1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	This manuscript "The distribution of hydrogen/water in Al and Ti-containing forsterite:
11	A thermodynamic model" is a preprint manuscript uploaded to EarthArvix which has
12	not yet undergone peer review. It has been submitted for review. Subsequent versions
13	may have different content.

15	The distribution	of hydrogen/water	in Al and Ti-containing:	forsterite: A thermodynamic
----	------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

16 **model**

17	Joshua M R Muir ^{*1} , Michael Jollands ³ , Feiwu Zhang ¹ , Andrew M. Walker ²
18	Corresponding author: Joshua M R Muir j.m.r.muir@mail.gyig.ac.cn
19	1) Institute of Geochemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 99 West Lincheng Road,
20	Guiyang, Guizhou 550081, China
21	2) Department of Earth Sciences, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1
22	3AN, United Kingdom
23	3) Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, 61 Rt 9W, Palisades, NY 10964, USA
24	
25	Words:6637
26	Key Words: Forsterite; Water; Hydrogen; DFT; Point Defects; Titanium; Aluminium
27	Abstract
28	In forsterite the functional form of water is regard to be hydrogen. The distribution of this
29	hydrogen across different sites in forsterite is important because it determines what rheological
30	properties of forsterite are affected by water and how they are affected. In this study we use

31 lattice dynamic Density Functional Theory (DFT) to build a thermodynamic model of hydrogen in forsterite that contains both Al and Ti sites. We find that Al does not cause 32 significant variation in the distribution of water in forsterite but that Ti does. At low pressures 33 we find that water favours either $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ or $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ with the latter favoured by low 34 temperatures and high Ti contents. As pressure increases $(4H)_{Si}^X$ becomes the dominant site 35 36 of water even in the presence of enstatite, high temperatures and high Ti contents. Thus two charge balance regimes are seen across normal experimental and upper mantle conditions. We 37 predict the distribution of hydrous products along an upper mantle geotherm. The 38 concentration of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ likely controls Mg diffusion and conductivity and we find that this 39

peaks at ~100 km depth for 10 wt. ppm water, ~50 km for 100 wt. ppm water and at 0 km for 40 100 wt. ppm water before declining rapidly with depth beyond these points. The concentration 41 of $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ likely controls Si diffusion and the strength of forsterite. In relatively dry forsterite 42 we find that there is initially a big increase in the concentration of $(4H)_{Si}^X$ with depth before a 43 certain depth where the concentration of $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ becomes insensitive to depth as it is the 44 dominant product. As the crystal gets wetter the initial increase in concentration gets smaller 45 and the depth at which $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ becomes the dominant product becomes shallower. For 10 wt. 46 ppm water $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ concentration increases by 2 orders of magnitude over the first 200 km of a 47 geotherm before obtaining a near consistent value whereas for 1000 wt. ppm water $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ has 48 a consistent concentration throughout the upper mantle. This suggests that nearly dry olivine 49 50 gets considerably weaker as it descends into the mantle before a certain depth where it has consistent strength whereas wet olivine has a consistent strength throughout the upper mantle. 51 We predict the water exponents of defect concentrations and find that they can vary strongly 52 53 under different conditions particularly as charge balance regimes change. Water in forsterite thus behaves very differently in different P, T and water concentration regimes and 54 extrapolation of mechanical properties between these regimes is extremely difficult. 55

56

57 Keywords: Forsterite; Hydrogen; Water; Titanium, Aluminium, DFT

58

59 1 Introduction

Water is a strong control on the properties of forsterite and olivine. Small amounts of water
can lead to significant changes in strength ("hydrolytic weakening) (Demouchy et al., 2012,
Girard et al., 2013a, Fei et al., 2013, Karato and Jung, 2003, Mei and Kohlstedt, 2000a, Mei
and Kohlstedt, 2000b, Karato et al., 1986, Mackwell et al., 1985), texture development (Jung
and Karato, 2001, Karato et al., 2008) and diffusion of cations and conductivity (Fei et al.,

2013, Fei et al., 2018). The upper mantle contains around 20-500 ppm water on average
though it is likely most of it is quite dry <50 ppm with some regions considerably more enriched
(Hirschmann, 2006, Demouchy and Bolfan-Casanova, 2016). Therefore we must understand
the effect of water on olivine to understand the rheological properties of olivine in the upper
mantle.

70

To determine the effect of water on mechanical properties we must know where it is located. Water that exists on Mg vacancies will have different effects on the properties of olivine that water that exists on Si vacancies for example. Water in forsterite is generally regarded as a series of hydrogen containing defects (see Equation 1) and thus the water sites in forsterite are all sites containing hydrogen and the distribution of water shall also be the distribution of hydrogen.

Experimentally there is a long literature examining the question of hydrous defects in olivine 77 78 (Matveev et al., 2001, Le Losq et al., 2019, Berry et al., 2005, Tollan et al., 2018, Lemaire et al., 2004, Mosenfelder et al., 2006, Mosenfelder et al., 2011, Padron-Navarta et al., 2014, Berry 79 et al., 2007a, Tollan et al., 2017, Blanchard et al., 2017) but in general 4 types of hydrated 80 defects have been observed. These are (using Kroger-Vink notation): $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$, $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$, 81 $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}\$ and $\{triv_{Mg}^{'}(1H)_{Mg}^{'}\}\$ where triv is a trivalent atom such as Fe(III) or Al (III) or 82 Cr(III) (Tollan et al., 2017) most commonly Fe(III) (Blanchard et al., 2017). There is 83 considerable disagreement about the relative favourability of these defects under different 84 conditions. $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ appears to be favoured at high pressures (Smyth et al., 2006, Xue et al., 85 2017, Withers and Hirschmann, 2008, Mosenfelder et al., 2006) but this may not be the case in 86 the presence of Ti which forms (at low pressures) $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ with a water exponent of 1 87 (Tollan et al., 2017) or high temperatures which favour $(2H)_{Mg}^X$ (Walker et al., 2007). It is 88 also important to know not just the most favoured defects but the concentrations of all hydrous 89

90 defects to precise levels as properties like diffusion can be affected by defects that are present
91 even at ppt levels due to the low concentration of intrinsic defects (Muir et al., 2020).

92 Some theoretical work has been performed on the structure of hydrous defects in olivine. Early studies investigated the effect of hydrogen on defects using interatomic potentials (Wright and 93 Catlow, 1994) but given how point defects alter the electronic structure of the crystal it has 94 95 proven necessary to use electronic structure methods (Brodholt and Refson, 2000, Haiber et al., 96 1997, Braithwaite et al., 2002). More recent studies have investigated the interaction between hydrogen and trace elements such as titanium (Berry et al., 2007b, Walker et al., 2007) or boron 97 98 (Ingrin et al., 2014) or attempted to link atomic scale models of the structure of various hydrous defects with the results of infra spectroscopy (Balan et al., 2011, Umemoto et al., 2011, 99 Braithwaite et al., 2003). In general these studies have confirmed the structure of the various 100 hydrous defects by determining the low energy forms but have not considered the effect of 101 temperature or built a model of their energetic relationships to each other and to intrinsic 102 defects with the exception of $(2H)_{Ma}^{X}$ and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ (Walker et al., 2007, Qin et al., 2018). 103

Thus in this work we shall use *ab-initio* calculations to build a thermodynamic model and probe the distribution of hydrogen in forsterite. We shall include Ti so as to examine the important $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}\$ defect and Al to probe the effect of trivalent elements. These are two elements that occur in olivine to high concentrations (up to around 300 ppm) (De Hoog et al., 2010).

108

109 2 Methods

110 2.1 General Method

In this work we calculated the energy of different isolated defects in forsterite. This was done use lattice dynamics DFT. These energies are then used to calculate the energy of a series of reactions (see Results). We then determine the energy of different concentrations of these defects using the energies of these reactions and configurational entropy calculations and determine the defect concentrations that give the minimum free energy at any particularcondition and this is the equilibrium distribution of defects.

117

118 2.1 Defect calculations using density functional theory

All calculations were performed with planewave DFT using version 16.11 of the CASTEP code (Clark et al., 2005). On-the-fly ultra soft pseudopotentials were used with 2s, 3p and 3s, 2s and 2p, 3s and 3p, 1s and 3p, 3s, 4s and 3d electrons in the valence for Mg, O, Si, H and Ti respectively. The PBE (Perdew et al., 1996) exchange correlation functional (a revised GGA functional) was used alongside a planewave cutoff of 1000 eV and a (4x4x4) k-point grid in reciprocal space (Monkhorst and Pack, 1976).

A (2x1x2) supercell of forsterite was used into which hydrous vacancies were inserted. After 125 placing defects in the supercell, the structure was then relaxed until the forces on all atoms 126 were less than 0.01 eV/Å and an energy tolerance of 1×10^{-5} eV/atom was repeated. Repeating 127 calculations with increased cutoffs changed the energy of the supercell by <0.1 meV/atom. A 128 (2x1x2) forsterite supercell was used to ensure that there was roughly 10 Å between repeating 129 vacancies in all directions, a distance we found to be sufficient to contain the important atomic 130 relaxations. For simulating $\{2Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}\}$ trios a (4x2x4) supercell was used due to the large 131 size of the defect. To approximate the dilute limit volumes were fixed to those of the pure 132 133 forsterite supercell for both static and QHA calculations. Defect energies were calculated at 0, 5, 10 and 15 GPa and at temperatures 1000, 1300, 1500, 1600 and 2000 K. 134

To calculate high temperature free energies the phonons of the most stable arrangements of each type of defect were calculated using finite differences (displacements of 0.01 bohr) in the CASTEP code (Clark et al., 2005). This was performed for at least 5 different volumes for each system and the energy calculated as a function of volume with equations given in Muir et al. (Submitted). The thermal expansion of forsterite was calculated and then at each temperature and pressure the energy of each defect was calculated at the appropriate volume
of forsterite at those conditions. More discussion on the approximations involved here is given
in the supplementary information.

Our method for calculating non-hydrous vacancies is covered in Muir et al. (Submitted). 5 143 different hydrous defects were examined- $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$, $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$, $(1H)_{Mg}'$, H_{Int}^{\bullet} and $Ti_{Mg}^{\bullet\bullet}(2H)_{Si}''$. 144 In each case their energy was sampled at each possible site in the crystal. $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and $(1H)_{Mg}'$ 145 were be placed at M1 and M2 sites in the crystal replacing a Mg atom. For $Ti_{Mg}^{\bullet\bullet}(2H)_{Si}^{\prime\prime}$ the 146 Titanium was placed at an M1 or an M2 site replacing a Mg and the $(2H)_{Si}^{\prime\prime}$ was placed at an 147 adjacent silicon site. The enthalpy of all possible arrangements of these two groups at adjacent 148 sites was calculated (Table S3). For charged defects a correction was applied as outlined in 149 150 Muir et al. (Submitted).

For $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$, $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$, $Ti_{Mg}^{**}(2H)_{Si}^{"}$ and $(1H)_{Mg}^{'}$ there are multiple possible arrangements of hydrogen in the vacancy. If we consider an arrangement of hydrogen as being each hydrogen bound to a specific oxygen (in an (OH)⁻ group) we tested every possible arrangement of hydrogen with hydrogens pointing both into and out of the vacancy (Table S1-5). In each case the arrangement with the most stable enthalpy was used at high temperature.

156 2.2 Thermodynamic Minimisation

For any pressure and temperature, we first determined the energy of each defect at those conditions. This was done by projecting first along pressure and then along temperature using polynomials and points at 5, 10 and 15 GPa (uncorrected) and 1000, 1500 and 2000 K. The energy of each defect was then placed into the reactions found in the text and the energy of each reaction (E_i) determined at those conditions. We then used a series of minimisations to find the distribution of defects that gave the lowest free energy. In all cases the water content, Ti content and Al content were fixed for each minimisation. Each combination of defects can be represented via a series of variables $(x_1...x_{22})$ where each variable represents one reaction in the text and goes from 0 (reaction does not proceed, all reactants) to 1 (all products).

167 The free energy of each distribution was determined with Equation 1:

168 $\Delta G = \sum_{i} \Delta E_i \times x_i - TS_{confa}$ Equation 1

with the first part related to forming the defects and the second part related to their 169 configurational entropy. The first part is determined by simply the energy (E_i) of each reaction 170 times by how far it progresses (x_i) while the second part is more complex. In short we 171 determine for each defect the different enthalpies of its possible hydrogen arrangements, its 172 173 placement on different lattice sites and its geometrical arrangements for defects that are 174 pairs/trios and then we use the Gibbs entropy formula with the Stirling approximation to determine the configurational entropy of the whole system. Full details of our configurational 175 entropy calculations and the approximations involved are given in the supplementary 176 information. Using a bespoke solver (information in supplementary information) we vary each 177 variable x1...x22, solving Equation 1 at each point, and do this until the energy no longer 178 decreases and that is determined as the thermodynamic equilibrium distribution. 179

180 2.5 Pressure Correction

181 While DFT generally reliably reproduces pressure derivatives, the absolute pressures 182 calculated by DFT are known to be systematically incorrect in that they are shifted in one 183 direction. To correct for these we used a simple linear correction

184 $P(V,T) = P^{DFT}(V,T) - P^{DFT}(V_0^{exp})$ Equation 2

Where the subscript 0 represents the value of a parameter at a reference volume. For this equation we used V_0^{exp} values of 287.4 Å³ for olivine (Isaak et al., 1989), 74.71 Å for MgO (Speziale et al., 2001) and 832.918 Å³ for enstatite (Kung et al., 2004). This provided corrections of -4.95, -4.45 and -3.91 GPa respectively. The energy of our reactions were then
adjusted to account for these different pressure corrections using our calculated dE/dP values.
All pressures are presented corrected unless stated.

191 *2.6 Units*

In this work water concentrations are always given in wt. ppm H₂O, Ti concentrations in wt.
ppm TiO₂ and Al in wt. ppm Al₂O₃.

194

195 <u>3. Results</u>

196 *3.1 Water Reactions*

197 Water could adsorb in forsterite via a reaction like:

198 $Mg_{Mg}^{\times} + H_2O + \frac{1}{2}SiO_2 = (2H)_{Mg}^{\times} + \frac{1}{2}Mg_2SiO_4$ Equation 3

Determining the parameters of this reaction is difficult due to the presence of free water. Instead we can determine the favoured site for water in forsterite by calculating the energy differences between different sites. This was done for water defects, intrinsic defects and some selected non-hydrous extrinsic defects. A buffer reaction was used whose progress was set manually to control the SiO₂ activity. The following reactions were present in our model (using Kroger-Vink notation):

205 Hydrous Reactions

206
$$2(2H)_{Mg}^{X} + Si_{Si}^{X} + 3Mg_2SiO_4 \rightarrow (4H)_{Si}^{X} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSiO_3 R1$$

- 207 $(2H)_{Mg}^X + V_{Mg}'' \to 2(1H)_{Mg}' \text{ R2}$
- 208 $(2H)_{Mg}^X \to V_{Mg}'' + 2H_{Int}^{\cdot} R3$
- 209 $(2H)_{Mg}^X + Ti_{Si}^X \rightarrow \{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ R4

210
$$3(2H)_{Mg}^{X} + Al_{Mg}^{I} + Al_{S1}^{I} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4} → 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 2Al_{Mg}^{I} + 2(3H)_{S1}^{I} + 4MgSlO_{2}$$
211R5212 $(2H)_{Mg}^{X} + Si_{S1}^{X} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + Al_{Mg}^{I} + Al_{S1}^{I} + 4MgSlO_{3} → 2Al_{Mg}^{I} + 2(1H)_{Mg}^{I} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + 1$ 213 $3Mg_{2}SlO_{4}$ R6214 $(2H)_{Mg}^{X} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + Al_{Mg}^{I} + Al_{S1}^{I} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4} → 2Al_{S1}^{I} + 2H_{int} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSlO_{3}$ R7215Anhydrous Extrinsic Reactions216 $Al_{Mg} + Al_{S1}^{I} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSlO_{3} → 2Al_{Mg}^{I} + V_{Mg}^{I} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4}$ R8217 $2Al_{Mg}^{I} + Al_{S1}^{I} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSlO_{3} → 2Al_{Mg}^{I} + V_{Mg}^{I} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4}$ R8218 $Al_{Mg} + Al_{S1}^{I} - \gamma (Al_{Mg}Al_{S1}^{I})$ R10219Anhydrous Intrinsic Reactions220 $Mg_{Mg}^{X} → V_{Mg}^{I} + Mg_{1}^{I}$ R11221 $O_{0}^{X} → V_{0}^{I} + O_{1}^{I}$ R12222 $Sl_{S1}^{X} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4} → V_{S1}^{III} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSlO_{3}$ R14224 $Mg_{Mg}^{X} + O_{0}^{X} + MgSlO_{3} → V_{Mg}^{I} + V_{0}^{I} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + 4MgSlO_{3}$ R14224 $Mg_{Mg}^{X} + O_{0}^{X} + MgSlO_{3} → V_{Mg}^{III} + 2V_{0}^{III} + 2MgSlO_{3}$ R16225 $Mg_{2}SlO_{4} \to Mg_{1}^{II} + O_{1}^{II} + MgSlO_{3}$ R16226 $Sl_{S1}^{X} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{Y} + MgSlO_{3} → 2V_{Mg}^{III} + Sl_{S1}^{Y} + 3Mg_{2}SlO_{4}$ R18228 $Mg_{2}SlO_{4} \to Mg_{1}^{II} + O_{1}^{II} + MgSlO_{3}$ R16229 $Sl_{S1}^{X} + 2Mg_{Mg}^{Y} + Mg_{S1}^{II} + 2Mg_{S1}^{II} + 4MgSlO_{3}$ R20230 $2Mg_{Mg}^{X} + Sl_{S1}^{X} + 4Mg_{S}^{Y} - 2V_{Mg}^{II} + 4MgS$

232 R22) $MgSi_2O_4 \rightarrow MgO + MgSiO_3$ R22

Energies of these reactions are presented in Table 1 and Table S6. Despite using Kroger-Vink 233 notation we allow the number of sites in forsterite to vary if forsterite is created or destroyed 234 (such as in R23 and R24) as explained in Muir et al. (2020) but this has no noticeable effect on 235 the results. Defects in {} brackets are charge pairs that are associated with each other, this is 236 represented in our model by placing them on adjacent sites. For most charge pairs the energy 237 238 gain from randomly placing them in the crystal is larger than the energy gain (due to 239 electrostatics) from pairing them. This is explored in Table S7. There are three exceptions. $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}\$ pairs have large binding energies (5-6 eV) and thus should always occur as pairs 240 and are represented as such in our model (R4). $\{Al_{Mg}i_{Si}\}$ pairs and $\{2Al_{Mg}i_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}\}$ triplets have 241 242 middling binding energies and could occur as bound pairs/triplets in some situations. We allow for these systems to be both bound and unbound through reactions R9 and R10. We find that 243 244 R9 does not happen in any of our explored conditions (as speculated in (Muir et al., 2020)) and all $\{2Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}\}$ triplets are unbound. We find that R10 happens moderately with $\{Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}Al_{Si}^{\prime}\}$ 245 bound pairs being anywhere from 1.01% to 99.81% of the $Al_{Mg}^{\cdot}Al_{Si}^{\prime}$ pairs with the remaining 246 247 percentage being unbound. Lower temperatures, higher Al concentrations and pressures lead to more bound $\{Al_{Mg}^{i}Al_{Si}^{i}\}$ pairs with water concentration having little effect. All reactions 248 above have been written in a system where MgSiO₃ is present and numbers shall be presented 249 250 as such. This can be converted to a system where MgO is present by using R22 in appropriate amounts. All is placed initially as an unbound pair of Al_{Mg}^{\cdot} and Al_{Si}^{\prime} . Ti is initially placed as a 251 4+ cation replacing Si (Berry et al., 2007b). 252

In this formulation water starts (arbitrarily) as $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and then reacts until it reaches its thermodynamically favoured distribution across the various water sites. The possible sites for water are $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ (concentration of these sites shall be referenced as [HMg]), $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ ([HSi]), $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ ([TiH]), $(1H)_{Mg}^{'}([1HMg]), H_{Int}^{"}$ ([HFree]) and $(3H)_{Si}^{'}$ ([3HSi]).

258 *3.2 Pure Forsterite*

We predict water in pure forsterite to produce 2 defects $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$. Two other 259 defects have been proposed in the literature and these are $(1H)'_{Mq}$ and H^{\bullet}_{Int} produced by R2 260 and R3. While there is evidence that $(1H)'_{Mg}$ is produced in the presence of ferric iron (Berry 261 et al., 2007a, Blanchard et al., 2017) there is no clear evidence for the production of $(1H)'_{Ma}$ 262 and H_{Int}^{\bullet} in forsterite. We find these to be extremely minor products. In none of our runs did 263 the concentration of $(1H)'_{Mg}$ exceed 1×10^{-20} (the limit of detectability we set in our model) and 264 H_{Int}^{\bullet} never exceeded 1x10⁻⁷ defects/f.u. and 1 x10⁻⁹ defects/f.u. in the absence of Al (Figure 1). 265 To confirm this we looked at R2 and R3 as isolated reactions occurring by themselves with no 266 other reactions to consider. R2 proceeding to the right is disfavoured by enthalpy and produces 267 no entropy gain and thus $(1H)'_{Mg}$ is never favoured to be produced over $(2H)^X_{Mg}$. R3 268 proceeding to the right is strongly disfavoured by enthalpy and strongly favoured by entropy 269 and thus occurs at small water contents. At 0 GPa (corrected) and 2000 K we find that H_{Int}^{\bullet} 270 exceeds $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ only when water content is <0.2 wt. ppb. This is an extremely small water 271 content. Lower temperatures or higher pressures will decrease the concentration at which H_{Int}^{\bullet} 272 is favoured and the amount of H_{Int}^{\bullet} that is formed (see Table 2). Thus H_{Int}^{\bullet} and $(1H)'_{Mg}$ are 273 not substantially stable products in these systems and shall be ignored in the rest of this work. 274 In Kohlstedt (2006) exponents of water concentrations are derived based upon charge balance 275 276 conditions and we find that for any reasonable amount of water (above 1 ppb) the charge balance condition is $[p^{\bullet}] = 2[H'_{Me}]$ under this scheme. 277

In pure forsterite either $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ or $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ can be the dominant water product (Figure 1). High temperature encourages the formation of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ (Figure 2) as it increases the configurational

entropy (by having 2 defect sites to 1 for $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$), high water concentration stabilises $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ 280 (Figure 1, again due to entropy) and high pressure (Figure 3) encourages the formation of 281 $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ as seen previously experimentally (Smyth et al., 2006, Xue et al., 2017, Withers and 282 Hirschmann, 2008, Mosenfelder et al., 2006). This is because R1 which produces $(4H)_{Si}^X$ 283 eliminates a vacancy which are large and disfavoured by pressure. We plot the pressure at 284 which this occurs in Figure 4. Decreasing SiO₂ activity (by swapping enstatite for MgO) 285 increases $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ stability considerably but the mantle is more closely represented by an 286 enstatite buffer so from now on all of our results will be buffered by enstatite as presented in 287 the reactions above. For large amounts of water (>~520 wt. ppm) $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is always the 288 dominant water product even at 2000 K and 0 GPa. In upper mantle conditions with low 289 amounts of water <500 wt. ppm water should switch from $(2H)_{Mg}^X$ to $(4H)_{Si}^X$ at some 290 characteristic depth depending upon water content and temperature as shown in Figure 4. 291

A key variable in predicting water effects is the water exponent (r) generally defined as:

293 $[Defect] \propto f_{H_2O}^r$ Equation 4

In simple systems where each product can be described by a single equation (such as $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ being solely produced by R1) and where configuration entropy is unimportant each product can be described by a single number which should be relatively insensitive to pressure, temperature and water concentration. In complex systems r will vary significantly with condition. We examine this in our system in Table 3.

- In our system we do not have water fugacity but we can instead determine
- 300 $[Defect] \propto [H_2 O]_{bulk}^r$ Equation 5

All values of r in this study shall refer to that of Equation 5 rather than 4. While Equation 4
and 5 have occasionally been treated as the same in previous literature they are not as Equation

4 has additional mixing terms that are not present in Equation 5. For Equation 5 the dominant 303 304 water defect (the species that provides the charge balance regime) in forsterite should have an 305 r that trends towards 1 while the exponents of the other water species are (in a simple system) dependent on how the minor water species relate to the major species. For example in a simple 306 system where $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ is the major product it will have an exponent of 1 and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ will have 307 an exponent of 2 based on R1. Conversely where $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is the major product it will have an 308 exponent of 1 and $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ will have an exponent of 0.5 in a simple system. This can be seen 309 in Table 3 for the Ti and Al containing system where at 2000 K and 0 GPa the exponent for 310 $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ is 1 and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is 2 (a system charge balanced by $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$) but at 10 GPa these values 311 are 0.5 and 1 (a system charge balanced by $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$). The exponents for $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ 312 as well as those of V''_{Mg} and V'''_{Si} always have a roughly 1:2 ratio because the Si vacancies are 313 controlled by R1 and R14 respectively. 314

315 Our exponents were determined by fitting to:

316
$$ln[Defect] = a + rln[H_2O]_r$$
 Equation 6

where a is a variable and the results are presented in Table 3. We find that exponent values are 317 quite variable and often do not have their ideal value. At low temperatures and high pressures, 318 the exponents approach their ideal values but as temperature rises or pressure decreases the 319 exponents are always above their ideal values due to configurational entropy which relatively 320 321 increases in both of these cases. Exponents were measured in Tollans et al. 2017 where they found values of 2.5 for $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$, 1.1 for $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and 0.9 for $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ using Equation 4 322 instead of 5. These values are all slightly higher than the ideal values with deviations coming 323 both from possible non-ideality of their NaCal fluid but also the presence of some 324 configurational entropy will always raise exponents above their ideal values as shown here. 325 Thus the water exponents r in real systems should be heavily dependent upon pressure, 326

temperature and chemical environment and can vary across common water ranges withparticularly large variations as the major hydrous product changes (Figure 1).

The presence of water will also have a large effect on the intrinsic defects of forsterite as shown in Figure 5. In general the presence of water suppresses the formation of intrinsic defects. This is because they form due to configurational entropy gains upon formation and these gains are relatively decreased in the presence of water (or other extrinsic defects).

Each atom in Mg₂SiO₄ can have a vacancy or an interstitial defect. Mg vacancies (V''_{Mg}) and 333 Mg interstials $(Mg_{l}^{\bullet\bullet})$ are the most prominent extrinsic defects due to the favourability of R11 334 over other extrinsic reactions (Table 1 and S6). $V_0^{\bullet\bullet}$ is the next most prominent vacacy due to 335 R15 and then $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ due to R14. We find that $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ is produced by R14 and not by any of the 336 other $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ reactions which are higher in energy (Table S6). Thus the concentration of $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ is 337 proportional to the concentration of V''_{Mg} which is a reactant in R14. Previous thermodynamic 338 models have used R13 as a base for $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ (Stocker and Smyth, 1978) and thus came to different 339 conclusions about the effect of various conditions on $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ but we find this to be extremely 340 unfavourable. No mechanism that we tested that produces O_1'' or $Si_1^{\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet}$ was favourable and 341 thus the production of these defects was below the detection limit $(1x10^{-20} \text{ defects/f.u.})$ and 342 likely far below this limit based on the extremely high energies of all reactions that produce 343 these interstitials. Thus we conclude Si and O interstitials are not present in forsterite to any 344 significant degree. 345

The effect of water on intrinsic defect exponents has been previously speculated in (Kohlstedt, 2006). Using speculations on the key defect producing reactions and the effect of water on K they postulated that water has no effect on Si and Mg vacancies (r=0) in the charge balance regime $[p^{\bullet}] = 2[H'_{Me}]$. This was extended to O vacancies (Fei et al., 2016) which also had r=0. We find, however (Table 3) that generally these products have negative exponents due to the suppressive effect of water on their configurational formation entropy. The exponent of V''_{Mg} is sometimes positive due to the effects of R3 which creates V''_{Mg} . While R3 only operates in very small amounts relative to other water products it can still create V''_{Mg} at significantly greater rates than are produced intrinsically. We cannot determine exponents for V''_{Si} directly because the concentration of V''_{Si} is extremely low and often below our detection limit but as the concentration of V''_{Si} is controlled entirely by R14 this exponent should be close to twice that of V''_{Mg} .

We find significant deviations from the r values of literature (r=0) particularly in the presence 358 of Al and Ti. This is unsurprising as configurational entropy (which deviates from these perfect 359 values) will always be important for intrinsic defects as it is fundamental to their creation. All 360 the intrinsic defect forming reactions have high positive enthalpies meaning that they only 361 proceed forwards due to the configurational entropy gain of producing defects. Thus in most 362 scenarios the exponents for intrinsic defects will be heavily sensitive to configurational entropy 363 364 and deviate from their normal values. This means that when dealing with intrinsic defects their 365 exponents are particularly hard to extrapolate across temperature and pressure space and must be measured at the desired conditions. 366

367 The Effect of Al

As shown in Figure 1 Al has no large effects on the distribution of water in forsterite. Some (3*H*)'_{*Si*} is produced through R5 and a very small amount of H_{int} through R7 though considerably more than produced in pure forsterite. R6 is not significant and never produces any detectible amounts of (1*H*)'_{*Mg*}. R8 can produce large amounts of V''_{Mg} leading to an increase of the concentration of V''_{Mg} compared to pure forsterite but this effect is suppressed by water and is neglible beyond ~5 wt. ppm water (Figure 5). The effects of this reaction are explored in more detail in Muir et al. (2020). R5, R7 and R8 all increase the ratio of Al^*_{Mg}/Al'_{Si} from its initial value of 1 with this effect mostly controlled by R5. This ratio is plotted against water concentration in Table S8. We find that these changes are generally small with Al_{Mg}^{\bullet} usually being <0.1% larger than Al'_{Si} but at high temperatures, low pressures, low Al content and high water content the $Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}/Al'_{Si}$ ratio can become significant and a strong measure of water content in forsterite.

380 The Effect of Ti

Ti has a large effect on water distribution through the formation of $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ as R4 is very 381 favourable. As shown in Figure 1 and 3 at low pressures $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ can compete with 382 $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ to be the major product. Low temperatures (Figure 2) and high Ti concentrations 383 (Figure 6) favour $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ over $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ while pressure (Figure 3) and water 384 concentration have little effect (Figure 1). R4 is insensitive to pressure (Table 1) and thus with 385 increasing pressure $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ is disfavoured against $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ similar to $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$. This is 386 seen in Figure 4 where Ti makes only small changes to the pressure at which $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is 387 388 dominant.

Similar to Al the site of Ti is a measure of water content. As shown in Table S9 the $Ti_{Si}^{X}/Ti_{Mg}^{...}$ ratio is roughly linear with water content for a fixed P, T and Ti concentration. The ratio varies strongly and nonlinearly with P and T so fitting a universal law is complex and will have overlapping points but inside a known P and T the water content can be solved. This provides both a test of unknown water content if this ratio can be measured and a test of our model if water content is known.

395 4. Discussion

396 *The distribution of water in the upper mantle*

Figure S4 shows the distribution of water along an upper mantle geotherm (Ono, 2008) (Table S10) in a pure forsterite. $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is always favoured over $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ even with 10 wt. ppm water because at low pressures (which favour $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$) the temperature is also low which favours $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$. As depth increaseds pressure increases and there is a sharp decline in [HMg]. While there is an increase in [HSi] with depth this increase is negligible compared to the concentration at 0 km and so in the absence of other defects [HSi] is steady throughout the upper mantle.

The presence of Al and Ti changes this picture. Figure 7 shows the distribution of these products along the same geotherm but with Al and Ti added. The concentration of both Al and Ti was set to a realistic distribution across the mantle using Equation 13 from De Hoog et al. (2010) (values are given in Table S10) such that the concentration of Al and Ti decreases with depth.

In the presence of Al and Ti we find that at shallow depths $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ is the most prominent 408 defect except with large amounts of water (>~500 wt. ppm) when $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is the prominent 409 defect throughout the upper mantle. With increasing depth each of the 3 important hydrated 410 defects change in different ways. [HMg] initially increases slightly with depth (due to 411 increased temperature favouring $(2H)_{Mg}^X$ over $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$, peaking at ~100 km for 10 wt. 412 413 ppm water, ~50 km for 100 wt. ppm water and 0 km for 1000 wt. ppm water, before decreasing in concentration sharply beyond this point. [HTi] decreases throughout the upper mantle. 414 Initially [HTi] decreases slowly up to around the same point that [HMg] peaks before 415 decreasing sharply. [HSi] initially increases sharply with depth as the increased pressure 416 favours it over the other two defects before reaching a point where $(4H)_{Si}^X$ is the most 417 prominent defect and it becomes essentially unchanged with depth, mimicking the behaviour 418 seen in Ti and Al-free forsterite in Figure S4. The depth at which this change in behaviour 419 420 occurs is shown in Figure 8 and is ~200 km for 1 wt. ppm, ~150 km for 10 wt. ppm, ~100 km

for 100 wt. ppm and 0 km for 1000 wt. ppm water. Thus in shallower drier areas of the upper
mantle [HSi] increases sharply with depth but in wetter areas it is consistent with depth.

The changes between Figure 7 and S4 are induced by Ti and not by Al as demonstrated above. 423 The concentration of Ti in the sample is important only if the Ti concentration is low compared 424 to the water concentration in which case $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ will saturate and be lower than 425 predicted here. Figure S5 shows the same plot as Figure 7 but with a constant (500 wt. ppm) 426 427 amount of TiO₂ and Al₂O₃. Figure S5 and 7 are nearly identical. This is because at shallow depths, where Ti makes a large difference to the distribution of water, there is large amounts 428 429 of Ti in both our geological distribution in Fig 7 and in our fixed Ti-rich trace in S5. At deep depths where there is large amounts of Ti in Figure S5 and small amounts in the geological 430 distribution in Figure 7 $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ dominates regardless of Ti concentration. Thus in shallow and 431 dry areas of the upper mantle Ti concentration (relative to water concentration) is important 432 but in deep and/or wet areas of the upper mantle Ti concentration levels are irrelevant for the 433 main distribution of water in forsterite. Figure S5 contains the highest level of Ti that is likely 434 present in the upper mantle and real samples are likely somewhere between this and Figure 7. 435 Thus $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is likely always the dominant water product in mantle forsterite and steady 436 throughout the upper mantle except for the shallowest, driest and most Ti rich forsterites. 437

438 *[HMg]*

Increasing the concentration of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ will primarily have effects on the diffusion of Mg (Fei et al., 2018), the diffusion of hydrogen and the conductivity in regions above ~900 C and with high water concentrations- ie most of the upper mantle (Demouchy and Bolfan-Casanova, 2016, Demouchy and Mackwell, 2006, Yoshino et al., 2017, Novella et al., 2017). We find that with small amounts of water (with some Ti and Al) [HMg] initially rises and then falls sharply after a depth defined by temperature, water and Ti concentration. With large amounts of water[HMg] decreases slowly around the first 100 km of the upper mantle and then quickly.

Under young oceanic plates conductivity increases on the order of a magnitude have been seen peaking at around 70-120 km (Baba et al., 2006, Baba et al., 2010). If these regions contain water this conductivity spike could be explained by $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$. The conductivity increase seen in these regions is also strongly anisotropic which can also be explained by an increase of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ as increasing the Mg diffusion rate by adding vacancies should lead to anisotropic diffusion and thus conduction.

In the general upper mantle conductivity either increases sharply up to 100 km depth and then slowly afterwards in oceanic mantle or continually increases at similar rates in continental mantle (Sun et al., 2019). While conductivity will generally increase as you descend into the mantle simply due to the increased temperature if conductivity in this region is tied to Mg diffusion rates which are tied to water one would expect, based on this work, a large decrease in conductivity with depth which is not observed in reality.

458 There are three reasons why such a signal may not be observed. First the relationship of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ to Mg diffusion rates and conductivity may not be straightforward. A relatively 459 immobile $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ could explain why there is no large decrease in conductivity with depth. 460 Alternatively Mg diffusion in forsterite might not be the controlling factor for forsterite in these 461 conditions with polaron or grain boundary diffusion or other mechanisms actually being 462 dominant. Second the increased temperature of the deep upper mantle which will increase 463 conductivity may overweigh the decreases caused by a shrinking [HMg]- the diffusivity of 464 $(2H)_{Mq}^{X}$ needs to be known to address this point. Third it may be that Mg diffusion controls 465 the conductivity of forsterite but that the upper mantle is very dry. A dry upper mantle would 466

467 only have small changes to Mg diffusion regardless of the relative prominence of $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and 468 thus no conductivity decreases with depth.

469 *[HSi]*

Increasing the concentration of $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ will have large effects as Si is the slowest diffusing 470 species in olivine (Chakraborty, 2010) and thus is assumed to control its diffusion-mediated 471 creep, both in diffusion creep and dislocation creep regimes where they are climb limited (see 472 Demouchy and Bolfan-Casanova (2016) for a review). Thus adding water to forsterite, 473 particularly at high pressure, should increase its creep rate and cause it to weaken. This 474 "hydrolytic weakening" has been observed in both diffusion and dislocation creep regimes 475 (Mei and Kohlstedt, 2000a, Mei and Kohlstedt, 2000b, Karato et al., 1986, Demouchy et al., 476 2012, Girard et al., 2013a, Tielke et al., 2018, Jung and Karato, 2001, Hirth and Kohlstedt, 477 2003, Mackwell et al., 1985), as has an increase in the silicon diffusion rate (Costa and 478 Chakraborty, 2008, Fei et al., 2013) with these two mechanisms hypothesised as linked (Fei et 479 al., 2016). The strain rate of forsterite has been found to increase in the presence of water from 480 481 around half an order of magnitude (Mei and Kohlstedt, 2000a, Mei and Kohlstedt, 2000b, Fei et al., 2013, Girard et al., 2013b, Tielke et al., 2018, Demouchy et al., 2012, Umemoto et al., 482 2011) to a couple of orders of magnitude (Costa and Chakraborty, 2008, Karato et al., 1986, 483 Jung and Karato, 2001) with these differences often explained by experimental differences in 484 strain rates, compositions and water content with grain boundary water likely an important 485 confounder of results. The two works at the highest pressures (4-8 GPa (Fei et al., 2013, Girard 486 et al., 2013a)) where [HSi] should be the largest found the lowest weakening which could be 487 evidence that either [HSi] is not important in Si diffusion or that Si diffusion is not important 488 in the rheological strength of forsterite (which would also explain the difference between direct 489 strength measurements and those from Si diffusion measurements) but may be evidence that 490 491 other studies have overestimated the weakening effects.

Determining the water exponent of hydrolytic weakening will give insight into its weakening 492 mechanism. The exponent of water's effect has been measured as 1/3 (Fei et al., 2013), 0.2-1 493 (Costa and Chakraborty, 2008), ~1.2 (Hirth and Kohlstedt, 2003, Tielke et al., 2018) and 0.2 494 (Mackwell et al., 1985) though in all cases the experimental data is scattered and could be 495 plausibly fit with different exponents. In Fei et al. (2016) an exponent of 1/3 was explained 496 497 for Si diffusion by co-diffusion of Si and O using the exponents of Kohlstedt (2006) and a charge balance regime of $[(OH)_{O}] = 2[V_{Mg}'']$ with V_{Si}''' having an exponent of 2/3 and with 498 $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ being immobile. We find this unlikely for a few reasons. We find that the charge 499 balance regime is either $[p^{\bullet}] = 2[H'_{Me}]$ or $[p^{\bullet}] = 4[H'_{Si}]$ and thus V'''_{Si} will be either 500 unchanged by water content (r=0 in the ideal case) or somewhat decreased due to entropy 501 concerns (we find r for $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ to be ~0- -0.5 in the conditions of the experiment 8 GPa, 1600-502 1800 K). Thus an immobile $(4H)_{Si}^X$ would lead to a decrease in Si diffusion rates with water. 503 Even in the limit of the charge balance $[(OH)_O^{\cdot} = 2[V_{Mg}'']$ the measured exponent of 1/3 is 504 against [H₂O]_{bulk} rather than water fugacity (Equation 5 rather than 4) and thus the perfect 505 exponent for $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ would be 2 and not 2/3. If $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is the dominant water structure and $[p^{\bullet}] =$ 506 $4[H'_{Si}]$ is the charge balance in these products as we predict then the exponent of both V'''_{Si} and 507 $V_0^{\bullet\bullet}$ should be 0 in the ideal case and that of $(4H)_{Si}^X$ should be 1 with the actual exponent of 508 $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ and $V_{O}^{\bullet\bullet}$ being slightly negative. Determining the water exponent of Si diffusion is 509 impossible in this work without knowing the diffusivity of dry and wet Si vacancies but a Si 510 diffusion exponent of $\sim 1/3-2/3$ at high pressure (where the $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ exponent is ~ 1) or ~ 1.2 at 511 lower pressures (where the $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ exponent is ~2) makes sense if Si diffusion is a mixture of 512 these two species as it would place the exponent roughly halfway between these two species. 513 Thus we propose that the water exponent of Si diffusion is variable and is low $(\sim 1/3)$ at high 514 pressure but higher at low pressure (<~1 GPa depending upon temperature and water content). 515

If Si diffusion is responsible for weakening of forsterite then the same exponent should alsohold for olivine strength.

Such an effect has been seen in olivine creep strength in Karato and Jung (2003) where it was observed that in wet olivine creep strength decreases rapidly with pressure below ~1 GPa but slowly above this. This is evidence of a changing exponent at around 1 GPa which makes sense if creep rate is tied to Si diffusion which is tied to [HSi] as around 1 GPa you change from a $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ dominated region to one dominated by $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ and change the exponent of $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ from 2 to 1.

We predict such changes to occur in the upper mantle. As can be seen in Figure 8 there are 524 two regions for [HSi] in the upper mantle reflective of these two charge balance regions. In 525 the shallow upper mantle and in drier rocks there is a region of sharp increase in [HSi] with 526 depth, this is a region where $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ or $Ti_{Mg}^{**}(2H)_{Si}^{"}$ dominates. In this region there should 527 be sharp increases in [HSi] with depth and thus large changes in olivine strength with depth. 528 For 100 wt. ppm water [SiH] increases by over an order of magnitude over the first 150 km, 529 for 10 wt. ppm water [SiH] increases by 2.5 orders over the first 200 km of the upper mantle 530 and olivine strength should lower accordingly. The second region is one where $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ is the 531 dominant product and in this region [HSi] is nearly insensitive to depth. It increases slightly 532 with depth in all cases but this change is so small as to be negligible. Across this region the 533 strength of wet forsterite should be fixed with depth. This region starts earlier in the mantle 534 with more water (~200 km with 10 wt. ppm, ~150 km with 100 wt. ppm, ~0 km with 1000 wt. 535 ppm) such that very wet crystals should have consistent strength throughout the upper mantle. 536 These results suggest, therefore, that drier shallower olivines could have strengths that vary by 537 orders of magnitude with depth and that olivine cannot be treated as a structure with a fixed 538

strength throughout the upper mantle unless it is very wet such that [HSi] does not very withdepth or extremely dry such that water does not change the strength at all.

541

In conclusion we find that water distribution in lower mantle forsterite is mainly a function of 542 depth. Lower water concentrations and higher temperatures favour $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ while higher Ti 543 concentrations favour $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ but pressure overwhelmingly favours $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ and this 544 becomes the key factor descending into the lower mantle. In drier rocks $(2H)_{Ma}^{X}$ or 545 $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}\$ can be the dominant water defect and peak in concentration around 100-150 km 546 suggesting a maximum Mg diffusion rate and conductivity around this depth. In these drier 547 rocks [HSi] increases steadily across this range of depths and thus the rocks should become 548 weaker as they increase in depth. In very wet rocks $(4H)_{Si}^X$ is the dominant water carrying 549 phase throughout and thus there should be consistent Si diffusion rates and strength throughout 550 the upper mantle. Water in forsterite is highly sensitive to the environmental conditions and 551 so universal laws are likely to fail except outside the conditions in which they were created. 552 553 554 555 556 BABA, K., CHAVE, A. D., EVANS, R. L., HIRTH, G. & MACKIE, R. L. 2006. Mantle dynamics beneath the 557 East Pacific Rise at 17 degrees S: Insights from the Mantle Electromagnetic and Tomography (MELT) experiment. Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth, 111. 558 BABA, K., UTADA, H., GOTO, T.-N., KASAYA, T., SHIMIZU, H. & TADA, N. 2010. Electrical conductivity 559 imaging of the Philippine Sea upper mantle using seafloor magnetotelluric data. Physics of 560 561 the Earth and Planetary Interiors, 183, 44-62.

BALAN, E., INGRIN, J., DELATTRE, S., KOVACS, I. & BLANCHARD, M. 2011. Theoretical infrared
 spectrum of OH-defects in forsterite. *European Journal of Mineralogy*, 23, 285-292.

BERRY, A. J., HERMANN, J., O'NEILL, H. S. C. & FORAN, G. J. 2005. Fingerprinting the water site in
 mantle olivine. *Geology*, 33, 869-872.

BERRY, A. J., O'NEILL, H. S. C., HERMANN, J. & SCOTT, D. R. 2007a. The infrared signature of water
associated with trivalent cations in olivine. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 261, 134142.

- BERRY, A. J., WALKER, A. M., HERMANN, J., O'NEILL, H. S., FORAN, G. J. & GALE, J. D. 2007b. Titanium
 substitution mechanisms in forsterite. *Chemical Geology*, 242, 176-186.
- 571 BLANCHARD, M., INGRIN, J., BALAN, E., KOVACS, I. & WITHERS, A. C. 2017. Effect of iron and trivalent 572 cations on OH defects in olivine. *American Mineralogist*, 102, 302-311.
- 573 BRAITHWAITE, J. S., SUSHKO, P. V., WRIGHT, K. & CATLOW, C. R. A. 2002. Hydrogen defects in
 574 Forsterite: A test case for the embedded cluster method. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 116,
 575 2628-2635.
- BRAITHWAITE, J. S., WRIGHT, K. & CATLOW, C. R. A. 2003. A theoretical study of the energetics and
 IR frequencies of hydroxyl defects in forsterite. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*,
 108.
- BRODHOLT, J. P. & REFSON, K. 2000. An ab initio study of hydrogen in forsterite and a possible
 mechanism for hydrolytic weakening. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 105,
 18977-18982.
- 582 CHAKRABORTY, S. 2010. Diffusion Coefficients in Olivine, Wadsleyite and Ringwoodite. *In:* ZHANG, Y.
 583 X. & CHERNIAK, D. J. (eds.) *Diffusion in Minerals and Melts.*
- 584 CLARK, S. J., SEGALL, M. D., PICKARD, C. J., HASNIP, P. J., PROBERT, M. J., REFSON, K. & PAYNE, M. C.
 585 2005. First principles methods using CASTEP. *Zeitschrift fuer Kristallographie*, 220, 567-570.
- 586 COSTA, F. & CHAKRABORTY, S. 2008. The effect of water on Si and O diffusion rates in olivine and
 587 implications for transport properties and processes in the upper mantle. *Physics of the Earth* 588 and Planetary Interiors, 166, 11-29.
- DE HOOG, J. C. M., GALL, L. & CORNELL, D. H. 2010. Trace-element geochemistry of mantle olivine
 and application to mantle petrogenesis and geothermobarometry. *Chemical Geology*, 270,
 196-215.
- 592 DEMOUCHY, S. & BOLFAN-CASANOVA, N. 2016. Distribution and transport of hydrogen in the 593 lithospheric mantle: A review. *Lithos*, 240, 402-425.
- 594 DEMOUCHY, S. & MACKWELL, S. 2006. Mechanisms of hydrogen incorporation and diffusion in iron-595 bearing olivine. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals*, 33, 347-355.
- 596 DEMOUCHY, S., TOMMASI, A., BAROU, F., MAINPRICE, D. & CORDIER, P. 2012. Deformation of
 597 olivine in torsion under hydrous conditions. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 202,
 598 56-70.
- FEI, H., KOIZUMI, S., SAKAMOTO, N., HASHIGUCHI, M., YURIMOTO, H., MARQUARDT, K., MIYAJIMA,
 N., YAMAZAKI, D. & KATSURA, T. 2016. New constraints on upper mantle creep mechanism
 inferred from silicon grain-boundary diffusion rates. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*,
 433, 350-359.
- FEI, H., WIEDENBECK, M., YAMAZAKI, D. & KATSURA, T. 2013. Small effect of water on upper-mantle
 rheology based on silicon self-diffusion coefficients. *Nature*, 498, 213-+.
- FEI, H. Z., KOIZUMI, S., SAKAMOTO, N., HASHIGUCHI, M., YURIMOTO, H., MARQUARDT, K.,
 MIYAJIMA, N. & KATSURA, T. 2018. Mg lattice diffusion in iron-free olivine and implications
 to conductivity anomaly in the oceanic asthenosphere. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*,
 484, 204-212.
- GIRARD, J., CHEN, J., RATERRON, P. & HOLYOKE, C. W., III 2013a. Hydrolytic weakening of olivine at
 mantle pressure: Evidence of 100 (010) slip system softening from single-crystal deformation
 experiments. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors,* 216, 12-20.
- GIRARD, J., CHEN, J., RATERRON, P. & HOLYOKE III, C. 2013b. Hydrolytic weakening of olivine at
 mantle pressure: Evidence of [100](010) slip system softening from single-crystal
 deformation experiments. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors,* 216, 12-20.
- HAIBER, M., BALLONE, P. & PARRINELLO, M. 1997. Structure and dynamics of protonated Mg2SiO4:
 An ab-initio molecular dynamics study. *American Mineralogist*, 82, 913-922.
- HIRSCHMANN, M. M. 2006. Water, melting, and the deep Earth H(2)O cycle. Annual Review of Earth
 and Planetary Sciences.

619 HIRTH, G. & KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2003. Rheology of the Upper Mantle and the Mantle Wedge: A view 620 from the Experimentalists. Geophysical Monograph Series, 138, 83-105. 621 INGRIN, J., KOVACS, I., DELOULE, E., BALAN, E., BLANCHARD, M., KOHN, S. C. & HERMANN, J. 2014. 622 Identification of hydrogen defects linked to boron substitution in synthetic forsterite and 623 natural oliyine. American Mineralogist, 99, 2138-2141. 624 ISAAK, D. G., ANDERSON, O. L., GOTO, T. & SUZUKI, I. 1989. ELASTICITY OF SINGLE-CRYSTAL 625 FORSTERITE MEASURED TO 1700-K. Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth and Planets, 626 94, 5895-5906. JUNG, H. & KARATO, S. 2001. Water-induced fabric transitions in olivine. Science, 293, 1460-1463. 627 628 KARATO, S., JUNG, H., KATAYAMA, I. & SKEMER, P. 2008. Geodynamic significance of seismic 629 anisotropy of the upper mantle: New insights from laboratory studies. Annual Review of 630 Earth and Planetary Sciences. 631 KARATO, S. I. & JUNG, H. 2003. Effects of pressure on high-temperature dislocation creep in olivine. 632 Philosophical Magazine, 83, 401-414. 633 KARATO, S. I., PATERSON, M. S. & FITZ GERALD, J. D. 1986. RHEOLOGY OF SYNTHETIC OLIVINE 634 AGGREGATES - INFLUENCE OF GRAIN-SIZE AND WATER. Journal of Geophysical Research-635 Solid Earth and Planets, 91, 8151-8176. KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2006. The role of water in high-temperature rock deformation. In: KEPPLER, H. & 636 637 SMYTH, J. R. (eds.) Water in Nominally Anhydrous Minerals. Chantilly: Mineralogical Soc 638 Amer & Geochemical Soc. 639 KUNG, J., LI, B. S., UCHIDA, T., WANG, Y. B., NEUVILLE, D. & LIEBERMANN, R. C. 2004. In situ 640 measurements of sound velocities and densities across the orthopyroxene -> high-pressure 641 clinopyroxene transition in MgSiO3 at high pressure. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary* 642 Interiors, 147, 27-44. 643 LE LOSQ, C., JOLLANDS, M. C., TOLLAN, P. M. E., HAWKINS, R. & O'NEILL, H. S. C. 2019. Point defect 644 populations of forsterite revealed by two-stage metastable hydroxylation experiments. 645 Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology, 174. 646 LEMAIRE, C., KOHN, S. C. & BROOKER, R. A. 2004. The effect of silica activity on the incorporation 647 mechanisms of water in synthetic forsterite: a polarised infrared spectroscopic study. 648 Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology, 147, 48-57. 649 MACKWELL, S. J., KOHLSTEDT, D. L. & PATERSON, M. S. 1985. THE ROLE OF WATER IN THE 650 DEFORMATION OF OLIVINE SINGLE-CRYSTALS. Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth 651 and Planets, 90, 1319-1333. 652 MATVEEV, S., O'NEILL, H. S., BALLHAUS, C., TAYLOR, W. R. & GREEN, D. H. 2001. Effect of silica 653 activity on OH-IR spectra of olivine: Implications for low-aSiO(2) mantle metasomatism. 654 Journal of Petrology, 42, 721-729. 655 MEI, S. & KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2000a. Influence of water on plastic deformation of olivine aggregates 1. 656 Diffusion creep regime. Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth, 105, 21457-21469. 657 MEI, S. & KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2000b. Influence of water on plastic deformation of olivine aggregates 2. 658 Dislocation creep regime. Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth, 105, 21471-21481. 659 MOSENFELDER, J. L., DELIGNE, N. I., ASIMOW, P. D. & ROSSMAN, G. R. 2006. Hydrogen incorporation 660 in olivine from 2-12 GPa. American Mineralogist, 91, 285-294. MOSENFELDER, J. L., LE VOYER, M., ROSSMAN, G. R., GUAN, Y., BELL, D. R., ASIMOW, P. D. & EILER, J. 661 662 M. 2011. Analysis of hydrogen in olivine by SIMS: Evaluation of standards and protocol. 663 American Mineralogist, 96, 1725-1741. 664 MUIR, J., ZHANG, F. & WALKER, A. M. Submitted. The Controls of Pressure and Water on Highly 665 Anisotropic Mg Diffusion in Forsterite., Preprint available at https://doi.org/10.31223/osf.io/ck3af. 666 MUIR, J. M. R., JOLLANDS, M., ZHANG, F. W. & WALKER, A. M. 2020. Explaining the dependence of 667 668 M-site diffusion in forsterite on silica activity: a density functional theory approach. Physics 669 and Chemistry of Minerals, 47.

- NOVELLA, D., JACOBSEN, B., WEBER, P. K., TYBURCZY, J. A., RYERSON, F. J. & DU FRANE, W. L. 2017.
 Hydrogen self-diffusion in single crystal olivine and electrical conductivity of the Earth's
 mantle. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 10.
- 673 ONO, S. 2008. Experimental constraints on the temperature profile in the lower mantle. *Physics of* 674 *the Earth and Planetary Interiors,* 170, 267-273.
- PADRON-NAVARTA, J. A., HERMANN, J. & O'NEILL, H. S. C. 2014. Site-specific hydrogen diffusion
 rates in forsterite. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 392, 100-112.
- QIN, T., WENTZCOVITCH, R. M., UMEMOTO, K., HIRSCHMANN, M. M. & KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2018. Ab
 initio study of water speciation in forsterite: Importance of the entropic effect. *American Mineralogist*, 103, 692-699.
- SMYTH, J. R., FROST, D. J., NESTOLA, F., HOLL, C. M. & BROMILEY, G. 2006. Olivine hydration in the
 deep upper mantle: Effects of temperature and silica activity. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 33.
- SPEZIALE, S., ZHA, C. S., DUFFY, T. S., HEMLEY, R. J. & MAO, H. K. 2001. Quasi-hydrostatic
 compression of magnesium oxide to 52 GPa: Implications for the pressure-volume temperature equation of state. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 106, 515-528.
- STOCKER, R. L. & SMYTH, D. M. 1978. EFFECT OF ENSTATITE ACTIVITY AND OXYGEN PARTIAL PRESSURE ON POINT-DEFECT CHEMISTRY OF OLIVINE. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 16, 145-156.
- SUN, W., YOSHINO, T., KURODA, M., SAKAMOTO, N. & YURIMOTO, H. 2019. H-D Interdiffusion in
 Single-Crystal Olivine: Implications for Electrical Conductivity in the Upper Mantle. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 124, 5696-5707.
- TIELKE, J. A., MECKLENBURGH, J., MARIANI, E. & WHEELER, J. 2018. The Influence of Water on the
 Strength of Olivine Dislocation Slip Systems. *JGR Solid Earth*, 124, 6542-6559.
- 694TOLLAN, P. M. E., O'NEILL, H. S. C. & HERMANN, J. 2018. The role of trace elements in controlling H695incorporation in San Carlos olivine. Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology, 173.
- TOLLAN, P. M. E., SMITH, R., O'NEILL, H. S. C. & HERMANN, J. 2017. The responses of the four main
 substitution mechanisms of H in olivine to H2O activity at 1050 degrees C and 3 GPa.
 Progress in Earth and Planetary Science, 4.
- 699 UMEMOTO, K., WENTZCOVITCH, R. M., HIRSCHMANN, M. M., KOHLSTEDT, D. L. & WITHERS, A. C.
 700 2011. A first-principles investigation of hydrous defects and IR frequencies in forsterite: The
 701 case for Si vacancies. *American Mineralogist*, 96, 1475-1479.
- WALKER, A. M., HERMANN, J., BERRY, A. J. & O'NEILL, H. S. 2007. Three water sites in upper mantle
 olivine and the role of titanium in the water weakening mechanism. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112, 12.
- WITHERS, A. C. & HIRSCHMANN, M. M. 2008. Influence of temperature, composition, silica activity
 and oxygen fugacity on the H2O storage capacity of olivine at 8 GPa. *Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology*, 156, 595-605.
- WRIGHT, K. & CATLOW, C. R. A. 1994. A computer simulation study of (OH) defects in olivine. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals*, 20, 515-518.
- XUE, X., KANZAKI, M., TURNER, D. & LOROCH, D. 2017. Hydrogen incorporation mechanisms in
 forsterite: New insights from H-1 and Si-29 NMR spectroscopy and first-principles
 calculation. *American Mineralogist*, 102, 519-536.
- YOSHINO, T., ZHANG, B. H., RHYMER, B., ZHAO, C. C. & FEI, H. Z. 2017. Pressure dependence of
 electrical conductivity in forsterite. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 122, 158171.
- 716



718

Figure 1: Distribution of products at 2000 K and 0 GPa (corrected) as a function of water 719 content (vs temperature is shown in Figure 2 and vs pressure in Figure 3). Different colours 720 represent different defects and lines different systems (solid line= pure forsterite, dashed 721 line=forsterite+ 500 wt. ppm Al₂O₃, dotted line forsterite+500 wt. ppm TiO₂). 722 Concentrations are defects/f.u. so [Si] has twice as much hydrogen as [Mg] with an 723 equivalent concentration. [Hfree] is nearly identical with and without Ti. [HMg] is identical 724 at this scale for pure and Al-containing forsterite. With increasing water [Si] is favoured. A 725 high pressure graph (10 GPa corrected) is shown in Figure S1 which has very similar trends. 726



Figure 2: Distribution of the 3 major products as a function of temperature at 0 GPa

(corrected) with 500 wt. ppm Al₂O₃ and TiO₂ with 2 different water contents (10 wt. ppm=
solid lines, 500 wt. ppm dashed lines). The same graph at 10 GPa is shown in Figure S2 and
for pure forsterite in S3 though trends are similar in both cases just with changes in absolute
values.





3: Distribution of the 3 major products as a function of pressure at 2000 K with 500 wt. ppm
Al₂O₃ and TiO₂ with 2 different water contents (10 wt. ppm= solid lines, 500 wt. ppm dashed
lines). Pressure increases [HSi] but this effect decreases with water content as [HSi]
becomes the most prominent defect at all pressures (see Figure 4). [HMg] heavily decreases
with pressure, [HTi] increases slightly with pressure and then heavily decreases.



744

Figure 4: The crossover pressure as a function of water at fixed T from water being mostly in (2H) $_{Mg}^{X}$ and { $Ti_{Mg}^{...}(2H)_{Si}^{...}$ } to being mostly in (4H) $_{Si}^{X}$ (lowest pressure at which (4H) $_{Si}^{X}$ contains over half the water in the system). Shown are a pure forsterite buffered by enstatite (solid line), periclase (dotted line) and a forsterite containing 500 wt. ppm TiO2 buffered by enstatite (dashed line) with colour representing temperature (red=2000, green=1500 K). For 1500 K in a pe buffered Ti-free system (4H) $_{Si}^{X}$ contains the majority of the water even at 0 GPa as with 1000 K for all conditions.







K and 0 GPa (corrected) with three different crystal chemistries (solid line=pure forsterite,

dashed line= 500 wt. ppm TiO₂, dotted line= 500 wt. ppm Al₂O₃). The only major difference

induced by crystal chemistry is Al induces extra V''_{Mg} due to R8 but this effect is suppressed by high levels of water. The absolute value of these concentrations is less constrained than

for intrinsic defects as their concentration is much smaller but the trends with water

concentration are better constrained.

760

761



6: Change in the concentration of the three major defects as a function of Ti content at 2000
K and 0 GPa (corrected) and with different amounts of water (10 wt. ppm solid line, 100
dashed line, 1000 dotted line).



Figure 7: Plot of the distribution of the three major products along a geotherm with geological distribution of Al and Ti (Table S8) with three different water concentrations (10 wt. ppm=solid lines, 100=dashed lines, 1000=dotted lines). For a system with no Ti and Al see Figure S4 and for one with fixed Ti and Al see Figure S5. The general trend is that of increasing $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ while $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ increases and then decreases.

775



Figure 8 As Figure 7 but just showing the values for [HSi] with different total water
concentrations. With decreasing water [HSi] has a larger increase in concentration over
shallower depths.

		0 GPa			5 GPa		10 GPa			
	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K	
R1	-1.337	-2.139	-3.376	-1.336	-2.119	-3.672	-1.337	-1.794	-3.413	
R2	0.585	0.564	0.564	0.585	0.564	0.564	0.585	0.565	0.565	
R3	6.639	7.772	8.554	6.891	8.700	9.954	7.142	9.627	11.354	
R4	-1.031	-1.169	-1.281	-1.045	-1.183	-1.296	-1.006	-1.150	-1.272	
R5	-0.421	-0.765	-1.071	-0.282	-0.585	-0.871	0.021	-0.240	-0.513	
R6	1.157	1.227	1.142	1.099	1.211	1.124	1.071	1.248	1.178	
R7	4.278	4.464	4.472	4.223	4.440	4.388	4.207	4.537	4.490	
R8	2.121	2.387	2.560	2.140	2.603	2.842	2.100	2.705	3.023	
R11	5.960	6.375	6.918	5.661	6.180	6.877	5.368	5.939	6.747	
R22	0.270	0.239	0.231	0.282	0.254	0.258	0.298	0.269	0.278	

Table 1: Reaction energies (in eV/f.u) for the hydrated defect reactions (R1-R7) and some
other important reactions as a function of pressure and temperature. All other reactions are
shown in Table S6.

P Corrected (GPa)	Т (К)	Water Conc (wt. ppm)	log 2*[2H]	log [Hint]
		0.001	-7.80	-15.95
0	1000 K	1	-7.30	-15.95
		1000	-6.80	-15.95
		1	-6.57	-11.66
0	1500 K	10	-6.06	-11.68
		100	-5.56	-11.65
		1	-5.51	-9.24
0	2000 K	10	-4.93	-9.24
		100	-4.41	-9.24
		1	-7.94	-14.78
10	2000 K	10	-7.41	-14.78
		100	-6.91	-14.48

789 Table 2: Concentration (log defect/f.u.) of 2*[2H] and [Hint] (so that they have equal

amounts of hydrogen) as a function of pressure and temperature in a system with only 1
reaction R3. As can be seen by comparing these values to those in Figure 1 the introduction

of other reactions lowers [Hint] except for R7 which raises it a lot. [Hint] is always a lot

smaller than [2H] except for extremely small water contents.

794

			[HMg]	[HSi]	[HTi]	$[V_{Mg}'']$	[<i>Mg</i>]••]	$[V_0^{\bullet\bullet}]$	[<i>V</i> _{Si} ''']proj
	_	2000 K	0.82	1.63	n/a	0.00	-0.14	-0.84	-0.29
	5 GPa	1500 K	0.60	1.19	n/a	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
Draw	Gra	1000 K	0.50	1.01	n/a	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
Pure		2000 K	0.50	1.00	n/a	0.29	-0.49	-0.49	-0.99
	15 GPa	1500 K	0.50	1.00	n/a	0.26	0.13	0.00	0.26
		1000 K	0.50	1.00	n/a	0.25	0.34	0.00	0.69
	_	2000 K	0.98	1.96	0.61	0.51	-0.56	0.00	-1.12
$TiO_2 = 500$	5 GPa	1500 K	1.08	2.12	0.49	0.56	-0.82	-0.80	-1.60
ppm	01 a	1000 K	1.37	2.65	0.48	0.65	-1.40	-1.51	-2.70
$Al_2O_3=$		2000 K	0.51	1.02	0.49	0.26	-0.53	-0.50	-0.39
500	15 GPa	1500 K	0.50	1.00	0.47	0.25	-0.19	-0.13	-1.06
Phu	Ora	1000 K	0.50	1.00	0.46	0.24	-0.02	0.00	-0.04

Table 3: The water exponent r determined for each of these systems by fitting equation 5
between 10-1000 wt. ppm water. Below 10 wt. ppm water there are sometimes sharp

changes in concentration which can strongly distort the exponent. An exponent for $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$ cannot be reliably determined because it's concentration is small but its concentration is overwhelmingly controlled by R14 and thus its exponent should be roughly double that of $V_{Ma}^{\prime\prime}$ similarly to how [HSi] is roughly twice [HMg] because it is controlled by R1.

These exponents can be converted into those of equation 4 by assuming an exponent for one of the products. If we assuming [HMg] has a water exponent in Equation 4 then the Equation 5 exponents of the other products can be determined by dividing their exponents by the exponent of [HMg] (first column).

806

807

809 <u>Supplementary Methods for "the distribution of hydrogen in Al and Ti-containing</u> 810 <u>forsterite: A thermodynamic model"</u>

811

In this section we go into more detail about how we determine energy of different configurations, the different arrangements involved in each defect, the different assumptions involved in our calculation and how our thermodynamic minimiser works.

815

816 Determining the energy of defective systems

27 defect forming reactions are presented in the text. We need to find the concentration of defects that provides the lowest possible energy. Each reaction is assigned a reaction vector (x1...x27) between 0 and 1 which determines how far each reaction proceeds to the right between all reactants and all products. For any combination of x1-x27 we can solve for the free energy and the thermodynamic equilibrium is where this free energy is minimised. Solving for the free energy consists of two parts determined as the non-configurational energy and the configurational entropy section:

824
$$\Delta G = \sum_{i} \Delta E \times x_{i} - TS_{confa}$$
 Equation S1

The first half of Equation S1 involves multiplying the energy of each reaction at the appropriate P and T (see Table 1) by its reaction vector to obtain the non-configurational entropy. The second half of Equation S1 involves finding the configurational entropy term S_{confa} for any collection of defects.

829

1.1) Configurational Entropy

830 The configurational entropy term S_{confa} has many different components and is not 831 straightforward to determine. In short we used the Gibbs entropy formula:

832 $S = -k_B \sum_i p_i ln p_i$ Equation S2

833 Where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, j represents a specific configuration of defects and p_j the 834 probability that configuration occurs. A configuration refers to how defects are arranged across 835 the supercell with a set concentration.

836 The probability of any specific configuration occurring is:

837
$$p_j = \frac{1}{z} e^{(-U_j/k_B T)}$$
 Equation S3

838 Where U_j is the internal energy of each configuration. Z in Equation S3 is the canonical 839 partition function:

840
$$Z = \sum_{i} e^{(-U_j/k_B T)}$$
Equation S4

841 Strictly speaking S3 and S4 should be calculated with G_j (the free energy of each 842 configuration) rather than U_j (the internal energy of each configuration). This was an 843 approximation made to allow us to calculate the energy of many different configurations 844 quickly as U is much easier to calculate the G. We shall discuss this approximation later. We 845 also do these calculations in the dilute limit with all systems fixed to the forsterite unit cell. 846 This means PV terms do not vary reducing H_j terms to U_j.

At this point we shall define a scheme to group the configurations and bring them down to a 847 calculable number. We shall thus define a configuration as a state where each of the defects of 848 each type is confined to a single type of site. This can be imagined by having a single defect 849 850 of each type and so the different configurations simply change which site each defect occupies. With our assumption that defects are independent every configuration with the defects confined 851 to a single site is identical and configurations where defects occupy multiple sites are included 852 by the partitioning function. V''_{Mg} , $(1H)'_{Mg}$, $(2H)^X_{Mg}$ and Al^{\cdot}_{Mg} were confined to M1 and M2 853 sites, $V_{Si}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime}$, Ti_{Si}^{χ} , $(4H)_{Si}^{\chi}$, $(3H)_{Si}^{\prime}$ and Al_{Si}^{\prime} to Si sites, $Mg_{I}^{\bullet\bullet}$ to M1 and I2 sites, $V_{0}^{\bullet\bullet}$ and H_{Int}^{\bullet} to 854 O1, O2 and o3 sites and O_I'' and $Si_I^{\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet}$ to I1,I2 and T1-T5 sites (which are defined in (Muir et 855 al., 2020)). $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}, \{2Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}V_{Mg}^{"}\}\$ and $\{Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}Al_{Si}^{\prime}\}\$ were calculated as pairs/trios with 856

each element of the defect confined to a next or second-next neighbour site. All possible 857 geometries of these pairs/trios were tested. For hydrogen atoms in $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$, $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$, $(1H)'_{Mg}$, 858 $(3H)'_{Si}$ and $(2H)''_{Si}$ defects we considered them bound to an O in the vacancy. We calculated 859 the relative enthalpy of every possible arrangement of hydrogen in these vacancies where an 860 arrangement has each hydrogen bound to a specific O and pointing the hydrogen either in or 861 out of the vacancy. For H_{Int}^{\bullet} the hydrogen was considered bound to an O1, O2 or O3 atom in 862 the bulk. The relative enthalpy of placing a defect in a specific site with a specific hydrogen 863 arrangement was then calculated as a function of pressure as shown in Table S1-S5. We also 864 calculated the enthalpy for all geometric arrangements (with each defect on a next neighbour 865 site with the enthalpies shown in Table S11-S13). For calculating the final free energy of the 866 reactions the most enthalpically stable defect for each arrangement was chosen and its free 867 868 energy calculated at high temperature. The effect of other arrangements is confined to the configurational entropy term. 869

All possible configurations (with a defect in a specific site and hydrogen in a specific 870 arrangement) were then tabulated and their relative energy U_i assigned by applying energy 871 penalties determined from the relative enthalpies in Table S1-5. 872 The energy penalty is determined by the difference between the enthalpy of the defect in its current site with its 873 current hydrogen arrangement compared to the enthalpy of the defect in its favored site with 874 its favored hydrogen arrangement. This assumes that the energy of placing and moving a defect 875 around the crystal is independent of the other defects and that defect-defect interaction terms 876 are minimal. 877

878 To calculate the degeneracy (W) of each configuration, we must first calculate the 879 degeneracy at each site:

880 W= $\ln \frac{N!}{a!h!...z!}$ Equation S5

881	Where N is the total number of sites, and a,b,cz are the different types of
882	atoms/defects at each site including a final z term, which is simply (N-a-by). To solve this
883	numerically, all defect concentrations were written in terms of defects/mol and then the Stirling
884	approximation was used $(lnn! \cong nln - n)$, giving:

885 $W = NlnN - N - alna + a - blnb + b \dots - zlnz + z$ Equation S6

Additional degeneracies from hydrogen arrangement degeneracy and the degeneracy of thebound pairs and trios were derived in a similar way added to this term.

Knowing the degeneracy and relative energy of all configurations, the entropy was
calculated using Equation S3 but summed across i, where i is simply a sum across every
configuration (j) appearing a number of times equal to its degeneracy (W).

891 In summary, each reaction proceeding to the right produces a set of defects, and then these defects are spread across their different sites according to the energy differences between 892 these sites and the thermodynamic minimum of this distribution. This is determined by the state 893 of every other reaction. An alternative way to consider or calculate this is that (for example) 894 Reaction 5 is 4 reactions- one producing an M1 vacancy and an M1 interstitial, one producing 895 896 an M2 vacancy /M1 interstitial, one an M1 vacancy /I2 interstitial and one an I2 vacancy /M2 interstitial. However, this will produce the same answer as a single reaction producing a 897 vacancy and an interstitial that are then thermodynamically distributed across their two sites 898 899 including all the configurational entropy of the different distributions across the sites.

- 900
- 901

1.2 Testing our assumptions

For this model we assume that the relative energy of placing defects in different sites is not a function of temperature, and that temperature effects occur only in differences between different types of defect (such as V''_{Mg} and $Mg_I^{"}$) and not between the same defects at different sites (V''_{Mg}) at M1 and M2 for example) as the different Mg sites are similar and thus their vibrational frequencies should be similar.

This was tested for three defects $Mg_I^{\bullet\bullet}, V_{Mg}''$ and $(2H)_{Mg}^X$. For the two Mg vacancies 907 (hydrous and anhydrous) it was found that the vibrational entropy difference between the two 908 sites was less than 0.1 eV/defect at 2000 K due to the large similarities between the two sites. 909 910 This is much lower than the enthalpy differences between these sites and this should be true for most defects which do not have large differences in geometry between M1 and M2 sites. 911 912 Mg interstitials have very different geometries between M1 and I2 sites and their vibrational entropies are also different. The vibrational entropy difference between these two sites is 913 914 tabulated in Muir et al. (Submitted) and included in the model and thus for Mg interstitials we 915 use G rather than U in Equation S3 and S4.

We also assume in this model that different arrangements of hydrogen have negligible 916 entropy differences. We tested this with two different arrangements in $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ and $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$. 917 For Mg we tested configurations 2 and 4 (based on their order in the Table S1) and found the 918 entropy difference was less than 0.085 eV/defect at 2000 K. For Si we tested configurations 1 919 and 3 (based on their order in Table S2) and found the entropy difference is less than 0.22 920 921 eV/defect at 2000 K- this is higher because these configurations are quite different where 4 has a hydrogen outside the vacancy and 1 has all hydrogens inside. This is likely to be the largest 922 923 entropy difference of all the likely hydrogen arrangements due to the extreme difference in geometry between these two arrangements. For $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$ we tested 4 different 924 arrangements (Row 13 Column 2, R2 C2, R1 C1 and R4 C14 in Table S3) and found 925 differences less than 0.103 eV/defect at 2000 K. These energies are still much lower than the 926 reaction energies and configurational entropy is only a small driver of these reactions so our 927 approximation of using U_i rather G_i is likely reasonably adequate. As shown in Table S7 928 when we rule out the formation of bound defect pairs we mostly assume that the bound pair 929

does not have a large increase in favourability with temperature and rely upon enthalpy to
determine if they are bound. This assumption was tested for some pairs as shown in Table S7
and was found to be the case.

We also assume that a quasi-harmonic approximation derived via linear displacement 933 at a single q-point is a good measure of the energy of these systems. In Muir et al. (2020) we 934 tested this assumption for dry vacancies and found it to be accurate. While hydrous vacancies 935 936 have considerable anharmonicities these largely cancel out as previously demonstrated from and bridgmanite similar ringwoodite which have hydrous vacancies REF 937 938 **RINGWOODITEPAPER.**

- 939
- 940

1.3 Thermodynamic Minimisation

Once we can determine the energy of any configuration, we need to find which 941 configuration of defects gives the lowest energy. This is a difficult problem as we are dealing 942 with variables that can have values that are many orders of magnitude different, multiple local 943 minimums and a configurational entropy term that has many terms and is difficult to solve 944 analytically. Instead we used a bespoke solver which minimised each variable in turn through 945 brute force and went through the variables multiple times. Such a method relies upon the large 946 energy differences of each of the different reactions (R1-R5). R1 is the most favoured reaction 947 and the progress of reactions R2-R5 has little effect on the progression of R1 because the energy 948 terms involved in R1 are much larger. Thus we solved each reaction in turn from most favoured 949 to least favoured and repeated this until the energy no longer varied. As stated in the text, 950 determining concentrations of defects that are below 1×10^{-20} defects/f.u. proved very difficult 951 as we encountered issues with floating points numbers and the precision of our calculations 952 (when the other defects had much higher concentrations) and thus we used this as a baseline 953 cutoff beyond which variables were not minimised. Our minimisation process does not present 954

a formal solution and may miss a true energy minimum and small variations in the final
concentration of the products but should provide a good guide to how different conditions vary
the concentration of the water products.

958



959

Figure S1 Distribution of products at 2000 K and 10 GPa (corrected) as a function of water content. Different colours represent different defects and lines different systems (solid line= pure forsterite, dashed line=forsterite+ 500 wt. ppm Al₂O₃, dotted line forsterite+500 wt. ppm TiO₂). Concentrations are defects/f.u. so [Si] has twice as much hydrogen as [Mg] with an equivalent concentration. [HSi] and [HMg] is near identical for all three compositions and cannot be distinguished at this scale. With increasing water [HSi] is favoured. [Hfree] is nearly identical with and without Ti and is around -14.25.

967



Figure S2: Distribution of the 3 major products as a function of temperature at 10 GPa (corrected) with 500 wt. ppm Al_2O_3 and TiO_2 with 2 different water contents (10 wt. ppm= solid lines, 500 wt. ppm dashed lines).



Figure S3: Distribution of the 3 major products as a function of temperature at 0 GPa (corrected)
with pure forsterite and with 2 different water contents (10 wt. ppm= solid lines, 500 wt. ppm
dashed lines).



Figure S4: Plot of the distribution of the three major products in pure forsteritealong a geotherm
with three different water concentrations (10 wt. ppm=solid lines, 100=dashed lines,
1000=dotted lines).

		Energy (eV)					
Arrangement	Degeneracy	0 GPa (corrected	5	10			
Oli Oli	1	0.501	0.503	0.489			
O1i O2i	4	0.348	0.002	0.002			
O1i O3i	4	0.536	0.561	0.575			
O2i O2i	1	0.000	0.000	0.000			
O2i O3i	4	0.544	0.525	0.503			
O3i O3i	1	0.154	0.161	0.162			
O1i O1o	2	1.265	1.370	1.456			
O1o O1o	1	2.108	2.300	2.470			
Olo O2i	4	1.174	1.269	1.352			
Oli O2o	4	1.417	1.085	1.168			
O1o O2o	4	2.374	2.585	2.835			
O1o O3i	4	1.140	1.242	1.334			
O1i O3o	4	0.944	1.048	1.138			
010 030	4	1.740	1.930	2.099			
O2i O2o	2	0.982	1.085	1.170			
O2o O2o	1	2.058	2.265	2.405			
O2o O3i	4	1.480	1.586	1.612			
O2i O3o	4	1.005	1.094	1.171			
O2o O3o	4	2.297	2.515	2.635			
O3i O3o	2	0.663	0.745	0.818			
O3o O3o	1	1.276	1.435	1.582			

Table S1: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of hydrogen in $(2H)_{Mg}^X$ as a function of 985 pressure. Each arrangement is defined by the type of oxygen the hydrogen is bound to (O1, 986 O2, O3) and whether it points inside (i) or outside (o) the vacancy with the lowest enthalpy 987 possible for that arrangement listed in every case. Arrangements with hydrogen pointing 988 outside the vacancy are much higher in energy than those where all hydrogen point inside the 989 vacancy. These values are for $(2H)_{Mg}^X$ at the M1 site, values at the M2 site are similar but all 990 enthalpies at 0.51/0.59/0.59 eV higher at 0/5/10 GPa (corrected) respectively as $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ is 991 favoured at the M1. 0.51/0.59/0.59 eV is used for the site preference enthalpy of $(2H)_{Mq}^{X}$. 992

993

		Energy (eV)				
Arrangement	Degeneracy	0 GPa (corrected)	5	10		
O1i O2i O3i O3i	1	0.494	0.606	0.554		
O1o O2i O3i O3i	1	0.334	0.363	0.350		
O1i O2o O3i O3i	1	0.000	0.000	0.000		
O1i O2iO3o O3i	2	0.036	0.061	0.049		
O1o O2o O3i O3i	1	0.350	0.412	0.385		
O1o O2i O3o O3i	2	0.434	0.480	0.459		
O1i O2o O3o O3i	2	0.136	0.213	0.175		
O1i O2i O3o O3o	1	0.285	0.384	0.338		
O1o O2o O3o O3i	2	2.200	0.465	0.269		
O1i O2o O3o O3o	1	0.465	0.659	0.565		
O1o O2i O3o O3o	1	1.914	2.227	2.076		
010 020 030 030	1	2.469	2.913	2.699		

Table S2: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of hydrogen in $(4H)_{Si}^{X}$ as a function of pressure. Each arrangement is defined by the type of oxygen the hydrogen is bound to (O1,

998 O2, O3) and whether it points inside (i) or outside (o) the vacancy with the lowest enthalpy
999 possible for that arrangement listed in every case. The most stable arrangement has one
1000 hydrogen pointing outside the vacancy as also found by Qin et al. (2018).

		0 GPa	(correct	ted)				5 GPa	5 GPa				10 GPa					
Arrangement	Degeneracy	M1 A	M1 B	M2 A	M2 B	M2 C	M2 D	M1 A	M1 B	M2 A	M2 B	M2 C	M2 D	M1 A	M1 B	M2 A	M2 B	M2
O3i O3i	1	1.759	0.002	1.068	2.347	1.502	0.863	1.810	0.001	1.020	2.243	1.506	0.796	1.850	0.001	0.968	2.140	1.5
O3i O2i	2	1.960	1.228	0.995	1.038	1.688	1.085	2.009	0.000	0.923	0.253	1.683	1.041	2.046	0.003	0.857	0.201	1.6
O3i O1i	2	1.759	1.114	1.068	1.089	1.500	1.087	1.808	1.095	1.019	1.017	1.505	1.041	1.849	1.067	0.968	0.949	1.5
O2i O1i	1	1.961	1.236	1.229	0.316	3.252	3.291	2.009	1.239	1.191	0.264	3.265	3.292	2.046	1.239	1.145	0.216	3.2
O3i O3o	2	2.136	0.262	3.677	1.457	1.927	1.547	2.230	0.314	3.753	1.458	1.979	1.539	2.310	0.366	3.813	1.452	2.0
O3o O3o	1	2.756	2.641	4.694	4.753	2.584	2.591	2.915	2.799	4.862	4.872	2.706	2.686	3.060	2.942	5.006	4.977	2.8
O3i O2o	2	2.181	1.587	1.462	0.431	1.947	3.772	2.258	1.609	1.466	0.412	1.986	3.791	2.327	1.625	1.461	0.400	2.0
O3o O2i	2	2.249	0.261	3.783	1.813	2.041	1.454	2.351	0.314	3.855	1.772	2.091	1.480	2.437	0.364	3.905	1.453	2.1
O3o O2o	2	2.748	2.659	4.673	2.723	2.543	4.759	2.915	2.805	4.852	2.820	2.666	4.880	3.065	2.938	5.001	2.901	2.7
O3i O1o	2	6.759	5.002	6.068	5.316	5.665	5.863	6.810	5.001	6.020	5.264	5.854	5.796	6.850	5.001	5.968	5.216	6.0
O3o O1i	2	2.134	0.261	3.572	1.459	1.925	1.455	2.230	0.314	3.685	1.458	1.977	1.480	2.310	0.365	3.771	1.454	2.0
O3o O2o	2	2.133	0.261	3.572	1.457	6.239	3.920	2.229	0.313	3.687	1.458	6.503	4.123	2.310	0.364	3.780	1.451	6.7
O2o O1i	1	1.924	0.000	3.393	2.111	5.768	5.513	1.965	0.002	3.511	2.164	5.930	1.041	1.994	0.000	1.142	2.220	6.0
O2i O1o	1	2.249	1.432	1.466	0.431	3.389	3.736	2.340	1.472	1.466	0.412	1.990	3.808	2.416	1.503	1.463	0.400	2.0
O2o O1o	1	2.181	1.430	1.464	2.578	6.240	6.291	2.257	1.473	1.464	2.694	6.469	6.520	2.325	1.500	6.668	2.804	6.6

Table S3 Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of hydrogen in $\{Ti_{Mg}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}\$ as a function of pressure. Each arrangement is defined by the type of oxygen the hydrogen is bound to (O1, O2, O3) and whether it points inside (i) or outside (o) the vacancy with the lowest enthalpy possible for that arrangement listed in every case. There are 6 Ti sites relative to the $(2H)_{Mg}^{X}$ (see (Walker et al., 2007)), 2 in an M1 site which are each 2 fold degenerate and 4 in an M2 site which are each 1 fold degenerate.

		Energy (eV)					
Arrangement	Degeneracy	0 GPa (corrected	5	10			
Oli	2	0.263	0.267	0.264			
010	2	1.149	1.255	1.350			
O2i	2	0.000	0.000	0.000			
O2o	2	1.132	1.240	1.337			
O3i	2	0.063	0.064	0.063			
O30	2	0.723	0.809	0.890			

Table S4: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of hydrogen in $(1H)'_{Mg}$ as a function of pressure. Each arrangement is defined by the type of oxygen the hydrogen is bound to (O1, O2, O3) and whether it points inside (i) or outside (o) the vacancy with the lowest enthalpy possible for that arrangement listed in every case. Arrangements with hydrogen pointing outside the vacancy are much higher in energy than those where all hydrogen point inside the vacancy.

		Energy (eV)			
Arrangement	Degeneracy	0 GPa	5	10	
Annangement	Degeneracy	(corrected)	5	10	
O1i O3i O3i	1	0.285	0.320	0.298	
O2i O3i O3i	1	0.000	0.001	0.001	
O1i O2i O3i	2	0.405	0.000	0.000	
O1i O3o O3i	2	0.545	0.656	0.609	
O1o O3i O3i	1	0.283	1.003	0.314	
O1o O3o O3i	2	0.544	0.663	0.611	
O1i O3o O3o	1	0.921	1.141	1.040	
O1o O3o O3o	1	3.271	3.853	3.577	
O2i O3o O3i	2	0.492	0.568	0.534	
O2o O3i O3i	1	0.332	0.397	0.367	
O2o O3o O3i	2	1.041	1.224	1.137	
O2i O3o O3o	1	1.170	1.143	1.258	
O2o O3o O3o	1	2.154	2.582	2.378	
O1i O2i O3o	1	0.659	0.800	0.739	
O1i O2o O3i	1	0.522	0.609	0.573	
O1o O2i O3i	1	0.404	1.087	1.036	
O1i O2o O3o	1	0.902	1.137	1.025	
O1o O2i O3o	1	2.785	3.249	3.033	
O1o O2o O3i	1	0.520	0.886	0.721	
O1o O2o O3o	1	0.898	1.171	1.044	

Table S5: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of hydrogen in $(3H)'_{Si}$ as a function of pressure. Each arrangement is defined by the type of oxygen the hydrogen is bound to (O1, O2, O3) and whether it points inside (i) or outside (o) the vacancy with the lowest enthalpy possible for that arrangement listed in every case.

	0 GPa			5 GPa			10 GPa		
	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K	1000 K	1500 K	2000 K
R9	-2.179	-2.814	-3.198	-2.166	-2.934	-3.480	-2.124	-2.994	-3.678
R10	-0.959	-1.296	-1.680	-0.949	-1.311	-1.747	-0.951	-1.311	-1.776
R12	10.268	11.156	11.934	10.531	11.612	12.559	10.915	12.184	13.291
R13	25.757	32.592	40.442	26.195	32.219	39.363	27.542	32.586	38.873
R14	5.622	5.226	4.855	5.335	4.742	4.202	5.161	4.354	3.625
R15	7.092	8.211	9.304	6.988	8.275	9.528	6.868	8.272	9.668
R16	9.077	9.261	9.491	9.144	9.478	9.852	9.355	9.817	10.313
R17	20.114	21.857	23.571	19.619	21.462	23.365	19.206	21.056	23.068
R18	19.748	26.901	35.046	20.472	27.012	34.620	21.994	27.768	34.707
R19	9.077	9.261	9.491	9.144	9.478	9.852	9.355	9.817	10.313
R20	18.224	18.883	19.160	17.096	17.793	18.425	16.271	16.889	17.587
R21	36.437	39.543	43.304	37.252	41.554	45.818	39.306	43.776	48.399

Table S6: Reaction energies (in eV/f.u) for minor reactions as a function of pressure and temperature.

			[H ₂ O] _{bulk} wt. ppm							
Temp	Pressure	[Al ₂ O ₃] wt. ppm	1	5	10	25	50	100	250	500
•		10	1.349	1.005	1.017	1.074	1.201	1.509	2.665	5.213
		25	1.240	1.002	1.007	1.030	1.082	1.205	1.628	2.410
	F	50	1.161	1.001	1.004	1.016	1.042	1.105	1.317	1.684
	5	100	1.101	1.001	1.002	1.008	1.022	1.055	1.165	1.351
		250	1.052	1.000	1.001	1.004	1.010	1.024	1.073	1.155
		500	1.031	1.000	1.000	1.002	1.006	1.014	1.042	1.088
		10	1.001	1.013	1.032	1.094	1.194	1.380	1.892	2.702
		25	1.000	1.006	1.014	1.041	1.085	1.166	1.379	1.694
2000 V	10	50	1.000	1.003	1.008	1.023	1.048	1.093	1.212	1.384
2000 K	10	100	1.000	1.002	1.005	1.014	1.028	1.055	1.125	1.225
		250	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.007	1.015	1.029	1.066	1.119
		500	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.005	1.010	1.019	1.042	1.077
		10	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.005
	15	25	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.003
		50	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002
		100	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001
		250	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001
		500	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		10	1.003	1.024	1.054	1.149	1.300	1.581	2.373	3.711
		25	1.001	1.010	1.023	1.064	1.127	1.243	1.550	2.010
	5	50	1.001	1.005	1.013	1.035	1.069	1.133	1.297	1.534
		100	1.000	1.003	1.007	1.020	1.040	1.076	1.169	1.302
		250	1.000	1.002	1.004	1.010	1.020	1.039	1.086	1.153
		500	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.006	1.013	1.024	1.054	1.097
		10	1.001	1.004	1.007	1.014	1.023	1.040	1.079	1.134
		25	1.001	1.002	1.004	1.007	1.012	1.021	1.042	1.071
1500 K	10	50	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.005	1.008	1.014	1.027	1.046
1500 K	10	100	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.003	1.005	1.009	1.018	1.030
		250	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.002	1.003	1.005	1.011	1.018
		500	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.002	1.004	1.007	1.012
		10	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		25	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	15	50	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	15	100	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		250	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		500	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
1000 K	5	10	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.005	1.008	1.013	1.016
1000 K	5	25	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.003	1.005	1.008	1.011

		50	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.002	1.003	1.006	1.191
		100	1.002	1.006	1.010	1.020	1.034	1.057	1.113	1.104
		250	1.001	1.003	1.005	1.011	1.018	1.031	1.061	1.045
		500	1.001	1.002	1.004	1.007	1.012	1.020	1.027	1.027
	10	10	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.003	1.004	1.008	1.014
		25	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.003	1.005	1.009
		50	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.002	1.004	1.006
		100	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.003	1.004
		250	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.002	1.003
		500	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001	1.002
		10	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		25	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	15	50	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	15	100	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		250	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
		500	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table S7: (Al'_{Mg}/Al'_{Si}) as a function of Al content, pressure, temperature and water content. For most conditions these are identical $(Al'_{Mg} = Al'_{Si})$ which is the base state but at high temperatures, low pressures and low Aluminium large amounts of water changes this ratio significantly and in near linear fashion. In these conditions water concentration has a near linear effect on the ratio and thus measuring the ratio can tell you the water content.

			[H ₂ O] _{bulk} wt. ppm							
T	D	[TiO ₂]	1	5	10	25	50	100	250	500
Temp	Pressure	wt. ppm 10	1.882	1.189	0.894	0.514	0.240	-0.018	-0.328	-0.541
		25	1.901	1.206	0.910	0.527	0.250	-0.012	-0.325	-0.539
		50	1.930	1.234	0.936	0.548	0.265	-0.001	-0.320	-0.536
	5	100	1.983	1.285	0.984	0.589	0.297	0.020	-0.310	-0.531
		250	2.113	1.411	1.106	0.698	0.388	0.084	-0.279	-0.515
		500	2.269	1.566	1.259	0.846	0.523	0.192	-0.223	-0.486
		10	1.577	0.935	0.684	0.384	0.179	-0.012	-0.248	-0.418
		25	1.612	0.961	0.704	0.397	0.186	-0.007	-0.245	-0.416
		50	1.665	1.002	0.737	0.417	0.199	0.000	-0.242	-0.414
2000 K	10	100	1.757	1.078	0.799	0.458	0.226	0.016	-0.234	-0.410
		250	1.956	1.259	0.961	0.578	0.308	0.065	-0.212	-0.398
		500	2.165	1.462	1.157	0.749	0.443	0.154	-0.171	-0.377
	15	10	2.625	2.271	2.119	1.919	1.768	1.616	1.416	1.264
		25	2.628	2.272	2.120	1.919	1.768	1.617	1.416	1.264
		50	2.631	2.273	2.121	1.920	1.768	1.617	1.417	1.264
		100	2.637	2.276	2.122	1.921	1.769	1.617	1.417	1.264
		250	2.654	2.283	2.128	1.924	1.771	1.619	1.418	1.265
		500	2.683	2.296	2.137	1.929	1.775	1.621	1.419	1.266
	5	10	0.987	0.325	0.068	- 0.236	- 0.440	-0.628	-0.861	-1.029
		25	1.107	0.408	0.124	- 0.209	- 0.426	-0.621	-0.858	-1.027
		50	1.259	0.534	0.219	- 0.160	- 0.401	-0.609	-0.853	-1.025
		100	1.466	0.732	0.396	- 0.054	- 0.346	-0.582	-0.843	-1.020
		250	1.798	1.076	0.746	0.263	- 0.142	-0.487	-0.809	-1.004
		500	2.076	1.364	1.045	0.594	0.196	-0.271	-0.744	-0.975
		10	1.240	0.851	0.691	0.483	0.329	0.280	0.025	-0.151
1500 K		25	1.287	0.870	0.704	0.491	0.333	-0.028	-0.182	-0.336
	10	50	1.362	0.903	0.726	0.504	0.177	-0.027	-0.181	-0.335
	10	100	1.498	0.969	0.771	0.529	0.182	-0.024	-0.179	-0.335
		250	1.790	1.151	0.903	0.609	0.192	-0.019	-0.176	-0.333
		500	2.066	1.380	1.095	0.741	0.224	-0.003	-0.167	-0.328
		10	3.389	3.039	2.891	2.691	2.542	2.390	2.191	2.039
		25	3.393	3.043	2.893	2.694	2.543	2.391	2.192	2.040
	15	50	3.394	3.043	2.894	2.694	2.543	2.392	2.192	2.040
		100	3.395	3.044	2.894	2.694	2.543	2.392	2.192	2.040
		250	3.398	3.045	2.895	2.695	2.543	2.392	2.192	2.039

		500	3.403	3.049	2.896	2.695	2.543	2.392	2.192	2.039
		10	1.882	1.189	0.894	0.514	0.240	-0.018	-0.328	-0.541
		25	1.901	1.206	0.910	0.527	0.250	-0.012	-0.325	-0.539
	F	50	1.930	1.234	0.936	0.548	0.265	-0.001	-0.320	-0.536
	5	100	1.983	1.285	0.984	0.589	0.297	0.020	-0.310	-0.531
		250	2.113	1.411	1.106	0.698	0.388	0.084	-0.279	-0.515
		500	2.269	1.566	1.259	0.846	0.523	0.192	-0.223	-0.486
	10	10	1.577	0.935	0.684	0.384	0.179	-0.012	-0.248	-0.418
		25	1.612	0.961	0.704	0.397	0.186	-0.007	-0.245	-0.416
1000 K		50	1.665	1.002	0.737	0.417	0.199	0.000	-0.242	-0.414
1000 11		100	1.757	1.078	0.799	0.458	0.226	0.016	-0.234	-0.410
		250	1.956	1.259	0.961	0.578	0.308	0.065	-0.212	-0.398
		500	2.165	1.462	1.157	0.749	0.443	0.154	-0.171	-0.377
		10	2.625	2.271	2.119	1.919	1.768	1.616	1.416	1.264
		25	2.628	2.272	2.120	1.919	1.768	1.617	1.416	1.264
	15	50	2.631	2.273	2.121	1.920	1.768	1.617	1.417	1.264
	15	100	2.637	2.276	2.122	1.921	1.769	1.617	1.417	1.264
		250	2.654	2.283	2.128	1.924	1.771	1.619	1.418	1.265
		500	2.683	2.296	2.137	1.929	1.775	1.621	1.419	1.266

Table S8: Log of $(Ti_{Si}^{X}/Ti_{Mg}^{"})$ as a function of Ti content, pressure, temperature and water content. Adding water decreases this ratio by making more $\{Ti_{Mg}^{"}(2H)_{Si}^{"}\}$, adding more Ti or increasing the temperature increases this ratio, changing the pressure has varied effect depending upon temperature. The effect of water on the value is nearly linear within a set P, T and Ti concentration for all conditions and thus measuring this ratio is a good measurement of water concentration.

	Static			1500 K			Key	
	0 GPa	5	10	0	5	10	Concentration (0 GPa 1500 K)	Conclusion
	0 01 0	5	10	not	not	not	Gru 1900 R)	Conclusion
$Al^{\bullet}_{Mg}+(1H)'_{Mg}$	-0.68	-0.82	-0.83	examined	examined	examined	7200.548	Unbound
$Al'_{Si}+H_{Int}$	-2.26	-2.48	-2.55	-1.68	-2.00	-2.11	1127.549	Unbound
				not	not	not		
$Al_{Mg}^{\bullet}+(3H)_{Si}^{\prime}$	-0.93	-0.95	-0.95	examined	examined	examined	3020.346	Unbound
				not	not	not		
$Ti_{Mg}^{"} + (2H)_{Si}^{"}$	-5.00	-5.69	-5.74	examined	examined	examined	< 0.01	Bound

Table S9: Binding energy of some defect pairs. $Al'_{Mg} + Al'_{Si}$ is R10 (Table S6) and 2 *

 $Al_{Mg}^{\cdot}+V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}$ is R9 (Table S6). In each case we present the energy and then a key concentration which is the concentration at which the preference goes from unbound to bound pairs in a simplified system in which only these defects exist and they behave perfectly.

			Ti+Al
			concentration
Depth	Temp	Pressure	(oxide wt.
(km)	(K)	(GPa)	ppm)
0	1575.00	0.00	488.27
25	1586.28	0.83	370.43
50	1597.56	1.67	282.35
75	1608.84	2.50	216.21
100	1620.12	3.34	166.30
125	1631.40	4.17	128.47
150	1642.68	5.01	99.67
175	1653.96	5.84	77.65
200	1665.24	6.68	60.74
225	1676.52	7.51	47.70
250	1687.80	8.35	37.60
275	1699.09	9.18	29.75
300	1710.37	10.01	23.63
325	1721.65	10.85	18.83
350	1732.93	11.68	15.07
375	1744.21	12.52	12.09
400	1755.49	13.35	9.74
410	1760.00	13.69	8.94

Table S10: Details of our geotherm and the concentration of products along it. These points were achieved by extrapolation from Ono (2008) whereas those of Al concentration were from solving equation 13 in De Hoog et al. (2010) adjusted for Al_2O_3 weight. TiO₂ was set to the same as Al_2O_3 weight. All runs along a geotherm used these points, for some runs additional points were necessary for smoothing and these were determined by interpolating between the 3 nearest points.

		Energy (eV)		
Arrangement	Degeneracy	0 GPa (corrected)	5	10
M1a-Si	1	0.315	0.323	0.329
M1b-Si	1	0.001	0.000	0.000
M1c-Si	1	0.000	0.000	0.000
M1d-Si	1	0.315	0.323	0.329
M2a-Si	1	0.128	0.063	0.006
M2b-Si	1	0.356	0.305	0.259
M2c-Si	1	0.340	0.294	0.255
M2d-Si	1	0.331	0.284	0.242

Table S11: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of $\{Al_{Mg}Al'_{Si}\}$. In each case the Al_{Mg} was on a nearest neighbour or a next nearest.

Arrangement	Degenerac y	0 GPa (corrected)	Arrangemen t	Degenerac y	0 GPa (corrected)
M1-M1-M1	1	0.941	M2-M2-M2	1	2.249
M1-M1-M1	1	0.085	M2-M2-M2	4	2.181
M1-M1-M1	4	1.356	M2-M2-M2	4	1.946
M1-M1-M1	4	1.008	M2-M2-M2	4	1.966
M1-M1-M1	4	0.736	M2-M2-M2	4	1.931
M1-M1-M1	4	0.614	M2-M2-M2	4	2.276
M1-M1-M1	4	0.634	M2-M2-M2	4	1.841
M1-M1-M1	4	1.128	M2-M2-M2	2	1.758
M1-M1-M1	2	1.057	M1-M2-M1	4	1.799
M2-M1-M2	2	0.669	M1-M2-M1	2	1.789
M2-M1-M2	4	0.614	M1-M2-M1	1	1.623
M2-M1-M2	2	0.742	M1-M2-M1	4	1.503
M2-M1-M2	2	0.590	M1-M2-M1	4	1.461
M2-M1-M2	4	0.356	M2-M2-M1	4	2.008
M2-M1-M2	1	0.000	M2-M2-M1	4	2.210
M2-M1-M1	4	0.969	M2-M2-M1	4	1.895
M2-M1-M1	4	0.757	M2-M2-M1	4	2.268
M2-M1-M1	4	0.562	M2-M2-M1	4	2.026
M2-M1-M1	8	0.541	M2-M2-M1	2	1.871
M2-M1-M1	2	0.506	M2-M2-M1	2	1.754
M2-M1-M1	2	0.081	M2-M2-M1	4	1.723
M2-M1-M1	8	0.949	M2-M2-M1	4	1.778
M2-M1-M1	8	0.820	M2-M2-M1	4	1.870
M2-M1-M1	4	0.697	M2-M2-M1	4	2.029
M2-M1-M1	4	0.540	M2-M2-M1	4	1.625
M2-M2-M2	1	2.292	M2-M2-M1	4	1.793

Table S12: Relative enthalpy of different arrangements of $\{Al_{Mg}^{\cdot} - V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime} - Al_{Mg}^{\cdot}\}$. Only enthalpy at 0 GPa was considered but considering the high relative enthalpy of nearly all arrangements except for 3 it is unlikely pressure or temperature has an effect on the configurational entropy. In each case a Al_{Mg}^{\cdot} was placed in an M1 or an M2 site, $V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}$, was placed in a next-nearest site and then Al_{Mg}^{\cdot} in a next nearest site to the $V_{Mg}^{\prime\prime}$. The most stable arrangements have all three sites in a single line.

		0 GPa	5	10
$(2H)^{X}$	M1	0.000	0.000	0.000
$(2\Pi)_{Mg}$	M2	0.626	0.687	0.729
(1H)'	M1	0.000	0.000	0.000
(111) _{Mg}	M2	0.848	0.909	0.951
	01	0.000	0.000	0.000
H_{Int}^{\cdot}	O2	0.326	0.301	0.275
	03	0.326	0.299	0.275
$V_{*}^{\prime\prime}$	M1	0.000	0.000	0.000
•мg	M2	1.117	1.199	1.250
	M1	0.000	0.000	0.000
	I2 Static	-0.004	-0.155	-0.237
$Mg_{I}^{\bullet \bullet}$	I2 1000 K	0.315	0.209	0.192
	I2 2000 K	0.468	0.372	0.378
	I2 1000 K	0.623	0.524	0.543
Al^{\bullet}_{Mg}	M1	0.000	0.000	0.000
	M2	0.012	-0.055	-0.107
	01	2.269	2.327	2.367
$V_0^{\bullet\bullet}$	O2	0.806	0.731	0.655
	03	0.000	0.000	0.000
	I1	1.203	1.180	1.156
	I2	0.015	0.016	0.016
	T1	1.487	1.542	1.609
$O_I^{\prime\prime}$	T2	0.000	0.000	0.000
	T3	0.015	0.017	0.015
	T4	0.741	0.889	1.027
	T5	0.017	0.018	0.016
	I1	4.130	4.122	4.114
	I2	1.927	1.821	1.978
	T1	0.279	0.000	0.000
<i>Si</i> _{<i>I</i>}	T2	1.660	1.519	1.641
	T3	0.000	0.149	0.530
	T4	0.000	0.150	1.654
	T5	3.010	3.246	3.482

Table S13 Relative Enthalpy of different defects in different crystallographic sites- for sites containing hydrogen this is in their most stable arrangement. For $Mg_I^{\bullet\bullet}$ temperature variation is also shown to relative to the M1 site which is always set to 0. For definition of the O and Si interstitial sites see Muir et al. (2020).

- DE HOOG, J. C. M., GALL, L. & CORNELL, D. H. 2010. Trace-element geochemistry of mantle olivine and application to mantle petrogenesis and geothermobarometry. *Chemical Geology*, 270, 196-215.
- MUIR, J., ZHANG, F. & WALKER, A. M. Submitted. The Controls of Pressure and Water on Highly Anisotropic Mg Diffusion in Forsterite., Preprint available at <u>https://doi.org/10.31223/osf.io/ck3af</u>.
- MUIR, J. M. R., JOLLANDS, M., ZHANG, F. W. & WALKER, A. M. 2020. Explaining the dependence of M-site diffusion in forsterite on silica activity: a density functional theory approach. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals*, 47.
- ONO, S. 2008. Experimental constraints on the temperature profile in the lower mantle. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 170, 267-273.
- QIN, T., WENTZCOVITCH, R. M., UMEMOTO, K., HIRSCHMANN, M. M. & KOHLSTEDT, D. L. 2018. Ab initio study of water speciation in forsterite: Importance of the entropic effect. *American Mineralogist*, 103, 692-699.
- WALKER, A. M., HERMANN, J., BERRY, A. J. & O'NEILL, H. S. C. 2007. Three water sites in upper mantle olivine and the role of titanium in the water weakening mechanism. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Solid Earth*, 112.