the seafloor and using crustal age as the common index (Table 2). While useful for estimating global properties when data are sparse [13,14], this model is unlikely to successfully predict crustal properties at any given geographical location. Uncertainties for all crustal properties were estimated by iteratively removing samples greater than 5 standard deviations from the mean, and then computing the remaining average

![Fig. 1. Porosity of upper oceanic crust as a function of age.](image-url)
Fig. 2. (A) Global sediment thickness as a function of crustal age. The geographically distributed data [15] are merged with crustal age [16] and then compiled in 20 equal area bins. Dashed bounding lines represent global sedimentation rates of 6.5 and 4.0 m/Myr respectively. (B) Compiled global heat flow data [17] compared to predicted flux from the purely conductive GDH-1 model [13, 14]. The difference between measured heat flow and the conductive model represents two-way advection of heat and fluid between the crustal reservoir and overlying seawater.
deviation. Twenty equal area age bins, each 5% of the total range, were chosen for all distributions other than porosity. An additional age bin of 0–1 Ma crust allowed identification of young on-axis hydrothermal flux, and each subsequent bin contains an area of $1.34 \times 10^4$ km$^2$. Global sediment thickness for the ocean basins has been determined geographically [15] and then merged with a separate crustal age distribution [16]. These data do not include Atlantic data north of 50°N [15]. Sediment thickness for time intervals of equal area are plotted as a function of age in Fig. 2, showing the expected systematic increase in sediment cover with increasing crustal age.

Heat flow data were also compiled geographically [17], marginal basins were excluded, and then merged with crustal age over the same intervals as in Fig. 2. Although Fig. 3 represents more heat flow data than used by the most recent previous compilation [13,14], our results are not dramatically different. The age of 65 Myr where heat flow data and the conductive flux model merge, and where the crustal reservoir can be considered convectively disconnected from the overlying ocean by thick impermeable sediments, is approximately the same as that determined by previous analyses [13]. This is a globally averaged crustal age, and both venting and re-charge of fluid can occur locally in much older crust [14].

3. Crustal temperatures

Biological and chemical processes within the
oceanic crustal reservoir depend strongly on temperature. To estimate the temperature variation of the sediment/basement interface with crustal age, we used a method previously applied to heat flow data on the eastern flank of the Juan de Fuca Ridge, which was verified by the logging of several ODP holes [18]. In this technique, temperature gradients determined from surficial heat flow measurements are projected downward to the sediment/basement interface, using estimates of sediment thickness and thermal conductivity, and adjusted for bottom water temperature. Sediment thermal conductivities can vary both geographically and as a function of depth, and we used a global compilation derived from the extensive ODP data set [19]. The linear fit applied to sediment thermal conductivity ($T_c$) data as a function of depth is:

$$T_c = 8.4312 \times 10^{-4} \times (\text{sediment thickness})/2 + 1.0525$$

(1)

with an uncertainty for each point of ±0.35 W/m/°K. Basement temperatures at the sediment/rock interface were calculated using $Q = C_0 T/z$, where $Q$ is heat flow in W/m², $C$ is thermal conductivity in W/m/°K, $T$ is temperature in °K, and $z$ is vertical dimension in meters. Results from the calculation of sediment/basement interface temperatures are shown in Fig. 3, with the youngest (sediment-covered) basement temperatures near 10°C, rising near 30°C for 120 Myr old crust.

Estimates of reservoir temperatures below the upper sediment/basalt interface require projection of the heat flow-derived thermal gradient into a porous medium that may contain convecting fluid and therefore may not be well-represented by heat conduction in a solid. Any vertical fluid motion occurring within the reservoir will increase effective thermal conductivity, resulting in lower crustal temperatures for the same heat flow than for a non-convecting environment [20,21]. If, however, the vertical fluid velocity of this convection is slow (tens of cm/yr [22]), vertical temperature gradients within igneous basement can be approximated as a non-convecting mixture of water and rock. This assumption allows the effective thermal conductivity to be estimated using a simple mixing model based on crustal porosity and the static physical properties of the two phases. Crustal permeabilities in youngest ocean crust appear larger than the critical value for the onset of fluid convection [23]. However, in basement older than 4 Myr, any perturbation to conductive thermal gradients by convection becomes small due to the reduction in crustal permeability by three orders of magnitude [20,21]. For these calculations, effective thermal conductivities for within the upper extrusive layer were determined using a mixing model between basalt of 2.4 W/m/°K and seawater of 0.528 W/m/°K calculated as:

$$T_c = 2.4 \times (1 - \Phi) + 0.528 \times \Phi$$

(2)

where $\Phi$ is crustal porosity from our Fig. 1.

In order to test the use of the simple mixing model for crustal thermal conductivities, heat flow values for several ODP drill sites were projected downward into the crust below the basement/sediment interface (Table 3). The temperature gradient of the crustal section was measured during the downhole logging of each hole and compared to the temperature gradient predicted using the simple mixing model for crustal thermal conductivity. In the three cases below, temperature gradients were measured long after the cessation of the drilling, and, for Hole 504b, after fluid exchange through the drill hole had largely ceased. For Hole 504b, only the temperature gra-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drill hole</th>
<th>Crustal age (Myr)</th>
<th>Sediment thickness (m)</th>
<th>Basalt penetrated (m)</th>
<th>Porosity</th>
<th>Heat flow (W/m²)</th>
<th>Temperature gradient measured (°C/m)</th>
<th>Temperature gradient predicted (°C/m)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>843b</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.0258</td>
<td>0.0235</td>
<td>[44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417D</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0462</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>[42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504b</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>[45]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Test of the mixing model for crustal thermal conductivity
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dient in the upper 600 m of basement was included in the average. Active fluid circulation would increase the effective thermal conductivity, and reduce the measured temperature gradient, by 20% in the case of 504B. Our interpretation of these results is that conduction in a porous solid is a reasonable approximation for crustal heat transfer, particularly in crust older than 4 Myr.

Estimated mean basement temperatures using this simple non-convecting model are substantially elevated above bottom water temperatures, increasing to near 40°C in crust of mid-Cretaceous age (Fig. 3). This increase of crustal temperature with increasing age older than 20 Myr is a consequence of a relatively uniform heat flow for older crust that is accompanied by an increase in Cretaceous sediment thickness (Fig. 2). Although the middle and lower reservoir temperatures can be over-estimated by this method by as much as 20% in young crust where convection is present [20,21], the temperatures at the sediment/rock interface, and the associated thermal and fluid fluxes into the ocean, are not affected by the model assumptions.

4. Thermal flux

For a given age interval, the difference between measured heat flow and the thermal flux expected for a conductive-only plate model provides an estimate of the ‘missing’ heat flux due to the advection of fluid from basement to overlying seawater [13,14]. These differences between measurement and model, along with sediment/basement temperatures (Fig. 3) and a global bottom water temperature of 1.5 ± 0.5°C [24], were converted into estimates of fluid flux into/out of the basement reservoir as a function of crustal age (Fig. 4). Volume fluxes were determined using:

\[
Q_h = \rho C_q (T - T_o)/A
\]

where \(Q_h\) is the heat flux, \(\rho\) = water density, \(C\) is the specific heat of water, \(q\) is the volume flux, \(T\) is temperature at the rock/sediment interface, \(T_o\) is global bottom water temperature, and \(A\) is the area.

Fig. 4. Flux of hydrothermal fluid to/from the crustal reservoir as a function of age. Shaded area shows the range of propagated uncertainties that contain 50% of the calculated values for each age bin. Estimates of flux are high for young crust and approach zero at 65 Myr.
is the bottom water temperature and $A$ is the area of the seafloor in the bin. Other parameter uncertainties were propagated to obtain the uncertainty in volume flux.

As measured heat flow data approach purely conductive values (Fig. 2B), average fluid flux approaches zero for crust 65 Myr and older. Fig. 4 shows that at least 50% of the total global hydrothermal flux is from ridge flank crust with ages between 4 Myr and 65 Myr. Our analysis does not include the small component of high temperature venting from the axial zone where fluid temperatures can exceed 350°C [25], which would require the percentage of the off-axis fluid flux to be slightly larger. Residence times were calculated using the volume of each bin divided by the flux for that bin. For the hydrothermal fluid within the global upper crustal reservoir, this residence time is $(1.95 \times 10^{16} \text{ m}^3)/(7.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr})$, or approximately 2700 years.

5. Discussion

Recent global data compilations permit first-order estimates of the size and basic physical properties of an unexpectedly large reservoir of seawater residing within upper oceanic crust. Crustal porosity data indicate that the reservoir contains $2 \times 10^7$ km$^3$ of fluid, a quantity that is approximately 40% the volume of the Arctic Ocean and four times the combined Mediterranean and Black seas. Mean crustal temperatures decrease from 40°C for the youngest ages through a minimum at 20 Myr, then increase to near 50°C for the oldest seafloor. It is probably significant in terms of an oceanic crustal biosphere that global average reservoir temperatures everywhere are below the proposed 113°C upper limit on microbial activity [26]. Our analysis agrees with earlier compilations using fewer data [13,14,25] that show general isolation of the crustal reservoir from overlying seawater occurs near 65 Myr. Calculations based on these parameters give a total age-integrated flux of $7.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ of hydrothermal fluid, with $2.3 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ in the axial region and $4.8 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ occurring in crust older than between 5 Myr and 65 Myr. These compare to previous estimates of $4.2 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (axial flux [25]), $7.3 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (flank flux [25]) and $11.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (total flux [25]) and $2.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (flank flux only [22]) that were based on earlier data compilations.

While our estimated global hydrothermal fluid flux amounts to 18% of that due to riverine flow into the oceans, which is assumed to be $4 \times 10^{13} \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ [27], the impact of this flux on the seawater chemical inventory is uncertain. The composition of hydrothermal fluid from varying reservoir source temperatures is substantially different than river water, and crustal fluid is injected near the seafloor while river input is added at or near the surface. There is a continuing ambiguity in the chemical composition of the ridge flank hydrothermal fluid, which is strongly dependent on temperature, age, rock alteration and circulation history, and only limited fluid chemical analyses are available from anomalous sites unlikely to represent global averages [22,25,28].

With our calculated flux rates and reservoir size, an integrated mean residence time for fluid within the crustal reservoir can be estimated as 2700 yr, although for heavily sedimented crust older than 65 Myr, residence times for these isolated sections can approach very long periods. Similar calculations show that the net global flux rate would circulate the entire volume of seawater through the upper ocean crust in only 200 000 yr, significantly shorter than previous estimates [25]. If, however, a major portion of the crustal porosity is isolated from the general hydrothermal circulation by sediment cover, rock alteration or chemical precipitation, the total effective reservoir size will be smaller, and the calculated residence and ocean through-put times will also be shortened. While our analysis is based on an extrapolation of geographically limited data, hydrothermal fluid contained within the upper oceanic crustal rocks appears to form an unexplored body of seawater that is truly global in scale.
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